Educating Teacher Educators: International Perspectives

Almost two decades ago, I wrote an article about teacher educators, which I titled

"Learning and unlearning: The education of teacher educators" (Cochran-Smith, 2003). The

editors of this issue of *The New Educator,* which focuses on the preparation of teacher educators,

invited me to reflect back on the 2003 article and then comment on how teacher educators are

currently being prepared in the US and in selected other countries where I have worked with

teacher educators in various capacities. I invited three senior colleagues in teacher education

from New Zealand, Israel, and Norway (Lexie Grudnoff, Lily Orland-Barak, and Kari Smith,

respectively) to join me. This article provides a sense of the intriguing variations among these

quite different countries as well as some of the central questions that cut across them.

Learning and Unlearning: Looking Back

As I noted in my 2003 article, despite ongoing critique of university teacher education

programs and despite the growth of alternate routes into teaching, at that time, responsibility for

preparing most of the nation's teachers rested primarily with teacher education programs at

higher education institutions. This meant that whether by design or default, teacher educators—

the people who taught teachers—were assumed to be the linchpins in many educational reforms,

expected to ensure that all teachers could teach to new P-12 curriculum standards, integrate

technology into the curriculum, meet the needs of the increasingly diverse school population,

prepare students to pass new high stakes tests linked to funding and policy decisions, and

respond to many other demands. In the article I pointed to the disparity between the multiple

demands placed on teacher educators and the lack of attention to a course of study for teacher

educator preparation or to policies that would create the conditions to support their ongoing

learning. I pointed out that this problem was not unique to the US, acknowledging that teacher educators were also a neglected group in many other countries.

The article focused on my experience as a teacher educator engaged in multiple learning communities at two different universities from the early 1980s through the late 1990s. The central argument of the article was this:

> [T]he education of teacher educators in different contexts and at different entry points over the course of the professional career is substantially enriched when inquiry is regarded as a stance on the overall enterprise of teacher education and when teacher educators inquire collaboratively about assumptions and values, professional knowledge and practice, the contexts of schools as well as higher education, and their own as well as their students' learning. (Cochran-Smith, 2003, p. 7)

The article made this argument by using the actual words and offering rich details about the actual work over time of teacher educators (including myself) involved in efforts to unpack and question their own and others' assumptions about race and racism in teaching and learning, the nature of learning to teach, the meaning of justice in teacher education programs, and many other issues. An important part of the article was the idea that engaging in critical inquiry about one's work as a teacher educator is a process of continuous learning as well as "unlearning" by interrogating long-held and largely invisible ideas, beliefs, and practices related to race and equity, which are painfully difficult to own and uproot while simultaneously trying to change practice. Here, the word, *un*learning, was intended to signify both growth and the undoing or reversing of that growth. This contradiction was intentional, chosen to point not only to the potential but also the enormous complexity inherent in the ongoing education of teacher educators who work with others to challenge the status quo.

My original article also suggested that we needed a reconceptualization of the role of the teacher educator and a new way to think about the continued professional education of teacher educators. Grounded in ongoing inquiry about teacher educators' knowledge and practice, the new role I proposed would privilege neither scholarship nor practice in teacher education but would instead depend upon a rich dialectic of the two. Here the lines between professional practice in teacher education, on the one hand, and research and ongoing inquiry related to teaching and teacher education, on the other, would be increasingly blurred.

Although my article was published in 2003, it is important to note that it reflected a period in time just prior to the point when the neoliberal agenda for reforming teacher education and what became teacher education's "accountability era" (Cochran-Smith, Cummings Carney, et. al, 2018) got into full swing. Things have changed considerably since that time in the US and in many other countries, as this special issue of *TNE* makes clear. We return to these ideas about learning and unlearning, teacher educators' multiple roles, and their critical importance to the education of teacher educators in the conclusion of this article.

The Education of Teacher Educators: Four Countries

Below, we consider the education of teacher educators in New Zealand, Israel, Norway, and the US. Each section is written by a senior teacher educator from that country, which means that these sections reflect different voices, priorities, positionalities, and experiences. Although the sections are differently organized and focus on different issues, each takes up the broad question of how teacher educators are currently educated in their countries, and each at least touches upon issues related to equity and diversity. These differences are not surprising given that these countries vary considerably in historical, geopolitical, and policy contexts. Each author

has chosen particular aspects of those contexts that are most important based on her longevity in the field of teacher education research, policy, and practice.

The Education of Teacher Educators in New Zealand (Lexie Grudnoff[1])

In New Zealand, issues related to the education of teacher educators are set in the context of a bifurcated field. The majority of teacher educators work in universities, a situation that is the result of the merger between 1991 and 2006 of six former stand-alone government-funded teacher education colleges with their local universities. For example, Hamilton Teachers College merged with the University of Waikato in 1991, while Auckland College of Education, the largest of the teachers colleges, amalgamated with the University of Auckland in 2004. The assumption was that the combination of universities' research focus with the colleges' professional practice focus would yield higher quality beginning teachers. Currently some 85% of elementary and secondary teacher candidates graduate from university programs.

Prior to the mergers, the traditional route to becoming a teacher educator was teaching itself. That is, teacher educators were recruited from the schools into the teacher colleges because of their professional knowledge and expertise. These professional experts, many of whom had master's degrees and close relationships with the teachers colleges, also had the necessary credentials to supervise teacher candidates' practicum experiences, which is a key requirement in New Zealand's teacher education accreditation system. After the amalgamations, some teacher educators from the teachers colleges earned doctorates and developed programs of research related to teaching and learning to become what Gunn, Hill, Berg and Haigh (2016) term "dually qualified teacher educators," or professional experts with the credentials to supervise practicum

---

[1]Lexie Grudnoff has been a teacher educator practitioner and researcher at the University of Auckland, New Zealand. Over her 40 years as a teacher educator she has had extensive involvement in program leadership, evaluation, and national policy reviews and initiatives. .
.

as well as do research. Many of those who did not become dually qualified were eventually

casualties of staffing cuts due to dropping enrollment and the effects of institutional reviews in

relation to New Zealand's Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF).

