
1-19-2020

Learning to Teach in Diverse Schools: Two Approaches to Teacher Education

Ashlee B. Anderson

University of Tennessee, abanders@utk.edu

Brittany A. Aronson

Miami University - Oxford, aronsoba@miamioh.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>



Part of the [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#), [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

This Article has supplementary content. View the full record on NSUWorks here:

<https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol25/iss1/8>

Recommended APA Citation

Anderson, A. B., & Aronson, B. A. (2020). Learning to Teach in Diverse Schools: Two Approaches to Teacher Education. *The Qualitative Report*, 25(1), 105-126. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2020.3746>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Qualitative Report at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Qualitative Report by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.



Qualitative Research Graduate Certificate
Indulge in Culture
Exclusively Online • 18 Credits
LEARN MORE

NSU
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN
UNIVERSITY

NOVA SOUTHEASTERN

Learning to Teach in Diverse Schools: Two Approaches to Teacher Education

Abstract

With this paper, we explore two approaches to teacher education, paying attention to how teachers are prepared to work in diverse school settings in a time of increasingly competitive neoliberal, market-based reform. These two approaches reflect completion of a traditional teacher education program and completion of Teach for America (TFA). The findings are based on two independent interview studies that are informed by the researchers' joint commitments to postcritical ethnography, which consider issues associated with positionality, reflexivity, objectivity, and representation. The first interview study engaged teachers who graduated from a traditional teacher education program, as well as two participants with a more specialized urban focus. Interview questions asked teachers to describe their implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy in their classrooms and how prepared they were to do so. The second study addressed the experiences of TFA alumni as they matriculated through the program, with special emphasis being paid to the support that each corps member received during and immediately following their tenure.

Keywords

Teacher Education, Teach for America, Educational Policy, Postcritical Ethnography

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Learning to Teach in Diverse Schools: Two Approaches to Teacher Education

Ashlee Anderson

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, USA

Brittany A. Aronson

Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, USA

With this paper, we explore two approaches to teacher education, paying attention to how teachers are prepared to work in diverse school settings in a time of increasingly competitive neoliberal, market-based reform. These two approaches reflect completion of a traditional teacher education program and completion of Teach for America (TFA). The findings are based on two independent interview studies that are informed by the researchers' joint commitments to postcritical ethnography, which consider issues associated with positionality, reflexivity, objectivity, and representation. The first interview study engaged teachers who graduated from a traditional teacher education program, as well as two participants with a more specialized urban focus. Interview questions asked teachers to describe their implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy in their classrooms and how prepared they were to do so. The second study addressed the experiences of TFA alumni as they matriculated through the program, with special emphasis being paid to the support that each corps member received during and immediately following their tenure. Keywords: Teacher Education, Teach for America, Educational Policy, Postcritical Ethnography

Introduction

There have always been newcomers in this country; there have always been strangers. There have always been young persons in our classrooms we did not, could not see or hear. (Greene, 1992, p. 13)

Maxine Greene (1992) speaks of a pluralism that has produced “unimaginable diversities” in our country (p. 13). In order to reconcile these diversities with the expanded sense of community that they make possible, we must heed the multiplicity of voices, once silenced, through “concrete engagements” (p. 13). For educators whose classrooms more often than not reflect such “unimaginable diversities,” these points become particularly salient. At the same time that our K-12 student populations are becoming more and more racially and linguistically diverse, our teaching force remains predominantly white and monolingual English-speaking, a demographic divide that has serious implications for all students, especially those who identify with cultures that may be unfamiliar to their teachers (Boser, 2014; Goodwin, 2017). Yet, many future educators are not given opportunities via teacher preparation to develop the competencies necessary to meet the pedagogical needs of all students, regardless of their individual backgrounds, learning styles, and/or interests. The same social foundations of education coursework that has the capacity to provide “teachers with the opportunity to understand such cultural mismatches and their attendant implications for students’ academic engagement, acceptance of the achievement ideology, social and cultural

capital, and home-school relations” are becoming more and more marginalized in teacher education (Butin, 2005, p. 220). What is more, traditional teacher preparation programs are being forced to compete with alternative certification routes that embrace the perceived advantages of on-the-job teacher training, as opposed to extensive pre-service preparation for diverse classrooms. The ultimate outcome is the development of educators who may be ill-equipped to engage the students for whose academic successes they will be responsible and, consequently, the potential silencing of student populations whose backgrounds may be inconsistent with whitestream norms perpetuated in public schools.

With this paper, we explore two approaches to teacher education, paying particular attention to how teachers are prepared to work in diverse school settings in a time of increasingly competitive neoliberal, market-based reform. These two approaches reflect completion of a traditional teacher education program and completion of Teach For America (TFA). This sort of comparative design was used to reflect key distinctions in the ways in which teacher education has been operationalized in the U.S. As such, a comparative approach highlights established divergences in national discourses surrounding the goals and purposes of teacher education. The findings are based on two interview studies that are informed by the researchers’ joint commitments to postcritical ethnography, which consider issues associated with positionality, reflexivity, objectivity, and representation. The first interview study engaged teachers who graduated from a traditional teacher education program with teacher educators who explicitly teach for social justice. Interview questions asked teachers to describe their implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy in their classrooms and how prepared they were to do so. The second study addressed the experiences of TFA alumni as they matriculated through the program, with special emphasis being paid to the support that each corps member received during and immediately following their tenure. The overarching research questions guiding this joint analysis were:

1. How are novice teachers in a university-based teacher education program versus Teach for America (TFA) prepared to work in diverse school settings?
2. How are they supported as they transition into the classroom?

These questions are informed by the individual research questions that guided the two independent studies: (1) Traditional teacher education: How are pre-service teachers in a traditional teacher education prepared to teach in diverse settings? (2) TFA: How are corps members prepared, via their preservice training and in-service support, to create the systemic changes necessary to end educational inequity? We begin with a discussion of the larger reform context in which teacher education is positioned, after which we outline our process of analysis and methods. Next, we describe the specifics of each individual program and the participants with whom we spoke. Finally, we discuss the findings individually and then collectively, and we provide implications for teacher education as a whole.

The Current Landscape of Teacher Education

From the late 1990s into the 21st century, several political movements impacted teacher education research, policy, and practice, including the standards and accountability movement, initiatives to privatize education via market-based education reforms, and the positioning of educational access as a civil rights issue (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, 2011; Zeichner, 2010). Within these political movements, “teacher quality” became explicitly linked with student success, despite the overall lack of definitional clarity regarding what constitutes success (Floden, 2005). In addition, widespread concern over the importance of teachers and the perceived “low-standards” of public schools opened teacher education up to critique as one

contributor to persistent inequities and international underperformance (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, 2011; Kumashiro, 2010). As such, teacher education became a central target of educational policy debates in the early 2000s.

Competing Agendas

Several scholars have written about teacher education reform over the last two decades (e.g., Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, 2011; Zeichner, 2005, 2010, 2011; Sleeter, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2014). For example, Cochran-Smith and Fries (2005) highlight four major political agendas impacting teacher education reform. While these agendas are competing with one another in many ways, they are not mutually exclusive and often overlap (p. 44).

