

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ISRAELI AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TEACHER TRAINERS ON SOCKETT'S FOUR MODELS OF TEACHER EDUCATION

¹James E. HOLLENBECK, ²Hanna EZER, ²Miriam MEVORACH

Indiana University Southeast, USA

Levinsky College of Education, ISRAEL

Abstract. This study examined the beliefs of teacher educators and their impact on pre-service teachers as they entered the profession and identified commonalities between Israel and the United States teacher education programs. 150 teacher educators were surveyed from a cross section of teacher educators on Hugh Sockett's four teaching models proposed for teacher preparation from Israel and the United States. The research queried three questions: (1) teacher educators' evaluation of the field of teacher education, (2) beliefs regarding the four basic components of teacher education as described by Sockett, and (3) beliefs regarding teacher education in the institution they taught.

Keywords: teacher education, Sockett's professional models, American education, Israeli education, education reform. teacher education reform

Introduction

Teacher education is at crossroads with many coexisting models world-wide. The United States and Israel are among the leaders in education reforms in teacher education. The reforms in Israel are guided by a centralized authority, and in the United States the reforms are lead by a coalition of 50 state government departments of education, state universities and other institutes of higher learning, a multitude of non-government agencies and thousands of local school districts across the nation. Teacher reform agendas may stem from “grassroots” that is from the bottom up with teacher educators working with teachers directly, or from private corporations with their own agendas.

Previous literature searches have been insignificant of comparative studies in teacher training, and especially between the United States and Israel. This research surveyed 150 American and Israeli teacher educators on their perceptions of teacher education using the four professional models described by Sockett (2008) in teacher education. A comparative study between the United States and Israel was done because both nations are examining their teacher education methodology, and most importantly, because of shared values and experiences. Both nations have been founded on the basis of immigration, and are composed of multicultural components coming together as one heterozygous culture centered on education.

A central issue in education for both Israel and the United States is the relationship between teacher quality and the nature of teacher education (Cochran-Smith, 2005). Cochran-Smith & Fries (2001) presented two approaches to teacher education in the United States of America (USA).

The first approach views the teacher as the professional. This first model advocates the creation of academic standards, and consideration of the age of the learner. This model reflects extensive institutional teacher

education programs with academic standards. In Israel and the USA, teaching is viewed as a dynamic profession that requires teacher candidates to develop practical-reflective experience as an ongoing process of on-the-job training, shifting from the practical to the theoretical applications over time (Heibert et al., 2002; Margolin & Enzer, 2003; Moore, 2004).

This process of organized teacher education departs from the craft knowledge methodology in which knowledge was imparted to the student and the student became the master of the “craft” (Moore, 2004) and would in turn pass on the information in lectures and assignments (Korthage & Kessels, 1999). This produces a system very accountable to the ministries and departments of education and provides direct influence on teacher education.

The second approach to teacher education is the movement to deregulate teacher education, and the “schools” of teacher education. This movement is growing in support in the United States by direct and indirect actions. One attempt at this approach is the introduction to alternate licensure in many states. Indiana, for example, has a transition to teaching program which allows one to become a teacher if they possess a bachelor degree, a qualifying grade point average and successfully completes the Praxis Exams by the Education Testing Services. Kentucky allows candidates various paths to certification i.e.: military service, transition to teaching or utilization of foreign training. Some politicians have called for the dismantling of teacher education programs and disbanding the monopoly of teacher education that the profession has enjoyed “too long” (Cochran-Smith, 2001; Hollenbeck, 2008). According to Cochran-Smith & Fries (2001) this regulatory approach contends that the demands for professional licensure and for the schools of education constitute an unnecessary restraint that deters talented people out of the teaching field, and instead focuses on social goals rather than academic achievement. This approach is consistent with the professional point of view that perceives the teacher as a charismatic subject (Moore, 2004) and believes

that good teaching is not a matter of education and training; rather it is associated with the teacher's personality and inner qualities. According to this view, charisma is not an acquired characteristic, so there is no need for protracted teacher training.

Bouwer & Korthage (2005) support the approach advocating professionalism in teaching and using research results to improve teacher education. These authors believe in bridging the gap between practice and theory. This bridging will require a life-long commitment to renewal and greater application of the practical knowledge base than the theoretical knowledge base. This belief is based on studies that have shown what is learned in theoretical studies does not transfer to the practical field, and new teachers must undergo a process of survival that is not related to what they learned during their teacher preparation (Hollenbeck, 1999). He found in research teachers provided with extensive practical experience prior to student teaching and a rigorous and sound academic preparation in the student's content area, have a significant advantage in their first five years of teaching.

