Transforming the Teacher:
Examining Personal Transformations of Faculty Redesigning Courses from Face-to-Face to Online

KATHERINE L. TERRAS
University of North Dakota

Abstract

This study investigated faculty's personal transformations when redesigning face-to-face courses for online delivery. The transformative learning theory provided a rich context for ascertaining transformed frames of reference. Eight mid to late career faculty from a college of education participated. Qualitative methods were employed, with data collected using semi-structured interviews and inductively analyzed for themes. Findings revealed two frames of reference about online teaching and learning were transformed while one remained intact. A transformed frame of reference was that quality learning can be achieved online, thus it is not inferior to face-to-face instruction. Second, faculty's self-identity as an exemplary, face-to-face teacher was transformed, as they identified the need for increased organization and detail. Faculty's frame of reference not transformed was that pedagogy is at the forefront of decision-making, not technology. Implications are that challenging experiences can be provocations for growth and that pedagogy can remain constant across the two environments.

Keywords: transformative learning theory, online teaching, face-to-face, faculty

According to Allen and Seaman (2016), more than one in four students (28%) now take at least one distance education course (a total of 5,828,826 students, a year-to-year increase of 217, 275). Based on this growth, many faculty members are asked to develop and teach online courses they had previously taught in a traditional, face-to-face classroom. To successfully transition to an online environment, faculty members must have technology skills, content knowledge, and sound pedagogy.

As we move deeper into the 21st century, teaching is becoming one of the most challenging professions in a society where modern technologies provide educational possibilities and place more demands on educators to make use of innovative technologies in teaching (Schols, 2012). This is a concern if instructors are ill-equipped to deal with the changing nature of teaching online (Redmond, 2011). King posited that not only must we find the best ways to guide faculty's technology usage, we must understand the changes faculty go through as they learn and transform their own teaching practices (2001). This understanding is paramount because when instructional technology is incorporated into teaching practices, complexity increases in an already multifaceted environment, and it "introduces a realm of expertise apart from the subject matter, conditions that transformative learning suggest can trigger a

transformative learning experience" (Whitelaw, Sears, & Campbell, 2004, p.13).

During the transformative process, several challenges have been cited in the literature related to the planning and implementing of the online course. These challenges include, but are not limited to, having the time it takes to develop and teach an online course (Lewis & Abdul-Hamid, 2006), having the ability to use available technology tools and/or learning management systems to support student learning (De Gagne & Walters, 2009), implementing appropriate pedagogical strategies in the online course (Brinthaupt, Fisher, Gardner, Raffo, & Woodward, 2011), and adapting to the role of facilitator rather than being the "sage on the stage" (Johnson, 2008). Planning, preparing, and teaching online represent more than a paradigmatic shift in the way faculty work; it initiates new ways to think about learning.

As faculty transform their face-to-face course to online, the process and experience also transform them. The transition to online teaching and learning from a traditional face-to-face approach challenges the expectations and roles of instructors. For some, when they change the place of teaching, they feel their identities are under threat because they are tied to past face-to-face teaching (Redmond, 2011). Redesigning courses from face-to-face to online delivery can create a *disorienting dilemma* for instructors because "changing teaching places means they need to redefine themselves in light of the change in landscape (Meloncon, 2007, pp. 37-38). Consequently, educators engage in critical reflection and consider new views as they learn new knowledge and skills to best apply learning technologies, which requires them to re-conceptualize traditional educational concepts (Schols, 2012). Faculty may find this process both intimidating and frustrating.

The purpose of this study was to investigate faculty's personal transformations when presented with a *disorienting dilemma* of redesigning previously taught face-to-face courses for online delivery. Exploration of these personal transformations were situated in Jack Mezirow's transformative learning theory, as "this theory allows for understanding and characterizing many of the complexities that faculty experience brings to the learning process…." (King, 2001, p. 27). Moreover, transformative learning is considered an adult learning theory. Although transformative learning theory remains one of the most popular theories in the field of adult education, studies on fostering transformative learning, particularly in groups and in the workplace, remain sparse (Choy, 2009; Franz 2005). In higher education, this theory is typically applied formally to adult learners who are in the student role, but not applied to their instructors.

This paper is comprised of five parts. First, the theoretical framework for this study is delineated. Next, the method is reported, followed by a presentation of the results. The paper concludes with a theory-based discussion and implications for practice.

