

“A whole new language and a new world”: Seconded Teachers’ Experiences in a Faculty of Education

*Andrea Reupert*¹, *Jane Wilkinson*²

Monash University¹, Australia; Charles Sturt University², Australia

It is common practice in university faculties of education to second teachers for limited periods. However, few recent studies have examined how secondees perceive themselves in this role, particularly in relation to the increased demands to assume research as well as teaching duties. Three seconded school personnel were interviewed to explore their experiences of secondment in a faculty of education in Canada. One had previously been a teacher, one an educational consultant, and the third a principal. Qualitative data analysis revealed (a) the differences between schools and faculty; (b) the benefits of secondment for secondees and the institution; (c) secondees’ identity as teachers; (d) secondees’ mixed feelings about research; and finally (e) the drawbacks and issues in being seconded. Recommendations for future secondments and research directions conclude the article.

Dans les facultés d’éducation à l’université, le détachement de personnel pour une période limitée constitue une pratique courante. Quelques études récentes portent sur la perception qu’ont les employés détachés de leur rôle, notamment en fonction de la hausse de demandes exigeant qu’ils accomplissent des tâches liées à la recherche en plus de celles relatives à l’enseignement. Nous avons interviewé trois membres du personnel scolaire détaché par rapport à leurs expériences de détachement dans une faculté de formation des enseignants au Canada. Parmi ces membres, il avait un ancien enseignant, un conseiller pédagogique et un directeur d’école. Une analyse qualitative des données a révélé: (a) les différences entre les écoles et le personnel; (b) les avantages du détachement pour les employés détachés et les institutions; (c) l’identité d’enseignant des employés détachés; (d) les sentiments ambivalents des employés détachés par rapport à la recherche; et finalement (e) les inconvénients et les enjeux liés au détachement. L’article conclut en présentant des recommandations qui visent les détachements et les orientations en recherche à l’avenir.

A common feature of staffing in faculties of teacher education in North America and Anglophone nations such as Australia is the practice of seconding teachers. A recent study estimates that many North American teaching students have their entire program delivered by non-tenured instructors, including those on secondment from school positions (Kosnik & Beck, 2008). At the same time, there appears to be little research on seconded teachers’ experiences while working in universities. The concept of teachers being involved in teacher education is grounded in the value of practical experience, long acknowledged as important in this area (Kirk, 1980). Yet despite this acknowledgment, secondees are often characterized as the

domestic laborers or Cinderellas of teacher education (Zeichner, 2005), that is, metaphorically located on the devalued “practice” side of the theory/practice binary (Reupert, Wilkinson, & Galloway, 2010).

In this article, we define secondees as those seconded from school or educational consultancy positions for a limited period to work as a member of a faculty of education. Our aim is to identify the experiences, needs, and supports of these secondees while they are still being employed by a school body. We do so in the light of increasing expectations that secondees undertake research as part of their university work: expectations that place a greater set of demands on secondees both in terms of expected duties and ongoing identity formation.

Research on the experiences of secondees is limited, although the employment of “shadow” or adjunct faculty members (Housego & Badali, 2000) is commonplace in a number of teacher education programs in Canada (Beynon, Grout & Wideen, 2004; Housego & Badali, 2000; Kosnik & Beck, 2008; McEachern & Polley, 1993); the United States (Levine, 2006); and Australia (Costley, Gannon, Sawyer, Watson, & Steele, n.d.; Reupert, Wilkinson, & Galloway, 2010).

In a Canadian study, McEachern and Polley interviewed three seconded teachers during three phases of their secondment, namely, the initial phase, the middle, and finally the post-secondment phase. All were seconded for one year only. Participants cited a range of benefits from their experiences of secondment including increased professional freedom, expansion of professional networks, and personal growth. A large-scale study of secondees (known in that study as faculty associates) consisting of 10 focus group interviews with 56 secondees, 156 questionnaires, and 14 individual interviews was also conducted in Canada (Beynon et al., 2004). This study discovered that although secondees found that crossing boundaries from schools into universities precipitated issues of identity, they also found that secondees added to rather than left behind their teaching identities, a process that led to professional growth and learning. Another Canadian study of 17 secondees in British Columbia also confirmed the positive aspects of secondment, including gaining deep levels of professional development as a result of their immersion in academe and the development of teaching discourse and repertoires (Housego & Badali, 2000). Time for reflection on one’s practice was also viewed as a major advantage (Housego & Badali, 2000).