The PBRF is the country's research evaluation exercise, the results of which determine

the allocation of funding to every university according to the quality of the institution's research,

assessed partly at the level of individual research performance. The first PBRF in 2003 indicated

that 74% of those in Faculties of Education, including many teacher educators, were classified as

"research inactive" (Alcorn, 2014), meaning they did not meet minimal requirements for

research productivity. Not surprisingly, the PBRF encouraged intense competition among

universities, which had consequences for teacher educators because research was more highly

valued than practice. Since the first PBRF, universities have worked to reduce the percentage of

"research inactive" staff and increase the percentage of "research active" staff. This led to the

recruitment of both "academic" teacher educators, who teach teacher candidates and do research,

but cannot supervise practicum, and professional experts who supervise practicum but are

primarily relegated to non-tenured, short-term positions. This means that an unintended

consequence of the amalgamation and of universities' responses to the PBRF has been the

bifurcation of teacher educators into "traditional academics" who engage in research alongside

their teaching, and "professional experts" who do the demanding and lower status work

associated with practice (Gunn et. al, 2016).

Little attention is given to the professional education of New Zealand teacher educators

by either policy makers or universities. This is the case because teacher education is not regarded

as a distinct teaching and learning context, one that is different from the context of teaching

school and also different from teaching students in tertiary institutions. This assumes that teacher

educators do not necessarily need deep knowledge of what it means to learn, teach, and learn to teach in New Zealand's increasingly complex and diverse environments. Without this knowledge, teacher educators' work is likely to be informed primarily by their own biographies and by their often unexamined beliefs about race, language, culture, and ability. Because most teacher educators in New Zealand are middle class and Pākeha (i.e., New Zealand European), the lack of specific professional education attuned to New Zealand's complex historical and current contexts is problematic.

New Zealand's status as a bicultural nation was established by the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 between British colonizers and the indigenous Māori. Today, treaty obligations are highlighted in all official government policies related to education, and teacher educators have "bicultural responsibilities" to prepare teachers who help Māori students achieve success as Māori[2] (Durie, 2003). While Māori comprise about 15% of the population, according to the 2013 Census, 25% of New Zealanders were born overseas, mainly in Europe and the Pacific Islands and in Asia. In the face of increasing diversity, New Zealand's persistent problem with differential student achievement is a major concern. New Zealand students appear to do well in the aggregate, but students from poor communities who are often Māori or Pacific Island heritage are over-represented in the low achieving group while Pākeha and Asian students, often from wealthier communities, are over-represented in the high achieving group (Snook & O'Neill, 2014).

---

[2] Māori achieving success as Māori means teachers and teacher educators valuing Māori identity, language and culture and supporting Māori students in gaining the skills, knowledge and qualifications they need to achieve success in *te ao Māori* (the Māori world), in New Zealand, and in the wider world.

Given the profile of New Zealand teacher educators, it is critical that teacher candidates examine their own cultural positionalities, assumptions, and pedagogical actions in relation to difference and learn to use cultures as an asset in teaching and learning. Without this, unconscious biases reinforce patterns of discrimination and inequity (Blank, Houkama, & Kingi, 2016). Especially relevant here are findings from Te Kotahitanga (Bishop & Berryman, 2006), a government-funded program of pedagogical and school reform aimed at improving outcomes for Māori students. This identified teacher deficit thinking as a major cause of negative student-teacher relationships, which impacted on Māori student' attendance, engagement and achievement. Māori students reported that to effectively engage them in learning, teachers—who were mainly Pākeha—needed to value their identity as Māori learners and to utilize relationship-based pedagogies in their classrooms. This suggests that learning how to navigate cultural relationships for responsive pedagogy (Berryman, Lawrence, & Lamont, 2018) is essential for teacher educators who create programs, structures, and processes that are equity focused.

Unfortunately the bifurcation of New Zealand's teacher educators has entrenched the two-worlds fallacy that research resides in universities and practice resides in schools. This assumption works against the development of equity-focused programs attuned to New Zealand's conditions, which enable teachers, teacher educators, and candidates to meet their Treaty and ethical obligations as educators.

The Education of Teacher Educators in Israel (Lily Orland-Barak[3])

---

[3] Lily Orland-Barak is actively involved in the study and practice of teacher education at the University of Haifa, Israel. Her research focuses on teacher mentoring, mentored learning in practice and professional development in pre-service and in-service education. She has been centrally involved in the development and dissemination of teacher education curricula with a focus on workplace learning in the context of school-university partnerships in Israel.

Teacher education in Israel takes place within the double challenges of content and culture.   Over the past three decades, teacher education has gradually gained prominence as core to the preparation and professional learning of teachers, both at pre- and in-service levels. On average, 10,000 new teachers at all levels and from all sectors graduate every year from 40 academic institutions, including research universities and academic colleges. Given the multicultural and politically charged "melting pot" of Israeli society, teacher education in Israel faces a double challenge: On the one hand, it needs to create sound and relevant connections between the content knowledge acquired at the university and the practical knowledge acquired at school. At the same time, it also needs to be attentive to how the diverse cultural backgrounds, ideologies, values and belief systems of prospective and novice teachers inform their interpretations of these connections to guide their pedagogical judgment and practice (Orland-Barak, 2010).