Transformative Learning Theory

Transformative learning theory is based on constructivist assumptions. According to Mezirow (2006), transformative learning is a rational process of learning, within awareness is a metacognitive application of critical thinking that transforms an acquired *frame of reference* (a worldview of orienting assumptions) by assessing its epistemic assumptions. Mezirow defined learning as "the process of using a prior interpretation to construe a new or revised interpretation of the meaning of one's experience to guide future action" (Wiessner & Mezirow, 2000, p. 5). He labeled this process *transformation*.

Jack Mezirow began his work in 1978 when he qualitatively investigated women

returning to postsecondary study or the workplace after an extended time out. Concluded from this seminal work was that these women went through a personal transformation, and Mezirow identified 10 phases they experienced (Kitchenham, 2008). Over time, Mezirow's work on adult learning evolved into the transformative learning theory with an additional phase incorporated in 1991. It was not until 2003 when he provided a clear definition of his theory:

> Transformative learning is learning that transforms problematic frames of reference-sets of fixed assumptions and expectations (habits of mind, meaning perspectives, mindsets) to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change. Such frames of reference are better than others because they are more likely to generate beliefs and opinions that will prove more true to guide action. (Mezirow, 2003, pp. 58-59)

Transformative learning is the process of affecting change in a frame of reference. "Frames of reference are the structures of assumptions through which we understand our experiences. They selectively shape and delimit expectations, perceptions, cognition, and feelings (Mezirow, 1997, p. 5).   A general frame of reference is a *meaning perspective* defined as a collection of meaning schemes comprised of higher order theories, worldviews, propositions, etc. that provide us with criteria for judging and evaluating, such as right from wrong or bad from good (Taylor, 1998). Frames of reference are largely shaped by cultural assimilation and idiosyncratic influences of primary caregivers and have two dimensions: *habits of mind* and *points of view*. Habits of mind are mind-sets of broad, abstract habitual ways of thinking, feeling, and acting that are influenced by assumptions that constitute a set of codes (i.e., cultural, political, social, education, economic) (Mezirow, 1997). Within these mind-sets, perspectives are formed, and each perspective is expressed as a point of view (also referred to as a *meaning scheme)*. Specifically, a point of view is a constellation of knowledge, beliefs, values, judgments, attitudes, and feelings that shapes an interpretation of an experience (e.g., quality of online learning) (Mezirow, 1997). Points of view are continually changing because they are influenced by our ongoing experiences (Kitchenham, 2008).

To transform an acquired frame of reference, one must assess its epistemic assumptions. Typically, a learner navigates through 11 phases during the assessment process, beginning with a disorienting dilemma (see Table 1). Embedded within these phases are four main components (Merriam et al, 2007): centrality of experience, critical reflection, critical-dialectical discourse, and action. To begin, the adult learner has an experience, which is the gist for critical reflection. The learner then critically reflects on the experience by examining the integrity of assumptions and beliefs, leading to a discovery of contradictions among thoughts, feelings, and actions. In essence, the learner realizes inconsistencies in what has been held as true. Next, the learner proceeds to take part in dialogue to further examine new thoughts and ideas that have come out of the critical reflection and is the essential medium through which transformation is promoted and developed. This dialogue consists of gathering opinions of others to further question the comprehensibility, truth, appropriateness, and/or authenticity of what is being asserted or to question the credibility of the person making the assertion. The final step is taking action through the integration of the new meaning perspective into one's life.

Method

Previously, Chaisson, Terras, and Smart (2015) conducted a study that explored faculty experiences of moving a face-to-face course to online instruction. A secondary analysis of this original data set was conducted using Meizirow's (2003) Phases of Transformative Learning Theory. This analysis was distinct because it specifically focused on faculty's personal transformation as compared to their broad-based experiences in the original analysis.

The purpose of this study was to investigate faculty's personal transformations when presented with a disorienting dilemma of redesigning previously taught face-to-face courses for online delivery. More specifically, were faculty's frames of reference changed about online teaching and learning? The transformative learning theory provided a rich research context for this study. According to King, transformational learning theory affords an explanation of educators' experiences of a fundamental change in their perspectives or frames of reference (2002) because "transformational learning has occurred when faculty critically examine their beliefs, assumptions, and values in light of acquiring new knowledge and experiences with technology and experience as fundamental change in their perspective of frame of reference in this area" (2001, p. 27) The transformation of faculty's frames of reference about online learning were investigated both narrowly and broadly. Each of the 11 phases of the transformative learning theory was operationalized for this study's context through the development of guiding questions (see Table 1). These questions provided the framework for understanding each faculty member's transformation, as well as discovering the collective meaning of all transformative experiences central to each phase. Next, faculty's perspective of transformations were ascertained more broadly through the centrality of the experience, critical reflection, critical-dialectical discourse, and reintegration into one's life (i.e., action).

