

Chapter 16

Beginning Teacher Educators: Working in Higher Education and Schools

Jean Murray

Introduction

Teacher education across the world is increasingly positioned as a lever for achieving educational change in the school sector (Darling-Hammond & Lieberman, 2012). Reflecting this, the field internationally has experienced many and frequent changes. In countries as diverse as the USA, Australia, the Netherlands and Belgium, Nigeria and Columbia (see Furlong et al., 2009; Rubiano, 2013; Townsend, 2011), policy makers and educators relentlessly devise new routes for pre-service education and Continuing Professional Development, change the form and content of existing pre- and in-service programmes, institute new standards or competencies for student teachers to attain and put into place rigorous auditing or inspection procedures to evaluate the effectiveness of programmes.

Despite this plethora of activity in the field of teacher education, teacher educators themselves remain an under-researched, poorly understood and ill-defined occupational group (Murray, 2014). The amount of research on the group has certainly grown in the last 10 years but is still far from extensive (Davey, 2013; Izadinia, 2014; Mayer, Mitchell, Santoro, & White, 2011). Within this literature, researchers have explored the needs and experiences of beginning teacher educators, producing rich and revelatory accounts of tensions within the field. Although there are a number of studies of this sub-group, these ‘beginners’ making an important transition into the field rarely receive the degree of attention from researchers and policy developers which they undoubtedly deserve if they are to thrive in their new occupation.

This is a curious situation; international studies of education show growing consensus that good educators and the high quality of their teaching are the major

J. Murray (✉)

The Cass School, University of East London, London, UK

e-mail: j.m.f.murray@uel.ac.uk

influences on pupil learning (see, for example, Barber & Mourshed in The McKinsey Report 2007; OECD, 2005) but, although teacher education is now the subject of so much attention from policy makers, internationally, there is still little accompanying consideration of teacher educators – throughout their career courses – as the people central to teacher education and present throughout the teacher life cycle, modelling and exemplifying professional practice, and undertaking the research that informs much learning and teaching (Hamilton, 1998; Korthagen & Russell, 1995; Loughran, 2006; Lunenberg & Hamilton, 2008; Murray, 2002). The emphasis on beginning teacher educators in this chapter is not meant to imply that there is a fixed endpoint in the process of becoming a member of the occupational group at which an individual becomes a fully fledged teacher educator, with no further learning or changes in professional identity to come. It is fully acknowledged, rather, that professional change and learning continue across the career course.

The main aims of this chapter are as follows: first, to review the literature on beginning teacher educators, identifying their experiences, identity shifts and knowledge changes and aiming to analyse the commonalities and differences across the body of available research. Second, the chapter conducts a further review of the literature on the professional learning needs of beginning teacher educators and looking at a range of types of induction provision that aims to meet those needs. But it is impossible to conduct either of these reviews without contextualising the occupational sub-group of beginning teacher educators within the field of teacher education which they enter, the varied work they do and the general occupational group of teacher educators to which they eventually join. Similarly, the empirical studies of beginning teacher educators need to be read and understood through awareness of the research methodology and methods that have generated them.

This chapter therefore begins with three sections contextualising the research on beginning teacher educators: a section defining teacher education as a far from homogeneous field; a second section looking at the work of teacher educators; and a third looking at the problems around definitions and ownership of the occupational group. Here the commonalities and differentiations across this heterogeneous group are identified with particular relevance to beginning teacher educators as they enter teacher education in various international and institutional settings. Issues of methodology and methods are then discussed in order to enable understand how this body of research related to other research in and on teacher education. A further section reviews studies on beginning teacher educators including their motivations for entry, their experiences of transition, their identity shifts, including the need to acquire new senses of identity as teacher educators, new (or re-newed) knowledge bases created and the new or re-focused pedagogical skills required to teach intending and serving teachers rather than school students.

The main focus here is on teacher educators employed primarily within the Higher Education sector and therefore teaching in Higher Education Institutions or HEIs (universities, polytechnics or colleges of some type). There are, of course, a growing number of school-based teacher educators in some national systems (see, for example, Murray et al., in preparation, on England; Van Velzen & Volman, 2009, on the Netherlands) who work in schools with pre-service teachers, usually

undertaking roles far more extensive than those of the traditional mentors. As yet, however, there are very few research studies that focus explicitly on newcomers to this emerging occupational group. The next section looks at beginning teacher educators' professional learning needs during transition into Higher Education (HE) and highlights some examples of the induction provision that aims to address these. The conclusion summarises and discusses key issues around beginning teacher educators, their initial experiences of the field and the support for their induction and further professional development.

Defining Teacher Education as a Field

The field of teacher education is far from homogeneous and has long been a site of contestation between diverse academic and professional interests and national and local governmental influences. These interests and influences are located in and derive from the various historical, cultural, social, linguistic, economic and political aspirations and assumptions of each society, as 'translated' into different education systems. Teacher education in general – and pre-service provision in particular – has been a particularly contested area within the education system for a number of reasons. First, teacher education is clearly a major context in which the discourses and practices about what it means to be a teacher are transmitted and both produced and reproduced (hereafter '(re) produced' or '(re) production' are used to denote this duality); one of the effects of this is that pre-service teacher education is often seen to have a major role in determining the types and quality of teachers entering the school system. The potential for control of schooling this offers has meant that, since the inception of organised systems of teacher training in the nineteenth century, national and local governments – and in many countries religious bodies – have been major stake holders in teacher education, again particularly pre-service. As indicated earlier, when the education system as a whole has been under scrutiny, teacher education becomes subject to changes, often radical and rapid.

Second, the principle of locating teacher education in HEIs is a tradition based on over 100 years of history in many countries across the world (see, for example, Dent, 1977 on England; Fraser, 2007 on the USA; Swennen, 2012, on the Netherlands). Many of the imperatives the field faces come from both HE and schooling. This has meant that there has long been a fundamental dualism in teacher education, with those involved in it necessarily referencing both worlds in their work, gaining their values and traditions from both settings, and playing out the resulting historical, social and political contestations in their practices, beliefs and values. Teacher educators are then involved in the (re)production of both educational discourses and professional practices; their work is a synergy that bridges both settings for teacher learning. The HEIs that offer teacher education programmes and the schools involved in partnerships with them are necessarily the pedagogical and institutional sites where tensions and contestations between these two worlds are played out. These tensions have often had adverse effects for the field. Schools

of Education,¹ for example, have often been perceived to have a low status in intra institutional academic and departmental hierarchies (see Ducharme, 1993; Labaree, 2004). Since pre-service work, in particular, often has “its own orthodoxy, its own way of doing things, rules, assumptions and beliefs” (Grenfell & James, 1998, p. 20), the relevance for the school sector of placing pre-service courses predominantly in the HE sector has been repeatedly questioned in some countries (see, for example, Chubb, 2012 and Hess, 2009 in the USA; Department for Education (DfE), 2015 and Gove, 2010 in England).

These factors and the aspirations and assumptions that inform teacher education are the background to its development into its current, often fiercely contested, forms. These have produced changing versions of what Popkewitz (1987) terms ‘the public discourses’ of teacher education that shift over time; here competing ideas and principles are often conceptualised and constructed as dichotomies (for example, training/education, academic/professional, academic/pastoral, theory/practice and subject-centred/learner or child-centred [see Maguire, 1993; Popkewitz, 1987]). Other ideas, such as partnership between HEIs and schools become hegemonic and largely uncontested within particular time frames. Particularly those who know and acknowledge the history of teacher education in their analyses can sometimes trace some recurring factors, themes and issues of the field beneath the surfaces of current public discourses. But, given the tendency of many to overlook that history (Fraser, 2007; McCulloch, 2011; Murray & Maguire, 2007; Reid, 2011), the discourses often serve to “dull one’s sensitivity to the complexities that underlie the practices of teacher education ... (by) a filtering out of historical, social and political assumptions” (Popkewitz, 1987, p. ix). This focus on the ways in which these public discourses work, often at the macro level, provides one explanation of why the complexities of the field at the micro level have often been overlooked. An example of this ‘over-looking’ is the relative scarcity of research into teacher educators as an occupational group, referred to earlier, and the way in which the importance of the occupational group has been downplayed over time.

The timeframe for writing this chapter is an interesting one internationally. Part of the response to the pressures on teacher education as outlined above, has been a ‘practicum turn’ or ‘practice turn’ in the field (see, *inter alia*, Conway, Murphy, & Rutherford, 2013; Grossman et al., 2009; Mattsson, Eilertson, & Rorrison, 2011; Reid, 2011). As Groundwater-Smith (2011, p. ix) articulates, this ‘practicum turn’ has involved exploring “professional practice knowledge and the ways in which our understandings impact upon the design and enactment of ... the practicum curriculum”.

Faced with the need to accommodate this ‘turn’, many universities have engaged in various forms of knowledge generation on/in practice, as part of their changing teacher education provision; this turn has, however, played out differently across various countries and institutional settings. In some countries, for example, the USA and England, it has resulted in “a hyper-emphasis on clinical practice –

¹ This term is used here to describe the academic organisational units variously known as Schools, departments or faculties of education.

extensive immersion in the field, (and) limited (or no) emphasis on research or ‘theoretical’ course work” (Goodwin & Kosnik, 2013, p. 335). In countries where these emphases are found traditional HE routes in teaching are often under threat, alternative routes into teaching proliferate and HE-based teacher educators see themselves as living in a hostile political landscape and subject to sustained criticisms (Gilroy, 2014; Goodwin & Kosnik, 2013; McNamara & Murray, 2013a, b).

In contrast to this depressing picture, in parts of Continental Europe the ‘practicum turn’ has instead involved following the Finnish model in which ‘research informed clinical practice’ is part of pre-service provision in both universities and schools. This emphasis, together with the qualifications framework agreed in the pan-European Bologna Agreement in 1999, has contributed to ‘a university turn’ in teacher education (Murray, 2015). Following that Agreement, some countries, including Finland and Portugal, already have all pre-service programmes at Master’s level, and others including Norway, the Netherlands and the Republic of Ireland have made significant policy moves in this direction. A master’s level of qualification in pre-service involves more time in the university and more sustained student teacher involvement in research (BERA-RSA, 2014), signifying national commitments to strengthening the ‘academic’ and ‘cognitive’ elements of teacher education (DEL, 2014, p. 44). In these renewed and renewing landscapes of teacher education within universities then, HE-based teacher educators may well undertake their work with increased levels of confidence and security.

How Can Teacher Educators and Their Work Be Understood?

Teacher education can be conceptualised as an ambiguous, ill-defined and far from homogeneous field (Bourdieu, 1987) within the general discipline of education (Furlong, 2013). Teacher educators’ knowledge bases are complex and difficult to define, characterised in part by the uncertain and ill-defined nature of professional knowledge. Further complexity is added because of the specific, but sometimes tacit and under-valued, pedagogical knowledge and skills needed to teach teachers (Korthagen & Russell, 1995; Loughran, 2006). These complexities and uncertainties affect the work and status of teacher educators in many countries, often causing them to be (wrongly) positioned as only ‘semi-academics’ (Ducharme, 1993; Labaree, 2004; Murray, 2002) and to be effectively overlooked or dismissed by policy makers.