To address this double challenge, Ministry of Education initiatives have pushed towards clinical teacher education at the pre-service level, including the support of partnerships between university/colleges and schools. This has involved policy resources for preparing school teachers for new clinical roles as supervisors and mentors, through support frameworks that assist mentors in developing appropriate mentoring skills (Ariav & Imanuel 2007; Margolin 2012; Zellermayer & Margolin 2005). These collaborative inquiry frameworks for mentoring school mentors also encourage them to share and reframe conflicts related to the political pressures that emerge when school and university partners hold contrasting perspectives about the role of the teacher, which could jeopardize the partnership and its collaborative working agenda (Maskit & Orland-Barak, 2015).

The first years of teaching are also well acknowledged as an important time in Israeli

teacher education. The Ministry has designated the first three years of teaching as the period of induction and supported learning for new teachers through mentoring systems and professional development institutes for new teachers. Vast resources have been invested in supporting new teachers' in-service learning through structured first and second year of teaching workshops and mentoring (Hadar & Brody, 2012). Programs for mentors are organized around three developmental stages during a three year period. The first year (60 hours) constitutes the basic mentoring program and results in a mentoring certificate. The second year (150 hours) is an advanced program that results in an expert mentoring certificate, and the third year prepares senior mentors to become mentors of new mentors. The prerequisites for entering the program are a BA/B.E.D Degree, at least five years of teaching practice, the school principal's recommendation, and a formal interview. Recently, another initiative was launched by the Ministry whereby 84 programs throughout the country were opened for the preparation of teacher mentors within communities of learning.

The above mentioned programs, however, focus solely on the preparation of teacher educators-as-mentors working with novices and teachers at school and *not* on teacher educators who work as pedagogical lecturers at universities. The education of university teacher educators who prepare student teachers for subject matter teaching is undeveloped in Israel. One reason is that school-university partnerships are supported financially by the Ministry, which is the regulator of in-service education and has an explicit agenda to promote clinical teacher education and mentored learning at the workplace. By contrast, the courses instructed by pedagogical lecturers are in the context of pre-service education, and are financed by the government's "Committee for Planning and Budgeting" (CPB, 1996). However, funding to universities excludes any kind of teaching that relates to clinical/practical experiences outside the university.

It follows, then, that although university faculties of education are encouraged to develop robust professional programs for the preparation of prospective teachers, there is a stark absence of resources for developing a rich and comprehensive praxical curriculum, which would also ideally include supporting teacher educators in the development of their unique knowledge base.

It should be mentioned, however, that although not geared specifically to university teacher educators, the MOFET Institute[4] for the advancement of teacher education in Israel has been leading a program since 2015 to promote young faculty who are pedagogical lecturers at teaching colleges. The program has already recruited 50 young excellent teacher educator-researchers in five cohorts, selected through rigid screening processes. Their research topics all relate to teacher education and professional development. Each postdoc is assigned to a mentor according to the subject of the research project. The group meets each month for a full day, which serves as a scaffold for enrichment, peer learning, and support from the staff.

The cultural challenges that teacher educators face in the context of teacher education in Israel are many. Although there is widespread recognition of the importance of educating teachers for social justice and cultural diversity in a country of immigration and multiculturalism, the preparation of teacher educators and teacher education programs in Israel tends to push to the background culturally charged issues that might give rise to undesired conflicts in the classroom. Rather, programs focus mostly on assisting student teachers in dealing with heterogeneity in the classroom (Perry, 2007), understanding students' attitudes toward different cultural groups or their achievements, and models of multicultural education (Paul-Benjamin, & Reingold, 2016). Furthermore, although most student teachers are placed in practice teaching settings that are

---

[4] The MOFET Institute, founded by the Ministry of Education in 1983, is a national intercollegiate center for the research and development of curricula and programs in teacher education and teaching in the colleges. It constitutes a unique framework both in Israel and worldwide for supporting teacher educators' professional development.

consistent with their own ethnic backgrounds (Arab speaking students in Arab schools and Hebrew speaking students in Jewish schools), many of them (especially Arab speaking EFL student teachers) are placed in Hebrew speaking schools. Having been educated in separate school systems, each with its own language and religion, this is usually Arab speaking teacher candidates' first encounter with the mainstream Jewish education system (Perry, 2007). This generates numerous difficulties related to aspects of identity, as well as practical issues such as language barriers, which can make it difficult for those students to realize their full potential as teachers (Eilam, 2003; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). Further these aspects of diversity in supporting new teachers learning to teach are not addressed in the preparation of mentors (Ezer, Melat & Patkin, 2004; Diab, Bar Shalom & Rousso, 2009). There is, then, a serious gap in teacher educators' knowledge and experience about how to integrate student teachers' cultural and ethnic backgrounds into their mediation processes of teacher professional learning and how to direct and support new teachers' pedagogical reasoning and enactment both in pre-service and in-service education (Orland-Barak, 2010).

The Education of Teacher Educators in Norway (Kari Smith[5])

In Norway, there is a major effort to develop research-competent teacher educators. As in any country, the education of teacher educators in Norway is influenced by the larger society and its culture, financial system, political and administrative systems, labor unions, and not least, the forces of globalization (Karlsen, 2005). As a result, teacher education is in constant movement, responding to changes in the surrounding systems (Karlsen, 2005). Norway today is a

---

[5] Kari Smith is an experienced teacher and teacher educator in Israel and in Norway. She was involved with establishing the Norwegian Research School in Teacher Education (NAFOL), of which she is currently the Director. She is member of the Scientific Advisory Board to the European Doctorate in Teacher Education (EDITE). Smith is the Head of the International Forum for Teacher Educator Professional Development (InFO-TED).

multicultural society with 17.8% first or second generation immigrants (Statistisk Sentralbyrå, 2019) and the indigenous Sami people comprising about 1% of the total population. In Norway, the political response to the ongoing dynamics of society has been in the form of multiple national education reforms—seven major reforms since 1973.

