EMPIRICAL FEATURE ARTICLE

Becoming and being a critical language teacher educator: A duoethnography

Yasemin Tezgiden-Cakcak[1] 🄳 | Ufuk Ataş[2] 🄳

[1]Middle East Technical University

[2]Artvin Çoruh University

Abstract

Language teacher educator (LTE) identity development is an emerging field exploring how LTEs learn to teach and negotiate their identities and how their identity construction processes help teacher candidates learn. The complexity of the issue has prompted researchers to explore their professional journeys and experiences in various contexts from differing perspectives. Still, the field is constantly evolving as LTEs strive to understand the multifaceted nature of the profession and its implications for teacher education. Within this perspective, through a duoethnographic study, in this research the authors aim to explore how they construct, negotiate, and enact their critical LTE identities and agency as two Turkish-speaking, mid-career English language teacher educators situated currently in two different higher education institutions in Türkiye. The researchers collected lengthy personal narratives recounting their experiences and thematically analyzed them through iterative coding. Three major themes concerning their meso and micro contexts emerged: their trajectories in becoming LTEs, issues of belonging and marginalization, negotiating their LTE identities, and exercising agency. Their narratives indicate how they followed different trajectories to become teacher educators, were positioned as *others* in their institutional

settings, legitimized their LTE identities in time, and became empowered to practice their aspired identities. Despite being marginalized in different contexts, their narratives show they have consistently created counter-hegemonic discursive and experiential spaces in their classrooms and institutional contexts as micro-level policy-makers enacting their critical LTE identities.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Now that the field of language education has established a body of scholarship exploring language teacher identity (Barkhuizen, 2016; Norton, 2013; Varghese et al., 2016; Yazan & Lindahl, 2023), language teacher educator-researchers have started reflecting more systematically on their language teacher educator (LTE) identity development, and their central roles in educating, supervising, and supporting teacher candidates. The complexity of the issue has prompted researchers to explore their professional journeys in various contexts. These studies focus on defining LTEs and their negotiated and aspired identities (Barkhuizen, 2021), identities developed through the implementation of social justice–oriented curricula (López-Gopar et al., 2022), and identity construction in beginning LTEs (Trent, 2013). Studies also reflect autoethnographic accounts of transnational LTE (Fairley, 2023; Yazan, 2019), the link between individuals' autoethnographies and actual pedagogical practices (Kessler, 2023), duoethnographic accounts of critical LTE identities (Banegas & Gerlach, 2021), lived experiences in research, teaching, and practicum supervision of LTEs (Yuan & Lee, 2022), and identity negotiation using critical autoethnograpic narrative (Yazan, 2022b). These studies, underscoring the significance of context in LTEs' work and identities, reflect various journeys and unique voices shaped by factors such as educational background, teaching experience, beliefs about language and pedagogy, and personal and cultural influences. Power differentials come into play at macro/global and social levels, meso/institutional levels, and micro/classroom levels (De Costa & Norton, 2017) in interaction with social identity markers such as class, gender, race, and ability.

LTE identity is conceptualized as a fundamentally diverse and complex construct. Yazan (2022a) notes that "becoming a language TE requires developing an identity for it. That is, learning to teach and developing a teacher educator identity are two concomitant and interwoven processes" (p. 2). With this mindset, we argue that while the processes of learning how to teach, receiving education, and drawing from our diverse backgrounds are integral to our professional growth, they alone do not encapsulate the entirety of our identity development and ways of being and becoming LTEs. We also need to critically reflect on our evolving LTE identities, emotions, and agency in close interaction with the dominant discourses and power hierarchies. Therefore, we believe that we need more case studies and self-studies from LTEs investigating their own experiences of negotiating their identities and practicing teacher education at the nexus of macro, meso, and micro power differentials, especially in TESOL, where such individual voices are rare (Yuan & Lee, 2022).

Following Sawyer and Norris (2013), we aim to "[re]construct our narratives as [we] deconstruct them" (p. 4) through duoethnography, which enables us to collaboratively explore and elucidate the complex nature of our evolving roles and ongoing identity formation. Duoethnography

is a qualitative research methodology in which researchers work collaboratively and dialogically to bring about and question the meanings they assign to social issues and the associated epistemological underpinnings to reveal new insights about the topic at hand (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). This critical-reflexive exercise allows us to (re)examine our experiences in depth and in dialogue with each other (Banegas & Gerlach, 2021). It not only helps us reach ideological and epistemological clarity (Sharkey et al., 2021) about our identities, practices, and agency, but also emancipates us from "destructive power dynamics" (Fairley, 2023, p. 1). This includes identifying our feelings and the various coping strategies we employ to navigate the challenges that come along. As Song (2021) asserts, the emotional reactions of teacher educators' pedagogical decisions and sense of identity mediate their daily practices. Therefore, emotional reflexivity and self-exploration (Song, 2021) are also linked to LTE identity development.

Informed by the need and background of LTE identity development presented above, in this study we aim to explore how we construct, negotiate, and enact our critical LTE identities and agency as two mid-career language teacher educators situated currently in two different higher education institutions in Türkiye. As we question our LTE identities and the ways of becoming and being, we also recognize and acknowledge the emotional dimensions inherent in questioning our identities. The following research question guides our study: How do we construct, negotiate, and enact our critical language teacher educator identities and agency in two higher education contexts in Türkiye? The article is organized as follows. We first define the conceptual background, focusing on LTE identity, agency, and critical LTE. Then, we present the details of the methodology. Following that, we present and discuss our critical narratives. Lastly, we discuss the implications of our findings on critical LTE identity development.

2 | CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

2.1 | Language teacher educator identity

The significance of LTE identity development has recently gained recognition within the broader literature of teacher educator professional development, signaling a shift toward a more detailed understanding of the multifaceted nature of LTE identities (Barkhuizen, 2021; Yazan, 2022a). Teacher educator identities are complex, dynamic, and multifaceted as they "reflect an unstable and ever-shifting weave of personal and professional phenomena" (Dinkelman, 2011, p. 309). They are shaped not only by how LTEs position themselves but also by their colleagues and the institutional context (Dinkelman, 2011; Yazan, 2018). Following Yazan (2022a), in this study we adopt Akkerman and Meijer's (2011) definition of professional identity as "an ongoing process of negotiating and interrelating multiple I-positions in such a way that a more or less coherent and consistent sense of self is maintained through various participations and self-investments in one's (working) life" (pp. 317–318), which are shaped at the nexus of dominant ideologies and discourses and our past experiences and future aspirations. Depending on the interaction of macro, meso, and micro contexts with the individual personal experiences, beliefs, and ideals, LTEs develop and negotiate multiple I-positions as educators of content knowledge, supervisors of teaching practice, builders of relationships with and among teacher candidates (TCs), mentors, and school administrators, and researchers of teaching and teacher education practices.

