

Strangers in a strange land – on becoming scholars of teaching

Hanelie Adendorff*

Centre for Teaching and Learning, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa

This paper reports on a qualitative study that explored the challenges experienced by nine emerging scholars of teaching at a research-intensive university in South Africa. It details three problem areas encountered during the process of becoming scholars of teaching: (1) negative perceptions about the work and related reward concerns, (2) concerns about mastering this form of enquiry, and (3) identity issues. Whilst the first two have been described in SoTL literature, the third – identity issues – has not received attention in the literature in this area. These concerns are discussed using the constructs of Discourse, academic cultures and communities of practice.

Keywords: education development; scholarship of teaching and learning; recognition and reward; discourse; identity

Introduction

The scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) is a prevailing theme in teaching development with many universities embracing the notion in one way or another. Despite ongoing debate about what SoTL is and how it should be measured, there is general agreement that it could play a vital role at a time when the higher education sector is facing significant challenges (Cross 1996; Huber and Hutchings 2005; McKinney 2003; Kreber 2007b). It has been argued that SoTL should be viewed as an imperative rather than a choice (Huber and Hutchings 2005), but what awaits those academics who become involved in SoTL work?

Shulman (2004) warns of a risk to one's career when choosing SoTL over disciplinary research. Although numerous problems associated with work in this area have been documented, literature on the topic centres around three broad themes. The first relates to negative beliefs and perceptions: about teaching as a profession (Huber and Morreale 2002; Hutchings and Shulman 1999), about those who do SoTL work (Hutchings and Shulman 1999; Bass 1999) and about the work itself (e.g., Hutchings and Shulman 1999; McKinney 2006; Wankat et al., 2002). The second theme concerns reward and recognition for SoTL work in appointment and promotion decisions (e.g., Hendersen and Buchanan 2007; McKinney 2006; Potter 2008; Theall and Centra 2001; Wankat et al. 2002) while the third theme refers to difficulties related to mastering the methods of this field, especially for academics from non-social science backgrounds (e.g., Wankat et al. 2002; Richlin 2001; McKinney 2006; Tight 2004; Healy 2000).

This paper reports on a study that explored the experience of nine academics involved in SoTL work at Stellenbosch University (SU), a medium sized, research-intensive South African university. Despite the practice of support for SoTL at SU by its Centre for Teaching

*Email: hja@sun.ac.za

and Learning and other key role-players, verbal accounts of academics involved in SoTL work hint at concerns similar to those detailed in literature. Understanding why certain challenges persist despite apparent support for SoTL work is of critical importance for educational development centres wishing to effectively support SoTL. This paper commences with a brief discussion of documented SoTL challenges after which three theoretical lenses will be applied to this literature and to the findings. It concludes with comments on the implications of these findings for educational development units.

The scholarship of teaching and learning

The interest of this study was in the experience of academics that use teaching and learning literature for reflection, dialogue and systematic inquiry into their own teaching practices. Although the respondents conceptualised their work as educational research rather than SoTL, the study was initially framed using the SoTL literature because this literature offered useful descriptions of the range of activities and difficulties associated with academics' efforts. This approach was adopted cognisant that SoTL remains a contested concept. Issues of concern include its definition (Boshier 2009), context specificity (Healy 2008; Huber and Morreale 2002) and the link to political imperatives (Boshier 2009). Another area of contestation is the relationship between SoTL and pedagogical research (PR). Whilst the research aspects of SoTL could be considered as pedagogical research (or the scholarship of discovery), authors such as Prosser (2008) and Kreber (2007a) argue for a mutually beneficial relationship which could include PR, whilst still recognising elements such as reflection and discussion.

Despite these problems, there seems to be some agreement that SoTL is 'about improving teachers' understanding of the [teaching and learning] process within a context' (Gurm 2009, 7). It has thus been argued that activities collected under the umbrella of SoTL could add to our collective understanding of teaching and learning and could ultimately aid in addressing current issues facing higher education on the teaching and learning front (Cross 1996; Huber and Hutchings 2005; McKinney 2003; Kreber 2007b).