In 1973 teacher education for primary school teachers was a 3-year program following successful graduation from upper secondary school. In 1977 teacher education moved from the school department of The Ministry of Education to the higher education department and became subject to regulations for higher education (Karlsen, 2005). At that time, much of the autonomy of the individual institutions was reduced, with multiple national-level detailed frameworks and regulations imposed on teacher education programs. Influenced by globalization, New Public Management (NPM) governance developed in Norway in the 1990s. Teacher education became subject to demands for higher production and improved quality, monitored by the Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education (NOKUT), established in 2001 as "an independent expert body under the Ministry of Education and Research" (https://www.nokut.no/en/about-nokut/). Solhaug's (2011) analysis of Norwegian politicians' view of the NPM approach to educational reform indicated general consensus across major political parties on "most important aspects of NPM, such as basic economic values, devolution and some aspects of the national test system" (p. 276).

The most recent reform regarding teacher education requires that all teacher education is carried out in 5 year programs at the master's degree level. The Ministry of Education has also required major structural reforms. Higher education institutions have been subject to an extensive amalgamation process whereby university colleges merged with universities *or* several university colleges became one institution structurally, but without moving campuses. Today

these institutions have central leadership and local management of the regional campuses, which many have experienced as a loss of institutional identity. Additionally, higher education institutions are financed according to measurable achievements such as the completed study points of graduates and the number and quality of publications of the faculty in indexed journals.

Within the context of rapid and multiple reforms, Norway has had no formal requirements for becoming a teacher educator. As long as teacher education was not part of higher education, however, teacher educators were recruited from schools. They were often excellent teachers who were invited by the institutions to teach and mentor student teachers. Most of them had masters degrees in education or in a specific discipline, but teacher educators were first and foremost teachers, and teaching was their main responsibility until the new governance of the 1990s. Even at that time, however, there was a difference between the major universities and the university colleges where there was a growing demand that teacher educators engage in research even though there was no systematic support for this.

Today the education of teacher educators is different. The higher education system is based on measurable results, and producing publications has become a major pressure that all Norwegian teacher educators experience, independent of their teaching contexts. There is an increasing demand for teacher educators to have a doctorate, in part to meet NOKUT accreditation requirements, and in part because of the shift to masters level teacher preparation, which means that teacher educators must supervise teacher candidates' research-based master's theses. This is a huge challenge for many institutions because many teacher educators do not have the required research competence, and unless they embark on doctoral education, there is no systematic support for this.

In response to this situation, the Norwegian government has invested in a number of support systems, not a required formal education for teacher educators, but support related to the doctoral education of teacher educators. The National Research School in Teacher Education (NAFOL) was established in 2010. NAFOL has had about 140 graduates, and its 130 current students are all teacher educators who are enrolled in doctoral programs at various institutions across the country. So far, the vast majority of graduates return to teacher education in their respective institutions. In a small country with 22 teacher education institutions, these numbers are significant, but it is clear that NAFOL alone cannot meet current demands. Another positive governmental initiative is the provision to school-based teacher educators of courses that provide theoretical and practical knowledge about mentoring and support for practice-oriented research activities.

As indicated, Norwegian teacher education has been subject to multiple rapid reforms, which have had a strong impact on the work of teacher educators. Furthermore, Norwegian society is no longer the homogeneous society it once was. These issues are addressed to a certain extent in teacher education, but they are not given attention in the above-mentioned reforms and incentives related to the education of teacher educators. Currently there is strong pressure for higher education institutions to produce measurable achievements, mainly in the form of publications, but there is no formal support for those who choose not to take on a doctoral education. This raises many questions about what happens to the quality of teaching in Norwegian teacher education when research seems to be what counts. Another issue is about the pathway for becoming a teacher educator in Norway. Is it enough to have a doctorate, or are there other critical skills and experiences involved in teaching teachers that are not related to research competence? How do teacher educators acquire these? An additional worry is that most

Norwegian teacher educators experience little or no induction into their new roles (Langøren & Smith, 2018). Norway invests heavily in education and in teacher education, but the question is, do we invest wisely? Do we invest in those who teach teachers, and do we prepare them for educating teachers for the multicultural schools and society that now exists? My answer is, not enough.

The Education of Teacher Educators in the US (Marilyn Cochran-Smith[6])

Teacher education is a major enterprise in the US with more than 200,000 new teachers prepared every year in more than 2000 teacher preparation programs (King, 2013). However, over the last several decades, lack of consensus about the value of teacher education coupled with the nation's decentralized and multi-layered approach to education policy (Horsford, Scott & Anderson, 2019) and the dominance of market-based responses to the perceived pressures of the global economy (Ambrosio, 2013; Scott, 2016) have produced a crowded, rapidly changing, and fragmented teacher education field with multiple reforms and new providers (Lincove, Osborne, Mills, & Bellows, 2015).