- The *professionalism* agenda aims to make teaching a research-based profession, in part by ensuring that all teachers are fully certified to implement professional standards (i.e. NCATE).
- The *deregulation* agenda aims to eliminate entry requirements into the teaching profession to allow for alternative routes to certification [i.e. American Board for the Certification of Teaching (ABCTE) and Teach for America (TFA)].
- The *regulation* agenda supports increased involvement from both the federal and state governments regarding regulations (i.e., content of courses in teacher education) in relation to outcomes (i.e., teacher entry examinations).
- Finally, the *social justice* agenda has conceptualized teaching in terms of social justice as a means to end inequitable practices in public schools (i.e. tracking and/or the overrepresentation of students of color in special education).

Additionally, Zeichner (2010) contends that recent trends in U.S. teacher education are tied to larger global neoliberal forces that characteristically support privatization, deregulation, and competition between the public and private spheres. For example, the *commoditization of teacher education* is paving the way for alternatives to traditional teacher education (similar to Cochran-Smith and Fries' *deregulation* agenda). This is a bi-partisan effort actively encouraging states to loosen their teaching certification requirements through programs such as the ABCTE and TFA. Zeichner (2010) explains, "what is important to note about the alternatives being encouraged is that they are often closely linked with a technicist view of the role of teachers and with efforts to erode teachers' autonomy and collegial authority" (p. 1545). In terms of social justice, this movement encourages "good enough teachers" to teach marginalized students by obediently following scripted curricula and raising standardized tests scores.

Zeichner (2010) also reports *increased and often excessive accountability demands* placed on teacher education programs by states and national accrediting bodies. Zeichner asserts that, while there is nothing inherently wrong with having teacher educators determine the extent to which candidates are prepared to meet agreed-upon standards, there is a problem when the "level of details teacher educators are required to produce for evaluators begins to interfere with the accomplishment of the goals of teacher educators and is loosely if at all connected to actual program quality" (pp. 1547-1548). Teacher educators, then, are at risk of becoming as regulated as classroom teachers.

Finally, Zeichner (2010) identifies a trend relating to *attacks on multicultural education*. He explains, "these attacks equate a focus on social justice and multiculturalism with a lowering of academic standards and blame university teacher educators for the continued problems in educating public school students who are increasingly poor and of color" (p. 1549). These attacks divert attention away from the real problems that impact public education:

underfunding, lack of affordable housing and transportation, healthcare, and a shortage of jobs that pay a living wage (Anyon, 2014).

Similar to Zeichner's (2010) analysis, Sleeter (2009) contends that teacher education reforms are undermining equity and democracy by restructuring education around corporate needs. She explains that neoliberals have joined with conservatives to transform education via market-based competition, choice, and privatization. As a result, teacher education programs are: 1) steering away from social justice preparation in order to prepare "teachers as technicians to raise test scores"; 2) moving away from professional knowledge and teacher quality to become more content focused; and 3) becoming shorter and/or by-passed altogether via alternative methods of certification (Sleeter, 2009, p. 612).

To marry these conversations, Gastic (2014) explains how teacher education can be understood as either "Teacher Preparation 1.0 or 2.0." Traditional teacher education programs with a mixture of pedagogy and field-based placements situated in universities are the 1.0 programs, or what we think of when referring to traditional teacher preparation. Programs developed and funded by social entrepreneurs, such as the Relay Graduate School of Education or TFA, are the "newer" versions of teacher preparation (emerging in the 1990s) that are referred to as 2.0. However, Zeichner (2016) contends that, "although most teacher educators in 1.0 and 2.0 programs state that they focus on issues of social justice and equity in preparing teachers, few programs in both categories have enacted in their practices some of the key values of social justice teacher education" (p. 152). With this study, we aim to investigate how these "values" are manifested in the ways in which these two approaches to teacher education prepare (or don't prepare) teachers to work in diverse school settings, something that we believe is essential to social justice teacher education and will return to later in our discussion. Additionally, the comparative approach utilized here is consistent with these diverging approaches to teacher education. As such, our analysis of these two independent data sets will provide more meaningful implications that are positioned in larger discourses surrounding teacher education.

Analytical Approach & Methodology

Postcritical Ethnography

We position ourselves as researchers committed to postcritical ethnography. Postcritical works couple the commitments of critical ethnography and poststructuralism. Born of the marriage of critical theory and interpretive ethnography, critical ethnography seeks to problematize and critique the ways in which power structures social life, primarily through research designed to "develop forms of critical consciousness, both in the researcher and the researched, that can lead to positive social change" (Hyttén, 2004, p. 97; see also, Carspecken, 1996; Noblit, Flores, & Murillo, 2004; Thomas, 1993).

The sort of emancipatory and transformative change advocated by critical researchers, however, has been challenged on the basis of its perceived substitution of one form of power for another, a process which ultimately reinscribes dominance through research. Ultimately, although critical ethnographic works have been rather successful in their ability to enhance the mission of critical theorists, the extent to which they have been able to transform the lives of the oppressed remains a matter of debate (Hyttén, 2004).

To address these concerns, ethnographers committed to postcritical works seek to interrogate contexts of power and systemic inequity, while at the same time advocating for the perceived advantages of a poststructural orientation to knowledge. This anti-essentialist ideology rests on the concept of multiple truths, mediated in large part by the dynamic interplay of discourse as a system of representation that is realized in the lived experiences of individuals.

As a result, poststructuralists aim to deconstruct master narratives, primarily at the level of discourse, and base truth on context instead of seeking to develop monolithic ways of capturing a culture or an identity. For postcritical researchers, then, this coupling of critical and poststructural perspectives means taking seriously issues associated with positionality, reflexivity, objectivity, and representation (Noblit et al., 2004).

Our decision to explore comparisons between these two distinct teacher preparation programs reflect our own experiences as educators. One of us completed a traditional teacher education program, while the other was an alternatively certified classroom teacher (not TFA) who experienced limited preservice training. Although our experiences in some ways overlapped, we were prepared in very different ways to teach in diverse school settings and subsequently had very different classroom experiences, despite similar school contexts.

We contend that our experiences and joint commitments allow us a unique opportunity to collectively explore how these two programs compare, an approach that has been utilized elsewhere (Marx & Pennington, 2003). For example, Marx and Pennington (2003) present findings from two independent studies that examine the authors' experiences, as white female teacher educators, teaching white students about whiteness and white racism. Like those of Marx and Pennington (2003), our studies were similar in that we were interviewing novice teachers about their teacher education, including their experiences teaching diverse populations of students and their understandings of equity/change. These alignments are representative of our joint interest in the creation of more excellent and equitable learning environments for all students, which will undoubtedly impact the analyses that we apply to the data. Where our studies diverged, however, besides the obvious difference in the participants whom we interviewed and their unique teacher education experiences, was in the primary research questions and interview protocols that we generated to guide the studies independently.

