Understanding the Teaching Experiences of New

Tenure Track University Professors

Jamie Caron

Mount Saint Vincent University

A thesis submitted to Mount Saint Vincent University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, in partial

fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Lifelong Learning, June 2020

Thesis Supervisor: Dr. Patricia Gouthro

Committee Member: Dr. Ardra Cole

Table of Contents

Abstract

As universities face increased competition to attract and retain students, greater attention is being paid to the quality of teaching in higher education. This thesis uses a small qualitative study to explore how two new tenure-track professors in fields outside of Education describe their experiences in learning to teach and navigate the first few years of a tenure-track position at their small, undergraduate universities located in Atlantic Canada. Data from qualitative semi-structured interviews were gathered and thematically analyzed. The participants' perceptions of learning to teach were explored by looking at how they acquired teaching and learning strategies, interacted with students, navigated the tenure-track process, and managed the competing demands of the job. This qualitative analysis drew upon critical theory to consider how higher education contexts are shaped by neoliberal expectations. In addition, the analysis discussed the importance of preparing faculty to address issues of diversity and inclusion in their teaching. The nature of professorial work is demanding, and the teaching loads of those working in primarily undergraduate universities in tenured or tenure-track positions are quite heavy. Therefore, having prior practical teaching experiences and instructional opportunities from Teaching and Learning Centres during their doctoral studies was beneficial to the new professors interviewed in this study, since they had little time for professional development once hired to a tenure-track position. As learning to teach requires some trial and critical reflection, new faculty would benefit from a reduced teaching load. Rich insights were shared about the experiences of new faculty learning to teach, which may further inform university centres for teaching and learning, doctoral students considering professorial careers, and university policymakers and decisionmakers.

Chapter One – Introduction

At the beginning of a tenure track professor's career, she must quickly and concurrently learn to be a colleague to other more experienced faculty, acclimatize to the culture of the institution, start a body of research, and learn how to teach. Teaching is an art as well as a science and the way in which new university faculty learn how to teach is the focus of this study. Certainly, classroom-teaching is a skill that is developed over time through lived experience (Kugel, 1993). Yet, new faculty are often held to the same standard as veteran teachers by their students the moment they enter the classroom. The pressures felt by university professors to convey their expertise—in a meaningful way so that students are more likely to learn—come from many different sources. These demands are felt by new university professors when they plan their first semester of teaching, apply for reappointment or when they receive student evaluations for the first time (to name a few of many instances that can cause added stress to new faculty adjusting to their chosen career). Despite the external and internal pressures new faculty experience, most university professors have no formal training in teaching, and it is unclear how they develop the skills necessary to facilitate student learning. More information is needed to understand if universities in Canada adequately prepare doctoral graduates for teaching-related activities, and to determine whether primarily undergraduate higher education institutions provide sufficient time and support for new faculty to develop pedagogical skills.

Teaching and learning have become a focal point for me as I continue to develop and grow as a new academic. My personal experiences shape who I am and have drawn me to this topic. Studying Business Administration was the first experience I had as a student in a post-secondary setting. Throughout my undergraduate studies, I was fascinated with the broad range of teaching strategies I experienced as a learner. In some courses, Business faculty were very

enthusiastic, passionate and took risks in their teaching. Other classes were delivered in a traditional lecture-style by faculty who appeared (to me) somewhat disinterested with teaching. A decade later I began deeply engaging with educational theory when I returned to university to do a Bachelor of Education and a Masters in Graduate Studies in Lifelong Learning. Through my studies in Education, debates about teaching and learning resonated with me and I developed a better understanding for how post-secondary institutions are structured.

In addition to my experiences in higher education as a student, I have also been motivated to explore this topic further due to personal relationships. Throughout my master's degree in Education, I was fortunate to have many conversations with my brother who was entering the realm of professorship. The combination of his journey and my newfound interest led to many discussions between the two of us about how new faculty prepare to become educators on top of the many other duties professors have. Our discussions led me to question how new professors in fields outside Education, with no formal teacher training, learn to teach. These discussions also made me reflect on my time as a learner in the undergraduate Business program. As a result of these connections, exploring how new faculty learn to teach has become the primary area of interest within teaching and learning that excites me. In this thesis I argue that new faculty should be given better supports in developing their own capacities as educators during their doctoral studies and when they are hired into new faculty positions.

Overview of Research Study

The purpose of this qualitative study is to gain insights from new professors into their experiences of learning to teach at Canadian "teaching universities" that have primarily undergraduate programs. To accomplish this, I interviewed two participants who are tenure-

track faculty members working in the first three years of their professoriate careers at Canadian teaching universities. I investigate the extent to which these newly-hired, tenure-track faculty members—recruited specifically because they did not study in the field of Education—describe their readiness to assume full-time teaching responsibilities at Canadian "teaching-universities".

Universities that are not equipped with large research centres tend to have smaller student-populations and are often referred to as teaching universities. Sometimes they are also called "primarily undergraduate" universities (Gopaul, Jones, Weinrib, Metcalfe, Fisher, Gingras, & Rubenson, 2016, p. 60) in the literature. Faculty who are hired to work in these institutions often have larger teaching loads (usually 3 to 5 classes per year), but whether they are well-prepared for this aspect of their work is a concern.

The goal of this research is to examine the experiences of Canadian university professors entering their first few years of teaching in a tenure-track position in teaching-universities. I chose to interview participants that do not have a background in Education since professors who have studied in the field of Education have familiarized themselves with pedagogical theories and may be comfortable with the idea of teaching. The purpose of intentionally excluding professors of Education is to better understand how the vast majority of university professors, who often have minimal exposure to teaching, learn the craft.

By doing interviews with two recently hired professors, I was able to gain insights into how new faculty acquire classroom teaching skills. While I had hoped to have one or two more participants involved in my research study, the interviews I was able to secure provided rich perspectives of teaching in undergraduate courses at Canadian universities. Other beneficial information revealed through the interviews relates to how participants experience university supports in the development of their teaching practice. It appears that the participants' eagerness

to teach directly connects to the types of supports they receive. Since all university professors on a tenure track must complete a Ph.D., an additional consideration in this thesis is to identify the development process of teaching skills gained during Ph.D. programs as teaching methods, lesson-planning, and educational theory are not generally included as part of the formal curriculum for graduate students in Canadian doctoral programs in fields outside of Education.

By using a qualitative approach and conducting interviews with newly hired tenure-track professors, this research focuses on the teaching-aspects of their job. Increasingly, institutions are beginning to feel the pressure to develop the teaching skills of their faculty (Austin & McDaniels, 2006) and, "many experienced faculty [say they] wish they had received teacher training during their graduate education to avoid the many pitfalls of the 'learn by doing' approach" (Kenny et al., 2014, p.3). Historically, developing teaching skills for university professors has been largely avoided in Ph.D. programs, where, "doctoral students in all fields (including arts and sciences, engineering, social sciences, and humanities)…shared concerns that an overemphasis on research in their programs led to inadequate preparation for teaching, curriculum planning" (Abell, Rogers, Hanuscin, Lee & Gangon, 2009, p.147.). This lack of support for developing teaching skills is further reinforced by limited faculty development supports currently in place in many primarily undergraduate institutions, along with the policies in collective agreements at different Canadian universities which tend to emphasize the importance of research – points that will be examined in more detail in later chapters.

When new faculty are hired into a tenure-track position at a university, they are working towards a permanent position. Becoming tenured is often achieved through a five-year probationary period along with a re-appointment process. Upon their initial hiring, it is common for new faculty to be told that they should be prepared to allocate their time following the

traditional "40-40-20 guideline" (Bennet, Roberts, Ananthram & Broughton, 2018). This states that one should spend forty percent of their time on research-related activities, forty percent on teaching activities and twenty percent performing service-related duties. Teaching expectations in Canadian universities vary depending on the institution and the department one is working in. This thesis also includes a discussion of different collective agreements from primarily undergraduate universities in later chapters, noting that institutions often range in their expectations regarding faculty workload.

The time spent on planning, executing, reflecting and refining one's teaching practice is shaped by expectations that universities have for their faculty. In some cases, universities have explicitly and formally written policies stating that professors will spend forty percent of their time on teaching related activities while at work. Universities who do not have this definition of time allocation formally written in their contracts may rely more on leadership and senior faculty to create culture of engagement in teaching. Once again, higher education institutions have significant differences between them, as is evident through observing each university's culture, policies, or a combination of both. The culture and policies of an institution may affect the time faculty dedicate to improving their teaching performance, and this perhaps answers the questions of why some professors spend a lot of their time with teaching while others do not.

Personal preferences also play a significant role in this decision about allocating time towards teaching. Gopaul et al. (2016) conducted a quantitative study that presents faculty members' perceptions of the work they do in Canadian universities in which they found that some faculty view teaching as a wonderful experience and relish each opportunity in the classroom, while others view teaching as a burden and a drain on their time; an activity that requires a lot of energy which could be better served doing research. The following is an excerpt

from their study based on the question, "regarding your own preferences, do your interests lie

primarily in teaching or in research?" (p. 68):

> Respondents heavily favoured an investment in both teaching and research, as
>
> reported by 80% of respondents; however, importantly, 54% of total respondents
>
> indicated that their interests lay in both teaching and research but leaned toward
>
> research, while 26% said they were interested in both teaching and research but
>
> favoured teaching. This finding is not surprising, given professional and institutional
>
> emphasis on research activity, including the practice of awarding grants based, in part,
>
> on the applicants' excellence in achieving sustained and robust research trajectories
>
> (p. 68).

Considering the wide range of expectations and personal preferences in higher education, my

study attempt**s** to understand the experiences of new professors working in Canadian teaching-

universities as they navigate learning how to teach while managing the other expectations of

their work.

Developing a relationship with the participants is important and can be difficult in a one-

This study is an unfunded master's thesis where ideally, I would have had three or four

participants. The rationale for interviewing more than one person is to have a more rigorous

exploration into the matter while having multiple data sources (Baxter, 2008, p. 554). Further to

that, limiting the number of participants is important since "fewer interviews that are thoroughly

analyzed are preferable" (Brinkmann, 2013, pp.59) in order to garner a strong data set. Even

though this research ended up with a smaller sample than desired (two), the interviews yielded

significant information.

Developing a relationship with the participants is important and can be difficult in a one-

hour interview; however, the data were strong, thus indicating that a relationship between the

interviewer and each participant was fostered in a short period of time. In addition, by doing face-to-face interviews the data tend to be more robust since often more intimate information is shared (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011, p. 182). DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree (2006) discuss how interviews are intentionally personal. A strategy I used to develop a relationship was to reveal to each participant why I am engaged in this topic, as I have in the introduction to this thesis, which allowed the process to feel more like a natural conversation. DiCicco-Bloom et al. (2006) discuss the importance of the relationship between the interviewer and the participant:

> Unlike the unstructured interviews used in traditional ethnography where rapport is developed over time, it is necessary for the interviewer to rapidly develop a positive relationship during in-depth interviews. The process of establishing rapport is an essential component of the interview (p.40).

When transcribing the audio recordings, it was clear that as the interviews progressed the answers became more colourful and detailed. By having in-depth conversations about the participants' experience as new university professors, excellent insights were shared on teaching methods, feedback models and assessment strategies, which will be discussed in later chapters.

It was also important to create a discussion with each participant about the university with which they are currently employed in order to set the context, since expectations can vary from employer to employer. Seeking information about topics such as: pressures from the institution, reward structures, workload expectations and teaching expectations provided valuable information about the contexts of this setting and this shared information created a more meaningful discussion with each participant. Perhaps more importantly, learning the participant's educational or professional history provides a greater understanding of a newly hired professors' comfort-level with teaching, since they reveal how their Ph.D. programs prepared them for

teaching at the university-level and how their current institutions support them in developing

their teaching skills.

I did a thematic analysis of the interviews, which enabled me (the researcher) to explore

the similarities and differences within and between the perspectives of the two faculty members

who participated in this study. I also approached each interview as if they were case studies, so

that each interview would be analyzed individually, prior to comparing the two.

Research Questions

The questions that guide this research are categorized into three broad topics. They were

carefully designed to allow me to first build a rapport with the participant, and then learn about

what brought them into the profession. The questions posed dealt with the new professors'

interest-level with respect to teaching and asked about how much time and care they take to

prepare for their classes. The three categories of topics the participants and I discussed were: the

professor's professional and personal background (how did they become professors?), the

participant's experience dealing with the competing demands of the job (how does teaching fit

into their professorial experiences?) and finally their understanding of the institution's

expectations.

<div align="center">

Context of University Teaching

</div>

This thesis research investigates how new professors navigate learning how to teach

while juggling their other work responsibilities. In this study I focus on faculty who teach in

smaller, "teaching focused" or "primarily undergraduate" universities in Canada. The students

who attend these classes pay their tuition with the assumption they will receive quality

instruction from their professors. Over fifty percent of Canadians aged twenty-four to sixty-five hold either a college diploma or a bachelor's degree (Statistics Canada, 2016), so, a large proportion of people attend post-secondary institutions in Canada. More and more Canadians are attending university, and roughly nine percent of them progress to take a master's or doctorate degree (Statistics Canada, 2016). Therefore, undergraduate studies are in high demand and there is competition among universities to attract students to their campuses. As a result, universities have to separate themselves from other institutions to offer a unique education or experience.

When a professor is hired and they have not spent time working or studying at this university, they may not initially grasp its unique culture. It is difficult for faculty to know exactly what expectations institutions have for them prior to starting a new tenure track job as they have many roles to fulfill at the university. It is equally difficult to assess how faculty believe they should prioritize their own job functions to meet the varied demands of their work. The participants of this study discuss familiarizing themselves with the collective agreement and having discussions with colleagues to make sense of what they should prioritize. It is possible that new faculty's' expectations sometimes do not match with those of the institution, or they are being provided with conflicting information from colleagues and peers. This research discusses how new faculty navigate these different structures from the experiences of two new faculty as they enter this complex workplace.

Professorial Work

Canadian university professors have three main job functions: research, teaching and service (Statistics Canada, 2018; Jones, Weinrib, Metcalfe, Fisher, Rubenson & Snee, 2012). With respect to research, professors are expected to "engage in research, scholarly or creative

work, to show scholarly integrity therein, and to endeavour to disseminate after the results of

their scholarship or exhibit the results of their creative work" (Mahon & Amelinckx, Lethbridge

Handbook, 2016, p.22). Teaching in the context of this paper refers to in-class instruction,

wherein the professor interacts with her students and helps them learn (Bain, 2011, p.5). Service

(sometimes referred to as administration) on the other hand, includes duties such as supervising,

mentoring and advising students to help them achieve their academic goals while serving on

committees to bolster the institution's community involvement or status (Mahon, 2016).

Supervising student's thesis work (for example) is an important form of teaching, but the

primary focus of this research study is on class-based teaching.

Although in class teaching is the focus of this research, it is important to acknowledge all

aspects of professorial work. The percentage of time that one must spend performing each job

function depends on the institutional and departmental focus as well as the size and culture of the

university. Canadian universities can be grouped into three institutional categories:

"medical/doctoral", "comprehensive", and "primarily undergraduate" (Gopaul et al., 2016, p.60).

Each type of institution has different priorities, for instance, at primarily undergraduate

institutions (e.g., St. Francis Xavier University), professors are expected to spend most of their

time teaching courses (e.g., 18+ credit hours/year). At "medical/doctoral" institutions (e.g.,

University of Toronto), professors are expected to spend most of their time on research

(publishing, developing an externally funded research laboratory, etc.) and they have lower

teaching loads. Therefore, the disparity in hours spent teaching in-class or thinking about

teaching is quite significant.

Faculty Collective Agreements

Collective agreements contain legal terminology and deliberate language around topics like employee rights and salaries. They also act as employee references, as they contain important policies that employees must follow. Whether intentional or not, collective agreements reveal institutional goals and indicate the culture that is reproduced at that university, as they contain guiding principles and parameters for faculty. For example, if an institution's collective agreement outlines that fulltime faculty should only teach one class per semester, then it is likely that faculty are expected to allocate more of their time to doing research. Sometimes the guidelines provided in collective agreements are vague and other times they are very specific. In Chapter Five of this thesis I review collective agreements from several Canadian universities. To provide a clearer picture of how university professors' responsibilities are drastically different, this thesis compares collective agreements of larger, medical/doctoral universities and primarily undergraduate institutions. Of course, no two documents are the same, as they are a reflection of an agreement between employers and employees to ensure working conditions are fair. It is useful to examine the language around promotion and how collective agreements define how "effective teaching" is assessed. This examination indicates institutional attitudes and shows how mixed messaging can take place as a result of expectations that are written in the collective agreements. Furthermore, details regarding workloads for new professors in these documents highlight the competing demands on professors' time. All of the above are significant to the daily lives of professors, and this has the potential to create high stress for new professors learning to navigate this system.

Centres for Teaching and Learning

At most universities there are available resources and dedicated faculty or staff to support teaching skill development for faculty. In fact, there are ninety-one Centres for Teaching and Learning (CTL) at post-secondary institutions across Canada (Forgie, Yonge and Luth, 2018, p.1). These centres operate under the assumption that faculty need support in order to grow their professional teaching practice. Centres for Teaching and Learning are areas on university campuses that are designated to enhance faculty's knowledge of pedagogy and teaching-related activities in order to enhance the learning-experience of the student body. CTLs often offer workshops and seminars on teaching (Kenny, 2014) that are based on the latest research. The staff at CTLs offer tutorials and evidence-based teaching strategies, services such as curriculum and program review, classroom observations, helpful resources (like guides to writing a teaching portfolio), and many even offer a teaching certificate (Kenny, 2014). At the outset, when CTLs began to appear at universities in Canada in the late 1960s (Grabove, Kustra, Lopes, Potter, Wiggers, & Woodhouse, 2012), they intended to support faculty for teaching-related activities through research-based knowledge. There is a broad range of services that CTLs offer their faculty and depending on the institution the services offered can vary as they cater to the needs of their university.

Centres for teaching and learning at primarily undergraduate universities often have less funding available and operate with fewer staff which creates challenges in supporting an entire university faculty. This is not an indictment on the centre's commitment to teaching and learning, nor an indication that faculty do not use the resources available to them. However, this demonstrates the conundrum of "teaching universities" where faculty have larger teaching loads than their counterparts (at research-universities), yet have less teaching supports and smaller,

often under-funded, CTLs. In addition, Canadian primarily undergraduate universities have a

reputation as being "teaching intensive", and market themselves as having features like small

classroom sizes for better instruction.

Theory Informing the Study

This thesis explores how new professors learn to teach students at primarily

undergraduate universities and draws upon critical theory to make sense of the effects of

neoliberalism that impact on the higher education context. In my analysis I also use critical

theory to better understand some of the challenges facing new faculty learning to teach in

university contexts that are shaped by increasing diversity and globalization.

Universities are expected to prepare students to gain critical thinking skills to enable

them to deal with new global challenges and complex societies and workplaces. Young, &

Sanago, (2019) argue that there is a need to address how teaching and learning takes place in

higher education contexts in Canada, stating that there has been a "knowledge explosion". The

researchers add that higher education institutions prioritize "how students learn and how to best

prepare them to live in this changing world" (p. 1). Campbell (2011) discusses a strategy that

Australian university policymakers have implemented to ensure that critical thinking is being

incorporated across all disciplines, "universities have been mandated to produce graduates with

core generic skills and attributes relevant to employers and the Australian community and are

committed to lifelong learning" (p. 487). Paying attention to trends like this one from other

countries can lend an understanding of how and what graduates expect to learn in a global

marketplace.

Diversity and migration are two other characteristics impacting upon current higher education contexts. Canadian university enrollment shows that international students hold over 14% of the seats across all disciplines and have increased enrollment by 42,387 between 2014 and 2018, (Statisics Canada, 2018). Further to this, female and gender unknown students occupy roughly 57% of the seats in Canadian universities (Statisics Canada, 2018). These statistics alone show trends in the increasing diversity of higher education classrooms in Canada. Newton, Miller- Newton et al. (2019) add that, "there is more diversity in the students who attend post secondary education…[and] there is increased pressure from the government, parents, and general public to make changes in the educational system at all levels" (p.1). Much of this pressure is due to globalization, and the apparent need for graduates to have a different set of skills than the students from previous decades.

Global economies require "global graduates" (Campbell, 2011) in an age where the skills one develops in an undergraduate degree are expected to fit the society they plan to contribute to and belong to. Robson (2011) discusses the "changing world" mentioned above with respect to higher education as it fits with employment. She says:

New forms of assessment have been developed to evaluate the skills, attributes, and intercultural competences required by employers in the global economy. These include generic capabilities such as open and reflective behaviors (Green & Olsen, 2003), self-management, conceptual, and analytical skills, and other competences considered necessary to life and work (p.622).

Canadian universities have to ensure their professors are prepared to teach a set of diverse learners, both in the sense that students increasingly come from diverse cultural backgrounds and students have diverse learning needs. This thesis will use aspects of critical educational theory to

explore how new university professors view their preparedness to take up critical issues around race, gender, and other variables that impact on identity.

Globalization has also affected higher education in Canada since it has made space for neoliberalism to shape educational contexts. Neoliberalism affects the way in which universities operate, and understanding the neoliberal agenda provides this research with a necessary foundation for analysing the data. Neoliberalism explains why higher education institutions create curricula that attempts to, "meet 'international standards', compete in the 'global market' and form partnerships with business and industry" (Gymera & Burke, 2018, p.2). These behaviours change the way higher education is taught and may also affect the way new professors learn to teach. The concern with a curriculum that is constructed to attend to the neoliberal mindset, Gymera et al. (2018) point out, is that it can, "silence complex inequalities and power relations" (p.1). One way of combating the potentially harmful effects of neoliberalism is to, "integrat[e] adult education teaching techniques into traditional pedagogy" (Halx, 2010, p.523). Having the knowledge of critical educational theories equips those in teaching positions in higher education to create spaces conducive of global citizenship, inclusion and enables critical thinking in those environments. Gaining the perspectives of professors early in their careers as they develop their scholarly practice is the goal of this thesis research. Using theory to contextualizes the data will provide clarity in the discussion in the subsequent chapters.

The following chapter is a review of the literature and the aforementioned theories are explored in greater depth. Chapter Three details the methodology that guided the research aspect of this study. Following, the Findings chapter has been broken down into three main themes and includes many quotations from the participants. After the data have been presented, Chapter Five analyses the data by maintaining the same three themes and drawing in research presented

in the literature review chapter. The final chapter outlines some concluding remarks based on

the analysis in the previous chapter.

Chapter Two – Literature Review

Within the complexities of the university environment, this thesis research explores how new faculty prepare to teach. The literature review begins with an examination of the concept of the "scholarship of teaching". This concept has been researched extensively in the field of higher education and has been influential in the development of the language, policies and strategies used by higher education institutions to support and assess teaching. Referencing the scholarship of teaching and learning, when examining the data collected from the participants, will add to the discussion and provide more clarity on how the language regarding teaching and learning has been taken up in higher education institutions, and offers insights into the rationale for developing teaching and learning centres in universities across Canada.

Following this section is a more general discussion on how teaching is currently learned, supported and assessed in higher education contexts. Next, I include a discussion of neoliberalism**,** to draw attention to the environment in which new faculty learn to teach in Canadian higher education institutions. Finally, I am interested in how the field of adult education and lifelong learning can contribute to our understanding of how new faculty learn to teach in university-based contexts. The research and theory related to critical pedagogy within the field of adult education/lifelong learning is helpful in exploring how power impacts on teaching and learning contexts for new faculty in terms of issues such as social class and identity issues, including race, gender, and sexual orientation. The literature also addresses the importance of generating amongst faculty an awareness of the increasing diversity within higher education, and concerns related to globalization, cultural competencies and inclusion issues. These are all factors that impact on how new faculty learn to teach.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

The "Scholarship of Teaching and Learning" (SoTL) is the erudite inquiry into student learning intended to improve teaching practices by publishing and sharing research. In most of the literature around SoTL, Ernest Boyer's (1990) seminal work on teaching in the tertiary context is often referenced. Boyer began a movement in higher education with his writings on the idea that, although one may "teach" course content, students have not necessarily "learned" the intended content. Thus, Boyer's work was one of the first to discuss the effectiveness (or lack thereof) of teaching methods in higher education institutions. In fact, his work has been taken up so widely that entire journals have been created on the topic, such as, *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.* In one paper, Boyer (1990) notes:

> What we need, then, in higher education is a reward system that reflects the diversity
>
> of our institutions and the breadth of scholarship, as well. The challenge is to strike a
>
> balance among teaching, research, and service, a position supported by two-thirds of
>
> today's faculty who conclude that, 'at my institution, we need better ways, besides
>
> publication, to evaluate scholarly performance of faculty.' (p. 34)

Here, Boyer suggests that more attention is needed when it comes to acknowledging "teaching and service" of the three pillars of a university professor's job function and universities should find a more effective way to evaluate their professor's overall performance.