The process is consistent with the notion of teaching as a practical-reflective occupation in which the knowledge required of the student-teacher involves knowing how to function in "real-time" teaching situations so the transition between theory and practice must be seamless when "on-the-job", moving back and over time (Korthagen & Kessels, 1999; Margolin & Ezer, 2003). Heibert et al. (2002) also believe in the need for a knowledge base that grows and develops out of practical experience. They advocate the teacher-as-a-researcher movement, according to which teachers should develop professionally by expanding their knowledge in practice – primarily by researching their own practical experience. In this context, Korthagen & Kessels (1999) propose a teacher education model composed of acting, looking back, being aware and creating alternative methods of action and trial. Instituting a teacher education program that considers practical issues will

lead to close cooperation between schools and colleges of education. This program will enhance the role of teacher education mentoring.

The preceding discussions are best summed up by the four models of moral and epistemological purposes proposed by Sockett (2006). They are: (i) the scholar-professional; (ii) the nurturer-professional; (iii) the reflective-adaptive professional or the clinician professional; and (iv) the moral agent-professional or the moral change professional.

The first model, the scholar-professional, regards the acquisition of knowledge as the focus of education, and the teacher should be dedicated to imparting knowledge and fostering the life of the mind. The moral purpose here is tradition and conventional virtue. The epistemological purpose for teacher educators and teachers is the unique character of the disciplines and their inter-relation to other disciplines with an understanding about the nature of knowledge.

The moral purpose of education in the tradition of the scholar-professional is to address the classical, historical and conventional needs of society. The acquisition of knowledge is virtuous and preserves a democratic society of “good” people. Students are guided by mentors towards intellectual autonomy, and will form moral choices by examination of the classics, and will act to do right by being guided to making the right decisions. This method of teaching is best demonstrated by seminar teaching reserved for advance placement level classes at the secondary level and post-secondary education. The scholar-professional requires the students to attain a rigorous understanding of one or more disciplines within a conceptual framework providing intellectual virtue and the belief that moral virtue will inevitably follow (Sockett, 2006).

The nurturer-professional model is concerned about the development of the individual. The teacher is focused on development of relationships with the learner. The teacher becomes as a parent of *in loco parentis* as the mother.

The teaching encompasses intuition and “personal embodiment of a pedagogical thoughtfulness”. Teaching is centered on individual nurture: care or tact demands self-understanding of the teacher and the discipline knowledge is equal in importance to the reason why the learning is important to the learner.

This role of the nurturer has been largely displaced by the process of due-process in teacher-parent relationships. Much of theory of the nurturer has been shifted from the neutral “good parent” to not of the father or mother but the *mother* (Sockett, 2006). The emphasis is rooted in the feminism of the 20th century, developed by Betty Feidan and others. Their premise is that women did not think about moral issues in terms of rules and principles, but in terms of relationships. Teaching becomes concerned about caring rather than social ends.

The major concepts described by Sockett (2006) based on Noddings’ (1984) research of a relationship is established on: (a) the student and teacher must be open to each other; (b) a trust must be built between the teacher and student; (c) mutual understanding between the teacher and student has to be present.

Furthermore, in later work, Noddings (1992) argues that liberal traditional education does not provide the best education for everyone because it: (d) overemphasizes rationality and abstract reasoning; (e) fosters the belief that academic excellence is superior to other kinds of abilities; and (f) undervalues the values and capacities associated with women.

This model allows for more autonomy and freedom for the teacher than the other models proposed by Sockett, and may be best used in an alternative educational setting. This alternative setting may be for students unable to learn in a mainstream setting, or are delinquent or other reasons outside the public classroom. Home schooling is one such possibility for this model.

The reflective-adaptive model, or the clinician professional, is the third model described by Sockett, and is perhaps the most widely practiced by teacher educators and teachers. This model was developed from an account of the work performed by public school teachers in a democratic society. This methodology emphasizes teaching to a social purpose with social justice with socialization as the educational aim (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). The curriculum in this model focus on how teachers learn, especially those practices that influence student learning and what teaching strategies are developmentally most appropriate for students. The curriculum in this model is based on knowledge of subject matter, pedagogical content knowledge, and an understanding of the social dynamics of schooling. Understanding of the curriculum from holistic view encourages the individual student-teacher curricular vision which guides learning. Sockett's (2006) research discovered that the success of the teacher adapting and understanding is grounded on their learning experience in the classroom.

