

South Dakota State University

## Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange

---

Teaching, Learning and Leadership Faculty  
Publications

Teaching, Learning and Leadership

---

2009

# The Preparation, Roles, and Responsibilities of Teacher Educators

Robert Hite

Edward Fletcher

Paige Bruening

Anthony Durr

Brian Yontz

*See next page for additional authors*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/tll\\_pubs](https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/tll_pubs)

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

---

**Authors**

Robert Hite, Edward Fletcher, Paige Bruening, Anthony Durr, Brian Yontz, Rhonda Zatezalo, Nicole Williams, and Kattlyn Wolf

---

# THE PREPARATION, ROLES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF TEACHER EDUCATORS

Robert R. Hite  
Edward Fletcher  
Paige Bruening  
Anthony Durr  
Brian Yontz  
Rhonda Zatezalo  
Nicole Williams  
Kattlyn Wolf

The Ohio State University

## ABSTRACT

The literature in teacher education is filled with discourse around the topic of what it is that teacher candidates need to know and be able to do upon completion of their teacher preparation programs. However, a seriously under-researched area in the literature of teacher education is the task of preparing prospective teacher educators in doctoral programs across schools, departments, and colleges of education. Teacher educators must negotiate their varied roles as researchers, teachers, and service stewards without sacrificing their responsibility of modeling sound teaching practices for their teacher candidates. Further, these individuals must learn what the expectations and values are across diverse types of institutes of higher education (IHE). In fact, the transition from P-12 teacher to teacher educator/faculty member often proves difficult while the expectations often seem convoluted. These individuals must have a breadth of knowledge regarding the totality of teacher education as a whole, instead of the prevalent phenomena of a fragmented discipline based on content area-specific scholarship. Thus, an analysis of the pervasive challenge of equipping these individuals with the necessary tools and wisdom of practice needed to fulfill their roles and responsibilities as future teacher educators, warrants attention. This chapter uncovers topics related to the preparation of teacher educators

and challenges related to teaching, research, and service for teacher educators. Therefore, this chapter attempts to reveal what it is that teacher educators need to know and be able to do to become effective teacher educators prepared to mentor teacher candidates as well as graduate students in teacher education for the twenty-first century. Implications for future research regarding the topic of preparing teacher educators are outlined throughout each chapter. This discussion is timely and important for sustaining the field of teacher education and its future existence as well as re-negotiating the less than flattering stigmatization of teacher educators in the environment of academia.

## INTRODUCTION

During autumn quarter 2008, a group of seven doctoral students enrolled in a Seminar in Teacher Education: The Roles and Responsibilities of Teacher Educators. All seven students were pursuing majors or minors in teacher education policy and leadership at The Ohio State University. The final group product for this seminar was the conceptualization of this chapter which is organized around the themes explored in the course.

While ongoing in-depth attention has been given since the early 1970s to P-12 teacher effectiveness, there is a lack of inquiry into the preparation of those who prepare P-12 teachers - that is, teacher educators. The purpose of the seminar and that which follows is to assist in spawning a spotlight on the study of those who provide leadership for and who are charged with delivering programs across our nation which prepare P-12 teachers.

The reader of this chapter will find an exploration of teacher educators as teachers, researchers, and stewards of service. The chapter concludes with a brief summary of what

teacher educators should know and be able to do, implications for the preparation of teacher educators, and implications for future research regarding teacher educators.

## PERCEPTIONS ON TEACHER EDUCATOR PREPARATION

The profession of teacher educator is unique. Not only do education faculty have to take on the traditional faculty roles of teaching, research, service, and advising, but the added responsibility of being teaching role models for future P-12 educators. This is perceived as different from other professional school faculty such as those in schools of law and medicine. Teacher educators are called to model the desired practices expected of candidates while enhancing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of prospective teachers. While professors of law and medicine focus on developing the above attributes in students through good teaching, they are not expected to model the actual practice of law and medicine within their classrooms. In fact, teacher educators actually perform their practice in the presence of candidates.

Many novice professors of education believe it will be easy to fulfill the responsibilities of teaching, research, service, and advising, because most began their careers as P -12 teachers. They believe that the competencies developed as classroom teachers will simply transfer to their new roles as professors (Kane, 2007; Kessler, 2007). Yet, once in the position of being a teacher education faculty member, many novice professors of education feel ill-prepared teaching prospective teachers. Many find the transition from being a P-12 teacher to a university teacher educator very difficult and problematic (Korthagen, Loughran, & Lunenberg, 2005). Kane (2007) argued that this is because P-12 teachers are qualified to teach children and adolescents, while teacher educators teach only adults. Because of the lack of necessary expertise to teach at the university level, many new professors rely on more seasoned faculty for guidance and use

established course syllabi and teaching methods that previous faculty advocate (Kessler, 2007). These techniques often reflect more traditional notions of teaching (Kane, 2007) and do not promote modeling of the skills and dispositions the teacher educator desires of teacher candidates (Kessler, 2007). The challenge becomes teaching adults while demonstrating for candidates the most promising practices of P-12 instruction.

Darling-Hammond (2006) noted that because teacher educators have little or no training in teaching at the collegiate level, faculty tend to instruct teacher education candidates in the same way non-education students are taught. She found that many teacher educators use uninspired teaching strategies, and do not model the active hands-on, minds-on teaching that is advocated for teacher candidates to implement in P-12 classrooms as beginning teachers.

Darling-Hammond also found the curriculum of many preparation programs to be superficial, and that many teacher educators continue to use long-held ineffective teaching practices.

Concomitantly, many do not view themselves as teacher educators, but as specialists in their subject area (e.g., English, math, science). Thus, these professors do not focus on teaching teachers how to teach, but on the content that teachers should be taught (Darling-Hammond, 2006). According to Grossman (2005), the emphasis on content specialization, coupled with the lack of research on the pedagogical practices of teacher educators, are major drawbacks of many teacher education programs.

The findings that teacher educators are ill-prepared to explicitly model what is expected of beginning teachers were substantiated by Kremer-Hayon and Zuzovsky (1995). While studying the professional development of teacher educators, these researchers found that many novice education professors perceive they did not have the professional knowledge needed to fulfill the multiple and varied roles a teacher educator must perform. Many teacher educators

believe they possess the skills that allow them to successfully deal with problems which arise in P-12 classrooms, but not the competencies needed to cope with dilemmas found in teacher preparation programs. In addition to concerns about professional knowledge, many novice education faculty express apprehension about instructional approaches, ideological issues, confidence, and personal development. Kremer-Hayon and Zuzovsky argued that in order to alleviate some of the uneasiness these new faculty experienced, teacher educators need to have specific preparation that address these anxieties.