Participants and Setting

Eight mid to late career faculty with 15-25 years of college teaching were purposely selected based on their experience of redesigning a face-to-face course to an online format (Creswell, 2013). All eight participants met the criteria of having developed and taught an online course they had previously taught in a face-to-face format within the last three years. Prior to teaching the course online, seven of the eight participants received some type of technology training, and all eight participants received assistance from a University level instructional designer to assist with technology. All participants were either associate or full professors who taught within the education college at a mid-western university. Departments and programs represented included counseling, educational leadership, and teaching. This study was conducted with the approval of the university's Institutional Review Board

Data Collection

A semi-structured interview protocol consisting of five demographic questions and 11 open-ended questions that were reflective in nature was used. Interviews lasted between one to two hours. All interview transcripts were assigned a code to maintain confidentiality (e.g., FP1=1st Faculty Participant). The participants were provided a transcript for verification of accuracy (i.e., member checking).

Table 1 Phases of Transformative Learning Theory and Guiding Questions

Phases (categories) of Transformative Learning	Guiding Questions
1. A disorienting dilemma	● Why did faculty consider the redesign from face-to-face to online to be a dilemma? ● Did any new dilemmas emerge?
2. A self-examination with feelings of guilt or shame	● What were the concerns/thoughts about faculty's skills/abilities regarding being able to do the redesign? ● Did they think they could do it or not do it?
3. A critical assessment of epistemic, sociocultural, or psychic assumptions	● How did faculty compare and contrast online delivery to face-to-face? ● What were faculty's presuppositions regarding: 1) the effectiveness of online teaching, and 2) the temporal investment?
4. Recognition that one's discontent and the process of transformation are shared and that others have negotiated a similar change	● Who did faculty talk with about the redesign process to confirm/disconfirm presuppositions and/or guilt/shame?
5. Exploration of options for new roles, relationships, and actions	● How did faculty start exploring online teaching, and where did they explore? ● What did they learn?
6. Planning a course of action	● What were faculty's conceptual frameworks for planning and designing their online courses?
7. Acquisition of knowledge and skills for implementing one's plan	● What trainings/activities did faculty participate in to acquire knowledge and skills?
8. Provisional trying of new roles	● How did they redesign their courses (e.g., strategies, meeting course objectives)? ● What did the teaching process look like?

Table 1 Phases of Transformative Learning Theory and Guiding Questions *continued*

Phases (categories) of Transformative Learning	Guiding Questions
9. Renegotiating relationships and negotiating new relationships (critical self-reflection)	● What relationships were formed through self-reflection?
10. Building competence and self-confidence in new roles and relationships	● Did faculty become more confident and/or competent? If so, in what ways? If not, what was the impediment? ● Have faculty's presuppositions about online teaching changed?
11. A reintegration into one's life on the basis of conditions dictated by one's perspective	● Would faculty teach online again? Redesign another course?

Data Analysis

For this study, a three-step process was used to analyze data. The steps are described below:

1. An analytic schema was developed for Meizirow's (2003) 11 Phases of Transformative Learning Theory. Guiding questions for each phase were formulated to provide parameters during the initial coding process in order to extract the critical elements in each phase (see Table 1). Crabtree and Miller (1992) supported the use of prefigured codes or categories when utilizing a theoretical model within a qualitative study as long as additional codes and categories are allowed to emerge.
2. From the interview transcripts, data were coded by transferring text segments to the analytic schema and placed under the appropriate phase (category). Once complete, coded data in each phase were organized into categories, which were analyzed for patterns and labeled *themes*.
3. The analytic schema was audited by an external evaluator trained in qualitative research methodology. If there was disagreement, deliberations ensued until consensus was reached.

Results

Upon completion of data analysis, 22 themes emerged across the 11 phases of the transformative learning theory (see Table 2). Below, the themes for each phase are presented along with supporting evidence.