Some researchers assert that there is a strong collective sense of vision for teacher educators (see, for example, Kennedy, 2006); others dispute this sense of a unique, collective vision or of any kind of occupational habitus (Bourdieu, 1987) across or within the professional group (Mayer et al., 2011; Murray, 2014). The stance adopted here is that a collective habitus (or vision) in a simple sense has to be questioned, in part because of the lack of homogeneity in the field and the heterogeneity of the occupational group. Within our national and local teacher education systems, however, we form occupational groups and sub-groups as teacher educators; these

shift as the group membership changes, approaches to pedagogy and research alter and local, institutional or national requirements vary. Within those groups there may be some diverse, individualised ideas about personal practice, particularly about pedagogical and research approaches and their theoretical underpinnings, but there may well be agreement on the basic principles and key values underpinning those practices. Many teacher educators, for example, would assert their commitment to rich models of teacher professionalism, to social justice and to broadly constructivist models of pedagogy (Loughran, 2006). In many national systems, such as England, where teacher education is highly regulated, attempts by the state or by the HEI to enforce conformity may also reinforce the sense of a communal identity as teacher educators resist or accommodate external enforcements (Boyd & Tibke, 2012; Czerniawski et al., 2013).

Certainly what makes teacher educators different from other groups of academics and professional educators is that supporting student and serving teachers as they learn to teach or further develop their existing practice are the essential focuses of their work. Previous research into teacher educators' work, knowledge and identities emphasises the centrality of two factors. First, teacher educators' constructions of their knowledge are determined in part by the ways in which they understand the processes of (re) production of the knowledge and practices of schooling during teacher education programmes (Atkinson & Delamont, 1985) and their understanding of their own roles and identities in these processes (Lunenberg, Dengerink, & Korthagen, 2014; Murray, 2002). Second, within these constructions, the importance of service to education is an integral part of how teacher educators see their professional missions (Korthagen & Russell, 1995; Loughran, 2006; Swennen & van der Klink, 2008). How teacher education is understood and lived then, as a social and moral enterprise which 'serves' education and is part of a contribution to 'the public good' and to achieving social justice, is seen here as an essential part of the confirming strength of teacher educators' knowledge bases and identities, especially as they enter the field and begin to forge their practices as educators.

Following Murray (2002), if schooling is conceptualised as the *first order field* for the (re) production and transmission of the discourses of education, then school teachers may be seen as *first order* practitioners and as the main agents within the field. Teacher education is another, closely related field which is also involved in the (re) production of education but at one remove; this sense of remove is partly because of the location within HEIs of the majority of pre-service courses, but also because the primary focus of this field is the learning of student and serving teachers who then go on to address the learning of school students. Hence teacher education may be conceptualised as a *second order* field and its agents, the teacher educators, may be understood as *second order practitioners* (Murray, 2002). As key agents of the second order field, they are involved in (re) producing the discourses and practices of schooling with and for their students; they are similarly involved in the (re) production of academic discourses about education as their discipline or subject in HE. Teacher educators may once have been school teachers (or *first order practitioners*) working in the *first order field* of schooling, but their work has changed; they

have become teachers of teachers operating in teacher education and the different pedagogic settings and practices it offers (Loughran, 2006).

Second order practice as a teacher educator demands new and different types of professional knowledge and understanding, including different and extended pedagogical skills (Berry, 2007; Korthagen & Russell, 1995; Korthagen, Loughran, & Lunenberg, 2005; Koster, Korthagen, & Wubbels, 1998; Loughran, 2006; Swennen & Van der Klink, 2008), differentiated from those required of schoolteachers. In some national systems, having experiential knowledge of teaching in the school sector is seen as vital for teacher educators, particularly those working on the 'practical preparation' elements of pre-service courses or undertaking supervisory work in schools. But this professional knowledge – and pedagogical skills it often brings – are not in themselves enough, as becomes clear through analysis of beginning teacher educators' experiences and struggles to generate new forms of pedagogical practice for teaching in HE.

Scholarly and research activity is usually seen as an integral part of the complexity of teacher educators' work and their professional expertise as second order practitioners. As Cochran-Smith (2005) in a discussion of teacher educators' roles asserts "part of the task of the teacher educators is functioning simultaneously as both researcher and practitioner" (p. 219). She refers to the "reciprocal, recursive and symbiotic relationships" between scholarship/research and pedagogical practice as "working the dialectic" (p. 220). From her perspectives such symbiotic relationships have 'fed' and enriched teacher education. The scholarship and research involved in knowledge of an area, subject or discipline within education and the pedagogical awareness of how to teach it in HE are, then, often inseparable. Taking this view of teacher educators' work involves seeing teaching, scholarly and research activity and service as integral and synergistic. But the issues around research in, on and for teacher education are far from straightforward. As Cochran-Smith and Demers (2008) rightly comment,

The history and development of research on, in, about and for teacher education is nested inside of, but also braided with, larger developments in the history of education research generally and in the development of education as a field of study within the university. (p. 1009)

Issues of Definition and Differentiated Occupational Groups

Internationally, teacher educators are acknowledged to be a heterogeneous occupational group (see, *inter alia*, Davey, 2013; Izadinia, 2014; Martinez, 2008; Van Velzen & Volman, 2009), working in many roles to support pre- and in-service teachers, usually from within a type of HEI, as indicated above. There has long been an acknowledged "problem of definition" (Ducharme, 1993, p. 2) with discussing the occupational group, in part because of the diverse roles and work patterns within the field, but also because of issues around self- and communal-ownership of the term. This definition problem is not new. Taking a historical view by analysing the

literature from the USA in the late twentieth century shows a number of researchers (including Ducharme 1993; Ducharme & Agne, 1989; Lanier & Little, 1986) commenting on it. Types of teacher educators listed by Ducharme (1993, p. 6, citing Ducharme, 1986) in the 1980s and 1990s, for example, were “school person, scholar, researcher, methodologist, and visitor to a strange planet” differentiated by the degree by which individuals’ behaviours were judged to be like those of school teachers or of academics in other disciplines within HE. Some of these older studies (Ducharme, 1993; Lanier & Little, 1986) construct a deficit model in which some teacher educators are seen as adapting poorly to academia, as at best only ‘semi-academic’²; this deficit is often associated with pre-service work and continuing to adhere to the norms of schooling in HE. Other later researchers in different national contexts adopt similar types of classification, although without the sense of deficit model; for example, see occupational sub-groups of teacher educators positioning themselves in four ways, as (still) a school teacher, a teacher in higher education, a teacher of teachers or a researcher.

Most of the available research on teacher educators shows them to be academics (that is, faculty members or academics) in an HEI of some type, as indicated previously; most of them work within Schools or Departments of Education, although as noted below, an increasing number work in schools in some countries. Contractual bases for work in HE vary from full-time to part-time or casual (hourly paid); some educators will be on secure, permanent contracts, others on temporary ones which bring little or no job security. Changes within the HE sector internationally, to be discussed below, have led to an increase in the casualisation of the workforce in the last 10 years (Marginson & van der Wende, 2009). Part-time posts, often working across both HEI and schools, are also increasing in teacher education in some countries. A number of countries follow the system found in the USA and Canada of tenure and non-tenure tracks for academic faculty; other countries differentiate between ‘full’ academic contracts (in which academic work includes research, teaching and service) and ‘teaching-only’ contracts (in which formal research engagement is not required).

The HE sector in every country is, of course, reflects an essentially hierarchical system, with universities occupying positions in that system in relation to their historical and contemporary missions and functions. Whilst the HE system world-wide has certainly expanded and become more diversified over the last 20 years (Marginson & van der Wende, 2009), in many countries global quests for excellence have also provided further reinforcement for many of the traditional signifiers around institutional status. For example, the research ‘excellence’ and ‘productivity’ of each institution are often key parts of the methodologies used to draw up international and national league tables. This has led many universities to place increasing significance on research activity and quality (Stromquist, 2002), particularly in countries, like the UK, Australia and New Zealand where research audits

²Parallels may be drawn between the analysis of these teacher educators as semi-academics and Etzioni’s (1969) analysis of teachers and other highly feminised occupational groups as semi-professionals.

occur regularly, or for research-intensive universities in countries like the USA and Canada where the HE system is heavily marketised.

Internally, HEIs are far from homogeneous entities, not least because of the ways in which the fields within them value differing practices and types of knowledge (Becher & Trowler, 2002). In some research-intensive universities, education in general – and teacher education, in particular – is still not highly esteemed in relation to other disciplines (Furlong, 2013; Labaree, 2004). But, in contrast, in many newer universities and colleges, teacher education may be highly valued as an important part of the core business (and financial health) of the institution (Mayer et al., 2011).

Beyond contractual and institutional differences, further differentiation within the occupational group occurs through the types of routes on which educators work and their roles within each taught programme. For example, in under-graduate routes where students study subjects both within the School of Education and in other subject disciplines, there may be a core group of teacher educators involved in teaching curriculum methods or foundation courses or preparing students for the practicum. Many HEIs also employ teacher educators to support the practicum, whether by a direct model of ‘supervision’ involving observations and assessments of student teaching, or by working in partnership with mentors and schools to support student learning. Most of these workers in the field would probably claim to be teacher educators, thus forming the ‘core’ of the occupational group.

Outside this ‘core’ group, there may be other academics teaching other subjects or disciplines to future teachers. Here issues around what may be termed ‘claiming, owning and enacting’ inclusion in the occupational group emerge as many of these academics would not automatically see themselves as teacher educators. Indeed, given the scale and organisational methods of many university education systems, they may not even be aware of the presence of student teachers in their lecture halls or seminar rooms. Yet policy shifts suggest widening the occupational group to include this group of academics. A recent European report (The European Commission, 2013, p. 8), for example, defines “*all those who actively facilitate the (formal) learning of student teachers and teacher educators*” (my italics) – *anywhere* in the school or HE systems – as teacher educators. This important report – issued with advisory status across all 28 European Union member states – identified the importance of teacher educators in improving European school education systems. As well as this inclusive definition of teacher educators, it also included recommendations for creating a coherent and comprehensive policy in support of all members of the occupational group. In this inclusive definition of teacher educators then, academics will also be considered part of the broad occupational group, even if they do not easily ‘own’ or ‘claim’ these definitions.

Educational change may also trigger shifts in who is defined as a teacher educator. In Scotland, for example, the Donaldson Report (Donaldson, 2011) recommended major changes to pre-service teacher education. These included the introduction of under-graduate teaching degrees that combined “in-depth academic study in areas beyond education with professional studies and development” and thus involving “staff and departments beyond those in schools of education” (p. 88).

The Schools of Education have therefore needed to engage far more with academics from other disciplines who now teach on those degrees, many of whom will now be positioned as teacher educators, given that they teach intending teachers. These reforms, currently being implemented, will necessarily involve just such a ‘broadening’ of the occupational group.

On many post-graduate courses, particularly those of only 1 year duration often found in Anglophone countries, teacher educators’ work is likely to be located only in the School of Education and to focus in the main on practice-orientated curriculum and methods courses (Howson, 2015; McNamara, 2010). In countries offering Master’s level post-graduate courses of 2 or more years of duration, particularly those following Nordic models, teacher educators will include those teaching courses on defined as subject matter, pedagogical content knowledge, educational studies, research methods and preparation for the practicum (Kansanen, 2013, p. 281).

If the fragmented and diverse nature of staffing within HEIs posed problems in defining teacher educators as an occupational group, then policy shifts towards greater degrees of partnership between HEIs and schools or school-led teacher education have exacerbated the problem of definition in some countries. Again, using Scotland as an example, further recommendations in the Donaldson Report were for stronger and more extensive partnerships between universities and schools, in which school staff were encouraged to take on greater responsibility as “teacher educators” (p. 98). Recommendation 39 in the Report extends the definition of ‘who counts’ as a teacher educator by firmly stating that “all teachers should see themselves as teacher educators and be trained in mentoring” (p. 94). This, of course, mirrors the similarly inclusive definition adopted the pan-European report quoted above (The European Commission, 2013).