For the purpose of this paper SoTL is defined as the use of teaching and learning literature for reflection, discussion and the systematic study of teaching and learning as well the public sharing and review of such work. This definition thus includes pedagogical research.

Challenges associated with SOTL work

Negative perceptions about SoTL work

Bass (1999) argues that the success of the SoTL movement will depend on finding problems worthy of investigation. However, this process is hampered by the perception that having teaching problems is indicative of bad teaching (Hutchings and Shulman 1999). Academics who make their teaching problems public by opening them to investigation thus face the risk of being labelled as inferior.

These problems are compounded by negative perceptions related to the credibility of SoTL work. Hutchings and Shulman (1999) recount an anonymous Carnegie scholar's fear that his SoTL work will not be seen as credible by others in his discipline, a problem they relate to broader concerns about rigour and credibility. Various other authors echo this, referring to scepticism about this kind of work (Wankat et al. 2002), negative beliefs about the quality, generalisability and usability of SoTL work (McKinney 2006) as well as concerns

about the lack of status of this type of research resulting in inferior standards of evidence in papers published in this area (Healy 2000).

Drawing on Becher and Trowler's (2001) system of classifying discipline specialisms according to scales of 'hardness' and 'purity', Potter (2008, 60) argues that being 'soft' and 'applied', SoTL work is likely situated fairly low on the academic pecking order. This is an especially pertinent concern at research-intensive universities where SoTL might be in competition with what is regarded as cutting edge research (Hendersen and Buchanan 2007).

Recognition and reward of SoTL work

A review of the literature identifies career advancement issues as the most widely documented risk associated with SoTL work. Numerous authors (Healy 2000; Huber and Morreale 2002; Kreber 2003; Potter 2008; Theall and Centra 2001; Witman and Richlin 2007) have referred to problems related to the limited recognition of SoTL work at the level of the discipline, with restrictive perspectives on scholarship often reducing the value afforded to SoTL work in some disciplines (Potter 2008).

Similar issues manifest at institutional level when those in power hold narrow views of scholarship which do not value SoTL (McKinney 2006). Thus, even where the will and ability to pursue SoTL work exist, departmental and institutional culture might not be receptive, making it a risk for both appointment and promotion (Hutchings and Shulman 1999). Wankat et al. (2002, 8) claim that the 'playing fields' for those doing SoTL work and those doing disciplinary research are not even and that SoTL remains undervalued in career advancement decisions. This does not bode well for SoTL practitioners if one takes into account the inadequate or misaligned rewards for this kind of work (McKinney 2006; Kreber 2001). Even though research-intensive universities may have more resources to promote and support SoTL work, reward structures may still not recognise SoTL due to the value accorded to traditional disciplinary research (Theall and Centra 2001). In the light of this, the fear that involvement in SoTL work will negatively impact academic careers is no surprise.

The nature of SoTL as a mode of enquiry

Though less well documented, SoTL literature also refers to difficulties associated with the nature of work in this area, especially with respect to mastering the methodology. A number of authors have expressed concern about the absence of rigorous methods and methodological weakness of papers published in this area (Wankat et al. 2002; Richlin 2001; McKinney 2006; Tight 2004; Healy 2000). Besides lacking theoretical perspectives (Tight 2004), it is argued that many SoTL articles include little or no empirical data (McKinney 2006) and that even SoTL practitioners from social science backgrounds tend to abandon the standards of rigour they would use in their discipline when publishing SoTL work (Richlin 2001).

With knowledge, values and approaches to inquiry shaped by socialisation into the discipline (Potter 2008), academics who are new to SoTL face significant challenges when departing from what is familiar. Unfortunately, problems in this area are intensified by a lack of definitive methodological resources to guide newcomers with respect to the 'methodologies for pedagogic research in HE' (Stierer and Antoniou 2004, 276). Trying to understand and follow the ground rules of research in the field of higher education studies has been likened to being 'strangers in a strange land' (Stierer 2008, 37). Not surprisingly, respondents often struggle with clearly defining the problem, establishing the baseline and relating it to what has already been done (Richlin 2001).

