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Abstract

An Exploratory Study Of The Role Of Cooperating Teachers In Preparing Teacher Candidates For Academic Success With Students Of Color In High-Need Schools

by

Audra M. Watson

Advisor: Dr. Nicholas Michelli

This dissertation investigates the teaching practices, attitudes, beliefs, and expectations, cooperating teachers hold and model for teacher candidates preparing to work in high-need schools with significant populations of students of color. Using a culturally relevant and critical race theory lens, I argue that the clinical placements in which many teacher candidates are placed provide limited opportunities for them to see and engage in the full spectrum of culturally relevant pedagogical practices.

The data for this study were captured from participants in a nationally-administered, state-based teacher preparation program through surveys, interviews, and observations over a period of four months. Using a mixed method design, an analysis of findings reveals that while committed to preparing teacher candidates to work with significant populations of students of color in high-need schools, cooperating teachers have a limited understanding of and use of a full range of culturally responsive teaching practices. Moreover, explicit discussions of race and racial inequities institutionalized within schools and classrooms are largely missing from discussions between cooperating teachers and teacher candidates.

The importance of this study lies in capturing the goals, stated beliefs, understandings, and pedagogical practices of multiple actors (program directors, cooperating teachers, teacher
candidates) involved in the preparation of teacher candidates for high-need schools with significant populations of students of color. It is hoped that this study will force critical analysis and reconsideration of the ways in which we recruit, select, and prepare cooperating teachers and ensure that they can facilitate serious discussions about and model a wider range of culturally responsive pedagogies that will support the success of students of color.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Though the last decade has seen proposals for more robust clinical teaching placements in high-need settings, there has been no comparable attention to the skills and abilities of the cooperating teachers who prepare teacher candidates to work with students of color in high-need schools. Substantive discussions regarding cooperating teachers’ beliefs and practices have been largely absent. Moreover, current research fails to provide insight as to whether the attitudes, beliefs, and practices held and modeled by cooperating teachers in high-need clinical placements ultimately translate into effective pedagogical actions for pre-service teachers in both the clinical environment or within their future classrooms.

This issue is critically important considering that K–12 educational reforms, policies, and initiatives aimed at improving the outcomes of students of color, English Language Learners (ELLs), and poor students have yet to improve the systematic failure of large swaths of students. Likewise, in spite of myriad teacher education regulations enacted since the 1980s and the greatly expanded federal educational presence since 2001 (National Research Council, 2011, p. 15), outcomes for many students of color remain stagnant. Evidence of these dismal outcomes is clearly borne out by K–12 assessment data, high school completion figures, college admission and attrition rates, and unemployment statistics. “For too many decades students of color have graduated from high school at much lower rates than their peers, which has led to comparably low employment rates and earnings. Nationally 25% of all students do not graduate from high school on time. However for students of color, this number is closer to 40%” revealing a shocking pattern of inequity (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2012, p. 2). Though these failures are also attributable to social and macroeconomic policies, which must be addressed,
teacher preparation programs must simultaneously take action to improve the education of teachers for the nation's most vulnerable children.

Most troubling is that “attention to the problem of preparing teachers to teach a diverse student body is not a new concern in U.S. teacher education” (Zeichner, 1992, p. 2). As early as 1969, the National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth published “Teachers for the Real World” (Smith, 1969). It was both an indictment of teacher education for its failure to prepare effective teachers of "culturally disadvantaged" students and a call to transform the preparation of teachers for diversity and equity (p. 2). Smith maintained there were many problems inherent in teacher preparation programs including that “program content reflects current prejudices; the methods of instruction coincide with the learning styles of the dominant group and …subtle inequalities are reinforced in the institutions of higher learning” (p. 3). Smith determined that for teachers to be adequately prepared to meet the needs of all students it was incumbent upon teacher education to provide prospective teachers with opportunities to examine their beliefs. “Proper education of the teacher will lead him to examine his own human prejudices generally and, specifically, his racial prejudices....” (p. 20). Smith also alleged that, "teachers need to develop not only further skills and techniques for working with children and their parents but also the knowledge to comprehend the social circumstances of the children, their habits and attitudes” (p. 158).

Attention to diversity in teacher education is evident in the literature from the mid-1970s to the early ‘90s. In 1976, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) mandated institutions seeking accreditation to provide evidence that their teacher candidates had received adequate opportunities to focus on issues concerning teaching diverse populations (Gollnick, 1992). By 1993, “forty states required schools or teacher education programs to include the study of ethnic groups, cultural diversity, human relations, or
multicultural/bilingual education in their programs” (Banks et al., 2005, p. 242). In the years after 1993, multicultural courses and diversity classes continued to emerge and “culturally relevant pedagogy was being extensively taught in teacher education programs and promoted by scholars and practitioners as an effective pedagogical tool to work with students of diverse backgrounds” (Young, 2010, p. 248).

Today, in spite of the nearly ubiquitous use of multicultural coursework and the attention paid to diversity in many teacher preparation programs, academic outcomes for students of color unequivocally need improvement. For example, Baldwin et al. (2007) studied undergraduate teacher candidates who participated in a service learning program in which they were able to “examine the limited expectations they had for the children, their families, and their communities” (p. 321). As was the case in other studies, they found that the teacher candidates’ preconceptions of students of color included assumptions about “poverty stricken and crime-plagued urban and rural underserved communities” and “negative assumptions about children’s intellectual abilities, interests, and motivation” (p. 322). By and large, the teacher candidates changed their expectations. Many “even began to question societal inequities that they encountered” (p. 326). Unfortunately, however, some candidates’ assumptions were reinforced. This is unsurprising in light of the fact that some scholars, like Irvine (2003), contend that even after taking courses in multicultural education, some pre-service teachers maintain low expectations and harbor negative beliefs about students of color. Such sentiments by prospective teachers are deeply unsettling considering the lack of comparable academic achievement between students of color and their white peers and the markedly inequitable resources available to the schools that serve them. Such beliefs also call into question the efficacy of the processes and methods used by teacher preparation programs to prepare teacher candidates who have the
pedagogical skills, attitudes, and beliefs necessary to facilitate high academic achievement, cultural competence, and critical consciousness sorely needed to ensure the success of students of color.

Some, like Haberman, believe that experiences, attitudes, and dispositions are the best predictors of teacher success in diverse schools. Haberman states that these traits cannot be taught but should instead be used as selection criteria to make decisions about program entry (Haberman and Post, 1998). While this may serve as one solution, the grasp of prejudice and institutional racial inequities may call for different approaches for teacher preparation. This bears consideration in light of Stangor’s (2000) differentiation between direct forms of prejudice and more subtle forms of prejudice that are less transparent, and far more damaging and insidious. Greater focus on race, cross-cultural competence, and culturally responsive teaching is necessary, bearing in mind the continual attempts at education reform, rhetoric about closing the so-called “achievement gap” and the contention that “if the American education system continues to underserve an increasingly large portion of students of color, the gap in graduation rates will never close, and the national graduation rate will stagnate or decrease” (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2012, p. 2).

Multicultural, cultural, and gender-relevant pedagogical coursework, while necessary components of teacher preparation, are inadequate for preparing prospective teachers for high-need urban classrooms with large numbers of students of color. Instead, prospective teachers, who will teach in these contexts, must have experiences working alongside and learning from teachers whose explicit beliefs—as well as their pedagogical practices—facilitate the academic achievement of students of color. Using survey and interview data and classroom observations this study seeks to examine the beliefs and practices of cooperating teachers to determine how
effectively they are supporting the development of teacher candidates who will be able to
successfully work with high-need students of color.

**Introduction to Research Questions**

1. How do educator preparation programs (EPPs) select cooperating teachers (CTs)?
   - What standards are delineated?
   - How are they applied?
   - Who controls the selection process?
   - Is professional development (PD) provided for CTs, and is it a requirement?
   - How are cooperating teachers evaluated and how are the evaluations used?
   - Are cooperating teachers appointed as clinical faculty?

1a. To what extent do EPPs select CTs who intentionally communicate and model: high
expectations, culturally responsive pedagogy, and persistence of K–12 students of color for
teacher candidates (TCs)?

2. What are the attitudes and philosophies about teaching students of color in high-need
schools held by CTs and how are they conveyed to STs during student teaching? To
what extent do they intentionally communicate and model: high expectations, culturally
responsive pedagogy, and persistence of K–12 students of color for TCs?

3. How effectively do CTs enact and model pedagogical and non-pedagogical practices
that support the success of high-need students of color?

4. Is there evidence that the philosophies, expectations, and teaching practices take root
during the student teaching cycle? Is there evidence of transference?

**Purposes of the Study**

The intent of this study is to utilize surveys, interviews, and classroom observations to
unpack a series of important research questions. Using a mixed method design, the study
explores the field-based preparation of student teachers for diverse classrooms. Specifically, the
main goals are to elicit the degree and the ways in which teacher preparation programs
purposefully select cooperating teachers who intentionally communicate and model teaching
practices that will support the achievement of students of color in high-need schools; to
illuminate the attitudes and philosophies held by cooperating teachers of students in high-need
urban classrooms; and to determine the extent to which the attitudes, philosophies, and teaching practices modeled by cooperating teachers take root in the practices of student teachers. Finally, changes needed in the preparation of teachers and in the policies that guide preparation programs will be posited.

The Demographic Imperative

For the purposes of this study, it is important to understand rapidly changing student demographics and their relationship to the teacher population. Merely 40 years ago, students of color constituted 22% of the school-aged population. By 2000, this population had increased to 39% with African-American students, in particular, representing 17% of public school enrollment (Hollins and Guzman, 2005). Demographic projections speculate that by 2035 the population of students of color will have grown so substantially that they will, in fact, comprise the majority of the U.S. student population, and by 2050 they will make up 57% of the student population (Villegas and Lucas, 2002). Darling-Hammond also offers a rich illustration of this diversity within classrooms:

In the classrooms most beginning teachers will enter, at least 25% of students live in poverty and many of them lack basic food, shelter, and health care; from 10% to 20% have identified learning differences; 15% speak a language other than English as their primary language (many more in urban settings); and about 40% are members of racial/ethnic “minority” groups, many of them recent immigrants from countries with different educational systems and cultural traditions. (2006, p. 301)
More recent data captured by the 2010 Census revealed that in 2008, 43% of PK–12 students were children of color with Hispanics representing the largest and fastest-growing demographic. Additionally, as cited by Boser (2011), William H. Frey (2011) hypothesizes that within the next 10 to 12 years, the nation’s public school student body will have no one clear racial or ethnic majority. In stark contrast to the growing diversity of the U.S. student population, data compiled by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES, 2013) reveals that during 82% of public school teachers were non-Hispanic White, 7% non-Hispanic Black, 8% Hispanic, 1.6% Asian American, and 0.8% Native American. In essence, the population of teachers is largely homogeneous. In light of these statistics, it is unsurprising that teaching candidates in the nation’s teacher preparation programs are also primarily white, working and middle class women. These aspiring teachers grew up in largely suburban or rural backgrounds effectively limiting their exposure to and interaction with individuals from different backgrounds (Frankenberg and Orfield, 2006).

This growing incongruence between U.S. teachers and the students they serve poses significant challenges in the preparation of pre-service teachers; particularly considering the scope of the traditional teacher preparation enterprise. This study will focus primarily on traditional teacher preparation programs in which the vast majority of teacher candidates are prepared to teach. Specifically, there are approximately 1400 institutions that offer education degrees (Aldeman et. al, 2011, p.2); between 70% and 80% of students who complete teacher preparation programs are enrolled in one of 1,096 programs situated in postsecondary institutions (U.S. Department of Education, 2006); and these postsecondary programs produce more than 200,000 new teachers every year (National Research Council, 2010).
Again, because the vast majority of teachers continue to enter the profession through the traditional teacher education pipeline, which includes a sequence of coursework (generally a mixture of foundational courses, content courses, and methods courses) and field work (generally observation hours and the culminating student teaching experience), the outcome of the study is to understand whether and how traditional teacher preparation programs are effectively preparing their teacher candidates to support the academic achievement and other needs of students of color. It is important to better understand whether clinical field work is structured with the explicit purpose of ensuring the success of students of color. More specifically, in light of the demands on teacher education to better prepare teachers, it is essential to ascertain whether programs effectively select for and/or develop within cooperating teachers multicultural ideologies and culturally responsive teaching practices that foster high academic expectations of students of color in high-need schools.

**Unanswered Questions and Concerns about the Research to Date**

In spite of the general agreement that clinical fieldwork is an important aspect in the development of prospective teachers, an important review of student teaching research, published recently, confirms that many questions remain as to exactly how clinical fieldwork contributes to pre-service teacher development. Anderson and Stillman’s (2013) review of the research is significant because it provides a comprehensive view of the literature and serves to reaffirm and extend my thinking. After reviewing 100 articles, Anderson and Stillman engaged in an in-depth analysis of 54 peer-reviewed studies conducted over a 20-year period. The vast majority of studies in this area are qualitative. Merely seven of those reviewed by Anderson and Stillman were quantitative and six used mixed methodologies. Anderson and Stillman highlight that much of the clinical preparation literature is focused on student teachers’ changed
perceptions regarding diversity and/or on the preparation and potential ability of white teachers to work in schools with large numbers of students of color (p. 34).

Anderson and Stillman’s (2013) review generally revealed that pre-service teachers who engaged in multicultural field work experiences, and/or were placed in diverse settings tended to positively change their perceptions and attitudes and/or increase their feelings of efficacy after having participated in experiences with students of color in high-need schools. Two exceptions to the general findings stand out: In the first instance, pre-service teachers continued to lack or indicated a lower sense of efficacy with regard to classroom management and instructional strategies (Bloom & Peter, 2012). In the second instance, Nelson et al. (2012) noted the lack of influence of multicultural coursework on pre-service teachers’ perspectives of diversity despite having participated in more multicultural coursework. Similarly, Anderson and Stillman (2013) found that a very small proportion of the studies reviewed indicated “mixed, neutral, or negative shifts for pre-service teachers in beliefs and attitudes about their readiness or desire to teach diverse learners in urban and/or high-need schools” (pp. 34 -35).

Despite the purported effectiveness of multicultural field experiences, Anderson and Stillman correctly question whether the changes in beliefs and attitudes are a function of pre-service teachers’ “understandings of what TEP faculty— who are often the researchers—desire and expect of them” (p. 36) or whether these are indeed actual changes in perceptions. They suggest that important potential research questions emerge when considering “whether reportedly positive belief and attitude change represents meaningful and enduring change to PSTs’ belief systems’ the kind of change most likely to impact PSTs’ attitudes toward, interactions with, and teaching of students over the long term” (p. 36). There is a question as to whether these are lasting changes in teacher candidates’ perceptions, attitudes, and efficacy. As
yet, there is no empirical evidence that these changed perceptions endure. More importantly, for
the purpose of this study, there is no evidence that changed beliefs result in high expectations,
effective teaching practices, and improved student achievement. To date, the evidence appears
to suggest that teacher candidates feel least efficacious about instruction (Anderson & Stillman,
2013, p. 40; Bloom & Peter, 2012; Kumar & Hamer, 2012).

Further, Anderson and Stillman’s work is important because they advocate for greater
methodological rigor and “a more robust research base-one that includes more extensive, diverse
and compelling evidence of the contributions of TEPs [teacher education programs] and their
constituent components to intended learning outcomes” (p. 59). The significant number of
perception studies is troubling and this heavy reliance on self-reports provides limited
information in an area that is important. Novice teachers may or may not have an accurate sense
of their teaching and, more importantly, may want to appear (or truly believe they are) more
efficacious than they truly are. My own experience as a teacher and as a teacher of teachers
continually reminds me that our perceptions of our practice and our practice are often
incongruent. This study seeks in part to address some limitations posed by perception studies by
also utilizing an observation protocols and through conducting interviews with CTs and TCs
about their work in the classroom. These multiple methods will serve the purpose of
triangulating the data.

Finally, and most importantly, though the last decade has seen reforms focused on
providing more robust clinical teaching placements in high-need settings, there has been no
comparable discussion about the necessary beliefs and practices that cooperating teachers must
enact to support the development of pre-service teachers who can improve student achievement.
The current research fails to provide any data as to whether the changed attitudes and beliefs
described by pre-service teachers in high-need clinical placements ultimately translate into effective pedagogical actions in the clinical environment or in their future classrooms. Anderson and Stillman (2013) make the case for engaging in such research, stating “the lack of depth and nuance of the studies [in that they do not] explore how beliefs and attitudes shape what TCs actually learn about teaching” (p. 34). This study examines the hypothesis that the beliefs and practices enacted explicitly and implicitly by cooperating teacher are likely a critical factor in the development of effective teachers for diverse students.

Definition of Terms

A few key terms are defined in this section to support the reader’s understanding of the study.

CRT (Critical Race Theory): “Critical race theory refers to a historical and contemporary body of scholarship that aims to interrogate the discourses, ideologies, and social structures that produce and maintain conditions of racial injustice” (Hatch, 2007, p. 1).

CT (Cooperating Teacher): Teachers with whom teacher candidates are placed during field work and student teaching. These individuals work in conjunction with teacher preparation to develop the skills of future teachers.