Table 2 Analytic Schema

Phases (categories) of Transformative Learning	Themes
1. A disorienting dilemma	Courses were redesigned because it was a departmental expectation rather than a personal choice. Course redesign took a significant amount of time, but compensation for this extra time was inconsistent.
2. A self-examination with feelings of guilt or shame	Technology skills needed developing.
3. A critical assessment of epistemic, sociocultural, or psychic assumptions	Faculty assumed the same level of quality could not be achieved with online instruction. Pedagogical knowledge was critical with online teaching. Not all instructors nor courses are suited for online delivery.
4. Recognition that one's discontent and the process of transformation are shared and that others have negotiated a similar change	To negotiate their presuppositions, faculty had philosophical, broad-based discussions with instructional designers and faculty who were already teaching online.
5. Exploration of options for new roles, relationships, and actions	Faculty's dialogue with instructional designers and peers became more specific and skill-based. Pedagogy led the exploration for quality assurance, which was influential in the selection of technology.
6. Planning of a course of action	Faculty used their previously taught face-to-face courses as their conceptual framework for the online redesign as they were pedagogically sound.

Table 2 Analytic Schema *continued*

Phases (categories) of Transformative Learning	Themes
7. Provisional trying of new roles	Faculty's role shifted from the "sage on the stage" to the "guide on the side."
	Faculty included similar face-to-face instructional strategies in their online courses.
8. Renegotiating relationships and negotiating new relationships (critical-reflection)	Faculty who taught synchronously suggested online did not require a different type of instruction; whereas faculty who taught asynchronously felt differently.
	Some faculty noted feeling disconnected from students.
	Although most faculty liked teaching online, there were elements of face-to-face instruction that could not be replicated.
9. Building competence and self-confidence in new role and relationships	Faculty became more proficient at using technology.
	As a result of online teaching, faculty increased their confidence and believed they became better instructors in their face-to-face courses.
	Faculty were satisfied with their courses after the redesign, yet had goals for improvement.
10. A reintegration into one's life on the basis of conditions dictated by one's perspective	Most faculty were surprised they liked teaching online and were willing to do it again.
	Boundaries were less defined in an online class, making them essential to establish.

Phase 1: A Disorientating Dilemma

Theme 1: Courses were redesigned because it was a departmental expectation rather than a personal choice. For most participants, their courses had to be transformed for online delivery because they were part of a graduate, distance degree program. One member of the faculty admitted he initially did not want to do it, yet no participant directly challenged this expectation. Notably, one faculty member came to the university for the opportunity to acquire online teaching experience.

Theme 2: Course redesign took a significant amount of time, but compensation for this extra time was inconsistent. Participants were in agreement that they spent ample time re-designing their courses. Most participants were simultaneously developing and teaching the online course. One participant documented spending an average of 30 hours per week. A participant remarked that while the redesign was a huge time investment, it was well worth it! However, none of the participants were given release time for course development, but some received payment. For those who received payment, the range of compensation was $500 to $3000. One participant explained how she had to request compensation and learned that faculty within her department were compensated differently.

Phase 2: A Self-Examination with Feelings of Guilt or Shame

Theme 1: Technology skills needed developing. None of the participants reported specific feelings of shame nor guilt on the outset of the redesign process. All participants viewed their lack of technology skills as a barrier. When participants were asked to rate their skills prior to teaching online, a mean score of 3.8 was calculated (based on a Likert scale of 1 to 10). Some participants had not utilized Blackboard® (online course management system) while teaching their face-to-face courses, resulting in another barrier to redesigning the course for online.

Phase 3: A Critical Assessment of Epistemic, Sociocultural, or Psychic Assumptions

Theme 1: Faculty assumed the same level of quality could not be achieved with online instruction. What was most concerning for the participants was how a sense of community could be built. "Isolating" was used to describe online learning. They assumed interaction among students would be limited, as would their interactions with students. Ultimately, limited interaction would affect learning outcomes. One participant shared, "In my mind, it [online] was typically isolation for students. In the face-to-face classroom there is this synergy of a shared experience in time." He assumed in the online environment this synergy "wouldn't even start."

Theme 2: Pedagogical knowledge was critical with online teaching. Participants in this study were from a college of education, thus were considered pedagogical experts. Their presupposition was that technology would guide the redesign process, rather than pedagogy. Consequently, if technology guided the content rather than pedagogy, the teaching and learning process would be compromised.

Theme 3: Not all instructors nor courses are suited for online delivery. Some participants assumed that instructors who were not good teachers in the face-to-face environment, would be even worse teachers in the online environment. It was believed that online teaching needed to be "intentional" and "explicit," and for those who relied on charisma,

they would "really hate teaching online." A participant explained how some faculty members do fine in the online environment and how others do not have the "do-it-ness" and need to teach face-to-face. Another participant worried that some faculty use online teaching as a reason to not teach due to the ease of being "absent." In addition, some participants noted that graduate students are better suited for online learning than undergraduate students.