The research process in this project

Purpose of this study

It has been suggested that higher education has to make space for SoTL to live alongside disciplinary research (Huber and Hutchings 2005). In the case of Stellenbosch University, first steps have been taken towards achieving this: institutional provision for SoTL at SU includes a fund dedicated to SoTL work, an annual SoTL conference, various workshops on topics related to this kind of work as well as individual assistance from academic advisors, and public support for SoTL from university and faculty managers. Verbal indications of serious problems hindering the progress of academics involved in SoTL work therefore raised a question as to why they found their transition into this area of study so challenging. To explore this, two research questions were addressed:

- What were the challenges these academics faced in relation to SoTL work at SU?
- What theoretical lenses could aid in understanding and explicating the experience of the respondents in this study?

Research design

This study adopted a qualitative approach. Nine academics from four different faculties were purposively selected, based on the five criteria in Kreber's (2007a) conception of SoTL: a deep knowledge base, an inquiry orientation, critical reflectivity, peer review, as well as sharing or going public with the insights and innovations resulting from the inquiry process. For the purpose of this study, 'emerging scholars' – teachers who are in the process of becoming teaching scholars – are thus defined as academics who attempt to make sense of the teaching and learning environment through appropriate literature, who base teaching choices on systematic observation of the teaching and learning environment and who report SoTL findings to a wider audience than their departments only. These elements formed the basis of criteria used for selection of respondents.

Seven of the nine respondents were selected from the list of recipients of the university's grant scheme for research and innovation into learning and teaching. These institutional grants are awarded to full-time academic personnel for scholarly work on the teaching of their disciplines. The other two respondents were known to the researcher for their work in the area of academic development. Both had left their home disciplines to pursue careers in academic development. For the purpose of the study they were asked to reflect on the process of becoming scholars of teaching and to respond from their experience of being emerging scholars of teaching.

The discipline-based respondents in this study represented four faculties: health sciences (respondents HS2 and HS3), economic and management sciences (EMS1, EMS2 and EMS3), natural sciences (NS1) and agrisciences (Agri1). The other two respondents were originally from the faculties of health sciences (HS1) and natural sciences (NS2).

The data was collected by means of semi-structured interviews (Denscombe 2007). During these interviews, respondents were asked to reflect on the challenges and difficulties experienced during their scholarly work in the area of teaching. All the interviews were audio-taped, transcribed in full and coded in Atlas^{ti} using a provisional start list, as described by Miles and Huberman (1994). The codes in this list were based on the themes in the literature survey. After the first round of coding, the start list was amended to capture the themes emerging from the data.

Theoretical framework

Data interpretation introduced questions which warranted further exploration and challenges not sufficiently explained in SoTL literature. In an attempt to understand this data, three theoretical constructs were employed: discourse (Gee 1999), academic cultures (Becher and Trowler 2001) and communities of practice (Wenger 1998). Relevant aspects of each, and their combined role in illuminating possible difficulties associated with scholarly growth in the area of teaching, are briefly discussed below.

The ability to enact a particular socially recognisable identity requires the use of language combined with 'other stuff' (Gee 1999, 20). Gee (1999) calls this combination of language and 'other stuff' discourse with a capital 'D'. In order to be recognised and accepted in a certain social context, one needs to use the appropriate discourse or 'ways of combining and integrating language, actions, interactions, ways of thinking, believing, valuing, and using various symbols, tools and objects [in the right places and at the right times]' (Gee 1999, 21). It is important to realise that recognition through discourse is not a once off test, but an ongoing negotiation; if someone was to stop practising in the ways acknowledged by their discourse community, it could negatively affect their recognition.

In the academic context, it might be useful to think of these discourse communities in terms of the second construct, 'communities of practice', which Wenger (1998) describes in terms of three dimensions, namely a shared enterprise, a shared repertoire and mutual engagement. Newcomers to a community of practice need to learn the rules of engagement, master the repertoire and become familiar with community's perspective on the world before they can fully participate. Entry into a new community of practice also has identity implications resulting from a strong connection between identity and practice. In a community of practice, one's situated identity is constructed through participation, and in such a way that aspects of competence in the key dimensions become aspects of identity.