The above research demonstrates that many teacher education faculty are comfortable with the content they teach; however, content alone is not sufficient. Many new education faculty do not consider themselves to be prepared to serve the roles of teaching, research, service, and advising. Thus, many education faculty may become overwhelmed and perceive that they are unable to carry out the varied tasks required of them. To better understand this phenomenon, it is important to understand the three primary responsibilities of teaching, research, and service and how these affect the teacher educator.

### TEACHER EDUCATORS AS TEACHERS

There is a hackneyed saying that states: Those who cannot do teach, and those who cannot teach, teach others to teach. If an individual lacks the pedagogical knowledge and skills to teach future educators, then teacher candidates will most likely not experience and know what effective teaching looks and sounds like. If teacher candidates do not have role models who demonstrate the broad scope of responsibilities of teaching, then they will most likely not impact student growth. Thus, the role of the teacher educator is vastly different from other collegiate faculty. While faculty in schools of law and medicine must concern themselves with the practices of law and medicine, they often do not concern themselves with the practice of

teaching. Not only do education faculty have to understand and convey their content, and know and use effective teaching methods, they also have to be able to explicitly explain and reflect on their own teaching so that teacher candidates are able to see the instructional decisions and productive reflection that must continually take place.

In order to address these issues, researchers, and professional organizations have worked to explore and codify promising pedagogical practices for teacher educators. In particular, in 2007, the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) developed standards for accomplished teacher educators. The first standard addresses the modeling of teaching and appropriate behaviors. Thus, not only do teacher educators need to practice good teaching techniques, but also they must value and model the dispositions that influence these methods. ATE suggests that teacher educators model reflection, be open to revise courses to include new research, and use varying instructional strategies to meet the diverse needs of the teacher candidates in their programs. Much like what many teacher education programs urge teacher candidates to do, ATE encourages teacher educators to value and engage in culturally responsive pedagogy and foster a positive regard for *all* students. According to ATE, teacher educators should also engage in and value professional and program development if they want to affect teacher candidates' attitudes toward life long learning and student and professional advocacy. Thus, teacher educators need not only to model all of these skills and dispositions, but they also must be able to make this modeling explicit.

Lunenberg, Korthagen, and Sweenen (2006) agreed with the concept of teacher educators serving as role models for teacher candidates. They noted that the impact of teacher education on teacher candidates' beliefs and behaviors are often minimal, but they believed this is because teacher educators do not explicitly model the skills and dispositions they want teacher candidates

to possess. These researchers also pointed to the fact that many current teacher educators do not value the new visions of learning and teaching for which numerous teacher preparation programs advocate. Adhering to the status quo may have detrimental effects, these researchers argued, because the practice of modeling, informed by research and various learning theories, may have greater impact on candidates' beliefs and behaviors than just the content of courses. They noted that when teacher educators are open to modeling, they not only make explicit the tacit knowledge of teaching, but they also transparently demonstrate that teaching is about taking risks and learning from misjudgments. Thus, teacher educators must value their teaching both as professionals and as teaching role models.

While being held to the standard of being a role model for teaching, having a focus on teaching is often in conflict with what other roles teacher education faculty are expected to occupy. Tang and Chamberlain (1997) found that many faculty members do not believe that the university reward system acknowledges their teaching. These faculty also view research as impeding their ability to teach and believe that universities should focus on research or teaching, but not both. Interestingly, Tang and Chamberlain also found that administrators in the same programs do not believe that teaching and research are at odds with one another. This finding also was supported by Koster, Brekelmans, Korthagen, and Wubbles (2005) who discovered that although many universities argue that research and teaching are mutually supportive, many education faculty members do not agree. Thus, in many research focused universities, the preparation of beginning teachers is often neglected and more attention is paid to conducting research. Wright (2005) argued that this is because many institutions fail to establish and maintain clear and shared criteria for good teaching.

This is not a new phenomenon. In 1930, Edgar Dale wrote “the inadequacy of training which the doctor of philosophy receives to fit him for college teaching is a problem which has long agitated academic circles” (p. 198). Eighty years later, how professors engage in teaching and research is still a source of ongoing debate. Marsh and Hattie (2002) contended that researchers who are also teachers stimulate new methodologies and topics, excitement about new fields of study, and critical approaches to understanding. They claimed that teacher candidates tend to respect the knowledge and information of research-oriented professors more than those who have teaching as their primary focus.

Thus, it is clear that the contention among the various roles teacher educators are called to fulfill is complex. If new strides are to be made in preparing highly qualified P-12 teachers, than gargantuan steps must be made to prepare teacher educators for the immense undertakings with which they are charged.

### TEACHER EDUCATORS AS RESEARCHERS

Despite the dearth of literature and research on preparing teacher candidates, discussions regarding the preparation of teacher educators are scant (Grundy & Hatton, 1995; Murray & Male, 2004). In particular, few studies have focused on the roles and responsibilities of teacher educators as they transform from P-12 classroom teachers to take on the varied challenges of university faculty members (Murray & Male, 2004).

The prominence of research as a promising model for university faculty members burgeoned in the 1950s with the emergence of the National Science Foundation (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997). During this period, the university reward system deemed scholars whose research procured external funding and prestige to their institutions, the highest recognition and promotion. The increased focus on research sparked the re-structuring of

priorities for the professoriate in American higher education. According to Glassick et al. (1997), “ironically, the culture of the professoriate grew more restrictive and hierarchical at the very time that America’s higher education institutions became more open and inclusive in admitting undergraduates” (p. 8).

### *Defining Scholarship*

Beri and Griffith (2005) discussed what it means to question in the field of teaching. In addition, they contended that the creation of knowledge includes a collaborative effort among philosophers, theorists, and practitioners. According to Beri and Griffith (2005), “Understanding what it means to question...is the prolegomenon to all inquiry and aims at creating and sustaining conditions under which knowledge is possible, rather than at knowledge acquisition directly” (p. 427).

Glassick et al. (1997) advocated for colleges and universities to consider a re-conceptualization of faculty evaluations of their scholarship into four paradigms: (a) scholarship of discovery, (b) scholarship of integration, (c) scholarship of application, and (d) scholarship of teaching. Scholarship of discovery is considered the traditional research process of inquiry. The scholarship of integration focuses on more interdisciplinary scholarship and preparing teacher educators as generalists in the field of education. The scholarship of application deals with bridging the gap between theory and practice by making clear implications to practice as well as deriving research from practice. Stated differently, researchers may attempt to solve real dilemmas in the field by engaging in research. Lastly, the scholarship of teaching considers sharing research with collegiate-level students as well as gaining more knowledge through that exchange. Consistent with this re-conceptualization of scholarship, Paulsen and Feldman (1995) noted that the meaning of scholarship is not static; they defined scholarship as the combination

of research, teaching, and service that foster development, representation, and the utilization of knowledge. Nevertheless, they also acknowledged that scholarship is typically framed in the narrow view of research and publications.