Given this situation, the description that follows focuses only on the largest group of teacher educators in the US—faculty members (or doctoral students) in college and university teacher education programs, many of whom are simultaneously researchers studying teacher education *and* practitioners involved in the day-to-day work. Currently a relatively small number of doctoral programs in the US focuses explicitly on teacher education, teacher learning, and/or teacher development. A few of these are specialized PhD programs intended for students interested in the research and practice of teacher education, such as Montclair State University's

---

[6] Marilyn Cochran-Smith has been a teacher education scholar and practitioner for 40 years at the University of Pennsylvania and its partners in Philadelphia area schools and then at Boston College and partners in Boston area schools. She has been centrally involved in conceptualizing, enacting, and studying inquiry- and equity-centered preparation programs and in conducting national and international policy analyses.

program in Teacher Education/Teacher Learning and the University of Colorado, Boulder's program in Teacher Learning, Research and Practice. In addition, a number of PhD programs in areas such as Educational Studies, Curriculum and Teaching, or Teaching, Learning and Policy offer concentrations in Teacher Education/Teacher Development. There are also some EdD programs with a specialization in teacher education, which are intended to prepare teacher education practitioners.

Of course these programs differ, but there has been no systematic analysis of their curricula or the experiences and career trajectories of their graduates. In fact, there has been no large-scale tracking of teacher educators since the 1989 report on the teacher education professoriate (Ducharme & Wiesneski, 1989), which was part of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education's (AACTE) longitudinal "RATE" studies (Research about Teacher Education) of teacher preparation that occurred in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Although we know that the vast majority of faculty members involved in teacher education at colleges and universities have doctorates in areas such as literacy, curriculum, subject matter education, or educational psychology, it is safe to assume that most were not prepared in specialized teacher education programs, given their paucity and relative newness. Rather the generally unexamined assumption in the US has been that those with doctorates related in some way to teaching, learning, and schooling (or, in many cases doctoral students in those areas) are by virtue of the doctoral degree prepared to teach prospective teachers without further attention to the unique and complex issues of teacher preparation itself. It is also important to note that this description does not account for the university-based and school-based teacher educators and mentors who supervise and/or support teacher candidates' field experiences in many states. There are wide variations in requirements for supervisors and mentors across the states. Many

require teaching experience and/or credentials for this work, but not necessarily training in mentoring and/or supervision. Given the variegated patchwork of requirements (or lack thereof) for supervisors and mentors across the states and the assumption that doctoral-level faculty members (and doctoral students) are by definition prepared to teach teacher education courses, it seems fair to conclude that with some exceptions, there has not been a deliberate and comprehensive effort to prepare and develop teacher educators in the US.

Despite the relative lack of attention to the education of teacher educators in the US, one interesting aspect is the widespread involvement of university teacher educators in practitioner inquiry, self-study, and/or practitioner research about their own work as teacher educators. This was evident in a major review of research on teacher preparation by Cochran-Smith and Villegas in 2016, which was consistent with the conclusions of previous reviews (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005). Cochran-Smith and Villegas found that except for policy studies, which were conducted by economists and others outside teacher education, a very large chunk of the research on teacher education on a broad range of topics, from subject matter teacher education to teacher education for diversity, was conducted by scholars who were simultaneously researchers studying the practice of teacher education *and* practitioners engaged in the day-to-day work. In other words, the review revealed that much of the research on US teacher education is the result of teacher educators studying their own or their colleagues' assignments, programs, courses, and fieldwork experiences—and teacher candidates' learning and responses to these—at their own institutions. In addition, some teacher educators were engaged in research interrogating their own assumptions, values, beliefs, and/or the experience of be(com)ing teacher educators across the professional lifespan. The Cochran-Smith and Villegas review concluded that the purpose of most of the practitioner research and/or self-study by teacher educators was two-fold: (1) to

explore new strategies and practices and/or produce new insights about teacher education processes and learning to teach in the local settings that were the sites for the research, and (2) to extend their findings beyond the local context by conceptualizing new strategies, interpretations, frameworks, models or theories that could be useful outside the local site.

What this means is that over at least the last three decades, a significant number of university teacher educators in the US has been involved in a kind of self-education through ongoing inquiry and research, not unlike the role I imagined in my 2003 article wherein teacher educators' roles would privilege neither research nor scholarship, but a rich dialectic of the two, particularly in relation to issues of race, equity, and diversity. Along these lines, the Cochran-Smith and Villegas (2016) review demonstrated that in their dual roles as instructors and researchers, many teacher educators tried out new pedagogies or made structural changes intended to recruit more teachers of color or help teacher candidates shift from deficit thinking about minoritized populations and support teachers who were culturally responsive and socially just. While most of these studies reported that their interventions or new approaches helped participants think more complexly about diversity, it is important to note that the review also found that most of the pedagogies were *not* particularly innovative, and there was little evidence of the profound shift in teacher candidates' perspectives that many scholars regard as fundamental to becoming equity-minded or socially just teachers.

The prominence of the self-education of teacher educators in the US, much of which has to do with preparing teachers for diversity, raises many questions about the education of teacher educators. Practitioner research by teacher educators positions teacher educators not as the objects or receivers of "an education" orchestrated by somebody else, but as generators of knowledge and co-constructors of their own education (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). This is a

positive development in many ways. On the other hand, and at least as importantly, unless this self-education happens in the context of an edgy critical community wherein members find ways to get beneath the surface and interrogate their own and others' assumptions, the value of this self-education can be limited, sometimes simply confirming current practice, and often not getting very far toward teacher educators' deep learning and unlearning, which is critically needed.

Although we do not have empirical evidence in this area, it seems reasonable to assume that one of the reasons that practitioner research and self study are widespread in US teacher education is that nearly all university faculty who work in teacher education hold PhDs, and they are required to publish as part of their job descriptions. However, although research and publication expectations have increased at almost all US universities over the last several decades, there has been very limited funding for teacher education research (Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2016). It may be that many US teacher educators have chosen to engage in small-scale, local research related to their own work not only because this research enriches their practice and has the potential to prompt rethinking of long-held beliefs and assumptions, but also because this kind of research requires few material resources beyond the researchers' own time and commitment and is thus doable even within the constraints of the labor-intensive nature of teacher education practice.