Much of what has been learned about this teaching model has been gained by research of learning by medical professionals. The teacher educator described in this model act as a clinician, i.e. a person who reflectively uses research-based methods to guide apprentice teachers to learn the craft of teaching. This model is practiced throughout the world for teacher training.

Sockett's fourth model, the moral agent professional accepts the prior three conflicting education models and regards none of them as having priority since its focus is on teaching as primarily, predominantly, and comprehensively a moral activity. The model describes the teacher having a moral purpose on the child's comprehensive development and growth with attention to academic study with intellectual and moral virtues, such as accuracy, consistency, courage, and open-mindedness (Noddings, 1984; Sockett, 1993; 2006). Proponents of this model believe that educational engagement is a specific challenge in the student's development for which

teachers are given a moral authority to shape. The teaching of the morals is the most important task the teacher is entrusted with, and the means are secondary and justified through the goals. The teacher will not withdraw from the moral obligation or commitments of the role, as they are totally dedicated to the cause (Sockett, 2006). The moral cause directs the curriculum, subject matter, teacher's role and the individual outcome for each student.

Sockett writes that in order for the moral agent to be developed, teacher education must center itself on the process of self discovery. The teacher develops their identity from doing the task teaching, and examining their personal commitments and values. Teachers are not shaped from an adherence to professional norms. Teachers will guide their students in shaping their values by student self discovery by facilitating learning discipline, classroom experience, community service, or the arts and crafts of democratic practices in the classroom (Hansen, 2001; Sockett, 2006). Moral identity is not simply taught, but must be modeled by the teacher educator and in turn "modeled" in the classroom for students to observe, emulate and demonstrate. These values must be embraced and practiced by the institutions that profess to possess these values of sincerity, care, integrity, honesty, empathy, imaginativeness and courage (moral and intellectual). Moral change in teacher education starts with teacher trainers and their institutions. Research shows that teachers teach the way they learned their craft (Hollenbeck, 1999).

Methodology

A mixed method study - qualitative and quantitative (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004), was used to learn about the teacher educators in both countries. In this case we are able to combine qualitative data which can provide narrative information with quantitative data. Mixed methods research also brings the use of multiple approaches in answering research questions, rather than restricting or constraining the respondents' answers and choices,

which provide the study a more complete view of the questions. Mixed methods research also lends well to triangulation between obtained and interpreted data.

In Israel, 75 participants from different teaching disciplines in colleges of education around the country were surveyed. In the United States, 75 respondents also from teacher education faculties were queried. The American model was kept at 75 participants to balance the study with the Israeli number of participants. The 75 American participants were selected from a national pool from 32 states from all regions of the United States to achieve a cross section of teacher trainers at the post-secondary level of education. Teacher training institutes surveyed included: major research institutions, comprehensive universities and small liberal arts colleges. In the United States we also measured the number of responses by gender and found that there were 41 responses from female and 34 from male faculty. When the data was compared, there were no significant differences in responses by gender.

The questionnaire was specifically designed for this study, validated through a pilot study, and distributed among the teacher educators anonymously. The questionnaire was designed to be quickly completed and returned by participants in order to achieve our targeted goal of 150 participants in a timely manner. The results from the questionnaires were tabulated in aggregate sums for both Israel and the United States studies.

The three questions

How do you evaluate of the field of teacher education?

In order to learn how the teacher educators evaluate education, each question was ranked on a three point scale: low (1), medium (2) and high (3).

- Is teacher education an important field in your country?
- How do you rank your knowledge regarding teacher education?

- How do you rank yourself as someone who works effectively in the field of education?
- How would you rank the quality of teacher education in the colleges of education in your country?
- How do you rank the quality of teacher education in the college of education where you work?

What are your beliefs regarding the four basic components of teacher education?

An open-ended question was used to identify the beliefs regarding the basic components of teacher education.

What do you believe regarding teacher education at the institution where you teach?

A structured question with given components was used to measure the teachers perspectives regarding teacher education in the college where they work.