Similar definitions of schoolteachers as teacher educators are also found in the school-led or school-based teacher education systems now rapidly emerging in the Netherlands and England (McNamara & Murray, 2013a, b; Van Velzen & Volman, 2009). In England, where partnership between schools and HEIs has been mandatory for more than 30 years, both mentors in schools and HE-based faculty have long been positioned as having key roles in the education of pre-service students. But recent policy changes introducing an alternative route called School Direct have brought greater numbers of school-based teacher educators into the pre-service system (Boyd & Tibke, 2012; Brennan, Murray, & Read, 2014). These educators often take on full roles in recruiting, teaching and assessing pre-service teachers. In other countries, including Norway and the Netherlands, the development of mentoring as an expert form of teaching about teaching has also elevated this sub-group of teachers, bringing their work and identities much closer to those of some teacher educators (Ulvik & Sunde, 2013). In teacher education in countries such as the USA, theories of ‘third space’ originating in hybridity theory (Bhabha, 1994) have been used to break away from some of the traditional binaries that haunt teacher education and to create a ‘hybrid’ space for practice. Zeichner (2010, p. 94), for example, sees “third (*hybrid*) space” as “a lens to discuss various kinds of boundary crossings between higher education and schools involved in teacher education”. This has

generated models of ‘hybrid teacher educators’ (Klein, Taylor, & Onore, 2012; Martin, Snow, & Torrez, 2011) in which educators may work in schools and/or universities, but their practice is always conceptualised as happening in and around that ‘third space’; this practice bridges or transcends both physical locations and the binary knowledge domains they may traditionally claim.

As the description above indicates then, there will always be distinct structural and locational differences within the occupational group of teacher educators, particularly if an inclusive definition of ‘who counts’ as a member is taken, as in the Donaldson Review (2011) and the European Commission report (2013). These differences exist even before any considerations are taken of the – often inter-sectional – dimensions of gender, ethnicity and class, alongside personal experiences, attributes, qualifications and entry routes.

Large-scale demographic studies of teacher educators seem to have fallen out of research fashion, but in the past such studies (for example, the RATE studies in the USA, as analysed by Ducharme & Ducharme, 1996, and Turvey & Wright’s 1990 study of Australian teacher education) showed the occupational group then to be predominantly male and Caucasian in ethnic origin, with the few educators from ethnic minority groups largely found in urban areas. Goodwin and Kosnik (2013, p. 341) describe teacher educators in the USA as a group predominantly “mono-cultural, mono-racial in make-up”. In this study women were more likely to work in elementary or primary teacher education and in school-focused work (see also Acker, 1996; Acker & Feuerverger, 1997 writing from a Canadian context in the 1990s). The American data from the RATE studies also showed that those in pre-service were also more likely to be women and to work longer hours for less reward in terms of promotion and pay than other groups.

Gender patterns of participation in academic work as teacher educators vary over time, however, according to variations in the status of the work and the allocation of roles within it. More women came into teacher education in England, for example, as the academic status of the work was perceived to decline from the mid 1980s onwards (Murray & Maguire, 2007; Maguire & Weiner, 1994). Thompson’s analysis (2007) of gendered middle management roles for teacher educators in England in the last decade also shows how these positions tended to be occupied by women who undertook most of the hard ‘academic housework’ or bureaucratic tasks associated with pre-service teacher education.

The small amount of data on teacher educators’ socio-economic or class positioning (for example, Ducharme & Ducharme, 1996) paints a picture of these educators as being lower middle or middle class in social origins; their families have restricted experience of HE and their own university education has been at lower ranking institutions. But it should be noted that these studies, like many of the demographic surveys, are now dated. Many aspects of this picture of the social, economic and educational biographies of teacher educators are also found in the also dated study of Lanier and Little (1986). In a similar timeframe teacher educators’ ideologies were defined as essentially showing social orientations towards conservative discourses and values rather than radical or transformative (Grundy & Hatton, 1995). In these and similar definitions teacher education is essentially conservative and (re) productive of the status quo.

Van Velzen, Van der Klink, Swennen, and Yaffe (2010), drawing on international data, identify the two main routes into work as: first, teacher educators who have previously worked as school teachers, often with some peripheral involvement in teacher education; and second, teacher educators who hold doctorates – whether in education or in another discipline – and enter HE-based teacher education to continue their academic careers. In their study new teacher educators from the first group rarely enter HE with doctorates or sustained experience of doing educational research. Certainly, as Lunenberg and Hamilton (2008) note, having school teaching experience is now a common expectation in many national contexts. This route of entry is certainly found in countries such as England where experiential knowledge of teacher education is given very high priority. Indeed in this particular context, the need for all teacher educators to have had experience of working in schools has become part of the ‘common sense’ of teacher education work and is an essential recruitment criterion (Ellis et al., 2012). One consequence of this is that experiential knowledge of schooling and identities as ‘once-a-teacher’ form the foundations of pedagogy for many teacher educators, both beginning and experienced (Murray, 2002, 2014).

The second route of entry is found, for example, in countries such as Israel and in some research-intensive universities in North America (Van Velzen et al., 2010) where teacher education has an increasingly academic focus. Academics entering teacher education with a doctorate may or may not have classroom experience; if they have no such experience, then gaining that experience may become part of their induction. In a number of countries including Norway, the Netherlands and Australia both entry routes exist side-by-side. This dual pattern raises particular questions around the type of induction provision needed for new teacher educators, an issue which is discussed in more detail later in this chapter, using a Norwegian case study of two very different beginning teacher educators and the support they require (Smith, 2011). As Davey (2013, p. 48) points out, it is also possible to identify a third – or hybrid – group across these two basic pathways which she defines as “the practitioner pathway” and “the academic pathway”; this third, hybrid group consists of those who combine work as a teacher educator with doctoral study. This pathway is found in countries such as the USA and Canada where part-time doctoral study in education, alongside part-time or full-time work as a teacher educator is common.

In combination, this multiplicity of factors means that there are high levels of diversity and difference to be considered within the occupational group, which certainly helps to explain the “problem of definition” (Ducharme, 1993, p. 2) stated above. The implications of this heterogeneity for beginning teacher educators are that these newcomers to the occupational group may not only be entering through often unplanned, ‘serendipitous’ entry routes (Martinez, 2008; Mayer et al., 2011), bringing with them varying qualifications, types of experience and personal attributes, but going into different types of roles and work patterns in very different types of HEIs. Furthermore, they will be filtering their experience of becoming a teacher educator through their personal value systems and orientations to teaching and teacher education, as they begin the process of (re) constructing their professional identities. The available empirical research on beginning teacher educators,

reviewed below, needs then to be read and understood within these occupational traditions of diversity, difference and attention to values and personal orientations.

Studies of Beginning Teacher Educators: Issues of Methodology and Methods

Empirical studies of teacher educators in general – and beginning teacher educators in particular – usually sit within interpretivist or action research/practitioner research/self-study paradigms, using some type of qualitative methodology. Much of the research is undertaken by those who either are – or have recently been – beginning teacher educators themselves or by more senior educators with strong interests in the field and in teacher educators. These tendencies mean that most of the available research is small-scale and practice-based, that is conducted and reported by teacher educators who are practitioners and/or researchers and policy makers in the field, and based on self-report methods. There are a large number of single studies, unfunded by external grants, and also a scarcity of longitudinal research studies, drawing on large data sets (Menter, Hulme, & Murray, 2010).

In these characteristics, research on teacher educators has much in common with the general characteristics of teacher education research (see, for example, analyses of national research in New Zealand Cameron & Baker, 2004, Australia Murray, Nuthall, & Mitchell, 2008 and the UK Menter et al., 2010). This is not to imply that these characteristics of teacher education research are *necessarily* problematic in themselves, but they do limit the coherent accumulation of research findings and therefore the capacity for impact on the field (Menter et al., 2010). Even in the USA – where the body of research in and on teacher education is probably more diverse and certainly more substantial than in many other countries, including some large-scale, longitudinal studies – the multitude of small-scale studies can lead to a perceived lack of coherence (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005, p. 2). This can lead to lack of impact on policies and policy makers and on practice – beyond the level of the individual and her/his immediate institutional setting.

A considerable number of the available studies of beginning teacher educators are based on self-study research methods. The self-study tradition (Loughran, 2006; Russell, 2004), growing rapidly particularly in North America and Australia, foregrounds the importance of analysing the practices, experiences and processes of teacher education from the inside. It validates and respects the knowledge gained through practising in the field (Hamilton, 1998) and encourages teacher educators to research their own practices in systematic ways. As Russell (2004) identifies, it therefore has its roots in a variety of older traditions including action research, practitioner research and reflective practice. In 1999 Zeichner (1999, p. 7) referred to self-study as the most significant development in teacher education research at that time. More recently, Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009, p. 103) defined self-study as “a systematic research methodology that attempts to examine and improve professional practice settings”. This research tradition -and the studies resulting from it (see, inter

alia, Bullock & Ritter, 2011; Dinkelman, Margolis, & Sikkenga, 2006; Williams, Ritter, & Bullock, 2012) – have undoubtedly made a major contribution to understanding how beginning teacher educators experience their entry into teacher education work and the identity shifts and knowledge development which occur.

The self-studies of and by new teacher educators either draw solely on defined self-study methods (see, for example, Williams & Ritter, 2010; Butler et al., 2014) or create hybrid methodologies using these methods alongside other qualitative research approaches (see, for example, Dinkelman et al., 2006; Newberry, 2014). At their best, self-studies are clearly methodologically rigorous. An example here would be the work of Wiebke and Park Rogers (2014) which draws on methods, including systematic reflections on teaching and a collaborative journal created with a critical friend, to collect data which is interpreted through rigorous analytical methods and checked for validity and reliability (Loughran & Northfield, 1998). A further example of rigour in the self-study tradition is the work of Dinkelman et al. which deploys a hybrid methodology using case study in combination with self-study methods in an open and transparent research design. Within a broader case study, the specific aim of the research was to support a “formal and systematic inquiry” (ibid, p. 9) by two beginning teacher educators in a research-intensive university in Canada exploring their own progress over the first year in teacher education. Data collection instruments include semi-structured interviews, field observations of the beginning teacher educators’ teaching, artefacts of their practice and the completion by both practitioners of reflective journals. The processes for the inductive data analysis are detailed, particularly the recursive nature of the collection and analysis of data in which the analysis became in effect “a second data source” (p. 11).

Other types of research studies on beginning teacher educators are conducted within the interpretivist paradigm, often using conventional qualitative methods with interviewing being a favoured data collection tool. The study of Harrison and McKeon (2008) offers a strong example of this type of research, reporting as it does an exploratory case study of five beginning teacher educators over the first 2 or 3 years of their new careers in five different types of HEIs in England. This study is unusual in taking a longitudinal view of development. Semi-structured interviews with each participant, repeated at least three times a year over the timeframe in question, were the main data collection instruments. Alongside biographical profiles for each teacher educator, these interviews tracked the perceived experiences and patterns of progress for each individual, finding commonalities and differences in the process. Murray and Male’s (2005) study of a broadly similar sample group of 28 beginning teacher educators in England also used interviews and biographies as the data collection methods, but over a narrower timeframe.

Many of the self-studies are written by teacher educators who are or have been simultaneously both doctoral students and beginning teacher educators (see, for example, Murphy, McGlynn-Stewart, & Ghafouri, 2014; Ritter, 2007; Wiebke & Park Rogers, 2014). There are few self-studies from teacher educators entering HE without school experience, one notable exception being the work of Newberry (2014). Other types of qualitative studies have often been carried out by teacher

educators with a particular interest in induction and further professional learning for their occupational group.

