Chapter 12

THE EDUCATION OF TEACHER EDUCATORS

Clare Kosnik
University of Toronto

Cathy Miyata
University of Toronto

Yiola Cleovoulou
University of Toronto

Tim Fletcher
Brock University

Lydia Menna
University of Toronto

> Simply put, it is reasonable to assume that quality teacher preparation depends on quality teacher educators. Yet, almost nowhere is attention being paid to what teacher educators should know and be able to do.
> (Goodwin & Kosnik, 2013, p. 334)

Teacher education is a complex and multi-faceted endeavor with teacher educators playing a key role in the design, presentation, and evaluation of programs. Cochran-Smith (2003, p. 5) calls teacher educators the linch-pin in teacher education. Yet teacher educators are an under-researched group (Martinez, 2008; Murray & Male, 2005); much attention is given to the design of the program or the exit outcomes, but a key element of the process, those who must deliver the program, is often overlooked. It is encouraging that, slowly, the international community is increasing attention to the transition from classroom teacher to university faculty (Dinkelman, Margolis, & Sikkenga, 2006; Williams, Ritter, & Bullock, 2012), with many Canadians at the forefront of this work.

The organization of this chapter is as follows: first, data on teacher educators in Canada is provided, followed by a description of some studies of teacher educators. This leads to a discussion of self-study research, which has been a key form of professional development; there is discussion of individual studies and teacher educator inquiry groups. The chapter concludes with some suggestions for further research and suggestions for professional development.

Teacher Educators: A Heterogeneous Group

Part of the challenge in understanding teacher educators is that they are not a homogenous group. They may be tenure line (e.g., tenure stream or tenured), on contract (e.g., renewed yearly), seconded from a local school district (e.g., "borrowed" from the district for a number of years), or be graduate students (e.g., as part of their funding package). Determining the exact numbers of teacher educators is challenging because appointments change yearly. And each faculty of education has a different composition.

© Authors, 2015.

Falkenberg, T. (Ed.). (2015). *Handbook of Canadian research in initial teacher education.* Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association for Teacher Education. ISBN 978-0-9947451-3-2. Retrievable from http://www.csse-scee.ca/associations/about/cate-acfe

For consistency specific terminology was used in this chapter. The term teacher educator was used to describe those who teach courses in teacher certification programs, regardless of their designation (tenure-line, contract, or seconded). Those who only practice teaching supervision, on a temporary contract, were not included in this review of the literature. The term student teacher was used for students in the program regardless of the type of program (consecutive or concurrent).

Crocker and Dibbon (2008) were some of the first researchers to gather data on Canadian teacher educators. We applaud their efforts; however, it is important to recognize that these figures are quite general because they do not reflect institutions individually. For example, the University of Windsor does not second from local school districts, whereas York University has a long history of using many seconded professionals in their programs. The highly transient nature of work in teacher education (e.g., doctoral students who may only be involved for two years) makes quantifying the number of teacher educators and their backgrounds very difficult. Nevertheless, the baseline numbers are a beginning that we hope others will build upon.

Gender :

- male 43%
- female 57% (Crocker & Dibbon, 2008, p. 17)

Teacher educators come to their position with varying backgrounds. Some have had extensive work as classroom teachers while others have not been teachers. In some faculties of education experience as a classroom teacher is required, while others do not demand it.

Background of teacher educators in Canada:

- experience teaching in K–12 schools—71%
- doctoral degree—94% (Crocker & Dibbon, 2008, p. 17)

The simple "yes or no" response to classroom teaching experience although useful does not breakdown number of years as a classroom teacher, which is important. There is a significant difference between a teacher educator who was a classroom teacher for 20 years and someone with only 2 years experience. Further, what one does with the experiences rather than the years themselves makes the difference.

Years experience as faculty members:

- fewer than 10—41%
- 10–19—34%
- 20–29—18%
- 30 or more—7% (Crocker & Dibbon, 2008, p. 17)

Academic rank:

- assistant professor—26%
- associate professor—26%
- professor—35%
- other—13% (Crocker & Dibbon, 2008, p. 17)

In some ways the figures above are misleading because teaching responsibilities (teacher education programs versus graduate programs) are not decoupled. For example, at the Ontario

Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) the involvement of tenure-line faculty in the teacher education programs is only around 10% (usually teaching an elective course) while at other institutions such as Brock University the percentage is around 50%. There needs to be much finer-grain collection and analysis of the data.

Being such a heterogeneous group makes professional development for teacher educators complicated, because their work and needs vary widely. Some come to the enterprise with completed doctorates while others are completing a PhD. Some have a master's degree with no intention of pursuing further formal study. Some have been classroom teachers for many years while others have spent minimal years teaching pupils. The type of professional development they need or want varies: for example, new tenure-line faculty may need assistance developing a research agenda, while contract instructors often have to cobble together an array of small contracts at a number of universities teaching courses not in their area of specialization, and thus they need help with course planning.

Research on Teacher Educators

One of the earliest studies of Canadian teacher educators was Ardra Cole's (1999) 3-year study of pre-tenure professors of teacher education. She examined their work activities, context, and influences on practice including reform efforts to improve teacher education. Using a life-history methodology she uncovered the obstacles they face showing the "intersection between individuals' commitments to reform and institutional realities that often militate against or obstruct these efforts" (Cole, 1999, p. 281). She gave voice to mainly female teacher educators who found the transition to higher education challenging:

> The women spoke repeatedly about the difficulties associated with becoming familiar with the norms of the faculty culture and with gaining access to important information. One described her experience as 'being on the outside . . . not having access to the different [information] loops.' It is difficult to influence a culture without even having access to it. (p. 291)

Cole recognized the inequities in universities, the marginalization of faculties of education, and the contradictory messages sent to teacher educators—work hard at your teaching, reform teacher education, but publish. In many cases it was impossible to do substantial service work and build a thriving academic career as a pre-tenure faculty.

Like Cole, Sandra Martin and Claudia Mitchell studied female teachers and teacher educators. They adopted a sociological perspective (Weber & Mitchell, 1995; Mitchell & Weber, 1999) that led to them studying the images of teachers in popular culture. Sandra Acker's work also focused on gender education, looking at issues related to equity. The project *Doing Good and Feeling Bad: The Work of Women University Teachers* (Acker & Feuerverger, 2006) was an in-depth study of women in faculties of education across Canada. Acker's research highlighted experiences of women who worked exceptionally hard and assumed nurturing roles; however, felt unrewarded as a result of the unfair division of labour. Acker's most recent study of faculty, *Gendered Games in Academic Leadership* (2010), explored the experiences of women in academic leadership positions in higher education. Acker unpacked the metaphor of "the game" which women used to describe their experiences when assuming academic leadership positions. This international study called attention to the difficulties of 31 women from faculties of education who tried to build satisfying academic careers inclusive of leadership positions (Acker, 2010, p. 129). The circumstances under which women assumed

leadership positions were considered and expressions such as "fish in water" or demonstrating a "feel for the game" were noted.