### *Teacher Educator Perspectives Regarding Research*

Many colleges and universities consider scholarship, teaching, and service to be their mission as well as the metrics by which their faculty are evaluated (Paulsen & Feldman, 1995). What Rieg and Helderbran (2005) termed “an interdependent trilogy” is common among most colleges and universities; however, institutions differ greatly in respect to the weights given to each metric (scholarship, teaching, and service). Tensions regarding the balance of teaching, research, and service are prevalent in colleges and universities throughout the country, particularly in high research institutions. According to Cochran-Smith (2005), “a major part of the work of the teacher educator has been working dialectic of research and practice by blurring boundaries and functioning simultaneously as both researcher and practitioner” (p. 224). Tang and Chamberlain (1997) identified dispositions among administrators in relation to faculty, at six regional state universities in Tennessee, toward the mission of research and teaching. Based on their survey research, faculty members were less inclined to view research and teaching as instrumental to their jobs. They did not believe that their university reward system acknowledged their teaching. Moreover, they viewed research as impeding on their ability to teach and contended that the university should require one or the other, but not both. Administrators, on the other hand, viewed research and teaching as mutually supportive. They also believed that research promotes good teaching.

In a Delphi study of the quality requirements needed for teacher educators, Koster, Brekelmans, Korthagen, and Wubbels (2005) found indications of a growing importance of

conducting research with university-based teacher educators. However, more broadly, teacher educators do not yet subscribe to that stipulation.

### *Focusing Research in Teacher Education*

The knowledge-base in education is extremely diverse when compared to other professions, and there is constant debate about what should be, and should not be included in professional education. In fact, Sikula (1996) stated that “Few of the several hundred professions have as little of a consensus about a common knowledge base as does the teaching profession” (p. XV). The difficulties for teacher educators with regards to research stem from this lack of consensus. How do teacher educators focus their research efforts and decide what essential topics to investigate in their respective fields? The questions must be asked: What do we know about teaching and teacher education? Further, how do teacher educators and teachers make use of this knowledge? Christensen (1996) stated, “. . . is teaching and/or teacher education driven by some combination of guesses, past practices, and ‘feeling our’ way?” (p. 38). Teacher education should be driven by quality research that informs and improves practice, rather than solely on experiences or theoretical knowledge. The editors of the first edition of the *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* asserted that the research base in education was extremely thin for such important work as educating our nation’s teachers (Ducharme & Ducharme, 1996). The authors contended that the knowledge-base in education must be extended, and they posed questions to the profession that address areas they perceive require further research.

### *The Research Gap from P-12 Teacher to Teacher Educator*

The road from P-12 classroom teaching to a university teacher educator may be quite rough, making this transition problematic for many (Korthagen, Loughran, & Lunenberg, 2005). However, this topic is seriously under-researched (Rieg & Helderbran, 2005).

According to Tate (1993),

Instructors in community colleges and in small liberal arts colleges have been expected to be teachers first and researchers second. However, in the last few years' pressure has been mounting to require more research and publishing and grant-writing for teachers in all institutions of higher education in order to raise the status of their colleges. Teacher educators, in particular, may stand on the most slippery rungs of the academic ladder, for they hold to the norms of the K-12 schools while working in colleges and universities. (p. 18)

#### *Research Requirements across Institutions*

Henderson and Buchanan (2007) noted that comprehensive universities (Masters I and II) often have issues with institutional identities and role conflicts regarding their missions distinguishing them from doctoral universities and liberal arts institutions. They discussed the new realities of many comprehensive universities (referring to them as greedy institutions) in having extremely high expectations of their faculty to teach, participate in service, and the increasing demands to research. Consequently, surveys from faculty members at comprehensive universities reflect a great deal of dissatisfaction, especially during their first years.

According to Tinberg, Duffy, and Mino (2007),

Where the fight at research-centered universities and colleges is to valorize teaching as a legitimate subject of scholarship and research, the struggle at two-year colleges is to convince faculty and administrators that intellectual inquiry and scholarly exchange are activities appropriate to the mission of the institutions. (p. 28)

They further indicated that promotion and tenure prioritize teaching and service at two-year institutions giving the faculty a false sense of understanding that research is not highly regarded,

therefore not worthy of their time. In addition, the authors contended that going public with one's work is of utmost importance.

### *Engaging in Research with Others*

University researchers are often criticized as having unequal amounts of power in terms of their relationships with research subjects; they also are thought to rarely leave the confines of their ivory towers to collaborate with their communities, local schools, or other educational constituents. On the contrary, many teacher educators utilize teachers or teacher candidates as research participants in their studies. Smagorinsky, Augustine, and Gallas (2006) called for the inclusion of teachers or teacher candidates that are the subjects of the research to become co-authors in order to break down the hierarchy of the researcher and the researched; the notion of a more collaborative relationship with the researcher and participants is consistent with ethnographic perspectives regarding methods of research. They further extended the obligation to also include research assistants who contribute significantly to the research endeavor.

The practice of teacher educators researching their own teaching practices as well as their own teacher candidates is well noted in the literature (Cochran-Smith, 2005; Smagorinsky et al., 2006). However, the notion of this type of research is highly contested in some circles of academia (Cochran-Smith, 2005; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Fenstermacher, 1994). According to Cochran-Smith (2005), "...in the US, there are currently competing agendas and viewpoints about the worth of research conducted by teacher educators themselves on their own practice, their own knowledge and perspectives, and their own students (i.e., prospective teachers) learning" (p. 224).

Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) referred to three types of epistemological research methods: (a) knowledge-for-practice, (b) knowledge-in-practice, and (c) knowledge-of-practice.

Knowledge-for-practice is conceived of as what typical university-researchers create through formal knowledge and theory to enhance practice. Knowledge-in-practice constitutes knowledge espoused from master teachers as a result of reflection on their practice. Knowledge-of-practice is more congruent with methods of action research in which teachers utilize their classrooms as research laboratories.

Fenstermacher (1994) provided insight to the epistemological perspectives of practical knowledge and acknowledges its legitimacy as well as its potential to offer insight and heighten understandings as well as transforming the practice and advancing the knowledge base of teaching and teachers. Consequently, according to Fenstermacher, researchers who study practical knowledge have the obligation to follow the scientific protocol of establishing justification and rigor in their research.