The body of research on beginning teacher educators is, then, written in the main by teacher educators with varying degrees of experience of working and researching within the field. It is not only small in terms of quantity but also limited – at least in comparison to other forms of educational research – in terms of the methodologies and methods used. As indicated earlier, this is not to imply that these characteristics are necessarily problematic; much of the research on beginning teacher educators, for example, has contributed greatly to understanding the field from insider perspectives. But the limitations do mean that the findings of the studies reviewed below need to be read with consideration of those methodological issues, particularly in terms of issues around their scale, uses of self-report data collection methods and researcher positionality. Furthermore, to reiterate Cochran-Smith and Zeichner's (2005, p. 2) point from earlier arguments, it is difficult to achieve the coherent accumulation of research findings and therefore the capacity for impact and improvement in teacher education through this body of research.

Studies of Beginning Teacher Educators in Higher Education: Substantive Issues

A considerable number of the studies of beginning teacher educators in various national contexts, conducted since the turn of the century (see, *inter alia*, Dinkelman et al., 2006; Kitchen, 2005; Kosnik, et al., 2012; Martinez, 2008; Trent, 2013; Williams et al., 2012) are written by or about educators making the transition from school teaching into teacher education. Many of these studies identify that the transition between these two types of work is often stressful, with many teacher educators having initial difficulties in adjusting to the norms and expectations of HE. These are basic patterns of transition which seem to persist over time as analysis of a number of older studies, also conducted in various national contexts shows (see, *inter alia*, Acker & Feuerverger, 1997; Guilfoyle, Hamilton, Pinnegar, & Placier, 1995; Hatt, 1997; Nicol, 1997; Pinnegar, 1995; Sinkinson, 1997). Some of these broad patterns also often hold true, despite considerable variation in the types of HEIs in which the teacher educators and in much of the work they are asked to undertake. Nevertheless, further analysis of the literature does indicate subtle variations and differentiations, particularly around identity changes, role expectations and personal biographies.

For many new teacher educators, there is something of chance or serendipity about their career change; in this sense teacher education is the 'accidental' career (Mayer et al., 2011), with some new educators recruited on a seemingly casual basis from schools involved in pre-service programmes and others entering after undertaking part-time, casual work. Even with this 'chance' factor around the initial recruitment approaches, all the educators have made conscious choices to take up

those offers. What then were their reported motivations for becoming a teacher educator? The change in work may be undertaken for a variety of reasons including to seek greater personal autonomy, to become involved in research, to have a greater influence on the development of the school sector through teaching students, to seek further professional advancement, to pursue subject-centred interests and commitments and to focus on quality teaching in HE rather than a school system where performativity agendas dominate learning (Davey, 2013; Dinkelman, 2011; Dinkelman et al., 2006; Mayer et al. 2011; Van Velzen et al., 2010).

As indicated earlier, the majority of the studies focus on individuals with school teaching experience before they become teacher educators within an HEI. Many of these studies portray the transition from school to HE as characterised by new considerable challenges, 'identity shock' (Davey, 2013) and subsequent identity changes, and distinct shifts in knowledge and pedagogies. Themes of 'survival', anxiety about 'fitting in' and striving to make sense of HE work and its multiple demands are dominant in the accounts of life for beginning teacher educators (Boyd & Harris, 2010). There is a strong sense across many of the accounts of entering a new world, with a new language and ways of working and of 'masquerading' in Higher Education (Murray & Male, 2005). Part of this adjustment, particularly for those moving from school teaching, is coming to terms with the workplace itself, with greater degrees of isolation and the individualised focus of academic life within a huge HE organisation, in contrast to the smaller, more communal and focused structures in place in schools (Dinkelman et al., 2006; Van Velzen et al., 2010; Williams & Ritter, 2010). Similar themes of isolation and coming to terms with new institutional structures can also be traced in the studies of teacher educators without previous school teaching experience (see Newberry, 2014). Butler et al. (2014) talk of the 'guarded vulnerability' of the beginning teacher educators in their learning community members.

Another recurring theme across the studies of beginning teacher educators is that of making a "distinct and stressful career change, characterised by high levels of uncertainty and anxiety" (Murray & Male, 2005, p. 129). For Pinnegar (1995, p. 80) transition is clearly an emotional process; there are feelings of a "pervading sense of vulnerability and an uncertainty about what things mean and how to make sense of them". Other feelings about the early years of HE work are of being 'deskilled' (Boyd & Harris, 2010), of challenges and struggle (Martinez, 2008) and of getting by (Mayer et al., 2011), with professional unease and discomfort characterising the early stages of teacher education work. The strong senses of an emotionally raw and often far from comfortable transition and a distinct career change are recurring themes in many of the studies of beginning teacher educators, as are the needs to forge new identities and accommodate old ones, to acquire new knowledge and to develop new pedagogical skills. All of these themes serve to underline the significant differences between being a school teacher and becoming a teacher educator. In the sub-sections below, the themes are outlined and analysed.

Identity and Transition

Finding identity changes occurring during any career transition is far from surprising, but the strong sense of ‘identity shock’ in the literature on beginning teacher educators is marked, as are the emphases on the creation of new identities and the maintenance of old ones.

Because another chapter in this volume focuses directly on the identity of teacher educators, the focus here is deliberately limited, looking only on the issue of identity change during transition into HE work and not attempting to duplicate the theoretical perspectives on identity. Identity in this chapter – as in many of these studies of beginning teacher educators – is assumed to be multiple and changeable, responsive to shifts in both contextual and personal factors. Lunenberg and Hamilton (2008) see the personal as fore-grounded in the formation of the multiplicity of teacher educator identities. Dinkelman (2011) draws on a similar construction, but uses it to emphasise the importance of personal choices made in response to the challenges posed by sometimes conflicting roles and expectations within constraining work context. He states that,

Teacher educators shape their identities in the ways that they resolve competing demands on their time, in decisions to work towards continuous programme development, in the choice to trouble their own practices as teacher educators, in taking a stand to resist the ‘thin’ forms of accountability and other bureaucratically imposed schemes that actually undercut their efforts to better educate pre-service teachers and those students they will eventually serve. (p. 321)

Using these kinds of theoretical lenses then, identity may be seen as multiple and fluid, created through the interaction of the personal – that is the attributes, orientations, values and aspirations which go to create the *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1987) as the engrained and engraining ways of being – and the professional – that is the general cultural and institutional expectations and demands and the specific job demands encountered during adaptation to the new work of teacher education. This kind of theoretical perspective on identity is also found in Gee’s (2000, p. 99) understanding of a continuing but changing core identity or ‘I’ which exists alongside and in interaction with various social – group or collective – identities. These are constructed through inter-related perspectives on what it means to be recognised as a certain type of person (p. 105) or here, as a member of the broad professional ‘group’ of teacher educators working in particular contexts.

As Goodwin and Kosnik (2013, p. 334) comment, identities as teacher educators are constructed over time, rather than being automatically linked to the acquisition of the new role as a *second order* educator and the start of work. Taking on an identity as a teacher of teachers, alongside acquisition of the knowledge and skills needed to enact this *second order* practice confidently, is a recurring theme in some of the literature (see, inter alia, Dinkelman et al., 2006; Harrison & McKeon, 2008; Kitchen, 2005).

Some beginning teacher educators live with fears of losing the ‘street credibility’ of being a school teacher (ibid; Murray, 2002). Tendencies to frame identity “through

the lens of the ex-school teacher” (Loughran, 2006, p. 13) have, as noted above, been found across decades. For some of this group, ‘identity maintenance’ – specifically continuing to maintain a teacher identity (Murray, Czerniawski, & Barber, 2011; Williams et al., 2012) whilst working in HE-based teacher education – is certainly very important. This kind of ‘identity maintenance’ seems to serve important psychological functions in preserving the sense of past identity as once-a-school-teacher in conjunction with the new developing identity as second order educator. In Dinkelman et al.’s (2006) study, for example, one of the beginning teacher educator authors/research subjects, Jason, has a powerful sense of guilt about ‘abandoning’ the classroom and experiences a “felt contradiction between inspiring new teachers about teaching and having just left the profession” (p. 13). Both the teacher educators in this study felt themselves to be “expatriate teachers in a new world of teacher education” at times (p. 18), and to assuage his sense of guilt about leaving school, one returns to teach there during his summer break.

But the maintenance of a teacher identity also has professional importance for those undertaking roles which requires them to go into schools frequently to supervise the practicum or to work with mentors and co-operating teachers. And in a pre-service system, such as that found in England, where the knowledge base of teacher education is strongly centred around experiential and ‘practical’ knowledge of schooling, being able to cite school experience and to position oneself as ‘still-a-school-teacher’ is important professional capital. In both Murray’s (2014) study and Harrison and McKeon’s (2008) work, beginning teacher educators in both sample groups used their now past teacher identities to position themselves as powerful and credible teacher educators who ‘understood’ schools and schooling. As indicated earlier in this chapter, in some studies of teacher educators (Ducharme, 1993; Lanier & Little, 1986), adhering to a schoolteacher identity in HE has been identified as a deficit model. But more recent studies show that there are clear circumstances in which such identity maintenance may be understood not as ‘deficit’, but as either the strategic deployment of valuable capital, as in the two English studies above. Or, as in Dinkelman et al.’s study (2006) and the work of Williams et al. (2012) such maintenance is a part – perhaps temporary – of the process of identity shifting and reconciliation during a time of career transition. And as Williams and Ritter (2010, p. 90) state, “one identity is not discarded in favour of the other”.

Requirements to engage in research also trigger identity changes in a number of studies with research sometimes seen as daunting, time-consuming and a distinct part of the differences between the worlds of HE and schools (Boyd & Harris, 2010; Davey, 2013; Van Velzen et al., 2010). Attitudes to undertaking research and institutional expectations vary greatly amongst beginning teacher educators (Dinkelman et al., 2006; Mayer, et al., 2011; Murray, 2014). This is not helped by the mixed messages which some HEIs give out about the relative values of research and teaching in teacher education (Dinkelman et al., 2006; Murray et al., 2011). Some new educators reject any sense of having or developing a researcher identity, clearly seeing ‘researcher’ and ‘practitioner’ as polarised and incompatible identities (Harrison & McKeon, 2008). Most accounts though relate struggles to reconcile emerging identities as teacher educators and second order practitioners with an

emerging identity as a researcher. This difficult process is not helped by a number of defined factors including: mixed institutional messages about the value of teaching and research in teacher education; uncertainty about the type of research which is valued institutionally and who 'counts' as a researcher; lack of personal experience of research and accompanying lack of confidence; personal constructions of research as daunting and time-consuming; and struggles to find ways to reconcile committed practice as a teacher educator with viable and valid modes of research engagement. These kinds of struggles and identity shifts – for both beginning and experienced teacher educators are memorably explored in self-studies by Bullock and Ritter (2011) and Lunenberg and Hamilton (2008). In Murphy et al. (2014) the identity shifts which occur for the group are defined as being from doctoral students (or novice researchers) to emerging with identities as more confident and competent teacher educator researchers. In Butler et al. (2014), a self-study which looks at identity developments through participation in a teacher education-specific seminar series, identity shifts are similarly seen as being from educator to emerging teacher-educator researcher. These kinds of changes in professional identity are inescapably inter-linked with growth and changes in knowledge (Goodson, 2002) and practices (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Acquiring the Knowledge to Teach Teachers

Knowledge acquisition for beginning teacher educators and the development of pedagogies for teaching teachers (Berry, 2007; Loughran, 2006) are both key themes in the research literature. Importantly, knowledge of teacher education is crucial to the formation of *second order pedagogy* in teacher education (Murray, 2002); as Loughran (2008, p. 1180) states,

this involves a knowledge of teaching about teaching and a knowledge of learning about teaching and how the two influence one another in the pedagogic episodes that teacher educators create to offer students of teaching experiences that might inform their developing views of practice.