Clare Kosnik and Clive Beck have systematically studied many aspects of the work of teacher educators. They argued in the paper, *Who Should Perish, You or Your Students? Dilemmas of Research in Teacher Education* (Kosnik & Beck, 2000) that faculty need to study their own teacher education program in order to understand the process of becoming a teacher. They provided ample evidence that faculties of education do not support faculty studying their own work (e.g., problems with IRB granting approval to study their own practice). When they examined the work of faculty doing practice teaching supervision, they showed that, although time-intensive, supervision helped them remain current with school district initiatives and develop a strong collegial relationship with students and associate teachers (Beck & Kosnik, 2002). In their examination of the role of faculty in building community in a cohort-based program, they showed that faculty need to take the lead in building a vibrant community. Being cohort-based does not necessarily guarantee that a community will develop (Kosnik & Beck, 2003). They showed that senior administration does not highlight the importance of developing community; therefore, faculty have no direction or guidelines to achieve it. A theme that emerged across these studies was that faculty have little preparation for the multi-faceted aspects of their work.

Non-tenure line faculty are increasingly delivering teacher education courses (Kosnik & Beck, 2003, 2008). Kosnik and Beck gave voice to those teacher educators who were hired on contract in two papers: *Contract Staff in Preservice Teacher Education* (2003) and *In the Shadows: Non-tenure-line Instructors in Preservice Teacher Education* (2008). Similarly, Billie Housego and Sal Badali (2000) and Andrea Reupert and Jane Wilkinson (2011) conducted studies of seconded teacher educators. Across these four studies certain themes emerged: non-permanent teacher educators face marginalization within faculties of education; they had mixed feelings about the place of research in their courses; they had varying degrees of knowledge; and the development and delivery of their courses varied wildly.

In 2009 Kosnik received a large-scale SSHRC grant to study literacy teacher educators in four countries: Canada, United States, United Kingdom, and Australia. This was pioneering research because of its international scope, sample size, and focus on literacy teacher educators. The first set of findings from this study revealed that teacher educators had a range of classroom teaching experience which they drew on in many ways. Most went far beyond simply telling stories about their previous work. Many felt that they needed to hold dual identities—teacher and academic—because they were still heavily involved in schools through their research and in-service activities. Several felt that there was a hierarchy in their department with those most removed from schooling at the highest tier. Most saw themselves in the field of literacy not teacher education and gravitated towards literacy-focused conferences and journals rather than teacher education (Kosnik, Menna, Dharmashi, Miyata, & Beck 2013; Kosnik, Dharmashi, Miyata, Cleovoulou, & Beck 2014). Beck and Kosnik built on the SSHRC-funded research by co-editing the text *Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Student Teachers for a Changing World*, which profiled the work and challenges of literacy teacher educators in four countries (Kosnik, Rowsell, Williamson, Simon, & Beck, 2013). This text is one of the first to ever specifically examine literacy teacher educators.

Returning to the topic of professional development of teacher educators, Kosnik co-authored with Lin Goodwin the article *Quality Teacher Educators = Quality Teachers? Conceptualizing Essential Domains of Knowledge for Those Who Teach Teachers* (Goodwin & Kosnik, 2013). Like many others, they argued that induction programs for new teacher educators are a necessity; the transition from classroom teacher to teacher educator is not seamless; and teacher educators require a specific knowledge base (e.g., of their discipline, context of schools) and they need a repertoire of pedagogies for working with adults (e.g., leading debriefing sessions after practice teaching).

Peter Grimmett's research interests focused on how educators construct their professional knowledge, practice, and sense of identity (Grimmett, 2007, 2009). His early work examined how teachers used reflective processes, such as action research and inquiry groups to inform their professional learning and pedagogical practice (Grimmett, 1981; Grimmett & Erickson, 1988; Grimmett, 1996). A persistent theme throughout much of Grimmett's work has been the consideration of how socio-political dynamics shape teachers' and teacher educators' work environments and their process of professional identification (Grimmet et al., 2008; Grimmett, Fleming, Trotter, 2009). For instance, in a recent book *Teacher Certification and the Professional Status of Teaching in North America: The New Battleground for Public Education,* Grimmett and Young (2012) explored how current developments in teacher certification in North America have been steadily influenced by a larger international policy of "hegemonic neo-liberalism."

Over three decades of research has revealed the systemic barriers that teacher educators face. The issues identified by Cole, Mitchell, Weber, and Mitchell persist as was shown in the later work of Kosnik, Beck, and Grimmett.

Self-Study by Teacher Educators

Self-study research which emerged in the 1990s has been actively used by a number of Canadian teacher educators. It is worthwhile to consider a number of pivotal moments in the development of self-study methodology and community. Firstly, in 1993 the Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices (S-STEP) was granted status as a Special Interest Group at the American Educational Research Association. This SIG, which attracted teacher educators from a number of countries, has grown to over 300 members. Secondly, in 1996 a conference was organized specifically for self-study researchers at Herstmonceux Castle in East Sussex, England. This biennial gathering affectionately known as the Castle Conference has been a productive space for teacher educators to share their research, make personal and professional connections, and form international research partnerships. The Castle Conference has grown from 50 attendees in 1996 to over 150 in 2012. Thirdly, the self-study community firmly established itself as a research community by starting a journal *Studying Teacher Education* and producing the *International Handbook of Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices* (Loughran et. al., 2004). These efforts solidified the place of S-STEP in the education community. An important point in its development was the move to standardize research methodology for self-study. Laboskey (2004) identified five principles for self-study:

- self-initiated;
- improvement-aimed;
- interactive;
- multiple, primarily qualitative, methods; and
- exemplar-based validation. (pp. 842–852)

As self-study emerged there were some lingering doubts about methodology. In response to this criticism Lassonde, Galman, and Kosnik co-edited the text *Self-Study Research Methodologies for Teacher Educators* (2009). The edited volume profiled a number of methodologies (e.g., interviews) with examples of how they were actually done and the impact of the self-study on the researchers. Across the chapters they portrayed self-study as a very powerful form of professional development. Self-study research is not simply reflection but systematic study, following all of the conventions of

qualitative research (Lassonde, Galman, & Kosnik, 2009) focused on understanding and improving practice.