The scholarship of teaching and learning is an approach to academic teaching that allows professors to inform their pedagogy and is intended to increase levels of student learning. Kreber (2002) suggests that shifting the way teaching is viewed in academe has been difficult for some universities as, "teaching continues to be undervalued at research-intensive universities despite numerous initiatives to provoke change" (p.5). As SoTL has grown as a

body of work, there has been extensive research on high-achieving professors; for example,

What the Best College Teachers Do, a book by Ken Bain (2011) that describes the habits of

excellent college teachers. Less attention has been given to the other professors who do not win

teaching awards. There are also fewer studies on how prolific researchers perform as teachers in

the classroom. Overall, it would be interesting to see more research related to what typical

university professors experience in learning how to teach, and how this translates to student

learning.

Often people only equate research to scholarship; however, the concept of

'the scholarship of teaching and learning*'*, developed by Ernest Boyer (1990) highlights that

teaching, in and of itself, is an important function of scholarly inquiry and practice. Gopaul et al.

(2016) say that trends in higher education suggest teaching intensive universities and research

centered institutions should be separated since many scholars feel the current model of university

is no longer sustainable because they feel that there are too many competing demands on their

time (Britnell, Brockerhoff-Macdonald, Carter, Dawson, Doucet, Evers , & Wilson, 2010; Austin

et al., 2006). Despite faculty who feel there is too much being demanded of them, some

Canadian university professors believe their research reinforces their teaching (Gopaul et al.

2016), and SoTL researchers suggest that a better balance needs to be found in higher education

teaching, where both teaching and research are acknowledged as being equal and complementary

activities. These points made by various researchers underline the importance of the scholarship

of teaching as an informed practice. Boyer (1990) believes that the top performing faculty have a

balanced approach to their craft. He notes, however, that university professors are largely

measured on their publications, while classroom teaching can be viewed as less important in the

eyes of the institution. Boyer maintains that there should no longer be a distinction between

teacher and researcher. Building on Boyer's (1990) work, Kreber (2002) discusses the importance of faculty from different disciplines publishing peer-reviewed research about teaching and learning strategies in credible academic journals and notes these contributions should be valued as a part of the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Some research discusses the impact of having a focus on SoTL where educators emphasize their work as teachers in an effort to improve their delivery methods that support critical thinking skills. An empirical study of twenty faculty in an Australian higher education institution by Trigwell, Martin, Benjamin, and Prosser (2000) selected twelve participants based on their interest or motivation to improve their teaching skills. To inform this study, Trigwell and colleagues used Boyer's description of SoTL, which should "both educate and entice future scholars by communicating the beauty and enlightenment at the heart of significant knowledge" (p. 155). The authors used a phenomenographic methodology, whereby they mapped out the various understandings of scholarly pedagogies by the participants. From the findings of their study, they created a model for describing SoTL in two "modules": (1) focus on the practice of scholarly teaching, and (2) focus on the communication of that scholarly teaching. From this perspective, other faculty can learn how SoTL works and can be applied practically.

Including the scholarship of teaching and learning in this literature review is intended to strengthen the examination of the data collected from the participants. Having reviewed research that explains different aspects of teaching and learning adds clarity to and supports the points raised by the participants about their experiences as educators. The motivation to improve one's teaching practice can vary based on individual preferences and the culture of the institution. In order to support teacher training at the university level, the scholarship of teaching and learning

is a useful framework for professors and universities, no matter the discipline, subject or institution.

Learning to Teach in Higher Education

As noted in the introduction of this thesis, tenure-track faculty in universities have competing demands on their time and as a result of this pressure, teaching can sometimes feel like a daunting task. When assessing a Canadian university professor's career trajectory through a traditional lens, engaging in research activities (including grant-writing and presenting and national/international conferences) is often how academics have advanced their careers, especially now in a job market where it is increasingly difficult to obtain a tenure-track position. Dennis, Valacich, Fuller & Schneider (2006) say that, "journal publication is a primary consideration in the promotion and tenure decision for faculty in the United States and Canada" (p.2). Altbach et al. (2009) support this idea when they say that research remains at the forefront of most institutional visions, which indicates that some universities prioritize research over teaching, especially when professors are being measured by the amount and the quality of their publications.

Despite the pressure to produce valuable research, in recent years there has also been an increased emphasis on student learning (Jones et al., 2012) and the need to improve the quality of university teaching. In response to these pressures, and ongoing debates about improving university teaching practices, the number of centres for teaching and learning across Canada have increased. This indicates that there may be a growing interest for teacher training at post-secondary institutions. Forgie et al. (2018) raise a very important point when they say, "in primary and secondary education, teachers are trained in learning theories and in how people

retain information, and it is becoming increasingly clear that the same should be true in post-secondary education" (p.1).

Providing professional development opportunities for faculty may enable them to develop stronger teaching skills. For many faculty, just being reflective of one's own teaching practices is not necessarily enough to create change in an educator's practice, assumptions or beliefs. Pekkarinen & Hirsto (2017) point out how difficult this can be for university professors:

> There can be obstacles that prevent teachers' reflections from turning into actions; for example, if teachers do not have a clear understanding of what reflection is or how to be reflective. Also, a lack of time or the nature of the knowledge in one's discipline may restrict a teacher from applying certain teaching methods. Even if time could be found, the lack of appreciation of teaching and the lack of support from academic managers and peers have been identified as significant limiting factors in pursuing scholarly activities in teaching and learning (p.737).

Pekkarinen et al. (2017) believe that the above mentioned "obstacles" can be overcome through what they refer to as "pedagogical training" (p.737). Their study observed new faculty participating in training that lasts nine months and they found that this experience enhanced university professors' understanding of educating at the post-secondary level. The researchers of this paper say that it is typical in Finland (as in Canada) that professors are drawn to the profession for their love of researching, and later "turn to teaching" (Pekkarinen, 2017, p.748). The authors note that, more recently, many Finnish universities are looking for faculty to be engaged in both research and teaching. This is most often the case in Canada as well, regardless of whether faculty find themselves in a teaching-intensive or research-intensive university, they are expected to perform both duties harmoniously.

An increase in the number of Centres for Teaching and Learning (CTLs) on campuses across Canada indicate an increased focus on faculty development in teaching. Since their establishment, some CTLs have had difficult relationships on their campuses. Forgie et al. (2018) indicate that CTLs in Canada are making great efforts to change the way they are perceived. In the past, some universities' faculty would view centres for teaching and learning as spaces for colleagues who are struggling with their teaching practice or in some cases for those who have received poor teaching evaluations (p.5). Canadian CTLs are now working to create a supportive environment where communities of people can come together to learn and share best practices, free from stigma.

Centres for Teaching and Learning in Canada at primarily undergraduate universities are sometimes challenged with budgetary constraints. What Lewis (2010) points out for primarily undergraduate universities in the United States, holds true in Canadian institutions as well. "A large number of centers in small to medium institutions in the United States often have one part-time director/coordinator and perhaps a part-time clerical staff person with several student assistants" (p. 21). This suggests that "teaching universities", whose faculty have larger teaching loads (than their counterparts at research-universities), are potentially offered less teaching supports from the teaching and learning staff. The difficulty this situation presents for primarily undergraduate universities, is the reputation they have for being "teaching intensive" institutions. In fact, there are many smaller Canadian universities who market their small classroom sizes as a strength in order to attract students to their campuses with a promise a more intimate learning experience.

An example of an institution that offers mainly undergraduate courses is the University of Northern British Columbia. The university's website encourages people to study at their institution since the "faculty to student ratio is 1:8" and the institution inspires people to, "experience UNBC—one of Canada's best small universities, where big opportunities await" (UNBC, 2018). By investigating a little further on their website one can also find that UNBC has a large contingent of full-time, part-time and casual faculty and only two staff members are listed on their CTL webpage (UNBC, 2018, accessed Feb 3, 2020). The UNBC Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology offers resources for faculty that are primarily accessed online. Furthermore, there are no workshops scheduled for the foreseeable future, even though the UNBC Collective Agreement indicates that a normal teaching load will be five classes per year (UNBC, 2018, p.128).

In contrast, Dalhousie University's Centre for Learning and Teaching is an example of a "medical/doctoral" university that offers extensive programming and support for its faculty. They have weekly events that faculty are invited to participate in with the intention of ameliorating faculty teaching practice. For example, they have an event called "Change One Thing Challenge" (Dalhousie, 2019, Events) where they have an "open invitation to the university teaching community to submit a description of a student engagement activity that has been developed as a part of their current teaching practice". A winner is selected by the review panel and a $1000 grant is available to the participant that submits the best example. Further to events like this one, they offer a Faculty Certificate in Teaching and Learning, a Certificate in University Teaching and Learning as well as a Teaching Assistant Enrichment Program. Faculty members at Dalhousie University can consult with the Centre to develop curriculum as well as participate in online learning activities and gain access to well-prepared online resources. This is

an example of a well-developed and well-funded CTL. Such extensive programming and

resources are not available at all ninety-one CTLs in Canada, though. As is evident, universities

with smaller student populations tend to have less funding and, therefore, have less resources

available to faculty.

The establishment of centres that provide teaching support to members of faculty are an

important resource for new professors, especially when, "tenure criteria clearly focuse[s] on

teaching and research" (Jones et al., 2012, p.198). CTLs, however, are not the only way in

which faculty learn to teach. Doctoral and post-doctoral studies often incorporate opportunities

for new scholars to develop their teaching skills. Kenny et. al (2014) say that, "over the past two

decades, there has been increased pressure to provide opportunities for graduate student

pedagogical development" (p.2). Doctoral programs are intended to be developmental, so

learning how to teach seems like a logical component to Ph.D. programs, even though not all

doctoral graduates will pursue professoriate positions. In a 2012 report from Statistics Canada

that investigated graduates from doctoral programs in Ontario, they say, "although most young

doctoral students still pursue a doctorate degree to become university professors, many

contemplate other career options outside of academia" (Desjardins, 2012, p. 7). Many graduates

do consider alternative careers to professorship, perhaps in part because it is becoming more

common for new professors to experience difficulties finding tenure-track jobs (Ross, Mah,

Biggar, Zwick & Modlinska, 2018). However, exposure to teaching and learning techniques

contributes to the development of broader skills that are useful in disseminating knowledge and

communication (Kenny, 2014). Thus, learned teaching skills may be beneficial to include in

higher learning contexts even for doctoral graduates who pursue careers outside of the

professoriate.

Learning how to teach is a lifelong journey where one is always in search of new techniques and refining one's practice through critical reflection. A lesson's successes or pitfalls are assessed through a process of critical reflection and different feedback models. Improving one's teaching practice may involve reading about the latest techniques and talking to or observing successful colleagues. Becoming an excellent teacher is not an inherent skill passed down via genetics. As Kreber (2002) says, "we now widely accept that it is possible for everyone to become a good teacher who exerts the effort, and we recognize the belief that good teachers are born not made as a myth" (p.9). Teaching is a focused skill that often only the most veteran of teachers may claim to attain its mastery.

The Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario's 2010 report on teaching development discussed how university educators are prepared for their teaching duties:

Faculty acquire their knowledge and skills about teaching throughout their professional lives, with a need for substantial support in the early years of their teaching career. Many learned through a hands-on approach during their graduate study years, as a teaching assistant or in a teaching assistant training program. There has been a movement away from "learn by doing" and an influx of more formal methods over recent years, largely as a result of programs, guidance and teaching development offered by centres for teaching and learning. Informal discussions with peers and access to a mentor early on were both identified as important aspects of one's growth as a teacher. (Britnell et al., 2010, p.49)

Learning to teach at Canadian universities appears to begin, for many professors, in their doctoral studies. Although this quotation indicates that there is a shift within universities to move away from the "learning by doing" model, where 93.3% of the respondents checked

the box "learned by doing (teaching)" in response to the question, "please indicate which of the following activities you engaged in at the beginning of your academic career" (Britnell et al., 2010, p.20). Therefore, since only in certain international countries is post-secondary teacher-training mandatory for professors (Jones et. al, 2012), professors in Canadian universities often approach higher education teacher training through other strategies such as learning by doing, observations and conversations from their peers/mentor, and through non-formal training contexts and programs, such as those offered by CTLs.

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2012) released a guide to quality teaching practices in higher education and put forward the following recommendations for supporting professors to improve the quality of their teaching in post-secondary institutions:

- A centre for teaching and learning development

- Professional development activities (e.g. in-service training for faculty)

- Teaching excellence awards and competitions for remarkable improvements

- Teaching innovation funds

- Teaching recruitment criteria

- Support to innovative pedagogy

- Communities of teaching and learning practices

- Learning environments (libraries, computing facilities…)

- Organization and management of teaching and learning

- Support to foster student achievement (e.g. counselling, career advice, mentoring…)

- Students' evaluation (i.e. programme ratings, evaluating learning experiences)

- Self-evaluation of experimentations, peer-reviewing, benchmarking of practices

- Community service and work-based programmes, development-based programmes

- Competence-based assessments (p.7).

These recommendations are helpful to universities in that they list a number to support faculty in developing their teaching skills.

Understanding how professors can learn to teach is complicated, as there is not one single way for faculty to develop as educators, in fact there are many different ways that new professors can go about acquiring the necessary skills. At the same time, it is important to be aware of the complexities of the higher education context in which new faculty are learning to teach.

Neoliberalism

In order to make sense of the environment within which professors work, I include a discussion around neoliberalism as it pertains to the Canadian university environment. First, I discuss how neoliberalism is an ideology that influences policies and attitudes that affect Canadian institutions. To define "neoliberalism" in the most simplistic way possible: it is an economic and social theory that promotes the reduction in government control and the reduction of government spending (on important societal levers such as education). Neoliberalists would say that the most efficient economy exists in a true free market, with an increased focus on free trade, privatization, globalization and reduced public spending on various social services (Harvey, 2010). Privatizing governmental structures that are a part of the social responsibility of the government (or lowering the government's contributions) will increase competition in this overall marketplace, which includes higher education and the institutions that house higher learning.

Those in favour of neoliberalism say that non-government intervention in higher

education is intended to be for the benefit of all stakeholders. This ideology can be credited to

Frederich Von Hayek (1944), who believed increasing competition was the only way to ensure

that governments will not have too much control of its people. Von Hayek would say that pitting

two schools against one another (increasing competition) would produce the strongest schools

that provide the best education and produce the top students with the highest degree of

knowledge. Von Hayek (1944) says:

> The liberal argument is in favour of making the best possible use of the forces of
>
> competition as a means of co-ordinating human efforts, not an argument for leaving
>
> things just as they are. It is based on the conviction that where effective competition
>
> can be created, it is a better way of guiding individual efforts than any other. It does
>
> not deny, but even emphasises, that, in order that competition should work
>
> beneficially, a carefully thought-out legal framework is required, and that neither the
>
> existing nor the past legal rules are free from grave defects. Nor does it deny that
>
> where it is impossible to create the conditions necessary to make competition
>
> effective, we must resort to other methods of guiding economic activity. Economic
>
> liberalism is opposed, however, to competition being supplanted by inferior methods
>
> of coordinating individual efforts. (p.37)

Von Hayek wrote this book near the conclusion of World War Two, in which he argued that this

approach to developing the economic and social systems were the best way forward. This

ideology proved to be very influential. It was well intentioned and very successful, as

neoliberalism thrives today, crosses over political parties and is deeply ingrained in Canadian

culture.

Increasingly, however, critical theorists in Education argue that neoliberalism has a

detrimental impact upon higher education contexts. It seems that money fuels education, but what tends to be more complex is understanding how this impact on higher education where provincial and federal governments have reduced their stake in universities. Critical educator, Henry Giroux (2014) says, "critical thinking has been replaced with mastering test-taking, memorizing facts, and learning how *not* to question knowledge or authority" (p.4), which he attributes to neoliberal discourse that is hyper-focused on consumerism. This applies to the decision makers within universities who are being questioned as to whether or not they are providing spaces for students to engage in critical thinking. Giroux (2014) also discusses how corporate sponsors have been influencing institutions and he posits that it has gone so far as to affect the university curriculum. He argues that universities are now receiving content that will benefit corporations' interests.

Since a neoliberal philosophy is to blame for increasing competition and decreasing government intervention, university organizational structures have begun to mimic that of a business. In the last number of years there are fewer tenure-track jobs available (Ross et al., 2018), as academic labour is increasingly casualized. In addition, deans are being paid like CEOs and even being referred to in the literature as "academic executives" (Mang, 2019, p.24).

From Giroux (2014), we see that there is a systematic issue that removes critical pedagogy from higher education institutions so that students can become good "corporate citizens", while universities gain financial wealth. The commodification of knowledge (or students being treated as customers) is a fundamental flaw in the system and, as a result of this phenomenon, students simply want to finish their degree so that they can gain employment. Likewise, Canadian higher education institutions are appearing to operate more like businesses and, "might move towards a profit-maximizing [tuition] price if allowed to" (Easton, &

Rockerbie, 2008, p.196). As it stands, universities in Canada and are largely reliant on increasing the number of student enrollment and government grants to generate revenues. Since they are pressed financially, universities in Canada are seeking more opportunities to procure or generate revenue streams.

Some critical educators argue that universities are not as successful as they once were with teaching critical thinking skills (Chan, 2016) and this may be due to the neoliberal agenda that has institutions prioritizing revenues. On the other side of the same issue, students are increasingly less interested in learning critical thinking skills due to this neoliberal phenomenon. Students are becoming focused on achieving credentials that allow them to gain employment to earn better wages. Unfortunately, this may mean that students will neglect to advocate for a critical component of the higher education model, which is, to learn how to objectively analyze issues and question normative modes of thinking.

Furthermore, the Canadian Government has created policies that guide citizens to use education as a way to earn employment and bolster the economy. Spencer et al. (2013) state that "once upon a time it was the role of the government to provide for the needs of universities; but now universities are deemed to provide for the needs of government" (p. 30). What gets lost in this complex web, is that universities concentrate less on teaching liberal arts and criticality. The purpose of a university degree is shifting from an emphasis on "higher learning" toward acting as a credential-producing machine for individuals and businesses. Jarvis (2000) warns of this when he says, "universities are increasingly behaving like corporations" (p.63). In many cases, it is true that people choose to attend university perhaps not to learn more critical thinking skills, or to become a more socially just person, but to earn a higher wage or to transition into a more desirable vocation. When analysing transitions from school to work, graduates are sometimes

unprepared for the world but are prepared for their vocation. Universities and other higher education institution outcomes are not necessarily focused on creating social awareness with the community, but to prepare people for the working world.

When business and education crossover, the resulting education can be impacted insofar as education is treated as a commodity. When this happens, the relationship shifts from teachers and students, to a customer transaction construct. This directly affects the way in which faculty learn to teach and how their teaching is evaluated. For example, Guolla (1999) set out to better understand student satisfaction in introductory marketing classes. He specifically wanted to look into teaching quality and instructor satisfaction levels. He applied a customer satisfaction research model to this study, where students are considered to be customers since, "satisfaction with an educational product/service is one outcome of the exchange between instructors and students" (p.90). He went on to outline four "roles" students can possibly play in this scenario: customers, clients, producers, or products. Viewing the role of educators or universities through this lens adds a layer of complexity to the relationship that students have with higher education. Guolla (1999) begins the paper by discussing a central finding to his research, that students correlated learning activities to course satisfaction (p.87). This result indicates the importance students place on learning "something". What this paper omits is "what" the students have learned, and "how" student learning is measured. Therefore, students are engaged in learning, but it is very difficult to have a clear understanding of whether or not professors are teaching students to develop their critical thinking capacities in their lectures/lessons or courses. Furthermore, it is somewhat problematic if a customer satisfaction model is being applied to evaluate student engagement. This feeds into neoliberalism in higher education where students are seen by the institutions and view themselves as customers rather than students. This

perspective also has an impact on the feedback that new faculty will receive from students about their teaching.

Universities are placing more emphasis on student satisfaction and, as a result, universities are "enhancing consumer choice and control" (Naidoo, 2003, 252). By aligning themselves with the neoliberal agenda, universities are allowing students to view themselves as consumers and bolster competition between the institutions. The assumption is that universities will be:

> more responsive, flexible, efficient and [have] better-quality teaching more in tune
>
> with the labour market. However, research has indicated that the application of a
>
> business model to educational processes may have unintended pedagogical
>
> implications. The North American literature suggests that treating students as
>
> consumers has the potential to alienate them from the learning process. (Naidoo, 2003,
>
> p. 252)

Therefore, one can start to understand the shift in educational goals from what higher education historically was often intended to be (a place where learners are encouraged to develop deeper critical thought) to a vocational type of preparation. This is the result of increased pressures on higher education institutions to adhere to these demands, along with an over-dependence on student satisfaction surveys and credential-production. Most university educators would not reject the value of student evaluations; however, relying solely on this type of teaching-evaluation can be problematic.

What perhaps gets overlooked in this conversation around students' wants and needs are the consequences created by this current system, since the expectations universities have on professors do not necessarily align with professors' goals. Research is

often a central component to what university professors do, and what draws them to the profession in the first place (Pekkarinen, 2017, p.748). Some academics view research production as one of the priorities in their jobs (Jones, 2012), and the quality and quantity of publications, for like-minded professors, is the main measuring tool for knowing whether they are being productive or not. Anecdotally, we hear "publish or perish" in academic circles, which of course makes reference to the emphasis that is placed on publishing research in the culture of academic work. The work academics do is at times hectic, and the nature of the faculty positions available at Canadian universities is that these involve a lot of hard work. "The grinding combination of budget cuts, peer evaluation, the impetus to 'publish or perish,' …all speak not only to the transformation of the university into a pared-down teaching machine" (Haiven, 2010, p. 6). From this perspective, a "productive" academic is one who publishes frequently is awarded funding. This narrow notion of productivity is also a reflection of the effects of neoliberalism on higher education.

Jones et al. (2012) discuss the increased need to produce research in academic work on top of all the other responsibilities in their hectic jobs when they say, "the academic workplace is changing in response to the existence of new categories of employment, increasing student-faculty ratios, decreasing government support and new investments combined with increasing expectations in research" (p.190). Thus, all of the activities associated with teaching take a lot of time out of the professor's schedule (i.e. preparing the lecture, delivering it, marking and evaluating, and having office hours available for students). A university with a neoliberal mindset would view research output favourably and new professors working in an institution like that may be less attracted to investing their time in further developing teaching skills, especially if they are in pursuit of tenure.

Insofar as neoliberalism is impacting the way higher education is structured, this ideology is also impacting how course content is delivered. This complex ideology demonstrates when universities model themselves after businesses the priority shifts toward the employability of graduates and less emphasis is placed on critical issues that require deeper more meaningful thought. Holloway et al. (2011) discuss this point in the following quotation:

> The recent downturn in the economy has created a heightened sense of vulnerability that makes both academics and learners more susceptible to the influences of neoliberalism which encourages individualism and competition. Neoliberalism devalues a focus on critical thinking, considerations around diversity, and education that is centred on social justice, elevating instead the perceived 'needs' of the marketplace in shaping educational agendas. (p.33)

This is especially true when students are desperate to find employment, institutions are focused on research-related activities and tenure-track professors are eager to keep full-time permanent employment. This discussion illuminates the layered climate of higher education in Canada. Knowing that neoliberalism affects the way universities, students and professors interact is important for the analysis of the data, as the participants discuss their challenges in navigating the academy in their first three years of a tenure-track position.