Professional knowledge of teachers is complex, difficult to define and often contested, so it comes as no surprise that there is no codified and detailed knowledge base for teacher educators (Cochran-Smith, 2003); this is still true despite recent strong attempts to define some knowledge domains. Goodwin and Kosnik (2013), for example, define five knowledge domains for teacher educators: personal, contextual, pedagogical, sociological and social. The Dutch teacher educators' association, VELON, identifies four core domains of knowledge – the profession of teacher educator, education didactics, learning and learners and teaching and coaching – then two specialisation domains and four 'widening' domains (VELON, 2012). Drawing on these studies, the definition of knowledge adopted in this chapter is a broad one; it is embedded in practice and encompasses skills and values, as well as more conventional epistemological focuses on conceptual, experiential, social and research-based knowledge.

Given the distinctiveness, complexity and importance of teacher educator knowledge and its centrality in pedagogical development, it is not surprising to find concerns and insecurities about the adequacy of existing levels of professional knowledge in the research on beginning teacher educators (see, *inter alia*, Dinkelman, et al., 2012; Kitchen, 2005; Kosnik & Beck, 2008; Ritter, 2007). Wiebke and Park Rogers (2014)'s self-study exemplifies some of these concerns in detail; it describes a beginning science teacher educator, who is also a doctoral student, learning to teach student teachers how to plan a coherent series of science lessons. This account exemplifies many of the tensions around knowledge generation, particularly the enhancement and generalisation of existing knowledge of schooling, and describing the enactment of that knowledge in pedagogical practice. Here,

'a science teacher educators' PCK (*pedagogical content knowledge*) includes his/her knowledge about curriculum, instruction and assessment for teaching science methods courses and supervise field experiences, as well as his/her knowledge about pre-service teachers and orientations to teaching science. (p. 223)

As Wiebke and Park Roger's account identifies, however, this kind of attempt to list elements of teacher educator knowledge can reflect only what Goodwin and Kosnik (2013, p. 340) say is "simply surface knowledge" for a number of reasons. First, knowledge here is only exemplified in and through pedagogy, notably in the tensions between 'telling and (facilitating) growth' (Berry, 2007) and the modelling of practice for students (Loughran, 2006; Wiebke & Park Rogers, 2014, p. 223). Letting go of teacher expert and teacher-as teller-roles and going beyond "the toolbox of instructional strategies" are also areas of knowledge growth noted in other studies (see, for example, Butler et al., 2014, p. 226). Second, teacher educator knowledge is filtered through personal value systems and attitudes to teaching and teacher education, which change as beginning teacher educators work in teacher education, alongside their peers to forge new practices and new experiential knowledge and skills. The acts of teaching as a teacher educator then may be seen as knowledge-in-action; pedagogy here is more powerful than decontextualised attempts to define knowledge. The real value of detailed accounts such as Wiebke and Park Roger's then is in showing how personal knowledge and pedagogy change and grow in response to multi-layered contextual factors during the early stages of teacher education work.

In another example of how changing teacher educator knowledge contributes to increases in confidence as a second order practitioner (Murray, 2002), McKeon and Harrison's (2010) study traces the development of five teacher educators' pedagogical reasoning over a period of 3 years. The authors trace shifts from "teacher educator-directed learning" in the initial stages of teacher education work to more "student-teacher-led learning" modes in later years as the beginning teacher educators achieve greater clarity about their pedagogies, deeper perceptions of learning processes and a stronger conceptualisation of their roles as agents of change (p. 34). The teacher educators develop understanding of the "learning to teach" process and reflect on personal practice through developing insights of how and why their students learn (p. 35). Levels of confidence in personal knowledge of research and

theory varied between educators at the start of the study, but over the years of the study all started to use research to underpin their own and their students' learning. Their trajectories over time indicate sustained professional learning, developing pedagogical expertise and range, and increased levels of critique, with the last factor marked by what Butler et al. define (2014, p. 267) as moves "from uncritical self to critical self awareness". For these beginning teacher educators in McKeon and Harrison's (2010) study, pedagogy and pedagogical knowledge are explicitly or implicitly 'reconstructed' through "a complex interweaving involving identity, teaching strategies, subject knowledge, scholarly activity and affective aspects" (p. 27). Knowledge of modelling strategies and how to deploy them during teaching are further themes in the research.

In many of the studies of and by beginning teacher educators, becoming a confident teacher of teachers, able to draw on a range of appropriate pedagogical knowledge and skills, was a key indicator of achieving a new professional identity. Becoming a confident and active researcher in ways which accord with that new practitioner/teacher educator identity is a further indicator of growth and confidence as a teacher educator. Murray and Male (2005) identified in 2005 that on entry into their HEIs, new teacher educators were positioned as the *expert become novice* in terms of developing new pedagogies for second order work, but as the *novice assumed to be expert* in terms of their research activities. Ten years on from this study, these themes of reversal remain dominant in many accounts of beginning teacher educators in HE; it is unsurprising then to find that the main learning areas during induction are developing a personal pedagogy for teaching teachers and becoming research active. The implications of this finding are discussed in more detail in section.

Induction Support for Beginning Teacher Educators

The European Commission (2013) report, in recognising the centrality of teacher educators in education, recommended that each EU member state should create a coherent and comprehensive policy to support and develop teacher educators at all points of their careers. The document recognised the importance of lifelong professional learning opportunities, but placed particular emphasis on induction for beginning teacher educators. This emphasis has also been found in many other policy contexts, underlining the importance of high quality support during the transition time from previous careers (whether those were in academia – as student or faculty member or other types of teaching or consultancy/advisory work or the private sector) into teacher education work (Eraut, 2004).

The literature on induction provision predominantly focuses on teacher educators entering HE to begin their new careers; this literature review therefore reflects that balance. There is no codified knowledge base for beginning teacher educators and no set curricula for their induction. Many accounts indicate that induction is "often haphazard depending on the good will, time and effort of experienced col-

leagues” (Van Velzen et al., 2010, p. 24). But there are, of course, many institutional or ‘official’ requirements for passing a probation period or gaining tenure here which may impact on induction provision. And it is a rare institution – whether a school or an HEI – which does not now require its new faculty to attend a variety of programmes to ensure familiarity with its mission statements and all its workplace regulations. Beginning teacher educators in HE may also be required to study for formal qualifications; for many in Canadian, American and Australian universities, as the analysis above shows, this will involve registration for a doctorate. But other qualifications may also be required: in the UK, for example, many universities ask new academics, across all disciplines, to complete a Post Graduate Certificate in Higher Education teaching as part of their induction.

The MOFET Institute in Israel offers nationally relevant, formal induction courses for beginning teacher educators, based around the national standards for the occupational groups. Other professional associations for teacher educators such as VELON in the Netherlands, VELOV in Flanders or ATE in the USA also have professional standards and procedures for demonstrating and validating achievement of these by those entering the profession (see, inter alia, ATE, 2011; VELON, 2011). Studying for formal qualifications, attending available professional development courses relevant to the job and working towards achieving any professional standards set by national bodies form very important contributions to the learning of beginning teacher educators. Self-study or engagement in practitioner research of other kinds also creates very important contributions for the learning of beginning teacher educators. In the sub-sections below some of these approaches to induction are exemplified by reference to practice in Canada, the USA and Norway; these give more detailed accounts of activities and the ways in which they are designed to meet the differentiated professional learning needs of beginning teacher educators. The final sub-section draws on these examples and details a set of induction guidelines in order to identify broad principles governing effective ways of supporting new educators.

Induction for Teacher Educators Coming into Higher Education from Doctoral Programmes: A Community-Based Canadian Programme

Kosnik et al. (2012) state that teacher education in Canada is organized provincially with 55 universities providing teacher education courses at either under-graduate (45 % of students) or post-graduate levels (55 %). All teacher education is university-based, with no alternative routes into teaching as in the USA and England. Teacher educators’ prior experiences vary according to university recruitment criteria, with some institutions requiring school teaching experience, whilst others place greater value on research experience and possession of a doctorate. Many universities employ a number of teacher educators who have newly completed doctorates.

Drawing on the available research on beginning teacher educators in Canada (see, *inter alia*, Kosnik & Beck 2003, 2008), Kosnik, et al. (2012, p. 352) state that most have “little preparation before, and minimal support after, assuming their academic position”. They rely instead on whatever informal support they can find from colleagues, which often means uneven or inadequate support. Because of this situation, Clare Kosnik and 12 colleagues – both beginning and experienced teacher educators – set up a programme at OISE, the University of Toronto, which aimed to help doctoral students prepare for their future work in teacher education.

This group – the Becoming Teacher Educators (BTE) – functioned as a learning community specifically designed for doctoral students which worked together for 3 years, undertaking a self-study of their learning and analysing and reporting this through various channels, including Kosnik et al. (2012). As this co-written article describes, the key elements of the BTE group included: its strengths as a community; the importance of shared leadership; the opportunity to develop knowledge of teacher education; the improvement of research skills; the influence on identities; and improvement in practices as beginning teacher educators (pp. 357–360).

Provision within the programme was of a “rich, complex, and interconnected nature” (p. 357), with much of the learning drawn from the participants’ work (their research as doctoral students and increasingly, over the length of the programme, their personal and communal practices in teaching on teacher education courses). Specific activities within the programme included: discussing scholarly articles; observing and interviewing teacher educators; analysing personal pedagogies; reviewing curriculum methods and foundation course outlines; and identifying and analysing the instantiation and positioning of teacher education in different types of universities (teaching-focused or research-intensive); generating their own research and participating in research presentations; and undertaking peer review of providing feedback on research outputs.

As Kosnik et al. describe, the types of “knowledge-building activities” undertaken in the group changed over the 3 years, with beginning teacher educators drawing more on their own expanding experiences within the field as their confidence and knowledge developed. Participants increased their skills as teacher education researchers and, following Jenkins (2008, cited in Kosnik et al., 2012, p. 357), the authors report that processes of identity change were “negotiated on multiple levels and from multiple viewpoints at the same time”.

Similar, high quality provision within or alongside doctoral programmes and incorporating self-study is described in Dinkelman et al. (2012), also in Canada, and Butler et al. (2014) in the USA in studies of beginning teacher educator induction. In the latter study, for example, on-going seminars over a period of 6 weeks were designed to explore teacher education and to encourage student-teacher educators to engage in collaborative self-study groups through modes of engagement including reflective assignments, discussions of reading and self-study research projects. The participants in the seminar series – who are also co-authors of the paper – clearly gained considerable benefits from participation in the programme not least because they moved from “uncritical self to critical self-awareness” (p. 267) but interest-

ingly, they also left with “more tensions, doubts and questions about the work of teacher educators” (p. 272) than they had had before it. Given the challenging nature of work in teacher education and the appropriate emphasis on criticality, this is perhaps a fitting outcome for such an induction programme.

In these studies, as in Kosnik et al.’s work, there is no study for a formal qualification *specific* to practising as a teacher educator; rather individual study for doctorates – already on-going for many before the groups formed – becomes a resource from which learning opportunities or affordances (Billett, 2001) can be initiated. Similarly, analysis of the experiences of second order teaching offer learning affordances which become a further part of the informal and integrated workplace learning ‘curriculum’ which the beginning teacher educators – and often their more experienced ‘mentors’ – co-create. Most of the provision here then may be defined as situated learning, drawing from the daily work of the participants and with very high degrees of relevance to it. Formal learning opportunities, set up at first by the experienced teacher educators in the group, but increasingly negotiated within the group and then led by the beginning teacher educators, create focuses for further activities. Induction for these newcomers then takes place essentially within a *community of practice* model (Wenger, 2000) as beginners develop into co-investigators with full collegial status as fellow teacher educators.