The self-study movement has had a significant effect on the broader teacher education community with Zeichner calling it the most important development in research on teacher education (Zeichner, 1999, p. 8). It was spearheaded by a number of Canadian teacher educators including Ardra Cole, Gary Knowles, and Tom Russell along with John Loughran (Monash University), Mary Lynn Hamilton (University of Kansas), and Vicky LaBoskey (Mills College). Many Canadians have been highly active in this group: for example, Clare Kosnik has had a number of key leadership roles in the self-study community. As a result of the active involvement of Canadians in the international self-study community there is now a self-study SIG in the Canadian Association of Teacher Education which was started by Julian Kitchen. Kitchen and Russell (2012) recognized the contribution of Canadians to self-study: "As Canadian scholars often publish in American and international journals, their work may not be easily identifiable as Canadian or readily accessible to Canadian teacher educators" (p.3). Self-study research with its emphasis on critical friends has led a number of collaborations between Canadian and international scholars.

Ardra Cole and Gary Knowles were some of the first researchers to study their work as teacher educators and to articulate the importance of personal reflection. Kitchen and Russell (2012) described the importance of their work:

> They analyze critical incidents in their work to make explicit the ways in which beliefs, values and personal experiences inform their practice. At the same time, they are conscious of the impact of their reflexive process on their practice and their relationship with their classes. (p. 5)

One of Knowles and Cole's noteworthy publications (1994) was based on a series of letters they exchanged—Cole at OISE and Knowles at University of Michigan—while they were both tenure-stream. This work was pivotal because they identified challenges faced by teacher educators that were quite distinct from those faced by non-teacher education professors:

> In many ways, as new professors, we have relived elements of our own first years as teachers in elementary and secondary schools, both through our own experiences as neophytes in the world of higher education and, vicariously, through the experiences of those we study. (p. 27)

Given the wide variability and heterogeneity of Canadian teacher educators' professional landscapes and the contextual differences, many have taken to studying their own practice to illuminate the complexities of teaching about teaching (Loughran, 2006). While there is evidence of Canadian researchers employing diverse methodological approaches to studying their teacher education practice, self-study features prominently.

Tom Russell, currently at Queens' University, has contributed significantly to the advancement of our knowledge about teacher educators in Canada over his thirty-year career. His early works focused on reflective practice, which was due to his career taking a "reflective turn" after reading the work of Schön (1983) in the mid 1980s (Russell, 2011). Russell collaborated with Hugh Munby on a number of research grants and formed a construct they coined the "authority of experience." This construct recognized that student teachers needed to reflect on their own teaching to learn with authority (Munby & Russell, 1994, 1995). Another pivotal experience for Russell was his returning to the classroom to teach Grade 12 physics for two semesters from 1991 to 1993. Russell's in-depth reflection on this experience resulted in several scholarly articles (Russell, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c). At

this time Russell defined the study of his work as "action research conducted with a special reference to the significance of *self*" (Russell, 2004). His involvement in S-STEP had a significant impact on his work and began his collaborations with John Loughran. Russell and Loughran edited a number of texts: *Teaching About Teaching* (Loughran & Russll, 1997); *Improving Teacher Education Practices Through Self-study* (Loughran & Russell, 2002); and *Enacting a Pedagogy of Teacher Education: Values, Relationships and Practices* (Russell & Loughran, 2007). All of these works focused on self-study as a means of understanding the work of teacher educators enhancing teacher education. Andrea Martin also worked with Russell for many years. In one of their collaborations they looked at learning to teach science in teacher education (Russell & Martin, 2007), while another considered the collaborations between faculty and field practitioners (Russell & Martin, 2001).

In a clearly articulated program of research, Shawn Bullock has used self-study to systematically explore the development of his pedagogy of teacher education. Over the course of several years, Bullock conducted self-study both independently and collaboratively, questioning his own assumptions about teaching and learning, highlighting the challenges he faced. He documented his insights into being a teacher educator, and considered how his practices supported the development of student teachers' professional knowledge (Bullock, 2009, 2012a, 2012b, 2013; Bullock & Ritter, 2011).

In his efforts to disrupt his assumptions about teaching and learning, Bullock (2007) set himself the seemingly simple task of "developing principles of practice that [he] can enact as a new teacher educator" (p. 77). However, as most who are intimately involved in teaching teachers understand, this task was far from simple. As has been shown by others using self-study, Bullock (2007, 2009, 2012b; Bullock & Ritter, 2011) highlighted the inadequacy of his school teaching experiences to prepare him to be a teacher educator. One central concept that Bullock has returned to throughout his research concerns the extent to which he has been able to make his tacit knowledge of teaching explicit to his student teachers (Bullock, 2007, 2009, 2012; Bullock & Christou, 2009; Bullock & Ritter, 2011). He asserted that making his knowledge of teaching and learning explicit allowed him to develop principles of teacher education that enabled powerful learning for both him and his student teachers (Bullock, 2012a). Bullock consistently showed how useful self-study can be to develop deep, rich, complex understandings of teaching and learning. Across this impressive body of research, Bullock was perhaps one of the few researchers who might legitimately claim to have responded to Zeichner's (2007) challenge to those in the S-STEP community to make greater efforts to situate self-studies into broader programs of research on teacher education and to link studies.

In the work of Tim Hopper and Kathy Sanford (University of Victoria), a recurring theme has been the importance of situating teacher education programs or courses in schools. They examined the impact of school-based programs on both student teachers and teacher educators. In a three year action research project using multiple data sources including the student teachers' voices, they examined their "own assumptions about the value of the knowledge we offer and the ways in which we offer this knowledge to student teachers. . . . [we reviewed] our practices, assumptions, and values as teacher educators in an attempt to broaden the pool of resources and understandings from which student teachers might draw" (2004, p. 71).