#### *The Legitimization of Diverse Types of Research*

It is important to also recognize the need for qualitative research from teacher educators. Dillard, Abdur-Rashid, and Tyson's (2000) research sought to challenge the dominant epistemological assumptions regarding research and teaching in higher education by describing the essentiality of spirituality as an African-American faculty member and giving voice to what the researchers termed "endarkened epistemology". According to Dillard et al. (2000), "A discourse on spirituality as it intersects with education has the potential of yielding understanding of the epistemological foundations of successful African-American female teachers, and, as such, may reveal otherwise obscured clues about culturally relevant teaching and liberatory pedagogy" (p. 449).

The prevalence of self-studies in teacher education is ever-increasing in the literature (Zeichner, 2007). In fact, a special interest group (SIG) for self-studies in teacher education has

recently emerged in the American Educational Research Association (Korthagen et al., 2005). However, this type of research is not generalizable to other contexts. Zeichner noted that self-studies enable educators to showcase the noble and difficult task of educating the nation's teachers. He further articulated implications for the increase in self-studies by indicating that in the future there may be an increase in book collections centered on topics or issues. Lastly, Zeichner called for self-study researchers to explicitly emphasize implications of their research as well as specific contributions to knowledge.

### *Preparing and Mentoring Future Faculty for Research Responsibilities*

Most doctoral students regardless of the type of institution they attend, learn to do research in graduate school (Henderson & Buchanan, 2007). However, a limited amount of national and comprehensive research have been conducted to examine doctoral student experiences throughout their tenure, especially in comparison to undergraduate student attrition (Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992; Golde, 2005; Malone, Nelson, & Nelson; 2004; Smallwood, 2006; Tinto, 1993).

Even with the small amount of comprehensive research regarding doctoral education, many of the studies point to the myriad of perennial conundrums plaguing doctoral programs; these problems include the alarming 50 percent national attrition rate, time-to-degree completion rates, a lack of diversity, a lack of equity in mentoring practices among programs, irrelevant curricula regarding contemporary public issues, a scarcity of American citizens pursuing doctoral degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines, the lack of training provided to prepare doctoral students for professoriate roles, a lack of knowledge regarding positions outside of the academic realm, as well as a lack of technical and psychosocial structures utilized to support doctoral students (Allan & Dory, 2001; Bair & Haworth, 1999;

Cohen, 2006; Di Pierro, 2007; Golde, 2000; Herzig, 2004; Katz, 1995; Kleuver, 1995; Kleuver, 1997; Lenz, 1995; Lovitts, 2001; Malone et al., 2004; Nelson & Lovitts, 2001; Smallwood, 2006; Smallwood, 2004; Smallwood, 2005; Tinto, 1993).

The attrition rate in doctoral education is highly volatile, depending on the field of study, and even greater disparities exist among academic programs (Bair & Haworth, 1999). According to Golde and Dore (2001),

Students in some fields begin to conduct supervised research their first term and see their advisor nearly every day. They conduct research in laboratories, with teams of students, faculty, and postdoctoral fellows. In other fields, each scholar works in isolation, and students meet with their advisors infrequently. Consequently, the experiences of students across disciplines vary. Further, the experiences of students within the same program may vary as well. (p. 5)

The social sciences and humanities' academic areas have the highest attrition rates compared to their laboratory science counterparts (Bair & Haworth, 1999).

The doctoral student advising relationship may have a profound effect on a doctoral student's progress throughout their doctoral studies. Bair and Haworth (1999) in their meta-synthesis found that the amount and quality of contact between the doctoral student and his or her advisor(s) or other faculty was the single most cited indicator of successful completion of the doctoral degree across all types of methodological studies. Lovitts (2001) interviewed completers and noncompleters and found that most noncompleters had minimal interaction with faculty in all stages of graduate education. These individuals, according to Lovitts (2001), "characterized the faculty as being completely indifferent to students, more interested in their own research than in students, or preoccupied with their own students" (p. 118). Mullen (2007) contended that

faculty members that become mentors and are committed to their students are not the norm.

According to Mullen (2007),

In fact, many faculty members – even within major research universities – function as trainers who view mentoring as a transmission process and doctoral degrees as models of training; as illusionists who mainly are concerned with keeping up appearances; as tricksters who capitalize on weaknesses in the system; or even as escapists who disappear altogether. (p. 300)

According to Schlosser, Knox, Moskowitz, and Hill (2003),

This [the profoundness of the student-advisor relationship] is because advisors typically facilitate their advisees' progress through the program, work with students on research requirements (i.e., theses and dissertations) and serve in other capacities for their studies (e.g., providing clinical supervision, facilitating professional development). (p. 178)

Hollingsworth and Fassinger (2002), utilizing survey research of 194 respondents, found that doctoral students' mentoring experiences was a significant predictor of research productivity.

Brown and Krager (1985) outlined the ethical responsibilities for faculty and graduate students in higher education. They categorized five faculty roles to frame their discussion: (a) advisor, (b) instructor, (c) curriculum planner, (d) researcher, and (e) mentor. According to Brown and Krager, advisors must be knowledgeable about their advisees' personal and professional demands. Providing graduate students with fair and equal treatment was also described as very important; particularly, Brown and Krager noted the low pay of graduate assistantships and the issues of authorship between the advisor and advisee are often problematic. In addition, it is critical that advisors be advocates for their graduate student

advisees, specifically during their role as committee supervisor. Lastly, Brown and Krager emphasized that advisees also have responsibilities as well.

In Glassick et al.'s (1997) discussion of scholar qualities, they noted that colleges and universities need individuals who persevere in their responsibilities as faculty members. They stated, "colleges and universities cannot afford to waste valuable appointments on people who abandon scholarship once they win long-term employment" (p. 64).

According to Zeichner (2005b),

One of the major responsibilities of research universities like my own in the US is the preparation of the next generation of college and university teacher educators. In order to do this job well, I believe that we must use our teacher education programs as laboratories for the study of teacher education and develop in prospective teacher educators the same habits and skills of self-analysis and critique about their teacher education practice as we and they seek to develop in prospective teachers. (p. 121)

Evident in the discussion, teacher educators' responsibility for scholarship is a very robust and important topic. In fact, it is apparent that the scope of issues examined under the domain of teacher educators as researchers has expanded considerably in recent years pointing to its complexity and significance. This section synthesized what the research literature has uncovered in regards to the roles and responsibilities of teacher educators in fulfilling their obligations to further the knowledge base of the field. The literature has tended to focus on the expectation that more and more colleges and universities will continue basing their tenure and promotion decisions on research productivity. This is an extremely important message for current and prospective teacher educators, especially due to the stigma of teacher educators being less than intellectuals compared to their faculty colleagues in other disciplines. Moreover,

teacher educators are charged with the obligation to continue their scholarship subsequent to earning tenure. Concomitantly, teacher educators must also prepare their advisees for the roles and responsibilities they will face when entering into the academy as a novice teacher educator. These individuals must know that their practices in P-12 settings will not necessarily transfer to their new environments of higher education.