In all the three doctoral self-study groups referenced above, there is at least one experienced teacher educator who structures or leads the programme, at least in its early stages, until the confidence of beginning teacher educators grows to enable them to become co-leaders and co-researchers. Murphy et al.’s (2014) study differs in that it taps into a powerful tradition of teachers and teacher educators as autodidacts, describing three doctoral students organising and researching induction through a writing group which they set up for themselves. In this group mutual support mechanisms, particularly critical friendships and peer mentoring, enable the reciprocal development of teacher educator identities and research and writing skills.

All the above examples of self-study groups describe beginning teacher educators on doctoral routes in which they are part of a cohort of doctoral learners, a structure which has potential to offer them collegial support. Communal identity and opportunities for collegial learning, alongside dual positioning as both doctoral learners and beginning teacher educators, seems to give additional strength to these and similar groups.

Induction for Diverse Beginning Teacher Educators in Norway: Institutional and National Provision

Smith (2011) describes differentiated induction provision for beginning teacher educators in the fast changing context of teacher education in Norway. Here pre-service teacher education is being ‘reformed’ and strengthened so that eventually all

provision for both primary and secondary schooling will consist of 5 year courses at Master's level which will bring the country further into line with the European Credit Framework, as agreed in the pan-European Bologna Accord of 2009. These changes will bring multiple challenges for teacher educators and their work in Norwegian universities and colleges, which Smith describes as already 'multifaceted and complex'. At present teacher educators can be recruited with or without doctorates or experience of teaching in either schools or higher education. Smith comments that a likely consequence of the policy changes leading to teacher education at master's level is that all teacher educators entering HE will be required to hold a PhD degree in the future.

The paper gives pen portraits of two beginning teacher educators: John has more than 15 years experience as a school teacher; he has a first degree in Norwegian and a Master's degree in education, but no PhD. He was 'headhunted' for his job by the School of Education in which he now works. Karen has recently completed a PhD in educational psychology but has no teaching experience in schools. She already has publications in highly ranked journals and a reputation as an excellent researcher; both of these things bring valued research strength to her School of Education. Both new teacher educators teach on general education or pedagogy courses, as they are called in Norway, and are in charge of students' practicum experiences over a total of 14 weeks. Both are required to act as role models for their students, sometimes using either implicit or explicit modelling processes (Lunenberg et al., 2014). As Smith describes them, John's strengths as a beginning teacher educator lie in his experiential knowledge of teaching and the credibility that brings with students. But his challenges – and therefore the focuses for his induction – are that he needs to update his theoretical knowledge of education, develop second order pedagogical practices and find ways to 'share' his pedagogical and didactical knowledge of teaching – much of which is tacit – with his students. Karen's strengths are that she can "provide theoretical models, guide the students in their search for relevant readings and support them in their research assignments" (p. 342); her challenges are that she lacks experience of teaching in schools and HE, including the ability of skilled educators to do what is described as "build a bridge between theory and practice" for students to draw upon (p. 341).

In the case of these two beginning teacher educators, both join School of Education development programmes with a clear focus on the pedagogy of teacher education (Loughran, 2006) through joint planning and evaluation of courses, participation in self-studies and mentoring. Induction provision is also customised to meet individual needs. Here this includes Karen spending time in school during her first year as a teacher educator and working with an experienced colleague during her students' practicum, and John being 'adopted' by a research group and invited to join a research project as a co-researcher on a learning-by-doing model.

John may also be encouraged to start his PhD. If he does this then he may be able to take advantage of a Norwegian initiative known as the Norwegian Research School in Teacher Education (NAFOL), a national network of 24 collaborating universities and colleges which provides doctoral level training for researchers in teacher education and aims "to strengthen the quality of all types of teacher educa-

tion through a targeted, robust and long-term commitment to organized research in a national network of collaborating institutions” (NAFOL website, 2015). It achieves this through providing all teacher educators with support to get a doctorate and to empower their research competence (Smith and Ulvik, 2015). Established only in 2011, it already has 93 PhD candidates researching and working in teacher education. This provision is offered to all teacher educators, including those, like John, entering teacher education without PhDs and wishing to research in the field. For all, the cross-institutional, collaborative doctoral programme is likely to offer outstanding research induction opportunities.

Induction for Teacher Educators Coming into Higher Education from the School Sector: Guidelines for Practice in England

Structural and epistemological reforms to the field of teacher education in England over the last 30 years have seen shifts in the locus, control and epistemologies of student learning from academy to school (Furlong, 2013; Furlong, et al., 2000). The field has also seen a “turn to the practical” (Furlong & Lawn, 2011, p. 6) within Schools of Education. Many HE-based teacher educators, particularly those working on pre-service courses, *must* have experience of working in schools; as Ellis et al. (2012) identify this is a key recruitment criterion. Many educators are recruited without doctorates or other sustained experience of active research engagement. Very few have doctorates or sustained experience of engagement in research on entry into teacher education; registering for a doctorate is not a requirement in all universities, neither is being ‘research active’ in conventional senses.

A nation-wide survey (Murray, 2008) of induction for this group of teacher educators showed that formal provision was uneven, and at times inadequate, in supporting individual learning. The existing research on beginning teacher educators in the UK at that time (see, inter alia, Boyd & Harris, 2010; McKeon & Harrison, 2010; Murray, 2005; Murray & Male, 2005) indicated that many had three priorities in their first year: ‘survival’ in terms of understanding the basics of how the department and the institution work; ‘shifting the lens’ of existing expertise in teaching by coming to terms with the differing pedagogical demands of working with adults; and ‘laying the foundations’ for scholarship and research activity as an academic by building on their existing expert knowledge.

Drawing on this research, a set of guidelines on induction for teacher educators entering HE from schools was written for the Higher Education Academy (Boyd, Harris, & Murray, 2011). These guidelines advise striking a balance between provision of induction support at the different levels of formal, institutional provision, School of Education specific induction programmes, teaching and research team activities which provide workplace learning and mentoring and coaching by colleagues, either on a one-to-one basis or on a distributive model. Although originally designed for a UK national context, the work has now been disseminated to all EU

member states and has proved its more general applicability by influencing induction practice in countries as diverse as the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Australia, Israel and Canada.

The guidelines adopt the stance that, whilst the first year in teacher education is a time of rapid learning and acquisition of new forms of knowledge and understanding, very significant professional growth, requiring additional support, continues into the second and third years of teacher education work. Good induction programmes are therefore seen as being of 3 years' duration. The starting points for the design of each individualised induction programme are an analysis of the aspirations and experiences which the beginning teacher educator brings into teacher education against the requirements of the roles which she or he is asked to undertake.

Although acknowledging the importance of any formal study and set learning structures, the guidelines see the most influential professional learning for teacher educators as taking place informally in the workplace and occurring through the daily practices of teaching, researching and undertaking academic service. Key to this workplace learning are the multiple interactions which new educators will have with their academic colleagues and their students and the new educators' sense of personal agency in developing learning opportunities.

Specific areas for support include the development of pedagogical knowledge and skills for teacher education, strategies for coping with new institutional cultures and expectations (organisational learning) and the development of scholarship and research activity. The guidelines discuss the specific second order pedagogy of teacher education in some depth, analysing issues such as the skills and knowledge required for teaching adult learners, modelling skills as a teacher educator, the relative degrees of curriculum and pedagogical autonomy in HE and the "pedagogy of guidance" (Guile & Lucas, 1999, p. 212) which many teacher educators in England are expected to undertake in working with teachers in their partnership schools. Engagement in research is an area which presents particular challenges for teacher educators as many of these beginning teacher educators not only face the issues around lack of sustained research experience, identified above, but they also encounter the research cultures of Schools of Education where what counts as valid research has been re-defined and made more exclusive by successive national research audits (Gilroy & McNamara, 2009; Pollard, 2014).

Beginning Teacher Educators Learning in Their Workplaces

The research on beginning teacher educators, their professional learning and existing induction provision then all indicates that there is a definite need for well crafted, appropriate and often individualised programmes which recognise the importance of these educators, the previous experiences they bring to their roles and their future work (Goodwin & Kosnik, 2013). There is also consensus, that alongside any formal learning requirements, induction should also be structured around informal learning opportunities in the workplace. These include the daily practices

of teaching, researching and undertaking academic service in teacher education and the multiple interactions which new educators will have with colleagues and students (Murray, 2008). This situated learning draws from the daily work of the participants and has very high degrees of relevance to it.

But achieving high quality workplace learning is challenging; such learning is complex and multi-layered, requiring some form and structure but also accommodating the unforeseen and the serendipitous. Specific learning outcomes may be planned, but others may also occur which are quite unforeseen and unintended in their forms and in their powerful short- and long-term effects. Learning at and through work is, inevitably, influenced by the structural and socio-cultural factors inherent in the workplace and in the broader professional, socio-economic and cultural contexts in which it occurs. There are also complex and differing ways in which personal dispositions and senses of agency affect how individual professionals interact within the workplace, participate in different learning territories and take advantage of the opportunities offered (Hodkinson & Hodkinson, 2004). In this sense, what is learned by any professional in his/her workplace might be seen as an individual product, achieved through an individualised learning process whilst working towards individual and differentiated outcomes and differing levels of 'impact' on personal practice. Productive workplace learning might then be positioned as, at root, highly individualised and specific. Yet for an occupational group with the communal, social responsibilities of teacher educators, it is also important that induction for newcomers emphasises some common professional values and principles.

Analysis of the literature on induction for beginning teacher educators makes it clear that – even across national boundaries and differing teacher education systems – there is considerable consensus around the key principles which should inform the design and implementation of high quality workplace learning. In their guidelines on induction Boyd et al. (2011) draw on the work of Fuller and Unwin (2004) to show how 'expansive learning environments' in the workplace might be created for beginning teacher educators. The key principles they identify include: (1) a communal learning culture within the workplace in which beginners' achievements and learning are valued; (2) a culture in which symbiotic relationships and balances between multiple discourses about teaching, research and learning, practice and evidence can be facilitated; (3) opportunities participation in a well-planned, rich and flexible variety of activities which are appropriately challenging and balance organisational and individual needs, both during and away from the 'day job'; (4) the availability of time and space for those quality learning opportunities and experiences to occur; (5) further time to reflect upon learning, knowing that professional and personal critique is welcomed within the workplace culture; and, (6) supportive colleagues who are willing to undertake roles as designers, facilitators, coaches and mentors of the workplace learning.

But the creation of induction programmes is not just a one-way process of more experienced teacher educators creating provision for newcomers. Taking into account beginning teacher educators' identities and existing expertise and encouraging their voices and senses of agency will enable them to contribute to and shape

actively the workplaces in which they find themselves and the workplace practices in which they participate. Crucially, if organisational needs, particularly those which are dictated by narrow and instrumental outcomes and targets, are not to be allowed to dominate beginning teacher educators' learning and agendas, then some may need support from colleagues in developing integrated ways of conceptualising and articulating their workplace learning. They may also need guidance in developing the individual agency which will allow them to articulate their specific learning needs, to seek access to relevant knowledge bases and support systems and to critique established ideas around teaching and teacher education.

Conclusion

This review shows that the available empirical studies of beginning teacher educators are conducted using qualitative methodology and undertaken by those who are either beginning teacher educators themselves or more experienced educator-researchers with strong interests in the field. Consequently, most of the studies are small-scale and practice-based. These characteristics are not in themselves problematic, of course, but the findings of the studies reviewed in this chapter need to be read with consideration of those methodological issues, particularly in terms of issues around their scale, uses of self-report data collection methods and researcher positionality. A further issue is that there are very few longitudinal studies, even though some of the research indicates that the transition into teacher education work in HE contexts, can be challenging, multi-faceted and complex, and may be a process of up to 3 years in duration (Murray & Male, 2005).