The issue of recognition also receives attention from the third construct of academic cultures or 'tribes and territories' by Becher and Trowler (2001, 75). They argue that academic researchers are motivated by the 'desire to develop a reputation in the field' and to 'achieve status in the profession through advancing knowledge'. Key amongst the criteria for such academic success is the disciplinary validation of the worth of the research endeavour. Disciplines have clear, often tacit, understandings of what constitutes quality, with gatekeepers, usually the 'stars of a particular discipline' (Becher and Trowler 2001, 85), deciding what is valued, and what is not. Referring to the role of artefacts, literature and language in establishing the cultural identity of disciplinary groups, Becher and Trowler (47) argue that the strategies used by academic tribes to define their identities and defend their territories in reality serve to exclude 'illegal immigrants'. In this situation, the peer group embodies the normative state of the academic community preoccupied with standards, merit and reputations. They suggest that areas of research which do not sufficiently meet the criteria of hardness, purity and an urban research style might be 'doomed to a place far down the academic pecking order' (Becher and Trowler, 192).

Discourse can seem to have an impermeable boundary when it becomes a determinant for acceptance and recognition of the scholar and his or her scholarly output. Becoming a scholar of teaching involves two communities of practice: the SoTL community, into which emerging scholars are trying to gain acceptance, and the disciplinary community into which they have been socialised over time. Participation in the SoTL community requires competence in the SoTL discourse, but by acquiring this discourse emerging scholars might spoil their acceptance in their disciplinary community, especially if the new discourse is in an area which is regarded as less rigorous by the 'gatekeepers' of their discipline. In such instances,

restrictive notions of what counts as scholarship could result in the marginalisation of emerging scholars.

Emerging scholars might experience identity challenges during the process of scholarly growth in the area of teaching. How they construct themselves in a social context will depend, in part, on how they are perceived by existing scholars in the new community of practice, i.e., the SOTL community, and the extent to which their scholarly work is considered as worthy of recognition by their disciplinary peers, i.e., their old community of practice.

Findings

The findings in this study confirmed the presence of all the challenges documented in literature. In addition to accounts of disheartening struggles with mastering the discourse of this field, emerging scholars in this study expressed serious concerns about the extent to which work in this area would be recognised and rewarded. They did not distinguish between issues related to reward and those related to negative perceptions towards this kind of work. In respondents' descriptions of their experiences these two concerns always appeared concurrently, as aspects of the same issue. These concerns about reward and recognition are especially disconcerting given the level of financial and managerial support for SoTL at SU. This study also highlighted identity issues – an aspect not explicitly addressed in the SoTL literature known to the author. Arising both as a result of and separate to the issues of discourse and reward, respondents attested to painful experiences with establishing an acceptable and comfortable professional, academic identity after embarking on SoTL work.

Mastering the SoTL discourse

Comments in this category related mostly to the language, methods and literature of this field. The problems associated with a lack of fluency in the language of this new discourse are strikingly described by an emerging scholar from the health sciences:

I remember how I felt during the first two weeks of the MPhil [in higher education studies]. Most of our classmates were teachers and they used all these acronyms and words, and I sat there, but it really was – I mean, they could have been standing there talking Greek. I didn't understand a thing of what was happening there, but all the people were nodding their heads 'yes, yes' and asking questions 'but what about this, and this aspect of that?' And I sat there and wondered what we were really talking about, but it seems to me it was something we were actually supposed to know, so I wasn't going to put up my hand. That was literally how it was. I couldn't understand a thing. It was terrifying. (HS1, translated from the Afrikaans)

Being unfamiliar with the discourse limited the extent to which this respondent could engage in discussions in class. For emerging scholars of teaching, the SoTL discourse can be entirely new and alien and might even be incompatible with experience gained in their home discipline (Potter 2008). The reasoning required in SoTL work, where 'a cause-and-effect relationship between a treatment and an outcome can never be unequivocally demonstrated and replicated' (Wankat et al. 2002), is often so far removed from the patterns of reasoning in the home disciplines of emerging scholars that it might be treated with scepticism. These issues are clearly eminent in the sentiment of an emerging scholar from the natural sciences: 'The research... I find it woolly. You go and listen to the opinion of another person and that person is not going to tell you it is "zero" or "one"' (NS1, translated from the Afrikaans).