Critical Education

Critical education theories investigate how power shapes teaching and learning contexts. New faculty will likely encounter issues around identity or social class throughout their careers since there is increasing diversity within higher education. The fields of adult education and

lifelong learning provide many different avenues that can be explored within critical pedagogy; for example, critical race theory, feminist perspectives, and Queer pedagogies. Even though there are a variety of critical theoretical frameworks, they share a similar set of beliefs in that they draw attention to how power influences education and shapes teaching practices. Brookfield (2015) says, "it calls into question the power relationships that allow, or promote, one particular set of practices over others" (p. 16). Earlier critical theory tended to focus on social class, and more recent critical theory expands these discourses to take up identity issues (e.g., racism).

Within the field of lifelong learning, attention has also been paid to the purpose of adult and higher education. Challenging a neoliberal framework, critical theorists argue that the education of adults should encompass more than just learning for the workplace, and often highlight the importance of learning connected to citizenship and civil society (Brookfield, 2017; Gouthro, 2002). Foley (2015) explains the four elements that make up critical pedagogy: "democracy of education", "the role of teachers as transformative intellectuals", "critical pedagogy and the reproductive role of schools" and "critical pedagogy and the role of culture" (p. 122). These characteristics reoccur throughout critical literature and place the onus on teachers, educational institutions, and society at large to begin thinking more critically about the world and their communities which make up that world. According to Foley, the function of critical pedagogy is to challenge the status quo or normative thought in society while appreciating and respecting those who are marginalized from the dominant class. To inspire citizens to be more mindful of local and global social injustices, one must be able to analyze and think deeper about these issues. Critical educators such as Foley would say that all educators have a moral duty to incorporate these critical practices into their teachings to foster the aforementioned intellectual skills in their students.

With regards to preparation for the workplace, educators drawing upon a critical pedagogical framework to address the expectation that learners must be capable of adapting to evolving technologies and shifting expectations for employees. The nature of employment has drastically changed over the last thirty or forty years. Altbach et al. say that producing a skilled labour force who are equipped to be lifelong learners is critical. Institutions and professors alike should not sacrifice the important role of instructing and developing expertise amongst learners in their classrooms (p.112). Students who enter into higher education institutions want to be prepared for less certain work environments upon graduation as the nature of work is quickly evolving (Altbach et al., 2009, p.111).

Spencer et al. (2013) provides an insightful analysis, which differentiates critical thinking and critical thought:

> Critical thinking implies such important abilities as recognizing faulty arguments, or generalizations and assertions lacking evidence, or truths based on unreliable authority (its often represented as an ability to problem solve) but it does not necessarily imply critically examining life itself or an examination of power and authority or the role of ideology. Whereas critical thought, according to critical theorists, begins by questioning belief systems and by asking who benefits from dominant ideas, its project is educational and emancipatory. (p.77)

A point worth exploring is raised here, where critical thinking and critical thought are sometimes viewed as one in the same. While Spencer et. al. (2013) distinguish the characteristics of these terms, neither critical thinking nor critical thought are a focus of the university curricula uniformly.

Educators who draw upon a critical theoretical framework draw attention to why both critical thinking and critical thought are so important to higher education. In a period of time where information is so quickly passed on through social media, traditional media and high-speed technological means, deciphering credible information has never been more important. Universities historically have been spaces that thrive on the reproduction of critical thinking and, "exist to educate students for lives of public service, to advance knowledge through research, and to develop leaders for various areas of the public service" (Chan, 2016, p.2). Yet in 2020, many institutions are shifting their focus and beginning to mirror corporate structures insofar as they are more concerned with the bottom line. Chan (2016) elaborates on this point:

> These profound changes, in turn, have shifted higher education worldwide from once
>
> a public good to now a private benefit, whereby colleges and universities have begun
>
> to operate as a corporate industry with predominant economic goals and market-
>
> oriented values, which has reduced higher education to a transactional process rather
>
> than maintaining its transformative potential. (p.2)

The purpose of challenging students is to think beyond the surface meaning, so they are prepared to challenge widely accepted societal norms. Critical thinking skills are developed not only in Education courses, but across all disciplines, and preparing new faculty to teach in higher education raises important questions about how they might be expected to foster these approaches in their own teaching practices.

One of the most influential critical theorists in the field of adult education and lifelong learning was Paulo Freire. Critical thinking, Freire says, is created by dialogue first. Furthermore, he claims that dialogue leads to communication and "without communication there can be no education" (Freire, 1968, p. 93). Freire argues that, in order to foster critical thinking,

students and teachers must work together to create knowledge, challenging the traditional

didactic one-way flow of information. This is what Freire calls "problem-posing education"

(Freire, 1968, p.80), where one can combat this idea of banking education, which assumes

knowledge can be transferred from one person to another, like a banking transaction. Problem-

posing education encourages ideas like having an open dialogue with students where teachers

listen to the students' perspective, and students listen to the teacher's perspective before making

the lesson actionable. Dialogue is created by carefully constructed curricula where the educator

asks stimulating questions to evoke critical reflection and dialogue from the students. In other

words, teachers view their students as students whom they are teaching but also as colleagues,

with whom they share knowledge and create learning opportunities alongside as partners. This

allows for an open and inclusive learning environment, and Freire says, allows for critical

thinking to happen where "actual learning" will take place.

        According to many educators who draw upon critical theory, reflective practices must be

incorporated into their thinking and learning processes. Stephen Brookfield (2017) puts forward

the four lenses of critical reflection that shape professors' teaching practice: student's eyes,

colleagues' perceptions, theory and personal experience. He says that ultimately "critical

reflection is the internal process of identifying and checking the validity of our teaching

assumptions" (p.3). In order for one to promote criticality with their students, one needs to

consider whether they are applying these reflective practices themselves. Perhaps the most

important lens that Brookfield presents is the use of reflection on personal experience. Personal

experiences influence how people see the world, how people think and what assumptions people

carry. One of the benefits of incorporating a reflective practice, Brookfield says, is that

"reflective teachers probe beneath the veneer of common sense to investigate overlooked

dimensions to their practice" (p. 26). Students come to the classroom with their preconceived thoughts, beliefs and understandings of the world, and within it, dynamics of power structures. Brookfield implores teachers to constantly switch their techniques, and to check in with students to understand what works and what does not. This strategy is not only reserved for teaching techniques, but critical reflection also helps to uncover assumptions that one has about others. An important aspect of teaching is to create a dialogue so that students can begin to understand how social structures have shaped their perception of the world around them.

Critical theory delves into the challenges educators from any discipline might have in gaining a deeper understanding of power inequities. For example, within Canadian universities in recent years, there has been an emphasis on Indigenizing the Academy. Marie Battiste (2013) discusses how racism is experienced by learners through her Mi'Kmaq perspectives:

Race has long been debunked as a constructed category that justifies dominance and privilege and other forms of oppression. Yet, racialization is well known to all those targeted under the imaginary line of social justice. Whiteness and privilege are less evident to those who swim in the sea of whiteness and dominance. Confronting racism, then, is confronting racial superiority and its legacy, not only in history but also in contemporary experience. (p.125)

Battiste (2013) says that racism is more than someone being prejudiced, rather, racism is about the power to oppress.

As an educator, there are many factors to consider when approaching the classroom, and learning about the power one has, and avoiding perpetuating the dominant stereotypes steeped in racism is essential to high quality teaching (Brookfield, 2015). Having an openness to learning

lessons from the Indigenous way of thinking is increasingly an expectation for new faculty

learning to teach in Canada. Addressing this, Battiste notes that:

> Canadian administrators and educators need to respectfully blend Indigenous
>
> epistemology and pedagogy with Euro-Canadian epistemology and pedagogy to create
>
> innovate ethical, trans-systemic Canadian educational systems. (p.167)

Teaching from the euro-centric perspective only is less effective, and potentially harmful to a

group of diverse learners. Therefore, when teaching within different disciplines, one needs to be

acutely aware of how presenting the same topic from the Indigenous way of teaching may

strengthen the lesson and contribute to student learning in a much richer and more meaningful

way.

Critical theorists not only recommend that professors familiarize themselves with

different ways of knowing, they also point out the need to be aware of their own biases.

Brookfield (2017) argues that to become aware of one's own assumptions, one should learn the

difference between overt racism and "racial microaggressions" (p.211). Microaggressions are

more subtle but are "matter-of-fact behaviours that are experienced as exclusionary or

diminishing by people of colour" (Brookfield, 2017, p.210). Recognizing that one is reinforcing

some of these race-based dominant ideations comes from a self-reflective practice. Brookfield

(2017) provides an account of how much critical reflective thought goes into understanding

microaggressions from his white-male perspective:

> I don't like the fact that I have a lot of learned racism in me and that I'll struggle with
>
> this until I die. It's never going to go away and I'll never become the "good white
>
> person" I used to think I was. I've had to force myself to confront this part of me and
>
> to talk publicly about it. But that act of enforced vulnerability is made much easier

when it's done as part of a team-taught course, particularly if my colleague is a person

of color. I can check with my colleague if I've just committed a racial

microaggression against him or her and my colleague can point out whole swaths of

research or literature I'm unaware of or perspectives and interpretations that never

occurred to me. (p.146)

Of course, this is a white male perspective that demonstrates the initiative required to break

down some of the racial microaggressions that may be perpetuated in a classroom with a

professor of his ethnicity and sex. If the professor in charge of teaching the class is a female

of colour, for example, the dynamic could be experienced differently in the classroom.

Brown, Cervero and Johnson-Bailey (2000) discuss the "myth" that all professors have an

equal amount of power when entering the classroom. They say that the existence of this

myth supresses African American women in these positions, but society has begun to

awaken to this and "identified positionality of the teacher as an important factor in the

classroom… *Positionality* refers to the ways in which people are categorized in a Western

hierarchical society. The primary identifiers are race, gender, class, physical ability, and

sexual orientation" (Brown et al., 2000, p. 274). This opens a dialogue that contributes to

the understanding of the complexities of power dynamics experienced in a higher education

classroom.

In addition to a discussion on the role of race and power dynamics of a higher education

classroom, the inclusion of a discussion around sexism describes another set of issues. Since the

1970s female academics in higher education are increasingly holding more faculty positions in

Canadian universities (Lavigne, 2019). This is an encouraging statistic that shows evidence of a

receding gender gap in professorial work within Canadian universities. International research

shows that, although women are breaking through and holding more tenure-track positions than in the past, women are more often hired in female dominated professions such as teaching and nursing education (Angervall & Beach, 2018). The research suggests that female academics are being discouraged to work in disciplines like engineering and the physical sciences by influential attitudes of parents and advisors early on in their development. Furthermore, the culture within higher education generally makes advancing easier for men. It is also possible that women working in academic positions in Canada have different considerations when looking for academic work in an environment that has compulsory mobility (Careless & Mizzi, 2015) to earn full-time permanent academic work. Therefore, there is a higher proportion of, "women doctorates with young children [who] initially accept temporary or part-time positions, while others seek employment in teaching universities with less publishing pressure to accommodate childrearing without undue stress" (Baker, 2016, p.894). In either case, the fields dominated by men, "typically lead to higher levels of employment and larger salaries" (Baker, 2016, p.893). Furthermore, in order for an academic to advance their career to the role of administrator, Lavigne (2019) shows a "pattern of upward cumulative attrition" (p.9) for females, where Canadian university administrative positions, such as deanship, are dominated by men of Canadian origins. Therefore, to say that the playing field is equal for female and male professors in academe is inaccurate despite the positive strides that have been made over the past half century.

Another consideration of this research study is how critical education theories guide a discussion on identity-related issues. Microaggressions were discussed earlier in this chapter from the perspective of university professors using critical reflection in order to prevent the cycle of racism to continue. Issues surrounding cultural identity (Cohen & Kassan, 2018) are explored

by researchers when they consider the profound effects that microaggressions have on international students at Canadian universities.   Houshmand, Spanierman and Tafarodi, (2014) found that as a result of racism the participants of their study experienced in higher education contexts, "students reported disengaging from certain academic activities" (p.382). In another study on international students' perspectives Guo, Y., and Guo, S. (2017) found that there were four main challenges that students face, "(1) difficulty in making friends with local students, (2) problematic relationships with instructors and supervisors, (3) little internationalization of the curriculum, and (4) dealing with stereotypes and racism" (p. 858). The effects of racism felt by international students are a barrier to learning and advancing in higher education and research studies such as these point to the challenges new faculty face in attending to issues of inclusion within their own classrooms and teaching practices.

A similar yet distinct barrier in the university context can be experienced by the LGBTQ community. Researchers of queer theory shine a light on the struggle that takes place in higher education for students and faculty who belong to this community. Abes and Kasch (2007) explain that queer theory, "critically analyzes the meaning of identity, focusing on intersections of identities and resisting oppressive social constructions of sexual orientation and gender" (p. 620). Thus, queer theory is a collection of identity theories. In guiding understanding of how queer theory has explored the effects on higher education, Renn (2010) says:

> Although an argument can be made that efforts toward interdisciplinarity blur
> departmental boundaries, the reality remains that faculty and students in
> interdisciplinary programs face more structural obstacles in the academy than do their
> colleagues in the "pure" disciplines (Lattuca, 2001). In short, colleges and universities

have evolved to tolerate the generation of queer theory from within but have stalwartly

resisted the queering of higher education itself. (p. 132)

This discussion provides perspectives on some of the identity issues that students and

faculty face in higher education contexts. Although the inclusive nature of higher

education in Canada evolved over the last number of years, there is still room for

improvement as minority groups still face challenges in advancing in these contexts.

It is possible that some new professors who have had a heavy focus on research in

their graduate studies, may have experience teaching in a university classroom

environment. Some of the considerations expressed by researchers who use critical

education theories are useful to new professors since they explain the intangible forces that

permeate in a diverse higher learning setting. A few of those factors, for example, are

neoliberalism, sexism or racism. Holloway et al. (2011) argue that if faculty:

are encouraged to develop a social justice orientation to create more inclusive learning

environments for students from diverse backgrounds. Education is explored in broader

and more complex ways to consider how social, political, racial, religious, ability,

cultural, and economic factors impact upon learning contexts. Learners begin to

understand how power shapes their own teaching practices, providing insights into the

limitations and constraints that all educators encounter, as well as strategies for

addressing these concerns. (Holloway et al., 2011, p.30)

As universities are increasingly complex and diverse places to work, having an awareness of the

some of the critical discourses within adult education and lifelong learning could potentially help

professors adjust to their new academic roles as teachers.

Chapter Three –Methodology

This chapter is an overview of my approach to this research and provides a justification for why I chose a qualitative methodological approach. Within this chapter is a section that describes the significance of doing the study and explains why this topic was worth investigating. Following this, a conversation ensues about how and why I selected particular institutions and faculty who are currently employed at those institutions to participate in an interview. Subsequently, the attention given to any ethical concerns while conducting this research is discussed. Next, a rationale is provided for conducting semi-structured interviews or "talking with people but in ways that are self-conscious, orderly and partially structured" (Longhurst, 2003, p.103). The conversation about interviews precedes a description of the way I approached analysing the data. Once the data were collected, I used a thematic analysis as, "a method for identifying, analyzing, and interpreting patterns of meaning ('themes') within qualitative data" (Clarke et al., 2017, p.297). This framework is also supported by collective agreements from Canadian universities that were made available to the public online. Here, I explain that I did a brief review of the sections in collective agreements that address workload responsibilities for full-time faculty and of websites for Teaching & Learning Centres across Canada to help inform analysis.

I chose to use a qualitative approach in my research as I was interested in exploring how new faculty, in the early stages of their academic careers, develop their teaching capabilities. In addition, I also wanted to understand how various factors within the broader context of higher education impacted on the experiences of the participants learning to teach. Therefore, by choosing to gain the perspectives from two professors in the midst of experiencing teaching in higher education early in their careers, I was particularly "interested in how people interpret their

experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences. The overall purpose is to understand how people make sense of their lives and their experiences" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015, p.24). Therefore, my approach to this research was guided by my interest in gaining a deeper understanding of how the participants experience learning to teach early in their careers from their perspectives. Clarke and Braun (2013) provide a variety of reasons why it is more suitable for researchers to use a qualitative approach rather than a quantitative one when attempting to understand how people experience certain phenomena. One of the reasons they give—that guided my research—is having a qualitative approach "allows for a far richer (fuller, multi-faceted) or deeper understanding of a phenomenon than using numbers, not least because the complexity of people's meanings or experiences is revealed and retained in qualitative data" (p.24). This "richness" of the participants "meanings" in the data is what I sought to collect and understand in my research. With this goal as a central tenet of my study, I understood that there would be a welcomed element of subjectivity to this research because the participants' accounts are purposefully contextualized. Creswell and Poth (2016) say that qualitative researchers "focus on specific contexts in which people live and work in order to understand the historical and cultural setting of the participants" (p.24). With understanding the importance of discussing the contexts of higher education in Canada from the participants' point of view, I also used aspects of critical theories in adult education to support the analysis of the data and to make sense of the complex structures within universities. Lastly, with this qualitative approach, I carried out this research under the assumption that, "we cannot simply 'represent' participants' experiences. Understanding and representing participants' experiences requires interpretive activity; this is always informed by our own assumptions, values and commitments" (Clarke et al., 2013, p.285).

Therefore, by using semi-structured interviews as the method of data collection, I understood that my prior knowledge and experiences are considered in the interpretation of the data.

As indicated in the introduction, I am not a tenure-track professor, but I aspire to pursue a career in academia. Thus, this research is presented through the lens of someone who does not necessarily share a similar set of experiences with the participants. Therefore, using semi-structured interviews provided an opportunity for participants to share insights and reflections on their experiences of learning how to teach in post-secondary education during the early years of their academic careers. Marshall & Rossman (2011) say that qualitative researchers are "intrigued by the complexity of social interactions expressed in daily life and by the meanings that the participants themselves attribute to these interactions" (p. 2). This is the kind of information that I was seeking and by interviewing two professors I learned about each participant's teaching styles, what strategies they use and how they learned those particular approaches. In this study I compiled the data and presented it using themes. Being sensitive to the fact that each participant has a unique set of experiences that shape who they are, extensive quotes from the transcripts are included to represent their perspectives. In listening to what the participants have to say, insights are provided into the participant's convictions toward teaching that have been developed through their personal interest and their life experiences over time. Therefore, it is very important to contextualize each participant's academic and personal background.

Significance of Study

The majority of new professors are expected to spend approximately forty percent of their workload performing teaching-related duties. At the same time, most of the emphasis in

doctoral programs is placed on learning how to research rather than studying pedagogical methods, which raises the question of how Canadian professors learn the craft of teaching. Given the need for higher education to prepare students for an increasingly complex world characterized by change and diversity, it is important to consider how new faculty are prepared and supported to become educators as well as researchers.

This study asks the participants how they think their students are able to learn from them and how comfortable they are delivering expert knowledge. The main purpose of this study is to learn how professors at Canadian universities develop teaching skills, and whether they feel they are being supported by their respective institutions. This study may draw attention to the types of supports new professors receive at primarily undergraduate universities in Canada and serve to guide future academics and institutional policymakers. Lastly, this thesis will potentially create a basis for further research and has the potential to inform a future doctoral thesis that I would like to explore in more depth how Canadian universities prepare doctoral students for professorial teaching duties.

Recruitment Process

In the initial stages of this study, the goal was to recruit and interview three to four participants. Since this study is focused on understanding how new professors learn to teach, participants involved in this study are in the first three years of a tenure-track position. I prepared and distributed a flyer through university teaching and learning centres and I sent the same flyer electronically through university distribution lists. These distribution lists were created by me as I used staff registers from three Canadian "primarily undergraduate" universities to gather names and email addresses manually. Creating the distribution lists was a strategy that guaranteed I

would reach more people. Had I only distributed physical posters, there would have been a lesser chance of reaching individuals who were potentially interested in participating. Creating the distribution lists was very time consuming, as each university had different ways of accessing the same information. I decided to send this recruitment email to those who identified as "assistant" professors, and who were working in fields not associated with Education. I spent roughly 5 hours creating each list, for a total of roughly 15 hours. The next step was to send out an email to each potential participant through a blind carbon copy and noting who responded and who did not. After two weeks had passed, I tried a second round of emails for those who did not respond. This time I waited closer to three weeks, before sending out one final round of recruitment flyers.

After the third round of distributing the poster via email, I received responses from two professors who wished to participate and who met the criteria for selection. In consultation with my supervisor, I decided to move ahead with doing interviews with just two participants. The difficulties in recruiting participants may be attributed to the fact that this is a busy time in the lives of new faculty, coupled with the fact that this is an unfunded master's research where resources are limited. It was unlikely that I would have been able to recruit any further participants out of this small pool of universities located in the Maritime Region, within a day's travel from Halifax, Nova Scotia. Limiting myself to these geographical constraints was due to the fact that I wanted to have face-to-face interviews and did not have access to travel funds.

The participants that agreed to be a part of this study have not graduated with a degree in and do not teach in Education programs. Since faculty in the field of Education are more likely to have an understanding of pedagogical theories, teachers with this specialized training are intentionally excluded. Both participants understood that there would be a one-hour interview

and that I was interested in learning about their experiences developing as university-level teachers. Although they did not have a formal background in Education, both professors indicated a strong commitment to teaching, and they are very educated in their chosen discipline areas such as Biology, English or Psychology (to name a few). Both participants are female, and they did not indicate that they had a minority status.

Ethical Concerns

In order to proceed with a research study that involved human participants, I was required to have ethics clearance from Mount Saint Vincent University. Therefore, any ethical concerns raised in the beginning stages of the process were addressed prior to beginning the research. In the email I composed to each person I noted that participation in this study is voluntary, and more details would be provided in the participant information package (a detailed letter of informed consent). Once participants agreed to partake in this study, I emailed them a copy of the informed consent form (Appendix A). I also brought with me a hard copy of the informed consent to each interview and physically provided a copy as well as provided that same information orally.

Whenever a participant is being interviewed about aspects of their employment, not always, but often, the researcher must ensure full confidentiality for the participants. Since participants are on a tenure-track, they are not yet permanent employees, so it was especially important they have confidence in my ability to keep their identities confidential. To keep their identities unknown, certain details have been altered or excluded from my findings. For example, each participant was given a pseudonym and identifying factors such as the name of the institution where they are employed was altered or completely left out. In addition, some of the

quotations include edits to eliminate identifying attributes of the participants, such as specific

information about their teaching topics or family members.

Upon my arrival at each interview, I reviewed the letter of informed consent (Appendix

A) which gave the participants an opportunity to review transcripts at a later date. Both

participants checked the option "NO" to the following statement: "I would like to have my

transcript returned for review electronically Yes_____ or NO_____" (Appendix A). In addition,

the participants were orally informed that the transcriptions would be available to them if they

wished, and the letter of informed consent (Appendix A) also mentions that participants, "will be

given the option to receive a copy of this transcript and you can edit the transcript or request if

you would like part or all of the transcript to be deleted. You will be able to withdraw from this

study up to two weeks after the transcripts have been returned to you." I was not contacted by

the participants after the interviews.

Semi-Structured Interviews

This qualitative research study used semi-structured interviews to have participants tell

me about their experiences in learning to teach in post-secondary institutions. This method

allowed me to "improvise follow-up questions based on participant's responses and allow[ed]

space for participants' individual verbal expressions" (Kallio, Pietilä, Johnson & Kangasniemi,

2016, p.2955). This was important to this research since the interviews were personal in nature

and having a free-flowing narrative made for more authentic and robust responses. I also took

into account that they are intentionally casual as semi-structured interviews are "more than just

'chats'. The researcher needs to formulate questions, select and recruit participants, choose a

location and transcribe data while at the same time remaining cognizant of the ethical issues and

power relations involved in qualitative research" (Longhurst, 2003, p.106). From this perspective I made sure to present as professional by having a clean appearance, being punctual, presenting the letter of informed consent and allowing the participants to speak freely (to name a few). Yet, I was aware of the dynamics in doing these interviews, so, although the language used in the interviews was slightly more relaxed and the tone of the conversation was laid back, I wanted the participants to know how seriously these interviews were being taken.