Tim Fletcher (Casey & Fletcher, 2012; Fletcher, 2012; Fletcher & Bullock, 2012) has used his experiences in the Becoming a Teacher Educator (BTE) group (see Kosnik et al., 2011) as a springboard to systematically study his socializing experiences as a beginning teacher educator. Like Bullock (and often in collaboration with him), he documented how self-study enabled him to understand the relationship between these experiences and his teacher education practices. Fletcher has identified how he came to view his previous physical education teaching practices in secondary schools as an insufficient basis to design his teacher education courses for student teachers. As such,

a key feature of his independent and collaborative work has been an increased understanding of physical education content and pedagogies (Fletcher & Bullock, 2012). Moreover, in teaching (generalist) elementary student teachers about teaching physical education, he has had to learn how to present the ideas behind physical education theory and practice in new ways (Fletcher, 2012). These processes reflect Loughran's (2006) assertion that developing a pedagogy of teacher education involves seeing teaching about teaching and learning about teaching as inextricably linked elements. Teachers of teaching *need* to simultaneously be learners of teaching in order to understand the complexity of learning to teach through student teachers' eyes.

Although Cheryl Craig has been working at the University of Houston for a number of years, she has maintained a presence in the Canadian teacher education community. In 2011 she was inducted as Fellow of the American Educational Research Association, a highly prestigious award, which was a recognition of her sustained research activities. In one very interesting self-study she examined her experience as her faculty of education underwent a number of accreditation reviews (2010). Craig (2010) "reveals individual and institutional compromises that were made to achieve acceptable measures of success as determined by external agencies" (p. 63). She makes public the "pernicious impact on teacher educators' work and personal images of teaching" (p. 63) of the multiple accountability measures they must satisfy.

Monica McGlynn-Stewart's research illustrates the complex and difficult task of teaching a subject area that was not her area of expertise. In *Listening to Students, Listening to Myself: Addressing Pre-service Teachers' Fears of Mathematics and Teaching* (2010), she acknowledged that mathematics was a subject she feared teaching. She thoughtfully described how she used self-study to negotiate and deepen her understanding of her own teacher education practice as she simultaneously contended with her student teachers' fears and concerns. The study highlighted two significant considerations for teacher educators. The first surrounded teacher educators' qualities and practices that may lead to increased student teacher learning and experiences. These included listening to student teachers and providing safe spaces for sharing fears and concerns; providing opportunities to re-learn mathematics content in a collaborative, hands-on forum; and ensuring that student teachers experience success when teaching mathematics in their practice teaching placements (p.183). The second consideration was the professional development that influenced and helped to improve her practice. These forms of professional development included a critical friend to listen, support, and advise during critical times; and the process of self-study. A key message from this research is that self-study can situate research and teacher education practice in a synchronized relationship with one informing the other.

Darlene Ciuffetelli Parker's work (Brock University) is steeped in narrative inquiry. Like Cole, she drew on narrative inquiry and self-study methodologies in her work. In a collaborative self-study between herself, a pre-tenure faculty, and a tenured professor, both at Brock University, Ciuffetelli Parker identified three key aspects of the tenure process: fear and anxiety, building community and a collaborative mentorship, and balance between life and academia (Ciuffetelli Parker & McQuirter Scott, 2010, p. 405). As well, she did a collaborative self-study with Louis Volante (Ciuffetelli Parker & Volante, 2009), also at Brock University, examining the challenges of practice teaching supervision for faculty members.

Shaun Murphy (University of Saskatchewan) has studied issues of identity in teacher educators (Murphy, Pinnegar, & Pinnegar, 2011). In one fascinating self-study he crossed boundaries by collaborating with Stefinee Pinnegar (a professor), and a student teacher to examine "the ethical dilemmas, obligations, and plotlines that emerged" (p. 99). Using narrative inquiry, they explored "the intertwining issues of identity and ethics" (p. 99). Susan Elliott-Johns at Nipissing University worked with four other novice teacher educators to explore their practices and new roles. Their on-line community chronicled "their struggles and successes over the course of an academic year"

(Ramirez, Allison-Roan, Peters, Elliott-Johns, 2012, p.109). They examined their assumptions about working in teacher education. Lynn Thomas (University of Sherbrooke) did a collaborative self-study with Janneke Geursen from the Netherlands which included reflective journals that they shared with their students. Through this research they had a "much greater understanding of the complexities of reflective writing . . . and a much greater awareness of the importance of deliberate, explicit exchanges in teacher education classes" (Thomas & Geursen, 2013, p. 18).

One of the first self-studies that Kosnik completed examined the impact of action research in a teacher education program (2000). In the mid 1990s, the use of action research in teacher education was groundbreaking. Kosnik studied the impact on her as a faculty member, showing that her initial impetus for the action research was to help student teachers develop an inquiry perspective but that she was significantly changed by the process (1999, 2001). Although this work was informative, she did not reach the point where she asked, Is action research appropriate for student teachers? Is action research too sophisticated a process for beginners who are just trying to acquire a repertoire of teaching strategies and gaining confidence as teachers? Like many others she simply accepted that action research was "good" without being critical.

Kosnik, like Cole and Russell, was program co-chair for one of the castle conferences. After her term in 2004, Kosnik, Freese, Samaras, and Beck (2006) co-edited the text *Making a Difference in Teacher Education Through Self-study: Studies of Personal, Professional, and Program Renewal.* This text was significant because it included examples of self-study beyond an individual instructor to those studying their own programs. This was followed by the four editors co-editing *Learning Communities in Practice* (Samaras, Freese, Kosnik, & Beck, 2008). Kosnik researched their work as co-editors to show that an international learning community for teacher educators is feasible given technology, shared values, and approach to inquiry.

Many of these researchers have completed a number of self-studies, yet there is the nagging question of "So what?" Loughran (2010) says that we need to move beyond the stories. Self-study has a place for teacher educators to understand their practice, but, for it to be truly powerful, researching it must move beyond the individual to be of use to other teacher educators. As Zeichner suggests, there must be links between the studies. Bullock's (2007) work is a fine example of links between studies. An example of what Zeichner suggested was found in Kosnik's most recent self-study, where she built on her traditional research on new teachers (Kosnik & Beck, 2008). They found that new teachers felt that digital technology was not adequately addressed in teacher education. This led Kosnik in 2010 to make a concerted effort to integrate digital technology into her literacy courses. With Lydia Menna (her teaching assistant) and Shawn Bullock (their critical friend), they conducted a self-study of their efforts over three years (Kosnik, Menna, & Bullock, 2012). This self-study addressed Loughran's (2010) question, "So what?". They showed that teacher educators need a repertoire of strategies for using digital technology, that technology cannot simply be layered onto an existing course, and that student learning must not be overlooked when selecting digital technology.

Teacher Educator Inquiry Groups

In many self-study research projects described above there was an element of collaboration. Building on this key aspect of self-study, a number of Canadian teacher educators used self-study methodology as professional development for groups of teacher educators. These are significant, because they provide nuanced insights into professional learning communities that support the development of teacher educators.