However, the most recent study of eight non-tenured elementary literacy instructors (five of whom were secondees) in a large, research-intensive university in Ontario was less sanguine in its findings (Kosnik & Beck, 2008). Participants observed deep divisions between tenured and non-tenured staff due to their teaching roles and lack of participation in high-status labor such as research. Heavy teaching and supervision loads, lack of involvement in research, along with little input into decision-making in the programs in which non-tenured staff taught, led to what the non-tenured staff considered second-class academic citizenship. This lack of respect was despite the fact that non-tenured instructors comprised the vast majority of staff teaching in the preservice teaching program, had previously held high-status roles in their schools (three had been principals), and six of the eight participants had either completed doctorates or were close to completion. The lack of participation in faculty and university decision-making is a finding echoed in a large study of an allied group of staff, that is, cooperating teachers in Canada and Australia (cooperating teachers being those who work with beginning teachers in practicum settings) (Mitchell, Clarke, & Nuttall, 2007).

Another key finding of the Kosnik and Beck (2008) study was the lack of or inadequate induction and ongoing professional development for seconded and other non-tenured faculty, a

finding echoed in other secondee studies (Costley et al., n.d.; Housego & Badali, 2000; McEachern & Polley, 1993). The inadequacy of professional development is all the more worrying because the provision of a quality education and training system to facilitate economic growth and social cohesion is now increasingly seen as a critical role for faculty instructors. Yet little attention is paid in the research literature to the ongoing learning of faculty staff to prepare them better for these complex demands (Kosnick & Beck, 2008).

In addition to problematic induction processes, poor mentoring and few opportunities for collaborative work have been reported by five beginning teacher educators in the United Kingdom (Harrison & McKeon, 2008). When these participants were asked about potential research opportunities, only one, who was completing her doctorate, had been involved in any research projects, although three described ideas for practitioner-type research. These participants were permanent members of an education faculty, however, and not seconded, so it is difficult to say whether their experiences are aligned with those of temporary secondees to universities.

The place of research in seconded instructors' workloads has been only marginally touched on in the earlier literature (Costley et al., n.d ; McEachern & Polley, 1993). Although there appears to be debate as to whether research undertaken by academic staff adds to the value of teaching and students' learning (Ramsden & Moses, 1992), Lucas (2007) argues that research and teaching share a nexus that should be integrated rather than fragmented because of the potential of research to enrich and inform teaching. Specifically for teacher educators, research provides a means of developing a dynamic rather than static knowledge of how higher education pedagogy differs from classroom teaching (Kosnick & Beck, 2008). Livingston (2009) makes a strong case that teacher educators need to be involved in research, not only for the status and financial rewards that it may bring to the faculty, but also because of the importance of continual learning about learning and teaching, the dynamic view of knowledge, and the changing educational landscape.

At the same time, the expectation for teacher educators to undertake research varies according to country and institution. For example, whereas many Dutch teacher educators are not expected to undertake research, in Israel, Estonia, and Sweden, teacher educators' work is closely aligned to the conventional academic model of teaching, research, and administration (Murray, Swennen, & Shagrir, 2009). In the UK, Murray (2005) reports the differences in institutional probationary requirements for new teacher educators, ranging from no specific research requirements, to one university expecting completion of a doctorate, three publications, and application for external research funding within the first three years. One Canadian study indicates that secondees were not required to undertake research (Beynon et al., 2004).

Other beginning teacher educators experience difficulties in assuming research responsibilities. Sinkinson, (1997) found that only three of the 14 new teacher educators surveyed (with permanent university positions) cited research as one of the main reasons for moving into universities; the remaining respondents indicated that research was an obligation rather than an opportunity. In addition, Sinkinson found no systematic introduction to a research culture, with only one of 14 teacher educators having received support in this area. More specific to secondees, such teachers have been described as "experience rich but research impoverished" (Livingston, 2009, p. 197) in that they bring their experiences of classroom teaching, but little knowledge and experience in research. However, compared with other teacher educators, little is known about the research experiences of these seconded teachers.

