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Mapping the Indigenous Postcolonial Possibilities of Teacher Preparation

Introduction

The radical reimagining of teacher education is happening in isolated corners without widespread transformation of the field (Cochran-Smith & Reagan, 2022). Teacher preparation's historical grounding in systems of settler colonialism, white supremacy, and free-market principles situates it as an ongoing site of reproduction for existing power relations (Gorlewski & Tuck, 2018; Labaree, 2004; Love, 2019; Placier et al., 2016). Since “little attention has been given...to the issue of whose knowledge should count in teacher education” (Zeichner et al., 2014, p.123), the field has largely prioritized eurocentric knowledge systems that advance settler futurities through the elimination of epistemological heterogeneity (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013), which often engenders resistance for teacher educators working to create something new. To further understand the landscape of teacher education toward decolonization and postcolonial\(^1\) futures, we conducted a critical interpretive synthesis of empirical literature (Booth et al., 2016).

To make visible a pathway toward Indigenous postcolonialism, we sought efforts of decolonization, fugitivity, and abolition within teacher education programs. We understand decolonization as an effort to undo settler colonial structures within our current socio-political contexts, beginning with a recognition of Indigenous land relations (Smith, 2021; Tuck & Yang, 2012). We engage Stovall’s (2018) meaning of fugitivity as questioning “the constraints and

\(^1\) We build with Battiste (2004, p. 1) here, in seeing ‘Postcolonial’ as not a time after colonialism, but representing hope and commitment toward a future not yet achieved.
foundations of state-sanctioned violence as ‘schooling’,” (Stovall, 2018, p. 53) to theorize fugitivity as a reclamation of education through a potentially necessary disruption of current structures and functions of schools. With Love (2019), we understand abolition in teaching to restore humanity in the classroom with teachers willing to put their reputations and livelihoods on the line in rejecting school-based harm in commitment to nurturing the wellbeing of other people’s children; working far beyond desires to survive toward collective thriving.

With these commitments toward a postcolonial future, we grounded this systematic literature review in both theoretical and historical foundations of teacher education. We build with hooks (2010) in depicting how K-12 schools and higher education have been positioned as instruments of colonization, shaping content and pedagogical practices:

Education [as] a tool of colonization that serves to teach students allegiance to the status quo has been so much the accepted norm that no blame can be attributed to the huge body of educators who simply taught as they were taught. (p. 29)

hooks helps us consider how the system reproduces itself, recognizing both young learners who are shaped by colonialism and the ways teachers are taught to uphold hegemonic norms in their classrooms.

Love (2019) reiterates these sentiments through what she names the “teacher education gap”, examining how poorly teacher education has addressed issues of race and racism in the preparation of primarily white teachers. Likened to hooks’ reflection to withhold blame on the individual, Love calls on teacher education programs by asking (and answering):

How do we not only shift thinking, but prepare teachers to have the knowledge, language, and understanding to see past ideas of individualized blame and understand the
complexities of systemic oppression? The answer: teachers must embrace theory to help fill the teacher education gap. (pp. 131-32)

Although teacher education scholars and practitioners alike may agree with these assertions, the history and context of the field represents a maze of obstacles. In the U.S., teacher education in the 20th century evolved from two-year skills-based normal schools to four-year state teachers’ colleges and eventually morphed into state universities. Although teacher education moved into the university, it was not necessarily welcome. Faculty from colleges of arts and sciences resisted embracing teacher education as an intellectual equal in the academy (Labaree, 2004; Ogren, 2013; Zeichner, 2022). This division revealed a hardened belief that teacher preparation was of less value and seemingly less rigorous than other disciplines even within the larger discipline of education itself, which persists today (Labaree, 2004; Stillman et al., 2019). However, university teacher education programs are academically demanding in their own right, and must not only meet university and programmatic requirements, but also respond to escalating state licensure regulations, as well as state and federal policy mandates. University-based teacher preparation is tied to state-defined goals which have become increasingly focused on narrow accountability standards and measures (Dwyer, et al., 2020; Gorlewski & Tuck, 2018). Given this level of scrutiny, it is more difficult for teacher educators to create space where teacher candidates (TCs) can demonstrate more complex understandings and critical thinking beyond mere accountability. More importantly, it can prevent them from breaking inherited hegemonic norms to better serve Black, Brown, and Indigenous students and their communities.

To investigate how programs are making room for more than accountability, we conducted a critical interpretive synthesis of literature seeking empirical investigations of teacher education programs with efforts of decolonization, fugitivity, and abolition. Building with
Battiste’s (2004) depiction of postcolonialism as a hopeful aspiration toward futures beyond colonial enclosures, we sought examples of programs preparing candidates to recognize and resist settler colonial systems that drive the design and purpose of schooling. Specifically, we anticipated that such efforts may employ decolonizing, fugitive, and abolitionist practices in teacher education (Buena vista et. al, 2019; Gorlewski & Tuck, 2018; Love, 2019). Our review was guided by the following questions:

- How are teacher education programs preparing candidates to teach in both current realities and toward Indigenous postcolonial futures?
  - What examples exist of teacher education programs enacting efforts of decolonization, abolition, and/or fugitivity with Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities?
  - Which of these examples and insights may guide a radical reimagination of teacher education?