Mastering a discourse, as is illustrated in the literature (Gee 1999) and statements above, is a complex process. Becher and Trowler (2001, 48) refer to the initiation of novices into 'folkloric discourse and codes of practice and conventions that condition the way they see the world and interact with it'. Knowledge in different fields is 'distributed (spread out), inscribed in (and often trapped in) apparatus, symbolic systems, books, papers and journals, institutions, habits of bodies, routines of practice, and other people' (Latour 1987 and Traweek 1988, cited in Gee 1999, 28). Thus, emerging scholars have to figure out how this new discourse 'attunes actions, expressions, objects and people (the scientists themselves) so that they become "workable" in relation to each other'. They have to learn 'to recognise what counts as a relevant contribution, what counts as answering a question, what counts as having a good argument for that answer or a good criticism thereof' (Rorty 1979, cited in Becher and Trowler 2001, 50). The quote below relates the experience of a natural scientist upon joining a SoTL community of practice:

When I arrived here, it felt to me that everyone had already read the primary sources. Everyone could talk authoritatively about the influential authors in their field. They had a good foundation in philosophy. It is something I lacked. (NS2, translated from the Afrikaans)

Recognition and reward

In the April 2007 issue of the Stellenbosch University online teaching and learning journal, *Teaching Matters @ SU*, interviews with deans from three of the faculties represented in this study were reported. Each was asked whether academics in their faculties could choose the scholarship of teaching as a career path. In the words of one of these deans (TMSU 2007a): 'it is of critical importance that good, reliable research on teaching can be done in our context'. He asserted that the impression that there is something in place that prevents people from following a SoTL career route is not true. Another dean agreed that 'research on teaching would be entirely acceptable as an alternative field of research' (TMSU 2007b). Respondents in this study, however, do not share their optimism:

There is just this snobbishness with respect to the subject discipline and you have to publish [in it]. I think having something in both [teaching and disciplinary journals] will be good – it might add some weight to the teaching journals. (EMS3, translated from the Afrikaans)

This is in agreement with Richlin's (2001) position that departments and institutions often do not count SoTL work as scholarly output. It seems that, in the opinion of the emerging scholars in this study, the position of deans has not permeated to respondents' departments. Part of the problem might be disciplinary values of what counts as scholarship with the low ranking of SoTL work possibly having a dire impact on the perceived level of rigour of SoTL research. These sentiments are clearly echoed in the following statement by one of the emerging scholars in this study:

I can tell you already, it [scholarly publication in teaching and learning journal] will be made out as 'yes, okay, this is beautiful', but I can tell you it will be looked at with snide comments. (EMS2, translated from the Afrikaans)

Recounting a conversation with a professor in the natural sciences, one of the respondents explains how the professor voiced an alarming opinion about the cognitive demands of social science research, stating that 'in social science you just get on the internet and Google a few things and a few sources and then you are up and running' (NS2, translated from the Afrikaans). These quotes illustrate the role of the discipline and disciplinary

gatekeepers in deciding what is valued, what is viewed as quality and what constitutes scholarship. Negative perceptions about the difficulty of work in this area further compound this problem as expressed in the following concern voiced by one of the respondents:

With the strong drive to get published, there are a number of people who are doing SoTL type things, I think, because they think it is easier... I have to do research, so let me take the easy option and get my research responsibilities covered. (EMS1, translated from the Afrikaans)

In most cases, emerging scholars of teaching would have invested a substantial amount of time into building a reputation in their field. Fears that their focus on SoTL might be detrimental to these efforts are thus not unreasonable. Despite various initiatives to support SoTL work at Stellenbosch University, including funding and the supportive statements made by management, respondents in this study are of the opinion that the disciplinary and institutional culture and reward systems still are not responsive to work in this area. This supports arguments about problems related to unsupportive cultures and competition with cutting-edge disciplinary research at research-intensive institutions (Hendersen and Buchanan 2007; Witman and Richlin 2007).