The temporary nature of secondments makes the shift from the classroom to academe all the more challenging. It has been argued that secondees continue to call on their first-order practitioner identity as schoolteachers, which is at odds with the second-order context of universities (Murray & Male, 2005). This kind of second-order practice, in which there is no simple transfer of school teaching skills, demands a different set of pedagogical skills in relation to the teaching of adults (Murray & Male, 2005) and is reported to be a major issue for secondees (Housego & Badali, 2000). The second-order context of universities often means that secondees may feel temporarily deskilled, which is ironic given that the very work for which they have been employed appears to be devalued in an increasingly hothouse, research-intensive climate (Kosnick & Beck, 2008). The development and/or realignment of identity becomes yet more complicated as secondees know that they will probably return to their school environments.

In sum, earlier literature highlights the tensions in secondees’ understandings of the dynamic nature of higher education pedagogy, their devalued position in faculty departments, and the need for more substantial induction and professional learning, all issues that relate to seconded instructors’ workplace identity formation. Similarly, although the importance of developing a strong research culture in an increasingly competitive, globalizing world has been emphasized (Marginson & Considine, 2000), how seconded teachers are positioned in relation to research is still unclear. It is this struggle with ongoing identity formation and how teaching and research are configured in this process that underpins the secondee interview data that follow.

Methodology

Theoretical Framework

Data were collected and interpreted according to a qualitative approach using case-study methodology. Case studies produce context-dependent knowledge, allowing for real-life situations and attention to detail (Yin, 1984). Although a small number of cases might prove problematic for the generalization of findings, the *contextual* analysis of a limited number of cases is particularly appealing in the area of seconded teachers, which is an under-researched area. In this sense, our aim was not to generalize, but to employ a case-study methodology as a means of undertaking a holistic, in-depth investigation that would tap the experiences of a limited number of select participants.

Background Information

This study is set in a faculty of education in Ontario that targets Canadian graduate students for a one-year Bachelor of Primary Education course. According to a former head of school, secondees are important to the program in order to contextualize the curriculum and share teaching skills. He saw the role of seconded teachers as equivalent to that of the academic members of staff whom, he asserted, worked in partnership together. In his words, “Both provide two perspectives on teacher education ... [and] both are equally valid.” In terms of research expectations, seconded teachers are “not expected to be researchers ... [but instead] given encouragement and the possibility to be involved in research.” More specifically, he distinguished between being research initiators, indicating that instead seconded teachers

needed to be “active educational research consumers” who helped to “operationalize research” for teaching students (quotations are by permission of the former head of school).

Procedure

After ethics clearance was obtained from the appropriate ethical body, information sheets outlining the purpose of the study and sample questions and consent forms were e-mailed to seconded teachers working in a faculty of education based in Ontario. Three seconded teachers agreed to participate in the study, and a time was arranged for individual one-to-two-hour semistructured interviews. Questions were designed to tap into their experiences of secondment, including:

- What was it like coming into the university sector?
- What is your role?
- What have been the largest challenges in your role?
- What has been your experience of research while seconded?
- What has been your experience of teaching while seconded?
- What has been your role in research? Teaching?
- What do you see as the benefits and problems to being seconded, for yourself and the university?

Participants

Of the three secondees, two were female and one male, and they had held positions as a classroom teacher, a principal, and a consultant. Seconded positions for each of the participants were limited to two years, after which they were expected to return to their school positions. While at the university, they maintained teacher salaries and conditions such as school holidays. Two were within the first 12 months of their secondment and another was into the second year.

Results

Data Analysis

With the participants' permission, each interview was transcribed. Data analysis was undertaken in two parts: intra-interview analysis and then across-interview analysis. Intra-interview analysis focused on identifying themes in individual transcripts using a process of thematic content analysis (Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002). These themes along with interview transcripts were presented to each participant for verification, with an invitation for participants to change, delete, or add any aspect of their transcript and analyzed themes (member checks: Anfara et al., 2002). Across-interview analysis was then considered between transcripts. For ideas shared by more than one participant, specific categories were identified. These categories had internal convergence as well as external divergence so that each category was internally consistent, but each was also distinctly different from the other (Marshall &

Rossman, 1999). Categories were labeled directly from participants’ quotes when possible to maintain the richness of the data.

Five themes were identified, namely,

1. “A whole new language and a whole new world.”
2. The benefits of secondment.
3. “I’m a teacher first and foremost.”
4. “I should be doing research but ...”
5. Drawbacks and issues.