Given the practical orientation of LTEs' work, there is still a misconception that language teacher education does not require special education, as if a competent and experienced language teacher can automatically become an LTE (Yuan & Lee, 2022). Language teachers, graduate

students, or scholars do not automatically transition into LTE identity (Trent, 2013). They need systematic institutional support for their identity and professional development (Yazan, 2022a). However, university-based teacher educators may feel identity dilemmas between their LTE identities and researcher identities under the *performance* pressure of neoliberal higher education institutions (Barkhuizen, 2021), leading them to conduct research sacrificing quality practical work (Yuan & Lee, 2022) or carrying out research to meet institutional standards rather than engaging in meaningful research to impact community (Barkhuizen, 2021). This constant interplay between personal desires and social forces leads to identity tensions (Trent, 2013; Yazan, 2022b), which might be either productive or disruptive.

2.2 | Language teacher educator agency

Teacher educators enact their identities to the extent that they can assert agency when engaged in pedagogy, practice, and continuous professional development. Agency is "the socioculturally mediated capacity to act" (Ahearn, 2001, p. 112), shaped by personal and professional beliefs, motivations, past experiences, and future experiences. That said, agency is not an inherent capacity of individual teacher educators; instead, agency arises from the interplay between the capabilities and experiences of teacher educators and their surrounding environments. These environments encompass external and internal factors within universities, school–university partnerships, and communities, encompassing pressures and possibilities (Cochran-Smith et al., 2022).

Recent research has focused on LTE identity development from an agency perspective. For instance, Banegas and Gerlach (2021) share their experiences as two critical LTEs, highlighting the necessity for LTEs to engage in dialogic, inclusive, and collaborative activities with their TCs. Similarly, Yazan (2018) reports his experiences and efforts in designing, implementing, and reflecting on a TESL teacher education course using autoethnographic writing assignments. He underscores the importance of combining self-study in teacher education with an identity approach to strengthen TEs′ critical and self-reflexive practices.

As Berry (2008) mentions, "teacher educators who engage in the self-study of their practices recognize teacher education as an enterprise that is fundamentally problematic by virtue of the complexity and ambiguity of its various demands" (p. 15). From an agentive perspective, such complexity and ambiguity underscore the need for a nuanced understanding of the iterative relationship between teacher educators′ past experiences, present situations, and future aspirations in performing choices and asserting agency (Tao & Gao, 2021). It becomes linked to identity, is context-bounded, and is critically constructed by the macro and meso contexts. These agentic choices are often tricky for LTEs, causing tensions in their identity and self-development. Therefore, LTEs′ capacity to assert agency "includes the tension between the kind of TE they aspire to become and the kind they believe others expect them to become" (Yazan, 2018, p. 145).

2.3 | Critical language teacher educator

Drawing on critical pedagogy scholarship, we define a critical LTE as a transformative intellectual (Giroux, 1988) who *strives to* engage in critical dialogic praxis (unity of reflection and action) (Freire, 1970) in and out of the classroom to prepare language teachers with a critical lens to co-construct a just, egalitarian, and democratic school and society (Dewey, 1956). We argue that the critical praxis of a critical LTE includes three legs: 1) inclusion of critical content,

enabling reflection and problem-posing on critical issues around language, identity, school, and society; 2) co-constructing dialogic, egalitarian, and empowering relationships based on love, trust, and humility; and 3) using their agentive potential to take critical action, which might be political, professional, pedagogical, scholarly, discursive, administrative, individual and/or community-based.

For the first leg, critical LTEs raise critical consciousness on the undemocratic, inequitable, and dehumanizing life conditions surrounding us, how language functions in perpetuating those conditions and forming our intersectional identities, and how schools reproduce domination and marginalization (Cochran-Smith, 2006; Giroux & McLaren, 1986; Kincheloe, 2004). Then, they pose questions inviting student-teachers to question their identities, positionalities, and ideologies and their possible impact on their pedagogies, discourses, and student interaction (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009). Finally, they want student-teachers to reflect on what they could do to stop and/or prevent school-based discrimination, create democratic and safe spaces at school, and raise critical consciousness in their learners (Kumaravadivelu, 2003).

The second leg, dialogic relationship-building, is an indispensable part of critical education, as it aims to create a non-hierarchical relationship with TCs, not treating them as objects to be filled with knowledge (Freire, 1970; Morgan, 2009). Creating communities in and out of the classroom builds caring, genuine, and empowering relationships (Noddings, 2015). Critical LTEs and TCs are open to learning together in dialogue and discussing ideas respectfully without imposing. By building such relationships, critical LTEs model how to form relationships with learners.

The third leg is taking critical action for personal and social transformation. First, critical LTEs might assign pedagogic tasks that require them to take pedagogic, scholarly, and social action. One such task could be asking student-teachers to conduct critical textbook analyses and prepare critical language teaching materials (Tezgiden-Cakcak, 2024). Another could be carrying out critical autoethnographic narratives (Yazan, 2023). Other tasks could include reflective emotion diaries, critical issues analysis, and advocacy projects (Toker-Bradshaw, 2023). Second, critical LTEs and student-teachers could take transformative action collectively in their institutions, organizing critical reading and discussion circles, seminars, and/or webinars, raising critical consciousness, and forming solidarity groups for cultural and social exchange (Tezgiden-Cakcak, 2019). Third, critical LTEs might engage in counter-hegemonic discursive action by problematizing administrative, pedagogic, and policy issues at the local, national, and/or global levels.

Aiming for personal and social transformation, critical LTEs acknowledge the limiting situations ahead of them (Freire, 2015) and know their identity constructions and agency might be constrained or enlarged depending on time and context. Even if they may not enact their aspired identities entirely under challenging conditions, they may still exert their agency by opening counter-hegemonic spaces with their discourse, stance, and/or dialogic interactions. In this study, we explore how we negotiate our own critical LTE identities and agency.

3 | METHODOLOGY

For this study, we selected a methodological perspective that would allow us to critically document our stories of becoming and being critical LTEs in interaction with social and institutional discourses. Therefore, we decided to use duoethnography, which is a qualitative research methodology in which two or more researchers work in tandem as "they present their own narratives, formed around their inquiry themes and questions. Researchers construct narrative unities and

a new sense of coherence as they engage in dialogue" (Sawyer & Norris, 2013, p. 10). Each author in a duoethnographic study is both the researcher and the researched who "simultaneously generate, interpret, and articulate data" (Norris, 2008, p. 234).

In duoethnography, researchers usually collect data through narrative accounts of the phenomenon. Dialogue is the key as it allows the researchers to make their accounts explicit and as new perspectives emerge in engaging dialogic practice (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). These dialogues could be written (Kemaloğlu-Er & Lowe, 2023) or both written or oral accounts (Banegas & Gerlach, 2021) of individual voices made explicit, creating and transforming rather than merely uncovering meanings (Norris, 2008). These dialogic accounts enable the researchers to "illuminate and problematize their topics and their thinking" and consider "how to generate deep and meaningful critiques of self and society, and how to present these in ways that invite the reader into the conversation" (Sawyer & Norris, 2013, p. 29). This transformative research tool enables researchers to emancipate themselves from the unequal power dynamics and empower themselves as critical agents who speak back to the powers that marginalize them (Fairley, 2023). Although this endeavor is liberating, it might also put narrators in a vulnerable situation and require self-censorship, which we partly exercised in this article.