However, we contend that this divergence and the subsequent comparative approach that we present here is largely consistent with our commitments to postcritical ethnography. In particular, we find this collective approach particularly helpful in our efforts to engage the two data sources reflexively through joint analysis and deliberation. Although not initially designed to be analyzed in tandem, we saw parallels and convergences within our research that, we believed, provided for more meaningful comparative analysis in light of existing conversations surrounding teacher education. Similarly, postcritical ethnography demands an intentional concern with issues of representation. We believe that our comparative presentation of the two programs is contextually appropriate in light of the political debates surrounding teacher education (see above). In addition, this presentation adds complexity to the analysis and discussion, and so provides a contextual addition to the existing literature, which characteristically treats teacher education program research independently. In fact, we contend that this comparative approach has the capacity to bridge the often contentious research landscape that addresses the efficacy of both traditional teacher education programs and alternative licensure programs like TFA. For example, Cochran-Smith (2002) writes of the ways in which education researchers often use research as a sort of "weapon" to argue for/against a particular policy option. For Cochran-Smith (2002), "the weapon metaphor calls to mind images of fighting, attacks and counterattacks, winners, losers, and casualties; it also suggests the absence of compromise and consensus building" (p. 283). We are hopeful that the comparative approach that we present here, in addition to providing a more robust and reflexive analysis, might help to marry two sides that are often politically opposed.

Positionality of the Researchers

Ashlee's story. In many ways, my story is a lot like those of the individuals whom I interviewed. I had achieved numerous academic successes (and even an advanced degree) in

my subject area, but I had never seriously considered secondary teaching as a long-term career option. When the economy declined and job/schooling prospects diminished, I started looking for teaching positions in my subject area and was hired under an alternative licensure program at a public high school. However, I experienced no formal teacher training until December of that first year. As such, I was completely unprepared for the challenges I faced that first semester. Although I made it work and was viewed as successful by many of my colleagues and administrators, I knew that my lack of adequate training limited my capacity to reach a diverse student body who both needed and deserved an expert teacher. Ultimately, this experience served as the catalyst for my continued commitment to equity, diversity, and the preparation of teachers to meet the unique needs of students and the communities they serve.

Brittany's story. *I strongly identify with being a teacher and I made this decision when I was only 8 years old. From the time I started taking college-level courses, I signed up for anything having to do with education. I entered a traditional teacher education program starting my freshman year of college and studied elementary education. In many ways, I represent the vast majority of teachers in the United States—racially white, mono-lingual English-speaking, middle-class and female. I am also ½ Colombian (Latina) which shaped my later understandings of how whiteness impacts teaching. This has informed my research agenda and the ways we work to prepare teachers in understanding their own positionalities and, in many cases, their whiteness.*

Methods

Both of these independent studies utilized semi-structured interviews, which means that we had initial questions to ask, but as participants answered, more questions were sparked (see Appendix for interview questions). In the first study, Brittany conducted five interviews with exiting teachers (referred to as interns in their 5th year of collaborative mentorships with tenured teachers). While one of the participants XYZ, the remaining four graduated from a traditional teacher education program with an emphasis in social justice – all earning a Master's of Science degree. Additionally, four of the five participants were white females who would go on to teach English in public high schools, while the fifth, also a white female, would eventually teach in multiage elementary- and middle-level Montessori science classrooms. With the second study, Ashlee conducted five interviews with former TFA teachers after their exit from TFA, some earning a Master's in Education. The participant demographics are as follows: a white female and African American female, both of whom taught high school Social Studies (one traditional public school and one charter school); an Asian American female who taught high school Math in a traditional public school; a white male who taught high school Spanish and History in a traditional public school; and an African American female who taught in a public elementary school. After the interviews were transcribed and coded, the data was analyzed via thematic analysis, “a process that involves coding and then segregating the data by codes into data clumps for further analysis and description” (Glesne, 2006, p. 147). We present our findings both comparatively (i.e. individual experiences with teacher preparation, and jointly when themes aligned). For example, both sets of participants talked about the importance of mentorship, which we address jointly in the discussion section below. We also contextualize our data within the programs each of the candidates/teachers were a part of (whether it be the traditional teacher education program(s) or TFA).

Validity, Generalizability, and Limitations

Because qualitative works are based largely on interpretations and meanings that are “particular,” and so situational, positional, and so partial, and ultimately socially constructed,

they do not lend themselves to the kind of experimental examination and/or measurement so often advocated in quantitative research. As a result, issues of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability become much more pertinent to qualitative works than do quantitative concerns like validity, reliability, and objectivity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). However, although there exists no definitive criteria for evaluating the extent to which “truth” has been achieved, or if it is even possible, qualitative researchers can work to establish a certain degree of “trustworthiness,” in their claims (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), primarily by thinking seriously about “how adequately multiple understandings (including the researcher’s) are presented and whether they ‘ring true’ (have face validity)” (Rossman & Rallis, 1998, p. 66).

Creswell (2013) describes procedures that are particularly useful: (1) prolonged engagement, i.e. extensive time spent in the field; (2) triangulation, where multiple sources of data, methods, investigators, and theories are used (see also Lather, 1986); (3) peer review or debriefing; (4) negative case analysis, which refers to the active search of unconfirming evidence to inform the research hypotheses; (5) extensive self-reflection and clarification of researcher bias; (6) member checking to ensure that the findings are being accurately represented; (7) thick description; and (8) external audits of the research process (see also, Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Glesne, 2006; Rossman & Rallis, 1998). Throughout both of our projects, we engaged in several of these practices, particularly extensive self-reflection and clarification of researcher bias via analytic memos, member checking, wherein we submitted our work to the participants for review, and thick descriptions in an effort to add to the overall credibility of this work.

The Programs

Traditional Teacher Education Program

The interns all graduated from a large Southeastern research institution. Pre-service teachers who seek licensure in education must choose a content area major in the College of Arts and Sciences and minor in education. They complete 16-25 hours of undergraduate credits in human development, educational psychology, special education and diverse learners, field experiences/methods, introduction to schools (methods class), and technology in the curriculum. Upon graduation with bachelor’s degrees, students can opt into one of two tracks during their “fifth” year for a Master’s of Science degree. Most of the students decide to go the licensure route, which requires 33 additional credit hours and a one-year apprenticeship-style internship which earns them one-year of teaching credit in the State. Within this curriculum, every student takes courses titled, *Trends and Issues in Education* (all the participants shared the same instructor), *Computer Applications in Education*, and *Introduction to Multimedia in Education*. Additionally, they take 12 credit hours in their areas of concentration, 3-12 hours in electives, and an action-research class which counts as a “non-thesis” project. Those not going the licensure route more often will complete and defend a thesis project.

Teach For America

Teach For America seeks to “create the systemic changes that will help end educational inequity” both inside and outside the classroom, primarily through the development of a national teaching corps of high-performing recent college graduates and professionals, who have committed to teach for two years in hard-to-staff urban and rural public school districts (Teach For America, 2013, p. 1). Following a rigorous admissions process, accepted applicants

participate in a series of intensive pre-service activities: (1) thirty hours of independent work and experienced teacher observations; (2) a regional orientation to their new schools and communities (induction); and (3) a five-week training institute centered on practice teaching (summer school programs), veteran teacher feedback, and development (seminars and practice sessions). Once they begin their service in the classroom, corps members receive additional and ongoing TFA-sponsored support, including annual observations and feedback from instructional coaches, customized teaching resources, and periodic content and grade-level learning team meetings, as well as various school-based professional development events, on the path to achieve full teacher certification, which may or may not result in a master's degree (Teach For America, 2013). In theory, these activities prepare corps members to "become lifelong leaders in the effort to expand educational opportunity" (Teach For America, 2013, p. 1).