A group of teacher educator-researchers at Brock University have been at the cutting edge of

illustrating how self-study can be both a form of professional development and a methodology to study educational research (Kitchen, 2010; Kitchen, Ciuffetelli Parker, & Gallagher, 2008; Gallagher, Griffin, Ciuffetelli Parker, Kitchen, & Figg, 2011). Pre-tenure professors at Brock formed a self-study group with the goals of providing one another support and deepening their understanding of how to link their teaching and scholarship. By identifying "significant events," the group documented their learning and development, coming to realize the personal and professional value of a learning community. The findings demonstrate the benefits of a self-study community as a means for on-going professional development; in particular, the group provided a space for authentic conversations, where members found resonance in each other's experiences and stories (Gallagher et al., 2011, p. 884). Moreover, they developed a sense of belonging through the self-study community.

Julian Kitchen (Brock University), who was a member of the Brock University groups described above, has devoted significant time to studying his practice and leading professional development sessions for teacher educators. He recognized that teacher educators are in a space "betwixt and between" because teacher education is a professional program. He identified four features for professional development of teacher educators: initial teacher educator preparation; ongoing professional development; practitioner research by teacher educators; and disseminating teacher education research and reforms (Kitchen, 2009, p. 3).

Arlene Grierson and her teacher educator colleagues at Nipissing University engaged in a process similar to those of the group at Brock University, using self-study as a form of professional development. In a year-long collaborative self-study, seven teacher educators from Nipissing University examined the text *Developing a Pedagogy of Teacher Education: Understanding Teaching and Learning About Teaching* (Loughran, 2006). Following the structure of the Brock self-study group, the Nipissing group met monthly throughout one school year to discuss the text. The use of book-study to guide the discussion led to authentic conversation about group members' teacher education practices in relation to the text. Not only did participants discuss their own work, they also negotiated their work in relation to their peers (Grierson et al., 2012). They described the nuanced and complex work of teacher educators, as well as illustrating key characteristics of effective professional learning community groups. These included: sharing a common purpose or goal of improving teacher education practice along with active engagement in professional dialogue. Allowing for both independent and collaborative engagement in the process was deemed to be the most important factor that contributed to the success of the group. The Nippissing group's experiences support assertions that collaborative self-study is an effective vehicle for faculty development (Kitchen et al., 2008; Latta & Buck, 2007) and has extended existing understandings of teacher educator collaboration.

Gaalen Erickson and Gabrielle Minnes Brandes (1998) examined a community of inquiry which included high school teachers and teacher educators. Over five years, teachers and teacher educators took risks in the classroom, tried new pedagogical strategies, used the group as a forum for discussion and reflection, and modified strategies for future use. As a result, "they developed a collective expertise that constituted a form of theorizing about their own teaching practices and their students' learning practices" (p.46). In order for this to happen Erickson et al. (2005) identified three essential aspects of collaborative inquiry groups: (a) a mutually held understanding of what types of classroom practices nurtured good teaching and learning, (b) a setting where teachers had a strong commitment and control over the project and decided on its direction, and (c) a structure that allowed teachers and teacher educators to meet regularly in an atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding (p. 787). They found that the group evolved in an organic nature and the role of the participants was constructed and defined in the context of the meetings. As a result, the teacher educators' role was to facilitate discussion and respond to relevant topics and deliberations of the group, rather than logistical tasks like agenda planning

Kosnik and Beck formed the group Becoming Teacher Educators for doctoral students, as a way to prepare them for the demands of being teacher educators. In a self-study of this group (Kosnik, Cleovoulou, Fletcher, Harris, McGlynn-Stewart, & Beck, 2011), they argued that graduate students needed to be prepared *during* their doctoral studies for an academic career. Now in their fifth year, the group has discussed articles about new teacher educators, shared their research, examined the multifaceted work of teacher educators, and in general became a very supportive community.

When Kosnik was the director of the Elementary Preservice Program at OISE, she built a community for the 25 teacher educators, many of whom were on contract, and most of whom were coordinators of cohorts of student teachers. In addition to dealing with administrative tasks for running the cohorts, Kosnik and her team jointly did research on aspects of their program. For example, they studied the assignments in the program. In the chapter "Community-building and Program Development Go Hand-in-hand: Teacher Educators Working Collaboratively" (Kosnik & Beck, 2005), she showed how little preparation most of the instructors had for their role in coordinating a cohort and that jointly conducting research was a way to include non-tenure instructors in the research process. By working collaboratively, the teacher educators deepened their knowledge of teacher education (best practices) and learned a great deal about conducting research in their own cohort.

Discussion

In this section we discuss some of the findings and outline some next steps for both research on teacher educators and professional development for teacher educators. As was shown throughout this chapter, teacher educators are a heterogeneous group; however, there needs to be more fine-grained data on them. For example, knowing about previous work experiences (e.g., number of years as classroom teachers) may help develop a portrait of who should be recruited to work in teacher education. Further, since there are such wide variations across institutions the number of tenure-line instructors actually teaching in preservice programs needs to be gathered from a representative number of universities in each province in order to better understand the trends in teacher education.

There has been a significant number of self-study research projects by teacher educators with many of them studying the transition from classroom teacher to professor. This important work has deepened our understanding of the challenges new faculty face. We now need to build on this work by studying mid-career and later-career teacher educators (Kosnik et al., 2014). Findings from self-study research are not sufficient if we are to truly gain an understanding of the complex work of teacher educators. There need to be more systematic studies using traditional research methods studying a significant number of teacher educators. The work of teacher educators is multifaceted. Research studies need to capture the complexity of their work by examining their identities, practices, backgrounds, transition, challenges, individual talents, and contexts. Further, there should be studies of teacher educators by discipline. For example, Kosnik, Menna, Dharmashi, Miyata, and Beck (2013) have studied literacy teacher educators, but we do not know how similar their experiences are to those who teach other content areas such as mathematics or foundations courses. We suspect there are similarities but there may be significant differences in their backgrounds, the ways that they design their courses, their professional development needs, or the communities in which they are involved.