Based on these tenets of duoethnography, the steps and methods of our study include the following. After receiving the call, Yasemin shared it with Ufuk, her colleague/friend, considering that they share similar research interests. Ufuk suggested crafting a piece together. Later, we engaged in dialogic reflection via two Zoom meetings, discussing our research design, and decided to write a duoethnography in August 2023. Then, we formulated questions drawing on literature, especially Yazan (2022a), to critically examine how we constructed and enacted our past, present, and future LTE identities (see the appendix for the questions we used). We used these loose questions to write lengthy personal narratives that recount our histories and experiences of becoming and being critical teacher educators (from October to December 2023). After we finished writing our reflections, we exchanged them to reflect on each other's narratives (from December to early January 2024), leaving comments and questions for further elaboration and clarification to encourage each other to offer additional examples. We wrote around 8,500 words each in total. Throughout this process (from August 2023 to January 2024), we constantly exchanged ideas through distance communication tools (five Zoom meetings and two phone conversations, each lasting approximately one hour, and several WhatsApp and email messages). We also held two face-to-face meetings in Ankara. Even though we did not record or use these meetings as data sources in this study, our oral and written dialogue was instrumental in how we came to a mutual understanding of our identity and agency negotiations.

Following these, we individually coded our reflections inductively based on Saldaña's (2009) first-cycle coding framework to arrive at the initial topics of our experiences of being and becoming an LTE. Then, we discussed our codes in a second-cycle coding phase to agree on the emerging codes, focusing on convergences and divergences between our experiences. Then, we created a table to group data under those topics, listing points on convergence and divergence. Based on the most salient topics, we arrived at themes. Given this article's limited space, we focused only on four major themes concerning our meso and micro contexts: our trajectories in becoming LTEs, issues of belonging and marginalization, negotiating our critical LTE identities, and exercising agency. We left aside the macro context because of the heavy load it contains.

As for our story, our roads crossed when we started to study and work at the same top-ranking research university in Türkiye at about the same time but with differing positions—Yasemin as an instructor and a PhD student, and Ufuk as a research assistant and an MA student. Both of us come from middle-class, conservative Turkish families and speak Turkish as our first language.

In the following, we provide short accounts of our background and descriptions of ourselves to help readers familiarize themselves with our narratives and experiences:

> **Yasemin**: Being born to a middle-class family and growing up in a small, conservative town has had a long-lasting impact on me. I have long tried to emancipate myself from the constraining authoritarian, patriarchal ideologies of the predominantly Sunni-Turkish culture in which I was encultured. Encountering critical ideas at the high school from a few transformative intellectual teachers, I started to question the dominant ideologies. Although teaching was my childhood dream, I chose to study translation and interpreting for my BA because it was *more prestigious*. Studying at a bourgeois university in an upper-class neighborhood in Istanbul, I noticed my class background for the first time. When it became apparent that I could not survive working as a freelance academic book translator, I decided to take up teaching. I worked as a teacher of English at public schools and at the tertiary level, during which I completed my MA in TEFL. Taking my own critical teachers as my role models, I always wanted to pose questions in my students' minds. Later on, I became a full-time instructor and a PhD student in the Department of Foreign Language Education, where I encountered works of critical pedagogy and embraced it as my teaching philosophy. Since 2010, I have been working in the same program, aiming to educate teachers to become transformative intellectuals.

> **Ufuk:** I was born, raised, and studied until higher education in İstanbul, the most populated, multicultural, and cosmopolitan city in Türkiye. Conforming to societal roles and expectations, I did not feel oppressed or pressured by those around me. Coming from such a *sterile* background, I was away from all the discussions of oppression caused by gender, class, and race differences prevalent in society. After high school, I completed my BA degree in English language teaching (ELT) in Southern Türkiye, where I encountered these critical issues for the first time. Though I studied to become a teacher, I never worked as one at the primary or secondary levels. After graduating in June 2009, I started my graduate studies in ELT in September of the same year. At the same time, I was randomly assigned as a future faculty member, to be fulfilled after my PhD studies, for a future Department of Foreign Language Education (FLE) in a small city in northeast Türkiye. After my PhD, I found myself alone with no FLE department. I was then transferred to the Department of English Literature. I have been working as a faculty member since 2018, teaching courses that fit my educational background rather than training preservice teachers.

4 | OUR STORIES OF BECOMING LTES

4.1 | Yasemin's story

Although Yasemin initially chose translation as her profession, illusioned by its social prestige, she soon noticed she could not live by the precarious work conditions of freelance academic book translators in Türkiye. Therefore, she took up her childhood dream to teach and became a public school teacher of English with a 9-month teaching certificate program. However, she soon realized her competence in English did not translate well into teaching because she lacked

pedagogical knowledge. Only after several years of experience, self-study, deep reflection, and an MA degree in TEFL did she begin feeling like a competent teacher of English. When she wanted to change her institution, she applied for a position in an ELT program and was hired. The feelings of competence she had finally secured as a teacher of English would fade away in her transition to teacher education:

> I did not plan to become a language teacher educator. I became an LTE "by accident," as Gao (2017, p. 189) put it. Just as I entered the PhD program, the FLE department opened a position, and I found myself educating TCs. Initially, I taught academic English courses. After the comprehensive exam, I started to offer the practicum course. At first, I partly lost my confidence in seeing students' and colleagues' spoken English fluency and native-like accents. I considered myself lower when I compared myself to faculty members with titles. I had to teach courses for which I never received official training. I felt like an impostor. Without noticing, I had internalized the hierarchy and valued myself according to my rank. I was in self-depreciation, as Freire (1970) would say.

Yasemin followed a relatively traditional route from language teaching to language teacher education. Although she considered herself a successful language teacher, her transition to LTE was not easy at all. She did not automatically become a good LTE (Yuan & Lee, 2022). Although her colleagues shared their expertise, Yasemin received no systematic support during her transition period, like many beginning LTEs (Dinkelman et al., 2006; Yazan, 2022b). The graduate-level teacher education course she took gave her the space to think about her identity as an LTE, but it offered no mentoring. Again, she had to depend on her own resources to master educating teachers.