**Theoretical Framework**

To develop criteria for our literature search and a framework for analysis and synthesis, we employed theories of decolonization (Smith, 2021; Tuck & Yang, 2012) and Indigenous postcolonialism (Battiste, 2004; 2011). We see these theories as interrelated where given the deep establishment of colonialism in current socio-political contexts, enacting a process of decolonization is a necessary trajectory in realizing a postcolonial future. Tuck & Yang (2012) emphasize decolonization as directly connected to land, beyond metaphorical reference, to actual understandings and recognition of all lands as Indigenous lands (Calderón, 2014a; Deloria & Wildcat, 2001) that have been forcefully acquired for the purpose of individual ownership and resource exploitation (Wolfe, 2006). To understand and recognize all lands as Indigenous, and to
take up meaningful acts of decolonization, we must develop and uphold relationships with the lands and waters where we are situated (Coulthard, 2014). With this, we build with Khalifa et al. (2018), and “use ‘Indigenous’ to refer to non-White, non-Western peoples whose ways of being in the world are informed by Indigenous knowledge” (p. 7) and values. We understand Indigenous to include the axiologies, ontologies, and epistemologies across complex communities understood from a global perspective. In particular to U.S. history, this explicitly includes Indigenous Africans who were forcibly relocated via the transatlantic slave trade (Smith & Wobst, 2004), and the many Indigenous immigrants/migrants/refugees from Central and South America who often become homogenized as Latinx upon entry to the US (Rodriguez, 2014; Urrieta & Calderón, 2019).

The histories of European and U.S. empires have forged intimate connections between colonized spaces around the world (Byrd, 2011; Lowe, 2015; McCulloch, 2009). These relations create opportunities to seek out “abundant paths toward decolonisation and abolition presented by researchers, activists, and other ordinary people working” (Curley et. al., 2022, p.1045). By expanding our frame beyond decolonizing efforts in North America to include decolonization initiatives and efforts of postcolonialism in other parts of the world, we begin to see “multiple locations from which Black and Native people figure and reconfigure relation to land, space, and sovereignty” (Curley et. al., 2022, p. 1045). While this global perspective limits the amount of context we can analyze for each example, the wider scope fits with our goal of a radical reimagining of teacher education by increasing the diversity of perspectives incorporated.

As we enact decolonization as a theoretical framework toward the aims of postcolonial Indigenous futures, we conceive of an indigeneity beyond the politics of a nation state recognition that works toward an elimination of Indigenous peoples to secure settler futurities
(Coulthard, 2014). Concurrently, we refuse notions that “we are all Indigenous” stemming from settler innocence and forward a respect of inherent sovereignties across Indigenous nations (Urrieta & Calderón, 2019; Coulthard, 2014; Simpson, 2017; Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013). We put forth that recognition of these histories in all places and advancement of educational sovereignty is an essential step toward decolonizing systems of education (Calderón, 2014a; Dei, 2011; King, 2019; la paperson, 2010; 2014). In our review, we sought examples of how teacher education programs make space to engage settler colonial framings that shape schools, and engage various practices of decolonization, fugitivity, and/or abolition toward Indigenous futurities.

Methodology

We conducted a critical interpretive synthesis of empirical literature designed to better understand how teacher education programs prepare TCs to teach toward postcolonial futures. This qualitative systematic review of literature from 2000 to 2020 targeted research on existing programs and relied on researchers' descriptions of those programs which ranged from partial to full programmatic accounts. This type of review allowed for the research questions to be responsive to the literature as we identified it (Booth et al., 2016). It also reflected the critical perspective of our theoretical framework and scholarly commitments. Our review consisted of searching abstracts for a wide range of literature in university library databases using these keywords:

- preservice teachers or teacher candidates or student teachers and
- postcolonial or decolonial or fugitivity or abolition or decolonization.

The databases included: EBSCO eBook, JSTOR, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, Academic Search Complete, ProQuest All Other, and ERIC. This initial search resulted in 1,313 citations.
We believed that there might be more relevant literature than we yielded. Therefore, we conducted a search with these databases using additional related keywords:

- preservice teachers or teacher candidates or student teachers and
- settler colonialism.

This identified another 200 citations. After removing duplicates and adding two pieces from outside sources, the total citations remained 1,313 (see Appendix A).

We divided the abstracts across the team and examined 10 in common to norm our reviewing. For each citation, researchers analyzed whether it directly addressed our main research question and tagged it yes, no, or maybe. All abstracts tagged “maybe” were brought to the team for a final determination. Reviewing all “yes” abstracts against the three research questions resulted in an initial set of 36 citations. After this selection of the literature, we turned to snowballing backward (Ong et al., 2020), requiring researchers to examine the references of each article to see if they responded to the first research question. We found 20 additional pieces of literature. We also engaged in snowballing forward (Ong et al., 2020), screening each citation in Google Scholar and reviewing it against the first research question. This yielded 27 references. After removal of duplicates, the number totaled 78 and the critical literature synthesis starter set equaled 67 (see Table 1). These 67 pieces of literature were then read and researchers reviewed them using a data extraction form (Booth et al., 2016).