The interviews were a crucial aspect of this study, so I chose to only have face-to-face interviews, since I thought an in-person meeting would give me an opportunity to build rapport. A drawback that has to be considered for this method of data collection is rooted in the same reason as the benefit; there is a free-flowing conversation. At times, the responses trailed off from the main questions, or multiple questions from the interview guide were being answered with a single response. Since the interviews were semi-structured, having an interview guide with me kept the conversations on mostly on topic. I found that there was pressure to get a solid set of data from each interview because I knew that I would only have the one opportunity to speak with the participant, and this may have impacted my performance as the interviewer. Initially, when listening to the audio recordings I identified several moments during the interviews that I feel I could have had higher-quality probing or follow-up questions to draw more pertinent information out of the conversations.

In preparing to do this study, I read about how to do interviews, and my approach was influenced by insights offered by narrative research, in terms of being intrigued by what I might learn from other people's stories. Carless & Douglas (2016) state that "telling stories about the events of one's life is a primary way through which meaning is created and communicated. Working narratively allows researchers to learn from each participant's position as expert on her/

his own life" (p. 307).   Therefore, the goal is to understand how new professors learn to teach, I

wanted to gain the perspectives of new professors in a less structured setting so to permit a story

or series of accounts of their experiences learning to teach in their own way of telling that story.

Additionally, I felt as though interviewing professors who were relatively new to their jobs

(hired within the last three years) would provide a richer conversation about this recent learning

experience, rather than interviewing more seasoned professors and asking them to reflect on their

experiences from years gone by. To this point, Dempsey (2010) says that, "motivations and

rationales that informants describe retrospectively may not conform to those that they actually

held in the moment of the experience" (p.349). With this perspective in mind, new faculty were

asked to participate in this study because their experiences are current, and their emotions and

thoughts are fresh.

The interviews took place in the participants' offices where they likely felt comfortable

and having this secure location available made scheduling the interviews slightly easier.

Entering into their spaces was also helpful in drawing out more robust responses. A level of

comfort may have been felt by the participants since they were familiar with their immediate

surroundings and they had no reason to worry that someone could inadvertently overhear these

conversations. If we had met in a coffee shop or some other public area, the conversations would

more than likely have been different.

Another narrative researcher who influenced my decisions to conduct the interviews was

Clandinin (2006), who discusses the "three-dimensional space" within which narrative inquiry

takes place. The three dimensions offered by Clandinin (2006) are: (1) personal and social (the

interaction), (2) the past, present and future (continuity), as well as (3) the place (situation) where

the interaction happens. As I collected stories from the personal experiences and the interactions

with the participants, I considered how all three dimensions (the interaction, continuity, and the situation) factor into the research study.

Understandably, the interviews are the most important component to this research since the data yielded from them informs this thesis. I made the decision to do face-to-face interviews only, since I felt that this would generate more robust data. In choosing to exclude phone or Skype interviews as a part of this process, this limited the number of interviews I was able to conduct, since this is an unfunded master's research and travelling overnight was not possible due to budgetary constraints. Therefore, I was only able to seek participants from local universities. However, I believe that face-to-face interviews allowed me to attend to social cues, facial expressions and other subtleties in tone and body language.

Both participants were provided with consent forms (Appendix A) by email prior to the interviews and at the time of the interaction with a hardcopy where both participants declined to receive a copy of the transcript once typed out. I used the same set of questions (Appendix B) for both participants; however, the questions were not followed in a linear pattern since I allowed the participants to take the discussion in whatever direction they chose. "In this respect [allowing the respondent to continue on at length without interruption] I was following a general rule for conversationalists alert to the fact that a story is being told; that is, they allow the speaker to 'hold the floor' beyond the limits of a usual turn" (Mishler 1986 p. 74). I was drawn to the idea of what Clandinin (2006) calls "coming alongside participants" in the midst of their story. From this perspective I knew that there was a lot of information to be gathered in a one-hour time frame and they would have extensive experiences to draw on, so listening to, alongside the participants was a consideration I had prior to commencing the interviews.

I began both interviews by letting each participant know why this particular topic was of interest to me. I felt that by sharing my background, the participants could relate to me. In this respect I attempted to building a relationship with the participants, (Cohen, 2006). As per Baxter (2008), these interviews were semi-structured and by virtue of the conversations many of my questions were being answered without the need to ask them, which demonstrated the fluid nature of the semi-structured interviews and the relationships built during the interviews. Being in an interview with the participant allows for a free-flowing conversation, and when people are encouraged to discuss their own experiences in a setting like this, the rich responses show through and allowed for a very interesting learning experience.

Analysis

After collecting data, a researcher must follow a predetermined system for analyzing the information in a structured and consistent way. This thesis drew out themes and grouped similar clusters of data together and identifying and interpreting the information along with offering evidence of the differences in data. Using aspects of thematic analysis, the data were gathered and I, "identif[ied], organiz[ed], and offer[ed] insight into patterns of meaning (themes) across a data set" (Clarke & Braun, 2017, p. 57). The main reason for using themes to present the analysis from the stories is that this method can "provide insight into personal experiences, emotions, sense of self, actions, and meaning… [to] help us understand human conduct in ways that respect both agency and structure" (Smith, 2016, p. 260). Another benefit to using themes in the analysis of data sets, Smith (2016) says, is that it is accessible to wide audiences and is highly effective in knowledge translation. Being able to communicate the findings of this research to a

broad audience is very important, since, one of the goals of this research is contribute scholarly knowledge about teaching to those who work in fields both inside and outside of Education.

As the literature suggests, the first step I took, in initiating thematic analysis, was to familiarize myself with the data. Some researchers suggest coding key pieces of information even before searching for the themes (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.78). Coding was not used in this research since there are fewer sets of data to analyze. Omitting this step was possible, since I was familiar enough with the data, mostly due to the fact that there were just two interview transcripts to work with. Using this approach to analysis requires grouping the data by "themes". Initially there are were a variety of themes, some were palpable and stood out, while other themes required me to spend a lot more time with the data to uncover the subtle similarities. Maguire & Delahunt (2017) discuss the two levels of themes which they labelled as "semantic" and "latent" (p. 3353). Semantic themes are understood to be more surface-level or explicit, whereas, latent themes require the investigator to identify subtleties and assumptions or underlying ideas in the data. The semantic themes emerge where key words, sentences et cetera in both transcripts are very obvious. For example, both participants discuss feeling overwhelmed by the amount of work and limited in the amount of time they have for all the activities required of the job. This is a theme that the researcher can easily identify by the similarities in the responses. Conversely, latent ideas require more critical thought and deeper analysis. This type of theme emerges when the researcher really familiarizes themselves with the data. In this research, a latent theme that was revealed in the data is the idea of "mixed messaging". This theme was discovered through a deep familiarization with the data and the development of my analysis which included an examination of the different information provided through collective bargaining agreements. When interviewing the participants, who work at similar sized

universities, they each felt that they were expected to focus on different tasks. For example, one participant felt she should focus on teaching, while the other participant felt she should be focusing slightly more of her time on researching. Somewhere they have received mixed messages about what their university wants them to focus their time on. This identification of a latent theme allowed me to develop a comparison of how the participants interpret their role at the institution and how the institution projects their ideals. Latent themes strengthen the overall analysis, and paying attention to subtleties in the conversations lead to analytical questions that provide the foundation for a solid discussion. Additionally, in order to develop and strengthen my analysis chapter, I brought in issues raised in the related academic literature as well as information from supporting documentation on teaching and learning centres and faculty collective agreements from institutions across Canada.

Supporting Documentation

In order to strengthen this research, I incorporated the use of resources Canadian universities make available on the Internet to the public. I chose to look at how collective agreements and teaching and learning centres impact on the context in which new faculty learn how to teach. There are over 90 centres for teaching and learning in Canadian universities, so I examined four or five CTL websites from primarily undergraduate universities as well as four or five medical/doctoral universities' centres for teaching and learning websites. In addition to this research, I also examined collective agreements from these same institutions in order to gain a clearer understanding of the teaching expectations that exist in Canadian universities. This was a useful task that allowed me to compare and contrast the differences and similarities in expectations the different institutions have for their faculty.

Chapter Four – Findings

This chapter introduces the participants and discusses the emerging themes from the data which will be followed by a more in-depth analysis in Chapter Five. Both participants are introduced in Chapter Four under pseudonyms; Anne and Jane. At the time of the interviews the participants were within their first three years of a tenure-track position, which took place at the end of the winter semester when classes had ended. This timing worked well in providing an opportunity to connect with participants when I assumed they had more liberal time for interviews. This resulted in lengthier conversations as the faculty did not appear to feel rushed while we were talking.

Participants

Interview One – Introducing Anne

Anne was the first respondent to my recruitment efforts at three Canadian universities where I distributed the recruitment flyer to potential participants via the email distribution lists that I created. She presents as a white Anglo-Canadian female professor and is a mother of young children. At the time of the interview, Anne was applying for reappointment with her university. She is required to apply during the third year of employment in order to extend her contract for an additional two-year probationary period. Therefore, Anne is required to work a combined five years prior to applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Teaching is an important element of the assessment process for professors who are seeking re-appointment at her university, since they are being evaluated on their performance in the classroom. At the time of the interview, Anne was working diligently on her reappointment application; therefore, she was familiarizing herself with the nuances of her institution's

collective agreement to prepare a teaching dossier. A part of that preparation included collecting

evidence of her abilities as a competent educator to substantiate her application. Since all

collective agreements are slightly different, Anne was working through her institution's

agreement to understand what she needed to add to her portfolio to strengthen the submission.

Anne holds two undergraduate degrees, one in arts and the other in science. She also has

a master's degree in her discipline which allowed her to become a registered professional in that

field where she worked for one year. After completing fieldwork in that domain, Anne made the

decision to return to university and complete her doctoral studies. The four degrees she holds

were earned at three different institutions in Canada which exposed her to different university

cultures and sizes. When the interview took place, Anne was two and a half years into her

tenure-track position as an assistant professor. In this role, she is required to teach five courses

per year, two of which repeat in the second semester. However, in one semester, Anne is

obligated to teach three courses. This is in addition to her other responsibilities as a researcher, a

faculty member**,** a mother, and many other professional and personal responsibilities.

Interview Two – Introducing Jane

Jane is a white female Anglo-Canadian researcher who, at the time of the interview had

just completed the reappointment application and was in her third year as a faculty member at the

university where the interview took place. Jane explains that she has a "big research program",

she oversees a number of master's students, half of whom help her with a research project that

involves significant travel. In addition, Jane's professional obligations require her to teach five

courses as well.

Holding three degrees from two different Canadian universities, Jane's primary focus is science. During her master's studies Jane learned that she "really enjoyed research". She had a yearning to work with people though, so moving to a research-intensive university to complete her Ph.D. allowed her to fulfil this goal and work with people. Jane not only was working on her Ph.D., but she was also researching and travelling extensively. She said that "as soon as a I started [my Ph.D.], I knew I wanted to be in the academy". Coupled with her passion for research, Jane also loves to teach:

I think it's something about being raised by teachers, that you are almost lined up [to teach]. [One of my parents], taught [in the public education system]. When you are raised by a teacher, there are certain things you get used to doing. My partner loves when [parent who is a teacher] explains things because [they are] very methodical and takes [their] time and is very specific. [Example:] "I need you to go get this screwdriver, it's on the bench downstairs on the left." I think it's something about being in that environment that makes you aware and appreciate education.

Educating others is important to Jane and she credits her upbringing for channeling a passion for teaching others.

Theme 1: Experiences, Teacher Training and Teaching Strategies

The semantic theme of how the participants learned to teach materialized almost immediately due to the nature of the questions posed at the time of the interviews. The experiences that the participants shared in the interviews have similarities and differences that contribute to an interesting conversation and analysis that follows. Therefore, Theme 1 discusses the experiences the participants have had with teaching, how they have been trained as teachers

at the post-secondary level, and explores what teaching strategies they use as a result of those experiences and training.

Anne

At the time of the interview, Anne was a tenure-track professor who was beginning the process for reappointment for the first time in her career. As mentioned above, she had a full teaching assignment, where she was teaching three courses in the first semester and two in the second semester for a total of five courses per year. This was not the first time Anne taught a university level course though. She had previous experience in her doctoral studies saying that "I did do some teaching at [graduate school]. So, it's not my first exposure to teaching at university. I did a lot of training [in my doctoral studies]". Elaborating on these experiences, Anne provides some more details of what this teaching experience entailed:

> I taught at [a large university] only ever one course independently…I [was a teaching assistant (TA)]. So, I only did one course at a time [and] I was the head TA for a long time for a "mega-course" with 760 students in one course. I also managed the TA team of 17. [On top of that] I did training for [the other teaching assistants] and made sure that they were doing what they were supposed to be doing so the instructor of the course could just do the lecture [for] the course and do the stuff that comes up when you have 760 students.

These experiences are invaluable, as having this on a curriculum vitae while applying for a tenure-track position provides direct evidence of prior teaching experience. This experience also builds confidence and allows new professors the opportunity to try different teaching strategies early in their careers.

Anne learned the teaching strategies she uses by observing friends and colleagues over her career and from watching educators teach during her Ph.D. She gives credit to mentors, colleagues and friends, noting, the "strategies that I picked up over the years from friends and colleagues and from watching other educators teach while I was a PhD student. Also, like I had mentioned, I did a lot of teaching training at [graduate school]".

Anne actively sought out specific teacher training while studying in her doctoral program:

> [My former university] offers a one semester-long course for grad students that is specifically on learning how to teach at post-secondary level. We did a whole host of different things. We did do a little bit of theory, but the purpose of that course [wasn't] to learn about pedagogical theories. We did learn a little bit of that, but it was more of a hands-on practical course. So, we developed a teaching dossier. We had to do a lot of practice teaching, practice lectures, developing a lesson plan and reflection of ourselves as educators. They also offer "TA Day". This is for any grad students in the university. They have a day-long mini-conference [which included] a keynote speaker and then they do four or five concurrent session throughout the day. There will be like 10 different things you can sign up for… There was one I did called 'when X is not enough' it was on how to give good feedback on writing, such as students essays. There was one on accessibility, how to teach in an accessible way, sort of accessibility beyond physical spaces. So, I did that every year and so I racked up a lot of cool insights. I would just sign up for them and go. They would be an hour, an hour and a half. There would be a little activity or a little workshop, and you would practice what you learned. I did a lot of that at [that university]. There were definitely strategies that

I learned. When I first learned, I had to consciously think – ok this is a strategy that I

should use – now, this is more, I just do it because I practiced it.

Another optional training related to learning to teach that Anne participated in during her

doctoral degree is discussed here:

It wasn't mandatory at all, and actually because I was interested in doing more of that,

some of my Ph.D. peers [and I] got together and pushed for that to be done in a little

bit more of a mandatory way for our department. In my department, and I think this is

true in a lot of different departments, we had to do graduate seminar. We had it every

two weeks in our department (it was a mandatory seminar) for graduate students in

that department. They had usually focused on research that was happening in the

department, or from time to time someone would have brought in an external scholar/

visiting scholar in. Me and a couple of students got together and pushed for those

grad seminars to be less research focused and more professional development focused

and some of that professional development focus was on teacher training. I definitely

actively sought that stuff out as a student. I am glad that I did at that time, because had

I have saved it to a time where I was more involved as an educator or an instructor, it

never would have happened because I don't have time. I feel like I am glad that I

frontloaded it a little bit as a graduate student because it wouldn't have gotten done.

Now that I think of it, they also had a certificate program which I loved. At [my

graduate school], you could earn four certificates by doing different things.

"Certificate One" was attending seminars or attending workshops I mentioned, and

you'd have to write a reflection on them. "Certificate Two", you had to write a

teaching philosophy statement. "Certificate Four" was, you had to write a review

paper on a pedagogical theory. I wrote mine on feminist pedagogy, that was short. It

was five or eight pages. It was rewarding, but I don't have time for it now.

It appears that Anne strategically took every opportunity to learn about educating others in her

doctoral studies. Since these learning opportunities were optional, she actively sought these out,

and now seems at ease when discussing teaching in her current position despite only having two

years of experience in a tenure-track role.

Jane

Jane, a tenure-track professor, had already applied and been reappointed for an additional

two-year term when the interview took place. Jane noted that she primarily "learned by doing"

and through receiving feedback, especially when it came to developing teaching skills. She said:

I found myself teaching in all sorts of…situations with zero preparation and totally on

the fly and through trial and error…Maybe that's because I had supervisors that gave

me lots of autonomy, or maybe it's because they thought I would be fine, [perhaps]

they could tell from my personality. I think most of the time, there is no training. You

just kind of learn on the fly.

Some of the teaching strategies Jane has developed come from what she discovered over

time, by seeing and doing (Kenny, 2014) and by trial and error. In addition, she has also taken

some personal development courses that were specifically for graduate students learning to teach

at the post-secondary level. Jane went on to say:

During my Ph.D. there were instructional workshops, so I did those. They were three-

hour workshops. One good training session that I did do was on problem-based

learning (PBL). I taught a course at [a university] doing PBL and the professor took it

upon themselves to train us on how to do group facilitation, to shift people back in the

right direction if they are going off on tangents.

Jane indicated that her priority was in research, adding that the reason she pursued doctoral

studies was due to her passion for research that developed while taking her master's degree. At

the same time, she comes from a family of educators. Teaching, Jane said, is in her blood. Even

though research is her passion, she credits her personality and family background for leading her

to being naturally suited to teach students about her area of expertise.

Jane also credits a mentor from her doctoral studies who gave her some classroom

delivery methods and assessment strategies for post-secondary learning environments. She says:

I had this amazing prof I worked with at [a university], [when] I was the TA. She had

this little thing called "quick writes". Every day when you would walk into a lecture,

you would pick up a scrap piece of paper. At any point in the lecture, she would put it

up on the slide, a thought provoking question. I literally say, "I am not marking you.

If it is totally wrong, I don't care. Write something. If you have no freaking idea what

I am talking about, tell me something interesting related to [this discipline] that has

happened to you. Write anything, and you'll get participation marks." This gives me a

really clear idea of that thing I talked about last week, 3 people understood it and

everybody else has no idea what is happening. It takes me forever. For example, say I

teach Mondays and Wednesdays. Monday night, I get home with these scrap pieces

of paper and I pour myself a glass of wine. Seventy percent of the class has no idea

what's going on, or every single person knows what is going on, so, let's move on. It

is so much time. I could never do this in a class of 500, but because I am in a class at

[a small university], I can do this and understand what is happening. I do a lot of case

> studies, anecdotes, tell me what you are thinking kinds-of-things, because that is the
>
> way that I learn. I feel terrible for the students that come in when I say this is how I
>
> learn; this is how I am teaching. It has worked out really well so far in the classes that
>
> I am teaching.

Jane is a confident professor and demonstrates a strong expertise in her field when talking to her.

She has a deep passion for the material she teaches. She discusses what it is like teaching in her

current appointment:

> [The teaching load is] heavy at this university. I am very lucky in that I teach courses
>
> that are very relevant to my research program. I teach a course that I created that fits
>
> into my area of [expertise]. I teach [topics that I am passionate about]. I [also] teach a
>
> great course [that is really relevant to my students]. Then I teach an undergraduate
>
> research methods course. Exposing students to different kinds of research to get them
>
> excited about research. We show people that they need to be able to read [academic]
>
> journals, so if someone walks in [in the future when they are working in a related
>
> field] and [asks them a question] you can translate what that means in terms of the
>
> evidence that is out there for what you think you can actually get out of it. You can
>
> make evidence-informed decisions about how you are going to practice on this one-
>
> on-one endeavour. I [also] developed my own course [and] I will offer it for the first
>
> time [next year]. I am really excited because I get to teach what I do—this is my bread
>
> and butter. So, [the course I created] is going to be fun because I will be able to do
>
> whatever I want.   Sometimes people will say, "I am training to be a [registered
>
> professional] in Canada, why would I ever have to know about [issues related to] a
>
> low-income country?" Immigration is huge, have a worldview to understand different

situations or simply being a global citizen (is very important). So, this is going to be

so fun to have students who want to learn who elect to come into my class and to be in

that kind of environment to tackle these types of issues. I am very excited that this got

to come through.

Jane's passion about the topics she teaches comes across very genuinely. To summarize

what Jane teaches, she says:

I teach 4 courses but two of them repeat. I teach 3 courses in the fall, and then I

double-up and teach two more of those courses in the winter. I am really lucky in that

sense compared to other new faculty who [started working at this university] at the

same time [as me] in different departments have 5 unique courses in a year, or in first

year and another 3 unique courses in their second year. It's a lot of work to prep new

courses. I have taught three unique courses thus far. I just get to keep on improving

them over the years. Other folks, I know, are constantly being switched through

different courses, either by their own fruition or otherwise. So, I feel lucky that I have

these three courses that I teach in our undergrad program. I enjoy teaching in our

research program.

The heavy teaching load that Jane explains is quite common at primarily undergraduate

universities. She mentions being appreciative of having courses that repeat in both semesters

which lowers the preparation time. This also allows the professor to refine the course and make it

even more impactful each time the course is repeated.

The way that Jane views her role as a professor is through the lens of a researcher, although

within her body of research she applies her passion for teaching through mentoring graduate

students in one-on-one teaching scenarios. She explains in the following quotation:

It's so interesting because [friends of mine who are not familiar with academic work] assume that being a prof means that you teach university courses. So, it's almost like the research piece is completely ignored at that level. People think that since you're a professor you work September through April and you teach some students by getting up on this podium that you have a one-way communication with students. [Furthermore] you tout your own ideas and then when you finish, what do you do in the summers? You are just on vacation and hang out? I love research, so I see myself as a researcher first. When someone asks what I do, I say: "I am a professor, I research [in my preferred discipline]". I intro that way, and if people ask me if I teach, I tell them I teach students and things that I do teach them about that are of interest to my research program. Most often if someone asks me what I do, I tell them I am researcher. For example, my grad students are doing whatever, and so a big part of what I do in teaching, I see grad programs as almost apprenticeships. You are a learning how to research, but you are learning it on the fly. Your source of knowledge is your supervisor guiding you in this process. So, draft this, I'll give you loads of feedback, try it again, loads of feedback, try it again until you are on the right path. That, I think, is the most fun part of my job. Doing what I love, which is research, via these grad students who are learning so much and buggering everything up and getting it right.

Since she openly discusses prioritizing the research aspect of her job, Jane is driven by her body of research. Being motivated by research seems to be fueling a passion for teaching others to become researchers and to teach others about her research.

Jane mentioned that teaching was in her blood, but developing those teaching skills started during her graduate studies. Jane explains how a Ph.D. prepared her to be an educator:

Not very well, because it's an apprenticeship in research. So, during my PhD, I ended up learning about teaching because I was working in a situation where you end up having to teach people. For example, I was working in [another country], I had a staff of maybe 20 data collectors, and I had to teach them how to collect the data via a translator, I am teaching! When you are working with a translator, you have to be very picky about your words. If you talk for 10 minutes in English, that is 30 minutes in [an additional language]. You learn to say exactly what you mean, exactly what you want. Otherwise, training takes weeks and it's [disorganized]. I was working in [Africa], where, I was training mostly [local] men. Who am I? Some young white girl, coming in saying, "this is how you need to do a focus group". "Well no, this is how we do it here." So, coming up with unique ways of engaging with people. Because if you do the kind of didactic thing that we do in Canada, then it doesn't work. You need to turn it into a workshop, get their input, or turn it into a role-play. So, I found myself teaching in all sorts of these situations with zero preparation and [learning] through trial and error.

These skills that Jane worked on in her doctoral studies have helped her get to where she is today, since demonstrating the ability to teach likely helped her gain this current employment opportunity.