### TEACHER EDUCATORS AS STEWARDS OF SERVICE

Generally, service is seen as third in importance behind research and teaching. In some situations, faculty argue that service should not be considered part of their responsibilities as it is “extra work,” and takes time away from the research and teaching that promotion and tenure is predicated on. Neumann and Terosky (2007) advise junior or future faculty members by stating,

... university professors would do well to plan for and orchestrate, thoughtfully, the service dimension of the academic career. Professors plan their research careers strategically – what they will study, with whom, why, toward what ends, And increasingly, they think systematically about their teaching careers – as concerned simultaneously with their students’ and their own learning. Yet service gets little strategic thought; we might go so far as to say that in some university professors’ careers, only service avoidance is strategized. (p. 306)

A number of issues are involved in understanding the role of service in the professional lives of the teacher education professoriate such as: (a) the history of higher education; (b) the definition of service; (c) how faculty are evaluated; and (d) the purpose of service in the larger context of the institution and community.

### *The History of Service in Higher Education*

The professoriate has not always been structured as it is now: teaching, research and service with varying emphases depending upon the type of institution. In the colonial era, institutions of higher learning were clerical institutions with missions primarily for teaching and preparing students for denominational missionary work with Native Americans (AAHE-ERIC, 2003). This trend continued until the Civil War as additional colleges proliferated. After the Civil War, the influence of Darwin, led to the secularization of education and the rise of progressive education (AAHE-ERIC, 2003; Menand, 2001). Further, land grant legislation, such as the Morrill Act of 1862, the Hatch Act of 1887, and the Smith-Lever Act, created research institutions with direct ties to communities and government agencies. This led to “social good” being defined and the direction of research initiatives of institutions of higher education being determined (AAHE-ERIC, 2003). According to the AAHE-ERIC monograph, the era of land grant legislation precipitated a change in faculty roles from a focus almost exclusively on teaching to almost exclusively on research. Prior to the land grant era, the focus of the professoriate was on teaching while research was a component of service.

In the post-Civil War era, research and teaching became disjointed – as two separate, non-overlapping professional roles. While institutions had an obligation to fulfill a community mission, service became a third, non-overlapping professional role and the student missionary preparation had diminished.

The AAHE-ERIC monograph (2003) argued that the land grant era set up a situation where institutions focused on research agendas dictated by the government at the expense of all other roles – teaching and service. Because research was the source of advancement, faculty became more and more specialized within their research agendas and connected within

disciplines rather than within institutions. Faculty increasingly became disassociated with their employing departments and institutions. This was further exacerbated by the peer review processes that are yet today given preeminence in evaluation. As the situation has evolved, students (as clients) have become dissatisfied with their learning experiences and the greater community with institutional outreach. The monograph argued for a form of service the authors deemed “the scholarship of engagement.” In actuality the argument was to reform the way the professoriate works that heralded back to the colonial period of teacher-scholars. Research, teaching and service work to reinforce each other in the service of the community and institutional mission and needs. In fact, teaching, research and service are not separate entities, but are mutually supportive (AAHE-ERIC, 2003).

#### *A Definition of Service*

Few issues surface more prominently in discussing service as the basic definition of service. In a study by Neumann and Terosky (2007), faculty identified the lack of a clear definition of service as a barrier to operationalizing this responsibility. There are varied definitions of service without clear consensus among the disciplines. The greatest level of agreement is around internal and external service; there is little concurrence as to whether paid consulting, and civic participation are legitimate service activities to be considered in the promotion and tenure process.

For teacher education, the accrediting bodies provide some guidance for expectations of faculty service. Standard five of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Accreditation (NCATE) addresses faculty qualifications. Element D of NCATE Standard four speaks to the expectation of service. The following is the acceptable level rubric for faculty service:

Most professional education faculty provide service to the college or university, school, and broader communities in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission. They collaborate with the professional world of practice in P–12 schools and with faculty in other college or university units to improve teaching, candidate learning, and the preparation of educators. They are actively involved in professional associations. They provide education-related services at the local, state, national, or international levels. (NCATE, 2008)

The Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), the second of the two teacher education accrediting bodies, places its service requirement in the Capacity Standard (Standard four) – requiring teacher education faculty to be supported by the institution at the same level in service expectations as other faculty across a campus. The TEAC Standard sub-element is as follows:

The program must demonstrate an appropriate level of institutional investment in and commitment to faculty development, research and scholarship, and national and regional service. The program faculty's workload obligations must be commensurate with those the institution as a whole expects in hiring, promotion, tenure, and other employment contracts. (TEAC, 1997)

The two accrediting bodies take two fundamentally different orientations to faculty service. NCATE identifies service as a separate element. However, the exact definition of what constitutes service and the relative weight of service with respect to teaching and research responsibilities are left to individual institutions to define. TEAC, on the other hand, does not include faculty service as a sub-element in the faculty element of the capacity standard; rather, it is a sub-element of the fiscal and administrative element. Similar to the NCATE standards, the

TEAC service requirement allows an institution to define service given that it is applied evenly across similar departments.

The two main divisions of faculty service for higher education are internal and external service. The AAHE-ERIC monograph (2003) viewed internal service as institutional and disciplinary. Sometimes referred to as “inreach”, this type of service involves transmitting, applying, or preserving knowledge for the benefit of audiences internal to the institution. Service to departments, institutions and state, regional, national, and international associations and conferences is considered to be internal. Institutional citizenship generally involves assistance on committees for the purpose of academic oversight, institutional governance and institutional support. Departmental service involves serving on curricular, admission, and scholarship committees; advising students; collaborating on research projects with students; writing letters of recommendations for students and other departmental administration work. Service to the discipline is an area that the AAHE-ERIC monograph (2003) classified as internal service; others, including individual institutions, classify this as external service. The monograph argued that service to the discipline is internal because this increases the faculty members’ scholarly knowledge, expertise, and renown thus increasing the faculty members’ value to the institution and furthering the institution’s mission.

The AAHE-ERIC monograph (2003) defined external service as work that meets society’s needs. There are two general classifications - service that uses faculty disciplinary expertise for community needs, and service that does not use faculty’s scholarly expertise. External service is important to institutions because it is a way to connect the mission of an institution to the larger community and apply research knowledge to current societal issues. Since the land grant era, each county in the United States has an agricultural extension office.