Identity

While the interviews demonstrated the significance of mastery of the discourse as an issue in its own right, this often also influenced the emerging scholars' sense of identity as illustrated in the description below. While this quote could be seen to refer to the discourse issue, also it highlights the relationship between sense of competence and identity.

I have a [subject] language that I am very fluent in, but just to keep up to date with that language takes a lot of time, but now health science education is a completely new subject. So first of all I have to understand what people are saying. Often... the terminology is so removed from medical environment terminology that you almost have to walk around with little dictionaries... so I think that is one of the things that is very daunting, because people start throwing out words, and it is just because it is the way that you are used to communicating, and I sit there and I hear and I feel like an idiot, because I don't have a clue what that means. (HS2, translated from the Afrikaans)

Participation, however, is not the only area in which identity presents as a problem. As mentioned earlier, academic research is driven by the need for recognition, which is measured in terms of status and gained through the perceived value of one's work. Putting this into stark perspective is Knorr-Cetina's (1982, 112) claim that academics use the term 'value' with reference to the value of 'the scientists themselves'. The following sentiment, and the earlier ones about the way in which this kind of work and publication in this area will be viewed, can thus be seen as statements about the value and, consequently, the identity of the emerging scholar: 'I can already tell you; I know it for a fact that if you look at classes of importance... [SoTL work] will be amongst the peripheral things, Mickey Mouse stuff' (EMS2, translated from the Afrikaans).

The identity issue is perhaps most vividly described by respondent HS1, who entered the SoTL arena after having achieved a certain standing in his disciplinary field. Despite his success, he describes research in his discipline as 'not grab[bing his] heart' and continues to explain how he felt a sense of belonging when attending his first teaching learning conference:

I remember how it felt when I attended that first [disciplinary teaching] conference and that amazing feeling of excitement, of: 'Ahhh, now I am among my people. This is where I want to be. This is interesting. This is great'. (HS1, translated from the Afrikaans)

Despite this excitement, his entry into a different research field was not without challenge; his lack of competence in the new discourse impacted his ability to participate and, as a result, also his identity (see first quote under ‘Mastering the SoTL discourse’).

Subsequent to these experiences, he has gone on to become an educational developer, and even though he still practices some medicine, his summary of his own experience points to the tensions in this process:

I am still a [medical practitioner]... It was a very traumatic experience, moving from medicine to [my new position]. For as long as I can remember, I want to be a [medical practitioner]. So, it took quite a while before I was happy in my skin. (HS1, translated)

The findings in this study draw attention to involvement in two communities of practice in the problems experienced by emerging scholars – their disciplinary community and the SoTL community. Wenger (1998, 168) explains that crossing community boundaries is especially difficult when two communities are defined in opposition to each other, where ‘membership in one community implies marginalisation in another’. This might indeed be the case for communities of disciplinary research and communities of teaching in higher education. In a case study with an unnamed department, Jawitz (2007) found distinct undergraduate teaching communities (UTCs) and research communities (RCs) within the same department with clear expectations for new academics to progress from the UTC into the RC. Unfamiliarity with the teaching discourse in the field marks emerging scholars as strangers in the SoTL community whilst work in a field lower down the pecking order could have dire consequences for their credibility in the disciplinary community. As a result, they are not recognised by their home community or by the new community, and they no longer recognise themselves as competent in either community. When emerging scholars find themselves on the periphery of two communities, the SoTL journey can easily become a lonely one. In the words of one respondent ‘you become rather on your own’ (EMS1, translated from the Afrikaans). Three groups of respondents were discernible in this regard. Respondents who had left their home disciplines were the only ones to mention concerns about who they were and who they were becoming (see HSI above). For respondents who (e.g., EMS2) remained in their disciplines, but decided to pursue SoTL rather than disciplinary research, identity issues were linked with the extent to which their work would be valued by their disciplinary community. Respondents (e.g., HS2) who practiced both SoTL and disciplinary research, on the other hand, referred to competence issues related to their mastery of the SoTL discourse. How emerging scholars are positioned with respect to disciplinary research could thus influence the origin of identity issues. Those who are active in SoTL and disciplinary research, it seems, can still protect their status through their disciplinary research. Similarly, emerging scholars remaining in their disciplines express less fear of losing their disciplinary identity.

