"Speak Truth to Power Ourselves"

Teaching Social Justice in a Teacher Residency Program

Jori S. Beck

Abstract

The current study is part of a larger case study of faculty and staff methods at a teacher residency program. Teacher residencies, which were founded in the early 2000s, have an explicit mission of serving historically marginalized populations. However, more research is needed to better understand how these programs implement social justice teacher education. Indeed, there is a dearth of literature regarding the application of social justice practices in teacher education and the social justice beliefs of teacher educators. The interviews, documents, and observations collected for this study revealed a robust theme of social justice in participants' beliefs and their curricula and pedagogies both in the classroom and in community-based work. These findings have implications for research in teacher education as well as the literature on teacher residencies specifically.

Introduction

Around the world, student populations are growing increasingly diverse, and

Jori S. Beck is an assistant professor in the Department of Teaching and Learning at the Darden College of Education and Professional Studies at Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Viginia.
Email address is: jbeck@odu.edu

poverty is on the rise, while, simultaneously, many governments are pushing for greater accountability in education (Gale, Mills, & Cross, 2017; Mills & Ballantyne, 2016; Ritchie, 2012; Vass, 2017). As a result, many teacher education programs both in the United States and abroad have turned to preparing teacher candidates (TCs) to teach for social justice in response to these external pressures (Kapustka, Howell, Clayton, & Thomas, 2009). The implementation of social justice teacher education (SJTE) is complex (Rubin, El-Haj, Graham, & Clay, 2016), but many innovations are occurring in teacher education programs internationally to prepare TCs to serve diverse student populations and communities.

Teacher residency programs are one response to explicitly serving diverse student populations through contextualized teacher preparation (Matsko & Hammerness, 2013). These programs were first founded in the early 2000s in Boston, Massachusetts, and Chicago, Illinois, as a means of closing achievement gaps between students of color and their White counterparts through reducing teacher turnover.[1] The Urban Teacher Residency United Network—the foundational network for teacher residency programs—changed its name to the National Center for Teacher Residencies in September 2015, thus denoting a broader mission to serve rural as well as urban communities.[2] These programs have an explicit social justice mission of bringing equity to education through providing well-prepared, committed educators to students who routinely face a revolving door of teachers (Ingersoll, 2003).

Although the body of literature on SJTE is increasingly robust (a search of the Academic Search Complete database for the terms "social justice" and "teacher education" returned 461 hits), the body of literature on teacher residency programs is just emerging. It is important to learn more about the methods of these programs since they are being funded at increasing rates (i.e., the U.S. Department of Education's, n.d., Teacher Quality Partnership Grants) and because they are situated in our nation's most underserved communities. Additionally, there is a dearth of research on how social justice practices are actually enacted in teacher education programs (Kapustka et al., 2009), and more needs to be known about the social justice beliefs of teacher educators (Mills & Ballantyne, 2016). The current study is an effort to address these voids in the research through an intrinsic case study of faculty at one teacher residency program. The research questions guiding this study were as follows: What are faculty's understandings of structural inequalities in one teacher residency program? What are the social justice curricula and pedagogies of faculty in one teacher residency program?

Theoretical Framework

SJTE has developed from a rich body of work, including culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 2009), culturally responsive pedagogy (Gay, 2010), humanizing pedagogy (Freire, 1970/2000), and asset-based approaches (Moll,

Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). Dover (2013) cited the influence of democratic education and critical pedagogy in social justice education as well. Recent work on culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris & Alim, 2014) also echoes SJTE. Dover (2013) conceptualized teaching for social justice broadly as follows:

> An integrated pedagogical, ideological, and curricular approach that requires teachers to (1) assume all students are participants in knowledge construction, have high expectations for students and themselves, and foster learning communities; (2) acknowledge, value, and build upon students' existing knowledge, interests, cultural and linguistic resources; (3) teach academic skills and bridge gaps in students' learning; (4) work in reciprocal partnership with students' families and communities; (5) critique and employ multiple forms of assessment; and (6) explicitly teach about activism, power, and inequity in schools and society. (p. 90)

The use of the term *approach* is important since social justice can be enacted broadly and has been conceptualized as a disposition (Alsup & Miller, 2014; see Villegas, 2007, for a discussion of the term *disposition*), a moral (Burant, Chubbuck, & Whipp, 2007), an educational purpose (Sockett, 2009), and an orientation (Chubbuck, 2010).

Research on SJTE represents the complexity and diversity of the concept of social justice. This research includes hip-hop pedagogy (Akom, 2009), racial and ethnic dynamics in cross-cultural teacher education (Chinnery, 2008), globalization (Apple, 2011), sexual orientation and gender (Jones & Hughes-Decatur, 2012; Rands, 2009), and responses to neoliberal policies (Weiner, 2007). For the purpose of this manuscript, McDonald's (2008) definition of SJTE will be employed because it was the most concise yet inclusive definition uncovered through this review and related to teacher education specifically:

> Social justice teacher education programs intend to integrate social justice across the curriculum, making the social, political, and cultural structures that underlie inequity fundamental to learning to teach. . . . Such programs shift the focus from efforts to increase prospective teachers' cultural awareness of diversity to encourage teachers' commitments to social change and activism. (p. 152)

Reflecting this definition, in the literature review that follows, I use Chubbuck's (2010) components of social justice teaching as an organizational framework both because of the clarity that these elements provide and because of their alignment with McDonald's definition: (a) curricula, pedagogies, and teachers' expectations and interactional styles; (b) understanding structural inequities; and (c) transforming structures.