Results

The results of the study are presented in the three themes of inquiry: evaluation of the field of teacher education, beliefs regarding basic components of teacher education, and beliefs regarding teacher education in the institution where the respondents work.

Question 1: evaluation of the field of teacher education

This research surveyed 150 American and Israeli teacher educators on their perceptions of teacher education using the four professional models described by Sockett (2008) in teacher education. The frequency distribution was used to analyze the data for these questions. The results in Table 1 were converted into percentages for easier interpretation for reader.

Table 1. Comparative data between Israeli and American educators on teacher preparation

Question	Israeli sample N=75			American sample N=75		
	<i>L</i> <i>o</i> <i>w</i>	<i>Me</i> <i>diu</i> <i>m</i>	<i>Hi</i> <i>gh</i>	<i>L</i> <i>o</i> <i>w</i>	<i>Me</i> <i>diu</i> <i>m</i>	<i>Hi</i> <i>gh</i>
1. Is teacher education an important field in your country?	21	19	60	5	15	80
2. How do you rank your knowledge regarding teacher education?	10	17	73	0	22	78
3. How do you rank yourself as someone who works effectively in the field of teacher education?	6	25	69	0	17	83
4. How would you rank the quality of teacher education in the colleges of education in your country?	1	25	74	21	60	19
5. How would you rank the quality of teacher education in the colleges of education where you work?	0	20	80	0	15	85

In Table 1 a simple ranking questionnaire reveals those teacher educators in Israel and the USA consider the field of teacher education to be very important, with the Americans ascribing greater importance to it. The Americans (80%) gave the role of teacher education high importance and only 5% regarded teacher education as a low priority. Only 60% of Israelis surveyed ranked education to be a high priority. Knowledge of teacher education was ranked fairly even by the Israeli and Americans within five percent in high and medium rankings. Both Americans and Israeli teacher educators rank their effectiveness as teacher educators to be very effective as well, with Americans more confident of their effectiveness as teacher educators. No American re-

garded them to be in the low category in their skills, or being ineffective in teacher education.

Teacher rankings of five statements on perceptions of teacher education in Israel and the United States (responses in percentages)

In regards to teacher education in the United States in general, Americans are more critical of their teacher education programs than their Israeli counterparts. Americans (81%) ranked teacher education as a medium to low priority, with only 19% offering a strong vote of confidence in teacher training. The Israeli sample was much more optimistic as no one's survey indicated that teacher preparation as a low priority, and 74% ranked teacher training to be of high priority.

When asked about teacher training at the respondent's home institution, both Americans and Israelis believed that their institution provided a high quality program. No one reported their program as a low ranking program. The only question that received a large number of negative responses (low) was on judgment of other programs. The Israeli teacher trainers were more critical of the statement "Is teacher education an important field in your country?" This difference may be a result of cultural differences between the two nations.

Question 2: beliefs regarding basic components of teacher education

The question "What do you believe are the four basic components of teacher education?" enabled us to examine which teacher education model is employed in Israel and the USA. This open-ended question was analyzed by the means of content analysis, using Sockett's (2008) four models of teacher education: (a) the scholar professional; (b) the nurture professional; (c) the reflective-adaptive professional or the clinician professional; (d) the moral agent professional or moral change agent.

The responses to the question regarding the four models of teacher education for the Nurturing Professional, Reflective-Adaptive Professional, and Moral Agent Professional were similar in responses for both the Israeli and American professors. The American professors had the tendency to view teacher education as the Scholar Professional Model, their primary view of teacher education, but in actual practice the Reflective-Adaptive Professional became the real model sought after for evaluative purposes, and the other two models were perceived as being of less importance. The reason for the emphasis on the Reflective-Adaptive Professional in the USA is due to the required teacher exams over content in many states and new education policies being implemented at the national level.

The scholar professional in content areas

Teacher educators in Israel rank the Scholar Professional as a basic model of education for teacher education. Two components are mentioned with regard to this model: enrichment of knowledge in a computer-mediated environment, and the increase in the level of professional teacher education in the relevant content knowledge of teaching.

American educators have a greater tendency to relate to this model based on the fact that most colleges of education require an academic concentration for secondary teachers and many states now require teacher education candidates to successfully complete content knowledge exams as a condition to receive teaching licensure. The American teacher educators stress, for example: (i) content knowledge applications in K-12 settings and knowledge of schooling in America; (ii) knowledge-based mastery and acquisition; (iii) understanding content and process knowledge of discipline to be taught; (iv) curricular knowledge; (v) competencies in content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge; (vi) academic excellence.