Findings

Traditional Teacher Education Program

At the completion of their teacher education program, the interns' exit interviews revealed three predominant themes in relation to their preparation for diverse schools: (1) *support for social justice*, wherein the participants discussed the ways in which their teacher preparation exposed them to content/curricula that was explicitly oriented towards social justice, typically via teacher educators who shared that commitment; (2) *awareness and positionality*, which included discussions of the participants' recognition of various power dynamics, as well as how their perceptions were altered as the result of the social justice orientation of their preparation; and (3) *(in)competence*, which refers to those areas in which the participants felt competent vs. what they felt less prepared to handle, including how their perceived (in)adequacies regarding their preparation impacted their capabilities to teach in diverse schools.

Support for Social Justice

Each of the interns felt that they had received an extraordinary amount of support to aid in their teaching for social justice. In particular, the participants all spoke of coursework taught through a social justice lens by teacher educators who explicitly identified their commitments to social justice. For example, Rusty, who had taken a course titled "Trends and Issues in Education" that all Master's students are required to take, expressed how this class in particular supported her understandings of social justice:

I would say the social justice training in [trends and issues] was probably the most influential class. I feel like that class really broadened horizons for me and made me challenge my beliefs about race, religion. And then probably just the politics and how political everything is. (Rusty, personal communication, June 24, 2013)

Here, we see the ways in which Rusty was exposed to new ideas via coursework that intentionally took up complex social issues and inequitable power dynamics at work in U.S. society. This sentiment was shared across the participants, who unanimously labeled this

course as one of the most important requirements of their entire teacher preparation. This was due to both the coursework, as well as the intentional work of the teacher educators themselves

Quote about the teacher educators

Ultimately, it was clear that the support, and even mentorship, that the interns received from teacher educators, who were explicit about their commitments to social justice via their pedagogies and curricula, was key in their own understandings of how they could begin their journeys to teach for social justice in their own classrooms.

Awareness and Positionality

The interns spoke at length about their evolving critical awareness and their unique positionalities, which would inform both their pedagogies and the ways in which they implemented their curriculum. With this section, we elaborate these ideas via discussions of two primary sub-themes, which we have labeled as follows: (1) *students*, which refers to the ways in which the interns' positionalities impacted their perceptions of students; and (2) *race and whiteness*, wherein we discuss how the interns' changing perceptions altered their willingness/ability to confront race and their own whiteness.

Students. The participants' increasingly critical awareness of their positionalities bled into how they believed teachers should think about students. For example, Rusty explained:

I think that if you really want to reach your students, you need to meet them where they are in life. I think that you need to have that awareness. During my intern year, I saw a lot of teachers inadvertently make racist assumptions or racist comments, and it seems like they were trying to fit every child regardless of their ability, regardless of who they were personally or culturally into the same box. (Rusty, personal communication, June 24, 2013)

Rusty was able to use her understandings of differentiation related to culturally relevant pedagogy and her understandings of tracking to be critical of the segregation she saw happening in her school placement. This led her to question how teachers might connect with students in light of what she saw as an inadequate understanding of systemic racism and school structures. In a similar vein, Ariel struggled with what she considered to be traditional views of "diversity" in her training program, whose emphasis on cultural diversity tended to center race and ethnicity by working with students of color. While Ariel found this extremely important, she felt that it was more important to take what she learned in the program and bring it back to her rural hometown, which was predominantly white. She explained,

I think the social justice person in me steps out [by working with different groups of people], because I grew up in a very, very white community. Learning about difference has been really difficult for me—but very eye-opening. I think that's why I really want to teach in a rural school so much, because I feel like I have a lot to bring back and I really want to open up my students' eyes—how mine was open. I read "To Kill a Mockingbird" in high school, but we never talked, not even once about racism, not even once. We never had any sort of open discussion about sexism, gender roles, nothing. I really want to be able to bring that back for students in my hometown.

Here, Ariel is able to think about how her own experiences *not* discussing race and racism have influenced what she will take from her program and bring back to her hometown. Ultimately, the critical perspectives to which the interns were exposed in their teacher preparation altered

not only how they viewed their students, but also how they approached their roles as teachers in diverse (or not) schools.

Race and whiteness. Each of the intern teachers had their own personal experiences that impacted how they viewed school structures, how they saw diversity, and how this would impact their curriculum. What is more, the interns become increasingly aware of their positions as white women in classrooms mirroring national statistics of teachers, in part as the result of the social justice aim of the program. For example, Ariel shared, “Most of us are white, so we have to be open and aware that there are different cultures, and you can’t bring in your own prejudices, and just trying to be open” (Ariel, personal communication, June 13, 2013). In this way, Ariel acknowledges her own whiteness and how this might differ from her students’ cultures and backgrounds. Importantly, although the interns did acknowledge the power dynamics surrounding whiteness, they were, perhaps, not always *critical* of themselves in how whiteness would play a role in their teaching.

The acknowledgement of whiteness, however, served as a catalyst for their conversations about race in the classroom with students and would inform their various conceptions of racial hierarchies, especially in the context of their schools. For example, Natalie, who at the time taught in a racially diverse classroom, explained:

I would talk about race frequently, and I would always challenge my students to question me—and I would say, “so if I’m teaching something and you don’t find it relevant, ask me how it’s relevant. If I can’t tell you, then we’ll put it away and we’ll do what you want to do.” I stood by that. And they would say, “I don’t see how this is relevant—it’s a white person thing,” and I was like “OK, I’m going to tell you why it’s relevant,” and I’d tell them and they’d be ok . . . So being white, I did have to, I think, justify what I was doing a little bit more, at least at first, because once they trust you that doesn’t go away. You just got to get there. But I wasn’t afraid to talk about it, even when I was wrong. I talked about race all the time. (Natalie, personal communication, June 13, 2013)

Natalie was very aware of dominant narratives, particularly those related to the “white savior” in classrooms, and would frequently discuss the tension that she felt as a result:

There’s a fine line between talking about it [a savior] and being, *I’m going to save you, because I’m white and I’m smarter than you*, and I never wanted them to feel like that. A white teacher with black kids . . . because there is kind of that stuff that *oh you’re going to be my savior and you’re going to save the day*. I didn’t want that, but I did want them to feel like I’m white and you’re black, yeah, so what? That doesn’t mean you can’t learn from me. That doesn’t mean I can’t learn from you. But you got to put it out there and believe it. Anything, if you say something and you don’t believe it . . . I do think there are teachers who say they’re not scared, but they’re intimidated, and when you put that out there, they pick it up. (Natalie, personal communication, June 13, 2013)

Overall, the interns expressed that, as a part of their teacher education program, they were exposed to concepts and conversations that allowed them to be critical in their placements. Because of these conversations, they were also able to gain awareness of their own positions as white women in schools and the role that this played.