A whole new language and a whole new world

Participants spoke at length about the two environments of school and the university, with one reporting that it was like “a whole new language and a whole new world.” The freedom of university life as well as the lack of structure was stressed: “I felt like I was released in many ways but [I was] not really sure of my responsibilities and deadlines for what I needed to do.” This change was particularly salient in the initial transition period, with one participant reporting,

When I was in schools I was doing the day-to-day stuff that happens in classrooms ... [so] I went from tying up shoe laces to being asked to read a text book, explain theory and having colleagues, people with PhDs as well as students, ask me, “What do you think?” Terrifying!

Even the consultant, who was “used to dealing with adults all day”, found it different working with university students who, in her view,

wanted to be spoon-fed, not like the teachers and administrators I had worked with, who knew what they wanted ... with them it was a collegial, professional relationship ... with students it feels different, I have power I suppose, when grading and supervising their teaching practice, which I never felt with the teachers I worked with.

Participants also described the two foci between schools, where in the words of one participant, “I had to keep the board happy” to the greater independence of the university.

While I am supposed to teach my subject, I never feel that there is anyone looking over my shoulder, checking up on me ... that gives me greater freedom to do what I think is important, rather than what others might think is important.

One participant saw the opportunity for reflection and to “think about things” while in her university position:

I was able to work with brilliant minds, who were forever asking questions, challenging, thinking and who were genuinely interested in what other people thought and why they thought like that ... previously I had been to conferences but had no time to read articles, no access either [to] the sort of information I can easily get my hands on here ... [but now] it’s my job to read about this.

The secondee who had been a classroom teacher also described the flexibility of work hours and the advantages of being able to work from home as being markedly different from her previous school position.

Benefits of secondment

Participants outlined the advantages of secondments, personally, professionally and to the institution. Personal benefits included: “a great learning opportunity, a real opportunity for growth.” “It has been an incredible learning—I have grown intellectually more in the last four months than in my entire life.” In addition, the secondee who had been a teacher reported, “For me it was definitely a time for a change—the triviality [of classrooms] was driving me to distraction and I was becoming stagnant.” The same classroom teacher also reported that others had noticed how she had changed:

It is affirming because when I go back to [my old] staff, they see a change in me – they see a new professionalism and I am also more reflective—I now see things from different sides, the teachers, the kids, principals, the board.

Participants highlighted their practical, hands-on experience as the greatest asset they brought to the faculty:

I come from the heartbeat of schools—I have the experience of dealing with kids, parents, principals, the ministry—I have many, many years of experience and all the learning and practice that goes with that.

I bring a more hands-on perspective ... I think I bring a nice balance to the research that others bring.

I give students real and practical hints, they [students] call them “gems”... I give them what they need to survive because all new teachers need same basic things, in terms of behavior management and the curriculum.

They also reported that the links that they had developed to school boards and other school-based resources were useful to students.

I’m a teacher first and foremost

Secondees described their university role in terms of teaching responsibilities, and in the words of one participant, “I see myself as a teacher first and foremost.” There were subtle differences in how each secondee perceived himself or herself as a teacher in the university setting and how this teaching was then enacted. For example, the secondee who had previously been a teacher described little difference between her classroom practice and how she taught at the university:

I show the students how I teach in the classroom, I model [to] them different activities, strategies, lesson plans and hopefully they see one model of teaching and pick up bits and pieces from that.

In comparison, the consultant reported,

Previously, there was no need to back anything up ... I mean to have support, research and so on to back up your views. I would just do what I do and it was very much intuitive—whereas here I am a lot more nervous ... so I need to prove myself in many ways.

The principal, who was further into the secondment than the two other participants, described the role of teacher as sharing former experiences and well as professional readings.

I should be doing research, but ...

In the first instance, all participants recognized a systemic requirement to undertake research:

The Dean asked me what I was going to be writing this Friday and when I said a shopping list she did not smile—it hit me then that I needed to be doing research! The message was certainly top down. It has been made to me very clear that my present role should involve research.

At the same time, participants were keen to do research with one stating, “Yes, I feel like I should be doing research but I also want to.” This participant was keen to undertake research because

I have a personal interest in special ed so this is something I would like to focus on ... coming here I also feel the need to prove myself. Previously people knew me and thought I was competent, here they don’t know me ... there is also an element of peer pressure - because others are doing it the expectation is that I, too, will be doing it.