The nurturing professional

The Israeli teacher educators relate to the development of a nurturing teacher. They expressed an emphasis on interpersonal communication skills that would nurture “the acceptance of the other, multiculturalism and the love of mankind”. They listed these qualities that would support their perceptions of a nurturing professional: (i) the ability of listen and demonstrate sensitivity towards others; (ii) communicative skills; (iii) the ability to cope with various behavior problems and changing teaching environments; (iv) the ability to increase the pupil’s motivation; (v) the ability to help the pupils realize their competences and personalities; (vi) the ability to work in teams and cooperate in learning endeavors at all levels.

The American teacher educators recognized this quality to be a basic component of teacher education. They integrated into the Nurturing Professional the concept of multiculturalism and social awareness. They described the basic component with terms such as “flexibility”, “embracing all learners” and displaying empathy towards “developing self-potential and sensitivity to the ways students learn”. The strong commitment to multicultural inclusiveness for the American teacher educators is a result of living in a multicultural society that relishes all individuals.

The reflective-adaptive model

Many of the surveyed teacher educators related with this model. This is important to the student teacher’s personal development as well as to the development of teaching skills based on the personal abilities developed during the course of the training. Among the Israeli teacher educators, these abilities are part of the pedagogical skills. These skills involve classroom management skills, i.e.: leadership ability, willingness to accept responsibility, decision-making skills and curriculum planning and application. Personal aca-

demic qualities arise in this model, promoting independent thinking skills, self-learning and creativity.

The American teacher educators consider the components of this model to be basic properties of teacher education. The pedagogical aspects reflected in this model as described by the American teacher educators are: (i) Extensive field experience prior to student teaching. At Indiana University Southeast, our candidates complete over 100 clock hours; (ii) Solid teaching strategies grounded in theoretical knowledge; (iii) Critical inquiry, critical thinking, theory, research, cooperative learning, reflecting on “how we learn”; (iv) Encouragement of personal and professional reflection.

Teacher educators in the USA use the concept of learning-communities in many of their programs to encourage cohort learning and program development. Reflective portfolios are required by many teacher education programs as part of their assessment, and some states require portfolios as a part of their teaching licensure procedure.

The moral agent professional model

Teacher educators in Israel and the USA related to this model of teacher education. Israeli teacher educators related this model to involvement in the community and the development of values. For example: (i) nurturing a “virtuous” person who is involved in the community; (ii) making contributions to the community; (iii) increasing social involvement in the education field; (iv) establishing good relations with the field and the school; (v) familiarity with the teacher’s role at work and in the community.

Some of the teacher educators indicated “high level of openness”, “personal responsibility” and “commitment and dedication” as basic components of training.

The American teacher educators tend to see the components of this final category of moral perception with less interest than the Israelis. The

American responses concerning moral perceptions were: (vi) teachers should develop their own moral compass, but should be aware how they promote them to the students; (vii) cross-cultural experiences need to be respected and mindful of in the classroom; (viii) caution needs to be observed in the teaching of values in the classroom; (ix) human development needs to be included in education.

Since the USA is a multicultural society in regards to ethnicity, religion, and culture, American educators are careful to include all groups, and try not to ignore or offend anyone. The typical American classroom in a sense does not exist, as in each local area; there is an unique blend of cultures.

In the questionnaire, the teacher responded to the question “What are the basic components of the perceptions towards teacher education in the college/institution where you work?”

Table 2 presents the percentage of those who agree to a great or very great extent (5 or 6 on the ranking scale) with the roles presented. The distribution of the answers was calculated in percentages for each of the components presented to the teacher educators.

Question 3: Beliefs regarding teacher education in the institution where they teach

Table 2. Comparison of Israeli and American beliefs in teacher preparation

The Components	Israeli sample N=75	American sample N=75
Learning over the course of a lifetime/ Lifelong learning	81	96
Academic excellence	84	96
Promoting quality teaching among academic staff	77	88
Promoting cultural assets and universal values	63	92
Developing a technological infrastructures for teaching	75	83
Providing an educational response to the changing	66	88

needs of a pluralistic, multicultural society		
Involvement in the community	68	81
Fostering the development of students as educational leaders	68	82
Promoting the creativity of future teachers.	71	79
Reinforcing teaching experience throughout the course of study	79	70

Respondents who believe that the following components of teacher education are present in the institution in which they teach (responses in percentages)

The Table 2 shows that Americans ascribe greater importance to all of the components than the Israelis. The components most emphasized by the surveyed Americans (receiving greater than 85%) are listed: (a) learning over the course of a lifetime/Lifelong learning (96%); (b) academic excellence (96%); (c) promoting teaching among the academic staff (88%); (d) providing an educational response to the changing needs of a pluralistic, multicultural society (88%).