(In)competence. The final theme that was identified related to the interns’ feelings of competence vs. the areas where they were still struggling. Given that four of the five interns were in the English Education program, language/dialect was a topic that all of the interns felt

prepared to address in schools. For Rusty and Ariel, their experiences growing up in Appalachian communities familiarized them with the negative connotations often associated with dialectical differences, while Emma, Natalie, and Penny learned about linguistic diversity in their coursework. For example, Emma explained,

[I feel prepared] about having discussions with students at the beginning [of the school year] about [what Standard] English is and why we have to learn it, and how I'm not discouraging the use of their own language and dialect whether that is white lower class or African-American vernacular . . . whatever the different dialects that are specific to their subgroup. I will not devalue that language at all. [I will] just talk about how to frame it verses like power-white English, and how you have to know both [to succeed]. (Emma, personal communication, June 19, 2013)

While the interns acknowledged that they addressed concepts such as linguistic diversity in their coursework, they were not done learning about these topics and, in Natalie's case, would supplement what she felt she was lacking with current scholarship. However, they all felt extremely unprepared to address students with disabilities and English language learners (ELLs) in their classrooms. For example, when addressing the areas where she could have been more prepared, Emma explained,

Things about ELL[students] are mentioned but never really talked about specifically, and that is one of the reasons I was very reticent to apply to the [city name], because I know that they have a high ELL population and that intimidated me. [It's] not because I'm not interested in working with that population, but I knew that I don't have the skills to do it, and I don't speak Spanish. Nonetheless, do I have the ability as a first year teacher to work with people who this is their primary language in an English language classroom and that really intimidated me. (Emma, personal communication, June 19, 2013)

So, while the interns agreed upon "Trends and Issues" as one of the most important classes, they acknowledged it more as a survey course that touched upon different topics. They expressed interest in being able to dig deeper into identities/issues facing students, so that they could feel more equipped to handle multiple forms of diversity.

Teach For America

As noted above, the pre-service components of TFA consist of: 1) a week of induction, where corps members receive a general introduction to TFA and their placement regions, preparation for institute, and job fairs (not all corps members have jobs yet); and 2) institute, where they teach summer school under the tutelage of experienced TFA alumni and classroom teachers and receive technical training in areas like pedagogy, lesson planning, curricula, assessments, classroom management, the TFA vision, etc. With this section, we share the experiences of TFA corps members, paying particular attention to the supports that they received during their tenure. We divide the section into the training that the participants received prior to entering the classroom, which includes discussions of three predominant themes: (1) *intensity and (in)adequacy*, wherein the participants described the intensity of their five-week training and their accompanying feelings of (in)adequacy; (2) "*a rude awakening*," which refers to the participants' experiences as they matriculated into their own classrooms;

and (3) in-service support, which includes discussions of the various supports the participants received (or didn't receive) while they were teaching in their placement schools.

Intensity and (in)adequacy. All of the participants spoke of the intensity of their pre-service training, particularly Institute. For some, this intensity provided a sort of "vacuum" to learn and develop their skills (Maxine, personal communication, May 1, 2014). For others, this intensity provided unnecessary stresses, something that, at least according to Liz, TFA is working to address. Of course, the stress is to be expected in that TFA's mission is based on intensive pre-service training that will be supplemented with in-service support. Because corps members do not typically have a background in education, they require significant training and support. As such, an intensive program is necessary.

Regarding the adequacy of their pre-service training, several of the participants point to some problems, especially in regards to their ability to teach a diverse group of students. For example, both Maxine and Zoe express a significant disconnect between the students that they taught at Institute and their own students in their placement regions. Although induction seeks to provide this exposure, it lasts only one week, after which the participants transitioned to a new location to complete their summer training. Maxine says of the differences between the students she taught at institute and her students in her placement city as follows: "It was difficult teaching in a region that was not the region that you would be teaching in when the Fall came. Not every low-income minority community is the same, so it is really difficult for that to translate," (Maxine, personal communication, May 1, 2014). Although TFA appears to be addressing this shortcoming by creating more regional Institutes that include city-specific training, the national model continues to predominate at this time.

This limited exposure to the community is compounded by the fact that corps members are not always guaranteed practice teaching in the grade level/content that they will be teaching in their placement regions. All of the participants describe personal experiences with and/or anecdotal evidence of summer school teaching assignments outside the content areas that corps members will be teaching in their placement regions. Although the participants to whom this happened (Maxine and Paul) expressed that this helped them to expand their pedagogical knowledge, a majority of the participants (including Maxine) viewed this as a shortcoming.

Additionally, Zoe describes feeling frustrated by a lack of training in meeting the needs of students who require ELL and/or special education services. Zoe explains,

During the training, I was not exposed to how to approach teaching learners who speak languages other than English, and then I also wasn't trained or equipped with the knowledge, skills and mindsets around how to educate students who have special needs . . . the lack of preparation we had for teaching students who have special needs and received special services like ESL, we didn't get that and that's all that we dealt with. (Zoe, personal communication, May 8, 2014)

This lack of adequate training (and support), compounded by the fact that Zoe would be left alone in her school as a result of her colleagues' decisions to resign from the program, would lead Zoe to express feelings of frustration. Ultimately, the participants identified varied levels of adequacy regarding their pre-service training, particularly in terms of the diversity of their student populations.

"A rude awakening." The transitions into the classroom were rocky for all of the participants. Although this sentiment is certainly not unique to novice TFA teachers, the limited training that corps members receive and their general lack of experience often made their transitions into the schools difficult. For some of the participants (e.g. Sarah, Maxine, and Zoe), more training and/or exposure to the placement regions and the unique student

populations that they would eventually serve would have been beneficial. Others (Paul and Liz) felt that they were as prepared as they could be for the realities of the classroom. The guiding assumption here (and with the TFA model in general) is that any deficiencies in pre-service training can be remedied and supplemented with extensive and on-going in-service support, something that Paul reflects on:

I felt as if I was as prepared as you can be to enter into the fold. So, no. In no way was I prepared . . . No one is . . . I didn't know everything that I was doing, and I needed a lot of work along the way but what I do feel is that it prepared me from a mental and mindset standpoint. That said, I know how to manage a classroom to keep kids doing what they're supposed to be doing. And then the other things that I know that I don't know, I know that there're resources in place for me to get there. (Paul, personal communication, May 7, 2014)

For Paul, having basic, technical skills, along with the support of TFA staff and resources, made the transition easier. This particular understanding of the necessity of technical training stands in contrast to the experiences of the participants who completed the traditional teacher training with a social justice orientation. For example, the traditionally trained teachers received more exposure to critically oriented coursework and teacher educators than the TFA corps members, whose training was often based on classroom management, lesson planning, and curriculum.

In-service support. The participants all spoke at length about the supports that they received from TFA staff, TFA alumni, and their TFA colleagues. When those relationships were purposeful and positive, the recruits expressed feeling supported as they learned about their new roles as classroom teachers. This is consistent with TFA's overall mission to provide limited pre-service training that is supplemented with extensive on-the-job support as corps members complete their two-year service commitments. Sarah, Liz, and Maxine all express positive relationships with their MTL D's (Manager of Teacher Leadership and Development), while both Zoe and Paul discuss reaching out to other TFA alumni and staff for models of effective teaching when their MTL D was unable to help.

For Paul, this was largely the result of his MTL D's (at least in his first year) limited knowledge of his content. When, in his second year, he was assigned an MTL D who was familiar with his subject area, he reports that the relationship was more helpful. Zoe speaks of her initial MTL D (she would ultimately have three) not being able to provide her with effective models for teaching to her unique student population. This would improve when she began working with her third MTL D in her second year, who, she says, was able to provide her with more extensive support.