Literature Review

To be included in this literature review, an article had to explicitly identify a foundation in SJTE and be situated at the preservice teacher education level. Cur-

ricula, pedagogies, and teachers' expectations and interactional styles are reviewed first, followed by understanding structural inequalities and transforming structures.

Curricula, Pedagogies, and Teachers' Expectations and Interactional Styles

The curricula, pedagogies, and expectations and interactional styles related here are by no means exhaustive. However, these studies reflect the diversity of this element of SJTE. Kraehe and Brown (2011) employed arts-based methods to help their TCs examine the inequitable nature of U.S. education. This medium (i.e., arts-based education), while enjoyable, did evoke anxiety, fear, and a sense of danger in TCs, and it disrupted normalized thinking. Kraehe and Brown encouraged other teacher educators to consider the use of arts-based methods of inquiry broadly to generate TCs' critical sociocultural knowledge about teaching and learning. Lalvani and Broderick (2013) similarly sought to disrupt normative thinking and fostered a critical understanding of disability simulations in their TCs through a series of readings and reflections. The authors introduced the notion of disability simulations through reading a news article about a nearby school district implementing this technique. TCs initially thought that this was a good way for students to see what it was like to have a disability, the challenges of being disabled, and teaching positive social values. However, by the end of the semester, TCs came to see how these disability simulations were grounded in deficit thinking, "othered" students with disabilities, and represented ableist ideology. Some students also noted that the voices of diverse perspectives on disability were absent from these simulations. Like Kraehe and Brown's (2011) techniques, these methods likewise achieved the objective of supporting TCs' critical consciousness. Cook-Sather and Youens (2007) compared two programs—one in the United States and one in England—that centered P–12 students in TC learning through email exchanges and conversations and positioning P–12 students as TC mentors, respectively. Although no data were shared in this article, the authors advocate centralizing P–12 students in teacher preparation, which is in line with SJTE tenets.

Matias and Grosland (2016) grounded their use of digital storytelling in critical Whiteness studies, critical race theory, and critical emotion studies. Their study was situated within the first course of an urban and diverse teacher preparation program. Digital storytelling was used as "a perfect medium for which teacher candidates can document their emotional experiences in learning about race" (p. 156). The authors presented three different examples of these digital stories in their findings. Matias and Grosland underscored the importance of finding methods to deconstruct Whiteness in teacher education—whether through digital storytelling or other methods. McDonald (2008) studied the pedagogy of assignments at San Jose State and Mills College—two programs with professed social justice missions. She found that course assignments could facilitate connections between university courses and field placements and advocated placing TCs in diverse settings to fa-

cilitate these connections. Respectively, these studies demonstrated how technology can be used as a medium in SJTE and how SJTE can build connections between school and university for TCs.

Self-study (e.g., Dinkelman, 2003) is an increasingly popular method for teacher educators to reflect on their own beliefs and practices—particularly as these pertain to issues of social justice (Morettini, Brown, & Viator, 2018). Conklin and Hughes (2016) conducted a case study of their own practices and found that their methods included developing relationships with and among TCs; inviting TCs to practice new ways of viewing the world; and equitable, intellectually challenging teaching and learning. The authors concluded that "pedagogy that is modeled, enacted, prepared, rehearsed, or analyzed should be done so in relation to some explicitly named, clear purpose and set of ethical commitments" (p. 57). Ohito (2016) utilized a pedagogy of discomfort in her self-study of SJTE. Specifically, she studied a hot spot in one of her classes in which a White male uttered a racial slur while reading from a course text and how this moment was unpacked and discussed via face-to-face conversations and blog posts. She noted that "a pedagogy of discomfort catalyzed the radical processes of making meaning through both bodies and relationships formed in the context of a classroom as a political community" (p. 462). In the same vein, Desai (2016) utilized events, such as Trayvon Martin's killing, to teach TCs about implicit bias and racial profiling. The author described how he initiated this curriculum in one class but was unsuccessful in opening students' eyes to these inequalities. He then introduced a second round of curriculum in another advanced multicultural class and, through providing ownership to students and changing the curriculum, was able to successfully open some of the students' eyes to the inequalities present in society. From these studies it is clear that these pedagogies have an overarching goal of disrupting normative thinking and fostering critical consciousness. Self-study may help teacher educators to reflect on their methods for accomplishing this goal.

A number of authors fostered TCs' understandings of social justice through community- or field-based approaches. This manifested as service learning (Andrews, 2009; Baldwin, Buchanan, & Rudisill, 2007), the development of a fellowship program (Riley & Solic, 2017), engaging with families and communities (Zeichner, Bowman, Guillen, & Napolitan, 2016), and the use of youth participatory action research (Rubin et al., 2016). These studies conveyed the importance of careful reflection during these activities, the need to provide a range of activities, and the importance of embedding these experiences within a coherent SJTE program. These studies also demonstrated the uneven nature of learning to teach for social justice, the importance of scaffolding longitudinal experiences, and the difficulty of integrating community experiences and coursework. All of these pedagogies and curricula were employed with the intention of helping TCs to understand and challenge structural inequalities—topics to which I turn now.