The Education of Teacher Educators: Cross-cutting Directions

In all four of the countries highlighted here—New Zealand, Israel, Norway, and the US—teacher quality is assumed to be critical to the quality of the nation's education system and—for better or for worse—the way teachers are prepared is assumed to be a central factor in teacher quality. Across the four countries, as we have shown, there are widely varied, but equally

interesting, projects, innovations, programs, policies, and/or developments that are related to various aspects of the education of teacher educators.

Despite these innovations, it also clear that in none of these countries is there a comprehensive and deliberate approach to the education of teacher educators that simultaneously acknowledges the full range of teacher educators—from university course instructors to university-based supervisors of practicum experiences to school-based mentors and cooperating teachers—*and* that also provides the social, intellectual, and organizational contexts that support teacher educators' continuous learning.

Below we briefly consider several cross-cutting issues that these four country descriptions have raised.

(1) Across the different countries, varying groups of teacher educators have received more or less attention. Although each country has policies and practices in place that explicitly or implicitly acknowledge that multiple differently-positioned professionals play a role in the education of teachers, in no country is there a clear mapping out of these professional groups nor a comprehensive plan for their preparation and ongoing education. This suggests that across nations we need a framework for sorting out who is considered a teacher educator. We also need research that gets at where they are situated, what their background experiences and positionalities are, how they understand the work of teacher education, what they see as the most salient relationships of knowledge and practice, and what impact all of this has on their work.

(2) Although this plays out quite differently across the four countries, one assumption underlying policy and practice in all four is that more or less by definition, doctoral-level education in some area related to teaching, learning, schooling, or subject matter

qualifies faculty members (and sometimes, doctoral students) to be teacher educators and/or makes them better teacher educators. This raises many questions about the knowledge base for teacher educators, the nature of the work of preparing teachers, and the role of university-generated knowledge in that work. This also points to problems with privileging research over practice in the education of teacher educators and with assuming that teaching teachers is the same as teaching any other subject matter to university-level students. We return to these points in our conclusion.

(3) Even with projects and programs in some countries that attend to the education of one or more groups of teacher educators (e.g., school-based mentors of teacher candidates or university faculty members teaching teacher candidates), we know little about the actual content of these projects and programs intended for the education of teacher educators, including which issues are emphasized and which are left out or side-stepped. We also know little about what differently-positioned teacher educators make of their experiences and the impact they have over time.

(4) Finally variations across the four countries point to the impact on the education of teacher educators of the regulatory bodies that are involved. In many countries, because teacher education is now located primarily in universities, it is governed by policies and regulations regarding higher education and by the authorities responsible for quality assurance in higher education. Meanwhile the schools where teacher candidates gain valuable teaching experience and where they are taught by school-based mentors and supervisors are often regulated by different government agencies or different arms of the major regulatory bodies. As a result, this often means that different groups of teacher educators are governed and funded (or not) by different

entities that are siloed from one another, making a comprehensive approach to the

education of teacher educators very difficult.

All of the above issues are complex. There is some research that addresses aspects of each of

these issues, but more is needed along the lines considered above.

We conclude this article with a brief discussion about what we think *should* be included

in the preparation of teacher educators based on our experiences as scholars and practitioners in

this field over many years. We note, however, that this is a vast topic well beyond the scope of

this article and one that has been considered over the last two decades by various teacher

education scholars and/or professional associations (e.g., Association of Teacher Educators,

2008; Goodwin et al., 2014; Murray & Male, 2005; Smith, 2005).

Just as teachers do, teacher educators need to have deep knowledge of human learning

and development within complex socio-cultural contexts as well as extensive knowledge of

relevant subject matter, subject matter pedagogy, and the local/larger policies (and politics) that

shape the ways these are taught and assessed in schools. As importantly, there are many other

areas related to the theory and practice of teaching, learning, and schooling about which teachers

and teacher educators alike need to have knowledge. We do not try to name these areas here,

given that multiple long lists of what teachers should know and be able to do already exist. The

items on these lists have been elaborated in different ways in various handbooks of research on

teaching and other widely-disseminated publications and also instantiated in professional and

national standards for P-12 teachers in many countries.

Instead, the point we want to make in this final section is that teacher educators need to

know a great many things that are different from and go well beyond *both* what teachers need to

know *and* what university faculty members need to know about their own areas of scholarly expertise. Given the space and scope limitations of this article, however, we highlight just three aspects of the education of teacher educators that we think are critical.

First, teacher educators need to have knowledge of the pedagogy of teacher education. This does not emerge naturally from knowing how to teach in P-12 schools, even when teachers have attained the level of expertise that some would label "master teacher." Likewise knowledge of the pedagogy of teacher education is not an automatic result of scholarly expertise in an area that is relevant to teaching and learning, even when teacher educators have or are in the process of earning PhDs in those areas. Rather the practice of teacher education involves multiple, complex, and unique teaching and learning spaces that require a range of teacher education pedagogies as well as openness to new possibilities. Some of these spaces, which are directly embedded in the increasingly challenging and diverse contexts of schools, require teacher education pedagogies such as mentoring, coaching, and mediated interactions involving feedback, critical dialogue, and guided self-reflection. Other spaces, located in the context of universities, require pedagogies involving unique course assignments, whole class or specifically-grouped discussions, simulations, role play, critical dialogue, and course-linked fieldwork in schools and communities. Pedagogies involving these and other experiences for teacher candidates emphasize knowledge co-construction, teaching and learning as highly relational activities, the interrogation of taken-for-granted classroom/school practices and policies, cultural competence, and the impact of positionality and the intersections of racial/cultural/religious and other aspects of identity on teaching and learning. There are also new hybrid spaces in teacher education that deliberately span the usual university-school or university-community boundaries; these spaces require teacher educators to lead and/or

participate in new co-constructed pedagogies that do not privilege the university as sole knowledge resource and avoid exacerbating the problematic theory-practice divide.