**Table 1 Inclusion of Literature for the Starter Set**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Number of Articles</th>
<th>Duplicates Removed</th>
<th>Screened out for Relevance</th>
<th>True Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification 1</td>
<td>Initial Database Searches</td>
<td>+1,313</td>
<td>-142</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification 2</td>
<td>Addition of “Settler Colonialism”</td>
<td>+200</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification 3</td>
<td>Addition of Records from Other Sources</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening 1</td>
<td>Abstracts Reviewed and Initially Tagged in Zotero</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>-1,206</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening 2</td>
<td>Abstract Screening against All Three Research Questions</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification 4</td>
<td>Snowballing Backwards</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification 5</td>
<td>Snowballing Forward</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td>Literature Screened for Eligibility</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Starter Set Analyzed for Critical Literature Synthesis</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To structure a comprehensive review and synthesis of the literature, grounded in a framework of decolonization (Smith, 2021; Tuck & Yang, 2012) and postcolonialism (Battiste, 2004; 2011), we looked to de Oliveira Andreotti et al’s (2015) development of social
cartography to map the process of decolonization in higher education. de Oliveira Andreotti et al. (2015) contemplated the process of decolonization, and through this we see an opportunity to practice world-making. de Oliveira Andreotti et al.’s (2015) description of decolonization in teacher education captures its complex context through three broad categories: soft reform, radical reform, and beyond reform (see Figure 1). Soft reform and radical reform fall within system expansion as they continue to forward settler colonialism; beyond reform is situated within system decline as it rejects colonialism outright and can only take form within serious commitments to postcolonialism and a complete rejection of current social realities. Soft reform depicts a state of satisfaction with the current social reality grounded in settler colonialism, with a perspective that any existing problems can be addressed through individual action rather than social transformation. Radical reform engages a process of decolonization where one recognizes and actively engages in social transformation to undo racism, colonialism, capitalism, patriarchy, and nationalism through a change of “rules”, policies, curriculum, or other systemic structures. Beyond reform moves toward the postcolonial future we aspire toward (Battiste, 2004) where one recognizes the systemic structures as both unfixable and harmful and that continuing to engage such systems is ethically incongruent. We understood this framework as a pathway toward remedying current educational harms, rectifying historical origins of damage-centered teacher education (Carter Andrews et al., 2019), and establishing reimagined futurities.

Figure 1
*Mapping Discursive Responses to Modernity (Andreotti et. al., 2015, p.25)*
We conducted a framework synthesis which relies on an existing conceptual model to organize the findings (Booth et al., 2016). In this study we used de Oliveira Andreotti et al.’s (2015) framework and the areas of reform - soft, radical, and beyond - as our larger categories to initially organize the selected literature. We conducted initial coding of those studies and then utilized axial coding to understand the relationship between the framework categories and the initial codes (Vollstedt & Rezat, 2019; Saldaña, 2021). Saldaña (2021) asserts that axial coding is useful for studies with a range of qualitative data sources. Using this two-step coding scheme assisted us in defining our themes under each category and the literature aligned with each theme.
After coding and analyzing the literature into themes, we applied de Oliveira Andreotti et al.’s (2015) social cartography as a framework for synthesizing the reviewed literature on a continuum of reform efforts toward decolonization (e.g. system expansion, system decline). This approach of mapping different positions in relation to colonialism’s interrelated systems of violence depicts “a visual synthesis of different positions in tension… social cartographies are not meant to be neutral representations of reality, but situated snapshots of crossroads that can highlight different choices, and open new affective, discursive, performative and existential possibilities” (de Oliveira Andreotti et al., 2015, p. 22). Social cartography is not a two dimensional map without value, it offers options that focus attention on difference within and across decolonization efforts. This becomes particularly important since we conceived of this project in late-2019 and conducted it from 2019 through 2022 as we experienced and witnessed the COVID pandemic, the murder of George Floyd and other Black men, women, and youth, as well as targeted attacks against Black transgender and gender nonconforming people, the election of 2020, and subsequent events that deepened our desire for coherent, unambiguous projects. Decolonization and postcolonialism point us to the multiplicity of present realities and pluralism of possible futures even in the face of urgent social crises.

As such, our review does not drive for generalization, resolution, or prescriptions. Again, this is why we chose a critical interpretive synthesis, “to encourage a critique of literatures and thus to stimulate questioning of taken-for-granted assumptions” (Booth et al., 2016, p. 258). Instead, we follow de Oliveira Andreotti et al.’s (2015) intention to “further conversations about the contradictory imaginaries, investments, desires, and foreclosures that arise in efforts to address modernity’s violence and enact commitments to decolonization” (pp. 22-23), in our case, specific to teacher education. We sought futures that have not yet been envisioned within what
de Oliveira Andreotti et al. name a “beyond-reform” space, seeking “other modes of existence [in teacher education] based on different [non-western] cosmologies” (p. 28). Through our analysis and synthesis of the literature, we further detailed how teacher education programs engaged within each of the categories while also recognizing that these categories are not strictly bound and are instead fluid and permeable.

We are keenly aware that in Western tradition, cartography is a discipline deeply entwined with colonialism (Harley, 2002) as a tool for creating, organizing, and controlling space; maps tell us at least as much, if not more, about the mapmaker as they do the territory (Harley, 2002). But mapmaking as a lay practice is valuable for seeking new perspectives on the landscape and new pathways across the terrain. Our map of literature on decolonizing teacher education reflects an ongoing struggle to build towards postcolonial futures while participating in colonial institutions from our own complex positions as teacher educators.