Understanding Structural Inequalities

Several studies also explored the beliefs of TCs regarding structural inequalities. Baily and Katradis (2016) studied a master's-level teacher preparation program and found that their participants' beliefs about social justice moved backward and forward in a Z-wave pattern. This finding can be connected to the uneven and complex implementation described by other authors (e.g., Rubin et al., 2016). Johnson (2007) explored TCs' life histories and presented a case of one teacher through a lens of ethics of access. Specifically, this TC—Julie Robbins—experienced alienation in her early life experiences from particular textual materials and diverse others that led her to form her own conceptualization of ethical teaching. In her own classroom, Julie connected her students' cultures and experiences to the content they were studying in class. These studies demonstrated how cohesive, longitudinal exposure to SJTE practices may help to foster an understanding of social inequalities in TCs. However, these studies also demonstrated the difficulty of facilitating TC understanding of structural inequalities. Vass (2017) illustrated how difficult it was to foster social justice beliefs and practices in his three graduate student participants and how practicum elements—such as mentor teachers—actually served as barriers to implementing these practices. Since understanding structural inequalities logically needs to precede transforming these structures, this next step is understandably even more challenging for teacher educators employing SJTE, and only one study was uncovered through this review in which TCs were actively engaged in transforming structures. This may be due in part to the difficulty that some researchers have identified in assisting TCs to enact espoused beliefs (Aronson, 2016; Boylan & Woolsey, 2015).

Transforming Structures

Riley and Solic (2017) developed a fellowship program that required TC participants to attend local conferences and teacher inquiry and action group meetings. The authors audio recorded weekly meetings and took field notes in addition to conducting interviews and analyzing program documents. The themes uncovered included coming into contact with new perspectives, going home a changed person, and a desire to know more. The authors advocated that new teachers engage with educator communities beyond the university and also be supported in navigating relationships at home as they change and grow. Such networks have been shown to incubate and sustain social justice educators (Ritchie, 2012). Furthermore, Mills and Ballantyne (2016) have called for "further unpacking of the field placement and its potential to shape both preservice teachers' understandings and enactments of socially just practices" (p. 274). Thus research on field experiences may be ideal for learning more about how TCs can transform structures through social justice work.

On the basis of this review, preparing TCs for social justice work is an international issue in many Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

countries, such as the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia, which are facing similar political climates. Additionally, programs are taking innovative classroom- and community-based approaches to SJTE, but this work requires ongoing exposure of TCs to SJTE, and thus program coherence is imperative. Finally, more still needs to be learned about the explicit SJTE curricula, pedagogies, and understandings of structural inequalities of teacher education faculty.

Methods

I chose an intrinsic case study design for this investigation because my goal was to understand how faculty at the Lewistown Teacher Residency[3] (LTR) conceptualized and implemented SJTE. Boggess (2010) and Matsko and Hammerness (2013) have related how deeply contextualized teacher residency programs are, so it seemed appropriate to focus this study on understanding this case specifically based on LTR faculty and staff conceptualizations of SJTE. Stake (1995) defined an intrinsic case study: "We are interested in it [the case], not because by studying it we learn about other cases or about some general problem, but because we need to learn about that particular case" (p. 3). I was interested in learning more about SJTE within the LTR.

Research Context

Teacher residency programs are built on the premise that TCs need both theory and practice to be effective (Urban Teacher Residency United Network, 2006). There are four key elements to this model of teacher preparation: "*(1) targeted recruitment and rigorous selection; (2) intensive pre-service preparation focused on the specific needs of urban schools; (3) coordinated induction support and (4) strategic placement of graduates*" (Urban Teacher Residency United Network, 2006, p. 1, emphasis original). Teacher residencies aim to build effective partnerships among various entities, including school districts, teachers' unions, institutions of higher education, and community stakeholders. These programs serve school districts rather than TCs, which is a deviation from the traditional model of teacher preparation. Although teacher residency programs include yearlong experiences in schools, they also afford TCs induction support, thus bridging preservice to inservice preparation. Teacher residency programs are unique in their mission of preparing teachers to serve historically marginalized students through affording extended clinical experiences within university classrooms, schools, and communities and thus provide a rich setting for studying the social justice beliefs and methods of teacher education faculty.

The LTR is a partnership between three entities: (a) Lewistown Public Schools (LPS); (b) Sinclair University (SU); and (c) the Center for the Development of Education Talent, which was affiliated with SU and whose mission was

to develop teacher leaders. The majority of students in LPS identify as Black or African American (80%), and approximately 76% of K–12 students receive free or reduced-price lunches. SU is in the heart of Lewistown and identifies as an urban, research-intensive university.

Participants

The unit of analysis for this case study was LTR faculty and staff perspectives. Thus any faculty and staff who were working in the LTR at the time of my study were invited to participate. Out of the 12 eligible candidates, 11 elected to participate in the study. These participants had a variety of roles in the LTR, including marketing and recruiting for the residency, providing field support to residents, and teaching courses (see Table 1). LPS would not allow me access to its schools or personnel, so data were not collected from individuals inside LPS. Although limiting access to researchers is understandable in light of the severe scrutiny that public schools are under, this is a limitation to my study because the voices of veteran teachers serving as teacher educators are vital in studies of SJTE.