In addition to support from TFA staff, the relationships the participants were able to form with their TFA colleagues contributed to their feeling supported in their teaching. For example, Sarah says of her relationship with other TFA corps members and alumni at her school,

One thing that was really great was that I was at the same school with a bunch of other corps members, so two people who had been in my CMA group were teaching the same subject as I was on my floor. We had a Spanish teacher, a French teacher, a chemistry teacher and then a second-year corps member also teaching math with us. So, that was a great support system. (Sarah, personal communication, March 7, 2014)

In this way, TFA seems to have been successful in its efforts to provide its corps members with extensive support, not only from TFA staff, but also from TFA alumni, as well as to facilitate a community of TFA teachers, who would ultimately help one another with their practice.

Regarding specific school-based supports, a majority of the participants express positive, though not always professionally productive, relationships. For the most part, the participants tended to locate their support within the TFA community, as opposed to the school community. Sarah seems to attribute this to TFA's reputation for providing teachers who typically do not stay beyond their two-year service commitments. Because her school had witnessed TFA's high turnover firsthand, there was little incentive to invest more in its TFA teachers. Although she reports positive and supportive relationships with her school colleagues, she suggests that these relationships were not as extensive as those formed with other TFA recruits and staff. Liz also reports connecting more with other TFA teachers, largely as the result of her age and status as a newcomer to her school community, while Paul reports turning to veteran teachers for content assistance when his MTLT was unable to help (though, again, he locates his primary support from other TFA teachers and alumni).

For Maxine, the fact that her school housed a large number of TFA teachers and alumni, who could identify with her situation, and so provide support in that way, was overwhelmingly positive. In contrast, the relationships that Zoe was able to form with her school colleagues were not so positive. She describes being singled out by her principal (as the result of other corps members leaving) and feeling alienated by her colleagues as the result of her being hired over veteran teachers, despite a hiring freeze in her placement region. This improved as Zoe continued her service in her placement school and was later seen as a committed teacher by her principal. Ultimately, the relationships that they formed with their colleagues, and the relationships between TFA and schools/districts, were a major factor in the participants' feelings of support. Where those relationships were strained, new, or non-existent, as was the case for Zoe, there existed frustration and an overall feeling of isolation.

Discussion

With both of these studies, we sought to better understand two pathways to teaching and the relationship forged with notions of diversity. We found that the interns in the traditional teacher education program explicitly talked about social justice as a major component of their preparation, specifically sharing examples of their exposure to linguistic diversity and critical pedagogy. Although these pre-service teachers were taught to think about "diversity," they oftentimes did not feel that this diversity addressed students with disabilities or English Language Learners (ELL). The TFA teachers expressed varied levels of (in)adequacy regarding their training, especially in regards to teaching a diverse student population and students with disabilities and/or students who require ELL services. The general consensus was that the instruction and support received by TFA corps members was largely surface and often disconnected from the needs of student and/or school populations. Thus for both pathways, we found similar statements regarding teachers' preparation to work with students with disabilities or ELL students, but we found a difference in how the teachers talked about mentorship and support.

The most prevalent finding for the interns in the traditional teacher education program involved the support each intern received from teacher educators who were explicit about the reasons for why they should take risks and what praxis actually looked like. Because they were exposed to social justice throughout their teacher preparation, they were also exposed to what positionality looked like for them, i.e. they were able to address their whiteness and how that influenced their evolving pedagogies while teaching.

On the other hand, the general consensus among the TFA teachers was that the instruction and support received by the organization was primarily related to classroom management, pedagogy, and the overall TFA vision, which centers around the idea that all children should have access to a quality education and that corps members' leadership and dedication can provide that. However, this vision, although couched in the language of social justice, does not necessarily meet the needs of all students, because it does not provide its teachers with the requisite knowledge and engagement with the kind of social justice training for which we advocate. In this way, quality teaching becomes more about technical work rather than transformative intervention into the lives of students.

It is important to point out, too, that most TFA corps members (including a majority of the participants) have no early interest in and/or exposure to education. As such, their summer school teaching assignments may be their first introductions to the realities of the classroom. When they are assigned to teach student populations to which they have had little exposure (including students who require ELL and/or special education services) and/or in areas outside of their training, they are ultimately responsible for entirely new content (and new as well as more students) when they return from Institute. This is certainly problematic not only for the students assigned to these novice corps members, but also for the corps members themselves, whose inevitable first-year challenges become amplified.

Presumably, TFA aims to correct this potential challenge by selecting and supporting individuals whose dedication and leadership skills might help carry them through this overall lack of experience and limited pedagogical training. However, this contention also minimizes the effort required to prepare for teaching (deprofessionalization) and lends a certain air of elitism to the organization's overall mission. As such, we contend that there is a bit more to pre-service training than some of the participants (and TFA) suggest. Teaching is very hard work, and, although experience is certainly part of the equation, there are purposeful things that can be done to make sure that teachers are ready for their new roles, including sharing social justice principles. Should teachers feel under-prepared to teach diverse student populations, there is the risk that teacher training programs may "end up disrecruiting potentially great teachers instead of recruiting them" (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 37). Although we do not intend to single TFA out here, as there is certainly a wide range of quality in both traditional and alternative licensure programs (Cochran-Smith, Cannady, Mceachern, Mitchell, Piazza, Power, & Ryan, 2012), there is a need for adequate pre-service training to mediate the inevitable challenges of the first year, especially in light of the great diversity of U.S. classrooms. Based on analyses of the TFA participants' experiences transitioning into the classroom, this was something that, for most, was lacking, making that first year a sort of "crap shoot" unnecessarily (Sarah, personal communication, March 12, 2014).

Implications

One significant contribution that this comparative analysis provides relates to various inadequacies of both the 1.0 and 2.0 teacher education programs (Gastic, 2014). In presenting these two independent studies collectively, we can see clearly how each particular approach has its flaws, especially concerning the preparation of teachers to work across many differing forms of diversity. It is clear that the support to learn to teach for social justice, when intentional and explicit—and when teacher educators make this commitment as part of their pedagogy—impacts future teachers' commitment to teaching for social justice. This is also a process that takes time, and we contend that this is impossible to do in five weeks, or even in one fifteen-week course. This takes planning, collaboration, interdisciplinary program design, and dedication.

Regarding our implications for teacher education programming, one of the most obvious themes that we produced in this study was the importance of mentorship in and throughout teacher education, broadly conceived, as well as in the early years of teaching, which is consistent with Darling-Hammond's (2006) research on powerful teacher education. We see the experiences of the participants with whom we spoke as two sides of the same coin: extensive pre-service training with little in-service support vs. limited pre-service training with extensive in-service support. However, neither of these approaches center social justice principles, nor do they connect teachers within larger school and local communities as they are prepared for and initiated into their very important roles as teachers of diverse student populations. As such, we support the notion that social justice ideals should permeate not only the teacher education curriculum but also the pedagogy of teacher educators, whether through traditional or alternative licensure routes. The standardized curriculum, as dictated by what was NCATE (now CPEC), does not require social justice as a part of coursework, so the onus of responsibility should be on the part of teacher education program as well as the teacher educators to embody this.