In this chapter some models for professional development were discussed (e.g., Brock University support group, Nipissing University book-study); however, these seem to have been

initiated by faculty. It would be useful to learn about models of exemplary professional development that were organized by the institution to determine aspects of the programs that worked well, the factors necessary for success, and so on. There have been some larger-scale professional development initiatives for teacher educators in the Netherlands (Lunenberg, Zwart, & Korthagen, 2010), the United Kingdom (Boyd, Harris, & Murray, 2007), and Australia (e.g., Australian Learning and Teaching Council, 2010), but to our knowledge none on this level has been implemented in Canada. Using frameworks like the one developed by Goodwin (2010) on the knowledge base for teacher educators should be a guide for teacher professional development. Goodwin's five dimensions are:

(1) personal knowledge/autobiography and philosophy of teaching;
(2) contextual knowledge/understanding learners, schools, and society;
(3) pedagogical knowledge/content, theories, teaching methods, and curriculum development;
(4) sociological knowledge/diversity, cultural relevance, and social justice; and
(5) social knowledge/cooperative, democratic group process, and conflict resolution.

The Becoming Teacher Educators group (Kosnik et al., 2011) discussed earlier is an example of a professional community for doctoral students. This model could be modified and replicated because it has been such a powerful form of professional development. Communities for teacher educators could be developed in individual universities and across universities. Meetings could be held face to face and use digital connections to create on-line communities.

Induction for new teacher educators has clearly been identified as a need, both by Canadian and international scholars. We would argue that there should also be inservice for experienced teacher educators. With education changing (e.g., use of digital technology) and research on teacher education increasing, mid-career and experienced teacher educators need a forum to learn about these initiatives and research findings. It is difficult for an individual teacher educator to organize his or her own professional development; rather, support needs to come from the administration. For example, deans of education should consider professional development for teacher educators as a priority. They can dedicate funds for teacher educators to attend conferences and make "space" in their faculty of education for discussion about goals and pedagogy. Their academic leadership both formally and informally can have a huge impact on individual teacher educators. See Elliot-Johns (2015) for examples of deans of education providing support for faculty development.

Using the research on teacher educators is a necessary step in developing a pedagogy of teacher education for which Loughran and others have called. As a community of teacher educators, we need to be learning from each other about successful pedagogical practices. Kosnik, Menna, Dharmashi, Miyata, and Beck's (2013) research on teacher educators documented their priorities for their courses and saw significant differences among teacher educators. By engaging in discussion we may come to a better understanding and agreement of what is needed in teacher education.

Studying teacher educators is important, but another key area for research is to study the graduates of teacher education programs. By studying beginning teachers we can determine the impact and influence of teacher education on them. In this way, teacher educators can deepen their insights into the needs of new teachers and the effectiveness of the teacher education program, and identify areas in which to strengthen their teaching and program. Kosnik and Beck's (2009) longitudinal research on new teachers showed that many of the practices in teacher education were not that helpful. For example, touching on many topics, which they called "cover the waterfront," overwhelmed student teachers. As a result, student teachers did not really acquire sufficient knowledge about literacy teaching, nor a suitable number of teaching strategies. This led to Kosnik

and Beck (2009) developing seven priorities for teacher education. These may not be the "correct" priorities, but the general stance that teacher educators need to prioritize and study their graduates is a sound position. Many more longitudinal studies on graduates need to be conducted.

In our review of the literature we did not locate studies on and about Aboriginal teacher educators. Just as faculties of education are developing programs to prepare teachers to work in Aboriginal communities, we need teacher educators who are Aboriginal, have a deep interest in Aboriginal education, and research on Aboriginal teacher educators. We do not know if they require particular kinds of professional development or support, but suspect they do.

Many of the issues that teacher educators face are not new; they have persisted for years. Systemic barriers need to be addressed. This will require a concerted effort by many stakeholders including deans of education. We believe that the practices of teacher educators influence the work of teachers, which in turn influences the success of pupils. Caring for and supporting teacher educators may be one of the first steps in enhancing education. Preparation of teacher educators should include: space for discussion with fellow teacher educators; opportunity to observe other teacher educators; study of one's own practice; collaborating with other teacher educators on research and course development; attending conferences or courses on teaching in higher education; reading about teacher education; providing induction support (including mentors) for new teacher educators; and offering continuing professional development for mid- and later-career teacher educators.

The importance of teacher education and teacher educators should not be undervalued. Loughran (2006) sums up the complexity as follows:

> It is not difficult to see that teaching can be viewed as comprising a knowledge of theory in and through practice and that each gently moulds the other in the creation of purposeful pedagogical experiences. The ability to make all of this clear and helpful to students of teaching and learning in teacher education requires a genuine scholarship of teacher education and demands much more than simply "demonstrating good teaching." (p. 18)

This chapter, we hope, is another step in developing a scholarship of teacher education.

References

Acker, S. (2010). Gendered games in academic leadership. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, *20*(2), 129–152.

Acker, S., & Feuerverger, G. (2006). Doing good and feeling bad: The work of women university teachers. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *26*(3), 401–422.

Australian Learning and Teaching Council. (2010). *A guide to support Australian university teaching and learning centres in strategic leadership for teaching and learning enhancement.* Retrieved from http://www.flinders.edu.au/pathe/ALTC_report_final.pdf

Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2002). Professors and the practicum: Involvement of university faculty in preservice practicum supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(1), 6–19.

Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2003). Contract staff in preservice teacher education. *Teaching Education*, *14*(2), 187–200.

Boyd, P., Harris, K., & Murray, J. (2007). *Becoming a teacher educator: Guidelines for the induction of newly appointed lecturers in initial teacher education.* Bristol, England: Higher Education Academy.

Bullock, S. M. (2007). Finding my way from teacher to teacher educator: Valuing innovative pedagogy and inquiry into practice. In T. Russell & J. J. Loughran (Eds.), *Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education: Values, relationships, and practices* (pp. 77–94). London, England: Routledge.

Bullock, S. M. (2009). Learning to think like a teacher educator: Making the substantive and syntactic structures of teaching explicit through self-study. *Teachers and Teaching*, *15*(2), 291–304.

Bullock, S. M. (2012a). Creating a space for the development of professional knowledge: A self-study of supervising teacher candidates during practicum placements. *Studying Teacher Education*, *8*(2), 143–156.

Bullock, S. M. (2012b). Learning to teach physics teachers: Developing a distinct pedagogy of teacher education. In S. M. Bullock & T. Russell (Eds.), *Self-studies of science teacher education practices* (pp. 103–120). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Bullock, S. M. (2013). Using digital technologies to support self-directed learning for preservice teacher education. *Curriculum Journal*, *24*(1), 103–120.