Data Collection

Data collection took place between May and October 2013. Only qualitative data were collected for this case study and included semistructured interviews, observations, and documents. Semistructured interviews were chosen to cull data that were consistent in nature across participants (Merriam, 2009) while simultaneously affording me the opportunity to ask follow-up questions. Interview questions asked participants about their backgrounds (Tell me about your background and how

Table 1
Participant Demographics

Pseudonym	Role at the LTR	Years at SU	Years at the LTR
Diana	Professor	27	2
Barbara	Professor	6	2
Erica	Professor	1	0
James	Professor	7	2
Jessica	Professor	2	1
Lauren	Professor	9	2
Lori	Site director	2	2
Michael	Field support	2	2
Patrick	Professor	8	2
Sarah	Marketing and recruitment	2	2
Susan	Professor	17	2

Note. LTR = Lewistown Teacher Residency. SU = Sinclair University.

you ended up at [SU]?), work in the LTR (How do you design your class/seminar for the residency?), and elements of the residency (What are your thoughts on the candidate selection process?). A robust theme of social justice emerged from these broader questions, as detailed in the findings—likely due to the clear focus on SJTE in the program. Each of the 11 participants was interviewed, and interviews lasted between 20 and 86 minutes.

Observations of six participants were conducted, including three university classes, a residency seminar, and a residency workshop. The number of observations was fewer than the number of interviews because some participants did not teach classes or seminars in the LTR, so observations were not possible. Residency seminars were conducted during the summer and on Fridays during the school year, and the goal of these seminars was to help residents acculturate into LPS and Lewistown generally. The residency workshops were created for current residents as well as residency graduates and were tailored to their needs. I did not audio or video record these observations, and my participation ranged from observer to full participant. Finally, I collected 117 pages of documents, including syllabi, course handouts, and recruitment materials.

Data Analysis

Data analysis began with transcription and included four iterations. While transcribing each interview verbatim, I highlighted significant words or phrases and made comments in the margins in a process known as *precoding* (Layder, as cited by Saldaña, 2009). The initial rounds of coding were specific to the individual level. After the precoding, I collected all data relevant to that individual—for example, a syllabus, handout, interview, and observation—and conducted a line-by-line coding of those data. I used these initial codes to draft a narrative of each participant, which I sent to the appropriate individual for member checking. After each participant had an opportunity to verify or elaborate on his or her narrative, I then conducted a cross-case analysis on these narratives as a third iteration of this process. Finally, I used the themes derived from the cross-case analysis to return to my raw data in order to use these themes as lenses to scrutinize the data a fourth time. One of the four major themes uncovered in this study, teaching social justice and critical pedagogy, is explored here; the other themes have been developed elsewhere (Beck, 2016).

Validity

Findings are validated through evidence (Maxwell, 2013). I used three methods to produce this evidence, including conducting member checks, writing memos, and transparency. Member checks were conducted in two ways. First, I built member checks into my interviews (Sandelowski, 2008). After a participant finished speaking, I would repeat back to the participant what I thought I understood to allow him or her to correct, confirm, or elaborate. Member checks were also conducted by send-

ing narratives to each participant for confirmation and clarification. I wrote memos through all stages of the research process to reflect on my design, data collection, and analysis. Finally, transparency permeated all aspects of my research, from my open and honest relationships with my participants to the reporting of my findings.

Findings

Three subthemes emerged from this investigation: (a) social justice as a programmatic vision, (b) vetting for social justice dispositions, and (c) residency coursework as a vehicle for teaching social justice. In the following pages, participant quotations illustrate and expand on these themes.

Social Justice as a Programmatic Vision

There was a strong consensus among all faculty and staff interviewed in this study that the mission of the LTR was one of social justice, which the residency defined on its website as leveling the playing field for marginalized children through providing them with well-prepared, committed teachers. This first theme answered the research question, What are faculty's understandings of structural inequalities in one teacher residency? This explicit mission was carried out by the LTR staff and SU faculty members who worked with the residents. All of the faculty members who participated in my study expressed personal commitments to working with first-generation students, urban education, and social justice. SU's urban identity seemed to create a natural space for the LTR.

Social justice was deeply personal to both faculty and staff but was expressed with variability. James, a faculty member, explained his position:

> I've always been interested in issues of equity and social justice. . . . But . . . they have always operated kind of separately in my career. . . . I will also say for the record, I want to do things that are meaningful. And I have a lot of mini-existential crises where I sit in my office and I say, "What the hell am I doing?" You know, "Am I doing stuff that matters?" I will say I always feel like the work that I do in the [LTR] is meaningful, and that it has the potential to be really meaningful.

For James, the LTR offered an opportunity to put his beliefs about equity and social justice into practice for the first time during his tenure as a teacher educator. It seems significant that he saw his work in the LTR as a meaningful manifestation of his beliefs.

Sarah, who recruited candidates for the LTR, also viewed the program as a means of putting her beliefs about social justice into practice. She described the program as "soul work" and talked about her work in the LTR in a Confucian sense:

> I have an understanding that we're all just sort of here, where we were born is not something anyone ever chooses and that informs everything that I'm connected to. So I have a global responsibility to everyone else. This idea informs my thinking and action and connectivity and social responsibility to everyone else.

Sarah's view of social justice varied from James's in her notion of a connectivity between individuals. She had a degree in theology and experience in this profession, which may have shaped her beliefs. Much like James, however, she leveraged the LTR as an opportunity to do SJTE work.