However, all highlighted the difficulties they faced in undertaking research, particularly given the two-year secondment period:

I have not yet been involved in any research projects. I would have liked this to happen but still, I feel only now comfortable in the role. I am still getting teaching under my belt and have only started to develop relationships but am not yet ready to jump in.

Another participant also reported difficulty when “balancing home, teaching, and research and when push comes to shove, research goes!” Participants suggested that if they were to engage in research that they would do this with other, more experienced colleagues, although this was not without its problems:

If I wanted to do research, I could approach others, but at the same time others are busy and have their own interests. I want only to be a small part of their project ... and be the person who does the envelopes, collects questionnaires, and be the 14th name on a paper.

The research role that they might assume was further elaborated when other participants reported:

Now that teaching has slowed down ... perhaps next year? After one year, perhaps then I would be ready to go out of my comfort zone and then [be ready] to collect data and help someone else, but certainly I am not comfortable writing it.

I could help out with other people's research, as I have connections and can get people into schools, but I can't do all parts of a research project, especially the write-up.

Thus although participants acknowledged that they needed support in undertaking research, they were also able to articulate their strengths, namely, school connections, when working with other, more experienced researchers.

Drawbacks and issues

Participants described the issues and problems of their secondment role. Comments about the various aspects of their role, including its uncertainty, were repeatedly made:

I don't know if I am doing the right thing.

I needed much more orientation about the ins and outs, like whether to and how to use attendance lists, when to support students, when to back off, what it is like to teach at a uni level with uni students, how to take student feedback.

There was no induction, I felt lost. There was no communication about responsibilities, no clear expectations.

Computers, I was not used to working with computers so much.

Participants also described the disconnectedness that they experienced from their school-based positions:

I have no idea what is happening in spec ed—I just have to leave that for a couple of years—there have been changes such as to IEPs, which I will have to learn when I get back.

I am feeling increasingly isolated from the school board. This is a problem because I will be returning [to] the board [which] wants me back. The board is moving ahead in new directions and my friendships have moved on—they have continued on their road, while I have taken another, for example, many have been selected as VPs.

Another participant spoke about starting a new position:

Another issue is one of respect. In my previous position I had respect—people such as administrators, teachers, principals would come and ask my advice—they would look up to me and seek my feedback and use it. While here I am pretty much starting all over again.

Similarly, the classroom teacher talked about her former position and the difficulties in moving into another role when she described the following:

I miss the children and the interaction with them. I also find it difficult to watch a student's lesson when it is not going well—I want to fix it for them—I have a very hard time staying quiet.

All described not being clear about future career pathways. Although they described enjoying their secondments and expressed reluctance to return to their school-based positions,

they wished to maintain their teachers’ conditions and salaries. In the words of one participant, “Academics get paid nothing ... I get paid lots more back in schools, and at this stage of my life am not prepared to let that go.” Although the seconded teachers were, in the words of one participant, toying with the idea of permanent academic positions, they were nonetheless resigned to returning to their school-based positions.

Discussion

Because the secondment was for two years only, participants in this study keenly observed and described the differences between their former school settings and roles and the faculty environment, noting the freedom and independence of faculties as opposed to the day-to-day issues and responsibilities in schools. In terms of their identity, the secondees interviewed saw themselves primarily as teachers, with one explicitly describing how she used her classroom skills and experience when teaching her education students. Another instructor saw the need to back up what she was saying, but did not explore how this might change what she presented to teaching students. The teaching identity described by participants here is consistent with the “first-order practitioner identity” described by Murray and Male (2005). However, rather than seeing this as a problem or affording them a lower status in their institution as others have reported (Kosnik & Beck, 2008), the secondees indicated that their practical skills and classroom experiences were valued and provided a “nice balance to the research others bring.” Furthermore, their school connections were something that they could bring to others when undertaking research projects. More subtly, one of the secondees described not so much a loss of respect, but more having to start again to gain the respect that she had once had when working in schools. Thus their teaching experience and status was cause for celebration and a basis from which to “prove” [themselves], rather than an attribute to dismiss or devalue. As insiders who are experts in school-based practices, they reported bringing and *using* these school experiences in terms of concrete examples to share with students and in their teaching practices. Nonetheless, the secondees keenly observed the two distinct systems of schools and universities with corresponding differences in their roles, the language they used, and their purposes.