Implications

The three problem areas highlighted by respondents in this study provide useful insight into the challenges associated with becoming a scholar of teaching at SU. They emphasise important issues to take into account during the conceptualisation of support for work in this area. Whilst managerial and financial support is critical for the growth of SoTL work, it is only part of the answer.

The lenses used in this study help to explain why, despite support for SoTL work at SU, emerging scholars of teaching at this institution still fear that SoTL outputs will not be adequately recognised. What is lacking at SU, is support at the level of the department. Appropriate mechanisms of support at this level will require finding ways to prepare the

ground for acceptance and validation of SoTL work in departments. Given the vital role of departmental managers (Knight and Trowler 2000), effective support efforts will have to include work with departmental leadership.

This study also foregrounds the need to create supportive environments – cognisant of the issue of identity as a function of competence – in which esteemed disciplinary scholars can safely master the new discourse.

The concepts of discourse, academic cultures and communities of practice provide useful lenses for understanding the complex processes involved in scholarly growth in this area. Further study, using these constructs as lenses at the departmental level, could thus shed valuable light on other important issues to be considered.

Conclusions

We learn from the emerging scholars of teaching in this study that embracing this scholarship can be a daunting task. Understanding scholarly growth in the area of teaching and learning from the perspective offered in this article could provide some starting points for further study into how best to support emerging scholars. This work could contribute to the understanding of what it is that we ask academics to do when we ask them to pursue the scholarship of teaching.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr Brenda Leibowitz, Dr Susan van Schalkwyk, Dr Francois Cilliers and Ms Mégan Burgoyne for their input during the process of crafting this paper.

Notes on contributor

Hanelie Adendorff is Senior Advisor (University Education) in the Centre for Teaching and Learning, Stellenbosch University. She has a PhD in chemistry and started her academic career as a chemistry lecturer. Hanelie Adendorff has been involved in work in the area of educational development since 2003. Her research interests include academic development and science education.

References

- Bass, R. 1999. The Scholarship of teaching: What's the problem? *Inventio: creative thinking about learning and teaching* 1, no. 1. <http://www.doiit.gmu.edu/Archives/feb98/rbass.htm>.
- Becher, T., and P. Trowler. 2001. *Academic tribes and territories*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Boshier, R. 2009. Why is the scholarship of teaching and learning such a hard sell? *Higher Education Research and Development* 28, no. 1: 1–15.
- Boshier, R., and Y. Huang. 2008. In the house of scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL): Teaching lives upstairs and learning in the basement. *Teaching in Higher Education* 13, no. 6: 645–56.
- Cross, K.P. 1996. Classroom research: Implementing the scholarship of teaching. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* 60, no. 4: 402–7.
- Denscombe, M. 2007. *The good research guide for small scale research projects*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Gee, J.P. 1999. *An introduction to discourse analysis, theory and method*. New York: Routledge.
- Gurm, B. (2009, July). Is all scholarship equally valued? Fusion of horizons on the definition and status of scholarship. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 3, no. 2. http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijstotl/v3n2/essays_about_sotl/_Gurm/index.htm.
- Healy, M. 2000. Developing the scholarship of teaching in higher education: A discipline-based approach. *Higher Education Research and Development* 19, no. 2: 169–89.
- Healy, M. 2008. On discipline-based approaches to SoTL. *The International Commons* 3, no. 1: 2. http://www.issotl.org/international_commons_3_1.pdf.
- Hendersen, B.B., and H.E. Buchanan. 2007. The scholarship of teaching and learning: A special niche for faculty at comprehensive universities? *Research in Higher Education* 48, no. 5: 523–43.