Another SU faculty member, Erica, described herself as having a "critical perspective." She articulated her own vision of social justice as challenging systemic structures:

> My vision of social justice involves creating the context, or manipulating the context, to make it fair to everybody of every level of privilege, every color, every race, every ethnicity, sexual orientation, what have you. For me, it's not about teaching *those people* how to behave in a way that aligns with what you believe, but it's about challenging the structures that keep those people oppressed. (emphasis original)

Erica defied existing power structures; her view of social justice introduced another facet in the multidimensional vision of social justice within the LTR. Indeed, she critiqued any teacher education program that intended to "play White savior to the poor, Black neighborhoods." She saw these top-down approaches as unsustainable and inappropriate. Susan echoed elements of Erica's beliefs: "I really went into teaching to *help* with the desegregation process. That was my over-arching, philosophical business in the classroom" (emphasis original). This initial catalyst had, as a result, manifested as "working with urban kids." Kapustka and colleagues (2009) have advocated that institutions ground their conceptualizations of social justice in their missions and make them explicit. The LTR had a clear mission statement that permeated all aspects of the program, but faculty and staff internalized and enacted these beliefs differently based on their own prior experiences and personal beliefs.

Vetting for Social Justice Dispositions

The next two themes answered the research question, What are the social justice curricula and pedagogies of faculty in one teacher residency program? The social justice vision articulated by program staff and faculty was translated into a purposeful, meticulous TC selection process that began with recruitment. Staff at the LTR made it a point to "keep that social justice angle present on that [Facebook] page" through posting recent articles about achievement gaps in education. However, the social justice mission of the program went much deeper than simply marketing and included candidate recruitment and selection. Sarah explained,

> This work [i.e., teaching in Lewistown] is really hard work, it's discouraging work, it's *tricky* work. I mean if you're a do-gooder, you're going to be shot down. How do you join a system that you're going to be about changing without being a threat to that system? (emphasis original)

This question echoes the earlier sentiments of Erica's admonition against teacher education programs that espoused a "White savior" mission. To facilitate

the selection of appropriate candidates, Sarah noted that she was careful in her recruitment work to locate individuals who "would have a sense of their place in the world, and with great humility." Thus Sarah utilized her beliefs about social responsibility in recruiting candidates who would have this critical view:

> It's finding the candidate who's excited about their content area. And then they have this deep passion to level the playing field. They want to do meaningful work; they want to be about closing that opportunity gap. And inside of them parts of them suffer just because they were born in a different zip code they have access to resources that other people don't. . . . Or I have people who have come *out of* the context. You know, they have been raised in a high-needs community, whether it was a rural community or an urban one. (emphasis original)

Thus, for Sarah, the ideal candidate for the LTR was a content-area expert who had a penchant for social justice—often because of previous experiences. In recruitment and candidate selection, social justice meant a commitment to making education more equitable for children from disenfranchised backgrounds.

Michael and Diana lent support for this vision of the ideal LTR candidate. Michael reiterated the dangers of a top-down, hegemonic mind-set:

> They [residents] have to have such a strong sense of self, and such a sense of this being a worthy mission without them being a missionary. And that's *such a fine line*! Because if they come in as missionaries it's the *worst* case scenario; because we're not coming in to save people, we're coming in to lift them up and see possibilities and that's very different. So the stress is going to be incredible. It *really* helps if they know what they're getting into. (emphasis original)

Diana likewise expressed distaste for the "missionary" perspective and preservice teachers who held deficit assumptions of urban students and felt a responsibility to "save" their students. She noted that teachers who did not have this mind-set were the ones who remained in urban classrooms. Recruitment and selection of candidates was thus difficult work because it required locating interested participants with this very specific disposition.

A careful selection process was designed around vetting candidates for the mission of the LTR. In their initial application to the program, applicants reflected on their fit for this work through an activity. The reflection consisted of a series of yes-or-no questions, for example, "Do you have the passion to commit to a rigorous program to prepare you to be the best teacher you can be for the students of [LPS]?" This was followed by a description of the demographics of LPS. Candidates were required to complete this activity as part of Selection Days: two daylong sessions in which viable candidates who had already completed initial rounds of the application process traveled to Lewistown to visit with LTR faculty, staff, and current residents. During Selection Days, candidates completed a series of activities to gain admission to the program.

Selection Days activities sought to unearth candidate motivations for teaching

in urban schools and their beliefs about equity and social justice. For example, a group discussion prompt from the April 2013 Selection Day read as follows:

The Scenario:
Students in your school, Central Middle School (CMS), are doing poorly. Only 50% of CMS students are passing the state achievement tests. Your principal expects the same results as high-performing schools, despite the fact that most of your students qualify for free or reduced lunch. Veteran teachers in the school are up in arms. They believe a 50% pass rate is not bad given the poverty level of the students in the school. "The principal can't expect us to perform miracles!"

The group discussed these questions for 20 minutes and focused on their goals for students and accountability for teachers in this conversation. After this discussion, candidates were given 5 minutes to answer the following question individually in writing: "How will you measure your own success as a teacher at Central Middle School at the end of the year?" The work of vetting TCs within this framework was challenging, and the LTR had a 2% selection rate as a result of the battery of performance assessments and state licensure requirements that candidates completed. At the time of this investigation, the cohorts admitted by the LTR had not exceeded 16 TCs. These small cohorts had the potential to foster group cohesion and serve as a support system, and they privileged quality teacher preparation over quantity of candidates prepared.