High-Needs School: For the purposes of this study the term high-needs school refers to a school that serves elementary or secondary school children that meets one or more of the following criteria

a) a high percentage of individuals from families with incomes below the poverty line;

b) a high percentage of secondary school teachers not teaching in the content area in which the teachers were trained to teach; or

c) a high teacher turnover rate

http://www.ithaca.edu/hs/noyce/highneed/
**PD (Professional Development):** The opportunities afforded to cooperating teachers to support their work with teacher candidates.

**PD (Program Director):** Those individuals with oversight of teacher preparation programs. PDs are largely responsible for enacting program goals as well as for monitoring the progress of teacher candidates within coursework and clinical preparation.

**Significant Populations of Students of Color:** For the purposes of this study, the threshold being used to identify schools with significant populations of students of color is 40 percent.

**Students of Color:** Refers to students who are: Black, Hispanic, Native American, Alaskan Native, Biracial, Multiracial, and Asian.

**TC (Teacher Candidates):** frequently also referred to as a student teacher). Those individuals who are undertaking course work and field work to obtain certification to become teachers.

In addition to the terms defined above which are used throughout this document, it is also important to define and delineate the various conceptualizations of culturally responsive/relevant pedagogy from which this study draws (Table 1.1).
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladson-Billings</td>
<td>Teachers who engage in culturally relevant pedagogy: believe their students are capable of success, see their work as an art, see themselves as part of the community in which their students live, carefully construct learning communities with dynamic student-teacher relationships, foster student collaboration and accountability for one another, and understand their critical role as facilitators and bridge builders in the teaching and learning process. As a result, their classrooms demonstrate that knowledge is fluid, must be viewed critically, and must be assessed in varied ways (Ladson-Billings, 1995, pp. 478-482).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Gay also maintains that teachers who practice culturally responsive pedagogy are focused on: (a) academic achievement—making learning rigorous, exciting, challenging, and equitable with high standards; (b) cultural competence—knowing and facilitating the learning process to include the range of students' cultural and linguistic groups; and (c) sociopolitical consciousness—recognizing and assisting students in the understanding that education and schooling do not occur in a vacuum (Gay, 2000). However, while Gay also maintains that culturally responsive teachers must have deep knowledge of cultural diversity; she also insists that they also have detailed factual information about the cultural particularities of specific ethnic groups (Gay, 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villegas &amp; Lucas</td>
<td>Villegas and Lucas (2002) focus heavily on the ways in which teacher education programs should prepare culturally responsive teachers. They propose a vision for an integrated teacher education program, which prepares teachers who: “are socio-culturally conscious; have affirming views of students from diverse backgrounds; see themselves as both responsible for and capable of bringing about educational change; understand how learners construct knowledge and capable of promoting learners’ knowledge construction; understand the lives of his or her students; and use this knowledge about students’ lives to design instruction that builds on what they already know while stretching them beyond the familiar” (Villegas and Lucas, 2002, p 21).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Howard (2003) argues that one of the central principles of culturally responsive pedagogy is an authentic belief that students from culturally diverse and low-income backgrounds are capable learners and if treated competently they will ultimately demonstrate high degrees of competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rightmyer, Powell, Cantrell, Powers, Carter, Cox, &amp; Aiello</td>
<td>Rightmyer et al. (2008) have identified and delineated eight pillars of culturally responsive instruction which they use in their observations of reading classrooms. The pillars include: assessment practices, classroom caring and teacher dispositions, classroom climate/physical environment, curriculum/planned instruction, discourse/instructional conversations, family involvement and collaboration, pedagogy/instructional practices, and sociopolitical consciousness/multiple perspectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evident in these definitions are a number of cross-cutting threads and themes in the conceptualizations of culturally responsive pedagogy delineated above. This study is most interested in the following characteristics of culturally responsive pedagogy and will use them in considering study findings and recommendations.

- **Visions of students as able and competent learners**: The teacher understands that all students enter the classroom with deeply-rooted local knowledge and equipped to build on that knowledge as they learn new curriculum content.

- **Achievement-Focused**: Teachers prepare and enact lesson plans and learning experiences that are engaging, rigorous, and couched in how and why it matters.

- **Expectations and Accountability**: The teacher creates a classroom environment in which students are respected and act respectfully. Students are held accountable and are simultaneously cared for in a way that insists on high levels of success (Ladson-Billings, 2002).

- **Culturally Competent**: The teacher understands, appreciates, and celebrates cultural and linguistic diversity.

- **Deeply immersed within the community**: The teacher builds and develops non-hierarchical relationships with families/guardians and other influential adults in students’ lives and understands that there is much to learn from these individuals.

- **Sociopolitical Consciousness**: The teacher actively supports students of color in understanding that political, social, and structural inequities exist that are intended to negate the inherent worth and worthiness of students of color while reifying notions of white supremacy. The teacher provides students of color with the skills and abilities needed so that they can respond accordingly.
Background

As the struggle continues to prepare teachers who can effectively teach students of color in high-need urban classrooms, there have been a few important and positive developments towards this goal. First, it is now widely agreed that clinical field work is a critical component of the development of teachers. Among the host of papers and reports calling for improved clinical preparation is the 2010 NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel report titled “Transforming Teacher Education through Clinical Practice: A National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers.” The report sought to prioritize clinical practice in teacher preparation and explicitly proposes that teacher education “move to programs that are fully grounded in clinical practice and interwoven with academic content and professional courses (NCATE, 2010, Executive Summary).

Boyd at al. (2008), Grossman et al. (2008), and Grossman (2010) also identified clinical practice as an essential component of the preparation of effective teachers and called for careful oversight of student teaching experiences as a key feature of exemplary teacher preparation (Boyd, 2008, p. 40). Darling-Hammond (2010) also addressed the need for improved clinical experiences in what she called “the potential power of teacher education” (p. 39). First, she challenged both traditional and alternative programs to offer highly structured clinical experiences which will provide opportunities for student teachers "to examine and apply concepts and strategies they are learning about in their courses and...work alongside teachers who can show them how to teach in ways that are responsive to learners...” (p. 40).

A second development has been the move toward ensuring that clinical field work takes place in high-need schools and/or communities or in so-called “diverse learning environments”. While there is some disagreement, these kinds of clinical experiences are now largely believed to assist in changes in student teachers’ perceptions of urban schools students (Anderson &
Stillman, 2013; NCATE, 2002, 2010; Bleicher, 2011; Kumar & Hamer, 2012). Darling-Hammond (2010) rightly acknowledges the challenges associated with such placements in high-need schools. She highlights the difficulty of finding such placements in large enough numbers and also wisely cautions that “seeking diversity by placing candidates in schools serving low income students or students of color that suffer from the typical shortcomings many such schools face can actually be counterproductive” (p. 43). Darling-Hammond’s very legitimate concerns must be carefully heeded. Yet and still, taken together, these two developments are important and should be lauded as important first steps in ensuring that teacher candidates spend more time in classrooms that more closely resemble those in which they may ultimately become teachers of record.

On the other side of this debate, Gorski (2009) makes a persuasive argument that programs following NCATE standards (or TEAC and the newly adopted CAEP standards for that matter) are not preparing pre-service teachers for diversity. NCTQ (National Council on Teacher Quality), too, while most recently adding an Equity standard to its list of standards which guide determinations about the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs, fails to articulate a coherent and rigorous standard that will be useful for improving candidates’ efficacy with students of color. While critical of current programs, NCTQ fails to comprehensively articulate what a culturally competent candidate will be able to do but has “concluded that the best way for candidates to internalize appropriate values is to spend time in high poverty schools that are at least relatively high performing” (NCTQ, 2014, p. 47). Such a conclusion only serves to further illustrate the lack of thoughtful attention needed about the preparation of teachers for classrooms with significant numbers of students of color. Furthermore, Benton-Borghi & Cheng (2011) clearly demonstrate that current attempts to prepare pre-service teachers have been
unsuccessful and graduates are “without adequate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teach diverse students” (Benton-Borghi & Cheng, 2011, p. 29). Given the current demographics, standards must have more laser-like focus on developing cultural competence and culturally responsive teaching skills within teacher candidates that will support improved outcomes for students of color. Buehler et al. (2009) remind us that “Whites continue to dominate the ranks of teacher education nationwide” (p. 412). As they attempted to understand beginning teachers’ challenges navigating cultural competence, Buehler et al. determined that “taking on a culturally responsive disposition is, therefore, not a simple cognitive task that can be modeled and transferred to beginning teachers—it is a personal struggle that challenges affective as well as cognitive capacities” (p. 409). It must also be noted that Buehler et al. (2009) propose that achievement of cultural competence should not be the goal but argue that “uncertainties should be at the heart of teacher education for culturally responsive pedagogy” (p. 417). These perspectives all point out serious gaps in teacher preparation that likely have a negative impact on beginning teachers’ success in diverse classrooms.

**Theoretical Perspective**

**Race in the Foreground**

This section seeks to accomplish three goals. Primarily, I seek to bring race to the fore and to situate it as a critical factor, both consciously and unconsciously affecting teaching and learning within classrooms. Relatedly, I intend to describe the tenets, uses, and importance of Critical Race Theory (CRT) for this study. Finally, I will attempt to apply a Critical Race Theory framework to the proposed study. The intersection of these three goals will reveal that *race still matters*—and far more so than has yet been acknowledged:
Racism in America is much more complex than either the conscious conspiracy of a power elite or the simple delusion of a few ignorant bigots. It is a part of our common historical experience and, therefore, a part of our culture. It arises from the assumptions we have learned to make about the world, ourselves, and others as well as from the patterns of our fundamental social activities. (Bell, 1987, p. 4)

Race continues to perplex us. Despite the promise of the *Brown vs. the Board of Education* ruling, the advances made as a result of the Civil Rights movement, the election of the country’s first black president, and the hope for a post-racial society, the problem of the color line persists. As far as we have come, and we have made remarkable advances, there is still a long way to go. Omi and Winant (1994) concur with this sentiment writing that “…in the post-civil rights era, as previously, racial injustice still operates, it has taken on new forms, and needs to be opposed if democracy is to advance” (cited by Tate, 1997, p. 195). Though rare, there are still some who hold fast to notions of racial superiority and inferiority widely subscribed to half a century ago. Today, however, unlike the more blatant instances of racism from our history, race lies uncomfortably below the surface. Far more prevalent are the more insidious forms of racism and prejudice, which reveal themselves in myriad ways both consequential and seemingly inconsequential. Consequentially, prejudice and the resulting discriminatory behaviors give rise to life-altering inequities, such as limited access to employment, poor quality healthcare, constricted housing options and other indignities, known as microaggressions. While equally insidious, the problem of race is far more surreptitious, making it far more difficult to name, discuss, and thus eliminate. Consequently, we have yet to adequately and transparently address
racism in the very fabric of the institutions of the nation. Rather, we tiptoe around it; choosing to acknowledge it only when absolutely necessary. Again, while much has been accomplished, the most difficult work is still to come.

Amongst the most significant of these life-altering areas is access to quality public education. “The fact that U.S. schools are structured such that students routinely receive dramatically unequal learning opportunities based on their race and social status is simply not widely recognized” (Darling-Hammond, 2004, p. 39). In spite of an ever-present emphasis on improved student achievement and curricular improvements over the decades, students of color continue to bear the brunt of substandard teaching and learning practices. “Standards-based reforms have been launched throughout the United States with promises of greater equity, but, while students are held to common standards—and increasingly experience serious sanctions if they fail to achieve them—[…] the result of this collision of new standards with old inequities is less access to education for many students of color, rather than more” (p. 1).

Orfield (2012) in his report on the increasing re-segregation of public schools for black and Hispanic students concurs, noting that “we hold all schools equally accountable, but provide the most experienced teachers, the highest level of classroom competition and the richest curriculum to the most privileged communities—and the opposite to the most segregated and impoverished communities” (p. xiv). Orfield et al. (2012) confirm the staggering rates of school segregation for Latino and black students, and “that racially isolated schools continue to overlap with schools of concentrated poverty” (p. 1).

Race is a construction. There is no sound research that points to its biological or genetic existence. Instead, the construction of race has been for physical, social, legal, and historical purposes (Leonardo, 2013). In The Racial Contract (2007), Mills further illustrates the artificial
construction of race writing, “White supremacy is the unnamed political system that has made the modern world what it is today” (p. 1). In his text, Mills cogently argues that failure to find any reference to a system of white supremacy is not accidental but that instead, it is by design (p. 1). As a result, white privilege and the white political system remain largely unrecognized and white supremacy continues to dominate “non-white people” (pp. 1-2).

In keeping with this theory and the focus of this paper, this system of privilege and white supremacy must also have tremendous impact on our schools and our classrooms—because schools function in significant ways that extend far beyond the content and skills they impart to students. Giroux and McLaren, in particular, speak to the role teachers’ play within schools. They contend that teachers are political actors who work within institutions. Liston and Zeichner (1990) add that teachers are central actors who work within schools “where the effects of class, racial, and gender discrimination are quite apparent and where social, political, and personal meanings are conveyed and created” (p.14). Consequently, it must also be acknowledged that teacher educators also convey social, political and personal meanings, none of which is immune to institutional racism. As such, teachers, if not effectively prepared to work with children of varied races and social classes will merely reinforce prejudices, stereotypes, racial and class inequities. Teachers must not only possess superior content knowledge and pedagogical skills but must also have the sensibilities and competencies needed to expect and support high achievement for students of varying races. With these thoughts in mind, the role of the cooperating teacher becomes increasingly important.

In his overview for the classic text Stereotypes and Prejudice: Essential Readings, Stangor (2000) proposes that social categorization is a natural and automatic process in which we all engage. He further offers that we engage in categorization for a variety of reasons that
include: learning something more about others; reducing complexity, particularly when we have little time to probe deeper or learn more; and reinforcing positive feelings about ourselves and those like us (p. 4). Massey (2007) similarly concludes that “the roots of social stratification thus lie ultimately in the cognitive construction of boundaries to make social distinctions, a task that comes naturally to human beings, who are mentally hardwired to engage in categorical thought” (p. 8). While the categories we use to make sense of the world are ever-changing, individuals “fall back on them when they interpret objects, events, people and situations and they are especially reliant on these categorical judgments under conditions of threat or uncertainty” (p. 9). Stangor and Massey similarly address the relationship between categorization and stereotypes. Stangor maintains that in addition to our propensity to categorize, we all hold stereotypes about social groups that are stored in our memories as cognitive representations and evoked without awareness. Massey (2007) supports this contention, concluding that “all human beings, whether they think of themselves as prejudiced or not, hold in their heads schemas that classify people into categories based on age, gender, race, and ethnicity. They cannot help it” (p. 10).

Unfortunately, while seemingly innocuous, the result of the natural predisposition for social categorization is stereotyping and, potentially, prejudice; though the two concepts are not synonymous. “Unlike stereotypes which involve thoughts or beliefs about the group, prejudice has an emotional component as well. Prejudice involves negative feelings toward group members, including likes and dislikes, anger, fear, disgust, discomfort, and even hatred” (Stangor, 2000, p.8). Massey further explicates that “implicit prejudices can be overcome when there is a desire to overcome them and deliberate cognitive work is undertaken (Massey, 2011). Understanding the phenomena of prejudice and stereotyping takes on particular import when
considering the growing diversity of classrooms. Moreover, while “stereotypes (can be) proven false by a single case” (Bell, Horn, & Roxas, 2007, p. 130) they can also be similarly reinforced. In 1995, Ladson-Billing and Tate noted that race was under-theorized within education and that there were a paucity of tools to “explain empirical and theoretical arguments related to race” (Dixson, 2014, p.5). Tatum (2001) also maintains that the “development of a positive identity is a lifelong process that often requires unlearning the misinformation and stereotypes we have internalized not only about others but about ourselves” (p. 53).

**Critical Race Theory**

This study uses race as a central theoretical construct and thus draws upon the writings of numerous academics who have contributed to the legacy of scholarship upon which Critical Race Theory (CRT) is based (Kumasi, 2011). This legacy is made possible through the efforts of Douglass, Garvey, and Baldwin, and others, who committed their personal and professional lives to theorizing and discussing race and racism (Hatch, 2007). In *Critical Race Theory and Education: Mapping a Legacy of Activism and Scholarship* (2011) Kumasi offers an extensive list of scholars who have been actively involved in struggles against racism. Kumasi’s also posits that “the intellectual origins of CRT can be traced back to historic battles against white supremacy that were recorded in the mid-1700s” (p. 201).

A new generation of Critical Race scholars’ works offers intellectual and theoretical space for considering racial inequities within education and specifically within the teacher preparation enterprise. Critical Race Theory (CRT) illuminates why race continues to be such a vexing American issue, offers an activist dimension which extends beyond merely identifying and naming race and racism, and attempts instead to transform it (Delgado & Stefanie, 2001, p.
3); and boldly names the permanence of race that many choose not to acknowledge (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001).

To begin, there are multiple conceptions of CRT. In its current iteration, it is indebted to Derrick Bell, Richard Delgado, and Jean Stefanic, considered its chief architects. Bell, in particular, is considered the forefather of CRT, an offshoot of Critical Legal Studies (CLS) which emerged in the 1970s when some insisted that the advances of the civil rights movement were being diminished (Hatch, 2007, p. 2). CRT can be defined most broadly in the following way: “Critical race theory refers to a historical and contemporary body of scholarship that aims to interrogate the discourses, ideologies, and social structures that produce and maintain conditions of racial injustice” (p. 1).