A second essential aspect of the education of teacher educators is the need for multiple and ongoing opportunities for teacher educators to critique and rethink their own individual assumptions about issues related to diversity, race, ethnicity, culture, language, religion, sexual orientation, disability/ability, and educational/social inequality as well as how those assumptions are implicated in school policy and practice. These issues, which are often marginalized or dealt with primarily at the level of rhetoric in the education of teacher educators, are increasingly important worldwide given the growing cultural mismatch in many countries between teacher candidates/teachers and their students and, in some places, between teacher educators and teacher candidates. If teacher educators are going to help teacher candidates recognize the cultural and other assumptions that shape practice and reproduce inequity, then there must be opportunities for teacher educators themselves to interrogate their own beliefs and assumptions about topics including, but not limited to: the worth of the cultural, experiential, linguistic, and knowledge resources students bring to school with them; the nature of inequality in schools and society, including what factors have produced inequity, and what it would take to eliminate it; the powerful ways in which dominant cultural frames such as access, individualism, color-blindness, and meritocracy define and delimit students' educational opportunities and outcomes; and, the roles teachers and teacher educators themselves play in perpetuating or challenging inequity. Developing critical knowledge of this kind requires flexibility, openness, humility, and a process of continuous learning as well as "unlearning" that is difficult for teacher educators to accomplish while simultaneously engaging in the demanding processes of teaching teachers. Without deliberate attention to providing the social and intellectual contexts that support this

kind of learning and unlearning, it is unlikely to occur. Unfortunately, in some cases, issues like those listed above are the very issues that are intentionally ignored or side-stepped in the education of teacher educators because they are perceived to be too difficult, too controversial, or simply peripheral to the core work of teacher education. What we are suggesting here is that these issues should be at the heart of the education of teacher educators.

Finally we believe that teacher educators need to have rich opportunities to develop research capacity. This assumption is widely, although not universally, shared and in fact, it underlies recent teacher education policies in a number of countries, such as required mergers of teacher colleges with universities or requirements that more teacher educators have PhDs. However, we mean something different here from the deliberate policy effort in some countries to shift teacher education away from a practice-based epistemology and toward a research-based epistemology, which in many ways simply exacerbates the long-assumed dichotomy between theory/research, on one hand, and practice, on the other. We believe that a central component of preparing teacher educators as researchers should be the development of an inquiry stance (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009, which challenges the dichotomy between research and practice, thinking and doing, knowledge and experience. When this dichotomy underlies the education of teacher educators, practice is regarded as an atheoretical object—that is, as something that teachers and teacher educators *do* as well as how, when, for how long, and where they do it. But this perspectives fails to acknowledge that teacher education practice is inherently theoretical, and it underestimates the extent to which those engaged in teacher education practice constantly reflect upon, and hence theorize, what they are doing (McEwan, 1999). We submit that a more appropriate approach for the education of teacher educators is to regard research and practice as related to one another in terms of productive and generative tensions. This kind of approach

supports a role for teacher educators that privileges neither research nor practice in teacher

education but rather works the dialectic of the two, as we envisioned years ago.

References

Alcorn, N. (2014). Teacher education in New Zealand, 1974-2014. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 40*(5), 447-460.

Ambrosio, J. (2013). Changing the subject: Neoliberalism and accountability in public education. *Educational Studies, 49*(4), 316-333.

Ariav, T. and Imanuel, D. (2007). "How mentor teachers in professional development schools (PDS) perceive their professional growth: Barriers and opportunities". Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, U.S.A, April 9-13.

Association of Teacher Educators. (2008). *The teacher educator standards*. Retrieved from http://www.ate1.org/pubs/uploads/ materialstouse1.pdf

Berryman, M., Lawrence, D., and Lamont, R. (2018). Cultural relationships for responsive pedagogy: A bicultural mana orite perspective. Retrieved from https://www.nzcer.org.nz/system/files/journals/set/downloads/2018_1_003_1.pdf

Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2006). *Culture Speaks: Cultural Relationships and Classroom Learning.* Wellington, NA: Huia Publishers.

Blank, A., Houkama, C. & Kingi, H. (2016). Unconscious bias and education: A comparative study of Māori and African American students. Retrieved from http://apo.org.au/files/Resource/unconsious-bias-and-education.pdf

Carter, P. L. & Welner, K. P. (Eds.), (2013). *Closing the Opportunity Gap: What America Must Do To Give Every Child An Even Chance*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

CPB. (1996). Position paper for the public committee of tuition policy in higher education institutions. In: A report by the public committee of tuition policy and aid projects for students in higher education institutions, 1991-1196. Chaired by: Supreme Court judge (retired), Yaacob Meltz [in Hebrew].

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Learning and Unlearning: The Education of Teacher Educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education International Journal of Scholarship and Studies, 19*(1)*,* 5-28.

Cochran-Smith, M., Carney, M.C., Keefe, E.S., Burton, S. Chang, W., Fernández, B., Miller, A., Sánchez, J.G., Baker, M. (2018). *Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., Ell, F., Grudnoff, L., Haigh, M., Hill, M., Ludlow, L. (2016). Initial teacher

    education: What does it take to put equity at the center? *Teaching and Teacher*

    Education, 57(1), 1-12.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (2009). *Inquiry as Stance: Practitioner Research for the Next*

    Generation. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Villegas, A.M. (2016). Research on Teacher Preparation: Charting the

    Landscape of a Sprawling Field. In D. Gitomer & C. Bell, (Eds.). *Handbook of Research*

    on Teaching, 5th Ed., (pp. 439-547). Washington, DC: American Educational Research

    Association.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Zeichner, K. (Eds.) (2005). *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of*

    the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum

    Publishers.