Phase 4: Recognition that One's Discontent and the Process of Transformation are Shared and that Others have Negotiated a Similar Change

Theme 1: To negotiate their presuppositions, faculty had philosophical, broad-based discussions with instructional designers and faculty who were already teaching online. The university's instructional technology center provides instructional designers to assist faculty with online course conceptualization and technological skills. The participants sought assistance from the instructional designers, along with advice from their departmental peers, to investigate presuppositions and to explore ways of redesigning their courses. Beyond this, peers who embarked on the journey of online teaching served as vicarious models, as one participant shared, "People whom I never thought would teach online were doing it."

Phase 5: Exploration of Options for New Roles, Relationships, and Actions

Theme 1: Faculty's dialogue with instructional designers and peers became more specific and skill-based. Through professional discourse with other faculty and instructional designers, the participant's presuppositions became disconfirmed. Two participants admitted how this "opened my eyes to the possibilities," and how he could "get his way and not bend to the technology." Effectually, dialogue shifted from negotiation of presuppositions to acquisition of skills.

Theme 2: Pedagogy led the exploration for quality assurance, which was influential on the selection of technology. Most participants held individualized training sessions with instructional designers and departmental peers. At the forefront of these sessions was how technology would support pedagogical strategies, rather than how pedagogy would be adjusted to the technology. For example, one participant chose to use Second Life® (3D virtual world) because of how it supported her pedagogical strategy of building a community, which was one of her pre-established course goals. Another participant exemplified how a peer mentor held her accountable to the core purpose by asking essential, pedagogical questions (e.g., What is your goal? What is the purpose?).

Phase 6: Planning a Course of Action

Theme 1: Faculty used their previously taught face-to-face courses as their conceptual framework for the online redesign, as they were pedagogically sound. Because the participants considered themselves pedagogical experts, they believed their original, face-to-face courses were of quality due to being constructed on best practices for teaching, thus these courses were their frames of reference. This established pedagogy led the decision-making throughout the transformative process, not the technology, mainly because learner outcomes remained constant across the two delivery methods. One participant illuminated how her approach of interactive,

experiential learning (i.e., constructivism) was easily transferred into the online environment because of its strong pedagogical foundation.

Phase 7: Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills for Implementing One's Plan

Theme 1: Faculty did not receive formal online course development training. While some participants attended workshops, all preferred working one-on-one with instructional designers to learn how to effectively use technology to support pedagogy and/or to troubleshoot technology problems. All participants were highly satisfied with the ongoing support they received from the instructional designers.

Theme 2: Faculty sought pedagogical and emotional support from colleagues. While technology questions were directed at instructional designers, the participants established an informal support system with colleagues to discuss instructional strategies and assessments and to share their emotional highs and lows throughout their journey of transformation. "Be patient with yourself, and talk to those who have done it so that they can commiserate with you; because any problem you have, someone has had it too, and they may know how to work around it or through it" was the recommendation from one participant.

Phase 8: Provisional Trying of New Roles

Theme 1: Faculty's role shifted from the "sage on the stage" to the "guide on the side." Almost all participants noted a transformation in this role; they shifted from being the leader to the facilitator. While some felt comfortable in their new role because "it hands learning back to the learner where it belongs," others felt "sidelined" and like the "silent partner." One participant explained, "My role feels like it has shifted away from being part of the community of learners." She stated this may not be a "bad thing," just not her choosing, because part of the "dynamic of online is less control or input into the classroom environment, which is much less than face-to-face."

Theme 2: Faculty included similar face-to-face instructional strategies in their online courses. To support these instructional strategies, each participant used a variety of technological tools. However, adjustments needed to be made in order to fit the online environment. Examples of adjustments included: replaced DVDs with online videos, and reduced the number of "in class" activities by selecting the "golden nuggets" from the face-to-face course. A participant noted how the quality of work should be the same but felt the *amount* of work needed to be reduced in the online environment because face-to-face students learn from each other and have immediate access to the instructor, thus they have an easier time. Another participant had become more intentional at connecting students with each other in order for them to learn from one another.