4.2 | Ufuk's story

Teaching has always been a passion for Ufuk since high school, and he chose to study English language teaching for his BA. Upon graduation and realizing that to be an English language teacher in Türkiye, he needed to get high grades from the Public Personnel Selection Exam (KPSS in Turkish), which assessed no competencies in teaching English, so he did not take the exam, *sought higher* and wanted to become a member of academia as he felt becoming a teacher was not as prestigious as becoming an academic at a university. This encapsulates a strategic and intentional decision to pursue a career path that prioritizes academic excellence, research, and specialized expertise in language teacher education, signifying a desire for divergence from the conventional route of becoming a language teacher that Ufuk thought would not allow for intellectual and professional growth:

> After my BA, I enrolled in the ÖYP program (FDP, Faculty Development Program) in 2009. FDP was a 20-year project (2002–2022) that aimed to educate and train faculty members under the supervision of experienced universities to compensate for the shortage of academic staff at the newly established universities in Türkiye. At that time, that felt like the perfect pathway for me as a young graduate of a language teaching program who did not aim to teach English at high schools. I joined the program as a research assistant in 2009 and started my graduate studies the same year. This prompted the *formal* process of my becoming a language teacher educator.

Unlike Yasemin, Ufuk followed the non-traditional *academic pathway* (Davey, 2013). Transitioning from a graduate student to a language teacher educator, he faced challenges from his lack of classroom teaching experience. Acknowledging that *one side was missing*, even after a PhD in ELT, his journey reflected what Barkhuizen (2021) calls a "tentative start towards becoming a language teacher educator" (p. 17). Contrary to LTEs following the traditional route, non-traditional LTEs cannot rely on their experiences in institutional contexts or their personal pedagogy developed over time. Thus, they may need to gain legitimacy, resulting in delays in uptaking their teacher educator identity (Newberry, 2014).

Ufuk hoped to overcome the challenges caused by following the non-traditional route when he became a *full-time faculty member* in his new institution by establishing university–school partnerships (Trent, 2010) and educating his own TCs. Instead of a teacher education department, ironically, he found himself in an English Literature department:

> My evolving LTE identity never fit in my new institution because I could not enact my teacher educator identity as a member of a department (of FLE) that never existed. Secondly, the Faculty positioned me as someone who studies English and could overtake their burden of teaching compulsory English 101 courses. In the first years, I only taught reading and writing skills. A few years later, I was assigned (or allowed) to teach classes, including Applied Linguistics and Discourse Analysis. Only recently, I started teaching courses, including Teaching English to Young Learners and Language Teaching Methodology, where I could enact my identity as a critical LTE only for non-education degree students.

Transferring from the research assistant (RA) position to the assistant professorship did not fully provide Ufuk with the space to enact his LTE identity because he was assigned to a literature program. Not finding the opportunities to enact his imagined LTE and researcher identities in his immediate institutional settings, Ufuk had to rely on himself, his colleagues in other cities, and international networks.

4.3 | Points of convergence and divergence

Although both of us had a passion for teaching, we took up more *prestigious* careers for ourselves—Yasemin translation, Ufuk academia—in line with the dominant professional power hierarchies of the time. Yasemin followed a more traditional, accidental, and bumpy route to become a language teacher educator, while Ufuk chose a non-traditional and intentional one but encountered several roadblocks. Neither of us received any institutional support in transitioning or when constructing our LTE identities (Barkhuizen, 2021; Dinkelman et al., 2006; Trent, 2010; Yazan, 2022b); we had to rely mostly on ourselves and seek support from our colleagues.

5 | TWO SIDES OF A COIN: MARGINALIZATION AND BELONGING

5.1 | Yasemin's story

Yasemin's transition to her new teaching context was also challenging, perhaps because she gained entry to a highly competitive research-based program as an instructor and a graduate student at the same time and had multiple I-positions as a language teacher, LTE, graduate student, and researcher:

> When the committee hired me, I guess the rest of the staff knew nothing about me. When they learned that I did not have a PhD, in a meeting, some of them laughed out loud for quite a while. I was shocked to see that. I did not feel welcomed. I was introduced as "our new *lecturer* colleague." For me, it meant: "She is not one of us, tenure-track faculty members, just a lecturer." Our head of department then confused me with another newly hired colleague, which showed they were not interested in learning who we were. I did not feel valued—how I was positioned overlapped with my feelings of deficiency.

While Yasemin self-identified as a teacher educator with the dual role of teaching and researching, she had to grapple with academic hierarchies and power dynamics, which suggested a distinction between academics on the professoriate track and the teaching track (Yuan, 2017). This othering process would last long, as Yasemin felt she did not fit in, no matter how hard she worked:

> Perhaps until recently, I felt like "I am invisible," as if "I do not exist." Whatever I organized was not recognized. When I sent an email or raised an issue, there was no response most of the time. I felt like a marginal. The complete indifference towards my actions was hard to bear. I prioritized my teacher educator identity and my students, cared for them, built relationships, and organized seminars with them. Partly, it had to do with being a critical teacher educator-lecturer, and partly, it was related to general socio-emotional culture, which does not value a person just because they are. If what you do is not related to research, it is not taken seriously. The pressure to publish or perish is intrinsic to academia and shapes relationships largely.

In addition to her status, Yasemin felt marginalized because of her area of interest, critical pedagogy, and critical actions. Most faculty members had never heard about the field before, and most thought it was too political and had nothing to do with ELT. Yasemin's community-building efforts with students, such as the critical reading circle, were treated as *trivial pursuits* that were not worthy of attention. Besides, although she taught at an FLE program, teaching and teacher education were devalued by some of her colleagues, who identified themselves as scholars/researchers rather than as educators:

> Practicum supervision was not considered something valuable. Even though we had to supervise 30–40 TCs, our labor, problem-solving, and relationship-management skills were not appreciated. Doing that worthless activity was for those not in *valuable academic positions*. In one meeting, one colleague said everyone should publish, get promoted, and eliminate the burden of practicum supervision. When the Ministry passed a new regulation for each teacher educator to supervise 12 students maximum, most faculty members had to teach the practicum course, and our colleagues claimed practicum supervision does not require any special preparation, which diminished our expertise one more time.

This positioning as *unimportant* as an instructor, an LTE, and a critical pedagogue by others profoundly impacted Yasemin's emotional well-being. However, she resisted this positioning with her resilience, critical reflexivity, and the positive feedback she received from students:

> The TCs were the most welcoming, perhaps because I deeply cared about them, heard them, and improved my practice based on our dialogues. I survived with their positive feedback and learned many things from them.

Her students' motivating powers enabled Yasemin to construct and develop her LTE identity *from within* teacher education (Russell & Flores, 2021). So, Yasemin's relationship with students was one of her support mechanisms. Still, she needed professional support to resolve her emotional tensions:

> All this marginalization, feelings of incompetence, and insecurity created a significant tension, even an identity crisis in me. I had to start personal therapy. I had to rebuild myself and think over everything. With the support of therapy, I changed the way I perceived myself and others. The more I valued myself, the less I started to give importance to all those positionings. Although it still impacts me, it is not as strong as it used to be. With mental support and a great deal of self-help, I survived.

After 13 years working in the same department, Yasemin has only recently started to feel she truly belonged to the institution when she was assigned as the Vice-Chair of the Department one year ago:

> Although you get support and work on yourself to recognize your own success, strengths, and all, you still need the validation of your colleagues.