Residency Coursework as a Vehicle for Teaching Social Justice

Much like the variability within beliefs about social justice, the enactment of SJTE at the LTR was unique to each faculty and staff member and encompassed both classroom- and community-based approaches. Patrick approached his courses in the LTR as urban teacher education but not "in a narrow way." A pedagogical technique indicative of his approach was a privilege walk designed by Peggy McIntosh that he conducted during his residency course to help residents confront their own privilege: "It's like a privilege walk where you say like, 'If you can pump gas at 10:00 at night and not have to look over your shoulder take one step forward.'" This metacognitive activity aimed to foster higher level thinking about race, class, and culture to aid residents in reflecting on their own backgrounds. This was imperative since the residents were often from middle-class backgrounds and predominantly White and sometimes had difficulty connecting with the students whom they served. Patrick also related his use of critical pedagogy: "The other thing is I'm doing more with critical pedagogy than I used to do. Just raising awareness level, having folks learn how to read the world, sort of Freirean stuff." Patrick enacted this in the readings he chose for his course, including Janks's (2010) *Literacy and Power*—what he described as "critical discourse analysis." The critical conversations that Patrick designed around these readings were crafted to help residents further unpack race, ethnicity, and privilege.

Jessica also approached her course as urban teacher education, which she described as a "luxury" not afforded to her in designing other courses at SU. Much like Patrick, Jessica facilitated difficult conversations about ethnicity, race, and privilege; her vision of urban teacher education was manifested as critical ethnography:

> If I say to a bunch of White people, "Let's look at your privilege," they shut down. But if we approach it from, "Hey we all have different cultural and historical locations that help us perceive the world, and everybody has those things. And so our jobs as ethnographers are to learn about our own and then learn what other people's are. And so our constant work is to try to understand, and that's it." It's not as threatening for me or for them. It's not as scary. And they can just see it in a different way.

Thus Jessica attempted to foster empathy and understanding in her students as an appropriate posture for urban education. One means she used to accomplish this goal was an initial essay that residents wrote about these cultural positions. Much like Patrick's use of a privilege walk, this tool was intended to help residents unpack their own experiences with race, class, and privilege. The rationale behind these activities was the same: Residents must first understand their own experiences to understand those of their students.

Like Patrick, Jessica described her instruction as "critical pedagogy" and thus infused social justice into all facets of her course. She chose Weiner's (2006) *The Essentials: Urban Teaching* to provide residents with basic skills for urban teaching—including appropriate and effective classroom management—which she had seen as a deficiency in past cohorts of residents. She also attempted to challenge residents' prior knowledge, beliefs, and deficit assumptions about urban students. For example, she frequently told her students, "If we could *see* kids differently, from where *they are* reading the world, and set higher expectations and scaffold and provide them engaging opportunities, or engaging curriculum, then they will perform" (emphasis original). Despite the arduous vetting process, residents still needed to be challenged in their beliefs—perhaps a testament to the difficulty of SJTE.

Jessica also noted the need for both theory and practice and how she tried to balance these goals:

> I have some articles from *Urban Education* that talk about why Black kids still get suspended all the time, that kind of stuff. And then some really practical things from Rick Wormeli about how to plan, and then differentiated instruction, and so I'm really trying to balance that. And then a lot of videos that I'm going to show them in class about Gloria Ladson-Billings and Tim Wise and, *and* Rick Wormeli, and Carol Ann Tomlinson. (emphasis original)

This instructor's approach was to utilize research-based articles as well as experts on urban education to convey both theory and practice to her TCs. Jessica also used Sleeter's (2005) *Un-Standardizing Curriculum: Multicultural Teaching in the Standards-Based Classroom* and Wiggins and McTighe's (2005) *Understanding by*

Design for her course. She explained, "If our teachers leave and they understand backward design they can take any mandated, scripted curriculum and flip it and make it better." In the unit plans they created for her course, Jessica asked residents to focus on equity and also the community (i.e., Lewistown) by making explicit connections to the local context.

Erica designed her course in the LTR for an urban context, but she generally approached course design in this way:

> I think the best way to put it might be to say is the way that I design ed[ucational] psych[ology] classes *generally* is more suitable . . . for an urban ed[ucation] group. . . . So it's what the other kids [traditional SU TCs] are getting is more of this stuff. (emphasis original)

Thus she provided critical pedagogy to both her traditional SU TCs and to her LTR residents. Like Jessica and Patrick, this critical approach included careful selection of the text for her course:

> I chose [Arnett and Maynard's (2012) *Child Development: A Cultural Approach*], who's somebody who always takes a real critical perspective in all of his work. So for example [*pauses while flipping through the book*], for emotional and social development he will talk about the theory, but then he'll contextualize to like, here [*points to table of contents, reads*], "Crime, delinquency, depression." So there's more in the way of the issues that may be relevant to urban teaching than you might find in a traditional human development textbook. But then *again* I'm going to start using this book for all my classes, you know what I mean? So I'm not doing it *special* for this group because I happen to believe that stuff in there is valuable to everyone. (emphasis original)

Thus Erica did not take a unique approach in designing her LTR course but instead infused all of her courses with a critical approach to education. This posture hearkens back to the other finding from this investigation that the faculty and staff chosen to work in this program were naturally predisposed to work for equity in education.

James also designed his course as urban teacher education and noted that in the LTR, "we're [the faculty] a little more single-minded in purpose, so like our readings can be a little more focused." This faculty member noticed a coherence in the instruction in the LTR generally around the idea of urban education. Unlike Jessica, who aspired to balance theory and practice in her course, James pur-posefully emphasized theory: "As much as I think theory and practice should be integrated, the hardcore realities are you're busy when you're a teacher and you're doing *stuff* and you're not thinking about it in the same way" (emphasis original). James pushed residents to think critically about urban education through multiple lenses. These lenses were provided through reading and discussion, including texts such as Ayers's (2004) *Teaching Toward Freedom: Moral Commitment and Ethical Action in the Classroom*. After an observation of his class in which this text was discussed extensively, James provided the following elaboration:

> It's about being able to see the humanity in the kids you teach. And I think he [Ayers] talks about it in the book a lot too, but it's particularly interesting in the context of mostly middle-class, White people going into a school system that's pretty poor, and that's super-majority African American. And it's like, what are the things that would get in the way of you seeing the humanity in your students? But there's a lot of layers to that.