Findings

We reviewed a total of 67 empirical articles, chapters, dissertations, or reports for this study. From the original starter set, we recognized that 24 of the pieces discussed teacher education conceptually but did not discuss any particular teacher education program or efforts within a program. The majority of the research emerged from Canada (n=17) and the U.S. (n=17) with other locations including Australia, New Zealand, Bolivia, Namibia, the United Kingdom, and several others. The studies were primarily situated in university settings (n=40) and used qualitative methodologies with two employing mixed methods. Important to note, we anticipated finding programmatic efforts grounded in fugitivity or abolition but were proved wrong with no examples of research engaging theories of abolition and only one study in
fugitivity. Multiple programs reported efforts of decolonization to varying degrees.

**Thematic Analysis and Framework Synthesis of the Literature**

All 45 reviewed articles depicted teacher education aligned with system expansion. Of these, the majority of system expansion literature depicted efforts of soft reform (n=30), with 17 studies representing radical reform efforts. To portray our findings, we offer a thematic analysis of the types of efforts taken within teacher education as they align to system expansion and soft or radical reform (see Table 2).

**Table 2**

*Thematic Analysis of Reviewed Literature*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Reviewed Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Self Reflection (n=14)</td>
<td>Includes reflections of positionality and often includes recognition and consideration of whiteness and/or settler colonialism identity.</td>
<td>Boutte (2018); de Oliveira Andreottiet al. (2014); Dominguez (2017); French (2008); Halagao (2004); Johnston et al. (2009); Kerr (2020); Martin &amp; Pirbhai-Illich (2016); Mashford-Pringle &amp; Nardozi (2013); Mawhinney et al. (2020); McDowell (2017); Nardozi et al. (2018); Oskineegish (2018); Rodriguez de France et al. (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive Curriculum (n=13)</td>
<td>Adding multicultural, culturally relevant/sustaining, Indigenous, or decolonial content into an otherwise largely unchanged curriculum, can be embedded into a course experience, added as a workshop, or woven through a teacher education program in another</td>
<td>Belgarde et al. (2002); Brant-Birioukov et al. (2020); Dominguez (2017); Hampton &amp; DeMartini (2017); Kerr &amp; Andreotti (2019); Maloney et al. (2019); Mashford-Pringle &amp; Nardozi (2013); Nardozi &amp; Mashford-Pringle (2014);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Course (n=7)</td>
<td>Research or reporting of the integration of a single multicultural education course, Indigenous education course, foundational theory and development, etc. as an effort to make change in teacher education.</td>
<td>Boutte (2018); Brant-Birioukov et al. (2020); de Oliveira Andreotti et al. (2014); French (2008); Glas &amp; Cardenas-Claros (2013); Oskineegish (2018); Riley et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Indigeneity (n=8)</td>
<td>Programs that have begun to integrate Indigenous content, practice, and pedagogy in one or more courses. This may include the integration of Indigenous histories, knowledges, Indigenous guest speakers and the like.</td>
<td>Brant-Birioukov et al. (2020); Halagao (2010); Kerr (2014); Kerr (2020); Nardozi &amp; Mashford-Pringle (2014); Oskineegish (2018); Restoule &amp; Nardozi (2019); Riley et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding Epistemic Shifts (n=5)</td>
<td>This involves the discussion of meeting teacher candidates where they are in their thinking and building up their criticality/commitment from there. This sometimes took a specific focus on developing awareness of settler colonialism, whiteness, critical historicity, and analysis of school structures and subject matter.</td>
<td>Agbenyega &amp; Deku (2011); Boutte (2018); de Oliveira Andreotti et al. (2014); Kerr (2014); Restoule &amp; Nardozi (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Centered (n=2)</td>
<td>These efforts include integrating post-colonial Western constructivist frames of teaching into African countries (Namibia). Specifically, these efforts focused on early childhood education and learner centered pedagogy.</td>
<td>Arreman et al. (2016); Prochner et al. (2016c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging Cultural Knowledge to Curriculum (n=2)</td>
<td>Teacher education programs reflecting this theme scaffolded and integrated teacher candidates cultural knowledge with the required knowledge of the teacher preparation program.</td>
<td>Prochner et al. (2016a); Tupu Tuia (2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Radical Reform (n=14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Reviewed Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Epistemologies and Ontologies (n=10)</td>
<td>Integration and implementation of Indigenous knowledge systems and ontologies. Demonstrable effort to foster teacher candidate commitments and engagement of epistemological and ontological heterogeneity. There was a greater degree of Indigenous knowledge systems represented in the literature than ontologies within this thematic strand.</td>
<td>Amsler et al. (2020); Badenhorst (2019); Kasun (2017); Kerr &amp; Parent (2016); Lees (2015); Lees (2016); Lopes Cardozo (2012); Lopes Cardozo (2013); Martin &amp; Pirbhai-Illlich (2016); Prochner et al. (2016b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion Experience (n=8)</td>
<td>Immersion programs in teacher education place candidates outside of the university context for varied durations of time. Many of these programs researched study abroad experiences as efforts to prepare candidates to think differently about education and teaching in relation to BIPOC communities.</td>
<td>Badenhorst (2019); Kasun &amp; Saavedra (2016); Kasun (2017); Lees (2015); Lees (2016); Martin &amp; Pirbhai-Illlich (2016); Weuffen et al. (2019); Wiltse (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partnerships (n=8)</td>
<td>Within these partnerships, teacher educators collaborate with communities to develop teacher preparation experiences, holding courses within community or school settings, and engaging community members, teachers, and students as co-teacher educators.</td>
<td>Handa &amp; Tippins (2013); Kasun (2017); Lees (2015); Lees (2016); Lees &amp; Vélez (2019); Prochner et al. (2016b); Sosa-Provencio (2018), Wiltse (2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### System Decline (n=0)

### Beyond Reform (n=0)

The following provides the Framework Synthesis, where we turn our attention to each category of reform to discuss the specific themes found therein.