Others have also commented on the differences between schools and universities. Gravani (2008) argues that universities emphasize theory and propositional knowledge (abstract principles and ideas) and serve to generate knowledge, whereas schools value practice, procedural knowledge (situational and technical knowledge), and function as knowledge translators. Similarly, based on his experience of returning to a school position after completing doctoral studies, Mandzuk (1997) argues that schools are more concerned with *doing* whereas universities are more concerned with *thinking*:

In other words teachers may be orientated more towards teaching programs while their counterparts at the university may be orientated more towards the ideas and issues that *guide* the development of these programs. (p. 447, emphasis in original)

It is not only staff who highlight the differences between schools and universities. Teaching students also note the differences between the two settings, reporting that universities favor (and therefore assess) analytical and reflective thinking, whereas schools require immediate classroom effectiveness (Cope & Stephen, 2001).

We believe from the interviews reported here that seconded teachers are well placed to support teaching students in the two distinct environments of schools and universities. In the current study, seconded teachers indicated that moving from their school positions into the university gave them the ability “to see things from different sides” and at the same time, describe a growing appreciation of the various roles and functions of the two workplaces and their respective roles. While they still are learning “the new language” of the university, they are aware of the disparity of schools and universities because they are experiencing and living that transition themselves. Accordingly, this straddling of both worlds (Mandzuk, 1997) can be used empathically when working with teaching students who themselves are also moving between the two spaces of schools and universities.

Earlier, teaching students reported that their training was too theoretical and not practical enough (Louden & Rohl, 2006), with a policy report suggesting that academia and practice tend to be disconnected in education faculties (Levine, 2006). However, practice and theory do not need to be incompatible. Commenting on this relationship, Carr and Kemmis (1986) argue, “Theories are not bodies of knowledge that can be generated out of a practical vacuum and teaching is not some kind of robot-like mechanical performance that is devoid of any theoretical reflection” (p. 113). In other words, theory can shape practice, and practice can inform theory. Seconded hold a unique position between the two worlds and bring to the craft, knowledge of working with children, parents, teachers, and school administrators. Although practical wisdom is sometimes dismissed as idiosyncratic, anecdotal, and atheoretical (Polkinghorne, 1992), the relationship between theory and practice is organic, with both being equally important and interrelated. Just as the importance of practitioners being aware of what drives their practice has long been recognized (Schön, 1983), so too must the development of secondees’ practical and tacit knowledge when they move into faculty positions. Reupert, Wilkinson, and Galloway (2010, p. 47) describe a seconded who reports in relation to her faculty teaching: “I had all this experience but I didn’t know how to identify it, how to categorize it.” In other words, this seconded did not have the language to describe the teaching decisions and practices that she carried out every day. Supporting secondees in identifying the language and theory of their practice serves to develop rather than to discredit or ignore their previous experience and subsequently needs to be an essential part of their induction process. Thus support structures need to be developed that ensure that these tacit understandings have appropriate schemata for secondees to identify and employ, and can subsequently be delivered to education students, other education faculty members, and teachers (see, e.g., Loughran & Berry, 2005, for a discussion of the meta-cognition of teaching practice). This ensures that induction and professional development programs do not operate from a deficit model, but instead extend, formalize, and celebrate the practical knowledge and experiences that seconded teachers bring.

The tension and anxiety reported by participants about their research responsibilities further confirms their teaching identity and struggle with identity in their new university roles. All described the messages from administration that research was important. Surprisingly, however, a former head of school clearly stated that secondees were not expected to conduct research, although “encouraged” and given opportunities to do so. It appears that secondees perceived the need to be involved in research as stronger than encouragement. At the same time, none of the participants had been involved in any research projects and were at odds as to how to go about doing this. They believed that they were able to contribute to a research project, for example, through school connections, but were clearly uncomfortable in taking the lead. This finding adds to earlier literature by highlighting the impetus that secondees feel to pursue

research, as well as the barriers and problems that they face in undertaking research projects. It also suggests how the neoliberal climate that pervades contemporary universities may be exerting intense pressure on all staff to become research “productive” (Marginson & Considine, 2000) including those groups who were previously exempt from such demands.