Phase 9: Renegotiating Relationships and Negotiating New Relationships/Self-Reflection

Theme 1: Faculty who taught synchronously suggested online did not require a different type of instruction, whereas faculty who taught asynchronously felt differently. Student interaction and discussion were more easily maintained in synchronous courses; so for participants whose courses were discussion-based, this type of instruction most replicated their

face-to-face course. One participant stated that a "community was not sacrificed; it was built" because students could see and hear each other with synchronous instruction. For participants who taught asynchronously, they had to become much more detailed and explicit in their instruction, as well as intentional about interaction.

Theme 2: Some faculty noted feeling disconnected from students. Participants described this feeling in the following ways: "Felt like the silent partner, not the competent other;" "I feel like I am outside looking in. I am not inside. I don't feel as actively involved;" "I feel disempowered and disconnected;" and "I need to communicate face-to-face." These participants expressed a commitment to both understand this disconnection and to find ways to connect with students. Beyond feeling disconnected, one participant expressed concern about adjusting to the culture of the online environment. Her experience was that students requested adjustments that students in the face-to-face classroom never did, such as extended time for quizzes. She questioned if these were fair adjustments or if the cohort of students was being manipulative.

Theme 3: Although most faculty liked teaching online, there were elements of face-to-face instruction that could not be replicated. For some, the face-to-face environment still felt more "natural" because discussion was generated more abundantly; students were not able to "hide behind the technology." Additionally, they could better "feel the pulse of the class" for understanding. One participant reflected on her diminished role of "coaching" in the online environment and needed to find alternative pathways for this because it would "personalize" the course. Comparatively, one participant asserted that the online discussion "may have been more rich…the sharing was better because everyone had to share."

Phase 10: Building Competence and Self-Confidence in New Roles and Relationships

Theme 1: Faculty became more proficient using technology. On a scale of 1 to 10, participants rated their technological skills prior to teaching online as 3.8 (M) and after teaching online as 6.3 (M).

Theme 2: As a result of online teaching, faculty increased their confidence and believed they became better instructors in their face-to-face courses. Faculty stated they became more detailed, explicit, and organized. They also incorporated more technology, mainly Blackboard®. One participant shared how online teaching forced her out of her comfort zone causing her to learn about herself as an instructor and to gain more confidence. Another participant declared that she learned more from teaching online than from any other teaching challenge.

Theme 3: Faculty were satisfied with their courses after the redesign, yet had goals for improvement. The participants identified a feeling of accomplishment (e.g., "I did it!"). One even suggested being a model for other faculty when they go through the course redesign process. Although satisfied, the participants' future aspirations for improving their teaching were on the horizon. They had goals to increase interaction, incorporate more activities, increase the amount of detail, and become more connected to students.

Phase 11: A Reintegration into One's Life on the Basis of Conditions Dictated by One's Perspective

Theme 1: Most faculty were surprised they liked teaching online and were willing to do it again. Some participants liked how they learned to "let go" due to having less control and to "go with the flow" when an idea or technology did not work. One faculty illustrated how she learned so much about herself because she was pushed to find different ways to teach. For another participant, class time became more application-based rather than a review of the required reading. One participant found that she "loved teaching online more than teaching in an actual classroom," and asserted she "visited" with students more teaching online than she did seeing them once a week in the classroom. Although another participant felt she was often effective, she did not like it as well as traditional, face-to-face teaching because she did not have as much control, but was "learning to push the boundaries of control a little bit."

Theme 2: Boundaries were less defined in an online class, making them essential to establish. The main boundary that needed to be established was when participants would be (and not be) available to students. This was specifically targeted toward managing email, because being available to students 24/7 was neither realistic nor healthy. One participant suggested establishing office hours, perhaps virtually, so students know when instructors are available.

Discussion

Mezirow (1996) stated that transformative learning "is understood as the process of using a prior interpretation to construe a new or revised interpretation of the meaning of one's experience in order to guide future action" (p.162). In transformative learning, a new experience either reinforces the perspective or gradually stretches its boundaries (Kumi-Yebaoh & James, 2012) by providing a multidimensional paradigm that helps to develop the growing understanding (King, 2005). The purpose of this study was to investigate faculty's personal transformations when presented with a disorienting dilemma of redesigning previously taught face-to-face courses for online delivery. More specifically, were faculty's frames of reference changed about online teaching and learning? Concluded from this study is that two frames of reference were changed, but one remained intact.