Diab, H., Bar Shalom, Y. and Rousso, A. (2009). Expanding the meeting and learning between

    multicultural student teachers in Israeli society: Israeli case Study in Teacher Education

    College. *Bamichlala*, 21: 211-251 (in Hebrew).

Ducharme, E. & Wiesneski, D. (1989). *The Professors of Teaching: An Inquiry.* Buffalo, NY:

    SUNY Press.

Durie, M. (2003). *Ngā Kahui Pou: Launching Maori Futures.* Wellington, NZ: Huia Publishers.

Eilam, B. (2003). Jewish and Arab Teacher Trainees' Orientations Toward Teaching-Learning

    Processes, *Teaching Education*, 14(2), 169-186.

Ezer, H., Melat, S. and Patkin, D. (2004). Hearing their voices: teacher`s education stories in a

    multicultural context. *Dapim*, 38: 127-151 (in Hebrew).

Goodwin, L., Smith, L., Souto-Manning, M., Cheruvu, R., Tan, Mei Ying, Reed, R., & Taveras,

    L. (2014). What should teacher educators know and be able to do? Perspectives from

    practicing teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education. 65(4): 284-302.*

Gunn, A.C., Hill, M.G., Berg, D. & Haigh, M. (2016). The changing work of teacher educators

    in Aotearoa New Zealand: A view through activity theory. *Asia-Pacific Journal of*

    Teacher Education, 44(4), 306-319.

Hadar, L. L. & Brody, D. (2012) The Interaction Between Group Processes and Personal

    Professional Trajectories in a Professional Development Community for Teacher

    Educators, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(2), 145-161.

HEC (Higher Education Council). 2006. Higher Education Council report 2004-2005, No.31/32.

    Jerusalem.

Horsford, S.D., Scott, J., & Anderson, G.L. (2019). *The politics of education policy in an era of*

    inequality. New York, NY: Routledge.

Karlsen, E. G. (2005). Styring av norsk lærerutdanning- et historisk perspektiv (Governance of

    Norwegian teacher education: A historical perspective. *Norsk pedagogisk tidsskrift,*

    89(6). Retrieved from https://www.idunn.no/?siteNodeId=1854621

King, J. E. (2018). *Colleges of education: A national portrait [executive summary].* Washington,

    DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Langøren, K. & Smith, K. (2018). Støtte og utvikling I jobben som lærerutdanner i Norge

    (Supprt and development in the job as teacher educator in Norway). *Uniped, 41*(3).

    Retrieved from

    https://www.idunn.no/uniped/2018/03/stoette_og_utvikling_i_jobben_som_nylaererutdan

    ner_i_norge

Lincove, J. A., Osborne, C., Mills, N., & Bellows, L. (2015). Teacher preparation for profit or

    prestige: Analysis of a diverse market for teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher*

    Education, *66*(5), 415-434.

Lucas, T., & Grinberg, J. (2008). Responding to the linguistic reality of mainstream classroom:

    Preparing all teachers to teach English language learners. In M. Cochran-Smith, S.

    Feiman-

    Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 606-

    636), New York: Routledge.

Margolin, I. 2012. A coterminous collaborative learning model: Interconnectivity of leadership

and learning, *Brock Education, 21* (2):70-87.

Maskit, D & Orland-Barak, L . (2015). University-School partnerships: Student teachers'

evaluations across nine partnerships. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 41(3), 285-306.

McEwan, H. (1991). Narrative understanding in the study of teaching. Paper presented at the

Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1991.

Murray, J., & Male, T. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: Evidence from the field. *Teaching

and Teacher Education*, *21*, 125-142.

Office of Economic Cooperation and Development. (2011). *Society at a glance: Key findings

New Zealand.* Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/38/35/47573309.pdf

Orland-Barak, L.(2010). *Learning to Mentor as Praxis:Foundations for a Curriculum in Teacher

Education*: Springer.

Paul-Binyamin, I. & Reingold, R. (2016). Multiculturalism in teacher education

institutes - The relationship between formulated official policies and grassroots

initiatives*, in: Y. Yonah, G. Ben-Porat & B. Bashir(Eds.), *Public Policy and

Multiculturalism* (pp. 39-68). Raanana: Van Leer Jerusalem Institute Hakibbutz

Hameuhad (in Hebrew).

Perry, P. (2007). Developing social sensitivity among female student teachers. In: P. Perry (Ed.), *Education in a multicultural society: Pluralism and meeting points between cultural rifts.* Jerusalem: Caramel Publishing (in Hebrew).

Smith, K. (2005). Teacher Educators' professional knowledge- How does it differ from teachers' professional knowledge? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 177-192.

Snook, I. & O'Neill, J. (2014). Poverty and inequality of educational achievement. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand Hours: Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand*, (pp. 19–43). Auckland, NZ: Dunmore Publishing.

Solhaug, T. (2011). New Public Management in Educational Reform in Norway, *Policy Futures in Education, 9* (2), Volume 9 Number 267-279.

Statistisk Sentralbyrå (Statistics Norway) (2019). *Facts about immigration.*

Zellermayer, M., and Margolin, I. (2005). "Teacher educators' professional learning described through the lens of chaos and complexity theory." *Teachers College, Record,* 107 (6): 1275-1304.