While similar in origin, CRT is considered “both an outgrowth of and a separate entity from the earlier legal movement” (Taylor, Gillborn, & Ladson-Billing, 2009, p. 20). A second reason for the emergence of CLS was the recognition by a contingent of legal scholars that insisted that the concept of neutral, colorblind law was deeply flawed (Zamudio et al., 2011; DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). Nevertheless, like CLS, this challenges liberal assumptions of colorblindness and the meritocratic narrative, “CRT challenges the liberal doctrine that equates individual political rights with equality” (p. 19).

To further understand this theoretical framework, all Critical Race Theorists begin with the notion that racism is normal (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001). However, despite this principal construct and other common underpinnings, differing lines of emphasis have also emerged. Specifically, there has also been the emergence of LatCrit, AsianCrit, TribalCrit, FemCrit, and WhiteCrit (Zamudio et. al, 2011). The next section seeks to further define three prominent
conceptions of CRT and then to expound upon those ideas, which I deem most salient for the proposed study.

Delgado and Stefanic (2001) and Zamudio et al. (2011) offer insights about CRT worthy of highlighting. First, similar to Hatch’s definition, Delgado and Stefanic (2001) define the CRT movement as “a collection of activists and scholars interested in studying and transforming the relationship among, race, racism, and power” (p. 2). In their seminal text, *Critical Race Theory: An introduction* (2001), Delgado and Stefanic delineate a series of propositions upon which CRT is based. These propositions include: “racism is ordinary, not aberrational” (p. 7); there is “adherence to a system of “white over color ascendency”…. which advances the interests of whites (p. 7); race is a social construction (p. 7); we “racialize different minority groups” in accordance with shifting needs (p. 8); the need for intersectionality and anti-essentialism (p.9); and the existence of a “unique voice of color” (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001, pp. 7-9).

Zamudio et al. (2011) conclude that race, history, voice, interpretation, and praxis are the core propositions that all CRT theorists hold in common (pp. 1-3). Further, they describe two seemingly divergent lines of thinking. The first, advocated by realists, suggests that it is necessary to focus on “concrete manifestations of racism” (p. 9). Specifically, realists “focus on policies, practices and organizational structures that lead to racialization…the remedies advocated to reduce racialization must also be concrete and tangible including changes in public policies, practices and organizational structures… .(p. 9). The second promoted by idealists, is focused on “the superstructures (i.e., culture writ large) used to justify racism: ideologies, stories, master narratives (those narratives heard most loudly given that those, mostly whites, in control of the media also control the volume levels), public images, attitudes…This group of scholars argues that there are many ways in which hegemony plays out” (p. 9). To their credit, Zamudio
et al. argue that these two lines of thinking should be considered complementary rather than in contention with one another (p. 10).

Counter to Delgado and Stefanie and Zamudio et al., Darder and Torres (2009) maintain a distinctly different stance. They argue that instead of attempting to theorize race, we should instead theorize racism. Darder and Torres take issue with a persistent emphasis on race rather than the root issue of racism. “If ‘race’ is socially constructed and its origins clearly steeped in an ideology of exclusion, domination, exploitation, even genocide, why should we continue to make sense of people’s lives based on the legacy of a pseudoscientific distortion from a previous era? Is it not racism—as an ideology that exists within a structure of class differentiation and exploitation—rather than “race,” that merits our attention….” (p. 157)?

The work of these critical race theorists and that of a newer generation including Yosso (2002; 2005), Solorzano (1997), and Dixson & Rousseau (2006) is compelling. However, Ladson-Billing’s and Tate’s (1995) is the seminal text applying a Critical Race Theory analysis to education. They first stipulate that race has not been adequately theorized within education. They then use the concepts of interest convergence, historical context, narrative, and whiteness as property to explicate the manner in which institutional racism has functioned to the disadvantage of students of color and particularly African-American students.

Although CRT has numerous important concepts at its core, two in particular are most persuasive for understanding the manner in which racism manifests itself. The first, known as interest convergence, explains why we continue to hit roadblocks on the journey to full equality, despite the strides in race relations. Derrick Bell (2004) best illustrates this in his analysis of Brown vs. Board of Education. If nothing else, Brown should have symbolized a transformation in how the country dealt with the education of African-Americans. However, Bell suggests that
the success of *Brown* was due to the convergence of interests between blacks and whites in 1954. Bell’s well-known argument is that on the heels of WWII it was in the interests of both the NAACP and the government to portray an image of democracy and racial equality to the international community (p. 35). I would add here that there have been multiple instances of interest convergence since *Brown*. I think particularly of decision to combat teenage pregnancy, drug abuse, and our most recent decision to tackle gun control. Each of these issues, while prevalent within communities of color for decades, yielded little attention or policy work until their effects were felt within white communities. Occupy Wall Street serves as a more recent example. The movement sprang up to give voice to the economic inequities facing the largely white, college-aged middle class population when others had been facing very hard and very real economic inequities for decades preceding 2010. It is important to note here as well that some who contest Bell’s notion of interest convergence as related to Brown. Specifically, they contend that the roadwork for passing the Brown legislation was already large underway.

A second important theme that should be elevated is the inherent value of whiteness in our society. Echoing Ladson-Billings and Tate, Zamudio et al. (2011) argue that the value of whiteness is maintained in its “exclusivity” (p. 33). The authors contend that whites are the only ones who originally could have access to property. Citing Harris (1995) the authors note that “race and property were thus conflated by establishing a form of property contingent on race. In all things political and economic, whiteness was treated as a political right in the same way as liberal political economy treats the ownership of property as a right, an inalienable right” (Zamudio et al., p. 33). To further illustrate this point, Zamudio et al. (2011) remind us that because of their very skin color whites have rights and privileges extended to them that people of color frequently do not. Moreover, they have access, resources, and opportunities that are
reserved solely for their use. As stated by Zamudio, whites have, “concrete resources that enhance their… opportunities.” (Zamudio et al., p. 161)

But perhaps the most tangible long-term benefit that whites have accrued from a history of racial exploitation is their wealth, and subsequently their enriched position, in accessing educational resources….Wealth is directly tied to a history of exploitation. White communities have directly enjoyed, and accumulated across generations, the benefits of a color line used to determine the allocation of public and private goods such as education, jobs, and housing; the basic foundations for the accumulation of wealth (Zamudio et al., 2011, pp. 27-28).

While many take no notice, little of daily experience of people of color is not tied to a superstructure that caters to the needs and wants of whites. Gillborn (2005) refers to the routine privileging of white interests that goes unremarked in the political mainstream (Gillborn, 2005). As it stands, institutional structures have been constructed by whites for the benefits of whites. Many others then never had a full measure of access to the educational institutions which are purported to be economic and social levelers. Instead for many, who are not white, these institutions have widened and/or maintained the achievement gap between minority students and their white peers; tracked and limited access to high-quality educational programs (Darling-Hammond, 2006); facilitated the overrepresentation of students of color in special education classes (Ahram, Fergus, & Noguera, 2011); resulted in disproportionate numbers of school suspensions and expulsions for minority youth and increases in the school to prison pipeline (Alexander, 2012). Moreover, our recent educational policies, ostensibly designed to “leave no child behind”, have in fact, narrowed the curriculum, retarded effective teaching practices, and have made it virtually impossible for many children of color in high-need urban public schools to
access the rich teaching and learning needed to develop skills and abilities needed for college and career readiness or post-secondary success.

Yet another way in which the permanence of race is manifested within education is in the almost cyclical discussions of inferiority which emerge from time to time within the research agenda. Tate reminds us that historically people of color have been viewed as “biologically and genetically inferior to Whites” (Tate, 1997, p. 199). With these thoughts in mind, Critical Race Theory is necessarily an important realm of scholarship that may provide understandings about the preparation of teachers for increasingly diverse classrooms.

As is the case with any theoretical construct, there are also critiques of CRT. These critiques are important in that they enable the rigorous self-reflection needed by any significant theoretical framework. Two are particularly worthy of note. The first is important because this study which seeks to emphasize the ways in which race is seemingly unacknowledged within classrooms. Acknowledging racism as an American fact is not pessimistic. It is reality (Tate, 1997). Despite the permanence of race and the inherent value that whiteness holds, the goal of Critical Race Theorists neither convey a sense of hopelessness nor does it advocate forgoing a sense of agency. Instead, as Bell asserts “CRT is a theory of hopefulness…It provides a form of resistance to oppression. We must realize… that the struggle for freedom is, at bottom, a manifestation of our humanity which survives and grows stronger though resistance to oppression, even if that oppression is never overcome” (Bell, 1990, p. 379). Instead, CRT has a liberatory spirit.

The second criticism frequently leveled at CRT is its focus on the Black–White binary (Ladson-Billings, 2003, p.7). Without dismissing the oppression and inequalities faced by all marginalized peoples or minimizing the critical importance of those critical theoretical
frameworks, the unique nature of slavery (not to mention a constitution which labeled Blacks as three-quarters human (Tate, 1997)) must be stated. The legacy of slavery and the current socio-political and socio-economic conditions faced by Black Americans make it critical that we admit and attend fully to the Black-White binary. The deeply entrenched structures and policies in this country that continue to privilege white skin and disadvantage Blacks compel the belief that if significant strides can be made with regard to racism, and specifically the Black-White binary, issues affecting all people of color would also be resolved.

For the purposes of this study, four constructs can be instructive in considering the preparation of future teachers: First, race is all-pervading; it is in the fabric of our country (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). As such, it is a fact of life in our schools and classrooms. Second, White over Black ascendancy still exists (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001). The culture of middle-class Whites is seen as normative, while students of color are seen through lenses which frequently label them as “less than”. Third, racial inequities are insidious because they manifest themselves in our institutions (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001). While it is rare to experience blatant acts of racism, the very policies that govern our institutions enable racism and inequality to persist. Finally, and most importantly, notions of White supremacy are able to persist because there has been little acknowledgement of the humanity of people of color. Theologian and philosopher Cornel West posits that we need a sense of the humanity of all and maintains that “we need to begin with a frank acknowledgment of the basic humanness and Americanness of each of us (West, 1994, p. 8). To date, this has not been the case in any real national sense as is evident by the multiple needless deaths of young black men and in the recent emergence of the movement “Black Lives Matter”.
Sleeter (2012), a researcher in the preparation of teachers for diverse classrooms, insightfully maintains that discussions of race and “culturally responsive pedagogy have been relegated to the margins for three primary reasons: persistent faulty and simplistic conceptions of what it is, too little research connecting its use with student achievement, and elite and white fear of losing national and global hegemony” (p. 568). Similarly, the quest for improved teacher quality and student outcomes has sidelined explicit discussions about the relationship of race to the preparation of teachers who effectively teach all students. Anderson and Stillman (2013) note that within the studies focused on changes in beliefs and attitudes, there is little complementary focus on actual teaching practices. (p. 35). It is plausible that the lack of focus on actual teaching practices is further evidence of the four constructs outlined above.

Race must be brought to the fore so that we may engage in the work of effectively preparing teachers, not only with beliefs about the innate abilities of students of color to succeed in classrooms, but also with teaching practices that ensure their success.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

The demographic challenge and the abilities of majority teachers to effectively work in classrooms that are growing increasingly racially diverse is an incredibly broad area with many potential lines of inquiry. My specific interest is in exploring how cooperating teachers work with students of color in high-need schools and model cultural competence, culturally responsive pedagogy, and high expectations for teacher candidates. While there were no specific studies in this area to review, on the other hand, this suggests that what I am proposing is worthy of attention and potentially important for the teacher preparation research base.

For these reasons, the literature review was more wide-ranging than initially anticipated. Nonetheless, it has touched upon areas that are profoundly relevant for my specific area of interest. These six areas include: clinical preparation; student teaching; cooperating teacher and pre-service teachers’ perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs about racial minorities; sense of efficacy and expectations; and culturally responsive pedagogy.

In reviewing the literature (including both theoretical and empirical studies), as stated previously, the overwhelming majority of the studies were qualitative. The studies varied in methodological rigor but were helpful in most instances in furthering my understanding of the relevant themes. Nonetheless, as is the case with qualitative work, the studies had small sample sizes that may or may not be inextricably linked to the specific contexts in which the studies occurred. Moreover, many were studies of programs that the researchers themselves had implemented. On the other hand, these qualitative studies are significant in that they provide important insights and point to new directions in research that might be explored with larger numbers of pre-service teachers.
One such example is Ware’s (2006) study. Ware sought to determine whether the traits of African-American educators described in the literature (1975, 1989, 1998) could be observed. Ware’s two-phase study consisted of a pilot (in which she practiced the study methodology) and a follow-up comparative case study. The pilot study (comprised of three formal semi-structured interviews and five interviews following one-hour observations of the first teacher’s classroom and a series of 25 randomly conducted classroom observations with the second of two African-American teachers in an inner-city school district) enabled Ware to verify the eight broad categories corresponding with earlier literature. Ware concluded that African-American teachers function as “warm demanders” in their roles as: authority figures and disciplinarians (through discipline and high expectations); caregivers (through attentiveness to the holistic needs of students, beliefs about students, and other-mothering); and pedagogues (through adapting instruction to meet student needs and infusing aspects of students’ cultures in their teaching) (p.436). Ware also proposed that the similarities in the teachers’ instructional practices were, in part, the result of the cultural transmission of beliefs and that the cultural and racial heritage is a strong variable in their roles as warm demanders (pp. 453-454).

Ware’s work provides explicit illustration of the kinds of culturally responsive pedagogies and teaching practices that have been employed by some teachers that facilitate positive outcomes for students. The eight themes that emerged from the case study, while potentially limited in generalizability, were useful in considering specific pedagogical practices that might be taught in preparation programs and in my consideration of an observation protocol for the study. Unfortunately, the study suffers from Ware’s failure to theorize achievement and academic success. While Ware’s is not the most methodologically rigorous of the studies reviewed, it is included here because its failure to attend to the academic achievement for
students of color (or, to my mind, impact on student learning) is a recurring theme in much of the literature on diversity and culturally responsive pedagogy. Moreover, while Ware concludes that the “warm demander trait” is culturally unique to African-American teachers, I wonder if these traits cannot become practice-able instructional skills transferable to majority teachers so that they may support the achievement of students of color.

By contrast, while many of the quantitative studies reviewed had larger sample sizes, many were heavily focused on changes in perceptions as a result of student teaching, or other internship experiences in high-need schools. As mentioned previously, pretest-posttest designs are problematic in that they rely heavily, if not solely, on the perceptions of novices who may or may not have an accurate sense of teaching and, more importantly, may want to appear (or truly believe they are) more efficacious than they are. My own experience as a teacher and as a teacher of teachers continually reminds me that our perceptions of our practice and our practice are often incongruent. This limitation posed by instruments that capture only perceptions, however, might easily be overcome if observation protocols were in place to supplement self-reports or if there were other ways in which the perception data could be triangulated.

The common theme of both the quantitative and qualitative studies is the preparation and potential ability of White teachers to work in high-need schools with large numbers of students of color. Taken together the studies generally reveal that pre-service teachers who engage in multicultural field work experiences, and/or are placed in diverse settings tend to change their perceptions and attitudes and/or increase their feelings of efficacy after having participated in experiences with students of color in high-need schools. There are, however, some exceptions to the general findings. In at least one study, the areas in which pre-service teachers seemed to lack or have a lower sense of efficacy was with regard to classroom management and instructional
strategies (Bloom & Peter, 2012). While much of the literature indicates that the perceptions, attitudes, and efficacy of student teachers change when they have opportunities to practice teaching children of color, the length of some of the interventions described were as short as a week and none exceeded 16 weeks. It is unclear whether these changed perceptions are long-lasting and whether they translate into effective pedagogical actions once pre-service teachers are in classrooms of their own. Olemedo (1997) concurs that there is lack of certainty as to whether the positive effects of participating in diverse field placements are sustained in teaching practice.

Finally, based on an analysis of the various studies, I am proposing a mixed methodological study design. First, the limited number of rigorous quantitative studies that have multicultural education, culturally relevant pedagogy, or Critical Race Theory as a lens is troubling and does not bode well for ensuring that this issue is taken seriously by a wide variety of stakeholders. Until greater numbers of quantitative studies are undertaken in these areas, they will continue to yield little notice by policy makers. Second, despite my own very natural inclination and gravitation toward qualitative research, I believe a mixed methods approach to this important research provides a more comprehensive view of the topic at hand while simultaneously providing the rich detail and the nuance that numbers often belie.

**Situating Teacher Preparation within K–12 Education Reform Efforts**

Far too many teachers I talk with feel teacher prep programs simply aren’t preparing them for the realities of the difficulties and hard work they face in the classroom. . . . Programs that are producing teachers where students are less successful—they either need to change, or do something else, or go out of business.
(Arne Duncan, Secretary of Education, April 25, 2014)

Duncan’s statement is merely the latest in a string of condemnations of teacher preparation over the past 20 years. It would be simplistic to overlook that there are numerous complicating factors at play in improving outcomes for students. Nonetheless, national and international outcome data for American students paints a compellingly bleak picture of our waning educational preeminence (NCES, 2011). More importantly for me is the dismal state of academic achievement for far too many students of color. Pollack (2013) writes, “disaggregated data on school outcomes consistently show that African American and Latina/o students score significantly lower on standardized tests of achievement and show lower rates of high school graduation than do white students, even when socioeconomic status is taken into consideration” (Educational Data Partnership, 2005; National Center for Education Statistics, 2010a; U.S. Department of Education, 1990-2007) (p. 864).