Transformed Frames of Reference

The most robust transformed frame of reference was the perception that traditional, face-to-face teaching was superior to online. This was epistemically supported by their face-to-face courses that were considered "quality" because students were meeting course objectives and developing relationships with others. Following the redesign, this frame of reference was transformed. Two significant components of the transformative learning theory are critical reflection and discourse, and through these two pathways, faculty identified two points of view that changed within their frame of reference. The first point of view was that connections with students can be built and maintained in online courses; they just need to be intentional because connectivity was not going to occur more naturally like it did in their face-to face courses. Redmond (2011) had a similar finding when she investigated the experiences of faculty who taught in a face-to-face environment, then used blended instruction, and eventually taught using online delivery. She found faculty had an initial resistance to online teaching but changed their beliefs and teaching presence. Faculty were mindful of the student experience and promoted a dialogical approach to online learning.

Second, faculty came to the realization that they actually liked teaching online and were willing to embark on this journey again. Effectually, Choy (2009) reported how transformative learning transcends beyond skill acquisition of changes in frames of reference but also subsequent changes in perspectives that lead to more creative and innovative practices.

Another frame of reference that was transformed was their self-identity as a "good" teacher in the face-to-face setting. "Room for improvement" was the transformation. Faculty reflected and discussed the need to increase the amount of detail in course content, specifically with assignments, and also realized they could use instructional technology to their advantage in face-to-face courses. Choy (2009) asserted that many experienced or expert face-to-face teachers find themselves as novices or beginners when teaching online. Perhaps if faculty had not experienced this disorienting dilemma of online teaching, they would not have been open to such a personal examination of their teaching.

Ironically, faculty in the current study were so focused on the content and students in their online courses that they were somewhat oblivious to their personal transformation as an adult learner until they had completed the task and were able to reflect and discuss holistically about their central experience. In 2001, King investigated the experiences professors have as they learn and use technology for professional and instructional purposes in a variety of professional development formats. This research demonstrated, amongst others, that 71% of the professors experienced a perspective transformation in the context of learning and using technology for educational purposes; hence, perspective transformation does occur among this specific group of adults learners.

Most transformative learning theorists agree that true learning occurred when it produces action based on the newly transformed frames of reference (Jones, 2015). Faculty in this current study were specific about their future actions as a result of these changed frames of reference. They were willing to teach online again because quality could be achieved, and they were going to augment face-to-face courses to make them more detailed. Reflection and discourse were pivotal for faculty transforming their frames of reference. Faculty illustrated how reflection formally occurred after each online lesson was developed for students, but discourse was both informal and formal. Specific meetings were established with instructional designers and peers for active dialogue, but many impromptu discussions also took place.

Intact Frame of Reference

Looking in a different direction, faculty's frame of reference that remained consistent, thus did not undergo a transformation, was that their pedagogical beliefs and values did not shift when teaching an online course, because they would not let it. Instructional decisions were based on pedagogy, not technology. Keengwe and Kidd (2010) wrote, "…it is critical for faculty not only strive to learn the technologies associated with online learning, but also understand the need to fundamentally change and transform their pedagogical approach" (p. 6). Faculty in the current study were considered pedagogical experts for which their pedagogical foundation remained stable during the transformative process. Arguably, should the rudimentary principles of what constitutes quality teaching and learning be changed in the online environment? Faculty in the current study agreed with Johnson (2008) in how online, web-based instruction changes the delivery not the art of teaching; undoubtedly, educators have a responsibility to uphold these traditional, educational principles.

Implications

At its heart, transformative learning theory is about the nature of change (Jones, 2015). Change is paramount, because as we move deeper into the 21st century, the teaching profession continues to become even more challenging in a society where technology has such a great impact (Schols, 2012). Faculty need to take on these challenges by experiencing (perhaps even embracing) disorienting dilemmas in order to expand their knowledge and skills. Although fear and anxiety may be at the forefront, these are a necessary first step in the transformation process (King, 2007).

A second implication is that faculty must critically examine pedagogy and the online environment by ensuring pedagogy is leading the decision-making and not the technology. Faculty in this study were considered pedagogical experts and disconfirmed the evidence that pedagogy is dynamic, meaning, it must change to suit the teaching environment. For example, Redmond (2011) posited that the "replication of traditional methods does not capitalize on the dynamic nature of a technologically enhanced teaching and learning environment (p. 1051). Simply stated, faculty believed that good teaching is simply good teaching, and it can transcend environments.