In this context, self-study is often chosen by those attempting to make sense of their transition into new roles and contexts (Martinez, 2008) and could be used to help acquaint secondees with the research process. However, rather than place the responsibility of research training onto the secondees themselves, the university also has a responsibility to support new staff members, “rather than treating them as self-basting turkeys to do it themselves” (Martinez, 2008, p. 41) via appropriate induction and mentoring programs.

Despite the type of research in which they may be engaging and the particular career point at which they are located, teacher educators’ own learning is enriched when they engage in collaborative inquiry about the assumptions, values, practices, and knowledge of schools and universities (Cochran-Smith, 2003). More generically, however, Gitlin (2000) has pointed out that most educational research is typically not well regarded or utilized by teacher practitioners even if it is highly valued by universities.

On the one hand, gaining distinction in the university setting requires that teacher educators spend more time on research. On the other hand, by doing so, teacher educators distance themselves from teachers who largely reject research knowledge. (p. 25)

In this study, seconded teachers indicated that they had the potential to actively bring to research, their school connections, as well as their practical classroom experiences. Clark et al. (1996) described a collaborative research project with teachers and academics that involved “sharing and mutuality not in terms of *doing the research work*, but, rather, in terms of *understanding the work of one another*” (p. 196, emphasis in original). The emphasis on understanding each other rather than allocating various “research tasks” arose because it was acknowledged that teachers’ experiences were as important to the final research project as the research work (e.g., choosing the methodology and writing the results, Clark et al.). As we have previously suggested, secondees might support teaching students’ entry into, and understanding of, schools. We would argue that secondees might also support academics’ research in schools. Given their unique position and emerging identity, secondees can, with support, collaboratively develop a shared language or new discourse that helps bridge the gap between schools and universities, between theory and practice, and between research and teaching for teaching students and teaching faculty.

Based on this and other studies, a number of recommendations can be made for future secondments. More comprehensive induction programs need to be developed that provide a thorough and explicit overview of a seconded instructor’s responsibilities. In addition, secondees need to be given the opportunity to sustain school links, and to maintain currency and networks, because they will return to schools after their period of secondment. As outlined above, not all teacher educators are expected to undertake research. However, if research is an expectation, this needs to be clearly communicated and greater support provided. In particular, such support needs to be specifically tailored to meet the needs of this distinct group in order to nurture them successfully as neophyte researchers. Formalized mentoring that incorporates secondees’ practical knowledge and links to schools has been shown to be appropriate and effective in supporting secondees and other early career researchers in developing a research

profile (Reupert & Wilkinson, 2008). The self-study approach described by others (Mandzuk, 1997; Martinez, 2008) can also be a useful way of understanding the transition and the processes involved in research.

Future studies would profit from drawing on a larger sample size of secondees and following them through the various phases of their secondment in a longitudinal prospective study design. Given the varying perspectives only lightly touched on here between an administrator and secondees, it would be useful to ascertain the views of other key stakeholders such as principals, faculty staff, administrators, and teaching students. Overall, the study adds to the existing research by confirming seconded instructors' teaching identities and highlighting their views and needs regarding research. Finally, perceiving secondees in terms of the first-order identities they bring to their role, for example, their teaching strengths and experiences, and building on these rather than viewing them through a deficit lens needs to be a central plank from which comprehensive induction programs and research support can be developed.