5.2 | Ufuk's story

Ufuk started his career as an RA and did not feel treated as an equal faculty member, not considered capable (by law) of teaching a lesson entirely, and thus not possessing the same rights as full-time faculty members at the university. Despite feeling the challenges of this dual and temporary role as an RA and experiencing the *paradox of credibility* (Slack & Pownall, 2023) in terms of professional identity and the ability to assert pedagogical agency, Ufuk still felt he belonged to the institution socially and culturally, perhaps more in his role as a graduate student, as he found himself in a class of young graduate students from various parts of the country. As a graduate student, he also felt welcomed and supported by his advisors and other faculty members:

> Part of my identity negotiation as the language teacher educator I am (or I strive to be) today depends on the two advisors I had in graduate school (MA and PhD) and how they treated me as colleagues. As a young research assistant, I was involved in a 2-year research project with my MA advisor, which contributed significantly to how I position myself as a researcher today. In my later years as a graduate student, my PhD advisor guided me on how to handle the hard times and be professional and taught me that it is okay to feel tension along the way.

Ufuk started his career with feelings of belonging for the most part. This changed when he started working in his new institution, where *the sense of identity shock* peaked. He realized he would have to redefine the relationship between the professional world and the particular place attributed to it (Davey, 2013). He also felt that realization would not be achieved comfortably, being marginalized due to his marital status and his city of origin:

> I struggled for at least a year in my new context before I finally got used to the social and cultural setting of the institution. I was shocked to see the first couple of questions people at the institution asked: "Where are you from?" and "Are you married?" If not, "why? and I hope you will soon." Being exposed to these, I only wondered why no one was ever asking me about my dissertation, research interests, etc. These were signs that I would struggle to construct a social identity, and I slowly started alienating myself from them.

Despite Ufuk struggling to position himself as an LTE in his new context, he continued to identify himself as an LTE, possibly with the help of *positive alienation* (Menard-Warwick, 2011) in the workplace: "Given all the challenges and tensions I had along the way, I still believed in my identity as a LTE and tried to collaborate with colleagues outside my immediate context." The inquiries about Ufuk's personal life, such as his marital status and regional background rather than his academic pursuits, underscore the societal biases within the new academic environment. He also felt he was positioned as radical because of his casual clothing style. Despite these critical challenges, Ufuk persevered in maintaining his identity as an LTE, showcasing resilience and determination in navigating these biases and striving to contribute meaningfully to his professional field.

5.3 | Points of convergence and divergence

Beginning our teacher education journey in the same institution at the same time, we were positioned as non-equals in the micro-level power dynamics of the institution. Yasemin considered herself an *impostor*, and Ufuk sensed he was a *pseudo* faculty member. Her marginalization caused ontological problems in Yasemin, showcasing that lack of recognition causes psychological damage (Fraser, 2000; Sayer, 2005). To cope with the identity tensions she experienced, Yasemin developed critical reflexivity by reading critical theory, found comfort in her relationships with students, and resorted to personal therapy. She only recently started to feel belonging when she assumed an administrative position. Ufuk felt he was welcomed as a graduate student and received support from his supervisors. In his new institution, however, Ufuk never thought he fit in. He could not enact his LTE identity, either. Nevertheless, he never gave up his LTE identity and participated in research communities. While Yasemin's story progressed from feelings of marginalization toward belonging after years of hard work, Ufuk shifted from partial belonging to marginalization when he changed institutions.

6 | CONSTRUCTING AND NAVIGATING OUR CRITICAL LTE IDENTITIES AND ASSERTING AGENCY

6.1 | Yasemin's story

To get a deeper perspective on the FLE program, Yasemin conducted her dissertation study on the teacher roles the program fostered. The process of conducting this research provided her with a deeper understanding of the TCs' needs, faculty profile, and the gaps in the program. By diagnosing the areas for improvement, she started to see how she could contribute to language teacher candidates' learning with her former experience and her emerging knowledge in critical

pedagogy. Giroux's (1988) notion of a teacher as a transformative intellectual encompassed Yasemin's notion of an ideal teacher, and she aimed to become one:

> I have always wanted to become creative, critical, and coherent—my theory and practice should align. Role-modeling a caring, humble, honest teacher persona has been vital to me. I wanted to show my students how to care for each and every student.

Starting to embrace an asset mindset, Yasemin empowered herself to exercise her agency and engage in critical praxis (Freire, 1970; Waller et al., 2017). She enacted her critical LTE identity by 1) redesigning course content, tasks, and evaluation from a critical lens, 2) dialogic, interactive, democratic teaching practices, 3) building personal relationships with students in and outside the class, 4) organizing seminars, meetings, social events with students, 5) reading widely, researching and practicing what she theorized (Tezgiden-Cakcak, 2019). While Yasemin's transformative actions aimed to improve her pedagogy and the institutional culture, they also helped her legitimize her LTE identity:

> I overworked day and night persistently to do a good job, learn, teach, and be helpful to my students. That is how I felt competent and confident. I was trying to be the change. My pedagogy became my identity. That is how I proved my legitimacy as an LTE.

Legitimizing her LTE identity through her pedagogy, she finally stopped looking for the approval of others. What is more, her agentive actions have had some positive impact:

> My praxis created some minor changes. As for myself, my interaction with students became more dialogic, humble, and open. Students said they felt safe and welcome in my classes. Students became familiar with critical pedagogy and started to indicate interest in critical pedagogy, which became an acknowledged field of study in the department.

6.2 | Ufuk's story

Even if Ufuk did not educate his own TCs as an RA, he embraced the identity of an LTE researcher. His search for legitimacy as an LTE led him to conduct his dissertation (Ataş, 2018) on the professional development of teacher educators:

> I wanted to explore how other language teacher educators were doing, and deep inside, I was looking for legitimacy for my identity and role as a teacher educator. My PhD process has helped me immensely in, at least, accepting the multifaceted nature of the work as an LTE; everyone had a different and unique experience, and it was okay.

Ufuk resolved his identity tensions as an LTE and came to terms with his process of upholding an LTE identity. He described his aspired critical LTE identity as follows:

> I have always wanted to be a friendly, critical, and questioning language teacher educator. I remember that some professors at the department prioritized critical and social issues, such as teaching in a classroom with immigrant students, students with disabilities, and socially and marginally minoritized groups. That shaped my understanding of what kind of an educator I wanted to be. As a teacher educator, I said I should also critically examine my competence and insights into any situation.

Even in the limited space of the Department of English Language and Literature, he has exercised agency and enacted his imagined LTE identity. Despite institutional constraints, he tried to engage students through practical experiences like observation practices:

> Last year, while teaching the elective Teaching English to Young Learners course, I organized voluntary observation practices for the TCs in kindergarten, primary, and secondary schools. Though it was voluntary, 25 students signed in, and we discussed, through their observations, the practical aspects of TEYL. We worked closely together for a semester with pre- and post-interviews, observation, and reflection tasks. Seeing that the students were interested in becoming teachers, I considered it an excellent opportunity for my students and myself. They would learn about the school context, and I would have a chance to enact my LTE identity.