However, as far back as the establishment of formalized teacher training through normal schools during the mid-19th century (and even earlier) the lack of teacher competence has been a continual refrain. “Teacher education has been a contested enterprise since its emergence in the mid- 19th century” (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, p. 69). To understand the calls for change in the preparation of teachers, we must also understand the larger K–12 educational context and the increasing role of federal, state and local entities. Although the U.S. Constitution makes no provision for the role of the federal government with regard to education, state and local governments have a long and well-documented history of oversight of public schools. One can easily trace the advent of the federal role in public education back to the 1954 landmark Brown vs. the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas case. Shortly thereafter ESEA was passed “to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the nation’s
elementary and secondary schools” (ESEA, 1965). “ESEA established an important federal role in education, but it was a very targeted and limited role” (McGuinn, 2006, p.58).

At the heart of ESEA was a desire to ensure that each child has fair and equal access to exceptional education. The act “enshrined an equity rationale at the heart of federal education policy-the national government would provide states with supplemental funding and programs in the hope of equalizing educational opportunity for poor and minority students” (DeBray- Pelot & McGuinn, 2009, p. 17). Since then, both ESEA and HEA (described later) have provided monetary support for programs to: recruit teachers, prepare them to teach in particularly hard-to-staff subject areas, provide professional development, support accountability requirements, and facilitate experiments with qualifications and incentives (Sykes & Dibner, 2009, p. 2).

Noted education researchers Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) delineate two waves of school reform between 1978 and 1986 focused on different outcomes. The first, which followed on the heels of A Nation at Risk, focused primarily on improving student proficiency to ensure America’s preeminence in a changing work economy. This time frame aligns with the equity-focused time frame discussed by Debray-Perlot and McGuinn (2009). As described by Darling-Hammond and Berry, the underlying purpose of the reform supposed that “specified school processes and outcomes would lead to educational equality (p. 2). Ultimately, equity-focused educational policies would be deemed insufficient and an increasing need for new teachers coincided with demands for teachers who had the ability to provide higher levels of instruction needed to ensure student learning. By 1985, significant attention and legislation was directed towards augmenting the teaching force through the implementation of policies that supported stricter entry requirements and incentives to retain talented teachers (p.4).
In contrast with the first wave school reforms the second wave of school reform advocated the “regulation of teachers…in exchange for the deregulation of teaching” (Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1998, p.5). Second wave reforms and the accompanying reports and policies were seen as opportunities to “restructure the teaching career to make possible the transition to a professional model of teaching and instruction” (p.6). “The emphasis of reform proposals shifted in 1986 toward decentralizing school decision-making and professionalizing teaching-using rigorous preparation, certification and selection to ensure teaching competence in exchange for fewer rules prescribing what is to be taught, when, and how” (Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1998, p. v).

Relatedly, it was during the 1950s and 1960s that teacher quality became a fairly routine public policy concern at the federal level (Early, 2000). Also during the 1950s it became commonplace for public school teachers to receive at least some pre-service professional education in a college or university setting, though it was not a requirement (Fraser, 2007). The launch of Sputnik was yet another precipitant in the calls for an improved teacher workforce and resulted in greater scrutiny of teacher education curriculum as the United States lagged behind in science achievement (Early, 2000). The concluding determination was that far too much emphasis was being placed on teaching methods and too little on content.

Additional calls for improved teaching surrounded two important publications issued in 1963. First, James B. Conant concluded in *The Education of American Teachers* (1963) that the problem lay with the education classes teachers were required to take. Conant advocated that teachers be educated in master’s degree programs, similar to one he had established at Harvard, in which students studied liberal arts and experienced supervised practice teaching (Lagemann, 1989). In a second more damning report, *The Miseducation of American Teachers* (1963),
Koerner advocated a different approach. His approach would entail “training the intellect and moral facility of teachers through subject matter study”, while Conant argued for a more scientifically informed approach (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, p. 75).

Of the many responses to the calls for an improved teaching workforce was the authorization of the National Teacher Corps program in 1965. The program was intended to bring a greater number of teachers into the field, but its reach and effectiveness was limited. Sykes and Dibner (2009) point out that the nine evaluations conducted between 1965 and 1975 revealed that where the Teacher Corps was successful in recruiting minorities to teach in high-need schools, other programmatic goals, such as instructional change in schools and impact on universities, were much less successful (p. 16).

The 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk* also resulted in multiple additional impacts for teacher preparation programs, including the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. In 1986, the task force issued a report with a number of recommendations designed to improve the quality of the nation’s teaching force. One significant recommendation sought to “develop a new professional curriculum in graduate schools of education leading to a Master’s in teaching degree, based on systematic knowledge of teaching and including internships and residencies in schools” (*A Nation Prepared*, p. 3):

Higher standards of teacher preparation will also be required. To realize these standards, undergraduate education majors must be phased out. All teachers, including elementary teachers, will have a bachelor’s degree in the arts and sciences. A Master in Teaching degree will be created. The function of teacher preparation will be to teach teachers how to deal with real life situations in clinical
practice. Internships and supervised residency programs in local
districts will be required of all candidates. Any college graduate in
arts and sciences –including mature people in other industries –
could take the Masters in Teaching program or enter teaching
by an approved alternate path. Persons entering by an alternate
path would be required to meet standards at least as high as those
entering by traditional routes. The potential pool of well-educated
people who could become teachers will be greatly expanded.

(A Nation Prepared, p. 3)

“The argument was that redesigning the schools would require a restructured and differentiated
teaching force culminating for some in certification for a newly envisioned National Board for
Professional Teaching Standards” (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, p.81).

Myriad new teacher education regulations enacted from 1980 to 1990 was a harbinger of
the reach that state and federal policy would ultimately have. Territory that had previously been
monitored by schools of education was ceded and states took on the obligation to reform teacher
that between 1980 and 1990, “virtually every state enacted legislation to reform teacher
education, licensing, and compensation” (Hammond & Berry, 1998, p. v). As part of this trend,
policies were implemented to determine who entered preparation programs, the nature of the
program requirements, subject and/or grade certification, pathways into teaching, and
competency testing. Within the identical time frame, 27 states enacted policies that included
“tests of academic ability and minimum grade point averages (Hammond & Berry, 1998, p. vii).
This change in purview of teacher education also convincingly portrays that at the time there
were multiple stakeholders “making a bid for governance of teacher policy” (Hammond & Berry, 1998, p. xiv).

In October 1998, Congress voiced concern about the quality of teacher preparation by enacting Title II of the Higher Education Act, which authorizes federal grant programs that support the efforts of states, institutions of higher education, and their school district partners to improve the recruitment, preparation, and support of new teachers. Section 207 of HEA Title II requires reports from institutions of higher education (IHE) that conduct teacher preparation programs enrolling students who receive federal assistance under Title IV of the HEA. A teacher preparation program is a state-approved course of study, the completion of which signifies that an enrollee has met all the state’s educational and/or training requirements for initial certification or licensure to teach in the state’s elementary or secondary schools (NCATE website).

Since 2001, the federal role in education has been greatly expanded (National Research Council, 2011, p. 15). “Following decades of state leadership in standards-based accountability, federal policy makers intensified the focus with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. That law tied federal funds to measures of student learning mandating that states assess achievement in core subjects annually with the goal of ensuring that all students reach proficient levels in those subjects by 2014” (National Research Council, 2010, p. 154). Earlier attempts to regulate teacher preparation pale in comparison. Thus it is easy to understand the numerous publications that have been written about the state of teacher preparation in the past 10 to 12 years.

Released in June 2002, Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary’s Annual Report on Teacher Quality (U.S. Department of Education) delineated the following disturbing statistics:
• Only 24 states to date have implemented teacher standards tied to their respective academic content standards for grades K–12. (p. 23)

• Academic standards for teachers are low. On the Praxis Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST) used by 29 states, 14 of 29 states set passing scores below the 25th percentile. Moreover, nine states passing rates were below the 20th percentile (p.25).

• States frequently rely on teachers who lack permanent certification and many of these uncertified teachers teach in high-need schools and in high-need fields like special education, math and science (p. 34).

The report is of note because it provides significant advocacy for alternative teacher preparation programs. Simultaneously it takes issue with traditional preparation programs that are painted as posing multiple obstacles for those who want to pursue teaching as profession (Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge, 2002 pp. 13-14).

In 2011, Our Future, Our Teachers: The Obama Administration’s Plan for Education Reform and Improvement (USDOE, 2011) was released. The document asserts as a policy goal that “we want every teacher to receive the high-quality preparation and support they need, so that every student can have the effective teachers they deserve” (USDOE, Forward).

There is substantial evidence that the issue of teacher education/preparation has been part of a cyclical pattern of critique and reform, which emerged in the 1950s as proposed by Cochran-Smith and Fries (2005). As such, it should come as no surprise that the federal government is again poised to take action with regard to teacher preparation. As of Friday, May 3, 2014 the current administration has said it intended to do the following:

• Encourage all states to develop their own meaningful systems to identify high- and low-performing teacher preparation programs across all kinds of programs
• Ask states to move away from input-focused reporting requirements, streamline the current data requirements, incorporate more meaningful outcomes, and improve the availability of relevant information on teacher preparation.

• Rely on state-developed program ratings of preparation programs in part to determine program eligibility for TEACH grants, which are available to students who are planning to become teachers in a high-need field in a low-income school, to ensure that these limited federal dollars support high-quality teacher education and preparation. (Brenchly, 2014)

Clinical Preparation

Known most commonly as student teaching, opportunities for teacher candidates to practice teaching in classrooms has been an integral component of teacher preparation for nearly 200 years. The origins of student teaching can be traced to 1825 when James G. Carter proposed a new institution dedicated to teacher preparation (Carter, 1858). The curriculum he envisioned comprised a series of academic courses that eventually led to a culminating experience in classrooms “under the scrutinizing eyes of one who will note his mistakes of government and faults of instruction and correct them” (cited by Fraser & Watson, 2014, p. 1). Today, “while the courses vary widely, U.S. teacher preparation programs, even the alternative ones, almost universally require some version of student teaching….” (Fraser & Watson, 2014).

Teacher candidates nearly unanimously state that student teaching is the most important aspect of their preparation as teachers. Despite this, there are two notable obstacles that impede the implementation of high-quality clinical experiences. These include coherence between coursework and field work and better focus on rigorously supervising the mentoring experience. Many have long argued the need for “coherent” teacher education programs; Grossman et al. (2008), in particular, assert that despite calls for coherence in clinical practice, the area is largely
unexplored and “specific factors that contribute to coherence remain unclear” (p.3). Using 15 public and private institutions preparing K–6 teachers in New York City (22 graduate and undergraduate teacher preparation programs) as their test case, Grossman et al. were able to identify which features of teacher education programs contribute to student teachers’ perceptions of coherence between coursework and field work. The researchers surveyed teacher candidates completing their pre-service preparation (a 71% response rate). Important for this study was a question posed that sought to determine the candidates’ perceptions of the quality of the cooperating teacher. Interestingly, Grossman et al. (2008) found that programs utilize varied methods for selecting cooperating teachers (p. 5). Among the 22 programs, two allowed candidates to select the cooperating teacher, eight left selections to the discretion of school-based administrators make the decision, nine actively selected cooperating teachers. Three programs provided no information on the selection of the cooperating teachers. The researchers concluded that in programs “where faculty took primary responsibility for choosing cooperating teachers, student teachers reported higher perceived levels of program-field coherence than did “candidates from programs that allowed school sites or the candidates to choose” (p. 7). This finding supports the notion that “program control over the selection of the CT and requirements for CTs is necessary” (p.11). It is also pertinent when considering studies such as Chaplain’s (2008), which found that that teacher candidates believe that attaining an effective mentor teacher “is a matter of luck” (p.197).

In a later policy brief, Grossman (2010) expands the literature in this area and our understanding of the challenges of clinical field work by providing research on the ways in which student teaching specifically impacts the development of future teachers, particularly teachers of diverse students in urban and/or high-needs schools (p. 4). Grossman writes "overall
research suggests that the nature of schools in which perspective teachers are placed can affect their opportunities to develop knowledge, skill, and confidence. Given their importance to the development of effective teachers, such placements should never be left to chance." (p. 4).

Grossman offers two particularly germane recommendations to strengthen the preparation of novice teachers in clinical practice. First, she highlights the importance of creating stronger incentives and rewards for engaging in clinical work and developing programs to prepare people for the work of supervision and mentoring. Second, Grossman calls for heavier investment in and systems for providing feedback that are targeted specifically to instructional practices that are linked to student achievement. (pp. 6-7). This proposal is particularly relevant given that data from *Student Teaching in the United States* (July 2011) conducted by the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ), determined that less than 10 percent of preparation programs assign students to highly skilled teachers who give them meaningful feedback.

The current state of clinical field work and student teaching are worthy of intense analysis and consideration at this time because, as previously stated, student teachers believe that this is the most important aspect of their preparation. Moreover, in 2010 the National Research Council (NRC) identified clinical practice as one of three key features of teacher preparation that would increase student outcomes (p.180). In addition, the blue ribbon report issued by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in 2010 also called for the profession to spend more time focused on the clinical preparation of future teachers.

Building on the important contributions of *Transforming Teacher Education through Clinical Practice* (2010), the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the newly convened teacher accreditation entity which merged NCATE and TEAC, has issued new standards guiding the preparation of future educators. In particular, CAEP’s Standard 2 is
focused squarely on the issue of improving clinical partnerships and practice. The standard provides specific guidance regarding partnerships, clinical educators, and clinical experiences. In their rationale for Standard 2, they write:

Clinical educators are all EPP and P-12 school-based individuals, including classroom teachers, who assess, support and develop a candidate’s knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions at some state in the clinical experiences. Literature indicates the importance of the quality of clinical educators, both school- and provider-based, to ensure the learning of candidates and P-12 students. *Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice* described high-quality clinical experiences as ones in which both providers and their partner require candidate supervision and mentoring by certified clinical educators—drawn from discipline-specific, pedagogical, and P-12 professionals—who are trained to work with and provide feedback to candidates. Clinical educators should be accountable for the performance of the candidates they supervise, as well as that of the students they teach. (p. 7)

**Student Teaching**

This study is focused on student teaching in traditional teacher preparation programs. Nonetheless, there is the strong possibility that there are more similarities than differences in the ways that student teachers are prepared by CTs to teach. The likelihood is greater still that they are more similar than different in preparing candidates to teach students of color. In an early
study, Feiman-Nemser, Parker, and Zeichner (1992) analyze three data sources—a training manual, transcripts of conferences between mentors and pre-service teachers, and interviews with mentors about their conferences with their mentees—in an attempt to determine what cooperating teachers do in their work with teacher candidates. Though the research site was an alternative route teacher preparation program, they find similarities between what mentors do in this program and the “supervision of student teachers as described in the literature” (p.16). The study provides additional evidence of the need for improvements in this area. Feiman-Nemser, Parker, and Zeichner note the lack of alignment between coursework and field work required of teacher candidates. They also find limited attentiveness to: student teachers’ purposes and goals, content pre-service teachers teach, and what K–12 students are learning (p.15). Their findings lead them to hypothesize that traditional supervision is likely more similar than different when compared to mentoring in alternate routes. Mentoring is conceived, in this project, as a technical activity. More problematic, however, but also important for this study, Feiman-Nemser, Parker, and Zeichner highlight at least one instance in which the mentor reinforces deficit thinking and low expectations for the K–12 students and find that mentors dominate talk in their discussions with interns (p.15).

Despite the calls to increase the length of the student teaching experience, a recent study provides a different perspective. Ronfeldt and Reininger (2012) stress that there is a significant gap in the research with regard to whether there are indeed benefits to extending student teaching. As such, they attempt to determine: (a) whether teachers’ perceptions of instructional preparedness, efficacy, and their future career plans change across student teaching, (b) the effect of longer or better student teaching on perceptions of preparedness, (c) teacher efficacy, and
career plans, (d) and finally, whether the length or quality of student teaching varies based on the student demographic characteristics in field placement sites.

To answer these questions, Ronfeldt and Reininger (2012) survey four cohorts of student teachers (1057 student teachers). Exit surveys were given to the initial 50% of survey respondents and yielded a response rate of 61%. Ronfeldt and Reininger provide a strong methodological design for their study, including: participants from 36 different teacher preparation institutions teaching in 295 different schools; and a diverse K–12 student population (80% of the students in the represented schools were black or Hispanic and 75% of them qualify for free or reduced priced lunch) (pp. 1094-1095). These important features of their study serve to provide greater generalizability of the findings.

Ronfeldt and Reininger also note widespread satisfaction with their cooperating teachers (80%) and, per the literature, student teachers deem the quality of the cooperating teacher particularly important. Verifying the paramount importance of the cooperating teacher in the student teaching experience, Ronfeldt and Reininger also find that with regard to cooperating teachers, student teachers also have the highest percentage of responses in the “somewhat” and completely “dissatisfied categories” (p. 1095). Their findings suggest that the quality of the CT may have “the strongest, positive effect on perceived preparedness and efficacy” (p. 1101). Ronfeldt and Reininger’s evidence suggests that quality of the student teaching experience is more significant than the quantity. More precisely, student teachers in their study, who “report better quality student teaching experiences feel more prepared to teach, more efficacious, and plan more years in teaching and in the district than peers who report lower quality experiences” (p. 1103). Needing further study is the researchers finding that the “magnitude of the effect of the student teaching quality is substantially stronger when student teaching is short and in
schools with more Black and Hispanic students” (p. 1103). While generally methodologically strong and important for my own area of interest, again there is heavy use of self-reported data and no triangulation of the data. As a result, there can be no way to predict teacher effectiveness outcomes. To their credit, Ronfeldt and Reininger note and caution against the “imperfections of human perception and memory” (p. 1096). They also concede that further research may uncover whether certain dimensions of quality matter more than others in order to more accurately influence policy and resource allocation (p. 1103).