Having these prior teaching experiences allows one to develop a teaching style along with the motivating factors that drives one to continue to improve on their teaching skills. Jane's talks about her current teaching philosophy:

I have things set up in modules. If I am teaching research methods for example, I know there is X number of concepts that I want to get through. I want to talk about experimental design, I want to talk about statistics and sampling. Therefore, I make them into modules that are PowerPoint decks. One of these modules may take me half of the lecture, it depends. I am not a person that has, you know, this is a 30-minute part and you know that's not real life. This is content we have to get through. We will get through it when we get through it. If no one understands then we are just going to go through [it again]. The one thing that I will say, I teach to what students should be at that level. So, if it's a third-year research methods course. If I go in and say, of course you know about XYZ from your prerequisites, if they don't, I am not going back and teaching what they should know. You took Stats 1 and 2, you know what a "T-Test" is. I'm applying it to [the title of the class] research, if you don't know what it is, go home and read about it. I am not going back. So, I teach to this level where you should be. I tell students to go forward. I give people a chance to learn, but I am not going to hand-hold through this experience. I am not going to teach to the lowest common denominator, I'm teaching at this level where you are supposed to be and I'm going to challenge you and grade students in the course and we are going to get on and talk about these other amazing things.

From the dialogue, it appears that Jane spends a lot of time reflecting on her practice and takes it very seriously.

Theme 2: Institutional Attitudes, Expectations and Mixed Messaging

Developing one's professional practice as a post-secondary educator is often influenced by how much emphasis the employer (university) places on "teaching excellence". If an employer is not actively engaging their employees to become better teachers through motivations like training, policies, pay structures, advancement or other incentives, the professor will likely invest their limited spare time performing activities they feel will benefit the advancement of career (even if they have a genuine passion for teaching). In this section the latent theme that is discussed describes how the participants interpret their institutions' attitude toward teaching. The participants each discuss how they perceive that their universities want them to prioritize their time in allocating their workload between different responsibilities.

Anne

Anne discussed the importance of having a strong teaching dossier associated with her academic file for reappointment but noted that as long as you follow the guidelines, reappointment should not be that daunting. One of the factors that her institution takes into account for reappointment is proving her worth as a competent teacher. The nature of her job keeps her very busy, so in discussing the teaching criteria that professors at her institution must follow in order to be reappointed, she says:

> It's not something that matters in terms of my reappointment [or] keeping my job.
> They don't, well I'm sure they care, but when it comes down to the brass tacks that's
> not what is going to help me keep my job or help me grow in terms of reputation and
> all that kind of stuff. Being an excellent educator is admirable, it just comes down to
> how much time you can do everything.

Further to this idea, she notes that "it's not down to the letter clear, as in [if the collective agreement is] precisely [letting] you know what you need to do", and adding that, "I have read [the collective agreement], but it's a lot to take in". It is also important to note that Anne was not entirely sure to this point whether her institution could necessarily be considered a "teaching university" or not which adds to the complexity of what the university prioritizes between research, teaching or both. However, Anne discussed how she approaches her profession:

> I teach courses, I would describe myself as teaching and doing research and doing service. Usually people don't really know what I do, I explain that to them the classic split is 40-40-20. I research a lot, but I usually say that research is the most highly-prioritized thing in what you are mostly evaluated on; bringing in grant money, and publishing. So, I do that, and I would explain that I also teach three courses. Although I think it's a lot, but I think that a lot of people don't really understand. I never understood how insane teaching three courses is until I did it.

Anne also mentioned her teaching load and described it as being, "3/2, so I teach 5 courses every academic year. Right now, I only teach 3 unique courses. Two of my courses that I teach in the fall, I also teach in the winter [making them] repeats".

Anne describes what it can be like teaching at a primarily undergraduate institution. She says:

> Right now, I only have 30 [students], but it always seems inevitable that [one of them] has an injury. I don't know what it is. Students get injured because they do sports and whatever and then you [often seem to be] dealing with accommodation. Students can have hearing impairments or need whatever. No one actually has a sense of what this job is until they do it and it's really difficult to explain.

Anne also mentioned growing up in a home where there was an educator in her family sharing that, "my parent [had a career in education] and I don't know if (s)he knows [what it is like for university professors to teach]".

On top of this hectic teaching schedule, Anne is required to teach her students to prepare for a professional designation, which is governed by a professional body. Therefore, she teaches to a set of specific outcomes as well as using a plethora of teaching strategies to engage her students. However, when she was asked, she could not decide whether she felt that her role as an educator took priority in her job as a professor when she said, "I find I am [a teacher] and I find I'm not [at the same time].

The institution where Anne works assigned her a mentor to support Anne's development as she goes for promotion and towards becoming a tenured faculty member:

I have a tenured faculty mentor [and] we are well matched in terms of interests. Although she does [different disciplinary work], but we are well matched in terms of [interests as] she does critical theory stuff as do I. So that was good. However, I haven't drawn on that as much as I could have, I suppose. I didn't really feel like I needed it a lot. It was less for teaching as it was for research, I guess. Actually, it wasn't even for research as it was for being a faculty member. We have met for coffee a number of times and she is lovely. Again, it's one of those things that I don't have a lot of time for.

Anne's understanding of the mentor-mentee relationship is shown in the above quotation, where it seems that once a professor is hired into the role, they are expected to have a foundation of skills to be able to do the basic tenets of the job (i.e. research and teaching). From Anne's point of view, the purpose of this relationship is not to learn extensive amounts of teaching-related

skills, or how to perform stronger research, but Anne indicates that this mentor engaged her in

the role of a faculty member. When she discusses how she believes her institution wants her

allocating time to each of these functions, she has this to say:

> I don't really know? I have read the collective agreement. I guess I am not overly
>
> focused on it because I feel fairly confident that I meet the fairly vague language of
>
> the collective agreement. I don't say to myself, 'Oh, I am not doing research 40% of
>
> the time'. I don't even know if that is possible because it doesn't work that way. If I
>
> said 'my week is 40% and I math that out as 40% of my hours', it's not even 9-5. It's
>
> way more hours than that. Even if I said 'ok I work 50-60 hours a week, 40% of that is
>
> spent on research' it's just not possible, when you are working it's way more! When
>
> you have a thesis student nearing the end of their thesis, you are doing way more
>
> mentoring in terms of that. The research cycle doesn't work that way, since it comes
>
> in fits and spurts with everything. In terms of 'is it clear?' I don't know, I guess it's
>
> not down to the letter clear, as in this precisely you know what you need to do. I don't
>
> know if that's necessarily effective. I know [other universities have] more specific
>
> language or guidance in terms of what you should be publishing. There is a more
>
> specific guideline like you should have 2 publications a year kind of thing.
>
> Obviously, this looks different from area to area because if you [research in a different
>
> discipline] you are usually publishing articles and books and things like that, but I
>
> think there is a number of different pieces of more specific guidance around research.
>
> But I don't know if that is any better than having it vague and open either. For
>
> example, the area that I am in, the priority is more on, at least for my peers (not
>
> necessarily peers in my department) but people who do research in similar areas to

me. There's more of an emphasis than on the value of sole-authored publications.

[Within some disciplines], you have 5-6-7-10 authors on a paper, so what publishing

looks like is very different from discipline to discipline, even though the collective

agreement is very blanket. I think there are points of clarity and points are

perspectives or things that make it less clear. However, at least with reappointment,

it's fairly minimal in terms of research. I think the language [in the collective

agreement] is: "evidence of effective teaching", [which, in my opinion] is not that

high of a bar to set. Same with research, I think it's "some evidence of engagement in

research". So, it's not a super high bar. I guess I feel clear enough, is my answer.

With respect to the requirements of the job, Anne has a good sense of what the obligations of her

contract are, and is very engaged with her work. In terms of the supports her university provides

(other than the mentor-colleague that was discussed), she says:

Do I feel supported? I guess. I think that it would be easier for us to get to those

goals. Well it would be easier for us to do better work. I don't know if I would

benchmark it by getting to those goals. Even though those are the goals we have to get

to for reappointment. Again, I think the bars are set somewhat low for reappointment,

even though I wouldn't want them any higher. I think that it's achievable by most new

faculty, I would say. I think that in terms of "if I am supported", it would be better if

we didn't have to teach so much in our first year [of tenure track]. In other

universities they work up to a full course-load. I think I would like [a lessened

teaching load] better.

Furthermore, Anne describes the primarily undergraduate university who she is currently

employed by as having complicated priorities for faculty:

In theory [the focus] is on teaching here. There are some things that I think, it's not so

much about making it more of an emphasis on teaching, but less of an emphasis on

research. There's just less research money to go around here. That is somewhat by

virtue of it being a small university, or a small institution. In comparison to friends of

mine who are at bigger, more research-intensive schools there's more support on

research because there is more of an emphasis on research. Whereas here, I think, it's

not because we aren't getting a huge amount of support on teaching. Even though I

think the Teaching and Learning Centre is doing a good job, they also have very few

staff. It's super tiny compared to [the university where I completed my doctoral

studies]. It reflected that because they do a ton of support for staff. I guess in theory, I

think that [this university] is known as a teaching focused institution, but I don't know

if that is just because they largely don't have grad programs and don't support

research as intensively. What I am trying to say is, it's more of a lack of research

support than it is about guiding the focus on teaching because of the teaching support.

The university that employs Anne seems to lean toward being a teaching-intensive university,

but as she says, perhaps there is simply less of an emphasis on the research aspect of her job.

From this quotation, it is not completely clear as to what the university's identity is.

Jane

Jane observed in her time studying that there are different sizes of universities, and in

her opinion, the size of the university indicates the focus that the institution has:

There's the research intensive, there's comprehensive and then there's teaching

intensive. [My university] is in the teaching category. [The institution where I

studied], which I think is this amazing place, is comprehensive. So, there is a focus on

student learning, but a pretty big focus on research considering it probably only has

20,000 students. Then [the post-secondary institution she attended] is one of these

research mega houses. So, moving here was a big change; shifting from [her previous

experience] to come [here]. Just because the kind of supports available are very

different between the two institutions.

Jane paused during the interview and wanted to clarify a point for me before moving on to

another question:

One thing that I'll say before I get into this section, you should really look at what

university people were training at. Coming from [a medical/doctoral university], it's a

research-intensive university. They don't care about their undergrads. Why are the

faculty there? Because they have prolific research programs, so they teach out of pure

obligation. Not every prof. Most of them are teaching out of pure obligation because

they have to. Really, they are researchers who happen to have to teach a course. If

someone is coming to do their Ph.D. at a small university, like, if they went to [a

medical/doctoral university] or if they went to [a comprehensive university] (in a more

teaching-centric university) or a university that cares more about teaching undergrads,

you are going to see very different outlooks. It was very interesting coming from [her

former university], where I knew a lot of people who could care less. [Her colleagues

would say] I hate that it's Tuesday and it's one o'clock and I have to go teach these

undergrads." Versus here, where everyone is like "I know everyone's names, and you

as a new faculty have to know every one of your students' names".

Jane explains that she moved away from a research-intensive school to take this post, and her

current university is more focused on teaching. She also discusses briefly that the teaching

supports she received from the institution where she studied during her Ph.D. were greater than

her current institution. She also makes it quite clear that teaching, in her experience, is not

privileged among researchers, and is not a priority for many academics at Canadian institutions.

Not only does Jane feel the pressure from her colleagues to produce research, but she feels

the pressure from her students to provide high quality in-class teaching. Jane believes it is

problematic that students in her class are the ones evaluating her teaching skills. Jane adds that

there is evidence that proves if you are a white male, you will receive better evaluations by virtue

of gender and race. Despite this, she explains the other way new professors can choose to be

evaluated, Jane said, is to ask the chair to come in and evaluate a class. Knowing how busy

people are, she does not feel that that is a good use of everyone's time to request this. This

suggests that it is an imperfect system that could use further scrutiny or evaluation. Jane says:

> You could choose to have someone to come in. People are pretty cognisant that it's
>
> other people's time. Am I really going to ask my chair to take an hour and a half of
>
> her day to come and sit and watch me teach something that she already knows about?
>
> Then ask her to sit down and write a letter about it. Am I really going to send one of
>
> my colleagues to read through a syllabus and give me an A+? No, that is a waste of
>
> someone's time. So, if it's not required, then we are not going to do it. There's
>
> research to say that these student evaluations are garbage anyway. I'm sure this is
>
> what you are going to ask about, if you are a white man who looks distinguished and
>
> has grey hair. You are going to get great evals. If you are a young woman of colour
>
> you are going to get really junk evals. That's just how the cookie crumbles. I really

don't put much weight into it. If students happen to like you because you have a nice

friendly personality you get great evaluations. I get terrific evaluations. Does it make

me feel really special? No. I realize I am young and passionate about what I get to

teach. If I had to teach a really junky course, it would get terrible evaluations. My

research methods [a course that she teaches] evals are not as shiny because people

hate research.

Jane is referring to the inequality that exists with her male colleagues at the time of student

evaluations, and also notes other factors, such as race, that impact on how students assess faculty

teaching. Critical theorists argue that power dynamics are not equal with all professors when

they enter the class (Brown et al., 2000), a point that will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

In reference to how her current university evaluates her teaching performance, Jane says:

 At least on the tenure track at [this university], you need to go through the re-

appointment process, you have to put together a binder showing that you meet all of

the criteria. As part of that you need to have a teaching dossier and a teaching section

in this binder. It's almost pre-tenure. Essentially, I am just going to do this binder, put

a couple more things in and go for tenure in two years from now. As part of that, we

have to sit down and reflect on our teaching, read our teaching evaluations, reflect on

what our students think, reflect on what we think and evaluate our approach. Putting

that together is really helpful because you have to understand your teaching

philosophy and how you teach. For me, I am an auditory learner. I learn through

stories and anecdotes [so, I incorporate those things into my teaching].

The way her university evaluates teaching is clear to Jane, but when she was asked about which

of the three functions (teaching research and service) she prioritizes in her current role, she says:

at most universities when you come in, it's very clear. You are doing a 40-40-20.

40% research, 40% teaching and 20% service. When I was interviewing at [this

university], I asked the question, what is the breakdown? They said, well you are

teaching 5 courses, if you do the math, how could you have a research program and do

service if 40% is 5 courses.

This seems to be conflicting to a certain extent, since Jane's passion is researching, yet she is

saying that her institution prioritizes teaching. In other words, Jane is working within the

framework of a teaching-intensive university with a research-focus although it appears that she

has discovered a healthy balance between the priorities and fulfills her obligations appropriately.

When talking about how she feels her institution views teaching Jane says:

I put a lot of time in figuring out what I should write. I thought I had this

constructivist approach, where you are building on people's previous knowledge, you

are doing case studies, you are looking at what people already know. You are trying

various experiential learning opportunities to build on that. That is for sure what

happens in grad school. It is a little bit harder in class, but I am trying. That is kind of

my idea. One section of this, of course, I have a lot of research, I feel like it's kind of

like good job. This is not going to advance you on your career. You have to get great

evaluations on your teaching.

Jane's interpretation of how teaching is being recognized by her institution is interesting because

she understands that she could perform at a satisfactory level and her advancement will not be

tempered, but she is passionate about teaching and wants her students to learn.

Theme 3: Competing Demands

The overarching theme that recurred throughout the interviews was the idea that in addition to having new responsibilities, alongside all the regular stresses that come with a new job, new faculty who are navigating a new university culture also have unique challenges as academics. Professorship, as discussed in Chapter One, is multi-layered and requires a lot of time and energy invested into the three main functions of the job (research, teaching and service). The idea that these functions pull new faculty in different directions regularly (Austin et al., 2006) is presented below.

Anne

Anne explained that it is difficult to articulate what her job entails to people who are not familiar with the academic workplace, since they often believe her job is structured the same way as public high school teachers. It is very typical, she says, that people assume she has no responsibilities in the summer months since students are not in session. In general, she says, people tend to assume there is nothing for professors to do in the summer months. She indicates quite the contrary is true for her and that she is a prime example of a professor who tries to follow the "40-40-20 rule". Anne said that she researches a lot, but "I usually say that research is the most highly-prioritized thing in what you are mostly evaluated on; bringing in grant money, and publishing". Anne points to the fact that she finds herself thinking that she enjoys teaching but managing "the competing interests makes me not enjoy teaching" because it makes her feel like "something is pulling my time that already is so short". Furthermore, Anne says:

In terms of the "what am I", I have found that it is a real struggle to juggle those

competing interests. So, a conversation that I have been having a lot lately, especially

with a lot of other people that have been hired at the same time as me—here there was

[a number of] faculty that were hired at the same time as me and started within 6

months of each other. With that fairly large cohort, we have chats about how things

are going and venting. One of the things that I find myself saying is that, I do enjoy

teaching, but trying to manage the competing interests makes me not enjoy teaching.

It makes it difficult to enjoy teaching because it makes it feel like, it's not a hassle,

because I do enjoy it, but it makes it feel like something that is pulling my time that

already is so short. But all of the things that I do feel that way. Research, I don't feel

like a researcher, but I also don't feel like an educator because you don't ever feel like

you are ever doing anything well. You feel like you are full of potential. I could be a

better researcher if things weren't always feeling like they were in competition. That

might be true in any job? You feel like you could do one thing better if you didn't

have to do all these other things, but it just feels like you are juggling always.

Teaching is a component of Anne's reappointment application, even though she thinks

her institution prioritizes research. She says that despite the reappointment expectations at the

institution being relatively low, she is glad the expectations are not any greater. Anne also

unpacks the paradoxical situation that is her reality at the primarily undergraduate institution

where she works when she discussed her institution underemphasizing research and having less

funds available to faculty to support their research. She adds that:

I would be a better educator and a better researcher if I didn't have to do all of that

stuff at once. As much as I do, as a new faculty member, if I wasn't teaching five

courses in my first year. It's just too much. They need to do prof relief for new

faculty.

The conflicting feelings of how to prioritize one's time with the competing demands of the job are clear in this quotation. Anne would like more time in her schedule since she thinks she could be more effective at all facets of her job. She went on to say that:

> the course that I teach now, I repeat in the fall and in the winter. I think this is my fourth or fifth time teaching them. So, I have lots of time to revise workout kinks and all that kind of stuff and there are still things that I would like to revise, even like at Christmas break, I always notice that I should tweak this, or change the up the readings and I try to do that to the best of my abilities. It's just too much.

When asked about professional development and training opportunities, she describes the nature of the position where they have limited time throughout the workday:

> I think as I look to do more teaching training and again, one of the problems I find with this job. Although I love doing training on how to be a better educator, and I did it a lot at [my former university]. I find, I just don't have enough time to do it here. The teaching and learning centre here does a lot of good stuff. But I don't have time for it. I just don't have time.

Another factor that limits Anne's time is the fact that she has a family and is a mother. She discusses how that conflicts with her work life balance here:

> Things that would be nice to do may be manageable for other young faculty who don't have kids. I think that really does make a difference. Things look very different for me. I don't go home and relax, then dive back into work. I go home; make dinner, [and tend to my children].

Anne describes a very hectic work schedule in the above quotation, and provides important insights on what working in academe is like.

Jane

Jane discussed the flow of her general workday in the following quotation, which provides important insight into her feelings about juggling her workload. She describes her days as being:

crazy, because I am teaching five courses. I have undergrad students coming in and out of my office all day. Then when I go home, I am trying to write a paper. I see it as chunk of my life. [For example] the priority right now is getting these courses done, and also ensuring that these students don't feel alone and isolated. There is a definite ebb and flow to this life that I lead.

Jane then summarizes the way she views her job when she says, "you are essentially teaching one-on-one, then you are teaching a group of people through the week and then you are researching". This shows how often she is guiding and directing others in her job, and as is evident she spends so much of her day with others that carving out time for evaluating student's work and writing papers seems to be a difficult task, especially when research is so important to her.

Although she has a well-developed research program where she is responsible for overseeing several master's students, Jane has to prioritize teaching:

There are not enough hours in the day to have a real research program and teach and do service. So, I don't know what the breakdown is at this university. It is very clear that this university does not give a percentage breakdown. Teaching is the priority. For example, when you are hired at [this university], the collective agreement shows salaries based on criteria. When you enter, you are placed based on prior experience with things like teaching.

Jane explains how difficult it is to assess how the university she is currently working at sets

priorities for how faculty allocate time, with more hours expected to be dedicated to teaching

rather than research. This is especially difficult to rationalize when Jane's understanding of the

purpose of university is to generate knowledge through researching activities rather than

focusing on teaching. She says:

> Right from the beginning, they [the university where she is currently employed] are
>
> explicitly saying this is a teaching university, we really care about teaching. It is
>
> interesting to me, because universities are less about educating students and more
>
> about generating knowledge and doing research. So, I think it's very clear, based on
>
> our collective agreement and based on where resources are placed in this university,
>
> the teaching has a much higher priority than research.

Following the thematic analysis guidelines, the data that emerged from the interviews was

used to produce a detailed discussion in the Analysis Chapter below. The three main themes

presented in this chapter are analyzed and discussed in detail in the following chapter, using the

same structure.

Chapter Five – Analysis

These two professors' accounts describe their individual journeys in learning how to teach in higher education, and they have shared their personal and individual stories of their academic careers. Throughout these discussions, several common ideas overlapped within the narratives. The three main themes of (1) experience, teacher training and teaching strategies, (2) institutional attitudes, expectations and mixed messaging, and (3) competing demands have been presented above. This chapter uses those three main themes and analyzes them in connection to supporting educational theories. This analysis can be useful in sharing valuable insights with new tenure track faculty as well as prospective Ph.D. candidates who are currently considering professorial work.

Theme 1: Experiences, Teacher Training and Teaching Strategies

Learning to teach is a skill that one needs to acquire through either focused practice with critical reflection, specific teacher training, or better yet, a combination of the two. The question of how one acquires the knowledge and skills to effectively deliver course content to students (and then to be able to evaluate the effectiveness of the teaching methods) comes to light in Chapter Four as the participants shared first-hand experiences working through this process. Kreber (2002) introduces a typology of higher education teachers where educators can be considered either an excellent teacher or an expert teacher. She says excellent teachers are motivated intrinsically to teach people and the source of their skill development in teaching is usually from personal experience (p.9). The expert teacher, however, has a very deep understanding of their subject area but the foundation of the expert's teaching practice is developed through a process of trial and error and reflection.

It is a widely accepted notion within higher education literature that faculty learn about teaching largely as a result of their personal teaching experience. Bain's (2011) work adds to this conversation in that he says university professors are experts in their field, but he says that "people are unlikely to become great teachers unless they know something to teach" (p.16) in the first place. This is an important point, since university professors need to exhibit vast knowledge of a subject area first, and then learn how to properly and effectively share that knowledge with others.

In the case of both Anne and Jane, they clearly have a mastery of their subject areas. Anne took a number of optional teacher-training courses in her doctoral studies, while also having the opportunity to teach a large class at a large university. Jane spoke more about using a more self-directed approach to learning how to teach, learning "on the fly" through her international teaching experiences in community-based settings. She notes that she relied primarily on feedback and self-reflection to improve her practice, but she also took some professional training courses that related to teaching which she indicated were helpful.

The field of adult education/lifelong learning raises the importance of preparing educators to develop critically reflective capacities regarding their own teaching practices (Brookfield, 2017). Lange (2013) describes how one practices self-reflection when discussing transformative learning theory. She says the three forms of reflection are:

1) **Instrumental reflection** focuses on assumptions embedded in technical knowledge, such as in the physical sciences or applied technology.

2) **Practical reflection** focuses on assumptions embedded in cultural symbolism and interpersonal communication, as individuals engage in meaning-making.

3) **Critical or emancipatory reflection** focuses on unearthing the assumptions and interests embedded in social and knowledge systems. These include: epistemic habits (ways of knowing), sociolinguistic habits (ways of viewing social norms and culture), physiological habits (ways of viewing social norms and culture), psychological habits (ways of viewing self), moral-ethical habits (ways of thinking about issues of conscience), and aesthetic habits (ways of assessing beauty). (p. 109)

When unpacking these descriptions, it is evident that practicing critical reflection is more difficult than attempting instrumental or practical reflection and requires knowledge or training to effectively practice critical reflection. From the interviews, it is clear that the participants are naturally inquisitive people who are very engaged in their teaching. It also appears that both Anne and Jane are conscious of social and cultural factors that can impact upon teaching and learning experiences. Lange (2013) says that, "transformative learning is central to achieving social justice" (p.110). Although it is not reasonable to ask every university professor to become social justice experts, it is very important that professors are generally rational and critical thinkers who are conscious of social issues and who make efforts within their pedagogy to understand their own way of knowing and provide a safe space to all learners. Both Anne and Jane displayed these behaviours.