Even though his students were majoring in an English literature program, Ufuk used his agency to provide them with an experiential learning opportunity, which gave him immense joy. Apart from providing TCs with experiential opportunities, he also problematized daily life issues from a critical lens in his classes:

> Lately, I find myself discussing the situations in the country in almost one-third of the class time: whether our elevators are safe so that no one dies while using them, whether they would be able to make it through the next lunch without having health issues and with a full stomach, how they struggle to come to the campus through public transport in the morning, etc.

By inviting critical discussions in his classrooms, Ufuk wanted TCs to develop a critical lens toward their life conditions. He also dwelled on linguistic rights and gender issues in his classes, fostering a deeper understanding of the interconnectedness of social issues and empowering students to become active participants in shaping inclusive and equitable discourses within the courses' contexts. Ufuk has also built relationships with students:

> I also like to socialize with my students; talking to them about their concerns, expectations for the future, and plans to become teachers gives me joy. The feeling of *touching on the lives of young people* primarily motivates me to continue as a teacher educator.

When making pedagogic decisions, he took into account TCs' financial hardships:

> I can never ask my students to buy books as they are already struggling to survive on basic needs such as food and accommodation. I even observed that photocopying becomes a significant cost for some of my students.

The relationship he co-constructed with his students created an urge in them to organize an undergraduate student conference at their university:

> We planned to organize a national undergraduate student conference covering various topics such as language, literary studies, translation, and language teaching. After applying to secure permissions, the administrators raised concerns about using *gender studies*, citing tension due to LGBT-related issues not being welcomed. Despite efforts to explain the broader scope of our conference, we reluctantly removed *gender studies* from our proposal but received no response upon reapplication, leading to the eventual abandonment of the conference.

Even though Ufuk and his students took critical action to organize a conference, their agency was restrained because the authorities saw critical gender issues as a threat. This exemplifies how macro and meso-level pressures restrict agency (Cochran-Smith et al., 2022).

Although Ufuk has not been able to enact his LTE identity and agency as much as he wanted, he has taken part in national and international teacher education research communities (Swennen et al., 2009) to facilitate the transition into the role of being an LTE. Having established a friendly and growing circle of colleagues in both national and international contexts, Ufuk has reached a juncture where emotional reflexivity and self-exploration (Song, 2021) have empowered him to transform his tensions and concerns regarding seeking legitimization and positioning by others.

6.3 | Points of convergence and divergence

We both conducted our dissertation studies on teacher education practices to develop and legitimize our LTE identities. While Yasemin inspected the very program she taught at, Ufuk explored the professional development of teacher educators around Türkiye. These research endeavors helped us make peace with our LTE identities. Closely examining the FLE program from a critical lens, Yasemin diagnosed the areas of improvement in the program and engaged in critical praxis to transform herself, her pedagogy, and her interactions with students. She got so immersed in her critical teacher education pedagogy that she felt her pedagogy became her identity, which brings a new dimension to the existing literature concerning *identity as pedagogy* (Morgan, 2004). These efforts helped her gain competence and confidence, and she stopped looking for approval from others. Encountering the diverse experiences of language teacher educators in Türkiye, Ufuk emancipated himself from the deficit view of his non-traditional trajectory of becoming a teacher educator. With his growing experience and competence, he no longer seeks legitimacy from others. Even in his limited space in a non-teaching program, he has exercised agency to provide TCs with hands-on experience in teaching. With his commitment and critical dialogic interactions with his students, he has been able to inspire his students to develop teacher identity. He also joined national and international communities of teacher education research and practice. As university-based critical LTEs, both of us could include critical content, form dialogic relationships with our students, and take critical action within the relative autonomy provided by our institutions, despite some failed attempts.

7 | CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Our narratives shed light on the intricate journeys and challenges we faced in shaping our critical LTE identities. Our trajectories of being and becoming LTEs converge with a lack of institutional support during our transitions (Trent, 2013; Yazan, 2022a; Yuan & Lee, 2022). We both relied heavily on self-driven efforts, seeking support from colleagues and finding strength and resilience through having to reconcile our multiple I-positions.

The dichotomy of belonging and marginalization emerges as a crucial theme in our study. Yasemin's initial struggles with recognition, departmental positioning, and the devaluation of her research interests painted a picture of isolation and marginalization. However, her connection with students became a vital source of support, fostering a sense of belonging. Her pedagogic practices became her identity, highlighting the mutual relationship between pedagogy and identity (Morgan, 2004). On the other hand, Ufuk's early sense of belonging in a graduate student community shifted when he joined a new institution, where he struggled to align his identity with the expectations of his department. Despite feelings of alienation, he could form caring relationships with his students and managed to inspire them to develop teacher identities.

Negotiating and seeking legitimacy in our LTE identities marks another commonality, leading to a discussion of how our tensions facilitated identity development and change. We both engaged in extensive research endeavors to understand and legitimize our positions. As Davey (2013) argued, negotiating a professional LTE identity would involve a significant amount of taking agency. We could assert our LTE agencies by actively navigating challenges, engaging in critical praxis, and enacting our envisioned LTE identities under the influence of inequitable power dynamics in our work contexts (Barkhuizen, 2021; Fairley, 2023; Yazan, 2022a). Even if the way others positioned us overwhelmed us, especially when we were novice LTEs, we never refrained from exercising our agency as critical LTEs: we problematized critical issues in our classes, bonded with students in and outside the classroom and tried to take critical action (Freire, 1970; Kincheloe, 2004; Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Zeichner & Flessner, 2009). Even if some of our critical actions were met with indifference or outright rejection, in time we gained the resilience to appreciate our identities and not seek approval from others.

Although our identity struggles have led to personal growth in the long run, they could have been detrimental to our well-being if we had not developed our own support systems. Therefore, there is a need for systematic and institutional support for LTEs in their professional identity development so as not to risk their emotional stability (Banegas & Gerlach, 2021). However, as institutions are reluctant to support oppositional figures, the identities and agency of critical LTEs put them in a vulnerable position against the dominant power hierarchies. Therefore, alternative bottom-up caring collegial relations should be developed (Noddings, 2015). Finally, teachers and LTE should engage in counter-hegemonic praxis to challenge the lower prestige accorded both to teaching and teacher education (Barkhuizen, 2021; Yıldız & Ünlü, 2014).

In this study, we recognized the challenges and the intricate link between our social and professional identities in our pathways to becoming and being teacher educators (Peercy et al., 2019). We gained ideological and epistemological clarity about our ongoing LTE identities, positionalities, and agencies (Sharkey et al., 2021). The very act of writing and dialogically reflecting on our narratives for this study helped us unload the remains of the emotional baggage we have been carrying on our shoulders and liberated us further (Fairley, 2023), despite being painful. Still, our analysis and discussion of narratives involved instances of self-censorship due to the perceived risk of further marginalization by our institutions. This realization underscores the complexity

of teacher educators' challenges, not only in negotiating their identities but also in self-studying and publicly sharing them.