The Israeli teacher educators ranked as high (above 80%) the following: (e) academic excellence (84%); (f) learning over the course of a lifetime/lifelong learning (81%).

In summation, the field of teacher education in the Israeli colleges with a centralized education system and a national curriculum emphasizes the academic professional more than the moral and value-based components.

The American teacher trainers and the universities are faced with a complex task. At present, there is no national curriculum or a centralized education command. Each of the 50 states has their own education oversight, and each school district/corporation in each state is in charge of their own mission. Therefore, the colleges of education must achieve excellence in as many areas as they can. With a changing economy, a multicultural society, it behooves teacher preparation to be a comprehensive and complex process in the USA.

American teachers must be academically prepared, and be a moral and value-oriented agent.

Discussion

This research investigated how teacher educators perceive current teacher education practice in Israel and the USA. One of the ways to examine teacher perceptions is by means of a local, particular and idiosyncratic approach that focuses more on people and their beliefs, values, perspectives, attitudes, ideas and practices, and explains the individual's hidden understanding standings (Cole & Knowles, 2000). Taking this into account, this paper examined teacher educators' conceptions about teacher education in general and in their teaching institutions in particular.

Based on the data presented by this research, in Table 1, educators in Israel and the USA generally ascribed importance to the field of teacher education, with the American educators giving considerable more support to the statement 80% to 60% high. The Israeli educators were more critical 20% to 5% agreement to that there was low importance on teacher education. There is a tendency of the American teacher educators to rank themselves as effective teacher educators and their own schools of education of being high quality more positive than their Israeli colleagues. Ten percent of the surveyed Israeli educators were critical of their self knowledge of teacher education, whereas the Americans showed little self-criticism. The Israeli teacher educators gave all of their peer's higher marks than their American colleagues. The Americans were more critical of other schools of education. Table 1 indicates that American teacher educators are more secure about their profession and their schools of education than their Israeli counterparts.

Table 2 addresses the components of teacher education by surveying the perception of the teacher educators in Israel and the USA which corresponds to the teacher education models proposed by Sockett (2008). It seems

that the general perceptions of teacher educators in Israel and the USA differ. There were several differences: (A) The greatest gap between the percent totals between the Israeli and American educators was 29 and 22 points in the categories that listed “promoting cultural assets and universal values” and “providing an educational response to the changing needs of a pluralistic and multicultural society”; (B) The areas that the Israeli teacher educators place most important (>80%) were: academic excellence and lifelong learning; (C) The Americans placed greatest importance (90%) on academic excellence, lifelong learning, and promoting culture assets and universal values; (D) The least valued component for the Americans is reinforcing teaching experience throughout the course of study (70%).

On the explicit level educators in both countries relate to existing models of teacher training described by Sockett. The American teacher educators emulate the reflective-adaptive model which emphasizes teaching to a social purpose with social justice and socialization. Israeli teacher educators emphasize the scholar-professional model. The American teacher educators are moving toward a perception of the subject-matter as the central component of training, and the Israelis toward a perception of pedagogy as their central focus of teacher training. These differences are likely due to demographic, social and cultural differences that exist between Israel and the USA.

In Israel, a teaching certificate constitutes a part of the Bachelor of Education studies, with the degree concentration in teaching practices and pedagogy. In the USA, the emphasis is on an academic degree, with the education courses as a separate area of study and teaching licensure as a separate process, independent of the institution. In the USA, each state is responsible for the licensure of its educators. This means 50 states, and 50 sets of rules and procedures. The Department of Education at the federal level acts an advisory board.

Even with the differences in teaching licensure and certification, both American and Israeli educators ascribe importance to moral and value-based education models. The Israeli cohort perceives it as a model to aspire that is not realized as much as it should be practiced in the teacher education institutions in which they work. The Americans see the moral and value-based education implemented in their schools. This is attributed to the multicultural perception of political correctness that occupies an important place in education. In Israel, in contrast, value-based, multicultural nurturing is important and emphasized, but it is hardly implemented in practice during the course of teacher education (Ezer et al., 2006).