Critical reflection is an important component of transformative learning for educators in their teaching practice, although it is not clear whether most university professors in Canada are being prepared to critically reflect on their teaching or not. The two participants did demonstrate critically reflective capacities as they discussed their work as educators, which seemed to be connected to their educational backgrounds and experiences. In the case of Anne, her research is

grounded in critical theory and she has an academic background that included coursework in

Women's Studies, which may have influenced her awareness of variables pertaining to identity

that impact on teaching. Jane, on the other hand, developed important perspectives working with

diverse learners during her doctoral studies. In the interview she spoke about her experiences

researching and teaching in other countries. Jane's international work with learners no doubt

helped her to reflect upon social and cultural differences which helped her to develop cross-

cultural competencies in teaching.

As seen above, both professors (Anne and Jane) learned to teach in different ways, but

they were hired in their current posts because they demonstrated a solid foundation of prior

knowledge and had some experience with teaching (among other important skills and

qualifications). Kugel (1993) says that most professors learn to teach in five stages that

transition from a: focus on self, focus on subject, focus on students, students as active, and

students as independent (p. 316). He notes that the first stage in learning to teach is for faculty to

focus on themselves, before being able to focus on the learners. This is important since knowing

oneself is at the centre of critical reflective activities. Kugel (1993) believes that new

professionals in any industry are generally nervous and have a healthy fear of failing in public

but notes that becoming a new professor has additional pressures:

> The problem [teaching in public for the first time] is often worse for novice professors
>
> because they have seldom been taught much about the skill they are about to perform.
>
> They have been taught a lot about the subject they are about to teach, but little about
>
> how to teach it. (p.317)

Neither Anne nor Jane mentioned feeling as though they were nervous about teaching at this

stage in their careers, which may be because they had opportunities to teach before being hired

into their current full-time faculty position. This could indicate that both of these professors have moved along the five stages of learning how to teach prior to their current posts because of their prior teacher training and experiences. This points to the value of providing doctoral students with teaching opportunities to help develop their capabilities as educators.

Learning different in-class techniques and teaching strategies is a skill learned through a combination of specific training and lived experience (and critical reflection). As Pekkarinen et al. (2017) point out:

> University lecturers are not usually formally trained teachers; rather, they are
>
> primarily researchers. Teaching in universities is still viewed by many academics as
>
> an obligation that comes as part of their academic positions and an activity that
>
> requires no formal training. In many countries, merit as a researcher, rather than
>
> pedagogical skills, is used as a basis for recruiting university teachers. (p. 736)

New professors gain teaching skills by trial and error and also by observing, and it is important to remember that before professors became professors, they were students. One source that university professors use to strengthen their own teaching practice is to reflect on the strategies their teachers used that worked well for them as learners and interpret and emulate those effective techniques. Anne specifically mentioned that she took pieces of teaching styles from friends, colleagues and former teachers.

Gibbs and Coffee (2000) suggest that training for new professors can be done through observing their colleagues. In the Canadian university model though, observing one's colleague does not happen regularly. Jane explained her hesitations to ask a colleague to observe her. Thus, most of the development around teaching happens through optional training activities provided by the institution or through individual reflection on one's teaching activities. As in the

experience of both Anne and Jane, developing a foundation for teaching largely happened for them during their doctoral degrees. Kugel (1993) says, "most of what [new professors] have learned, they have learned from watching others and, as they start to do it on their own, they usually wish they had paid more attention to what their professors did as they taught" (p. 93).

Both professors involved in this research credit mentors and colleagues who took the time to explain and demonstrate what 'good teaching practices' are. Anne spoke about her experiences during her doctoral studies and mentioned the department she belonged to was pushing to make teacher-training mandatory for all Ph.D. candidates. Jane on the other hand discussed how a professor mentored her and demonstrated sound teaching techniques.

A risk with emulating other professors' teaching techniques; however, is the potential for perpetuating harmful or ineffective strategies. In other words, faculty can propagate harmful teaching methods to the new professors modelling these techniques (if the proper education is not imparted upon the less experienced professors). For example, Closson (2010) says, "many students, practitioners, and faculty colleagues continue to ask me, 'What is critical race theory?' an understanding of it apparently has not entered the everyday world of many students, practitioners, and faculty" (p. 261). She explains that there is not a very strong understanding of critical race theory amongst university faculty, despite the abundance of literature that exists. New professors may not have this knowledge, or develop it on their own without the proper guidance. Therefore, if universities incorporate aspects of critical pedagogy when training new professors how to teach, new faculty may be more likely to identify the positive strategies to develop more inclusive teaching practices.

The complexities of the classroom cannot be overstated, as there are significant power dynamics that new professors need to be prepared for. Anne shared her concerns about this:

What I have been talking about with peers and other new faculty is just the lack of

training for educators here around equity issues in the classroom. I would like to learn

about that more, how to address accessibility issues in the classroom. There is a whole

bunch of things. I think equity-related issues we aren't well prepared for. So aside

from just good teaching techniques, I think the equity issues that come up in a

classroom that we don't get well prepared for. You can easily avoid this, and for me, I

have actively sought this kind of training out. But, because dealing with equity and

race and class-based discrimination is part of my research, for me it blends into all the

things I do. For many faculty, it doesn't. So, they can just very easily not deal with

that.

On this topic, Brigham (2013) shares the following quotation to reinforce Anne's concerns about

the lack of critical race pedagogical training:

The idea that acknowledging race makes us racist needs to be challenged, for it is not

race per se that is the trouble, it is the interpretation of it. Pretending not to notice race

or racialization is, in effect, to be dismissive of the impact of race on people's daily

experiences. Racial identity is a critical part of each person's identity, whether it is

named or not, so to ignore racial identity is to ignore the wholeness of a person.

(p.124)

This argument holds true with not only race, but any visible or invisible inequity that may exist.

To ignore these serious power imbalances is to perpetuate them. Whether discussing race,

gender or any inequity, the literature suggests professors need to be made aware of assumptions

to provide the best education for their students. This is a very significant responsibility that

professors and institutions share, and it is an integral component of the entire scope of what

teaching in higher education is. St. Clair (2015) supports this idea that acknowledging the

existence of privilege and diversity is crucial in higher education when he says, "the most

unacceptable option is to pretend that it doesn't play a part in your teaching" (p.37). Yet as Anne

states, if the institution does not facilitate strategies for fostering more inclusive teaching

practices, it is easier for faculty who do not wish to tackle these more difficult issues to ignore

them. Anne approaches her teaching in a way that it is informed by criticality, and she is very

aware of the benefits of creating an inclusive learning environment for her adult learners that

allows students to feel comfortable to participate without judgement. She is conscious not to

ignore the, "relationships that are structured around class, race, gender, and sexual orientation

[that] are…played out in all adult education classrooms…[that] have a profound effect on all

teaching and learning processes" (Brown, 2000, p.273).

St. Clair (2015) argues that teaching at the university-level should be developed to address

some of these issues of inclusion:

It would be unfair to expect educators to be able to deal with every possible variation

of learning career and to resolve issues that may well go back to individuals' earliest

experiences with education. However, it would be reasonable to expect that they will

be conscious of these issues and sensitive to the wide range of effects they may have

in the teaching and learning process. (St. Clair, 2015, p.37)

This important part of teaching can be supported by adult education and lifelong learning

theories and addressed by educators in any discipline who pays attention to critical pedagogical

theories. Brigham (2013) also discusses the importance of challenging "racisms" in the adult

education context, she says, "such an approach involves educators and students analyzing class,

power, privilege, and language including the role of White supremacy that is embedded in the

curriculum, teaching and assessment practices" (p.124). It is unclear as to what extent critical

education practices are being incorporated into the teacher training that university professors

receive outside of the field of Education, but in an increasingly diverse university context, these

concerns are legitimate.

There were some indicators revealed in the interview with Anne, that perhaps more

critical pedagogical theory can be incorporated into the development process of training faculty

to teach. Since Anne participated in lot of optional teacher training in her doctoral studies, she

had more to share in this regard. Of the instructional training that Anne participated in during her

doctoral studies, she learned a "little bit of theory, but the purpose of that course [wasn't] to learn

about pedagogical theories" and instead the primary purpose of that course was to be a "more of

a hands-on practical course". This comment indicates that theory is often not presented as being

a "practical" aspect of preparing university faculty to teach. Perhaps if it was presented in a more

digestible way, it would be perceived as of practical benefit.

At the same time, Anne did complete a teaching certificate during her doctoral studies,

which was at a larger university and involved four levels that required different levels of

engagement. For the fourth, most complex level, "you had to write a review paper on a

pedagogical theory. I wrote mine on feminist pedagogy." This topic is of interest to her, as she

had previously also taken courses in Women's Studies, and her insights into gender and teaching

are evident in her discussions about teaching. Her example shows that teacher training for faculty

can include both more technical, skill-focused competences, and more theoretical reflections on

teaching. However, the breadth of offerings for faculty in CTLs seems to be more extensive at

larger universities.

Both Anne and Jane seemed to be attentive to issues of diversity in developing their own teaching practices. In addition to courses that have a more technical focus, Anne also teaches a course that takes a critical approach, taking up issues of social justice, diversity and equity that she describes as being, "central to constructing an identity…wrapped up in power inequities like race, class and gender". She also does a "module in sustainability…an advocacy project…and community engagement activities". Anne also adds that:

> as a white prof I am very conscious how I present that material to white students but also to students of colour in the classroom. I also talk about Indigenous issues [while] trying not to overstep and say something that is beyond my kind of right to say.

Balancing these perspectives in a respectful way resonates with what Battiste (2013) says:

> Indigenous humanities speak to the core of resilient humanity, the similarities and diversities of all people who develop from their ecological origins rather than from their cultural differences…[indigenous humanities] is a concept seeking to live beside and in balance with the discursive Eurocentric categories and regimes of the humanities as knowledge. In the Eurocentric humanities, the core is understood as learned philosophers, who devise by design their legacy, a history based on relations among nations that led to supremacy of being. (p.113)

Anne appears to be sensitive to the understanding that teaching from the Eurocentric perspective only is less effective, and potentially harmful to a group of diverse learners.

It would appear that Anne and Jane sought out their own methods of preparing to teach in higher education and have learned in different ways the importance of teaching with a socially just angle. Their institutions they belong to therefore rely on individual professors to take an interest in critical issues in teaching, since teacher training was not mandatory in either case, and

from the training that was discussed, only "some theory" was present. This indicates that these universities are reliant on doctoral graduates being highly motivated to learn how to teach.

When reviewing content from different teaching and learning centres' webpages (such as the University of Northern British Columbia's which was discussed in Chapter 1), many provide a "teaching handbook" for faculty. The handbook UNBC provides to its faculty contains many great tips and hints for how to properly have a classroom discussion or understand different student learning styles. In fact, the information comes from credible peer-reviewed sources; however, all of the subject matter in the handbook tends to take on a more simplistic, technical-rationale approach. Although addressing the technical approaches to teaching is a very important element to those learning the craft, this technical approach lacks an important element in designing courses, which is a thoughtful consideration for all learners who may be oppressed in one way or another. St. Clair (2015) says:

> This does not mean that educators have to explicitly engage in discussing the issues
>
> with the learners, which could be uncomfortable for all involved. What this does
>
> mean, in my view, is that the presence of privilege should be acknowledged when
>
> making decisions about design. (p.37)

Since professors have an important role to play in addressing how diversity is taken up within the university sector, it seems unfair to the educators and learners that more emphasis on criticality is not being incorporated into the teacher-training of new professors in Canada. Technical training will not equip professors to build presentations, discussions, projects and assessments for students of a dominated group. For example, African American educator, Johnson-Bailey (2007) says:

> The theme education for assimilation…[is] an ethnic or racial group's effort to
>
> relinquish its characteristics in favor of the characteristics and norm of the dominant
>
> group. (p.105)

In higher education settings, no matter the makeup of the class, or the gender or ethnicity of the professor, they still hold the balance of power. It is common in the smaller university setting that professors do not have TA support to mark papers and exams. Professors, therefore, are the sole evaluator in that class and are often responsible for allocating grades, sometimes in a rather subjective manor. They are also in a position of authority in designing the teaching experiences for their students. Therefore, these power dynamics exist in the classroom as well as within the larger university framework. Canadian universities could be doing a lot more to prepare and support their new professors with providing them with opportunities to learn more about critical pedagogy, especially when they expect their employees (faculty) to spend forty percent of their time performing these duties where the stakes are high in a learning environment that places a lot of pressure on the one person in the room, in charge of learning.

Important topics related to diversity and inclusion which include, but are not limited to, having in-depth discussions around privilege, hegemony, and dynamics related to racism and sexism, need to be taken up in higher education contexts. How does one create an environment that has these discussions openly? In what way can professors incorporate these deeper questions into their unique subject fields?

Faculty often find that they are challenged to address these kinds of issues in their teaching. Both Anne and Jane have had to confront challenges in their classes regarding gender, for example. Jane says:

I have this image in mind of this one male student. He always had something to say. I

am going to joke with you and make it very clear to everyone in this room that I love

that you are participating, but you need to stop because I am really interested in what

this other person has to say.

This is a power dynamic that needs to be considered, where her positionality (Brown et al., 2000)

is challenged as a female instructor. Anne experiences a very similar dynamic issue in her

classes. She says:

there is one male student in particular who is very vocal who takes up a lot of time and

space in the classroom and doesn't agree with a lot of the things I say. And I am

always very conscious of him in particular. Which I also try not to allow to happen in

the classroom, for him to take up so much time and space, even though I am more than

happy to talk to him. But he can't suck time and attention away from other students. I

don't mean to say that I am not interested in his questions, or that they are not valid

questions. But they just can't always be his questions, there has to be other's

questions as well.

Both Anne and Jane demonstrate an aspect of reflection, when trying to make sense of critical

issues that arise in the classroom and considering to address them appropriately. They indicated

an awareness of physical indicators of inequities, such as race or gender imbalances, although

there are also subtleties such as personalities, personal preferences and cultural influences that

may not be visible.

Although both Anne and Jane provided evidence of having an informed teaching skill set

in these interviews, they did not discuss any specific theories or theorists who informed their

work. During Anne's interview, she talked about the mentor she was assigned at the university

where she is now teaching and noted that they shared an interest in critical theory. Jane also

mentioned teaching a course that emphasizes worldview and global citizenship, which

demonstrates their interests and knowledge of the important critical theories in teaching.

     The experience of assembling a teaching dossier seems to be where professors are given

an opportunity to reflect on their values and how this impacted on their teaching practices. For

example, when Jane was discussing preparing her teaching dossier, she said:

> As part of [building our dossiers], we have to sit down and reflect on our teaching,
>
> read our teaching evaluations, reflect on what our students think, reflect on what we
>
> think and evaluate our approach. Putting that together is really helpful because you
>
> have to understand your teaching philosophy and how you teach.

Jane assesses her own teaching practice through reflection and familiarizing herself with how she

is perceived by her students. Ultimately, she describes refining her teaching practice by

"document[ing] [her] beliefs, values, and approaches" (Goodyear & Allchin, 1998, p.103).

     Both participants credit their development as scholars to the guidance they received from

mentors in their doctoral studies. In Anne's current university it does not seem possible for her

to observe or meet with mentor colleagues regularly. Early on in her appointment, however,

Anne was assigned a mentor with experience to help guide her. This is a common practice in

higher education, to ensure that new faculty have an available resource if they need "assistance

managing the occasionally conflicting requirements of course preparation, research expectations,

and appropriate levels of service" (Caskin, Lumpkin & Tennant, 2003, p.49). Jane did not talk

about a mentor at her current university in the interview but discussed her positive experience

with an educator in her doctoral studies who seemed to serve in a mentorship role for her.

Preparing new faculty or doctoral students to teach in higher learning contexts by including time and space for the related activities could be useful to ensure all new professors are adequately prepared for teaching responsibilities that come with their first appointment. Furthermore, by including insights from the field of adult education and lifelong learning, the overall teaching experience of new faculty and, equally, the learning experience of their students will be enriched. The participants shared how they learned to teach, and provided important insights that indicate they may have benefited from having more assigned time to further develop teaching skills. Jane views doctoral programs as "an apprenticeship in research", where most of her learning about teaching happened "on the fly", and Anne spoke of feeling as though she has "no time" for professional development once she began her post. Statements like these indicate that it might have been beneficial for Jane to get more opportunities to learn about teaching as a doctoral student. Likewise, early in her career, it appears that Anne could stand to benefit from more time in her schedule for professional development opportunities. Therefore, having more accessible supports for teaching early in the careers of new professors could possibly enrich the teaching and learning experience for new faculty and their students.

Theme 2: Institutional Attitudes, Expectations and Mixed Messaging

In order to begin this discussion—around the attitudes institutions project toward teaching and understanding how mixed messages can be sent and received in these contexts—Theme 2 looks at the differences in and similarities between how traditionally smaller Canadian institutions and the larger universities in Canada describe "teaching" in their collective agreements. Following an assessment of collective agreements, this theme discusses the

commentary from the participants that shows how mixed messaging can exist in higher

education even with the existence of formal policies.

Teaching Universities Collective Agreements

When comparing different collective agreements, each institution has its own definition

of what teaching is. Each institution also has a unique stance on how professors should earn

promotions, and how teaching will be assessed and weighted as a part of that process. Mount

Royal University describes teaching as, "all activities directed towards student learning for

which students are able to earn academic credit" (MRU, 2018, p.9). As a part of their

assessment which is tied to promotion, Mount Royal faculty on a tenure track are required to

have a minimum of three sets of student evaluations per year, which is not always the case.

Other universities define and evaluate teaching differently. For example, St. Francis Xavier

University outlines the minimum qualifications that a faculty member must exemplify in order to

qualify for promotion, among them is a single bullet that says, "evidence of effective teaching"

(St.FX, 2016, p.91). This is a common criterion that is seen in many collective agreements.

"Effectiveness in teaching" in this case is measured in "lectures, seminars, laboratories and

tutorials as well as in more informal teaching situations. It is recognized, however, that

scholarship must be manifested in the teaching function and that a dogmatic attempt to separate

'scholarship' and 'teaching' is somewhat artificial" (St.FX, 2016, p.79). This language reflects

the influence of how the discourse on teaching in higher education has been shaped by the

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) debates.

The often vague description and language used makes it difficult to decode what the

institution wants their faculty to exemplify in their teaching practice. The University of

Lethbridge have a much more digestible definition of teaching effectiveness in their collective

agreement where they outline the many different ways it can be measured. They go so far as to

include strategies, such as self-reflection which is included in the following definition:

> Effectiveness as a teacher implies a concentrated and successful effort to create the
>
> best possible learning situation for students. It involves continuing attention to course
>
> work, course design and related activities; and to the supervision of students in
>
> alternative modes of learning. It may involve participation in seminars and colloquia,
>
> the design of innovative methods of teaching, or other contributions to the teaching
>
> activities of the University and beyond. Effectiveness in teaching may be assessed by
>
> a variety of means including but not limited to: self-reflection; appraisals by fellow
>
> Members or pedagogical experts; examples of lectures, class materials, exams and
>
> assignments; presentations, articles and practice guides; prizes or awards; evidence of
>
> pedagogical leadership, impact, mentorship of others; receiving mentorship or
>
> training. (Lethbridge University, 2018, p.37)

Thus, the definition of teaching excellence varies somewhat amongst institutions, as is reflected

in each collective agreement. Collective agreements are important indicators, however, of the

university's culture or attitude they project toward teaching and learning.

Even with a clear definition of teaching excellence, measuring the effectiveness of teaching

can often be a difficult task. Most universities include professors' self-reflection as a method for

evaluating teaching excellence, in the form a teaching dossier. Queens University (2020)

provides this description of a teaching dossier for faculty:

> A teaching dossier provides a rich description of a person's teaching views,
>
> approaches, experiences, and evaluations. The sections, include a biographical

overview, teaching philosophy statement, teaching strategies, experiences,

effectiveness (evaluations and feedback), professional development, scholarship,

leadership, awards, sample syllabi and more. A teaching dossier is ever evolving like a

curriculum vitae or resume; however, it is distinct as it focuses on current goals and

relevant experiences and examples in teaching and learning within its typical 6-12

pages length. (Queens University, 2020)

Therefore, a teaching dossier is a document included in a faculty's application for appointment,

reappointment or promotion that provides evidence of that professor's abilities as an educator.

What seems to overlap in many of the collective agreements in Canada is the idea that

teaching dossiers are being used to assess "good teaching". For example, Acadia University's

(2017) collective agreement says:

Candidates shall present evidence of their teaching activities as part of their dossier.

Where the evidence relates to classroom performance, it should be based on direct

observation by peers and/or academic administrators or by student surveys as in

Article 17.02 A (n) (p. 39).

Regardless of the institution's definition of "teaching" the one commonality across all teaching

universities in Canada is that in order to qualify for promotion one has to demonstrate a

minimum aptitude for teaching. How each university describes teaching and measures teaching

effectiveness depends on the institution's agreed upon definition and means for providing

evidence of success.

Dalhousie University (2017), a large medical/doctoral university tells its faculty with

teaching responsibilities they:

have an obligation to make all reasonable efforts to develop and maintain their

scholarly competence and effectiveness as teachers within the area of expertise in

which they are employed, to prepare, organize, and present their subject matter so as

to facilitate comprehension by their students, and to revise that subject matter when

appropriate (p.66).

The way that Dalhousie University approaches evaluating their faculty's ability to meet the

above criteria is through student evaluation. This is reviewed when faculty apply for promotion

(Dalhousie University, 2017, p.63). The University of British Columbia has a similar definition

of teaching that their faculty are asked to follow, only their collective agreement is much more

focused on teaching as it pertains to promotion. Article 4 *Criteria for Appointment,*

Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion says, "candidates for appointment, reappointment, tenure

or promotion, other than those dealt with in paragraph (b), are judged principally on performance

in both teaching and in either scholarly activity or educational leadership" (UBC, 2017). This

demonstrates that even at research-intensive universities, faculty are held to a certain standard of

teaching. So, teaching is a main component to what faculty are expected to do no matter the size

of the institution.

Anne describes her institution as having less of an emphasis on research. Although Anne

acknowledges that "in theory" her institution values teaching, she indicates the way this is

accomplished is by deemphasizing research rather than prioritizing teaching. Furthermore, Anne

says that her institution may be considered a "teaching intensive university" due to its

population, but she is not receiving more supports in that regard. So, it is unclear to her whether

or not the institution sees itself as a teaching intensive university or not. Jane, who, works at a

similar-sized Canadian university where research is also not prioritized, definitively says her

institution is "in the teaching category". She also identifies that she receives lesser amounts of

teaching supports than what she experienced at larger research-intensive universities in the past,

who provide their faculty with more programming and robust supports. Jane, who was

accustomed to the culture at a larger research-university in her doctoral studies, was warned by

colleagues about taking this post when they told her, "it's terrible that you have to teach [so

many] courses [and] you are killing your research career". What is most curious about the

different interpretation offered by Anne and Jane of their working conditions is that they are both

required to teach a high number of courses during the year. At both institutions they each have a

disproportionately high number of undergraduate-level courses and the universities where they

work have a small student-population (under 10,000). Furthermore, their collective agreements

both clearly state that they are required to demonstrate the ability to teach. Yet, when examining

the responses, it seems that these professors are receiving mixed messaging about their

universities' goals, as to whether their main focus should be on teaching rather than research, but

it is also unclear who they are receiving the mixed messaging from. It appears that colleagues

who work in comprehensive or medical/doctoral universities may influence the perception they

have of their own institution's vision, since Jane seems to be able to do a lot of research in her

current appointment. Comments from both faculty members seemed to indicate that teaching

universities do not get the same teaching support that research universities receive. Although this

finding may seem to be somewhat counter-intuitive, as Anne explains, "it's not so much about

making it more of an emphasis on teaching, but less of an emphasis on research. There's less

research money…somewhat by virtue of it being a small university".