In conclusion, our duoethnography enabled us to uncover various aspects of identity formation, emotional engagement, and agency enactment within our specific pedagogical contexts. Thus, a duoethnographic lens could allow other researchers to understand identity development and agency in their trajectories of becoming and being an LTE. Future research could focus on longitudinal and comparative studies to understand the dynamic nature and evolution across diverse contexts. Language teacher education programs could implement structured mentorship opportunities to encourage collaborative professional communities. Additionally, we believe that advocating for institutional policies that recognize and value the contributions of LTEs is crucial. By doing so, these programs can enhance the quality of teacher education, support LTEs' emotional well-being, and create a more supportive and inclusive academic environment. Engaging in counter-hegemonic praxis and building bottom-up caring collegial relations can empower LTEs to challenge existing power dynamics and improve their professional experiences.

ORCID

Yasemin Tezgiden-Cakcak https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5064-8831
Ufuk Ataş https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8171-8334

REFERENCES

Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *30*(1), 109–137. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.109

Akkerman, S. F., & Meijer, P. C. (2011). A dialogical approach to conceptualizing teacher identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(2), 308–319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.013

Ataş, U. (2018). *Professional development and competence profiles of English language teacher educators in Turkey*. [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Middle East Technical University.

Banegas, D. L., & Gerlach, D. (2021). Critical language teacher education: A duoethnography of teacher educators' identities and agency. *System*, *98*, 102474. 10.1016/j.system.2021.102474

Barkhuizen, G. (2016). Reflections on language teacher identity research. *Taylor & Francis*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315643465

Barkhuizen, G. (2021). *Language teacher educator identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Berry, A. (2008). *Tensions in teaching about teaching: Understanding practice as a teacher educator*. Springer.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2006). Teacher education and the need for public intellectuals. *The New Educator*, *2*(3), 181–206.

Cochran-Smith, M., Craig, C. J., Orland-Barak, L., Cole, C., & Hill-Jackson, V. (2022). Agents, agency, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *73*(5), 445–448. https://doi.org/10.1177/00224871221123724

Davey, R. (2013). *The professional identity of teacher educators: Career on the cusp?* Routledge.

De Costa, P. I., & Norton, B. (2017). Introduction: Identity, transdisciplinarity, and the good language teacher. *The Modern Language Journal*, *101*(S1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12368

Dewey, J. (1956). *The child and the curriculum: The school and the society*. University of Chicago Press.

Dinkelman, T. (2011). Forming a teacher educator identity: Uncertain standards, practice, and relationships. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *37*(3), 309–323. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2011.588020

Dinkelman, T., Margolis, J., & Sikkenga, K. (2006). From teacher to teacher educator: Reframing knowledge in practice. *Studying Teacher Education*, *2*(2), 119–136. https://10.1080/17425960600983155.

Fairley, M. J. (2023). Theorizing transnational language teacher (educator) identities: An autoethnographic study of a border dweller. *L2 Journal*, *15*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.5070/L2.2465

Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking recognition. *New Left Review*, *3*(3), 107–118.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Seabury.

Freire, P. (2015). *Pedagogy of indignation*. Routledge.

Gao, X. (2017). Questioning the identity turn in language teacher (educator) research. In G. Barkhuizen (Ed.), *Reflections on language teacher identity research* (pp. 197–203). Routledge.

Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals*. Toward a critical pedagogy of learning. Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, *56*(3), 213–238.

Kemaloğlu-Er, E., & Lowe, R. J. (2023). Language teacher identity, World Englishes, and ELF: A duoethnography between a "native speaker" teacher and a "non-native speaker" teacher. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, *22*(5), 478–491. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2022.2141244

Kessler, M. (2023). Autoethnography for language teacher education programs: Connecting identities, ideologies, and experiences to curricular design practices. *TESOL Journal*, e772. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.772

Kincheloe, J. K. (2004). The knowledges of teacher education: Developing a critical complex epistemology. *Teacher Education Quarterly (Winter)*, 49–66.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. Yale University Press.

López-Gopar, M. E., Sughrua, W. M., & Cordova, V. H. (2022). The journey of a critical-oriented ELT curriculum and the identities of teacher educators: A collaborative and analytic autoethnography. *Teachers and Teaching*, *30*(2), 152–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2022.2062733

Menard-Warwick, J. (2011). A methodological reflection on the process of narrative analysis: Alienation and identity in the life histories of English language teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, *45*(3), 564–574. https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2010.256798

Morgan, B. (2004). Teacher identity as pedagogy: Towards a field-internal conceptualisation in bilingual and second language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *7*(2–3), 172–188. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050408667807

Morgan, B. (2009). Fostering transformative practitioners for critical EAP: Possibilities and challenges. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *8*(2), 86–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.09.001

Newberry, M. (2014). Teacher educator identity development of the nontraditional teacher educator. *Studying Teacher Education*, *10*(2), 163–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2014.903834

Noddings, N. (2015). Care ethics and "caring" organizations. In D. Engster & M. Hamington (Eds.), *Care ethics and political theory* (pp. 72–84). Oxford University Press.

Norris, J. (2008). Duoethnography. In L. M. Given (Ed.). *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (vol. *1*, pp. 233–236). Sage.

Norton, B. (2013). Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation. *Multilingual Matters*. 10.21832/9781783090563

Peercy, M. M., Sharkey, J., Baecher, L., Motha, S., & Varghese, M. (2019). Exploring TESOL teacher educators as learners and reflective scholars: A shared narrative inquiry. *TESOL Journal*, *10*(4), e482. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.482

Russell, T., & Flores, M. A. (2021). Developing as teacher educators: Lessons learned from student voices during practice and research. In A. Swennen & E. White (Eds.), *Being a teacher educator: Research-informed methods for improving practice* (pp. 43–55). Routledge.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.

Sawyer, R. D., & Norris, J. (2013). *Duoethnography: Understanding qualitative research*. Oxford University Press.

Sayer, R. A. (2005). *The moral significance of class*. Cambridge University Press.

Sharkey, J., Peercy, M. M., Solano-Campos, A., & Schall-Leckrone, L. (2021). Being a reflexive practitioner and scholar in TESOL: Methodological considerations. In R. Yuan & I. Lee (Eds.), *Becoming and being a TESOL teacher educator* (pp. 12–-146). Routledge.

Slack, H. R., & Pownall, M. (2023). "Treat GTAs as colleagues, rather than spare parts": The identity, agency, and wellbeing of graduate teaching assistants. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *47*(9), 1262–1275. https://doi.org10.1080/0309877X.2023.2241392

Song, J. (2021). Emotional reflexivity in language teacher education: Focusing on the role of emotion in teacher educator identity and pedagogy. In R. Yuan & I. Lee (Eds.), *Becoming and being a TESOL teacher educator: Research and practice* (pp. 108–126). Routledge.