Additionally, we support expanded mentoring for all new teachers, including school- and community-based supports. This conclusion is most closely aligned with what Zeichner (2016) labels teacher education 3.0. This new model

practices the values and commitments of social justice and democracy, rejects the choice that is now being provided in current policy debates and offers a model that is built on a new, more democratic architecture where responsibility for educating teachers is shared more equally by different stakeholders (i.e., schools, universities, local communities) who collaborate in equitable ways. (Zeichner, Payne, & Brayko, 2015, p. 154)

Essentially, with this new model, teacher education is seen as a laboratory project in which teachers place their work in the larger global struggle for social justice. At present, given the competing discourses in teacher education, we have moved away from a focus on social justice and toward a "technician" role for teachers to stick to their prescribed curriculum and prepare students for mandatory high-stakes testing (Kumashiro, 2010; Zeichner, 2011). This is particularly true for TFA corps members. However, we contend that this approach does little to produce more equitable schools and ultimately functions to maintain the status quo.

Although some suggest ways of improving teacher education, others marginalize its importance. As one example of this marginalization, shortly after the passage of No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001), Rodney Paige, then Secretary of Education, contended that teacher preparation was of little importance to the task of producing "highly-qualified" teachers. He argued in his first report to Congress (2004) that the current teacher certification system produced poorly qualified individuals and created barriers for more talented prospective teachers. He advocated for alternatives to college and university-based teacher education, which quickly became one impetus for the deregulation agenda mentioned above. Since then, others have questioned whether pre-service teacher education in colleges and universities should continue (Duncan, 2009; Hartocolis, 2005; Levine, 2006). This has led scholars to the conclusion that teacher education is "under siege" (Sleeter, 2008, p. 1947), that it has become "commonsensical" to view teacher education as irrelevant (Kumashiro, 2010, p. 56), and that it is under "outright vicious attack" (Villegas, 2007, p. 370).

Outside of policy, critique has been levelled against teacher education in the news media. For example, California journalist Peter Schrag (1999) critiqued diversity courses in teacher education programs in his periodical *University Business*. He claimed that the "heavy dose" of multiculturalism is what is wrong with teacher education. The guiding assumption

here is that coursework centering around multicultural issues divert attention away from high standards and other, more rigorous content-area instruction (Kanstoroom & Finn, 1999; Wasley, 2006; Will, 2006; Wilson, 2005) and potentially acts as a form of “political indoctrination” from those on the left (Villegas, 2007).

Additionally, philanthropic organizations such as the Gates Foundation and the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ), created by the Thomas B. Ford Foundation in 2000, have been highly critical of our nation’s schools of education. This sentiment is not isolated to private organizations, but rather has spread to the political debates in several states over the past few years. For example, in 2013 Colorado Senator Bennett re-introduced the Growing Excellent Achievement Training Academics for Teachers and Principals (GREAT) Act to reshape teacher preparation by virtually removing programs from university settings and establishing teacher and principal academics (Cody, 2013).

In 2013 NCTQ released its first national ratings of teacher preparation programs. Only four institutions (out of 1200 programs that were reviewed) received full credit, or four stars. Although critics have questioned NCTQ’s process of analysis, which was based solely on websites and course syllabi, NCTQ has continued to promote a very specific vision for what teacher education *should* look like. Pallas (2013) reports:

No one really knows if meeting NCTQ’s standards results in better teachers—but that hasn’t slowed down the organization a whit. If an ed school had a mix of goals and strategies different than NCTQ’s and chose not to cooperate in this institutional witch hunt, well, they must have something to hide.

However, we question what it is that NCTQ finds most important to produce effective teachers. One thing is clear: social justice is not one of those qualities (Authors, 2013). While the standards used to rate schools of education did address English language learners (ELL) and special education, there was no mention of preparing teachers to become culturally relevant practitioners. Rather, the focus of the standards was on such things as becoming proficient in CCS, content area, and the instructional role of standardized tests in schools (NCTQ Standards for Rating the Nation’s Schools, 2013).

References

- Anyon, J. (2014). *Radical possibilities, public policy, urban education, and a new social movement* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Boser, U. (2014). Teacher diversity revisited: A new state-by-state analysis. <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/race/reports/2014/05/04/88962/teacher-diversity-revisited/>
- Butin, D. W. (2005). Is anyone listening? Educational policy perspectives on the social foundations of education. *Educational Studies*, 38(3), 286-297.
- Carspecken, P. F. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005). The AERA panel on research and teacher education: Context and goals. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 37-68). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2011). Teacher education for diversity: Policy and politics. In A. F. Fall & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Studying diversity in teacher education* (pp. 339-361). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

- Cody, A. (2013). *Payola policy: NCTQ prepares its hit on schools of education*. http://blogs.edweek.org/teachers/living-in-dialogue/2012/05/payola_policy_nctq_prepares_it.html
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five designs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1/2), 35-47.
- Duncan, A. (2009). *Teacher preparation: Reforming an uncertain profession*. <https://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/teacher-preparation-reforming-uncertain-profession>
- Floden, R. E. (2005). When is philosophy of education? *Philosophy of Education*, 1-13.
- Gastic, B. (2014). Closing the opportunity gap: Preparing the next generation of effective teachers. In F. M. Hess & M. Q. McShane (Eds.), *Teacher quality 2.0: Toward a new era in education reform* (pp. 91–108). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Goodwin, A. L. (2017). Who is in the classroom now? Teacher preparation and the education of immigrant children. *Educational Studies*, 53(5), 433-449.
- Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers an introduction*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Greene, M. (1992). The passions of pluralism: Multiculturalism and the expanding community. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 61(3), 250-261.
- Hartocolis, A. (July 31, 2005). Who needs education schools? *New York Times Education Life* 22-28. <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/31/education/edlife/hartocolis31.html?pagewanted=all&r=0>
- Hyttén, K. (2004). Postcritical ethnography: Research as a pedagogical encounter. In G. W. Noblit, S. Y. Flores, & E. G. Murillo, Jr. (Eds.), *Postcritical ethnography: Reinscribing critique* (pp. 95-105). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Levine, A. (2006). Will universities maintain control of teacher education? *Change*, 38(4), 36-43.
- Kanstoroom, M., & Finn Jr, C. E. (1999). *Better teachers, better schools*. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED434124.pdf>
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2010). Seeing the bigger picture: Troubling movements to end teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1/2), 56-65.
- Lather, P. (1986). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange*, 17(4), 63-84.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Marx, S., & Pennington, J. (2003). Pedagogies of critical race theory: Experimentations with white preservice teachers. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(1), 91-110.
- National Council for Teacher Quality. (2013). *Standards and indicators for NCTQ teacher prep Review*. http://nctq.org/dmsView/NCTQ_Teacher_Prep_Review_1_0_Standards_and_Indicators
- Noblit, G. W., Murillo, E. G., & Flores S. Y. (Eds.) (2004). *Postcritical ethnography: Reinscribing critique*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Pallas, A. (2013). *The trouble with NCTQ's ratings of teacher-prep programs*. http://eyeoned.org/content/the-trouble-with-nctqs-ratings-of-teacher-prep-programs_478/