    It appears that mixed messaging may be a common challenge that new faculty encounter

throughout academia. Austin and McDaniels (2006) discuss the mixed messaging that is

received by doctoral students and say that, "aspiring scholars notice that although excellence in teaching is often applauded within research universities, the reward structure tends to emphasize research productivity (the scholarship of discovery)" (p.55). Williams (2013) suggest that, in order for the culture to change around teaching in higher education in Canada, deans and those who sit atop the institution must make a concerted effort to implement these types of changes to garner more support for focusing on teaching.

The climate in academia in which new faculty must learn to navigate the different expectations of their work is complex and layered, since the messages that are being sent and received by the stakeholders are being interpreted in different ways. Neoliberalism adds yet another layer of complexity to the web and is most evident when evaluating the impact of student expectations in assessing faculty teaching. Students are becoming more like customers and universities are mirroring businesses who are responsible for providing a product to their students (Giroux, 2014, p.4). As these business principles enter into the structures of universities in Canada, programs and campuses are the marketplace. Although Jane has not labelled the student behaviour she observes as neoliberal in nature, she senses an attitude shift in her students when she says:

> I hate to say this, but there is a sort of shift that is happening right now. The undergrads that are coming on, particularly the ones that are coming straight out of high school have a very different set of expectations that were not my expectations [when she was an undergraduate student]. One thing that I do that is not popular, I have a very limited email policy. Because when I went through my undergrad would I call (email wasn't really an option)? If I was desperate, would I go to their office hours? Absolutely, but it would be business-time. You don't waste your prof's time.

Here and when I was teaching at [my former university], it's like "hey [Jane] I wasn't

there on Tuesday, what did I miss?" That's so inappropriate and so disrespectful.

Come to my office, sit down and have a conversation with me. If it's a question [that

you should already know the answer to] I will tell you. Did you read your notes? Did

you ask your classmates? Then they will leave embarrassed and never do it again. So,

I have a ton of office hours, which sometimes is a huge "time-suck", but I think it's

better than a bunch of emails. I know [some of] my colleagues will be up to 3 am

answering student emails. I am setting this precedent clearly, do not waste my time.

The "shift" in student's attitudes that Jane mentioned comes from interacting with her students.

It may be that learners have become more demanding of their professors, programs and

universities since they view themselves as paying customers rather than simply learners

attending a higher education institution in pursuit of a post-secondary education. She notes that

undergraduates have a tendency to not try and problem-solve on their own. In this quotation,

Jane is pushing back against the neoliberal agenda that commodifies university education. The

idea that neoliberalism is strengthening in post-secondary institutions is subtle, yet evident here.

The bottom line is that higher education institutions are treating students more and more like

customers. This is particularly problematic since, as customers, students are beginning to

demand more from their professors. Jane's comments about how she did not share this

experience when she was a student is most likely due to the fact that neoliberal values have

strengthened in recent years.

As a result of neoliberalism's impact on higher education, professors are required to be

more accommodating to students, since universities are promoting their intimate class size as a

part of the student experience through marketing campaigns. Therefore, the pressures for more

individual student support are increased on faculty who teach in primarily undergraduate institutions. For example, St. Francis Xavier's website says "here, the focus is on the academic and personal development of every student, making community and social involvement a large part of the learning experience" (St.FX, 2020). The webpage goes on to boast about being the number one ranked university in Canada where professors know the student's name in 2016 (by MacLean's Magazine). Furthermore, the impact of neoliberalism complicates the message the university sends its faculty and its students. On the one hand, universities see themselves as institutions of higher learning, on the other hand they are effectively running as a for-profit business and faculty are expected to ensure customer satisfaction.

One of the obstacles faculty face is challenging students to think of their university education as an opportunity to engage in deeper, critical opportunities for learning and social engagement. Jackson (2007) says, "critical pedagogies involve transformative action and empowerment of students, acting as a site for struggle and the development of praxis" (p 209). Therefore, omitting critical pedagogical training for faculty directly plays into the neoliberal narrative of universities commodifying knowledge and having their students learn through a corporate training model rather than through critical thought.

Jackson (2007) indicates the problem universities face by commodifying the curriculum in higher education, especially when the purpose of a university education is shifting toward vocational training:

> The dominance of neoliberal discourse means that we are increasingly seeing the decline, even death, of adult ''liberal education'' programs, and the question of choosing whether or not to study for studying's sake will soon, to coin a phrase, be academic. (p. 204)

Education and the economy work together in a neoliberal world, and Jackson (2007) points

this out, by expressing concerns of losing learning for the sake of learning. As higher

education makes this shift, it changes who the students are, what they are expecting to learn

and how they expect to learn it.

Gouthro (2002) shares important insights on how capitalism impacts higher education by

considering how "critical thinking [is] suppressed when the marketplace becomes a predominant

influence in education" (p.334). It appears the attitudes and expectations of the university often

send mixed messages to faculty and students. Faculty need to have the critical capacity to be

vocal about what they see as the purpose of higher education, and to feel supported when they

assert, as Jane does here, the need to treat students as responsible and engaged learners, rather

than as customers who have the right to demand high levels of service. As an institution that is

preparing a new generation of higher learners, they should have a clearer stance on the

importance of students taking responsibility for their own learning, and new faculty should be

better supported to carry out that message.

Theme 3: Competing Demands

The third and final theme described in this chapter discusses how the participants juggle

the competing demands they are required to fulfill at their respective universities. As mentioned

in Chapter One, Canadian university professors are required to research, teach, and perform

service-related duties to fulfill their contractual obligations. Each of the three job functions

requires the professor's attention and understanding how these competing demands impact the

"teaching-function" is the focus of this theme. When analyzing the data, this theme emerged

rather quickly as the participants were forthcoming about discussing the time-work ratio they

contend with as professors. A discussion of the participant's comments on this subject is followed by an analysis of collective agreements from both teaching universities and research-intensive universities as they indicate the expectations of their faculty.

In the case of higher education, professors are not only teachers, they are researchers and mentors to future scholars. What is evident of a professor's job, is the non-linear nature of the day to day ebbs and flows that pull them in many different directions. Negotiating these demands can be stressful at times. Anne discusses how this negotiation of priorities works for her, stating:

> I do enjoy teaching but trying to manage the competing interests makes me not enjoy teaching. It makes it difficult to enjoy teaching because, it makes it feel like it's a hassle, because I do enjoy it, but it makes it feel like something that is pulling my time that already is so short.

Despite her conflicted feelings about her role as an educator, Anne confirmed that she views her role as being a teacher first and a researcher second. Jane views her position differently than Anne, sharing that whenever someone asks her what she does for a living, she informs them that she is a researcher. This difference in perception of priorities may be linked to their personal interests or motivations, as well as what the institution asks of their professors. Applying the work that Austin et al. (2006) present on Boyer's "four domains of scholarship"—the scholarship of application, the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration or the scholarship of teaching—professors need to determine what interests them the most. However, the authors argue that in order for university professors to be prepared for all aspects of the job, they should be prepared to participate in all of these activities:

In reality, an individual scholar will engage in each of these scholarships as his or her

professional roles, career stages, and research goals change over time. Understanding

both the unique characteristics of the four domains and how work in one domain

influences, expands, or connects with work in another will ensure that future faculty

have a map of the broad territory of scholarly activity and recognize the legitimacy of

different kinds of intellectual contributions. (p. 53)

Included in the four activities is the scholarship of teaching, which is an important aspect of the

university professor's scholarly functions.

Boyer (1990) as well as Bain (2011) argue that research and teaching should be seen, not

as separate activities, but as a harmonized dimension of the university professor's job function.

Therefore, research can be integrated into teaching and vice versa. As Bain argued, institutions

should strive to become "learning universities" where learning is central to the institution's

credo. In a learning university, both faculty and students gain knowledge from one another as

sharing and learning are paramount (p. 175). Bain recommends that institutions should change

the way that young scholars are developed, so that they are equipped to perform both research

and teaching functions. Creating a culture of learning is very important but the onus falls on each

individual institution to create this culture.

Williams, Verwoord, Beery, Dalton, McKinnon, Strickland and Poole (2013) looked at

how higher education institutions apply SoTL to create a culture change within institutions to

improve the quality of student learning. Williams et al. (2013), who are based in institutions all

over the globe, created a model for transforming cultures of universities by using social

networks. The model is based on three levels: the institution's strategy (macro), deans and

department chairs (meso) and faculty (micro). More simply stated, changing a culture happens

in three stages: (1) the institution is required to have the vision to implement such a strategy, (2) middle management must believe in it, embody the vision and talk about it often, and (3) if stages one and two are properly accomplished, faculty still need to buy in. According to the authors, this is how the culture is changed institution wide, but this theory is met with challenges in logistics and commitment from all stakeholders when trying to apply it in practice. In other words, to successfully change the culture of the institution individuals cannot be working in isolation but must rather participate in "social networks".

Often professors end up working in isolation as they independently have to decide how to juggle competing priorities. Williams et al. (2013) paint a picture of how implementing SoTL into one's daily practice can seem cumbersome and distracting, and this is especially true for new professors:

> Academics typically choose to invest their limited resources in meeting the demands
> of daily survival. Students need attention now, student work needs to be marked now,
> the department meeting is about to begin now, and it will be immediately followed
> by a supervision meeting, and then a lecture, which needs to be prepared...yesterday.
> In the face of these urgent demands, the call to integrate SoTL into daily practice is
> unlikely to be heeded unless it is immediately useful, and its benefits made clear. If
> the SoTL idea takes the form of a suggestion from a colleague, it may be ignored by
> the harried faculty member reluctant to take risks with teaching, and if it is issued as
> a directive by senior management, it may be dealt with in as perfunctory a manner as
> possible. Long-term strategies, especially those imposed from above, are often
> ignored (or openly dismissed) by individuals trying to just get through the day, the
> week, the term, or the national research assessment exercise. (p.51)

It is important to note that SoTL is meant to enhance student learning and contribute to the overall teaching and learning experience. It is always difficult to strike a balance in a work schedule; thus, it is understandable why professors would dedicate less time to improving their teaching skills when they already have so many priorities and improving teaching will not necessarily advance their career. Both Anne and Jane spoke extensively to the challenge of finding enough time to do everything that they were expected to in their jobs. However, teaching is as important as the other duties' professors have. Changing the way professors view this requires an adjustment in attitude and university culture. Changing a mindset of a campus is a significant undertaking and it must start at the top of the organizational structure with senior faculty and administrators.

The nature of the position in being a faculty member is chaotic at times, and expectations from different stakeholders may pull professors in polarizing directions. Therefore, understanding this complicated dynamic first is very important to unpacking how professors learn to teach. It entails a constant negotiation of managing priorities, yet achieving teaching excellence is still a goal for most professorial positions in Canadian universities as it is directly tied to compensation increases, tenure, and promotion (Jones, et al. 2012).

The participants of this study are motivated educators and push themselves to improve despite having time constraints. This focused hard work, Kreber (2002) says, is one of the fundamental traits of developing into a strong educator. While both Anne and Jane like to teach, working at primarily undergraduate universities means that they each have a heavier teaching load. On top of this, often professors who work at these smaller institutions are still expected to perform all the duties that are involved in professorship (i.e. mentoring graduate students, doing service, and establishing a program of research). Further to this, Anne is a mother of young

children and Jane travels extensively to work on her research. Anne and Jane both spoke of the unconventional nature of work they do that sees them, like many other scholars, working as many as sixty or seventy hours some weeks (McLean's, 2018).

Due to these competing demands on her time, Anne says she is glad she took advantage of what the centre for teaching and learning was offering early on in her career and "frontloaded" her learning about how to teach in higher education. Jane also took advantage of her time in her doctoral studies and said that, "during my Ph.D., I ended up learning about teaching because I was working in a situation where you end up having to teach people." Had Anne and Jane waited until they started working in a full-time capacity to learn to teach, perhaps they would be struggling with the transition from student to teacher, especially since the nature of the work is so demanding.

Teaching Universities Collective Agreements

In order to gain a clearer understanding of the workload demands at various teaching universities this thesis examines the collective agreements from the following institutions: Acadia University, Cape Breton University, Lethbridge University, Mount Royal University, Mount Saint Vincent University, Saint Francis Xavier University and University of Northern British Columbia. All of these universities have under 10,000 students and have a large proportion of undergraduate classes. Furthermore, they have similar workloads, where faculty are expected to be teaching as many as five classes per year, usually no more than three per semester. Some universities lighten the workload for their new faculty in the first two years, while others do not. Cape Breton University's collective agreement states that their teaching assignment for full-time faculty is fifteen credits-hours per year (or five half-year courses) and

add that no member will be required to teach more than nine credit hours per semester (CBU, 2016, p.57). In this document, the university has included a section about student advising, and state that full-time faculty are required to set aside five hours where they are available for their students and that these hours are clearly stated on the corresponding course syllabi (CBU, 2016, p.62). This is a distinct feature in Cape Breton University's collective agreement. The University of Lethbridge also has a unique approach, where they do not specify the teaching-workload for faculty. It is one of the larger institutions in this category, due to its student-population and higher number of doctoral programs offered. Having non-specific teaching workloads allows for negotiation on a case by case basis when hiring new faculty.

Research Universities Collective Agreements

Accessing collective agreements from the larger research universities in Canada is not as straightforward as in the case of smaller universities, where collective agreements are readily available on their respective websites. Collective agreements are also more complex for medical/doctoral universities as they are required to negotiate with multiple unions, sometimes in the dozens. The student populations range from nineteen thousand to eighty-eight thousand. This thesis also examines collective agreements from Dalhousie University, McGill University, The University of British Columbia and The University of Toronto that are categorized as research-universities. The reason for including this discussion of collective agreements from medical/doctoral universities is to share a comparative perspective of teaching expectations between "teaching universities" and "research universities". As previously mentioned, not having easy access to collective agreements to all universities in Canada creates challenges acquiring the information, since the documents are more difficult to find and are much more

specific in nature than their teaching university counterparts. Despite these challenges, McGill University has an accessible collective agreement between its course lecturers/instructor's union and the university. In this agreement, it defines the workload for its faculty in a very clear concise manor, but it does not specify a minimum number of teaching hours their faculty are required to teach per year. Dalhousie University, The University of British Columbia and The University of Toronto also leave the teaching appointment up to contractual obligations negotiated at the time of hiring. Though the aforementioned universities do not provide a specific number of hours new faculty can expect to teach, they do, however, outline that faculty will be expected to perform teaching, research and service-related duties while employed at their institutions. This may be partly due to the fact that graduate supervision plays a more central role for professors at larger institutions.

As previously stated, no two university's collective agreements are the exact same. They are unique and explicitly written since collective agreements are the result of the two parties' (university and faculty) negotiations. It is interesting to see that no matter the student population, (generally speaking) teaching performance is tied to promotion. Furthermore, the general duties that university professors perform are usually the same, although, the allocation of time spent doing each of those activities varies greatly depending on the focus that each institution has. New faculty should understand what duties they will be expected to perform, since they have access to collective agreements and their contracts specify expectations. At primarily undergraduate universities, faculty are usually expected to handle a heavier teaching load in terms of the number of courses they must teach. They may not have any, or many, graduate students to supervise, depending on the program or department they are working in/ belong to. Therefore, professors working in primarily undergraduate universities with heavy teaching

appointments need to be organized to juggle the competing demands of the job while providing effective instruction for their students.

The participants of this study discussed feeling limited with respect to time. The competing demands of the job and the time constraints experienced by these professors are no doubt a factor that explains why these professors potentially receive less teaching supports than professors who work in medical/doctoral universities, since they don't have time to participate in professional development. The other factor that inhibits professors from receiving adequate supports, is the idea that neoliberalism is influencing the decisions of the university. For example, if professors view teaching as a hassle or an obstacle in their profession, they are likely observing their role through a neoliberal lens. This can be seen when Anne says, "research is the most highly-prioritized thing in what you are mostly evaluated on; bringing in grant money, and publishing". She also adds that, "[teaching is] not what is going to help me keep my job or help me grow in terms of reputation." This indicates that Anne's understanding of how to advance her career has been influenced by neoliberal values that increasingly shape higher education contexts. Boyer (1990) would say that teaching and scholarship should be a harmonious activity that strengthens one's overall scholarship. To avoid perpetuating the neoliberal agenda in universities, institutions could pay attention to the culture and attitude around teaching and provide more time and space for their professors early in their careers to develop teaching skills. This of course could start in a Ph.D. program, where critical perspectives on education can contribute to inclusive teaching environments in higher education.

Chapter Six – Conclusions

Conclusions

This study investigates how two professors learned how to teach thus far in their academic careers. Their perspectives and experiences were central to learning how they acquired the skills necessary to facilitate student learning in the context of the universities with which they are affiliated. Their insights contribute to understanding the experiences of new faculty's readiness to teach.

By doing a qualitative study of the two professors' experiences, this thesis was able to provide evidence of a deeper understanding of the overlapping issues that both participants discussed. In doing so, this thesis drew some important conclusions about how new university professors experience teaching and how they navigate the structures that employ them to teach.

The first conclusion in this thesis is that teaching strategies are acquired by university professors over time through a combination of focused hard work, professional development and lived experience (with critical reflection). There is a lot of trial and error that takes place, while discerning "good" teaching strategies from those that are less effective. From the responses collected, this seems to be a self-reflective process as supports they receive once they are hired are minimal. In both cases, these new professors had some prior experiences with teaching during their Ph.D. programs. These experiences were very different from one another, but they each had opportunities to discover what their teaching-style was prior to beginning with their current employment. Although it seems that the participants had different approaches to acquiring their skills as teachers, the universities that hired them believed they were adequately prepared to take on this task. Furthermore, they both enjoy teaching even though they have differing perspectives on how to prioritize the three main functions of their job (teaching,

research and service). Since they both enjoy teaching, this suggests that both participants work

hard to acquire the necessary teaching skills to work as a professor. It is possible that other

doctoral graduates looking for work in the professoriate may have different attitudes toward

teaching, and may not take the initiative to learn these important skills.

        The second conclusion is that the nature of the position is very demanding and learning to

teach during one's doctoral studies is beneficial to one's success in this position. From the

narratives, it was clear that Anne and Jane were each given a very heavy workload in their

appointments. This meant they were juggling priorities to keep themselves afloat in the

beginning of their academic careers. Thus, it is advisable that academics develop a competency

in teaching prior to being a full-time professor. Having experiences teaching seemed to be a

prerequisite for the participants, but it is unclear if that is the case for every university.

Furthermore, the criteria for proving past teaching experiences was also unclear. However, the

participants demonstrated that, by taking opportunities for professional teaching development

and practical teaching opportunities early their academic careers, they have successfully

developed the necessary teaching skills to get hired at "primarily undergraduate" universities in

Canada.

        Next, the complexities of different higher education institutions contribute to a

misconception or misunderstanding of what is expected of new professors in their roles. Often,

from perspectives of those not familiar with higher education, university professors are teachers,

and the many other important functions that professors perform are lost upon those who are not

familiar with the system. The university structure is also complex, and the policies are vague at

times (to those who work in those structures). Expectations from within universities appear to be

somewhat subjective or vague also, and professors preconceived understandings can influence

their own, or their colleagues' understanding of a particular university's set of expectations.

From this perspective, it is difficult to differentiate fact from fiction in a career that is weighted

heavily on criteria such as production, output and colleague adjudication.

The fourth and final conclusion taken from the study is that Canadian universities could

allocate more time for their doctoral students as well as their faculty to learn the craft of teaching

in a more formal setting. In both interviews involved in my research it would appear that during

their doctoral studies both Anne and Jane had mentors who gave them exposure to teaching. It is

difficult to say whether all university professors would have teaching experiences or take the

optional professional development courses available to them and be as highly motivated as the

participants of this study. As previously mentioned, if professors get teaching appointments like

the ones Anne and Jane have, they will not have much extra time in their schedules to learn how

to teach. Since universities are asking that forty percent of their professors' time be allocated to

teaching-related activities, it seems that universities themselves could consider doing more to

preparing their doctoral graduates for teaching at the professorial level. Most importantly, for

the new professors who are already working in universities, having access to quality teaching

support is important to developing these skills. The interview with Anne indicated that, if she

had more time to participate in professional teaching development, she would like to learn about

critical perspectives of teaching. So, allowing more time for new tenure track professors to

develop as teachers and having the CTLs equipped to help them could potentially be of benefit to

new tenure track professors.

Limitations To this Study

This study involved a small number of participants, which created more homogenous results than desired. The participants themselves are very busy at this important time in their career, so the quality of their responses may have been slightly impacted due to time constraints. Furthermore, I assumed that those who voluntarily participated likely have a positive view of teaching to begin with since professors who do not see value in teaching would be less likely to voluntarily participate in a study such as this one. So, the data may be skewed or representative of a more positive outlook on teaching than if the participants were less engaged with that activity. Another important limitation to this research were the questions in the interview guide that did not directly ask the participants about their knowledge of critical pedagogical theories. This would have been an interesting addition to the data that was missed in the creation of the questions.

Future Studies

Differences in male and female professors may have come into focus with a larger pool of participants. This is one aspect of research that cannot be overlooked and understanding the power dynamics in a traditional vocation such as the work that university professors do. Therefore, it would surely highlight differences of experience based on the gender of the participant in future studies. More work could also be done in this area to understand the additional challenges female professors face in learning how to become expert or excellent teachers.

Further to the idea of diversity, it would be interesting to find out more about the teaching challenges faced by professors who identify as being of a minority ethnicity or race. In addition,

many teachers face increased difficulties when crossing-over cultural boundaries, such as, new professors teaching in an additional language. More information with respect to cultural differences of new professors would certainly be a worthwhile undertaking.

Future studies could also diversify in exploring multiple disciplines. This study purposely excluded faculty members from the Education department, but only focused on two professors. Gaining multiple perspectives that cross over disciplines would be beneficial to aid our understanding of how new faculty learn to teach across all subject areas. Furthermore, looking at the role of teaching in a larger university context would also be very enlightening, since most Canadian professorial jobs require them to teach regardless of the size of the institution. Research for a doctoral thesis, or a funded study would allow for a deeper exploration into the areas that were limited in this thesis study.

This thesis research could not have been made possible without the contributions of Anne and Jane who took time from their busy schedules to share their stories of how they learned to teach in a higher education institution in Canada. They provided rich insights into the commitment it takes to enter into the realm of academia, and the amount of effort that is exerted in striving toward teaching excellence while juggling a host of other responsibilities. Teaching in higher education is very complex, with layered responsibilities, and social hierarchical dynamics. The continuation of research like this one aims to contribute to the improvement of teaching and learning experiences in higher education contexts as learning environments evolve at a rapid pace.

References

Abell, S. K., Rogers, M. A. P., Hanuscin, D. L., Lee, M. H., & Gagnon, M. J. (2009). Preparing the next generation of science teacher educators: A model for developing PCK for teaching science teachers. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, *20*(1), 77-93.

Abes, E. S., & Kasch, D. (2007). Using queer theory to explore lesbian college students' multiple dimensions of identity. Journal of College Student Development, 48, 619–636.

Allen, M. (2017). Qualitative publishing in a neoliberal universe and university. *Cultural Studies, Critical Methodologies*, *17*(3), 214-220.

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution.*

Angervall, P., & Beach, D. (2018). The exploitation of academic work: Women in teaching at Swedish universities. *Higher Education Policy*, *31*(1), 1-17.

Austin, A. E., & McDaniels, M. (2006). Using doctoral education to prepare faculty to work within Boyer's four domains of scholarship. *New directions for institutional research*, *2006*(129), 51-65.