A second student teaching study, also by Ronfeldt (2012), provides evidence that easier-to-staff schools may provide the best sites for student teaching. Ronfeldt sets out to provide an answer to the ongoing debate about the best placements for student teachers. Using survey and administrative data from NYC, Ronfeldt finds that teacher candidates placed in an easier-to-staff school have better retention and student achievement gains, than those placed in harder-to-staff schools. This finding is also true for student teachers who eventually became teachers of record in hard-to-staff school (p. 3). Ronfeldt’s study appears to refute Haberman’s (1995) assertion that teacher candidates are not best served when prepared in less challenging settings (p. 22). This study, is worthy of consideration because it provides new insight on the types of settings that might best serve to prepare teacher candidates for high-need urban schools with significant populations of students of color. Nonetheless, Ronfeldt (2012) accurately acknowledges his findings are “average effects based on school-level measures… and more research is needed to understand the specific features that give rise to these average effects” (p. 22). One supposition posited by Ronfeldt is that easier-to-staff schools may “signal better average mentorship by senior faculty” (p. 22). This supposition is thought-provoking in light of the underlying questions posed by the current study.
Cooperating Teachers

Nearer still to the focus of my work is the research on cooperating teachers. In particular, Tellez (2008) makes a compelling argument about the importance of cooperating teachers’ local knowledge in preparing student teachers (STs). Tellez argues that the role of the cooperating teacher in preparing student teachers for student diversity has not been examined (p. 46). Tellez deems this significant because of the role of the cooperating teacher in furthering the STs’ knowledge base and because of the findings that many teachers, including both student teachers and cooperating teachers, view multicultural education as “superfluous” (p. 47). As such, this qualitative study focuses on how experienced cooperating teachers “assist STs in learning to teach multicultural education” (p. 47). Through interviews with each cooperating teacher, Tellez seeks to “elicit the cooperating teachers’ visions of equity pedagogy and capacity to share this vision with their student teachers” (p. 48). In addition, visits to the cooperating teachers’ classes captured the “features of the curriculum” and were intended to ascertain “the form of instructional conversations the CTs promoted”. Three themes emerged. First, STs struggled with maintaining high standards and caring as it related to issues involving academic work and behavior. Second, there was distinct inability by STs to use students’ background knowledge. As a result, student teachers tended to dominate instructional conversations and were unable to “recognize when students were using their own cultures to make sense of new content”; particularly in the upper grades (p. 51). Finally, student teachers had particular difficulty relating to the “wider cultural background of the students” and working with parents (p. 52). The study is compelling. However, a limitation of the study, also identified by the researcher, is the lack of interviews conducted with the STs themselves to determine what they perceived they had learned from their cooperating teachers about equity pedagogy. Noting the many charges leveled at the
teacher preparation enterprise and the very real achievement disparities among students, Tellez notes that this is an issue to which we must attend (pp. 52 -53).

Graham (2006) offers another important perspective on student teaching in her study to understand “pedagogical relationships between cooperating teachers and interns” (p. 1120) and learn how cooperating teachers foster learning. To provide better context and in light of Grossman et al.’s (2008) findings about the need for coherence, it must be noted that the study site was a Professional Development School (PDS), which has greater autonomy over the selection of the cooperating teacher. Graham posits that the success of teacher candidates is heavily reliant on the cooperating teacher and on the site in which they practice teaching (p. 1118). As an important aside, participating cooperating teachers noted that “strong organizational structures, clearly articulated expectations for all participants; cognitive involvement with the complex intellectual tasks of teaching; and professional mentoring – contribute to successful internships” (p. 1127). With regard to the ways in which CTs fostered ST learning, Graham discerns that CTs take on differing pedagogical roles. Some, called “maestros,” are largely focused on the technical and managerial skills needed” while others, deemed “mentors,” are committed to helping “interns connect their practicum experiences to their sense of emerging professional identity and capacities as well as to their developing understanding of the teaching/learning dynamic” (1127).

In another study undertaken to determine the traits of effective cooperating teachers, Glenn (2006) uses observations, semi-structured interviews, and artifacts to determine the traits of effective mentors. The study found that pre-service teachers deemed good “classroom organization and planning, positive rapport with students, knowledge of subject matter, establishment of a daily routine, good classroom management, and compassion toward students”
as the important qualities needed in a cooperating teacher. Study findings also indicate that effective mentors have the ability to assist the ST in reflecting on professional practice, can “collaborate rather than dictate; relinquish an appropriate level of control; nurture personal relationships; share constructive feedback; and accept differences” (p. 94).

Other researchers provide information on “the teaching perspectives of cooperating teachers and the significance of these perspectives in their work with student teachers” (Clarke and Jarvis-Selinger, 2005, p. 66). Using Pratt’s Teaching Perspectives Inventory (TPI), Clarke and Jarvis-Selinger differentiate among five perspectives on teaching that define CTs’ fundamental beliefs about teaching and learning. These perspectives are: transmission, developmental, apprenticeship, nurturing, and social reform. The TPI instrument was administered to 778 cooperating teachers. “The first level of data analysis was used to calculate the respondent’s dominant perspective” (p. 68). In spite of the 39% response rate, each cooperating teacher held a dominant belief about teaching. The nurturing perspective was found to be dominant among the group while the social reform perspective was found to be the least dominant perspective of the group (p. 69). Clarke and Jarvis-Selinger note that the fact that so many of the cooperating teachers maintain a nurturing perspective likely works well for much of the nature of the role (p. 69). They also find statistically significant differences in the teaching perspectives of males and females. The transmission perspective is overwhelmingly held by men whereas the apprenticeship perspective is held by women (pp. 70-71).

Based on the collective work of these researchers, it is clear that the role of the cooperating teacher is paramount in the student teaching experience. Durksen and Klassen (2012) argue the need for more purposeful selection of mentor teachers. Similar to Glenn (2006), they find that effective mentors “model effective assessment and management strategies;
created a collaborative practicum environment; provide several opportunities for practice and success; and offer constructive feedback” (p. 3). The research suggests the need to ensure that teacher candidates have access to cooperating teachers who can do this important and complex work.

**Teacher Beliefs, Expectations, and Efficacy**

Erkmen (2012) maintains that unlike the teacher studies of the 1970s it has been “well established that teacher beliefs about teaching and learning, about themselves, and their students influence the ways they view and approach their work” (Erkmen, 2012 p. 141). Erkmen’s study offers a framework for capturing rich data about teacher beliefs. In this qualitative, multi-method study, nine participants (a) are interviewed; (b) construct written credos (an open-ended belief-system questionnaire); (c) are observed in classrooms (and complete post-lesson reflection forms); (d) participate in stimulated recall interviews; (e) keep diaries; and (f) complete metaphor stem completion tasks. While the participants in the study feel that observations, post-reflection forms and stimulated and recall interviews are most effective for unpacking their beliefs about teaching, they find the other methods less so. Erkmen’s is only one study in a wide research base that varies in quality. Nonetheless, the literature on teacher beliefs about students of color (and tangentially the areas of teacher expectation and teacher efficacy) is robust and important to unpack for my proposed study. At the core of what I hope to share are cooperating teachers’ beliefs about their students of color and their ability to model high expectations and culturally responsive practices for their student teachers.

I choose to start here with Pollack (2013), who stresses that the fact most K–12 educators do not share their students’ racial, ethnic, or linguistic backgrounds is key to understanding teachers’ attitudes and beliefs about their so-called “disadvantaged” students” (p. 867). Pollack
seeks to discern the stories and messages related to diversity and “difference” that K–12 educators hear in informal conversations about students, families, and communities of color and how educators make sense of these teaching and learning narratives. Pollack maintains that stories communicate in “less overt and more socially acceptable ways … discourse about racial “Others” (p. 867). Using qualitative methodology, participants are tasked with “describing and examining the stories and messages about students of color” (p. 870). Pollack finds that “once confronted with the day-to-day challenges and frustrations of teaching and classroom management, beginning teachers often abandon the more progressive practices and beliefs they learned in their teacher training programs” (p. 887). Pollack asserts that “when narratives that communicate low expectations and negative assumptions are presented as a necessary “reality check” for newcomers, and when they are transmitted through casual, everyday discourse, they have the potential to become powerful socializing mechanisms that can negatively influence teacher development (p. 887).” Pollack proposes the need for “ethnographic and multiple case study approaches for gathering the “thick” data needed to draw more substantive conclusions and to determine additional implications for teacher and school leader development” (p. 888). I concur and further suggest that teacher educators must be attuned to deficit narratives (both blatant and less overt) amongst those who will serve in the role of cooperating teachers.

Again, a review of the literature substantiates that much teacher education research is focused on developing teachers’ beliefs and identities (Rozelle and Wilson, 2012). While Rozelle and Wilson’s ethnographic study focuses on the ways in which student teachers adopt the practices of their cooperating teachers, it bears particular note here. Through participant observation (including 56 observations and 216 observation hours in the school), ethnographic interviews, review of artifacts, and semi-structured interviews (3 per intern) with interns and
cooperating teachers, Rozelle and Wilson provide a rich and detailed description of the interactions between interns and the cooperating teachers and the changes that take place for student teachers over the course of a school year. Specifically, Rozelle and Wilson identify two distinct pathways through which student teachers progress in their learning. First, some interns are able to successfully “reproduce” teaching practices utilized by mentor teachers while “strugglers” are unable to do so. Those who successfully use their mentors’ practices also have visions of good teaching that include practices utilized by their cooperating teachers. On the other hand, the visions of good teaching described by “strugglers” are not reflective of their cooperating teachers’ visions. Instead, there is a lack of coherence between their practices and what they initially describe as good teaching.

Rozelle and Wilson find that changes in practices precede changes in beliefs (p. 1204). “When one engages in behaviors and develops competencies under the influence of the CT and field experience, one’s beliefs and teaching shift in that process” (p. 1205). This contention is both important and a central component of this study. Rozelle and Wilson see the need for closer attention to the teaching practices of cooperating teachers and appeal for further studies to deepen our understandings about the ingredients needed to support teacher change.

Rozelle and Wilson also maintain that it is rare for student teachers to engage in practices that run counter to "the status quo of their experience as learners” (p. 1197). "On relatively rare occasions exceptional mentors or innovative structures for student teaching are able to disrupt those patterns, but the research suggests that immersion in schools usually leads new teachers to become more educationally conservative and to replicate both the status quo and their experiences as learners” (p. 1197). Rozelle and Wilson also conclude that “CTs’ values and behaviors exerted a dominant influence on the internship” and that practices “promoted by the
teacher education program or those envisioned by interns prior to the year beginning – rarely surfaced” (p. 1204). Consequently, Rozelle and Wilson write “it behooves us to understand how teachers come to acquire practices and change beliefs” (p. 1205).

Rozelle and Wilson’s caution provides a substantial rationale for greater attentiveness to issues of teacher beliefs about racial diversity. “Beliefs play a major role in how prospective teachers respond to the diversity they will encounter in their classrooms” (Harrington & Hathaway, 1995, p. 275). In fact, while research conducted on teacher beliefs relate to the content, skills, and methods, teachers use in their professional lives, less is known about the scaffolding of the deeply held belief structures that provide the foundation for their development as teachers” (p. 276). More tellingly, in “Preparing Teachers for Diversity”, Hollins and Guzman (2005) maintain that many teacher candidates begin their programs “expressing negative or deficit attitudes and beliefs about those different from themselves…. However, they also often express a willingness to teach in urban areas despite limited experience and conflicting attitudes and beliefs” (p. 485). Irvine (2003), too, reveals that even after taking courses in multicultural education, some pre-service teachers maintain low expectations and harbor negative beliefs about students of color. This lends credence to the fact that stereotypes are behaviors that are easily learned but difficult to unlearn (Stangor, 2000, p.10). Thus, the beliefs cooperating teachers hold about their students of color and the ways in which they impart that knowledge to student teachers should be closely studied.

Whereas Rozelle and Wilson focus heavily on the ways in which the beliefs of student teachers are impacted by their interactions with cooperating teachers, Baum et al. (2013) assert that "teacher educators have a little knowledge of what takes place in field experiences…."

Consequently, they advocate that teacher educators instead embed three specific skill-based
strategies within academic coursework. To their minds, these practices entail: unpacking deficit thinking, cultural integration/funds of knowledge, and curriculum differentiation/scaffolding (Baum et al., 2013, p. 18). Krummel (2013) straddles perspectives on which setting is most apt to enable student teachers to change their beliefs about diversity. They note that both self-reflection and service-learning are oft-cited in the literature (Krummel, 2013, p. 3) while other research emphasizes the role of cooperating teachers and teacher educators in developing an understanding of diversity (p. 3).

Baum et al. (2013) also provide additional insight about the concerns pre-service teachers have about teaching in urban environments. In an attempt to deepen the literature in this area, they study teacher candidates who express concerns and/or no desire to teach in an urban school and those who seem optimistic about teaching in urban contexts. For those who have concerns and/or do not want to teach in an urban school three specific reasons are identified by study participants: “racial/cultural barriers, fears of unruly behavior, a difficult initial year of teaching” (pp. 8-10). On the other hand, those who are optimistic about teaching in urban environments feel that the challenges in urban schools serve as opportunities (pp. 11-12). The specific concerns for these teachers held the following pattern: the urban resource gap and the ability to use students as cultural resources. Also important is that Baum et al. (2013) find that regardless of whether candidates express a desire to teach in an urban environment or not "few could identify specific instructional strategies for teaching in an urban context. Instead, they report vague ideas about their potential practice as urban teachers" (Baum et al., 2013, p. 17). Again, the research shows that little of the work around beliefs seems to extend to teaching and learning outcomes for students of color who most need high-quality, rigorous teaching experiences.
Rushton (2000) sought to uncover the perspectives of student teachers conducting their field work in inner-city schools. Participants were interviewed multiple times during the school year; produced weekly two-page written reflections about an incident which stood out for them during the preceding week; and engaged in weekly, taped, group discussions with other teacher candidates. Rushton found that the group of student teachers all experienced a sense of “culture shock and disequilibrium (distance between expectations and reality)” as a result of their student teaching experience (pp. 371-374). Each teacher candidate needed a period of adjustment in order to successfully navigate their student teaching experience but each was ultimately successful. Rushton attempts to argue that placements in challenging inner-city schools speed the development of self-efficacy. However, it must be noted that in developing what Rushton deems “self-efficacy”, the study participants made curriculum and teaching strategies a low priority (p. 382). While making this point, Rushton seems to overlook the significance of this fact. This study and other literature in this area reinforce my sense that we must seek better understanding, not only of the ways in which cooperating teachers cultivate positive beliefs about students of color, but more importantly about their ability to model and develop practices within teacher candidates that foster high expectations and academic achievement for them. Again, Rozelle and Wilson’s notion that “practices precede beliefs” seems apropos here.

Like Rushton, Knoblauch and Woolfolk Hoy (2008) agree that urban field placements are critical to the preparation of teacher candidates for diverse classrooms. However, in contrast to Rushton’s study, they focus on the efficacy beliefs of teacher candidates after student teaching experiences in differing settings (urban, suburban, and rural). The researchers examine whether school placement has an impact on student teachers' sense of efficacy. Their study design is rigorous and includes a larger population of student teachers (102) participating in the 16-week
study. Three instruments are used to capture perceptions. The first is the short form, 12-question Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES), including three subscales: efficacy with instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management. The TSES is administered on three occasions—at the beginning of student teaching, at the eight-week point, and after student teaching. The Perceived Cooperating Teachers’ Efficacy Scale is also administered (a modified version of the TSES) and is a 12-item instrument, which measures aggregate Collective Efficacy scores for a school. Though not generally used in this way, the collective efficacy scale is completed by the student teachers. Biographical data, including information about school placements, is also submitted. Important to the study is the demographic designation of the school settings and the criteria used to make designations. Ultimately, 28 of the participants are assigned urban schools, 45 to suburban schools, and 29 to rural schools.

Six critical findings emerge. First, Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy find that across the geographical designations efficacy scores increase between the beginning and the end of the student teaching experience, however, there are statistically significant differences between the groups. Second, cooperating teachers’ sense of efficacy is a significant predictor of student teachers’ sense of efficacy. Specifically, there is a positive correlation between the posttest of perceived cooperating teacher efficacy scores and the posttest of the student teachers TSES scores. Again, differences are found to be significant between the groups. Third, student teachers placed in suburban schools have the highest mean scores for Collective Teacher Efficacy and those placed in urban settings had the lowest Collective Teacher Efficacy mean scores. Fourth, a multiple regression analysis determined which factors are more predictive of the teachers’ sense of efficacy after student teaching. Predictive variables include: student teachers' pretest TSE
scores, posttest Perceived Cooperating Teachers Efficacy Scores, and posttest collective teacher efficacy scores, the amount of observation experience, and the match or mismatch between the student teachers’ own K–12 educational setting and the student teaching setting. The Perceived Cooperating Teacher Sense of Efficacy is found to be a significant predictor and the post Collective Teacher Self Efficacy Scores approaches significance. Fifth, Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy find there is a significant difference between the posttest mean of collective teacher efficacy scores from the three settings. Sixth and finally, while Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy expected efficacy beliefs of student teachers in urban schools to decline, but this was not the case.