References

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2016). Online report card: Tracking online education in the United States. Babson Survey Research Group and Quahog Research Group, LLC. Retrieved August 9, 2016, http://onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/onlinereportcard.pdf

Chiasson, Kari, Terras, Katherine, & Smart, Kathy. (2015). Faculty Perceptions of Moving a Face-to-Face Course to Online Instruction. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning, 12*(3), 231-240.

Choy, S. (2009). Transformative learning in the workplace. *Journal of Transformative Education*. doi:10.1177/1541344609334720

Crabtree, B. F., & Miller, W. L. (1992). *Doing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. (2013). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Brinthaupt, T., Fisher, L., Gardner, J., Raffo, D., & Woodward, J. (2011). What the best online teachers do. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 7*(4), 515-524.

De Gagne, J. C., & Walters, K. (2009, December). Online teaching experience: A qualitative metasynthesis (QMS). *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 5*(4), 577-589.

Franz, N. K. (2005). Transformative learning in interorganizational partnerships: Facilitating personal, joint, and organizational change. *Journal of Transformative Education, 3*(3), 254-270.

Johnson, A. (2008, January/February). A nursing faculty's transition to teaching online. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 29*(1), 17-22.

Jones, P. (2015). Transformative learning theory: Addressing new challenges in social work education. In M. Li & Y. Zhao (Eds.), *Exploring Learning and Teaching in Higher Education* (pp. 267-286). New Frontiers of Educational Research. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-55352-3_12

Keengwe, J., & Kidd, T. T., (2010, June). Towards best practices in online learning and teaching in higher education. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 6*(2). Retrieved from http://jolt.merlot.org/vol6no2/keengwe_0610.htm

King, K. P. (2001). Professors' transforming perspectives of teaching and learning while learning technology. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 18*(1), 27-34.

King, K. P. (2002). A journey of transformation: A model of educators' learning experiences in educational technology. In J. M. Pettitt & R. P. Francis (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Adult Education Research Conference* (pp. 195-200). Raleigh, NC: North Caroline State University Press.

King, K. P. (2005). *Bringing transformative learning to life*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.

King, K. P. (2007).The transformation model. *International Journal of Communication and Technology Education, 3*(2), 26-31.

Kitchenham, A. (2008, April). The evolution of John Mezirow's transformative learning theory. *Journal of Transformative Education, 6*(2), 104-123.

Kumi-Yebaoh, A., & James, W. (2012, November). Transformational teaching experience of a novice teacher: A narrative of an award-winning teacher. *Adult Learning*. doi: 10.1177/1045159512457354

Lewis, C., & Abdul-Hamid, H. (2006). Implementing effective online teaching practices: Voices of exemplary faculty. *Innovative Higher Education, 31*(2), 83-98.

Meloncon, L. (2007). Exploring electronic landscapes: Technological communication, online learning, and instructor preparedness. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 16*(1), 31-53.

Mezirow, J. (1996). Contemporary paradigms of learning. *Adult Education Quarterly, 46(3)*, 158-172.

Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative Learning: Theory to Practice. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 5–12.

Mezirow, J. (2003). Transformative learning as discourse. *Journal of Transformative Education, 1*(1), 58-63.

Dirkx, J. M., Mezirow, J., & Cranton, P. (2006). Musings and reflections on the meaning, context, and process of transformative learning: A dialogue between John M. Dirkx and Jack Mezirow. *Journal of Transformative Learning*, 4(2), 123-139.

Merriam, S., Caffarella, Rosemary S., & Baumgartner, Lisa. (2007). *Learning in adulthood : A comprehensive guide* (3rd ed., The Jossey-bass higher and adult education series). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Redmond, P. (2011). From face-to-face teaching to online teaching: Pedagogical transition. In G. Williams, P. Statham, N. Brown, & B. Cleland (Eds.), *Changing Demands, Changing Directions. Proceedings ascilite Hobart 2011,* (pp. 1050-1060).

Schols, M. (2012). Examining and understanding transformative learning to foster technology professional development in higher education. *iJET*, *7*(1), 42-49.

Taylor, E. W. (1998). *The theory and practice of transformative learning: A critical review.* (Information Series No. 374). Columbus, OH: Center on Education and Training for Employment. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED23422)

Whitelaw, C., Sears, M., & Campbell, K. (2004, January). Transformative learning in a faculty professional development context. *Journal of Transformative Education, 2*(1), 9-27.

Wiessner, C. A., & Mezirow, J. (2000). Theory building and the search for common ground. In J. Mezirow (Ed.) *Learning as transformation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.