Across all of the empirical studies reviewed here a number of clear, substantive themes emerge. First, whilst the main qualification for becoming a teacher educator in many countries is possession of prior school teaching experience, the literature shows unequivocally that teaching in teacher education is not a simple and straightforward activity of merely 'transferring' that school teaching experience to the new context. This research shows then that school teaching experience and knowledge does not automatically equate with expertise as a teacher educator (Zeichner, 2005). This is very important in terms of claiming and marking out the distinctiveness of teacher educators as an occupational group. Second, many beginning teacher educators go through inter-related processes of identity changes and knowledge growth as they acquire the pedagogical skills and knowledge, which are characteristic of and unique to teacher education or second order pedagogy. The studies use a variety of transformative terms for these inter-related processes of change and growth; these terms include 'reforming', 're-defining', 're-constructing', 'restructuring' and even 're-packaging' but all transformations of some sort. Many beginning teacher educators then find themselves effectively positioned as *the expert become novice* (Murray, 2005), in that they need to acquire new knowledge and understanding of teaching in teacher education, even though they had extensive experience of school teaching.

Third, many teacher educators go through learning processes in coming to terms with requirements for active engagement in research and scholarship in HEIs. For many, there are tensions around understanding the mixed messages which HEIs give out about research and teaching, and ‘balancing’ research requirements with changing practitioner identities as a new teacher educator. Some teacher educators, particularly those in research-intensive universities where most academics in other disciplines are already presumed to be strong researchers on entry to HE, may therefore find themselves positioned as research novice presumed to be expert (Murray, 2005). Fourth, studies of teacher educators’ induction learning needs emphasise the importance of developing personal pedagogical skills and knowledge for teaching teachers and becoming research active. Finally, a review of the literature on induction provision of various types shows the importance of the provision of high quality workplace learning programmes, organised around the principles of expansive learning environments (Fuller & Unwin, 2004). Taking into account beginning teacher educators’ identities and existing expertise, encouraging their voices and senses of agency is also important. Self-study or other forms of practitioner research, drawing on these principles, provide both powerful pedagogical learning opportunities and a means of beginning to research and publish (although this latter benefit may depend on what is recognised as valid research engagement for teacher educators within the context of the specific HEI and national specifications for research productivity).

Being a novice and acquiring experience and expertise are recurring themes in the literature and it is undoubtedly important to consider learning opportunities and trajectories for beginning teacher educators’ induction. Here we need to remember Berliner’s (2001, p. 480) advice that, “whilst inexperience may well be equated with novices, the acquisition of experience does not automatically denote expertise”. Developing criticality around personal and communal practice is therefore a further priority during induction to lay the foundations for further professional learning as lifelong learners. Ultimately, regardless of the contexts in which they teach, we need all our beginning teacher educators – in their key roles in (re)producing the teachers of the future – to be autonomous, to have “a broad mandate, an expansive worldview, a collaborative approach and the skills to enact a rich curriculum” (Goodwin & Kosnik, 2013, p. 343) and to become confident “architects of change, not just passive implementers” of policy (ibid, p. 341).

References

- Acker, S. (1996). Becoming a teacher educator: Voices of women academics in Canadian faculties of education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(1), 54–72.
- Acker, S., & Feuerwerker, G. (1997). Doing good and feeling bad: The work of Women University Teachers. *Gender and Education*, 26(3), 401–422.
- Atkinson, P., & Delamont, S. (1985). Socialisation into teaching: The research which lost its way. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 6(3), 307–322.

- Barber, M., & Mourshed, M. (2007). *How the world's best-performing school systems come out on top*. New York: McKinsey & Company.
- Becher, T., & Trowler, P. (2002). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines*. Buckingham, UK: SRHE and OUP.
- BERA-RSA. (2014). *Research and the teaching profession. Building the capacity for a self-improving education system. Final report of the BERA-RSA Inquiry into the role of research in teacher education*. Author: London. Retrieved from: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/BERA-RSA-Research-Teaching-Profession-FULL-REPORT-for-web.pdf>
- Berliner, D. (2001). Learning about and learning from expert teachers. *International Journal of Education Research*, 35(3), 463–482.
- Berry, A. (2007). Re-conceptualising teacher educator knowledge as tensions: Exploring the tension between valuing and reconstructing experience. *Studying Teacher Education*, 35(3), 117–134.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). The third space. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity, community, culture and difference* (pp. 207–221). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Billett, S. (2001). *Learning in the workplace: Strategies for effective practice*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Bourdieu, P. (1987). What makes a social class? *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 32, 32–45.
- Boyd, P., & Harris, K. (2010). Becoming a university lecturer in teacher education: Expert school-teachers constructing their pedagogy and identity. *Professional Development in Education*, 36(1–2), 9–24.
- Boyd, P., Harris, K., & Murray, J. (2011). *Becoming a teacher educator* (2nd ed.). Bristol, England: The Higher Education Academy/ESCalate.
- Boyd, P., & Tibke, J. (2012). Being a school-based teacher educator: Developing pedagogy and identity in facilitating work-based higher education in a professional field. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 6(2), 41–57.
- Brennan, C., Murray, J., & Read, A. (2014). Creating the new, whilst maintaining the old? The School Direct programme and its effects on teacher education, presentation at the BERA Conference.
- Bullock, S., & Ritter, J. (2011). Exploring the transition into academia through collaborative self-study. *Studying Teacher Education*, 7(3), 171–181.
- Butler, B., Burns, E., Frierman, C., Hawthorne, K., Innes, A., & Parrot, J. (2014). The Impact of a Pedagogy of teacher education seminar on educators' and future teacher educators' identities. *Studying Teacher Education*, 10(3), 255–274.
- Cameron, M., & Baker, R. (2004). *Initial teacher education in New Zealand: 1993–2004 literature review and annotated bibliography*. New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Chubb, J. (2012). *The best teachers in the world: Why don't we have them and how we could*. Palo Alto, CA: Hoover Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Learning and unlearning: The education of teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19(1), 5–28.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). Teacher educators as researchers: Multiple perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(2), 219–225.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Demers, K. E. (2008). How do we know what we know? Research and teacher education'. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. McIntyre, & K. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 1009–1016). New York: Routledge.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. (Eds.). (2005). Executive summary. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner, (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education*, (pp. 1–36). New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Conway, P., Murphy, R., & Rutherford, V. (2013). Learning place' practices and pre-service teacher education in Ireland: Knowledge generation, partnerships and pedagogy. In O. McNamara, J. Murray, & M. Jones (Eds.), *Workplace learning in teacher education: International practice and policy* (pp. 221–241). Amsterdam: Springer/Verlag.

- Czerniawski, G., Kidd, W., & Murray, J. (2013). Understanding teacher educators as teachers of teachers: Exploring multiple perspectives. In: *Presentation at the AERA Conference, San Francisco, USA. 1st May 2013*. Education and Poverty: Theory, Research, Policy and Praxis.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Lieberman, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Teacher education around the world*. New York: Routledge.
- Davey, R. (2013). *The professional identity of teacher educators: Career on the cusp?* London: Routledge.
- DEL. (2014). *Aspiring to excellence – Final report of the international review Panel on the structure of initial teacher education in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: DEL. Retrieved from: <http://www.delni.gov.uk/aspiring-to-excellence-review-panel-final-report.pdf>
- Dent, H. (1977). *The training of teachers in England and Wales 1800–1975*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Department for Education (DfE). (2015). *Carter review of initial teacher training (ITT)*, London: DfE. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/carter-review-of-initial-teacher-training>
- Dinkelmann, T. (2011). Forming a teacher educator identity: Uncertain standards, practice and relationships. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 37, 309–323.
- Dinkelmann, T., Cuenca, A., Butler, B., Elfer, C., Ritter, J., Powell, D., et al. (2012). The influence of a collaborative doctoral seminar on emerging researcher-teacher educators. *Action in Teacher Education*, 34, 172–190.
- Dinkelmann, T., Margolis, J., & Sikkenga, K. (2006). From teacher to teacher educator: Experiences, expectations and expatriation. *Studying Teacher Education*, 2(1), 5–23.
- Donaldson, G. (2011). *Teaching Scotland's future: A report of the review of teacher education in Scotland*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Scottish Government.
- Ducharme, E. (1993). *The lives of teacher educators*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ducharme, E., & Agne, R. (1989). Professors of education: Uneasy residents of academe. In R. Wisniewski & E. Ducharme (Eds.), *The professors of teaching* (pp. 45–60). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ducharme, E., & Ducharme, M. (1996). A study of teacher educators: Research from the United States of America. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 22(1), 57–70.
- Ellis, V., McNicholl, J., & McNally, J. (2012). *The work of teacher education. Research report*. Bristol, UK: ESCalate. <http://escalate.ac.uk/downloads/7781>. Accessed 01.09.12.
- Eraut, M. (2004). Informal learning in the workplace. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 26(2), 247–273.
- European Commission. (2013). *Supporting teacher educators: Teaching the teacher*. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.
- Fraser, J. W. (2007). *Preparing America's teachers: A history*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fuller, A., & Unwin, L. (2004). Expansive learning environment integrating organizational and personal development. In H. Rainbird, A. Fuller, & A. Munroe (Eds.), *Workplace learning in context* (pp. 126–144). London: Routledge.
- Furlong, J. (2013). *Education – An anatomy of a discipline*. London: Routledge.
- Furlong, J., & Lawn, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Disciplines of education: Their roles in the future of education research*. London: Routledge.
- Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C., & Whitty, G. (2000). *Teacher education in transition: Reforming professionalism?* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Furlong, J., McNamara, O., Campbell, A., Howson, J., & Lewis, S. (2009). Partnership, policy and politics: Initial teacher education in England. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 14(4), 307–318.
- Gee, J. (2000). Identity as an analytical lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 99–125.
- Gilroy, P. (2014). Policy intervention in teacher education: Sharing the English experience. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 40(5), 622–632.