Of their findings, one bears mentioning here. Specifically, “student teachers’ perceived cooperating teachers’ sense of efficacy was moderately and positively correlated with the student teachers’ efficacy beliefs” (p. 175). This offers additional justification for this study’s focus on the role of the cooperating teacher in supporting teacher candidates’ effectiveness in diverse classroom settings. Nonetheless, I would be remiss if I didn’t also point out the complicating factors and limitations. First, as is prevalent in this literature, the surveys utilized are focused on the perceptions and/or self-reports of student teachers. Moreover, and the researchers readily acknowledge this, two of the instruments were used in ways contrary to their design. Specifically, the Perceived Cooperating Teachers’ Efficacy Scale was completed by the student teacher rather than by the cooperating teacher. Knoblauch & Woolfolk reference Bandura in positing that “student teacher’s efficacy beliefs may be more influential than the cooperating teacher’s beliefs themselves” (p. 171). Also, Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy chose to have student teachers complete the Collective Efficacy Scale rather than have the teachers in the school do so, as was intended. While the researchers make the case that having student teachers complete all
three scales provides “consistency with the other variables”, I have to wonder how differently the results might be if these two instruments were utilized as intended.

Jussim and Harber (2005) support the teacher expectations’ literature in their review of teacher expectation research undertaken during a period of 35 years. Their goal is to provide deeper understanding of the research that arose as a result of the Pygmalion study (1968). Jussim and Harber find that “self-fulfilling prophecies in the classroom are real”, however, in most cases the effects tend to be small (Jussim & Harber, 2005, p. 152). Jussim & Harber write “many studies and meta-analyses have addressed the extent to which teachers perceive differences between students from differing social and demographic groups, however only two have addressed whether the perceptions were accurate.” The researchers see the need for more research in this area (Jussim & Harber, 2005, p. 153).

**Culturally Responsive Pedagogy and Cultural Competence**

Teacher education for diversity involves much more than the transfer of information from teacher educators to their students. It involves the profound transformation of people and of the world views and assumptions that they have carried with them for their entire lives. (McAllister and Irvine, 2000)

A number of researchers have proposed culturally responsive pedagogy as a promising means by which to meet the academic and social needs of students of color (Ladson-Billings 1995; Gay, 2000; Howard, 2003). I draw here mainly from the research and theory of Ladson-Billings, Gay, and Villegas and Lucas in defining and considering the importance of culturally
responsive pedagogy in classrooms; particularly those with significant populations of students of color.

Between 1990 and 1995 Ladson-Billings examined the teaching practices of eight teachers (both Black and White) successful in teaching African-American/Black learners. The culmination of this research was the *The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African-American Children*, which delineated the characteristics of culturally relevant teaching practices. Ladson-Billings defines culturally relevant teaching as a set of practices which enable Black students to actively choose academic success while maintaining their cultural identity (Ladson-Billings, 1990).

Teachers who engage in culturally relevant pedagogy: believe their students are capable of success, see their work as an art, see themselves as part of the community in which their students live, carefully construct learning communities with dynamic student-teacher relationships, foster student collaboration and accountability for one another, and understand their critical role as facilitators and bridge builders in the teaching and learning process. As a result, their classrooms demonstrate that knowledge is fluid, must be viewed critically, and must be assessed in varied ways (Ladson-Billings, 1995, pp. 478-482). Essential, too, is Ladson-Billings’ notion of success. Contending that achievement is too narrowly constructed and works to the disadvantage of Black/African-American students, Ladson-Billings advocates a more holistic and inclusive notion of success, better aligned with the culture of African-American learners. Ladson-Billings argued for reducing the importance of standardized test scores to merely one facet of student achievement “that may not be reliable for understanding the range of pedagogical skills possessed by successful teachers of Black students” (Ladson-Billings, 1990, p. 337).
Gay also maintains that teachers who practice culturally responsive pedagogy are focused on: (a) academic achievement—making learning rigorous, exciting, challenging, and equitable with high standards; (b) cultural competence—knowing and facilitating the learning process to include the range of students' cultural and linguistic groups; and (c) sociopolitical consciousness—recognizing and assisting students in the understanding that education and schooling do not occur in a vacuum (Gay, 2000). However, while Gay also maintains that culturally responsive teachers must have deep knowledge of cultural diversity, she insists that they also have detailed factual information about the cultural particularities of specific ethnic groups (Gay, 2002).

While many teacher preparation programs maintain they infuse culturally relevant pedagogy and multicultural perspectives throughout their coursework and clinical experiences, external evaluations of teacher education programs illustrate little has changed to adequately support the needs of diverse learners (Gollnick, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1995) in the ways that Ladson-Billings, Gay, and others propose. Describing diversity efforts in 2005, Banks et al. conceded that schools of education had indeed revised courses, policies, and field work experiences to attend to diversity, multicultural education, and socio-cultural contexts. However, researchers also concluded that deeper analysis of teacher preparation programs revealed that many complied with the calls for greater attention to diversity by merely adding new courses.

Despite what is now the fairly commonplace use of courses focused on culturally responsive teaching, multicultural education and diversity, most attempts to prepare teachers for diverse populations of students have not been integrated across teacher preparation programs. Instead, many are stand-alone experiences limiting their ability to challenge deeply held values and cultural beliefs of the teacher candidates. “Often, diversity was addressed in optional or add-
on “diversity” or “multicultural courses”, whereas the rest of the teacher education curriculum has remained unchanged” (Hollins and Guzman, 2005, p. 480). As such, change in teacher preparation programs is “more rhetorical than real” (Cochran-Smith, 2006, p. 229).

Villegas and Lucas (2002) join the chorus of scholars who maintain that much of what has occurred in teacher education programs has not had a transformative effect on the core components of teacher preparation programs. Consequently, they propose a vision for an integrated teacher education program, which prepares culturally responsive teachers who engage in practices like those described by Ladson-Billings and Gay. In their vision, culturally relevant teachers “are socio-culturally conscious; have affirming views of students from diverse backgrounds; see themselves as both responsible for and capable of bringing about educational change; understand how learners construct knowledge and are capable of promoting learners’ knowledge construction; understand the lives students; and use this knowledge about students’ lives to design instruction that builds on what they already know while stretching them beyond the familiar” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 21). In such an integrated approach, these characteristics would provide the basis for a set of learning experiences that would be “consciously and systematically woven throughout both coursework and field work” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 21). In proposing this approach to preparing culturally responsive teachers, Villegas and Lucas challenge others charged with the preparation of teachers for diverse populations to test whether the structures and processes embedded within their programs effectively prepare teachers who engage in culturally responsive pedagogy.

Howard (2003), citing Ladson-Billings, argues that one of the central principles of culturally responsive pedagogy is an authentic belief that students from culturally diverse and low-income backgrounds are capable learners and if treated competently they will ultimately
demonstrate high degrees of competence. Additional research on culturally responsive pedagogy suggests that effective teachers insist on learning about the cultural knowledge of students (González, Moll, & Amantí, 2005) and then subsequently build upon that knowledge to support classroom instruction. However, in order to do this, McAllister and Irvine (2000) maintain that teachers must first recognize and understand their own worldviews (p. 4). Drawing on Gudykunst and Kim’s theories of cross-cultural competence, McAllister and Irvine also advocate a process-based approach to developing cross-culturally competent educators. Using such an approach, teacher educators would diagnose the readiness level of teacher candidates for multicultural learning experiences and then make strategic decisions as to the level of support and/or challenge needed to support new learning. McAllister and Irvine note that while risk-taking should be encouraged in support of fostering cross-cultural growth, too much risk may lead to resistance (McAllister & Irvine, 2000, p. 20). This preliminary research by McAllister and Irvine is important and could be used for determining progress in teaching. There is potential that a process-based approach to developing cross-cultural competence may alleviate some of the racial and cultural incongruence between teachers and students; through supporting a largely white suburban and middle-class teacher force to overcome deficit notions about students of color. In particular, a process approach to cross-cultural competence might also have more lasting impact on teacher beliefs and attitudes not seen with stand-alone multicultural classes or through the practice of investigating and utilizing students’ funds of knowledge.

Recently Ladson-Billings revisited her scholarship on culturally responsive pedagogy penning *Culturally Relevant Pedagogy 2.0: a.k.a. the Remix* (2014) in which she shares reflections on the “use, misuse” and extension of her scholarship in the twenty-five years since she first advanced the theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. Ladson-Billings notes and is
appreciative of newer conceptions of culturally relevant pedagogy which have subsequently been advanced in this area and contends that any good scholarship will morph and transform over time. She writes that as a result of the inequities faced by students of color in urban schools, “if we hope to disrupt this cycle, our pedagogies must evolve to address the complexities of social inequalities” (Ladson-Billings, 2014, p. 77).

Among those who have built upon and pushed Ladson-Billing’s theoretical conception of culturally relevant pedagogy is Djano Paris. While Ladson-Billings proposes that “the secret behind culturally relevant pedagogy is “the ability to link principles of learning with deep understanding of (and appreciation for) culture, Paris (2012) offers the term “culturally sustaining pedagogy” as an alternative to culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 2014, p. 82). As conceptualized by Paris (2012):

- culturally sustaining pedagogy seeks to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling. In the face of current policies and practices that have the explicit goal of creating a monocultural and monolingual society, research and practice need equally explicit resistances that embrace cultural pluralism and cultural equality.

  (p. 93)

Paris argues that culturally responsive and culturally relevant pedagogy are not sufficient to the task of supporting students of color. Instead, Paris contends that:

- the term *culturally sustaining* requires that our pedagogies be more than responsive of or relevant to the cultural experiences and practices of young people—it requires that they support young
people in sustaining the cultural and linguistic competence of their communities while simultaneously offering access to dominant cultural competence. (p. 95)


Another recent emergence in the culturally responsive teaching literature is an instructional framework and protocol focused on eight areas of culturally responsive pedagogy. A comprehensive review of the literature resulted in eight themes for culturally responsive instruction. Specifically, the CRIOP ( Culturally Responsive Instruction Observation Protocol) addresses: assessment, classroom caring and teacher dispositions, classroom climate/physical environment, curriculum/planned experiences, discourse/instructional conversation, family involvement and collaboration, pedagogy/instructional practices, and socio-political consciousness/multiple perspectives. To date the CRIOP has been used by the researchers to assess literacy instruction and to provide professional development (Powell & Rightmyer, 2011). While the researchers are still attempting to validate CRIOP as an observational protocol, the eight themes identified echo the characteristics of culturally responsive pedagogy and more importantly provide concrete descriptors which can support the preparation of teacher candidates.
In concluding this section, it is important to note the clear connections can also be drawn between culturally responsive pedagogy and Critical Race Theory. Culturally responsive pedagogy is important in that it is intended to provide students of color with the tools needed not just to acknowledge structural inequalities but to also have the tools to be successful. “Culturally relevant teaching is designed to help students move past a blaming the victim mentality and search for the structural and symbolic foundations of inequity and injustice” (Ladson-Billing, 2002, p. 111). Using the Critical Race Theory strategy of “counter-storytelling” through which teachers have students of color "disrupt dominant narratives about them, Solorzano and Yosso (2001) offer an example of the sociopolitical consciousness needed by teachers that Ladson-Billings, Gay, Villegas and Lucas, and Howard identify as central to culturally relevant pedagogy.

Ironically, there is a dearth of literature regarding effective strategies for preparing teachers of diverse populations. To date, this issue has not been a funding priority. Much of the research currently available is taken from qualitative studies of limited size, scope, and therefore generalizability. What’s more, the available research focuses heavily on the structure and format of teacher preparation programs. As a result, we know that much of the preparation of teacher candidates for diverse classrooms includes coursework and content focused on: prejudice reduction, equity pedagogy, and field experiences.

Unfortunately, the research on the effectiveness of each of these components is sparse. There is also no conclusive evidence of the effectiveness of these strategies for preparing aspiring teachers to work in diverse school settings. Little compelling evidence exists that prejudice reduction is sustained over time. Yet, there is more positive research indicating that aspiring teachers with clinical placements in urban communities and schools develop awareness
of cultural differences. This finding is encouraging as redesigning field experiences has tended to be the dominant way in which teacher preparation programs have attempted to improve their efforts to prepare teachers for diverse school populations. However, it is not enough that teachers with large numbers of students of color “develop an awareness of cultural differences”; it is merely one small step in the right direction. What is more significant and encouraging is that a majority of the currently available studies have reported short-term positive impacts regarding the use of pedagogical practices and strategies and materials that support the academic achievement of students from diverse backgrounds (equity pedagogy).

Most importantly, there is a need to determine whether there is a link between the preparation for diversity and student learning. Grossman and McDonald (2008) argue for a research agenda focused on both teaching and teacher education; such research would have the potential to identify the essential characteristics of culturally responsive instruction that predict achievement outcomes for students and then develop ways to help novices to skillfully enact these practices in both coursework and the field (Grossman and McDonald, 2008, p. 191). Grossman and McDonald concede that such research would require significant investment, which to date has not been forthcoming.

I close this literature review by returning to Anderson and Stillman’s (2013) meta-analysis as it is particularly useful in making the case for the importance of this study. Anderson and Stillman write there is “disproportionate emphasis on belief and attitude changes on the part of student teachers…and a slim body of research has focused on the development of actual teaching practice” (p.3). They further state that much of the literature “positions belief and attitude change as a core “object” or goal toward which PSTs should progress during student teaching” and is focused on changes in beliefs and attitudes, rather than on teaching practices.
In light of the current state of the research, it is the intention to use this literature review, the research questions, and the methodological design explained in the next chapter to add substantively to the current body of research.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This study is possible because of the very busy professionals—teacher candidates, program directors, and cooperating teachers—who made it possible to collect data through surveys, interviews, and classroom observations. While this research topic is important, I am humbled that so many teachers and teacher educators were willing to offer their limited time to support these research efforts. After a restatement of the research questions, the methodology used throughout this study will be described in full within this section.

Restatement of the Research Questions

In order to understand the beliefs and practices of cooperating teachers and to examine the practices they employ to support the development of teacher candidates who can successfully work with high-need students of color, the following research questions are posed:

1. How do Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) select cooperating teachers (CTs)?
   - What standards are delineated?
   - How are they applied?
   - Who controls the selection process?
   - Is professional development (PD) provided for CTs and is it a requirement?
   - How are CTs evaluated and how are the evaluations used?
   - Are CTs appointed as clinical faculty?

1a. To what extent do EPPs select CTs who intentionally communicate and model: high expectations, culturally responsive pedagogy, and persistence of K–12 students of color for teacher candidates (TCs)?

2. What are the attitudes and philosophies about teaching students of color in high-need schools held by CTs and how are they conveyed to student teachers during student teaching? To what extent do they intentionally communicate and model: high expectations, culturally responsive pedagogy, and persistence of K–12 students of color for TCs?

3. How effectively do CTs enact and model pedagogical and non-pedagogical practices that support the success of high-need students of color?

4. Is there evidence that the philosophies, expectations, and teaching practices take root
during the student teaching cycle? Is there evidence of transference?

These questions are important to the overall study. They seek to provide an initial understanding of the ways in which race, diversity, and culture influence the beliefs, expectations, and pedagogical practices of cooperating teachers in classrooms with significant populations of students of color. They also seek to and to determine both what and how these cooperating teachers model their beliefs, expectations, and pedagogical practices. The study also enables better understanding of the criteria by which teacher preparation programs are making decisions about recruiting and selecting cooperating teachers who can facilitate the development of teacher candidates for similar environments.

**Research Design**

Johnson et al. (2007) argue that varying definitions of mixed methods research have emerged in recent years. In their study, they provide those definitions while also delineating the criteria used by leading methodologists (p. 112). Nineteen definitions emerge from their discussions with 31 notable mixed methods research methodologists. Among these, Creswell’s and Patton’s are of particular significance for this study. First, Creswell writes, “Mixed methods research is a research design (or methodology) in which the researcher collects, analyzes and mixes (integrates or connects) both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or a multiphase program of inquiry” (Johnson et al, 2007, p. 119). In this study, I will collect, analyze, and mix interviews, surveys, and observations to address the questions posed. Patton adds nuance to his definition in describing mixed methods research in the following way, “I consider mixed methods to be inquiring into a question using different data sources and design elements in such a way as to bring different perspectives to bear in the inquiry and therefore support triangulation of the findings. In this regard, using different methods to examine different
questions in the same overall study is not mixed methods” (Johnson et al, 2007, p. 120). With Patton’s criteria as a model, this study uses surveys, interviews, and observations to explore each research question more deeply and uncover and reveal the understandings and perspectives of the participants on this research topic. Important, too, in the rationale for a mixed methods design for this research is the following statement by Johnson et al.’s (2007):

We would position mixed research between the extremes Plato (quantitative research) and the Sophists (qualitative research), with mixed research attempting to respect fully the wisdom of both of these viewpoints while also seeking a workable middle solution for many (research) problems of interest….Mixed methods research is, generally speaking, an approach to knowledge (theory and practice) that attempts to consider multiple viewpoints, perspectives, positions, and standpoints (always including the standpoints of qualitative and quantitative research. (p. 113)

As is the case with exploratory studies, the goal is to investigate and better understand a little-acknowledged and little-understood phenomena taking place in the classrooms in which many students of color are taught and teacher candidates are learning to teach (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 33). Consequently, I draw purposefully from the traditions of qualitative and quantitative inquiry to conduct this particular study.