- Rossmann, R. B., & Rallis, S. F. (1998). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schrag, P. (July 29, 1999). Who will teach the teachers. *University Business*, pp. 29-34.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2008). Equity, democracy, and neoliberal assaults on teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 1947-1957.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2009). Teacher education, neoliberalism, and social justice. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook for social justice education* (pp. 611-624). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sleeter, C. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. *Urban Education*, 47(3), 562-584.
- Sleeter, C. (2014). Toward teacher education research that informs policy. *Educational Researcher*, 43(3), 146-155.
- Teach For America. (2013). *About Teach for America*. https://www.teachforamerica.org/sites/default/files/2013-14_press_kit_updated_08_6_13.pdf
- Thomas, J. (1993). *Doing critical ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Villegas, A. (2007). Dispositions in teacher education: A look at social justice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 370-380.
- Wasley, P. (2006). Accreditor of education drops controversial “social justice” from its language. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(41), A13.
- Will, G. (2006, January 16). Ed schools versus education. *Newsweek*. p. 98.
- Wilson, R. (2005, December 16). “We don’t need that kind of attitude.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(17), A8-A11.
- Zeichner, K. (2005). A research agenda for teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education* (pp. 737-760). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance, and attacks on diversity: Neo-liberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the US. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(8), 1544-1552.
- Zeichner, K. (2016). Advancing social justice and democracy in teacher education: Teacher preparation 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 52(4), 150-155.

Appendix

Traditional Teacher Interview Questions

1. Tell me about yourself: short life story; self-definitions of yourself; why you became a teacher
3. Tell me how you became involved with the [type of Program] at the University X
4. What do you believe is the purpose of education? The school?
5. Tell me about the role you feel teachers play in society.
6. What kinds of things do you believe you need to know to teach?
7. What stands out for you in your teacher preparation in that program?
8. How do you define diversity?
9. Describe the preparation you had to teach diverse students.
10. Do you believe multicultural awareness is a necessary part of teacher preparation? Explain why or why not.
11. Describe the diversity in your current classroom. (*Potential follow-up questions*)
 - a. How does this influence your impact on students?
 - b. How do your students affect you?
 - c. How do you address diversity in the classroom?
 - d. What role do you see diversity playing in students’ academic success?

12. As teacher, how do you feel *you* are perceived in your school? (by students, faculty, parents, the community, etc.)
13. Do you see your *whiteness* playing a part in your teaching pedagogy/praxis? (If not a white teacher, how does your race impact your own teaching?)
14. Do you, and if so how, adapt methods to meet diverse student needs?
15. How do you become aware and informed of your students' backgrounds? What does it look like in your classroom?
16. How you learned from your students?
17. When discussing diverse issues in the classroom, or a topic becomes controversial, how do you handle that situation? (*Potential follow-up question*)
 - a. Has there ever been an instance where you've had to address such an issue?
18. When you hear *teaching for social justice* or *culturally relevant pedagogy*, what does this mean to you?
 - a. How does this affect your thinking? Your beliefs? Your actions?
 - b. What does it mean to be a change agent?

TFA Interview Questions

19. Tell me about yourself.
 - a. Brief life story
 - b. Self-definitions
 - c. What are you doing now?
 - i. Job?
 - ii. Work in education?
20. Motivation?
 - a. What drew you to education?
 - b. What drew you to TFA?
21. Tell me how you became involved with TFA.
 - a. How did you find out about the organization?
 - b. Recruitment practices?
22. Tell me about the admissions process.
 - a. Placement?
23. Tell me about your pre-service training.
 - a. Describe the preparation that you experienced.
 - b. What stands out for you in your teacher preparation?
 - c. Did you feel adequately prepared?
 - i. How so?
 - ii. In what areas?
24. Tell me about your first year.
 - a. What stands out?
 - b. How did you feel about teaching in a low-income school?
 - c. Where did you excel?
 - d. Where do you feel you could have improved?
25. Tell me about your in-service training.
 - a. Describe the preparation that you experienced.
 - i. School-based?
 - ii. TFA?
 - b. What stands out for you in your teacher preparation?
 - c. Did you feel adequately prepared?
 - i. How so?
 - ii. In what areas?
25. Tell me about your second year.
 - a. What stands out?
 - b. How did you feel about teaching in a low-income school?
 - c. Where did you excel?

- d. Where do you feel you could have improved?
 - e. What were your post-service plans?
 - i. Did TFA impact those plans? If so, how?
 - ii. What supports did TFA provide to help you to accomplish those plans?
26. Long-term plans?
- a. What are you doing now?
 - b. Did your work with TFA impact your career decisions?
 - i. How so?
 - ii. What elements of your training contributed to your long-term plans?
 - c. For what sorts of post-service careers did you feel prepared?
 - i. What qualities and/or experiences do you feel are relevant to those careers?
 - ii. How did TFA contribute?
 - d. Did your preparation impact your understandings of education and schooling?
 - i. Explain why or why not.
 - e. Did your preparation impact your career decisions?
 - i. How so?
27. Pre-conceptions?
- a. What do you see as the most pressing issues in education?
 - i. How do you think TFA addresses those areas?
 - ii. How did/do you address those areas?
 - b. What would a successful school look like?
 - c. What would change look like?
 - i. Define educational change.
 - ii. What does it mean to be a change agent?
 - iii. Who changes schools?
 - d. What roles do you think various stakeholders play?
 - i. The teacher?
 - ii. Administrators?
 - iii. Policymakers?
 - iv. Students?
 - v. Parents/Guardians?
 - vi. Community?
28. For those who have left their original placement schools à What influenced your decision to...?
29. For those who have left teaching (through job promotion in education) à What influenced your decision to...?
30. For those who have left the education field à Explain what factors affected your decision to leave the field.

Author Note

Ashlee Anderson is a Clinical Assistant Professor of Cultural Studies in Education (CSE) at the University of Tennessee. She earned a PhD in Education with a primary specialization in CSE and a secondary specialization in Educational Policy Studies from the University of Tennessee, where she now teaches graduate courses in the CSE doctoral concentration and master's degree program, as well as CSE undergraduate courses in international education. Her primary research interests include foundations of education/sociology of education, teacher education/teacher development, qualitative research methodologies, education policy and reform, international education, equity and social justice, and cultural studies in education. Correspondence regarding this article can be addressed directly to: abanders@utk.edu.

Brittany Aronson is an Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership at Miami University and teaching classes in sociocultural foundations and multicultural education. In her

scholarship, she focuses on preparing educators to work against oppression as well as critical policy analyses of both popular and political discourse. Her research interests include critical teacher preparation, social justice education, critical race theory, critical whiteness studies, and educational policy. Dr. Aronson earned a PhD in Learning Environments and Educational Studies from the University of Tennessee in 2014. Correspondence regarding this article can also be addressed directly to: aronsoba@miamioh.edu.

Copyright 2020: Ashlee Anderson, Brittany A. Aronson, and Nova Southeastern University.

Article Citation

Anderson, A., & Aronson, B. A. (2020). Learning to teach in diverse schools: Two approaches to teacher education. *The Qualitative Report*, 25(1), 105-126. <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol25/iss1/8>