Swennen, A., Shagrir, L., & Cooper, M. (2009). Becoming a teacher educator: Voices of beginning teacher educators. In A. Swennen & M. van der Klink (Eds.), *Becoming a teacher educator: Theory and practice for teacher educators* (pp. 91–102). Springer.

Tao, J., & Gao, X. A. (2021). *Language teacher agency*. Cambridge University Press.

Tezgiden-Cakcak, Y. (2019). *Moving beyond technicism in English-language teacher education: A case study from Turkey*. Lexington Books.

Tezgiden-Cakcak, Y. (2024). Pedagogizing critical materials analysis and development. In A. F. Selvi & C. Kocaman (Eds.), *International perspectives on critical English language teacher education: Theory and practice* (pp. 51–58). Bloomsbury.

Toker-Bradshaw, S. (2023). *Pedagogizing and investigating emotions, identity and agency in a critical practicum for pre-service language teachers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Georgetown University.

Trent, J. (2010). Teacher identity construction in school–university partnerships: Discourse and practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(8), 1609–-1618. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.012

Trent, J. (2013). Becoming a teacher educator: The multiple boundary-crossing experiences of beginning teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *64*(3), 262–275. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487112471998

Varghese, M., Motha, S., Park, G., Reeves, J., & Trent, J. (2016). Language teacher identity in (multi) lingual educational contexts [Special Issue]. *TESOL Quarterly*, *50*(3). https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.333

Waller, L., Wethers, K., & De Costa, P. I. (2017). A critical praxis: Narrowing the gap between identity, theory, and practice. *TESOL Journal*, *8*(1), 4–27. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.256

Yazan, B. (2018). TESL teacher educators' professional self-development, identity, and agency. *TESL Canada Journal*, *35*(2), 140–155. 10.18806/tesl.v35i2.1294.

Yazan, B. (2019). An autoethnography of a language teacher educator: Wrestling with ideologies and identity positions. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *46*(3), 34–56.

Yazan, B. (2022a). Language teacher educator identity. In TESOL International Association & J. Liontas (Eds.), *TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*. Wiley. 10.1002/9781118784235.eelt1025.

Yazan, B. (2022b). Multivocal teacher educator identity: A self-study of a language teacher educator's use of critical autoethnography. In R. Yuan & I. Lee (Eds.). *Becoming and being a TESOL teacher educator: Research and practice* (pp. 243–265). Routledge.

Yazan, B. (2023). Incorporating teacher emotions and identity in teacher education practices: Affordances of critical autoethnographic narrative. *The Language Learning Journal 51*(5), 649–661. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2023.2239843

Yazan, B., & Lindahl, K. (2023). An identity approach to teacher education. In TESOL International Association & J. I. Liontas (Eds.), *TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*. 10.1002/9781118784235.eelt1030.

Yıldız, A. & Ünlü, D. (2014). Metaforlarla öğretmenliğin dönüşümü: "Dün heybetli bir şelaleydik bugün kurumaya yüz tutmuş bir dere." In S. Baykal, A. Ural, & Z. Alica (Eds.), *Eleştirel eğitim seçkisi* (pp. 56–67). Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Yuan, R. (2017) "This game is not easy to play": A narrative inquiry into a novice EFL teacher educator's research and publishing experiences. *Professional Development in Education*, *43*(3), 474–491. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2016.1182936

Yuan, R., & Lee, I. (Eds.). (2022). *Becoming and being a TESOL teacher educator: Research and practice*. Routledge.

Zeichner, K. M., & Flessner, R. (2009). Educating teachers for social justice. In K. Zeichner (Ed.), *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice* (pp. 24–43). Routledge.

APPENDIX REFLECTION QUESTIONS

Reflections on our PAST TE identities

1. How did it all start? How did I (decide to) become a language teacher educator?
2. How did my colleagues, students, practicum school mentors, and administrators position me?
3. How did I negotiate my identity along the process? How did my identity negotiation process and my positioning evolve in time?
4. What kind of a teacher educator did I want to become?
5. What sort of tensions, challenges, and possibilities did I expect and encounter along the way?
6. How did I enact my teacher educator identity?
7. To what extent is my evolving teacher identity related to my biography, other social identities, and institutional belonging?

Reflections on our PRESENT TE identities

1. What kind of a teacher educator am I? How do I construct, enact, and negotiate my teacher educator identity now? Have I foreseen this?
2. Do I foreground my teacher educator identity, or is it sidelined among other professional identities (e.g., researcher, administrator, etc.)?
3. How am I positioned now? How do I position myself?
4. What tensions, challenges, and possibilities (macro-, meso-, micro-level) do I encounter in my daily practices?
5. How do I resolve tensions and challenges?
6. What joys do I experience enacting my teacher educator identity?
7. What support (institution, colleagues, others) do I receive (if any) in my role as a language teacher educator?
8. To what extent can I assert my agency?

Reflections on our FUTURE TE identities

1. How do I envision my future and future TE identities?
   a. in terms of how I position/am positioned by others?
2. To which communities do I wish to join in the future in addition to the current communities I belong to (e.g., Douglas Fir Group)? How does the idea of becoming a member of this imagined community influence my motivation and investment for professional development?
3. What kind of TE do I aspire to become?
4. How is my ongoing learning informed/oriented by my negotiated and aspired identities?
5. How do I foresee that the tensions and challenges I bring from the past and present will be resolved?
6. How do I feel about the way forward? What do I still need to do? (Banegas & Gerlach, 2021).
7. What are some suggestions for my own self?

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Yasemin Tezgiden-Cakcak is a teacher educator at Middle East Technical University in Ankara, Türkiye, in the Department of Foreign Language Education. After working as an English language teacher in diverse settings for eight years, she became a language teacher educator at her current institution in 2010. She has taught language skills, pedagogy, practicum, and critical pedagogy courses. Her research interests focus on critical pedagogy, teacher roles and identity, and critical language teacher education. Her publications problematize native-speakerism, teacher roles, and transformative educational action. Critiquing technicist language teacher education in Türkiye, she theorized her critical teacher education practices in her book *Moving Beyond Technicism in English Language Teacher Education* (2019). She is one of the associate editors of the book *A Language of Freedom and Teacher's Authority Case Comparisons from Turkey and the United State*s (2017).

Ufuk Ataş works as an associate professor at Artvin Çoruh University, Artvin, Türkiye in the Department of Western Languages and Literatures. He completed his graduate studies in English language teaching in the Department of Foreign Language Education at Middle East Technical University, Ankara, where he also worked as a research/teaching assistant for 10 years. Since 2018, he has taught courses on applied linguistics, discourse, language skills, and language teaching pedagogy, mainly to non-teaching degree students. His general research focuses on teacher education, particularly preservice/in-service teacher education, professional development, teacher identity, and teacher education programs/curricula. He also studies translanguaging as pedagogy in English-medium instruction (EMI) contexts. He is a member of the Association for Teacher Education in Europe (ATEE). Recently, his work has appeared in *European Journal of Teacher Education* and *Linguistics and Education*.