The combination of quantitative and qualitative data is intended to add methodological depth to the research questions. Punch (2009) further supports the case for using a mixed method design. In his discussion of variables and cases, Punch notes that “variable-oriented analysis in quantitative research is good for finding probabilistic relationships in a large population” (p.
This is the case for the surveys of program directors (15), cooperating teachers (67), and teacher candidates (249). On the other hand, the use of qualitative methods—both interviews and observations—with a subset of program directors, cooperating teachers, and teacher candidates, enable the ability to be “sensitive to the context and process, to lived experience and to local groundedness…” (p. 294). Concurrent mixed methods procedures “in which quantitative and qualitative data are merged in order to provide a comprehensive analysis of the research problem by… simultaneously collecting data and then integrating the information in the interpretation of my overall results” are used (Creswell, 2009, pp.14-15). Punch (2009) argues that this triangulation design—the purpose of which is to “obtain complementary quantitative and qualitative data on the same topic—brings together the strengths of the two methods.” Again, the data were “collected and analyzed concurrently but separately and then merged” (Punch, 2009, p. 296).

Three criteria, identified by Creswell (2009), also support the use of a mixed methods design: the research problem, personal experiences, and audience (pp. 18-19). First, the research problem is one that has yet to be fully studied. It is important to know more about the beliefs and instructional practices cooperating teachers model for teacher candidates in high-need schools with significant populations of students of color. Applying mixed methods to one teacher preparation program to explore the stated research questions enables the opportunity to “survey a large number of individuals, then follow-up by interviewing and observing a small number of participants to obtain their specific language and voices about the topic” (Creswell, 2009, p. 19). Second, both personal and professional experiences as well as the desire to share knowledge flexibly and in multiple ways, lend themselves to mixed methods research. Finally, the intent is to afford new knowledge to both individuals within the teacher preparation field and
the litany of others who take aim from the outside; specifically critics and policymakers, who to date have yet to consider, acknowledge, and attend to these important areas as newer generations of teachers are preparing for the nation’s underserved classrooms.

**Research Setting**

Table 3.1

*Teacher Preparation Programs- Entire Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># of Programs</th>
<th>Public/Private</th>
<th>Research 1/Non-Research 1</th>
<th># of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>5 Programs (1 Not included in the study)</td>
<td>1 Private 4 Public*</td>
<td>1 RESEARCH 1* 4 NON-RESEARCH 1</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>6 Programs</td>
<td>6 Public</td>
<td>3 Research 1 3 Non-Research 1</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>5 Programs</td>
<td>5 Public</td>
<td>1 Research 1 4 Non-Research 1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>7 Programs (1 Not included in the study)</td>
<td>1 Private 6 Public*</td>
<td>2 Research 1 5 Non-Research 1*</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial intent of this study was to have a more national focus. Unfortunately, access to a national database of programs that prepare students for urban environments with significant populations of students of color was not granted. As a result, the research setting was more confined while also having some national elements. Specifically, for the purposes of this study, the research setting (Table 3.1) is a nationally-administered, state-based teaching preparation program focused on the preparation of secondary STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) teachers for high-need urban and rural schools. The program is active in five states, only four of which currently have teacher candidates and graduates. The fifth state will matriculate teacher candidates in summer 2015. The preparation program is currently comprised
of 23 university programs, each of which prepares teacher candidates at the graduate level. The schools of education within these institutions include: public and private; small and large; and research and non-research teacher preparation institutions. For the purposes of the current study only 21 of the programs meet the criteria of placing students in high-need schools with significant populations of students of color. Two of the programs are specifically focused on the preparation of teacher candidates for rural schools and their partnering K—12 schools include few students of color. Information about the program including state participation, number of teacher candidates, gender and ethnicity are provided in Table 3.2. Unfortunately, records regarding teacher candidate ethnicity are unreliable prior to 2013. For that reason, the ethnicity data for teacher candidates in this program are not included here for cohorts prior to the 2013.
Table 3.2

*Teacher Candidates- Entire Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>State participation</th>
<th># of Teacher candidates</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>No available statistics</td>
<td>16 Female 10 Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>No available statistics</td>
<td>26 Female 17 Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Indiana Michigan Ohio</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>No available statistics</td>
<td>54 Female 50 Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Indiana Michigan Ohio</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>No available statistics</td>
<td>74 Female 56 Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Indiana Michigan Ohio</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>White- 93 Black- 11 Asian-7 Hispanic- 4 American Indian-1 Other- 0 Missing-1</td>
<td>66 Female 53 Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Indiana Michigan Ohio New Jersey</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>White- 128 Black- 24 Asian- 8 Hispanic- 5 American Indian- 2 Other- 1 Missing-14</td>
<td>105 Female 77 Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>604</td>
<td></td>
<td>341 Female 263 Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A defining characteristic of the group of preparation programs, while differing in the scope and sequence of the required coursework, is that each ensures that teacher candidates are placed in high-need schools with cooperating teachers between three and five days a week over the entire course of a K–12 academic year. Further, teacher candidates in all of the programs follow the school district calendar, rather than the university calendar, so as to ensure continuity in their preparation to teach in high-need classrooms.

Information about the entire population of cooperating teachers is unknown to the researcher. Cooperating teachers within the teacher preparation program work at the discretion.
of program directors and are recruited and selected by them or by their district partners. In most instances these lists were not made available. Instead, program directors forwarded on requests for their participation in the study.

**Research Population**

The research population includes teacher preparation program directors from 21 of the teacher preparation programs that make up the nationally-administered, state-based teaching fellowship program. Again, two programs, one in Indiana and the second in Ohio have been excluded because they focus on the preparation of teacher candidates for rural schools and were deemed not to be partnered with K—12 schools with significant populations of students of color. 682 teacher candidates have enrolled in the program in the six years since the program’s inception in 2009 (604 at eligible campuses), and approximately 110 cooperating teachers have supported the preparation of teacher candidates within the program. Again, cooperating teachers work at the discretion of program directors and are recruited and selected by them or by their district partners. In most instances these lists were not made available. Instead, program directors forwarded requests for participation.

For the purposes of this study, only teacher candidates and cooperating teachers working in high-needs schools with significant numbers of students of color (40% and above) are included. For the purpose of this study, a high-need school, as defined in section 201 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1021), is a school that serves elementary or secondary school children that meets one or more of the following criteria:

1. a high percentage of individuals from families with incomes below the poverty line;
2. a high percentage of secondary school teachers not teaching in the content area in which the teachers were trained to teach; or
3. a high teacher turnover rate

http://www.ithaca.edu/hs/oyce/highneed/

**Study Phases and Methodology**

The following figure provides a visual of the manner in which the study unfolds.

![Study Phases and Methodology Diagram](image)

*Figure 1. Study phases and methodology.*

**Quantitative Research Design**

Fowler (2014) was particularly instructive in developing surveys that inform the research questions. First, in heeding his advice that “one should thoroughly explore the potential for gathering the same information from existing records or from other sources” (Fowler, 2014, p. 2), there was careful consideration of each question to assess whether or not it was best answered in the survey or through interviews and observation. Fowler (2014) also supported subsequent decisions about sampling, question design, and data collection. Among these considerations were efforts to “minimize the random differences between the sample and the population” by attending to issues of sampling error and bias (p. 10). After conferring with committee member Anthony Picciano about the pros and cons of administering the survey by mail or via the internet,
Fowler’s (2014) discussion of the disadvantages of email surveys was again instructive. He specifically delineates the following considerations and limitations: “limited to internet users, need for comprehensive address lists, and the challenges of enlisting cooperation” (p. 73). Ultimately, internet-based surveys were administered with full knowledge of the potential limitations. This decision was based primarily on two advantages shared by Fowler (2014) “speed of return and the use of a computer-assisted instrument” (p. 73). A third determining factor was that SurveyGizmo (the online survey software utilized) also offers diagnostic tools that provide information about the estimated length of the survey, fatigue scores, and accessibility for users that would not otherwise have been come by easily. A second benefit of the SurveyGizmo software tool is its strong reporting feature, which afforded early access to important information prior to engaging in higher-level data analyses.

**Surveys.** Three surveys were simultaneously administered to the following groups: directors of the teacher preparation programs, teacher candidates, and cooperating teachers (Appendices A, B, & C). Descriptions of the surveys disseminated can be found in Table 3.3. All surveys were initially developed utilizing the research question as the frame of reference. A set of questions were then developed and shared with members of a dissertation study group for feedback and fine-tuning. Two were also shared with Dr. Picciano for additional feedback. Finally, SurveyGizmo was used to assess the surveys’ lengths, fatigue scores, and accessibility.
Table 3.3

Surveys Administered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey/Audience</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Program survey (for program directors) | Provides the following information:                                                                                           • Demographic Information  

  • Program Characteristics  

  • Cooperating Teacher Selection Criteria  

  • Professional Development Requirements and Topics  

| Teacher candidates        | Provides the following information:                                                                                           • Demographic Information  

  • Professional Development  

  • Attitudes and Beliefs about Diversity/Culture  

  • Cooperating Teacher’s use of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy  

  • Self-assessment of ability to work effectively with students of color in high-need schools?  

| Cooperating teachers     | Provides the following information:                                                                                           • Demographic Information  

  • Professional Development  

  • Attitudes and Beliefs about Diversity/Culture  

  • Use of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy  

  • Evaluation of teacher candidates’ ability to work effectively with students of color in high-need schools?  


Program Survey. The purpose of this survey is to understand features of the preparation program, including the clinical program design (Appendix A). Questions about the selection of cooperating teachers are also posed. Program surveys consist of three sections: A 14-item Demographic Information section, a 13-item Clinical Program Design section, which seeks to understand the features of clinical field work, and a final section with seven items, the Cooperating Teacher/Mentor Teacher section, which inquires about the criteria for selecting cooperating teachers, their preparation for the role, and expectations of them.

Teacher Candidate Survey. A second survey (Appendix B) is administered to approximately 604 teacher candidates (both currently and previously involved in the nationally-administered, state-based teaching fellowship program) seeks to understand the attitudes and philosophies held by teacher candidates about teaching students of color in high-need schools and to elicit information about the ways in which their cooperating teachers model culturally responsive pedagogy. Forty-two (42) of the emails were returned due to problems with the email addresses. The teacher candidate survey has three elements: Part I: poses demographic questions and comprises 14 questions. Part II of the survey seeks responses to TMAS (The Multicultural Attitude Survey) (Ponterotto et al., 1998). TMAS (Appendix D) is a 20-item survey intended to assess “awareness of, comfort with, and sensitivity to issues of cultural pluralism in the classroom” (Ponterotto et al., 1998, p. 1002). The TMAS construct was developed by Ponterotto to provide a “psychometrically sound and efficient (brief, i.e., under 30 items) self-report inventories of teacher multicultural awareness” (p. 1002). While other measures of cultural sensitivity and racial bias pre-dated TMAS, most were more time-consuming and cumbersome.

To determine construct validity of TMAS, the researchers utilized three similar instruments, the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI), the Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure
(MEIM), and the Social Desirability Scale (SDS). “Criterion validity was assessed using a group differences approach with sample cohort groups (gender, race, and multicultural specific training). The only statistically significant differences in scores were for subjects who had completed multicultural training. Multiple measures of internal consistency and a test-retest stability assessment indicated satisfactory levels of score reliability” (Ponterotto et al., 1998, p. 1002).

TMAS (Appendix D) uses a 5-point Likert Scale with responses that include (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Uncertain, Agree, and Strongly Agree). “Scores on the TMAS survey range from 20 to 100. It is important to note that items 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18 are scored as (1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5) while items 3, 6, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20 are reverse-scored (1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1). Higher scores indicate more appreciation and awareness of multicultural teaching issues. Permissions were requested and obtained from Dr. Ponterotto to utilize TMAS in this study (Appendix E). It is also important to note that TMAS is “meant for large-scale mean research, and should not be used in any evaluative way” (TMAS Scoring Directions, 1998).

Finally, Part III of the Teacher Candidate survey, entitled My CT’s Teaching Practice, seeks responses to seven items culled and adapted from CRIOP (Culturally Relevant Instruction Observation Protocol by Powell & Rightmyer (2011). The CRIOP (Culturally Responsive Instruction Observation Protocol) assesses the frequency of culturally responsive instruction within classrooms. The tool focuses on the frequency of specific practices including: assessment, classroom caring and teacher dispositions, classroom climate/physical environment, curriculum/planned experiences, discourse/instructional conversation, family involvement and collaboration, pedagogy/instructional practices, and sociopolitical consciousness/multiple perspectives. In this section of the survey, teacher candidates are also asked to respond to two
questions about their cooperating teachers’ use of culturally responsive pedagogy. Specifically, one item asks whether their cooperating teachers model the use of culturally responsive pedagogy. The second, a complementary open-ended question, asks teacher candidates who answered the preceding question affirmatively to provide specific examples of the culturally responsive practices/strategies being modeled by the cooperating teacher. The final item in this survey (Item 44) probes whether teacher candidates feel they have/will have the necessary skills to work effectively with significant populations of students of color in a high-need school.

**Cooperating Teacher Survey.** A third and final survey (Appendix C), similar to that administered to teacher candidates, is also administered to approximately 110 cooperating teachers to ascertain information about their classroom and about the teacher candidates with whom they have worked; their beliefs about classroom diversity and their use of culturally responsive teaching practices. Again, there are three components to this survey: Part I poses 14 demographic questions, Part II seeks responses to TMAS, and Part III, My Teaching Practice, asks cooperating teachers to respond to questions about their own practice. Cooperating teachers are also asked to respond to two very similar questions asked of the teacher candidates regarding culturally responsive pedagogy. However, cooperating teachers are asked whether they actively model culturally responsive pedagogy for the teacher candidate and as a follow up to provide specific examples of these culturally responsive practices/strategies being actively modeled for the candidates. The final survey item (Item 43) in the Cooperating Teacher Survey inquires as to whether or not the teacher candidate, with whom they work, has or will have the necessary skills to work effectively with significant populations of students of color in a high-need school.
Procedures for Quantitative Data Collection. All three surveys were launched on January 5, 2015, and closed on February 16, 2015. The Program Survey was also launched on January 5th and closed on February 16, 2015. Surveys were emailed directly to program directors utilizing my email lists. Two follow-up emails were also sent directly to the group on January 19th and February 9th to ensure completion.

The Teacher Candidate Surveys were emailed directly to teacher candidates in more urban-focused programs within the fellowship program using the most up-to-date email distribution lists to which there was access. As indicated previously, direct access to the cooperating teacher database was limited to (and managed by) program directors. As such, there was a need to “enlist the cooperation” (Fowler, 2009, p. 73) of program directors. Links to the Cooperating Teacher Survey, were distributed either directly to cooperating teachers via email lists that were provided or were distributed via email through the directors of the programs themselves. In both cases, three follow-up emails were sent to cooperating teachers (again directly, where possible, and through program directors, as needed) and teacher candidates (on January 11th, 18th, and February 9th) in an attempt to improve the response rate for both surveys.

As is indicated in the IRB application that supports this study, and to protect the anonymity of survey participants, surveys are anonymous and no identifying information is contained within the program, cooperating teacher, and teacher candidate surveys.

Procedures for Quantitative Survey Analysis. Various analyses of the survey data were undertaken once the surveys closed. In addition to basic descriptive analyses of the sample population (including mean and standard deviations) and in an attempt to determine consistencies and differences among various groups, data were also cross-tabulated by gender, race/ethnicity, and demographic profile of classrooms and analyzed to determine measures of
center and variability. Moreover, item analyses, interreliability, and significance were also tested. Open-ended survey responses were also manually coded to determine themes and data for the TMAS and CRIOP sections of the survey were analyzed using STATA.

**Qualitative Research Design**

Interviews and observations comprise the two qualitative methodologies used in this study. Interviews were first conducted with the directors of the teacher preparation programs. It was important that program directors were interviewed first as they then provided recommendations about possible cooperating teacher/teacher candidate pairs for subsequent interview. (Interview Questions are found in the Appendix F). The decision to analyze qualitative and quantitative data separately facilitated the opportunity to begin interviews with study participants, soon after the launch of the surveys.

**Interviews.** While there is some controversy regarding the effectiveness of interviews as a qualitative research strategy, compelling arguments are put forth by Seidman (2014) and Quinn (2010) about the advantages of interviewing. Seidman writes:

> Interviewing is a powerful way to gain insight into educational and/or other important social issues through understanding the experiences of the individuals whose lives reflect those issues. As a method of inquiry, interviewing is most consistent with people's ability to make meaning through language… Finally, it is deeply satisfying to researchers who are interested in others' stories. (Seidman, 2013, p. 13)

The interviews in this study provide more profound understandings (insights) into the attitudes and beliefs held by and the pedagogical practices enacted by cooperating teachers in high-need
classrooms with significant populations of students of color. Quinn, who focuses on discourse analysis, offers a second rationale for the use of interviews writing in that they provide an opportunity to “produce longer stretches of uninterrupted discourse than are likely to be sustained naturally… moreover, interviewing (in conjunction with my observations) poses the “possibility of identifying inconsistencies of belief” (Quinn, 2010, p. 244).