These offices provide university services to local communities. An institution's faculty coordinate workforce development and degree programs to meet community needs, and provide technical assistance. Teacher education faculty collaborate within university-P-12 school partnerships. Teacher preparation is further enriched when faculty cultivate professional development opportunities for school communities and engage in action research for the mutual benefit of P-12 schools and universities. In addition, some teacher education programs are heavily involved in professional development, laboratory, and community schools. They are also engaged in other educational reform initiatives designed to benefit P-12 and collegiate level students and faculty.

Consulting can be controversial as to whether it is external service for the purpose of promotion and tenure because it is generally the only type of service for which the faculty member is compensated. The AAHE-ERIC monograph (2003) questioned whether consulting work should be recognized in making promotion and tenure decisions. For consulting to be deemed a component of the promotion and tenure process, it may be argued that one must use their scholarly expertise in service of the institutional mission. For consulting to be considered as service, payment should not enter into the equation.

The lowest of all categories in terms of value for promotion and tenure are community and civic service. These include such activities as volunteerism, civic service outside of scholarly expertise such as Girl Scout or Boy Scout leadership, volunteering for charitable causes, coaching little league. Promotion and tenure committees often desire documentation that faculty are involved in the community as this provides goodwill for the institution's mission. Community and civic service alone, however, do not garner the same respect as scholarly-related service (AAHE-ERIC, 2003).

### *The Role of Service in Faculty Evaluations*

Faculty reward structures determine how faculty ultimately spend their time. The land grant era ushers in a faculty reward structure heavily weighted toward research and grant procurement for promotion and tenure decisions, especially at large, research intensive universities. Smaller teaching colleges have a different weighting scheme, but faculty cannot escape the “publish or perish” world of research.

The AAHE-ERIC monograph (2003) noted, that on many campuses, internal service at both the institutional and department levels, unless it rises to administration level work, are not compensated. Further, junior faculty in some institutions are provided “sheltered” status at the beginning of their career in order to meet publishing requirements of tenure. Once tenure is achieved these faculty face new expectations of service without warning. This finding is corroborated by the Neumann and Terosky (2007) study. It seems antithetical that teacher education at any type of institution can have a faculty reward system that does not place a high value on quality teaching, student learning outcomes, and service to partnerships with P-12 schools. However, this is the realization in many institutions, especially in research intensive colleges and universities.

### *Service in the Context of Institution and Community*

Higher education institutions across the nation are facing new realities which require institutional adaptations. Calls for accountability continue to increase due to disconnects between college and university programs and the general community. Students do not believe they are being well prepared for contemporary workforce expectations while the costs of education rise exponentially. Communities perceive institutional outreach to be less visible. Meanwhile, higher education has developed a reputation as being too lofty, and cut off from the “real world.” There

is pressure to demonstrate that institutions are meaningful and relevant to students (through teaching), and to the community (through germane research and service) with mission-focused delivery. Just as teacher education would seem to be challenged with the current research-centric faculty promotion and tenure structure, it may have the most to gain with a more service oriented “scholarship of engagement”-centered faculty evaluation system that takes broader account of the full range of experiences and responsibilities.

The current balance among faculty roles: teaching, research and service, has evolved from the time of colonial colleges. Much of the current system can be traced to the land grant system, emphasizing research, established after the Civil War. Higher education is at a stage in which the basic relationships among students, faculty, administration, alumni, and greater community are realigning due to the increased demand for greater accountability of each other.

The AAHE-ERIC monograph (2003) argued that the vehicle to accomplish the accountability each sector seeks is through the scholarship of engagement, returning faculty to being teacher-scholars where scholarship is pursued to inform teaching and service, and where faculty evaluation is tied to the broad range of responsibilities across the campus and beyond to fulfill the institutional mission. As a result, students receive a more superior education and more satisfying experience. The scholarship of engagement promotes an institution with faculty more willing to engage in mission-related work, both internal and external to the campus. The community receives greater support from the institution to solve community identified problems. From the faculty perspective, this paradigm produces no additional work. Research informs teaching, which informs research, which informs service, which informs research, which informs teaching, etc. Each informs and reinforces the other. Thus, each no longer is an isolated entity unrelated to the other. Neumann and Terosky (2007) found empirical support for the concept of

the scholarship of engagement. Their study noted that faculty were more favorable to service which contributes to the advancement of their research and teaching.

Teacher education is a service-oriented profession and discipline. While the tendency is to extract service from teaching and teacher education, it is in fact a critical component of each. To have an academic culture that does not value service is to have a culture that does not fully appreciate the nature of education or teacher education.

The increased attention to nationally accredit teacher preparation programs is likely to accelerate scholarship of engagement movement. In fact, both teacher education accreditation bodies, NCATE and TEAC, require evidence of faculty service (NCATE, 2008; TEAC, 2008). For example, all Ohio institutions preparing teachers for licensure must become and maintain national accreditation in order to be approved to offer teacher education licensure programs [OAC 3301-24-03 (F)(3)]. Furthermore, NCATE has developed partnership protocols with all 50 states (NCATE, 2008), and TEAC has developed agreements with 25 states (TEAC, 2008). The trend, according to accreditation officials, is for states to require national accreditation of teacher preparation programs. As teacher education accreditation becomes the norm, faculty service requirements in this field must be implemented in some fashion.

One of the effects of enacting the scholarship of engagement notion might be that faculty would be more efficacious in reaching promotion and tenure expectations. In essence, promoting scholarship of engagement across disciplines might lead to new ways of thinking about institutional promotion and tenure processes.

There is much that can be researched in the realm of service. Both the AAHE-ERIC monograph (2003) and the Neumann and Terosky (2007) study repeatedly cited the need for research to link faculty service with student learning outcomes – that is, aligning the candidate

proficiencies of an institution's conceptual framework with the expectations for faculty service. This is particularly important for future teacher educators given the requirement by both accreditation bodies (NCATE and TEAC) to critically review unit operations and efficacy of faculty roles.

Based on the literature cited above, there are three goals for engaging in service: (a) furthering the institutional mission, (b) increasing faculty scholarly knowledge, and (c) increasing faculty teaching skill. Research could focus on whether and how faculty service fulfills these goals. Service which effectively and efficiently connects institutions to the community may well be the impetus for much needed reform. Just as teacher education has taken a leadership role on campuses in fulfilling national accreditation standards for candidate assessment and unit evaluation, initiatives for assessing student learning outcomes across disciplines, may be the logical place to start for faculty service reforms in the scholarship of engagement.