James noted that the residents who participated in this discussion seemed to be particularly well suited to tackling issues of equity and diversity, which supports the efficacy of the battery of performance assessments intended to vet for this very disposition. These findings convey that faculty enacted SJTE differently in their methods, yet there was a coherence in vision.

Faculty at the LTR had also developed the Community Project as an explicit means of acculturating residents into the Lewistown community. The development of this project is described elsewhere (Beck, 2016), but—at the time of this study—the focus of the project was providing residents with a menu of options for experiencing Lewistown, such as shopping at a local market or riding the city bus. Thus, owing to its combination of field experiences and university coursework, the LTR was able to afford residents experiences at both the university and the community levels.

Discussion

The current study contributes to the growing body of literature on teacher residencies as well as the proliferating literature on SJTE. In particular, the contribution of this study lies in demonstrating the varied but coherent beliefs of faculty and staff working in the LTR steeped in the residency's mission as well as their SJTE curricula and pedagogies. Although these beliefs came from different experiences, the underlying theme of challenging systemic structures to serve marginalized students was apparent in the beliefs of these individuals, who also rejected savior views. The LTR was an outgrowth of a well-established university located in the heart of an urban center that embraced its mission of serving the local community. Thus a foundation seemed to have been laid for the creation of the LTR. However, the LTR was a residency program that operated alongside a more traditional teacher preparation program at SU. Although the two programs shared faculty, the explicit social justice vision was unique to the LTR. This is worth noting considering the pressing need for teacher candidates who can efficaciously serve students who are diverse in ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, language, and sexual identity. SJTE was relegated to this boutique program rather than informing the traditional teacher education program at this urban university, which was repeatedly emphasized by the faculty who taught in both programs. Future studies should continue to build on the contributions of the current study through exploring the beliefs of teacher educators in larger programs expressing SJTE missions.

Another contribution of this manuscript is in demonstrating how TCs were vetted for their social justice dispositions. This work was long and complex and resulted in small cohorts, but the faculty viewed the process as critical. Even though vetting was rigorous, TCs still needed to be challenged in their beliefs about students and communities, which supports the uneven development of these beliefs uncovered elsewhere (e.g., Baily & Katradis, 2016). Boggess (2010) studied how teacher quality was conceptualized in two different teacher residency programs in two different cities and found that one program valued individual accountability and perseverance, while the other fostered an "activist disposition" (p. 80). Boggess tied this to the organizational structure and funding arrangement in each respective city. However, to date, no other study has demonstrated how the work of vetting candidates for residency programs has been accomplished, and future studies should continue to explore this difficult, value-laden process—particularly as it pertains to SJTE.

Finally, perhaps owing to the program's coupling of theory and practice, as evident in the simultaneous implementation of university coursework and field experience, faculty at the LTR implemented both classroom- and community-based SJTE strategies. This is in line with the literature reviewed that recommends repeated, long-term exposure to these methods to foster social justice dispositions (Rubin et al., 2016). This may be a unique affordance of programs that offer extended clinical experiences and profess to serve diverse student populations such as teacher residencies. Indeed, McDonald (2008) has demonstrated how university assignments can link field experiences. Future studies should explore the beliefs and practices of residents graduating from these programs to better understand what elements of these programs helped to reinforce social justice dispositions.

What this manuscript did not uncover were the hiring practices used at SU and the LTR to attract faculty and staff who wished to pursue social justice agendas in their work. This recruitment process would likely be as difficult and important as recruiting TCs with this particular disposition. Moreover, SU was an urban university; more research should be conducted about rural institutions serving disenfranchised populations and how faculty enact their social justice agendas at these sites.

Although steeped in central tenets of SJTE as defined by McDonald (2008), faculty and staff at the LTR did not explicitly note addressing a critical body of pedagogy of teacher education (Jones & Hughes-Decatur, 2012), gender-complex teacher education (Rands, 2009), or ableism (Lalvani & Broderick, 2013). However, they did make their vision of SJTE clear at both the individual and program levels. This is in line with Kapustka and colleagues' (2009) recommendation that institutions ground their conceptualizations of SJTE in their missions and make these explicit. Indeed, it seems arguable whether it is necessary to have just one, operational definition of SJTE due to the varied nature of the construct across different locations, and it is fair to challenge the critique of SJTE as poorly theorized and nebulous (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009). However, programs professing to enact SJTE may well benefit from Zeichner, Payne, and Brayko's (2015) recommendation

to join with other social movements. Another study of the LTR demonstrated the uneven development of a social justice disposition in a resident who graduated from the program (Beck, 2020). Future studies should explore programs pursuing this larger social agenda and the efficacy of this approach as measured beyond simply test scores. As America's school-age population continues to grow increasingly diverse in race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and sexual orientation, teachers must be prepared for this work. As Patrick noted, "we need to figure out how we can use our forum . . . all these people together, to speak truth to power ourselves." This is the task that SJTE programs now face: transforming structures.