**Soft Reform**

Within system expansion, we saw efforts to reimagine teacher education and better prepare future teachers. Literature was categorized as soft reform, through the subsequent
themes, because it met the description of working to address systemic issues such as colonialism and racism through individual or institutional change, which is dependent upon a belief that the institution itself is only in need of adaptation to serve all communities. These engagements depicted commitments to advancing equity in education and in some instances anti-racist teaching. Although the pieces in this body of literature articulated interest in decolonization decolonizing theory, they did not include design principles to enact decolonization intellectually or in lived reality to bring about postcolonial futures.

**Critical Self Reflection**

Studies depicted critical self-reflection assignments and discussion experiences to foster primarily white TCs’ developing identities as teachers ready to work in schools serving Black, Brown, and Indigenous students and communities. These assignments and experiences explicitly engaged discussions around equity in education and the need to understand one’s own positionality. For example, Mawhinney et al. (2020) used critical self reflection assignments and courageous conversations to engage TCs in processes to “decolonize the mind” and understand issues of racism in education, but did not yet endeavor toward change beyond individual thought. Johnston et al. (2009) depicted a diversity institute for TCs where, through critical self reflection engagements, TCs were asked to consider their awareness of personalized behaviors; discover new experiences of the world; become open to new perspectives; and engage in discussion (Johnston et al., 2009, p. 6). Albeit introductory in nature, we saw critical self-reflection as an important initial aspect of TC development.

**Additive Curriculum**

Also prevalent in the review were teacher education programs that added curricular or experiential content relevant to decolonization, Indigenous knowledges, equity, or anti-racist
teaching through isolated experiences. Working to integrate Indigenous knowledges into program courses, Restoule & Nardozi (2019) highlighted the “Deepening Knowledge project” where Indigenous and settler educators partner as guest speakers. Halagao (2004, 2010) found both immediate (2004) and long-lasting (2010) effects for students through a two course sequence designed around “Pinoy Teach”, a comprehensive ethnic studies curriculum that integrated Filipinx and Filipinx American history and culture in US and global contexts. Taking another approach, Weuffen et al. (2019) discussed the integration of a community-centric museum exhibit highlighting the use of authentic Aboriginal voices and perspectives in the development of the exhibit. The literature depicting examples of additive curriculum toward decolonization in teacher education reported limited impact on TCs’ readiness to shift practices in school settings, however, we found they offered insight into the ways teacher educators are making beginning efforts of reform.

Single Class

A pattern across the literature depicted efforts within a single course in the continuum of a teacher education program. Riley et al. (2019) examined the experiences of TCs in a course around indigeneity. They included Indigenous guest speakers with a focus on settler government policies and their impacts on Indigenous peoples, contemporary racism, and art practices as an aspect of identity. Oskineegish (2018) examined a mandatory Indigenous education course, with four common themes: story, land, art, and reflection. Literature depicted that the single-course model proved effective in increasing TCs' understanding of Indigenous knowledges and inclusive pedagogical practices. However, both Oskineegish (2018) and Riley et al. (2019) agreed with others (see Moreton Robinson et al., 2012) that the single course design had
limitations and integrated, sustained requirements were necessary to engage content and pedagogical strategies.

**Introduction to Indigeneity**

Recognizing a need to disrupt western dominance and settler colonialism in teacher education, and similar to the *additive curriculum*, we found programs integrating aspects of Indigenous education at an introductory level. Kerr (2014), Restoule & Nardozi (2019), and Riley et al. (2019) each depicted efforts to shift curriculum by integrating introductory content around Indigenous histories, epistemologies, and guest speakers. These studies depicted how TCs were impacted by learning from and about Indigenous peoples and their resistance to such engagements. This theme offered examples of teacher educators trying to engage Indigenous pedagogies or practices in their courses. As an example, Kerr (2020) emphasized the need to examine whiteness to prepare TCs for meeting the needs of children across contexts and employed talking circles as a pedagogical strategy. Oskineegish (2018) acknowledged that instructors of such courses are challenged to teach critically important content and introduce new pedagogies to support the teaching and learning of Indigenous children. We agree with Oskineegish (2018) and worry that if these efforts are not supported they are at risk of perpetuating stereotypes through shallow learning engagements.

**Scaffolding Epistemic Shifts**

With teacher education programs working to shift TC thinking and world views, there was a pattern of teacher educators working to meet TCs where they are and build their understandings of epistemological heterogeneity. Boutte (2018) argued the need for scaffolding TCs development and underscored the depth of transformation teacher educators desire from TCs who have grown up in predominantly segregated spaces with deficit framings of Black,
Brown, and Indigenous communities. de Oliveira Andreotti et al. (2014) challenged TCs with texts that exposed the colonization of knowledge and educational practice in several geographic contexts. This literature depicted that primarily white TCs come to teacher education programs with varying degrees of understandings around world views different than their own, and depict programmatic efforts to build their readiness to engage a multiplicity of knowledges within their future teaching.