## CONCLUSION

### *What Teacher Educators Need to Know and Be Able to Do*

When reviewing the literature on teacher educators' roles and responsibilities, it is quite apparent that education faculty have a myriad of roles and responsibilities that they must fulfill in order to be effective teacher educators and agents of change in P-12 classrooms. Teacher educators not only need to understand and know how to teach their professional education content, but they must also know how to create and perpetuate effective teacher education programs. This means they need the skills to work collaboratively in departmental meetings in order to continue the development and evaluation of teacher education programs (Darling-Hammond, 2006). They also need to know how to integrate field experiences with coursework

and how to work with other departments and schools; this requires them to have the skills required of a teacher, supervisor, advisor, mentor, collaborator, and advocate (Darling-Hammond, 2006).

According to the literature, teacher educators also need to possess certain dispositions and be able to explicitly model these dispositions to teacher candidates. Darling-Hammond (2006) argued that teacher education faculty “must not only be good teachers and scholars of teaching committed to a greater agenda, but also [be] collaborative in their practice” (p. 298). These dispositions, as well as providing and receiving feedback from colleagues, evaluating their own teaching performance and having it evaluated by others demonstrates to teacher candidates the importance of these dispositions in effective teaching (Bullock, 2007; Darling-Hammond, 2006).

If teacher educators want to truly affect the learning and teaching that takes place in P-12 classrooms, they must practice what they preach. If teacher educators want to change the beliefs and behaviors of teacher candidates, then they must change how they treat teacher candidates in order to mirror this relationship. According to the reviewed literature, teachers must not only model good teaching, but also good scholarship. They must model the importance of using research to guide their practices. They must model the importance of acquiring new skills in order to deal effectively with the dilemmas of teaching in becoming adaptive experts. They must model that teaching is a profession beyond the classroom. All of these essential competencies require that teacher educators possess the acumen and confidence to acknowledge areas for further development which should ultimately result in enhanced learning by and relationships with candidates. Teacher educators must be willing to examine their own thoughts, attitudes, and

behaviors in order to determine whether their beliefs and actions are what they intend for candidates to possess and exhibit.

### *Implications for the Preparation of Teacher Educators*

The knowledge, skills, and dispositions that teacher educators need to possess do not come naturally to the majority of teacher educators. Through planned instructional and field experiences, prospective teacher educators need to acquire the following:

- (1) an understanding of adult learning and teacher development theories;
- (2) an understanding of rationales for using specific promising teaching pedagogies;
- (3) skills for monitoring what their candidates need professionally and personally;
- (4) skills for establishing, cultivating, and maintaining close relationships with schools and other external constituents;
- (5) skills for collaborating and working with stakeholders;
- (6) skills for networking with others in the field and the broader educational community;
- (7) skills for effective program development and evaluation;
- (8) skills for developing and evaluating conceptual frameworks;
- (9) skills for designing coursework aligned with conceptual frameworks;
- (10) skills for explicitly modeling teacher behaviors, dispositions, and decision-making;
- (11) their mission for being a teacher educator and their philosophy of learning and teaching;
- (12) an understanding of the literature of teacher education, its theories, and practices;
- (13) understand and be able to apply the multiple dimensions of quantitative and qualitative research methods and be savvy consumers of research;
- (14) skills to disseminate their research findings through conference presentations and scholarly publications, and to translate their research into classroom practices; and

- (15) an understanding of how to guide future researchers in the profession and the ethics of advising future researchers.

By reviewing these implications it is quite evident that there is a base of knowledge that teacher educators should have in order to enter the professoriate. Teachers of teachers cannot just transfer their knowledge to teacher candidates if they want to be effective. They need specific preparation and guided practice in order to grow and develop into teacher educators. Some say that all of these roles (research, teaching, service, and advising) are impossible for teacher educators to perform (Ben-Peretz, 2001), but they are necessary roles if we want to demonstrate the realities of teaching teacher candidates.

#### *Implications for Future Research regarding Teacher Educators*

As both Grossman (2005) and Zeichner (2005a) have noted, the research regarding teacher educators is quite new and thus limited. The field is ripe for inquiry that will not only determine the degree to which teacher educators have an impact on teacher candidates and ultimately on the education of P-12 students, but will enable further exploration of the characteristics of high quality teachers across the spectrum of life stages. Future research can take several avenues based on the roles that have been explored here, including:

- (1) the preparation of teacher educators;
- (2) the pedagogies teacher educators use and how these influence the methods that teacher candidates use in their classrooms;
- (3) the dispositions held by teacher educators and the impact of those beliefs and attitudes on teacher candidates;
- (4) the emotionality of teacher preparation classrooms and how those settings affect the environments created by beginning teachers in their own classrooms;

- (5) how teacher educators balance teaching and service with research, especially at very high research institutions;
- (6) how Glassick et al's re-conceptualization of scholarship plays out in promotion and tenure decisions;
- (7) the perceptions of higher education administrators and faculty in regards to the value of research, teaching, and scholarship;
- (8) the perceptions of teacher educators as to how well faculty were prepared for these roles;
- (9) how faculty service links with teacher candidate learning; and
- (10) how faculty involvement in service furthers the mission of an institution, increases scholarly knowledge among the faculty, and increases the teaching skills of faculty.

## References

- Allan, P. & Dory, J. (2001). Understanding doctoral program attrition: An empirical study. Working Paper.
- ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. (2003). Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. Retrieved October 25, 2007 from Wilson Web database.
- Association of Teacher Educators (2007). *Standards for Teacher Educators Draft February 5, 2007*.
- Bair, C. & Haworth, J. (1999). Doctoral student attrition and persistence: A meta-synthesis of research. *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, USA, 24*, 1-48.
- Beri, M. & Griffith, B. (2005). What does it mean to question? *Interchange*, 36(4), 405-430.
- Bowen, W. & Rudenstine, N. (1992). *In pursuit of the PhD*. NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brown, R. & Krager, L. (1985). Ethical issues in graduate education: Faculty and student responsibilities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 56(4), 403-418.
- Bullock, S. M. (2007). Finding my way from teacher to teacher educator: valuing innovative pedagogy and inquiry into practice. In T. Russell and J. Loughran (Eds.) *Enacting a Pedagogy of Teacher Education: Values, Relationships, and Practices* (pp. 77 – 94). New York: Routledge.
- Christensen, D. (1996). The professional knowledge-research base for teacher education. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 38-52). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). Teacher educators as researchers: Multiple perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 219-225.

- Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249-305.
- Cohen, P. (2006). The writing on the wall: Doctoral education in Texas and elsewhere. *Change*, 38(6), 42-48.
- Dale, E. (1930). The training of Ph.D's. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 1(4), 198-202.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: what teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dillard, C., Abdur-Rashid, Tyson, C. (2000). My soul is a witness: Affirming pedagogies of the spirit. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(5), 447-462.
- Di Pierro, M. (2007). Excellence in doctoral education: Defining best practices. *College Student Journal*, 41(2), 368-375.
- Ducharme, E. & Ducharme, M. (1996). Needed research in teacher education. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 1030-1046). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Fenstermacher, G. (1994). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in research on teaching. In Darling-Hammond, L (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education*, Vol. 20, (pp. 3-56). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Glassick, C., Huber, M., & Maeroff, G. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Golde, C. (2000). Should I stay or should I go? Student descriptions of the doctoral attrition process. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23(2), 199-227.

- Golde, C. (2005). The role of the department and discipline in doctoral student attrition: Lessons from four departments. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(6), 669-700.
- Golde, C. & Dore, T. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of doctoral students reveal about doctoral education*. Retrieved July 27, 2007, from [www.phd-survey.org](http://www.phd-survey.org). Philadelphia, PA: A report for The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Grossman, P. (2005). Research on pedagogical approaches in teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith and K. M. Zeichner (Eds.) *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 425 – 476). Washington, D.C.: AERA.
- Grundy, S. & Hatton, E. (1995). Teacher educators' ideological discourses. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 21(1), 7-24.
- Henderson, B. & Buchanan, H. (2007). The scholarship of teaching and learning: A special niche for faculty at comprehensive universities? *Research in Higher Education*, 48(5), 523-543.
- Herzig, A. (2004). Becoming mathematicians: Women and students of color choosing and leaving doctoral mathematics. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(2), 171-214.
- Hollingsworth, M. & Fassinger, R. (2002). The role of faculty mentors in the research training of counseling psychology doctoral students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49(3), 324-330.
- Kane, R. (2007). From naïve practitioner to teacher educator and researcher: constructing a personal pedagogy of teacher education. In T. Russell and J. Loughran (Eds.) *Enacting a Pedagogy of Teacher Education: Values, Relationships, and Practices* (pp. 60 – 76). New York: Routledge.

- Katz, E. (1995). The Dissertation: Academic Interruptus. *The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.*
- Kessler, C. (2007). A teacher of teachers. In T. Russell and J. Loughran (Eds.) *Enacting a Pedagogy of Teacher Education: Values, Relationships, and Practices* (pp. 124 – 137). New York: Routledge.
- Kluever, R. (1995). ABDs and graduates form a college of education: Responsibility, barriers, and facilitators. *The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.*
- Kleuver, R. (1997). Students' attitudes towards the responsibilities and barriers in doctoral education. *New Directions for Higher Education, 99*, 47-56.
- 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.
- Koster, B., Brekelmans, M., Korthagen, F., & Wubbels, T. (2005). Quality requirements for teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 157-176.
- Kremer-Hoyan, L. & Zuzovsky, R. (1995). Themes, processes, and trends in the professional development of teacher educators. In T. Russell and F. Korthagen (Eds.) *Teachers who Teach Teachers: Reflections of Teacher Education* (pp. 155 – 171). London: Falmer Press.
- Lenz, K. (1995). Factors affecting the completion of the doctoral dissertation for non-traditional aged women. *The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.*

- Lovitts, B. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: The causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study*. MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Lunenberg, M., Korthagen, F., & Swennen, A. (2006). The teacher educator as a role model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 586 – 601.
- Malone, B., Nelson, J., & Nelson, C. (2004). Academic and affective factors contributing to degree completion of doctoral students in educational administration. *The Teacher Educator*, 40(1), 33-55.
- Marsh, H.W. & Hattie, J. (2002). The relation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness: Complementary, antagonistic, or independent constructs? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 603 – 641.
- Menand, L. (2001). *The metaphysical club: A story of ideas in America*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Mullen, C. (2007). Trainers, illusionists, tricksters, and escapists: Changing the doctoral circus. *The Education Forum*, 71(4), 300-315.
- Murray, J. & Male, T. (2004). Becoming a teacher educator: Evidence from the field. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 125-142.
- National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2007). Revised standards. Retrieved October 25, 2007 from <http://www.ncate.org/documents/standards/UnitStandardsMay07.pdf>.
- National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2008). Retrieved January 10, 2008 from <http://www.ncate.org>.
- Nelson, C. & Lovitts, B. (2001). 10 ways to keep graduate students from quitting. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 47(42), 20.

- Neumann, A., Terosky, A. L., (2007). To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities. *Journal of Higher Education*, 78, 282-310.
- Paulsen, M. & Feldman, K. (1995). Toward a reconceptualization of scholarship: A human action system with functional imperatives. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66(6), 615.
- Rieg, S, & Helderbran, V. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator. *Education*, 126(1), 47-54.
- Schlosser, L., Knox, S., Moskovitz, A., & Hill, C. (2003). A qualitative examination of graduate advising relationships: The advisee perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50(2), 178-188.
- Sikula, J. (1996). *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Smallwood, C. (2006). The bumpy path to the Ph.D. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(31), 1.
- Smallwood, S. (2004). Doctor dropout. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(19), 10-12.
- Smallwood, S. (2005). Graduate schools are urged to look outward to help society. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(9), 21.
- Smagorinsky, P., Augustine, S., & Gallas, K. (2006). Rethinking rhizomes in writing about research. *The Teacher Educator*, 42(2), 87-105.
- Tang, T.L. & Chamberlain, M. (1997). Attitudes toward research and teaching: Differences between administrator and faculty members. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68, 212 – 227.
- Tate, P. (1993). The two worlds of teaching. *Journal of Education*, 175(3), 15-29.
- Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). (1997). Quality principles. Retrieved October 25, 2007 from <http://www.teac.org/accreditation/goals/index.asp>.

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). (2008). Retrieved January 10, 2008 from <http://www.teac.org>.

Tinberg, H., Duffy, D., & Mino, J. (2007). The scholarship of teaching and learning at the two-year college: Promise and peril. *Change*, 39(4), 26-29.

Ward, K. (1998). Addressing academic culture: Service learning, organizations, and faculty work. *New directions for teaching and learning*, 73, 73-80.

Wright, M. (2005). Always at odds? Congruence in faculty beliefs about teaching at a research university. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76, 331 – 353.

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

Zeichner, K. M. (2005a). A research agenda for teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith and K. M. Zeichner (Eds.) *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 737 – 760). Washington, D.C.: AERA.

Zeichner, K. (2005b). Becoming a teacher educator: A personal perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 117-124.