Notes

[1] See http://www.utrunited.org/

[2] See http://nctresidencies.org/

[3] All names of people and places are pseudonyms.

References

Akom, A. A. (2009). Critical hip hop pedagogy as a form of liberatory praxis. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 42*(1), 52–66.

Alsup, J., & Miller, S. J. (2014). Reclaiming English education: Rooting social justice in dispositions. *English Education, 46*(3), 195–215.

Andrews, D. J. C. (2009). "The hardest thing to turn from": The effects of service-learning on preparing urban educators. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 42*(3), 272–293. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680903060261

Apple, M. W. (2011). Global crises, social justice, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(2), 222–234. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487110385428

Arnett, J. J., & Maynard, A. (2012). *Child development: A cultural approach.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Aronson, B. A. (2016). From teacher education to practicing teacher: What does culturally relevant praxis look like? *Urban Education.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916672288

Ayers, W. (2004). *Teaching toward freedom: Moral commitment and ethical action in the classroom.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Baily, S., & Katradis, M. (2016). "Pretty much fear!!" Rationalizing teacher (dis)engagement in social justice education. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 49*(2), 215–227. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2016.1144833

Baldwin, S. C., Buchanan, A. M., & Rudisill, M. E. (2007). What teacher candidates learned about diversity, social justice, and themselves from service-learning experiences. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(4), 315–327. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/0022487107305259

Beck, J. S. (2016, Winter). The complexities of a third-space partnership in an urban teacher residency. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 51–70.

Beck, J. S. (2020). A continuum of critical consciousness: Exploring one resident's concerns. *Teacher Educators' Journal, 13*, 32–51. Retrieved from https://www.ateva.org/journal-1

Boggess, L. B. (2010). Tailoring new urban teachers for character and activism. *American Edu-*

Kapustka, K. M., Howell, P., Clayton, C. D., & Thomas, S. (2009). Social justice in teacher education: A qualitative content analysis of NCATE conceptual frameworks. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 42*(4), 489–505. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680903260101

Kraehe, A. M., & Brown, K. D. (2011). Awakening teachers' capacities for social justice with/in arts-based inquiries. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 44*(4), 488–511. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2011.610682

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley.

Lalvani, P., & Broderick, A. A. (2013). Institutionalized ableism and the misguided "disability awareness day": Transformative pedagogies for teacher education. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 46*(4), 468–483. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2013.838484

Matias, C. E., & Grosland, T. J. (2016). Digital storytelling as racial justice: Digital hopes for deconstructing Whiteness in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(2), 152–164. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115624493

Matsko, K. K., & Hammerness, K. (2013). Unpacking the "urban" in urban teacher preparation: Making a case for context-specific preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(2), 128–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487113511645

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McDonald, M. A. (2008). The pedagogy of assignments in social justice teacher education. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 41*(2), 151–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680801943949

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mills, C., & Ballantyne, J. (2016). Social justice and teacher education: A systematic review of empirical work in the field. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(4), 263–276. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487116660152

Moll, L. S., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 31*(2), 132–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534

Morettini, B. W., Brown, C. M., & Viator, M. G. (2018). Gaining a better understanding of self: A self-study in cultural competence in teacher education. *The Teacher Educator, 53*(4), 355–366. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2018.1434261

Ohito, E. (2016). Making the emperor's new clothes visible in anti-racist teacher education: Enacting a pedagogy of discomfort with White preservice teachers. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 49*(4), 454–467. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2016.1226104

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 85–100.

Rands, K. E. (2009). Considering transgender people in education: A gender-complex approach. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(4), 419–431. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109341475

Riley, K., & Solic, K. (2017). "Change happens beyond the comfort zone": Bringing undergraduate teacher-candidates into activist teacher communities. *Journal of Teacher Education, 68*(2), 179–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487116687738

Ritchie, S. (2012). Incubating and sustaining: How teacher networks enable and support social justice education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 63*(2), 120–131. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/0022487111428327

Rubin, B. C., El-Haj, T. R. A., Graham, E., & Clay, K. (2016). Confronting the urban civic opportunity gap: Integrating youth participatory action research into teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(5), 424–436. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487116667195

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sandelowski, M. (2008). Member check. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 2, pp. 501–502). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sleeter, C. E. (2005). *Un-standardizing curriculum: Multicultural teaching in the standards-based classroom.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sockett, H. (2009). Dispositions as virtues: The complexity of the construct. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(3), 291–303. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109335189

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Urban Teacher Residency United Network. (2006). *Core principles and synthesis of conceptual grounding.* Retrieved from http://www.utrunited.org/about-us/research-and-publications

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Teacher Quality Partnership Grant program*. Retrieved from https://ed.gov/programs/tqpartnership/index.html

Vass, G. (2017). Preparing for culturally responsive schooling: Initial teacher educators into the fray. *Journal of Teacher Education, 68*(5), 451–462. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117702578

Villegas, A. M. (2007). Dispositions in teacher education: A look at social justice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(5), 370–380. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487107308419

Weiner, L. (2006). *Urban teaching: The essentials* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Weiner, L. (2007). A lethal threat to U.S. teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(4), 274–286. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487107305603

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Zeichner, K., Bowman, M., Guillen, L., & Napolitan, K. (2016). Engaging and working in solidarity with local communities in preparing the teachers of their children. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(4), 277–290. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487116660623

Zeichner, K., Payne, K. A., & Brayko, K. (2015). Democratizing teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(2), 122–135. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114560908