Learner Centered

Two of the articles focused on educational interventions in Namibia where western constructivist frames of teaching and learning were instituted in the post-colonial era\(^2\) focused on early childhood education (ECE) and learner-centered pedagogy. Prochner et al. (2016c) examined one of these efforts and noted that “The lecturers and student teachers may well understand the dominant discourse in [ECE], but we ask if this is at the expense of Indigenous knowledges that may be associated with local languages.” (p. 96). Arreman et al. (2016) also examined a constructivist-based teacher education program in Namibia and found an impact on TCs, but the community worried that placing learners at the center seemed to come at the expense of respect for teachers.

Bridging Cultural Knowledge to Curriculum

We also found programs that attempted to scaffold and integrate TCs’ own cultural knowledge with the required knowledge of the teacher preparation program. These programs attempted to use the TCs’ backgrounds as a stepping stone to the formal preparation curriculum. Prochner et al. (2016a) described the "bridging program [in Canada as] grounded in critical pedagogy … to encourage the participating immigrant and refugee women to voice their

\(^2\) In this instance we use post-colonial to signify a particular time in the history of Namibia.
knowledges and ideas in order to influence their existing practice” (p. 57). However, the researchers note that despite the program’s orientation the TCs did not integrate their own cultural knowledges instead they adopted a more western approach in hopes of being considered “professional”. Tupu Tuia (2018) demonstrated a desire to bridge cultural knowledges with teacher education content, but made clear the difficulty due to resistance of the community who refused to allow for shallow representations of their epistemologies and ontologies.

**Radical Reform**

Within system expansion but depicting further desire to make efforts toward decolonization, we saw literature categorized within the radical reform space. Literature in this category was identified as radical reform as it depicted efforts toward systemic change that recognized systems of education are in need of complete transformation to address issues such as racism and colonization. This research focused efforts of transformation on immersion experiences, community partnerships, and integration of Indigenous epistemologies as central to curriculum. Many efforts aimed to shift teacher educators and TCs from an acceptance of settler colonialism as a necessary social construct toward a critical perspective with commitments toward more just futures.

**Immersion Experiences**

Immersion experiences took form through both short-term local and longer-term study abroad experiences. These experiences were situated in *radical reform* as the programs were working in collaboration with local communities to integrate multiple knowledge systems into the preparation programs, prioritizing opportunities for community educators to have a voice in the preparation of future teachers. Through this, researchers intentionally designed experiences in ways that were different than study abroad programs grounded in anthropological studies of
the “other.” Short-term immersion experiences were often situated in collaboration with Indigenous communities, primarily First Nations in Canada (see Weuffen et al., 2019; Wiltse, 2016), but also in urban Chicago (see Lees, 2015; 2016). This literature positioned TCs to learn Indigenous histories and epistemologies from Indigenous peoples to build critical understandings of settler colonialism. We also see important work by Martin & Pirbhai-Illlich (2016) to engage relational pedagogy that emphasized community axiologies and ontologies that were foundational to pedagogical approaches, which was missing in much of the literature. Intersecting immersion experiences with Indigenous community immersion, Badenhorst (2019) shared outcomes from a 5-week experience in Ecuador that facilitated TC interactions with Indigenous peoples and the natural world. Importantly, this study also recognized the need for caution in engaging immersion experiences and the risk of TCs feeling they can speak with authority on issues of indigeneity, asserting that immersion experiences require ongoing, structural facilitation and debriefing.

*Community Partnership*

Another theme depicted programs working to make systems-level change through close collaboration with community partners to rethink how beginning teachers are prepared and who is involved in such preparation. Prochner et al. (2016b) examined the implementation of an early childhood teacher preparation program in Colombia in a Misak community focused on EuroWestern early childhood principles of education. University professors co-constructed the curriculum with Misak educators who adapted curriculum materials to meet Misak educational goals. Emphasizing the need of partnering with Indigenous community members to develop teacher preparation content, Lees (2015; 2016) focused on building partnerships with Indigenous adults and elders as co-teacher educators within an urban Indigenous community center. This
work resulted in community members guiding TCs’ developing understandings of their future roles as teachers serving Indigenous children and families.

*Indigenous Epistemologies and Ontologies*

Frequently co-occurring with *immersion experiences* and/or *community partnerships* were programs that integrated Indigenous epistemologies, and less frequently ontologies, as central in their preparation curriculum. These programs worked to dismantle settler colonialism by disrupting epistemicide in curricular content. Kerr and Parent (2016) described incorporating multiple local Indigenous elders into a course that engaged TCs with elders’ knowledge through and within Indigenous storywork. This was different from literature in the *additive approach* or *single course* as the Indigenous community partners were engaged throughout the course and the integration of Indigenous knowledges and pedagogies were fundamental to the course design. Connections with land and water were integral in the immersion experience Baddenhorst (2019) depicted where TCs had structured experiences with both Indigenous peoples and the natural world. Thus, emphasizing that Indigenous epistemologies, ontologies, and efforts of decolonization must be nurtured in relation with lands and waters. Lopes Cardozo (2012, 2013) examined efforts by Evo Morales’ government in Bolivia to make teacher education *normales* engines of decolonization. This work was fraught with roadblocks, yet where courses on local Indigenous language and culture courses were added, there was greater self-identification of Indigenous TCs and more teaching about and engagement with Indigenous cultures (Lopes Cardozo, 2012).