References

- Anfara, V.A., Brown, K.M., & Mangione, T.L. (2002). Qualitative analysis on stage: Making the research process more public. *Educational Researcher*, 31(7), 28-38.
- Beynon, J., Grout, J., & Wideen, M. (2004). *From teacher to teacher educator. Collaboration within a community of practice*. Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research*. London: Falmer.
- Clark, C.T., Moss, P.A., Goering, S., Herter, R., Lamar, B., Leonard, D., Robbins, S., Russell, M., Templin, M., & Wascha, K. (1996). Collaboration as dialogue: Teachers and researchers engaged in conversation and professional development. *American Educational Research Journal*, 35(1), 193-231.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Learning and unlearning: The education of teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 5-28.
- Cope, P., & Stephen, C. (2001). A role for practicing teachers in initial teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 913-924.
- Costley, D., Gannon, S., Sawyer, W., Watson, K., & Steele, F. (n.d). *Teacher secondments and placements to university education faculties*. Sydney: University of Western Sydney. Retrieved on June 12, 2008, from: <http://www.dest.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/785696F1-3F38-4311-B14C-88069094122A/17577/TeacherSecondmentFinalReport1.pdf>
- Gitlin, A. (2000). The double bind of teacher education. *Teaching Education*, 11(1), 25-30.
- Gravani, M. (2008). Academics and practitioners: Partners in generating knowledge or citizens of two different worlds? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(3), 649-659.
- Harrison, J., & McKeon, F. (2008). The formal and situated learning of beginning teacher educators in England: Identifying characteristics for successful induction in the transition from workplace in schools to workplace in higher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(2), 151-168.
- Housego, B.E., & Badali, S. (2000). Teachers' secondment experiences. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 46, 327-345.
- Kirk, G. (1980). The theory-practice issue in teacher training. *Scottish Educational Review*, 12(2), 113-119.
- Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2008). In the shadows: Non-tenure-line instructors in pre-service teacher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(2), 185-202.
- Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers*. Washington, DC: Education Schools Project. Retrieved September 19, 2008, from: http://www.edschools.org/pdf/Educating_Teachers_Report.pdf

- Livingston, K. (2009). Teacher educators as researchers. In A. Swennen & M. Van der Kink (Eds.), *Becoming a teacher educator: Theory and practice for teacher educators* (pp. 191-203). Dordrecht: Springer Verlag.
- Louden, W., & Rohl, M. (2006). “Too many theories and not enough instruction”: Perceptions of preservice teacher preparation for literacy teaching in Australian schools. *Literacy*, 40(2), 66-78.
- Loughran, J., & Berry, A. (2005). Modelling by teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 193-203
- Lucas, L. (2007). Research and teaching work within university education departments: Fragmentation or integration? *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 31(1), 17-29.
- Mandzuk, D. (1997). A doctoral graduate’s return to the elementary classroom: An example of sociological ambivalence. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(4), 439-449.
- Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Martinez, K. (2008). Academic induction for teacher educators. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(1), 35-51.
- McEachern, W., & Polley, D. (1993). Teachers on secondment: Their perceptions of the experience. *Education*, 113(4), 585-591.
- Mitchell, J., Clarke, A., & Nuttall, J. (2007). Cooperating teachers’ perspectives under scrutiny: A comparative analysis of Australia and Canada. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(1), 5-25.
- Murray, J. (2005). Investigating good practices in the induction of teacher educators into higher education. Research study for ESCalate. York, UK: Higher Education Academy. Retrieved June 19, 2009, from: <http://escalate.ac.uk/1149>
- Murray, J., & Male, T. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: Evidence from the field. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 125-142.
- Murray, J., Swennen, A., Shagrir, L. (2009). Understanding teacher educators’ work and identities. In A. Swennen, M. Van de Klink (eds.). *Becoming a teacher educator. Theory and practice for teacher educators* (pp. 29-43). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Polkinghorne, D.E. (1992). Postmodern epistemology of practice. In S. Kvale. (Ed.), *Postmodernism and psychology* (pp. 146-165). London: Sage.
- Ramsden, P., & Moses, I. (1992). Associations between research and teaching in Australian higher education. *Higher Education*, 23, 273-295.
- Reupert, A., & Wilkinson, J. (2008). “One boot for kicking and one carrot for motivation”: Mentoring to support the writing projects of Early Career Researchers. Paper presented at the Charles Sturt University Research Colloquium.
- Reupert, A., Wilkinson, J., & Galloway, L. (2010). Neither fish nor fowl: Exploring seconded and contracted teachers’ experiences of the university sector. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 37, 3, 39-56.
- Schön, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner. How professionals think in action*. New York, NY, USA: Basic Books.
- Sinkinson, A. (1997). Teachers into lecturers: An agenda for change. *Teacher Development*, 1(1), 97-105.
- Yin, R.K. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Zeichner, K. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: A personal perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 117-224.

Andrea Reupert is a senior lecturer in the Faculty of Education, at Monash University, Clayton, Australia. Her research interests focus on disadvantaged groups in the education and health systems.

Jane Wilkinson is a senior lecturer in the School of Education, Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga. Her research interests include the theory and practice of leadership and diversity in schools and universities.