The teacher educators in Israel and the USA display knowledge of the existing professional models described by Sockett (2008) in teacher education. The Moral Agent Professional model is aspired to Israel, where according to the teacher educators' there is a discrepancy of what is reported and what is really occurring. In the analysis of the data from Table 2, the scholar-professional is the actual teaching model used by teachers and teacher trainers.

The schools of education in the USA are training teachers to be agents of the social change embedded in the prescribed reflective–adaptive model which is necessary with No Child Left Behind regulations and other new reforms i.e.: “Race to the Top” and other new developments that are being proposed. Both Israeli and American schools of education desire to move towards the scholar-professional model as the ideal model of teaching but in reality, a hybridization of the moral agent professional model with one of the other models will be formed to meet the demands of a multi-cultural society.

Conclusion

The research found that teacher educators in the United States tend to train teachers in the Reflective-Adaptive model to meet “Race to the Top” and “No Child Left Behind” regulations and other new reforms being proposed.

American teacher educators would prefer to use the Scholar-Professional model like Israeli teacher educators. Israeli teacher trainers aspire to implement the Moral Agent Professional model, but according to teacher educators' surveys there is a discrepancy of what is reported and what occurs in teacher education programs. Israeli and American schools of education desire to move to the model of the scholar-professional model. In reality for both nations, a hybridization of the Moral Agent professional model with the Reflective-Adaptive professional model which mirrors the high stakes examination environment and incorporates the multicultural needs is used to meet the demands of a multi-cultural society dependent on standardized exam scores.

REFERENCES

- Bouwer, N. & Korthage, F. (2005). Can teacher education make a difference. *American Educ. Res. J.*, 42, 153-224.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). The new teacher education: for better or for worse. *Educational Researcher*, 34(7), 3-17.
- Cochran-Smith, M. & Fries, M.K. (2001). Stick, stones and ideology: the discourse of reform in teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 30(8), 3-15.
- Cole, A.L. & Knowles, J.K. (2000). *Researching teaching; exploring teacher development through reflexive inquiry*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: what teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ezer, H., Millet, S. & Patkin, D. (2006). Voices of multicultural explorial experiences: personal narratives of three teacher educators. *Teacher Education & Practice*, 18, 55-73.
- Hansen, D. (2001). *Exploring the moral heart of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Heibert, J., Gallimore, R. & Stigler, J.W. (2002). A knowledge base for the teaching profession: what would it look like and how could we get one. *Educational Researcher*, 31(5), 3-15.
- Hollenbeck, J.E. (1999). *A five year study of the attitudes, perceptions, and philosophies of five secondary science education teachers prepared in the constructivist teaching methodology: UMI dissertation*: Ann Arbor: University of Iowa.
- Hollenbeck, J.E. (2008). Personal conversation with Dr. Tony Bennett, Superintendent of School. Utica: Greater Clark Schools.
- Johnson, R.B. & Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2004). Mixed methods research: a research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Korthagen, F.A. & Kessels, P.A.M. (1999). Linking theory and practice: changing the pedagogy of teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 28(4). 4-17.
- Margolin, I. & Ezer, H. (2003). The emergence of a teacher educators' community: open and hidden discourse. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 2(1) 61-78.
- Moore, A. (2004). *The good teacher: dominant discourses in teaching and teacher education*. London: Routledge.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: a feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: an alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sockett, H. (1993). *The Moral base for teacher professionalism*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sockett, H. (2006). *Teacher dispositions: building a teacher education framework of moral standards*. Washington: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Sockett, H. (2008). The moral and epistemic purposes of teacher education (pp. 45-65). In: Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman-Nemser, S., McIntyre, J.D. & Demers, K.E. (Eds.). *Handbook of research on teacher education*. New York: Routledge.

✉ Prof. James E. Hollenbeck (corresponding author)
Indiana University Southeast
New Albany, IN, USA
E-Mail: jehollen@ius.edu

✉ Hanna Ezer
Levinsky College of Education
Tel Aviv, Israel

✉ Miriam Mevorach
Levinsky College of Education
Tel Aviv, Israel

© 2014 BJSEP: Authors