Bullock, S. M., & Christou, T. (2009). Exploring the radical middle between theory and practice: A collaborative self-study of beginning teacher educators. *Studying Teacher Education*, *5*, 75–88.

Bullock, S. M., & Ritter, J. K. (2011). Exploring the transition into academia through collaborative self-study. *Studying Teacher Education*, *7*(2), 171–181.

Casey, A., & Fletcher, T. (2012). Trading places: From physical education teachers to teacher educators. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *31*(4), 362–380.

Ciuffetelli Parker, D., & McQuirter Scott, R. (2010). From mentorship to tenureship: A storied inquiry of two academic careers in education. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, *18*(4,) 405–425.

Ciuffetelli Parker, D., & Volante, L. (2009). Responding to the challenges posed by summative teacher candidate evaluation: A collaborative self-study of practicum supervision by faculty. *Studying Teacher Education*, *5*(1), 33–44.

Cole, A. (1999). Teacher educators and teacher education reform: Individual commitments, institutional realities. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *24* (3), 281–295.

Craig, C. (2010). Change, changing, and being changed: A study of self in the throes of multiple accountability demands. *Studying Teacher Education*, *6*(1), 63–73.

Crocker, B., & Dibbon, D. (2008). *Teacher education in Canada*. Kelowna, BC: Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education.

Dinkelman, T., Margolis, J., & Sikkenga, K. (2006). From teacher to teacher educator: Experiences, expectations, and expatriation. *Studying Teacher Education*, *2(1)*, 5–23.

Elliott-Johns, S. E. (Ed). (2015). *Leadership for change in teacher education: Voices of Canadian deans of education*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Erickson, G. L., & Brandes, G. M. (1998). Developing and sustaining a community of inquiry among teachers and teacher-educators. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *44*(1), 38–52.

Erickson, G., Brandes, G. M., Mitchell, I., & Mitchell, J. (2005). Collaborative teacher learning: Findings from two professional development projects. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*(7), 787–798.

Fletcher, T. (2012). Using self-study to develop a pedagogy of elementary teacher education: Addressing the specialist/generalist issue. In S. M. Bullock & T. Russell (Eds.), *Self-studies of science teacher education practices* (pp. 85–102). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Fletcher, T., & Bullock, S. M. (2012). Enacting literacy pedagogies: A collaborative self-study by teacher educators in physical education and science. *Studying Teacher Education*, *8*, 19–33.

Gallagher, T., Griffin, S., Ciuffetelli Parker, D., Kitchen, J., & Figg, C. (2011). Establishing and sustaining teacher educator professional development in a self-study community of practice: Pre-tenure teacher educators developing professionally. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(5),

880–890.

Goodwin, A. L. (2010). Globalization and the preparation of quality teachers: Rethinking knowledge domains for teaching. *Teaching Education*, *21*, 19–32.

Goodwin, A. L., & Kosnik, C. (2013). Quality teacher educators = quality teachers? Conceptualizing essential domains of knowledge for those who teach teachers. *Teacher Development*, *17*, 334–346.

Grierson, A. L. (2010). Changing conceptions of effective teacher education: The journey of a novice teacher educator. *Studying Teacher Education*, *6*(1), 3–15.

Grierson, A. L., Tessaro, M. L., Grant, C., Cantalini-Williams, M., Denton, R., Quigg, K. & Bumstead, J. (2012). The bricks and mortar of our foundation for faculty development: Book-study within a self-study professional learning community. *Studying Teacher Education*, *8*, 87–104.

Grimmett, P. P. (1981). Clinical supervision and teacher thought processes. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *6*(4), 23–39.

Grimmett, P. P. (1996). The struggles of teacher research in a context of education reform: Implications for instructional supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, *12*, 37–65.

Grimmett, P. P. (2007). Mentoring teachers in Anglophone Canada: Building learning communities. In M.V. Zuljan & J. Vogrinc (Eds.), *Professional inductions of teachers in Europe and elsewhere* (pp. 137–153). Ljubljana, Slovenia: University of Ljubljana.

Grimmett, P. P (2009). International teacher education: Liberal cosmopolitanism revisited or postmodern trans-nationalism, *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *36*(4), 7–25.

Grimmett, P. P., Dagenais, D., D'Amico, L., Jacquet, M., & Ilieva, R. (2008). The contrasting discourses in the professional lives of educators in Vancouver, Canada, *Journal of Educational Change*, *9(*2), 101–121.

Grimmett, P. P., & Erickson, G. L. (Eds.). (1988). *Reflection in teacher education*. Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.

Grimmett, P. P., Fleming, R., & Trotter, L. (2009). Legitimacy and identity in teacher education: A micro-political struggle constrained by macro-political pressures. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *37*(1), 5–26.

Grimmett, P. P., Young, J., & Lessard, C. (2012). *Teacher certification and the professional status of teaching in North America: The new battleground for public education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Hopper, T., & Sanford, K. (2004). Representing multiple perspectives of self-as-teacher: School integrated teacher education and self-study. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *31*(2), 57–74.

Housego, B., & Badali, S. (2000). Teachers' secondment experiences. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *46*(4), 327–45.

Kitchen, J. (2009). Advancing teacher education through faculty development. *Brock Education*, *19*(1), 3–19.

Kitchen, J., Ciuffetelli Parker, D., & Gallagher, T. (2008). Authentic conversation as faculty development: Establishing a self-study group in an education college. *Studying Teacher Education*, *4*(2), 157–171.

Kitchen, J., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (2012). *Canadian perspectives on the self-study of teacher education practices*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association for Teacher Education. Retrieved from http://www.csse-scee.ca/associations/about/cate-acfe/

Knowles, J. G., & Cole, A. (1994). We're just like the beginning teachers we study: Letters and reflections on our first year as beginning professors. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *24*(10), 27–52.

Kosnik, C. (1999). The transformative power of the action research process: Effects of an inquiry approach to preservice teacher education. *Networks: An On-Line Journal for Teacher Research*, *2*, 1–22.

Kosnik, C. (2000). Looking back: Six teachers reflect on the action research experience in their teacher education program. *Action in Teacher Education*, *22*(2), 133–142.

Kosnik, C. (2001). Effects of an inquiry-oriented program on a faculty member: Some critical incidents and my journey. *Reflective Practice*, *2*(2), 65–80.

Kosnik, C. (2008). Funny, this does not look like a community: Working collaboratively across borders and institutions. In A. Samaras, A. Freese, C. Kosnik, & C. Beck (Eds.), *Learning communities in practice* (pp. 219–230). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2000). Who should perish, you or your students? Dilemmas of research in teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *27*(2), 119–135.