**Beyond Reform**

To note, there were no examples of teacher education programs within the *beyond reform* stage. Given the conditions of teacher education, and higher education broadly, it feels
disappointing but expected that the programs under review have not given up on the game of teacher education (de Oliveira Andreotti, 2015). While Harney and Moten (2013) offer some framing for those engaging in fugitivity to dismantle the institution from within, we recognize the limitations of doing so when institutions are so entangled with colonial ideals and teacher educators bear responsibility for preparing TCs to serve today’s children.

Discussion

To answer our research questions through a critical interpretive analysis of the literature, we employed de Oliveira Andreotti et al.’s (2015) social cartography framework as a tool to analyze and synthesize the ways teacher education programs are working to prepare TCs toward Indigenous postcolonial futures across the continuum from system expansion to system decline. We identified themes within de Oliveira Andreotti et al.’s constructs of soft reform and radical reform in search of examples and insights to guide a radical reimagining of teacher education. While we sought examples of teacher education programs enacting decolonization, fugitivity, or abolition in the preparation of teacher candidates, all of the reviewed literature fell within system expansion and within that, most of the efforts were identified as soft reform. While unfortunate given our commitments and theoretical groundings toward postcolonial futures, we understand this finding in the field of teacher education given the history and design of the field, external constraints, and current sociopolitical contexts. The studies focused on the practice of preparing teachers within the confines of settler colonialism as it takes form through processes such as accreditation, regulation compliance, and high-stakes testing. While much of the literature depicted strong commitments by teacher educators to engage in decolonization and resist epistemicide in both teacher education and the K-12 sector, there are many restrictions to bringing such commitments to fruition especially through isolated efforts by single faculty.
A significant number of the studies (n=31) report on an individual professor or small group of professors enacting system expansion and beginning efforts of decolonization within a university course or program. These faculty members are using their formal authority to exercise power over the parts of the institution where they can, yet the work is bound by the higher education system, and limited by the many barriers that have been built up over time (Harney & Moten, 2013; la paperson, 2017). Conversely, projects where the state is the key actor, such as Bolivia (Lopes-Cardozo, 2012; 2013) have access to more forms of power to reshape institutions and transform systems, but have still been largely underdeveloped in practice.

Within the literature identified as radical reform, the majority of studies engaged decolonizing theories as the primary framework to engage TCs developing commitments to transformation and postcolonial futures. In fact, only one article referenced fugitivity, and none spoke to abolition in teacher education. This outcome depicts theoretical limitations of reform efforts and while we had anticipated examples of fugitivity and abolition, we make sense of the findings through a few aspects. First, theories of abolition and fugitivity are much more recent discussions in education (see Love, 2019; Stovall, 2018) and theories of decolonization have had more time to develop in applied settings. In fact, most of the reviewed literature was published between 2010-2020. We also did not search terms related to abolition and fugitivity as we sought programs working within current theoretical framings as developed through the specific literature base and previously defined. Moreover, it seems probable that scholars involved in projects pursuing fugitivity or abolition may protect this work and their positionalities by not publicizing it. We hypothesize that strategic obscurity and the timeframe of these theories in the field, might explain some of the absence in the literature.
We did see fugitivity applied by Lees and Vélez (2019) through their use of a university program that was intentionally and invisibly designed to foster fugitive spaces, based on la paperson’s (2017) concept of a “third university,” in which elements of the university can be strategically and opportunistically recontextualized to do decolonizing work. This suggests an important complication to the mapping framework, suggesting that projects which are system expansion in form may function in beyond reform ways. We call for more literature to analyze the institutional context in relationship with decolonizing projects so that the teacher preparation field can develop more sophisticated analytical tools and incisive practices.

As noted, the reviewed literature lacked examples of teacher education programs engaging beyond reform efforts within system decline. This should come as an unsurprising finding as the literature we reviewed came from mainstream academic journals and teacher education programs within university spaces. To prepare teacher candidates and conduct research within university settings is in itself contradictory to how de Oliveira Andreotti et al. (2015) theorize system decline. Working to prepare future teachers for the current reality of schools, within the limitations of higher education, directly contradicts notions to give up on the system altogether. We do hope, and expect, that such efforts are taking place outside of formal teacher education within communities and grassroots organizations that have developed localized education initiatives and community-based educators.

Furthermore, we find it critical to discuss the integration of Indigenous education within teacher preparation experiences that was prevalent in the reviewed literature. This effort is complex, urgently needed, and if not done well can cause great harm by furthering historical patterns of institutional violence toward Indigenous TCs and communities. Our reviewed literature depicted a continuum of approaches to engage Indigenous education including direct
partnerships with Indigenous communities, integration of Indigenous curricular content, and
some recognition of Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies. We also found a need in the
reviewed literature to further engage Indigenous axiologies and pedagogical supports to support
TCs understandings of curricular content as well as foundational understandings of “why” and
“how” such content is engaged (see among others Bang et al., 2016; Pewewardy et al. 2022;
Deloria & Wildcat, 2001; Kulago, 2019).