A Collective Agreement between the Board of Governors of Dalhousie University and the Dalhousie Faculty Association, (2017). Retrieved from https://cdn.dal.ca/content/dam/dalhousie/pdf/dept/hr/Academic-Staff-Relations/DFA-2017-20-Collective-Agreement.pdf

Bain, K. (2011). *What the best college teachers do* Harvard University Press.

Baker, M. (2016). Women graduates and the workplace: Continuing challenges for academic women. *Studies in Higher Education*, *41*(5), 887-900.

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. UBC press.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and

implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 544-559.

Bennett, D., Roberts, L., Ananthram, S., & Broughton, M. (2018). What is required to develop

career pathways for teaching academics? *Higher Education, 75*(2), 271-286.

Blanding, A. (2017). *UNBC teaching manual.* Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved February 29,

2020, Retrieved from https://blogs.unbc.ca/teachingmanual/

Bok, D. "The Improvement of Teaching." Teachers College Record, 1991, 93(2), 236–251.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). The Carnegie foundation for the advancement of teaching. *Scholarship*

Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. (Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University

Press, 1990)

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*

Psychology, 3, 77-101

Brigham, S. M. (2013). Theorizing race in Adult Education: Critical race theory. In T. Nesbit, S.

M. Brigham, N. Taber & T. Gibb (Eds.), *Building on critical traditions, Adult Education*

in Canada (pp. 119-128). Toronto, Canada: Thompson Education.

Brinkmann, S. (2013). *Qualitative interviewing*. Oxford; New York: Oxford : Oxford University

Press.

Britnell, J., Brockerhoff-Macdonald, B., Carter, L., Dawson, D., Doucet, L., Evers, F., . . .

Wilson, J. (2010). University faculty engagement in teaching development activities

Brookfield, S. (1995). Adult learning: An overview. *International Encyclopedia of Education*

Oxford, Pergamon Press, 1-11.

Brookfield, S. (2015). Critical reflection as doctoral education. *New Directions for Adult and*

Continuing Education, *2015*(147), 15-23.

Brookfield, S. (2017). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher* (Second edition. ed.). San

    Francisco, California]; San Francisco, CA: San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, A. H., Cervero, R. M., & Johnson-Bailey, J. (2000). Making the Invisible Visible: Race,

    Gender, and Teaching in Adult Education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *50*(4), 273–288.

Brumfit, C., Myles, F., Mitchell, R., Johnston, B., & Ford, P. (2005). Language study in higher

    education and the development of criticality 1. International Journal of Applied

    Linguistics, 15(2), 145-168.

Campbell, A. (2010). Developing generic skills and attributes of international students: The

    (ir)relevance of the Australian university experience. Journal of Higher Education Policy

    and Management, 32(5), 487-497.

Caskin, L. P., Lumpkin, A., & Tennant, L. K. (2003). Mentoring new faculty in higher

    education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, *74*(8), 49-53.

Careless, E., & Mizzi, R. (2015). Reconstructing careers, shifting realities: Understanding the

    difficulties facing trailing spouses in higher education. *Canadian Journal of Educational

    Administration and Policy*, (166).

Carless, D., & Douglas, K. (2017). Narrative research. The Journal of Positive Psychology:

    Qualitative Positive Psychology. Edited by Kate Hefferon and Arabella Ashfield, 12(3),

    307-308.

Choy, S. C., & Cheah, P. K. (2009). Teacher perceptions of critical thinking among students and

    its influence on higher education. *International Journal of teaching and learning in

    Higher Education*, *20*(2), 198-206.

Clandinin, D. J. (2006). Narrative inquiry: A methodology for studying lived

    experience. *Research studies in music education*, *27*(1), 44-54.

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(3), 297-298.

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2013). Teaching thematic analysis: Overcoming challenges and developing strategies for effective learning. *The psychologist*, *26*(2).

Closson, R. (2010). Critical Race Theory and Adult Education. *Adult Education Quarterly, 60*(3), 261-283.

Cohen, J., & Kassan, A. (2018). Being in-Between: A Model of Cultural Identity Negotiation for Emerging Adult Immigrants. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 65(2), 133-154.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Collective Agreement Between the Board of Governors of Acadia University and the Acadia University Faculty Association, (2017). Retrieved https://hr.acadiau.ca/tl_files/sites/hr/Collective%20Agreements/15th_AUFA_Collective_Agreement.pdf

Collective Agreement Between Cape Breton University Faculty Association (CBUFA) and Board of Governors Cape Breton University, (2019). Retrieved from https://www.cbu.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/CBUFA-Collective-Agreement-2019-2022.pdf

Collective Agreement Between the Mount Royal Faculty Association and the Board of Governors of Mount Royal University, (2018). Retrieved from https://www.mtroyal.ca/EmploymentCareers/HumanResources/_pdfs/mrfa_2018_to_2020.pdf

Collective Agreement Between Mount Saint Vincent University Board of Governors and Mount

Saint Vincent University Faculty and Staff, (2018). Retrieved

from https://www.msvu.ca/site/media/msvu/2015-2018%20MSVUFA%20FINAL.PDF

Collective Agreement Between the Board of Governors of St. Francis Xavier University, (2018).

Retrieved from https://www2.mystfx.ca/hr/collective-agreements-and-non-union-

handbooks

Connelly, F., & Clandinin, D. (1990). Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry. Educational

Researcher, 19(5), 2-14.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among*

five approaches. Sage publications.

Dalhousie University. (2019). Dalhousie university centre for learning and teaching. Retrieved

from https://www.dal.ca/dept/clt.html

Davies, M. (2011). Introduction to the special issue on critical thinking in higher

education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *30*(3), 255-260.

Davies, M., & Barnett, R. (Eds.). (2015). *The Palgrave handbook of critical thinking in higher*

education. Springer.

Dempsey, N. P. (2010). Stimulated recall interviews in ethnography. *Qualitative*

sociology, *33*(3), 349-367.

Dennis, A. R., Valacich, J. S., Fuller, M. A., & Schneider, C. (2006). Research standards for

promotion and tenure in information systems. *Mis Quarterly*, 1-12.

Desjardins, L. (2012). Profile and labour market outcomes of doctoral graduates from Ontario

universities. *Statistics Canada, *, 4-107.

Dicicco-Bloom, B., & Crabtree, B. F. (2006). The qualitative research interviews. *Medical Education, 40*(4), 314-321. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x

Dweck, C. S. (2008). *Mindset: The new psychology of success* Random House Digital, Inc.

Easton, S., & Rockerbie, D. (2008). Optimal government subsidies to universities in the face of tuition and enrollment constraints. Education Economics, 16(2), 191-201.

Fahim, M., & Masouleh, N. S. (2012). Critical thinking in higher education: A pedagogical look. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(7).

Foley, J. A., Morris, D., Gounari, P., & Agostinone-Wilson, F. (2015). Critical Education, Critical Pedagogies, Marxist Education in the United States. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies (JCEPS)*, *13*(3).

Forgie, S.E., Yonge, O., & Luth, R.W. (2018). Centres for Teaching and Learning across Canada: What's Going On?.

Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogies of the oppressed* [Pedagogia del oprimido] (M. Bergman Ramo Trans.). New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.

Gibbs, G., & Coffey, M. (2000). Training to teach in higher education: a research agenda. *Teacher Development*, 4:1, 31-44, DOI: 10.1080/13664530000200103

Gibbs, G., & Coffey, M. (2004). The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the approach to learning of their students. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 5*(1), 87-100.

Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism's war on higher education*. Toronto: Between the Lines.

Goodyear, G. E., & Allchin, D. (1998). Statements of teaching philosophy. *To improve the academy*, *17*(1), 103-121.

Gopaul, B., Jones, G. A., Weinrib, J., Metcalfe, A., Fisher, D., Gingras, Y., & Rubenson, K.
(2016). The academic profession in Canada: Perceptions of Canadian university faculty
about research and teaching. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 46*(2), 55-77.

Gouthro, P. A. (2002). Education for sale: at what cost? Lifelong learning and the
marketplace. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *21*(4), 334–346.

Gouthro, P., & Holloway, S. (2013). Reclaiming the Radical: Using Fiction to Explore Adult
Learning Connected to Citizenship. *Studies in the Education of Adults, 45*(1), 41-56.

Gouthro, P. A., & Holloway, S. M. (2018). Learning to be critically reflective: exploring fiction
writing and adult learning. *Studies in Continuing Education*, *40*(2), 133-148.

Grabove, V., Kustra, E., Lopes, V., Potter, M. K., Wiggers, R., & Woodhouse, R. (2012).
Teaching and learning centres: Their evolving role within Ontario colleges and
universities. Toronto, ON: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.

Guo, Y., & Guo, S. (2017). Internationalization of Canadian higher education: Discrepancies
between policies and international student experiences. *Studies in Higher
Education*, *42*(5), 851-868.

Guolla, M. (1999). Assessing the teaching quality to student satisfaction relationship: Applied
customer satisfaction research in the classroom. *Journal of marketing theory and
practice*, *7*(3), 87-97.

Gyamera, G. O., & Burke, P. J. (2018). Neoliberalism and curriculum in higher education: A
post-colonial analyses. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *23*(4), 450-467.

Haiven, M. (2010). Net/Working in the Edu-factory. English Studies in Canada, 36(4), 4-9.

Halx, M. D. (2010). Re-conceptualizing college and university teaching through the lens of adult education: Regarding undergraduates as adults. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *15*(5), 519-530.

Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *The annals of the American academy of political and social science*, *610*(1), 21-44.

Henard, F., & Roseveare, D. (2012). Fostering quality teaching in higher education: Policies and practices. *An IMHE Guide for Higher Education Institutions*, 7-11.

Holloway, S. M., & Gouthro, P. A. (2011). Teaching resistant novice educators to be critically reflective. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *32*(1), 29-41.

Houshmand, S., Spanierman, L. B., & Tafarodi, R. W. (2014). Excluded and avoided: Racial microaggressions targeting Asian international students in Canada. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *20*(3), 377.

Huang, H. M. (2002). Toward constructivism for adult learners in online learning environments. *British journal of educational technology*, *33*(1), 27-37.

Jackson, S. (2007). Freire re-viewed. *Educational Theory*, *57*(2), 199-213.

Jarvis, P. (2000). The changing university: Meeting a need and needing to change. *Higher education quarterly*, *54*(1), 43-67.

Johnson-Bailey, J. (2006). African Americans in adult education: The Harlem renaissance revisited. Adult Education Quarterly, 56(2), 102-118.

Jones, G., & Oleksiyenko, A. (2011). The internationalization of Canadian university research: A global higher education matrix analysis of multi-level governance. Higher Education, 61(1), 41-57.

Jones, G., Weinrib, J., Metcalfe, A., Fisher, D., Rubenson, K., & Snee, I. (2012). Academic Work in Canada: The Perceptions of Early-Career Academics. *Higher Education Quarterly, 66*(2), 189-206.

Kallio, H., Pietilä, A., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 72*(12), 2954-2965.

Kenny, N., Watson, G. P., & Watton, C. (2014). Exploring the Context of Canadian Graduate Student Teaching Certificates in University Teaching. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *44*(3), 1-19.

Kreber, C. (2005). Charting a critical course on the scholarship of university teaching movement. *Studies in Higher Education, 30*(4), 389-405.

Kreber, C. (2002). Teaching excellence, teaching expertise, and the scholarship of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education, 27*(1), 5-23.

Kugel, P. (1993). How professors develop as teachers. *18*, 315.

Lange, E. A. (2013). Interrogating transformative learning: Canadian contributions. In T. Nesbit, S. M. Brigham & N. Taber Gibb Tara ((Eds.), *Building on critical traditions, Adult Education in Canada* (pp. 107-118). Toronto, Canada: Thompson Education.

Lavigne, E. (2019). The demographics and career paths of Canadian university deans: gender, race, experience, and provenance. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1-12.

Lewis, K. G. (2010). Pathways toward improving teaching and learning in higher education: International context and background. *New directions for teaching and learning*, *2010* (122), 13-23.

Longhurst, R. (2003). Semi-structured interviews and focus groups. *Key methods in*

    geography, *3*(2), 143-156.

Mahon, M. J., & Amelinckx, A. (July 1, 2016). *The university of Lethbridge faculty handbook.*

    Retrieved April 29, 2020, Retrieved

    from https://www.uleth.ca/sites/default/files/2016/12/ulfa_faculty_handbook.pdf

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. (2011) *Designing qualitative research: 5th Ed.,* Sage Publications.

Merriam B., S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (second

    ed.). San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and*

    implementation. John Wiley & Sons.

Maguire, M., & Delahunt, B. (2017). Doing a thematic analysis: A practical, step-by-step guide

    for learning and teaching scholars. *AISHE-J: The All Ireland Journal of Teaching and*

    Learning in Higher Education, *9*(3).

Mang, C. (2019). Earnings differences among senior university administrators: Evidence by

    gender and academic field. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 49(3), 24-40.

McLean's. (2017). University rankings 2018. Retrieved from

    http://www.macleans.ca/education/university-rankings/university-rankings-2018/

McLean's. (2018). Canadian university professors spend roughly half of their time on teaching.

    Retrieved from https://www.macleans.ca/education/canadian-university-professors-spend-

    equal-amounts-of-time-on-teaching-and-non-teaching-work/

Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. (74), 5.

Mishler, E.G. (1986) *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative.* Harvard University Press,

    Cambridge.

Msila, V. (2007). From apartheid education to the Revised National Curriculum Statement: Pedagogy for identity formation and nation building in South Africa. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, *16*(2).

Naidoo, R. (2003). Repositioning higher education as a global commodity: Opportunities and challenges for future sociology of education work. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *24*(2), 249-259.

Newton, G., Miller-Young, J., & Sanago, M. (2019). Characterizing SoTL Across Canada. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *10*(2).

Nicholls, G. (2005). New lecturers' constructions of learning, teaching and research in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 30*(5), 611-625.

Norton, L. S. (2009). Why engage with the scholarship of teaching and learning? *Action research in teaching and learning: A practical guide to conducting pedagogical research in universities* (p. 36) Routledge.

Norton, L., & Aiyegbayo, O. (2005). (2005). Becoming an excellent teacher: Factors that influence new university lecturers' beliefs about learning and teaching'. Paper presented at the *5th International Conference on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), London,* 12-13.

Perry, C. (1998). A structured approach for presenting theses. *Australasian marketing journal (AMJ)*, *6*(1), 63-85.

Pekkarinen, V., & Hirsto, L. (2017). University lecturers' experiences of and reflections on the development of their pedagogical competency. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *61*(6), 735-753.

Queen's university centre for teaching and learning. (2020). Retrieved

from https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:oX0ROvOtS9gJ:https://w

ww.queensu.ca/ctl/teaching-support/teaching-dossier+&cd=3&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca

Renn, K. A. (2010). LGBT and queer research in higher education: The state and status of the

field. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(2), 132-141.

Robson, S. (2011). Internationalization: A transformative agenda for higher education? Teachers

and Teaching: Rethinking University Internationalisation: Towards Transformative

Change, 17(6), 619-630.

Ross, T., Mah, J., Biggar, J., Zwick, A., & Modlinska, E. (2018). Student needs, employment

realities, and PhD program design in Canada: The case of planning PhD

programs. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 48*(3), 82-97.

Schram, T. H. (2003). *Conceptualizing qualitative inquiry: Mindwork for fieldwork in education

and the social sciences*. Prentice Hall.

St. Clair, R. (2015). *Creating courses for adults* (First ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Simon Fraser University. (1999). Tenure-track faculty workload policy. Retrieved from

http://www.sfu.ca/policies/gazette/academic/a30-03.html

Smith, B. (2016). Narrative analysis in sport and exercise: How can it be done?. In *Routledge

handbook of qualitative research in sport and exercise* (pp. 282-295). Routledge.

Spencer, B., & Kelly, J. (2013). In Bartlett K. (Ed.), *Work and learning*. Toronto Ontario:

Thompson Educational.

Statistics Canada. (2018). Non-occupational classification (NOC) 2011. Retrieved from

http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3VD.pl?Function=getVD&TVD=122372&CVD=122

376&CPV=4011&CST=01012011&CLV=4&MLV=4

Statistics Canada. (2018). Non-occupational classification (NOC) 2011. Retrieved from

     https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/181128/dq181128c-eng.htm

Statistics Canada. (2018). Non-occupational classification (NOC) 2011. Retrieved from

     https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/cv.action?pid=3710008601

Statistics Canada. (2016). *Key results from the 2016 Census*. Non-occupational classification

     (NOC) 2011. Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-

     quotidien/171129/dq171129a-eng.htm

The Collective Agreement Between UBC and the UBC faculty association, (2016). Retrieved

     from http://www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty-relations/collective-agreements/

The University of Lethbridge academic staff Collective Agreement, (2018). Retrieved from

     https://www.uleth.ca/sites/default/files/2019/11/2018-2020-academic-staff-collective-

     agreement.pdf

The University of Toronto. (2018). Future students. Retrieved from

     https://www.utoronto.ca/future-students

Trigwell, K., Martin, E., Benjamin, J., & Prosser, M. (2000). Scholarship of teaching: A model.

     Higher Education Research & Development, 19(2), 155-168.

University of Alberta: Faculty of graduate studies and research. (2018). Retrieved from

     https://www.ualberta.ca/graduate-studies/professional-development/professional-

     development-requirement

University of Northern British Columbia (UNBC): Centre for teaching and learning. (2018).

     Retieved from https://www.unbc.ca/centre-for-teaching-and-learning/staff

Williams, A. L., Verwoord, R., Beery, T. A., Dalton, H., McKinnon, J., Strickland, K., . . . Poole,

     G. (2013). The power of social networks: A model for weaving the scholarship of

teaching and learning into institutional culture. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 1*(2), 49-62.

Yazan, B. (2015). Three approaches to case study methods in education: Yin, Merriam, and Stake. *The Qualitative Report, 20*(2), 134-152.

Appendices

Appendix A – Consent form

Understanding the Teaching Experiences of New Tenure Track University Professors

Principal Investigator: James Caron

Author Participant Information Package

Overview of Research Study

This study investigates how new faculty learn how to teach. Interviews will be conducted with **three or four** newly hired faculty.

Contact Information for Researcher

James Caron
Master's Student
Mount Saint Vincent University
Halifax, Nova Scotia   B3M 2J6
XXX XXX XXXX
James.Caron@MSVU.ca

Letter of Informed Consent

Dear **Name of Participant**,

You are invited to participate in a qualitative research study for a master's thesis, entitled **Understanding the Teaching Experiences of New Tenure Track University Professors.** James Caron, a master's student at Mount Saint Vincent University (MSVU) is the primary investigator. This study will involve interviews of three to four university professors. Each participant will partake in a semi-structured interview and have the option to share any course materials that they have developed.

If you agree to participate in this study, an interview will be set up at a time and place that is convenient for you. The interview will take approximately an hour to complete. This research will investigate teaching methods used in-class and to develop your courses. This means you will be asked to share information about learning experiences that may have influenced the development of your teaching skills. In particular, you will be asked to discuss how you know how to teach, as well as what supports you are receiving from the institution by whom you are employed. Although the interview contains some general questions, it will probably seem more like a conversation between you and the interviewer. An interview schedule, which overviews some of the questions that might be asked, is included in this document.

During the interview, a digital recorder will be used to record the conversation and you will be asked to sign a separate form agreeing to have your interview recorded. At any time, prior to, after, or during the study, you may decide not to participate. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to. The interview will be transcribed into text. You will be given the option to receive a copy of this transcript and you can edit the transcript or request if you would like part or all of the transcript to be deleted. You will be able to withdraw from this study up to two weeks after the transcripts have been returned to you.

Since one of the objectives of this research study is to learn about supports you receive at your institution, your identity as a research participant will be kept confidential. The transcripts will be used to provide data for this thesis and possibly professional publications and presentations. Information about the study will be made available to the public, while withholding any identifiable information of the participants.

If you choose to share course materials with the researcher, the focus of analysis will be on understanding how you planned to teach in the course. Any information used from the course materials will be screened or altered to ensure that no details are shared that could lead to your identification.

The data will be kept in a locked cupboard at the primary investigator's place of residence and on password protected computers. Data will be destroyed 2 years or after the completion of the study. A final summary report will be distributed at the end of the research study.

The following precautions will be followed to keep your identity confidential when this information is used from the transcripts: You will be referred to in general terms or by an alternate title i.e. "a participant says" and an alternate name. I will change or delete any features that may risk identification from the transcript (ie. names of workplaces or family members). Only James Caron and the thesis advisor, Dr. Patricia Gouthro, will have access to your transcripts.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary, and it entails minimal risk to you. At any point in time you have the right to withdraw from the study. Your signature on the bottom of this letter indicates that you have read the above information and agree to be interviewed. You can also choose whether you wish to agree to being audio-recorded during the interview, and whether you wish to share course materials. You will be provided with a copy of this letter.

If you have any questions about the research study, please contact James Caron at James.Caron@MSVU.ca or XXX XXX XXXX. If during or after the study you have any concerns about how the research was conducted, please contact the Chair of the University Ethics Committee at Mount Saint Vincent University, c/o the Research Office at (902) 457-6350. Thank you.

Sincerely,

James Caron

I have read through the above letter and agree to be interviewed for the study:

Signed   _____   Date: _____

I would like to have my transcript returned for review electronically Yes_____ or NO_____

If you would like an electronic copy of the transcript, please provide the email address of your preference: _____

Informed Consent – Sharing Course Materials

I have read through the attached letter detailing the research study, *Understanding The Teaching Experiences of New Tenure Track University Professors,* and agree to share the course syllabus, lesson plans, PowerPoints or class activities with the principal investigator, Jamie Caron.

Signed: _____   Date: ---

Informed Consent – Audio Recording

I have read through the attached letter detailing the research study, *Understanding The Teaching Experiences of New Tenure Track University Professors,* and agree to have my voice digitally recorded for the purpose of the study. I realize that I have the right to request that the audio recording machine be turned off at any time, and any information I do not wish to share I can request to have deleted from the transcripts.

Signed: _____   Date: ---

Interview Schedule

(Please note in a semi-structured interview other questions might be asked as well and it will feel more like a conversation than a strictly structured interview)

When did you first become interested in becoming a university professor? What were some of the factors/experiences that impacted this career choice? Have you always wanted to be a teacher? Do you see yourself as a teacher or researcher? Why?

How did your master's degree or Ph.D. program prepare you to be a university teacher?

What teaching and learning strategies/methods do you use?

How have you prepared for this semester? Do you have a lesson plan for each class that you are going to teach? Where did you find this information?

The three main functions of a university professor are research, teaching and service. Can you describe your priorities with respect to the three functions? Are these priorities clearly defined by the university?

Do you think that your gender affects the way that you learn how to teach? Does your gender affect the way you teach?

Does your nationality/cultural/ethnic background or gender/identity/sexual orientation shape how you approach your teaching. Can you share your thoughts on this?

Appendix B – Interview Questions

Background

1) To begin, I would like to know a bit about your background, and how you got this point in your career.

    a. Subject areas did you study?

    b. Your current department?

    c. Your current career trajectory?

    d. What classes do you teach?

    e. How long have you been in your current position?

2) When did you become interested in becoming a professor?

    a. How do you describe to friends and family, someone who is not well versed in academe, what it is that you do?

    b. Do you see yourself as a teacher or a researcher?

3) How did your master's degree or PH.D. prepare you to be a teacher?

Teaching

4) What teaching and learning strategies do you use?

5) How have you prepared for this semester?

    a. DO you have a lesson plan for each class?

    b. Where do you find this information?

    c. Do you have a mentor? Were they assigned?

6) The three main functions of a uni prof are: Research, teaching and service

    a. Can you order them in importance to you?

    b. Are these priorities clearly defined by the university?

    c. In what ways do you feel supported by the university to accomplish this?

    d. Do you get the feeling that your advancement in academe is tied to your ability to teach?

Other Influences This Study is Interested In

7) Do you feel that your gender affects the way you learn how to teach?

    a. Does your gender affect the way you teach?

8) Does your nationality/ cultural/ ethnic background or gender identity or sexual orientation shape how you approach your teaching? Can you share your thoughts on this?