- Gilroy, P., & McNamara, O. (2009). A critical history of research assessment in the United Kingdom and its post 1992 impact on education. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 35(4), 321–335.
- Goodson, I. F. (2002). *Professional knowledge, professional lives*. Maidenhead, England: Open University.
- Goodwin, A. L., & Kosnik, C. (2013). Quality teacher educators = Quality teachers? Conceptualising essential domains of knowledge for those who teach teachers. *Teacher Development*, 17(3), 334–346.
- Gove, M. (2010). *Speech to the National College Annual Conference, Birmingham on 16 June 2010*. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/michael-gove-to-the-national-college-annual-conference-birmingham>
- Grenfell, M., & James, D. (1998). *Bourdieu and education: Acts of practical theory*. London: Falmer Press.
- Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record*, 111(9), 2055–2100.
- Groundwater-Smith, S. (2011). Foreword. In M. Mattsson, T. Eilertson, & D. Rorrison (Eds.), *A practicum turn in teacher education* (pp. ix–xiii). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense.
- Grundy, S., & Hatton, E. (1995). Teacher educators' ideological discourses. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 21(1), 7–24.
- Guile, B., & Lucas, N. (1999). Rethinking initial teacher education and professional development in further education. In A. Green & N. Lucas (Eds.), *Further education and lifelong learning: Realigning the sector for the twenty first century* (pp. 203–224). London: Bedford Way Papers.
- Guilfoyle, K., Hamilton, M.-L., Pinnegar, S., & Placier, M. (1995). Becoming teachers of teachers: The paths of four beginners. In T. Russell & J. Loughran (Eds.), *Teachers who teach teachers* (pp. 35–55). London: Falmer Press.
- Hamilton, M. L. (Ed.). (1998). *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self study in teacher education*. London: Falmer Press.
- Harrison, J. K., & McKeon, F. (2008). The formal and situated learning of beginning teacher educators in England: Identifying characteristics for successful induction in the transition from workplace in schools to workplace in higher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(2), 151–168.
- Hatt, A. (1997). Teacher into tutor: A personal account of the move from primary teaching to initial teacher education. *Multicultural Teaching*, 19(3), 24–35.
- Hess, F. (2009). Revitalising teacher education by revisiting our assumptions about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 450–457.
- Hodkinson, H., & Hodkinson, P. (2004). Rethinking the concept of community of practice in relation to schoolteachers. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 8(1), 21–31.
- Howson, J. (2015). Legal aspects of initial teacher education in England. In D. Kuhlee (Ed.), *Governance in der Lehrerausbildung: Analysen aus England und Deutschland* (pp. 47–60). Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer.
- Izadinia, M. (2014). Teacher educators' identity: A review of the literature. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(4), 426–441.
- Kansanen, P. (2013). Teaching as a master's level profession in Finland: Theoretical reflections and practical solutions. In O. McNamara, J. Murray, & M. Jones (Eds.), *Workplace learning in teacher education* (pp. 279–292). London: Springer.
- Kennedy, M. (2006). Knowledge and vision in teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(3), 205–211.
- Kitchen, J. (2005). Conveying respect and empathy: Becoming a relational teacher educator. *Studying Teacher Education*, 1(2), 195–207.
- Klein, E., Taylor, M., & Onore, C. (2012). Finding a third space in teacher education: Creating an urban teacher residency. *Teaching Education*, 24(1), 27–57.
- Korthagen, F., Loughran, J., & Lunenberg, M. (2005). Teaching teachers—Studies into the expertise of teacher educators: An introduction to this theme issue. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(2), 107–115.

- Korthagen, F., & Russell, T. (1995). Teachers who teach teachers: Some final reflections. In T. Russell & F. Korthagen (Eds.), *Teachers who teach teachers: Reflections on teacher education* (pp. 187–192). London: Falmer Press.
- Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2003). The contribution of faculty to community building in a teacher education program: A student teacher perspective. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 30(3), 99–114.
- Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2008). *Priorities in teacher education: The 7 key elements of preservice preparation*. London: Routledge.
- Kosnik, C., Cleovoulou, Y., Fletcher, T., Harris, T., McGlynn-Stewart, M., & Beck, C. (2012). Becoming teacher educators: An innovative approach to teacher educator preparation. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 37(3), 351–363.
- Koster, B., Korthagen, F., & Wubbels, T. (1998). Is there anything left for us? Functions of cooperating teachers and teacher educators. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 2(11), 75–89.
- Labaree, D. (2004). *The trouble with Ed Schools*. New York: Yale University.
- Lanier, J., & Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 527–569). New York: Macmillan.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education*. London: Falmer.
- Loughran, J. J. (2008). Toward a better understanding of teaching and learning about teaching. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 1177–1182). London: Routledge.
- Loughran, J., & Northfield, J. (1998). A framework for the development of self-study practice. In M. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 7–18). London: Falmer.
- Lunenberg, M., Dengerink, J., & Korthagen, F. (2014). *The professional teacher educator*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense.
- Lunenberg, M., & Hamilton, M. L. (2008). Threading the golden chain: An attempt to find our identities as teacher educators. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 35, 185–205.
- Maguire, M. (1993). Women who teach teachers. *Gender and Education*, 5(3), 269–281.
- Maguire, M., & Weiner, G. (1994). The place of women in teacher education: Discourses of power. *Educational Review*, 46(2), 121–139.
- Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2009). *Higher education to 2030 – Volume 2. Globalisation*. Paris: OECD.
- Martin, S., Snow, J., & Torrez, C. (2011). Navigating the terrain of third space: Tensions with/in relationships in school-university partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(3), 299–310.
- Martinez, K. (2008). Academic induction for teacher educators. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(1), 35–51.
- Mattsson, M., Eilertson, T., & Rorrison, D. (Eds.). (2011). *A practicum turn in teacher education*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense.
- Mayer, D., Mitchell, J., Santoro, N., & White, S. (2011). Teacher educators and ‘accidental’ careers in academe: An Australian perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 37(3), 247–260.
- McCulloch, G. (2011). What can higher education offer teacher education? In SCETT (Ed.), *In defence of teacher education: A response to the Coalition Government’s White Paper for schools* (pp. 22–23). London: SCETT.
- McKeon, F., & Harrison, J. (2010). Developing pedagogical practice and professional identities of beginning teacher educators. *Professional Development in Education*, 36(1–2), 25–44.
- McNamara, O. (2010). Une approche technique et rationaliste: La formation des enseignants en Angleterre. *Revue Internationale D’Education*, 55(4), 49–60.
- McNamara, O., & Murray, J. (2013a). *Teacher Educators and Research-Informed Teacher Education across the UK*. Presentation to the Higher Education Academy Summit on Teacher Education. Milton Keynes.

- McNamara, O., & Murray, J. (2013b). *The school direct programme and its implications for research-informed teacher education and teacher educators*. York, England: Higher Education Academy.
- Menter, I., Hulme, M., & Murray, J. (2010). Teacher education research in the UK: The state of the art. *Swiss Revue of Education (Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Bildungswissenschaften)*, 1, 34–48.
- Murphy, S., McGlynn-Stewart, M., & Ghafouri, F. (2014). Constructing our identities through a writing support group: Bridging from doctoral students to teacher educator researchers. *Studying Teacher Education*, 10(3), 239–254.
- Murray, J. (2002). Between the Chalkface and the Ivory Towers? A study of the professionalism of teacher educators working on primary Initial Teacher Education courses in the English education system. *Collected Original Resources in Education (CORE)*, 26(3), 1–503.
- Murray, J. (2005). Re-addressing the priorities: New teacher educators' experiences of induction into Higher Education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 28(1), 67–85.
- Murray, J. (2008). Towards the re-articulation of the work of teacher educators in Higher Education Institutions in England. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(1), 17–34.
- Murray, J. (2014). Teacher educators' constructions of professionalism: Change and diversity in teacher education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(1), 7–21.
- Murray, J. (2015, in press). Teacher education and higher education in The Teacher Education in Times of Change. Bristol: Policy Press. *Publication details to be supplied once known*.
- Murray, J., Czerniawski, G., & Barber, P. (2011). Teacher Educators' identities and work in England at the beginning of the second decade of the twenty-first century. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 37(3), 261–277.
- Murray, J., & Maguire, M. (2007). Changes and continuities in teacher education: International perspectives on a gendered field. *Gender and Education*, 19(3), 283–296.
- Murray, J., & Male, T. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: Evidence from the field. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(2), 125–142.
- Murray, S., Nuthall, J., & Mitchell, J. (2008). Research into initial teacher education in Australia: A survey of the literature 1995–2004. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 225–239.
- NAFOL (The Norwegian Research School in Teacher Education). (2015). <http://nafol.net/english/>. Accessed 2 Mar 2015.
- Newberry, M. (2014). Teacher educator identity development of the nontraditional teacher educator. *Studying Teacher Education*, 10(2), 163–178.
- Nicol, C. (1997). Learning to teach prospective teachers to teach mathematics: The struggles of a beginning teacher educator. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education* (pp. 68–90). London: Falmer.
- OECD. (2005). *Annual report 2005 45th anniversary*. Paris: OECD.
- Pinnegar, S. (1995). (Re)experiencing student teaching. In T. Russell & J. Loughran (Eds.), *Teachers who teach teachers* (pp. 56–70). London: Falmer Press.
- Pinnegar, S., & Hamilton, M. L. (2009). *Self-study of practice as a genre of qualitative research*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Pollard, A. (2014). REF 2014: *What does it mean for education and educational research?* Retrieved from: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/promoting-educational-research/issues/ref2014>
- Popkewitz, T. (Ed.). (1987). *Critical studies in teacher education: Its folklore, theory and practice*. London: Falmer.
- Reid, J. (2011). A practice turn for teacher education? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(3), 293–310.
- Ritter, J. (2007). Forging a pedagogy of teacher education: The challenges of moving from classroom teacher to teacher educator. *Studying Teacher Education*, 3(1), 5–22.
- Rubiano, C. I. (2013). A critical exploration of Colombian teacher education from Freire's 'Directivity' perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 39(5), 574–589.
- Russell, T. (2004). Tracing the development of self-study in teacher education research and practice. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study and teacher education practices* (pp. 1190–1210). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.

- Sinkinson, A. (1997). Teachers into lecturers: An agenda for change. *Teacher Development*, 1(1), 97–104.
- Smith, K. (2011). The Multi-faceted teacher educator. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32(3), 337–350.
- Smith, K., & Ulvik, M. (2015). An emerging understanding of Mentors' knowledge base. In H. Tillema, G. van der Westhuizen, & K. Smith (Eds.), *Mentoring for learning: Climbing the mountain*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Stromquist, N. (2002). *Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of economic power, technology and knowledge*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Swennen, A. (2012). *Van oppermeesters tot docenten hoger onderwijs: De ontwikkeling van het beroep en de identiteit van lerarenopleiders* [The development of the profession and identity of teacher educators]. Retrieved from <http://dare.ubvu.vu.nl/handle/1871/38045>. Extended summary in English within the document.
- Swennen, A., & van der Klink, M. (2008). *Becoming a teacher educator: Theory and practice for teacher educators*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Thompson, B. (2007). Working beyond the glass ceiling: Women managers in initial teacher training in England. *Gender and Education*, 19(3), 339–352.
- Townsend, T. (2011). Teacher education: An international perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 37(4), 373–375.
- Trent, J. (2013). Becoming a teacher educator: The multiple boundary-crossing experiences of beginning teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64, 262–275.
- Ulvik, M., & Sunde, E. (2013). The impact of mentor education: Does mentor education matter? *Professional Development in Education*, 39(5), 754–770.
- Van Velzen, C., Van der Klink, M., Swennen, A., & Yaffe, E. (2010). The induction of teacher educators. *Professional Development in Education*, 36, 61–75.
- Van Velzen, C., & Volman, M. (2009). The activities of a school-based teacher educator: A theoretical and empirical exploration. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(4), 345–367.
- VELON [Dutch Association for Teacher Educators]. (2011). *Professional standards for teacher educators*. Zwolle, Netherlands: VELON.
- VELON. (2012). *Vereniging van Lerarenopleiders Nederland (Knowledge Base for Teacher Educators)* <http://www.lerarenopleider.nl/velon/knowledge-base-for-teacher-educators/> Accessed 15 Feb 2015.
- Wenger, E. (2000). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiebke, H., & Park Rogers, M. (2014). Transition to science teacher educator: Tensions experienced while learning to teach lesson sequencing. *Studying Teacher Education*, 10(3), 222–238.
- Williams, J., & Ritter, J. (2010). Constructing new professional identities through self-study: From teacher to teacher educator. *Professional Development in Education*, 36(1–2), 77–92.
- Williams, J., Ritter, J., & Bullock, S. (2010). Understanding the complexity of becoming a teacher educator: Experience, belonging and practice within a professional learning community. *Studying Teacher Education*, 8(3), 245–260.
- Zeichner, K. (1999). The new scholarship in teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 28(9), 4–15.
- Zeichner, K. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: A personal perspective. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 21, 117–124.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(2), 89–99.

International Handbook of Teacher Education

Volume 2

Loughran, J.; HAMILTON, M.L. (Eds.)

2016, VIII, 542 p. 6 illus., 3 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-981-10-0367-7