Mapping teacher education literature onto de Oliveira Andreotti et al.’s (2015) social
cartography offered an important framework to understand how teacher education programs are
preparing candidates to teach in both current realities and toward Indigenous postcolonial
futures. We analyzed the sophisticated ways that teacher education programs depicted efforts
toward decolonization and found they spanned themes. For example, many teacher education
programs utilizing a single course engaged TCs in critical self-reflection; and some immersion
experiences emphasized engagement with Indigenous education and often engaged community
partnerships. We see the permeable boundaries of our identified themes as expected and
desirable, indicating collective movement. In fact, we are encouraged to know that teacher
education programs working to engage systemic change are taking integrated efforts to do so,
offering glimpses of what teacher education can become.

Limitations

We suspect that our searches using university library databases missed significant,
relevant literature. Although our initial search yielded numerous teacher education articles, we
excluded them from our review due to their lack of focus on decolonization, fugitivity, or
abolition. Conversely, these searches failed to retrieve literature outside the field of teacher
education that specifically addressed these themes. These returns raise important questions
regarding the search algorithms employed by various databases and the extent to which certain keywords receive preferential treatment and those that are devalued. The observed pattern of absence highlights the challenges faced by Indigenous, Black, and Brown scholars who explore decolonization and postcolonialism. These authors cannot rely on formal institutional networks to share their scholarly work in fields that fall outside of EuroWestern norms. We also did not search for grey literature outside academic databases often depicting important field-based programs and practices. Additionally, examining and condensing a large number of qualitative research articles, chapters, reports, and more might produce an oversimplification of the work or dilute its findings. Still, we do believe it holds the potential to connect ideas and practices across typical academic boundaries.

Implications and Conclusion

As stated, we pulled 1,313 results for this review with 45 on-topic pieces of literature. Based on our critical literature synthesis, we concluded that the majority of research related to our keywords did not realize goals to disrupt the design or function of settler-colonial systems of education. Such examples mapped onto de Oliveira Andreotti et al.’s (2015) social cartography framework as efforts of system expansion, demonstrating a perspective that “Everyone can win once we all know the rules” (p. 25). However, we are left to ask, what are we playing for and should we even play?

The immediacy of current realities and its consequences often leave teacher educators few options. Without securing state recognition and professional accreditation, teacher education programs risk the short-term futures of TCs and their K-12 students. For teacher educators, we can see how the continued over-regulation of education has created significant structural problems, with preparation programs caught between higher and K-12 education (Zeichner et al.,
As this study and others demonstrate, teacher educators and K-12 colleagues have shown how they can work within existing educational structures creating space for innovative work that attempts to disrupt the systemic Eurocentric hegemony toward more just experiences for Black, Brown, and Indigenous youth. While related, each of these systems are on distinct evolutionary paths that, at present, do not entertain decolonial efforts towards radical reimaginings. This leads to the many examples we found of soft-decolonization tucked within teacher education programs, rather than programs working toward decolonization throughout the continuum of TC preparation. The majority of these efforts fell within soft reform where teacher educators and teacher education programs demonstrated beginning commitments to decolonization, but did not make the needed systemic changes to result in transformation toward postcolonial futures. The research within the radical reform space took greater action to disrupt settler colonial systems and make systemic change within teacher education; however, as these efforts remained within Andreotti et al’s (2015) state of systemic expansion the changes were not radical enough to move beyond reform toward a real imagination of sustainable futures.

Given that colonization is historically backed by the power of the state, we need more literature that theorizes the possibilities and problems of state-supported decolonization projects in teacher education to move beyond isolated efforts. Although we found few instances of state support for educational decolonization efforts, there were several examples where authorities adopted western education models and encountered resistance from Indigenous educators themselves (see Tupu Tuia, 2018; Prochner et al., 2016b; Prochner et al., 2016c). Indeed, these educational approaches - learner centered, play-based learning, etc. - were contrary to the Indigenous axiologies and ontologies in the local communities. As McCoy and Villeneuve (2020) demonstrate, there is a long and rich history of Indigenous agency in these types of
educational encounters that resist educational systems rooted in western values. These initiatives perpetuate harmful practices by continuing efforts of settler colonialism and epistemicide and do not move us toward radical reimaginations.

Based on our findings and the body of conceptual work we consulted that has engaged in radical reform spaces, a significant number of researchers agree with de Oliveira Andreotti et al.’s (2015) characterization of schooling as a “rigged” game with rules that need to change. Therefore, if teacher education is to fully commit to decolonization toward postcolonial futures, we believe engaging the beyond reform space in system decline is necessary. This is not an easy effort to take up and may not seem possible in the near future, but given the current conditions of teacher education and K-12 schooling, “playing the game” does not make sense through a lens of decolonization and Indigenous futures. We imagine a future of teacher education outside of universities to support community-based education, a space where we engage future educators in understanding and valuing epistemological, axiological, and ontological heterogeneity in order to enact teaching and learning environments relevant to local socioecological systems. Such heterogeneity would afford teacher educators the opportunity to authentically enact an intersectional lens in justice-oriented discussions that include race and ethnicity, dis/ability, and gender and sexuality, offering a context where a multiplicity of identities are affirmed and nurtured. While this may not be the current reality, and may seem outside our roles as teacher educators, it is an exciting possibility to consider that has the potential to “lead to other modes of existence” (de Oliveira Andreotti et al., 2015, p. 25) necessary for our collective continuance (Whyte, 2018).
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