- Huber, M.T., and P. Hutchings. 2005. *The advancement of learning: Building the teaching commons*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Huber, M.T., and S.P. Morreale. 2002. Situating the scholarship of teaching and learning: A cross-disciplinary conversation. In *Disciplinary styles in the scholarship of teaching and learning: Exploring common ground*, ed. M. Huber and S. Morreale, 1–24. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Hutchings, P., and L. Shulman. 1999. The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations, new observations. *Change* 31, no. 5: 11–5.
- Jawitz, J. 2007. New Academics negotiating communities of practice: Learning to swim with the big fish. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12, no. 2: 185–96.
- Knight, P., and P. Trowler. 2000. Department-level cultures and the improvement of learning and teaching. *Studies in Higher Education* 25, no. 1: 69–83.
- Knorr-Cetina, K.D. 1982. Scientific communities or transepistemic arenas of research? A critique of quasi-economic models of science *Social Studies of Science* 12, no. 1: 101–30.
- Kreber, C. 2001. Observations, reflections, and speculations: What we have learned about the scholarship of teaching and where it might lead. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 2001, no. 86: 99–104.
- Kreber, C. 2003. The scholarship of teaching: A comparison of conceptions held by experts and regular staff. *Higher Education* 46, no. 1: 93–121.
- Kreber, C. 2007a. The scholarship of teaching and learning: No one way. *TLA Interchange*. http://www.docs.hss.ed.ac.uk/iad/Learning_teaching/Academic_teaching/News/summer2007.pdf.
- Kreber, C. 2007b. What's in really all about? The scholarship of teaching and learning as an authentic practice. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 1, no. 1. <http://www.georgiasouthern.edu/ijstol>.
- McKinney, K. 2003. Applying the scholarship of teaching and learning: How can we do better? *The Teaching Professor* 17, no. 7: 1, 5, 8.
- McKinney, K. 2006. Attitudinal and structural factors contributing to challenges in the work of the scholarship of teaching and learning. *New Directions for Institutional Research* 2006, no. 129: 37–50.
- Miles, M.B., and A.M. Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Potter, J. 2008. Starting with the discipline. In *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education*, ed. R. Murray, 58–68. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Prosser, M. The scholarship of teaching and learning: What is it? A personal view. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 2, no. 2: 1–4.
- Richlin, L. 2001. Scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 2001, no. 86: 57–68.
- Stierer, B. 2008. Learning to write about teaching: Understanding the writing demands of lecturer development programmes in higher education. In *The Scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education*, ed. R. Murray, 34–46. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Stierer, B., and M. Antoniou. 2004. Are there distinctive methodologies for pedagogic research in higher education? *Teaching in Higher Education* 9, no. 3: 276–85.
- TMSU 2007a. *Interview with Prof Albert van Jaarsveld on the stature of teaching*, Vol 1, no. 1. <http://academic.sun.ac.za/sol/tmsu/TM/2007feb/article01.html>.
- TMSU 2007b. *Interview with Prof Johann de Villiers on the stature of teaching*, Vol 2, no. 1. <http://academic.sun.ac.za/sol/tmsu/TM/2007feb/feature02.html>.
- Theall, M., and J. Centra. 2001. Assessing the scholarship of teaching: Valid decisions from valid evidence. In *New directions for teaching and learning: No. 86. Revisiting scholarship: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching*, ed. C. Kreber, 31–45. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tight, M. 2004. Higher education research: An atheoretical community of practice? *Higher Education Research and Development*. 23, no. 4: 395–411.
- Wankat, P., R. Felder, K. Smith, and F. Oreovicz. 2002. The scholarship of teaching and learning in engineering. In *Disciplinary styles in the scholarship of teaching and learning: Exploring common ground*, ed. M.T. Huber and S.P. Morreale, 217–37. Washington: AAHE and Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Witman, P.D., and L. Richlin. 2007. The status of the scholarship of teaching and learning in the disciplines. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 1, no. 1: 1. www.georgiasouthern.edu/ijstol.