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*(2), 99–114.

Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2005). Community-building and program development go hand-in-hand: Teacher educators working collaboratively. In G. Hoban (Ed.), *The missing links in teacher education: Innovative approaches to designing teacher education programs* (pp. 209–230). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2008). In the shadows: Non-tenure-line instructors in preservice teacher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *31*, 185–202.

Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2009). *Priorities in teacher education: The 7 key elements of preservice preparation.* London, England: Routledge.

Kosnik, C., Cleovoulou, Y., Fletcher, T., Harris, T., McGlynn-Stewart, M., & Beck, C. (2011). Becoming teacher educators: An innovative approach to teacher educator preparation. *Journal of Education for Teaching. 37*(3), 351–363.

Kosnik, C., Dharmashi, P., Miyata, C., & Cleovoulou, Y. (2014). Beyond initial transition: An international examination of the complex work of experienced literacy/English teacher educators. *English in Education*, *48*, 41–62.

Kosnik, C., Freese, A., Samaras, A., & Beck, C. (Eds.). (2006*). Making a difference in teacher education through self-study: Studies of personal, professional, and program renewal.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Kosnik, C., Menna, L., & Bullock, S. (2012). Diving into social media: Using digital technologies to support student teacher learning. In S. Van Nuland & J. Greenlaw (Eds.), *Social media and teacher learning* (pp. 47-60). Oshawa, ON: University of Ontario Institute of Technology Press.

Kosnik, C., Menna, L., Dharmashi, P., Miyata, C., & Beck, C. (2013). A foot in many camps: Literacy teacher educators acquiring knowledge across many realms and juggling multiple identities. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *39*(5), 523–540.

Kosnik, C., Rowsell, J., Williamson, P., Simon, R., & Beck, C. (Eds.). (2013). *Literacy teacher educators: Preparing student teachers for a changing world.* Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

LaBoskey, V. (2004). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical underpinnings. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 817–869). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Lassonde, C., Galman, S., & Kosnik, C. (Eds.). (2009). *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators.* Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Latta, M. M., & Buck, G. (2007). Professional development risks and opportunities embodied within self-study. *Studying Teacher Education*, *3*(2), 189–205.

Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding about teaching and learning about teaching.* London. Routledge.

Loughran, J. (2010) Seeking knowledge for teaching teaching: Moving beyond stories. *Studying Teacher Education*, 6(3), 221–226.

Loughran, J., Hamilton, M. L., LaBoskey, V., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (2004). *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (1997). *Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education* (pp. 32–47). London, England: Falmer Press.

Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (2002) *Improving teacher education practices through self study.* London, England: Routledge.

Lunenberg, M., Zwart, R., & Korthagen, F. (2010). Critical issues in supporting self-study .*Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(6), 1280–1289.

Mitchell, C., & Weber, S. (1999). *Reinventing ourselves as teachers: Beyond nostalgia.* London, England: Falmer Press.

Martinez, K. (2008). Academic induction for teacher educators. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *36*, 35–51.

McGlynn-Stewart, M. (2010). Listening to students, listening to myself: Addressing pre-service teachers' fears of mathematics and teaching mathematics. *Studying Teacher Education*, *6*, 175–186.

Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1994). The authority of experience in learning to teach: Messages from a physics methods class. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *45*, 86–95.

Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1995). Towards rigor and relevance: How can teachers and teacher educators claim to know? In T. Russell & Fred Korthagen (Eds.), *Teachers who teach teachers: Reflections on teacher education* (pp. 172–184). London, England: Falmer.

Murphy, M. S., Pinnegar, E., & Pinnegar, S. (2011). Exploring ethical tensions on the path to becoming a teacher. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *38*(4), 97–115.

Murray, J., & Male, T. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: Evidence from the field. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*, 125–142.

Ramirez, L., Allison-Roan, V., Peterson, S., Elliott-Johns, S. (2012) Supporting one another as beginning teacher educators: Forging an online community of critical inquiry into practice. *Studying Teacher Education*, *8*(2), 109–126.

Reupert, A., & Wilkinson, J. (2011). A whole new language and a new world: Seconded teachers' experiences in a faculty of education. *Alberta Journal of Education*, *57*(1), 28–42.

Russell, T. (1995a). Reconstructing educational theory from the authority of personal experience: How can I best help people learn to teach? *Studies in Continuing Education*, *17*(1–2), 6–17.

Russell, T. (1995b). Returning to the physics classroom to re-think how one learns to teach physics. In T. Russell & F. Korthagen (Eds.), *Teachers who teach teachers: Reflections on teacher education* (pp. 95–109). London, England: Falmer Press.

Russell, T. (1995c). A teacher educator and his students reflect on teaching high school physics. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *22*(3), 85–98.

Russell, T. (2004). Tracing the development of self-study in teacher educaton research and practice. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 1191–1210). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Russell, T. (2011). Teaching teachers: How I teach IS the message. In J. Kitchen & T. Russell (Eds.), *Canadian perspectives on the self-study of teacher education practices* (pp. 9–22). Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association for Teacher Education. Retrieved from http://www.csse-scee.ca/associations/about/cate-acfe/

Russell, T., & Martin, A. (2007). Learning to teach science. In S. Abell & N. Lederman (Eds.), *Handbook of research on science education* (pp.1151–1176) Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Russell, T., McPherson, S., Martin, A. (2001). Coherence and collaboration in teacher education reform. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *26*(1), 37–55.

Russell, T., & Loughran, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education: Values, relationships and practices*. London, England: Routledge.

Samaras, A., Freese, A., Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (Eds.). (2008). *Learning communities in practice.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in act*ion. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Thomas, L., & Geursen, J. (2013). Creating spaces for reflection on learning to teach a foreign language through open journals: A Canadian-Dutch self-study. *Studying Teacher Education*, *9*(1), 18–30.

Weber, S., & Mitchell, C. (1995). *That's funny, you don't look like a teacher: Interrogating images and identity in popular culture*. London, England: Falmer Press.

Williams, J., Ritter, J., Bullock, S. (2012) Understanding the complexity of becoming a teacher educator: Experience, belonging, and practice within a professional learning community. *Studying Teacher Education*, *8*, 245–260.

Zeichner, K. (2007). Accumulating knowledge across self-studies in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *58(*1), 36–46.

Zeichner, K. (1999). The new scholarship in teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, *28*(9), 4–15.

Acknowledgement

We wish to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for their generous funding of this project.