Seidman, quoted above, noted for his use of a phenomenologically-based interviewing method, also provides important understandings about in-depth interviewing that can be used in interviews that do not conform to the three-step method that he proposes. Access to participants, making contact, and selecting participants were important issues with which to grapple early on in the study (Seidman, 2013). Seidman (2013) also argues that “the need for interview participants to consent to being interviewed introduces self-selection into the interview study which then works at cross purposes with the possibility of random selection- the dominant approach for experimental and quasi-experimental studies” (p. 55). Seidman offers purposeful sampling as the alternative to random sampling (2014). As the program director interviews began and the first two recordings were listened to, there was particular attentiveness to the need to: “listen more and talk less, keep participants focused, probe for concrete details and examples, and to follow [gut] hunches” (pp. 81-96).
Table 3.4

Interviews Conducted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program</strong></td>
<td>Provides the following information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN- DG</td>
<td>· Program Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN-DG/SZ</td>
<td>· Program Components (CT selection, evaluation, compensation, placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI- WB</td>
<td>monitoring, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-MF</td>
<td>· Candidate Preparation to use Culturally Relevant Pedagogical Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH-MW</td>
<td>· Discussions re: Race/Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH- LP/KP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ-IC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ-TM and LA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperating Teachers</strong></td>
<td>Provides the following information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN- BS</td>
<td>· Demographic Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI- KW</td>
<td>· Instructional Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH-JO</td>
<td>· Teaching Beliefs and Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ-KC</td>
<td>· Understanding of CRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Candidates</strong></td>
<td>Provides the following information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN- MB</td>
<td>· Challenges &amp; Successes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI- EP</td>
<td>· CT Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH-MP</td>
<td>· CT Pedagogical Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ-JP</td>
<td>· Understanding of CRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Discussions re: Race/Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Assessment of Ability to Teach in Similar Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptions of the interviews conducted in this study can be found in Table 3.4.

*Program Interviews.* All program directors were informed of the study, however, only directors of eight programs were invited, via email, to participate in a telephone interview.

Sampling criteria for this population was based on the fact that these program directors lead programs that are representative of the larger population of teacher preparation programs in the nationally-administered, state-based teaching Fellowship program. Specifically, programs were selected and approached to participate based on the following characteristics; size, public and private, and Research 1 status, and geographic location. Consequently, two programs were selected from each state taking into account program size, Research 1 status, and whether each is located within a public or private institution. Ultimately, nine telephone interviews (one
program director felt that her colleague, who leads the program’s clinical component, should also be interviewed and scheduling conflicts necessitated a separate interview) took place with the directors of eight teacher preparation programs. The interviews are intended to provide further understanding of: (a) the goals of the programs with regard to preparing candidates to work with significant populations of students of color and (b) how cooperating teachers are selected and prepared to do this important work. Program directors specifically discuss recruitment and selection criteria for cooperating teachers. Moreover, information was also gathered about the provision and content of cooperating teacher professional development, their evaluation, and the use and modeling of culturally responsive pedagogy at the clinical placement site. Program interviews were approximately 60 minutes (Appendix F).
Cooperating Teacher and Teacher Candidate Interviews. After telephone interviews with directors, each provided names of teacher candidates/cooperating teacher pairs they felt might be interested in and/or should be considered for interviews. The recommended cooperating teachers were canvassed via email (provided by the program director). Four teacher candidate/cooperating teacher pairs volunteered to participate in the study with full understanding that they all would participate in initial interviews but that for two pairs there would also be two classroom observations followed by a second interview. In addition, the cooperating teacher and teacher candidate participants were also fully aware that there would be no compensation for their participation in the study.

Interviews for cooperating teachers asked participants to discuss their: teaching backgrounds, teaching philosophies, instructional practices, beliefs about working with racially diverse students, knowledge and enactment of culturally responsive pedagogy, and expectations for students within their classrooms. First interviews for all cooperating teachers were approximately 45 minutes. The second interview for the two observed cooperating teachers was approximately 20 minutes. While similar in nature, the teacher candidates’ interviews largely asked that they discuss their cooperating teachers’ instructional practices, expectations of students, as well as their own knowledge of culturally responsive pedagogy and the frequency of its use by their cooperating teacher. Both cooperating teachers and student teachers were also asked whether, and if so with what frequency, they discussed issues of race and diversity. Initial interviews with all teacher candidates generally lasted 30 minutes, while the second interview (for the observed teacher candidates) lasted approximately 15 minutes.
Table 3.5

Cooperating Teacher/Teacher Candidate Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Subject(S)</th>
<th>Yrs teaching</th>
<th>Yrs mentoring experience</th>
<th>Previous mentoring experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT NJ</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Biology (Academic/ Honors/A.P)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC NJ</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT MI</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Biology/Anatomy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC MI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT OH</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>10th Grade Bio/Honors Bio</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC OH</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT IN</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Bio/Advanced Bio</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC IN</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic information about the cooperating teacher and teacher candidate pairs that were interviewed are found in Table 3.5. All interviews conformed to the guidelines established in the IRB application for this study regarding outreach and selection of interview subjects.
Outreach to potential interviewees was conducted via email and interviews with volunteers were scheduled via email. Informed consent forms were emailed to all interviewees and potential observation participants prior to the interviews. Participants returned the form via email. Each participant has a copy for their files. Interviews took place by telephone. Interview sessions were recorded by cell phone, via the DropVox application. All recordings were subsequently transcribed by Rev.com, a professional transcription service. Finally, the real names of the universities, program directors, cooperating teachers, teacher candidates, and schools are not used so as to protect the privacy of the study participants. Pseudonyms (in the form of initials) are used to ensure that the privacy and anonymity of the participants is maintained.

**Procedures for Qualitative Data Collection: Interviews.** In late January, the qualitative aspects of this study were undertaken beginning with the program directors of the eight selected programs. Dates for interviews were solicited via email and informed consent documents were sent to each participant. Those documents were signed, returned, and copies provided for their files. Interviews were undertaken with program directors, cooperating teachers, and teacher candidates. Following guidance offered by Creswell (2009), elements of the interview protocol included:

- **Administrative Information:** Pseudonym for the interviewee, date, and time of the interview
- **Introduction:** Thank you and explanation of the study
- **Interview:** Questions/Interview Areas
- **Conclusion:** An opportunity for the interviewee to share any last thoughts, questions, or things they felt it was important to know about the research topic
- **Final Thank You:** Thank you for participation (p. 183)
The first series of interviews were conducted with program directors. The first of these took place on January 13, 2015. After the first interview, interview questions were slightly modified to refine question wording of one of the questions and in one instance questions/themes were re-ordered to make more seamless transitions. The most significant modification to the interview questions/themes, however, was the addition of a final question that asked all participants if there were anything more they wanted to discuss. Specifically, interviewees were asked, “Are there any additional thoughts you would like to share? Is there anything that you feel is important for me to know? Is there anything that I should have asked and didn’t? Is there anything you are glad that I didn’t ask? Were there any surprises for you”? Each interview was recorded and then transcribed by a professional transcription service, Rev.com. In addition, a research log was kept to capture general thoughts and/or questions that emerged after each interview and as audio recordings were reviewed (Guba and Lincoln, 1985). The research log was reviewed and analyzed throughout the data collection process. The log was also used to construct future questions and to highlight areas and/or topics that required additional information or clarification during the observations and/or subsequent interviews.

Observations. The subsequent collection of data through classroom observations allowed for the triangulation of data captured through surveys and interviews. Classroom observations also afforded the opportunity to determine if there was alignment between the ways in which cooperating teachers and teacher candidates described their beliefs and practices and what was observed first-hand during classroom observations. After a cursory review of interview transcripts and the research log, classroom observations were conducted in two classrooms. The adapted CRIOP (Culturally Responsive Instruction Observation Protocol) (Appendix G) was used to focus these observations in an attempt to better capture concrete
evidence of instances and/or non-instances of culturally responsive teaching. Field notes were also taken to provide additional information about the school and the pedagogies being modelled and the expectations held by cooperating teachers. One observation site also afforded the opportunity to witness planning and debriefing sessions. Two full-day observations took place in each classroom (after the first interview and prior to the second interview). These visits provided an opportunity to observe and document instructional practices, interactions with students [verbal and nonverbal] and discussions between the cooperating teacher and her teacher candidate.

*Procedures for Qualitative Data Collection: Observations.* The choice of classrooms in which to observe was made after the teacher candidate and cooperating teacher interviews were completed, transcribed, and first cycle coding had been conducted (Saldana, 2013). Informed consent documents had already been signed by the participants prior to their first interviews. Consequently, in early March, observations of the two selected classrooms began and the second observations in each classroom were concluded in early April. Dates for observations were solicited via email.

Elements of the observation protocol included:

- **Collection of Administrative Information:** Pseudonyms for the observed pair, date, observation start and end times, and subject taught
- **Observation:** Field Notes and adapted CRIOP tool (Appendix G)
- **Conclusion:** An opportunity for the interviewees to share comments about the day and/or for questions to be asked
- **Thank You:** Thank you for participation.


*Procedures for Qualitative Data Analysis.* Again, data for this study were collected and analyzed separately. Interview transcripts were reviewed and analyzed using a deductive coding process described by Miles et al. (2014). Analysis began with pre-generated codes, which changed and were modified with each successive round of coding. As key themes emerged and were compared with subsequent interviews to determine patterns, consistencies, and contradictions. Attribute coding was also used to support the analysis of descriptive information about participants, demographics, setting, etc. (Miles et al., 2014).

Observation data collected utilizing the CRIOP (Culturally Responsive Instruction Observation Protocol) and also recorded in the research journal were analyzed and categorized using the eight pillars of culturally responsive pedagogy identified by CRIOP tool. The data collected from the observations provided examples of instructional practices cooperating teachers and teacher candidates engage in and the types of expectations cooperating teachers and student teachers have for students.
Chapter 4: Findings

Survey Findings

Surveys, interviews, and observations have provided the findings that are shared within this chapter. The purpose of the study is to provide an understanding of important research questions about the selection of cooperating teachers, their ability to intentionally model high expectations, persistence, and culturally relevant pedagogy, the attitudes they hold about working in high-need classrooms with significant populations of students of color, their effectiveness in modeling practices that support the success of these students, and whether these expectations take root during the student teaching cycle.

Surveys of program directors, teacher candidates, and cooperating teachers were administered. Demographic information is captured for all three groups. In addition, the Program Survey provides insight into program features, selection of cooperating teachers, and their preparation for the role. The Teacher Candidate Survey provides information about the candidates’ comfort with diversity (TMAS), perceptions of their cooperating teacher’s use of culturally responsive pedagogy (CRIOP), and a self-assessment as to whether they have the necessary skills to work effectively with students of color in similar high-need classrooms. Finally, the Cooperating Teacher survey similarly provides information about the cooperating teachers’ comfort with diversity (TMAS), use of culturally responsive pedagogy (CRIOP), and an assessment of whether or not the teacher candidate with whom they work has the skills necessary to work effectively with students of color once he or she is a teacher of record in a similar classroom. Much like the study unfolded, data from surveys will be presented first and then will be followed by findings captured through interviews and observations.
Program Survey Findings

Twenty-one of the 23 program directors for the state-based, nationally-administer teacher preparation program were asked to complete the program survey. Table 4.1 shows information about the programs that responded to the survey. Fifteen of the 21 program directors responded, a survey response rate of 71.4%. Seventy-five percent of the programs based in Indiana responded, 83.3% in Michigan, 100% in NJ, and the lowest response rate came from the program directors at the OH institutions (33.3%). Of the 15 institutions represented in the findings, 86.6% are programs in public universities. Additional demographic information reveals that the institutions represented are largely not classified as Research 1 institutions. Only 33.3% of the programs represented in the responses have that distinction.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Survey Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the research questions which guide this study, the recruitment and selection practices, utilized by program directors to secure cooperating teachers, are explored. Program directors were asked how decisions are made with regard to recruiting cooperating teachers who will work with their teacher candidates (Item 28). Program directors were not constrained to a
single response; instead, they were given the opportunity to provide as many responses as necessary. Consequently, multiple respondents indicated that decisions are largely made by principals and the programs themselves 66.6% and 60% respectively. However, other responses provided by program directors also reveal that districts have a role in selecting cooperating teachers and, at times, cooperating teachers identify themselves for the role. Finally, joint decisions (the program works in consultation with the school district on selection), recommendations from other cooperating teachers, and on-going relationships are among the least frequently identified ways of selecting cooperating teachers. The frequency with which each of these methods is identified was limited to only response for each.

Table 4.2

*Program Responses Regarding the Selection of Mentor Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who selects Cooperating Teachers?</th>
<th>% of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Identification</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidates</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Efforts/CT Recommendations/Ongoing Relations</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 provides data from a second question posed in the program survey which also intended to provide further understanding about the selection of cooperating teachers. Specifically, program directors are also asked to identify pre-requisites or criteria used in the selection of cooperating teachers (Item 29). Again, they are asked to indicate all applicable
responses from the response set given. The percent of programs selecting the following pre-requisites follows: Subject area matches (91.3%) years of teaching experience (73.9%), and previous experience as a cooperating teacher (56.5%) were ranked as the top three selection criteria respectively. Program directors indicated that Recommendations by: university faculty (37.0%), supervisory evaluation data (28.3%), and an application for the position (23.9%), were secondary criteria. In contrast, professional development as a cooperating teacher (17.4%) and experience working with adult learners (13.0%) were not frequently used selection criteria. Merely 4.3% of the program directors indicated that student achievement was a factor in the selection of cooperating teachers. Finally, 70.2.6% of the program survey respondents responded “no” when asked, “when participation in PD (professional development) is required as a criterion for selection, is culturally relevant pedagogy/cultural competence a topic of the professional development” (Item 32).

Table 4.3

Criteria Used In the Selection of Cooperating Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Requisites for Cooperating Teacher Selection</th>
<th>% of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation by university</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory evaluation data</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student achievement data</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience working with adult learners</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development as Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject match</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous experience as Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development in CRP is not needed for the role</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural PD requirement</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Candidate Survey Findings

Table 4.4

*Teacher Candidate Survey: Teacher Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total participating teachers</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By state:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By race:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (including Hispanic, multiracial &amp; Asian)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25 years old</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years old</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 years and older</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 provides demographic information about teacher candidates who completed the Teacher Candidate Survey. The response rate for the Teacher Candidate Survey is 44.3%. The demographic characteristics of the 249 respondents of the Teacher Candidate Survey follows: Respondents were fairly well represented among the four states with the exception of New Jersey (NJ). The percent of all respondents from NJ is just ten percent (11%). However, it is important to note that New Jersey is the newest of the four states in which the preparation program operates and as yet has had only one cohort of teacher candidates currently preparing to teach. As expected, the vast majority of the respondents are White (80%) and female (62%). Few respondents classify themselves in the Hispanic, Asian, or multiracial categories. As a result,
these respondents have been collapsed into a single category titled “Other” (8%). Sixty-eight percent of the teacher candidate respondents are younger than 36 years of age.

Table 4.5

Teacher Candidate Survey: Classroom Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 provides information regarding the demographic profiles of the classrooms in which the teacher candidates are preparing to teach. Thirty-nine percent of the teacher candidates have clinical placements in classrooms that have populations of students of color that is 40 percent or less (low-diversity classrooms). Twenty-eight percent are in classrooms with between 41 and 80% students of color (medium-diversity classrooms), and 33% are in classrooms in which the percentage of students of color is 81% or more (high-diversity classrooms). Finally, demographic information also reveals that White teacher candidates have twice the rate of participation in low-diversity classrooms (40%) than their Black counterparts.
(20%) and Other race teachers participate in low-diversity classrooms at nearly two and a half times the rate of their White counterparts (52%).

**Figure 2.** Teacher candidate TMAS findings.

Average scores for the TMAS segment of the survey for teacher candidates are relatively high (Figure 2). The rate for all teacher candidates is 79 on a 100 point scale and 3.9 on a 5.0 scale. As noted by Ponterotto, higher scores are an indicator of a greater level of “awareness of, comfort with, and sensitivity to issues of cultural pluralism in the classroom” (Ponterotto et al, 1998, p. 1002). These relatively high scores provide some evidence that the 249 teacher candidates have a good level of awareness and comfort with diverse classrooms.
Table 4.6

*Teacher Candidate Survey: Average TMAS Scores by Race and Classroom Diversity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20 items (100-point scale)</th>
<th>9 items (45-point scale)</th>
<th>20 items (Likert scale)</th>
<th>9 items (Likert scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color (n=80)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color (n=55)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color (n=63)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color (n=6)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color (n=10)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color (n=14)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color (n=11)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color (n=4)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color (n=6)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 shows that beyond the relatively high scores of the entire population of teacher candidate respondents, when disaggregated by race and classroom diversity, the responses of Black teacher candidates in all three classroom types (low, medium, and high-diversity) and for teacher candidates who classify themselves as “Other” are higher than those of White teacher candidates in all classrooms on the original 20-item scale. The one exception is teacher candidates who classify as “Other” in medium-diversity classrooms.
Table 4.7

*Teacher Candidate Survey: TMAS Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>20 items (100-point scale)</th>
<th>9 items (45-point scale)</th>
<th>20 items (Likert scale)</th>
<th>9 items (Likert scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All teachers (n=249)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By teacher race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (n=198)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (n=30)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (n=21)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By classroom diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color (n=81)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color (n=75)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color (n=93)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By teacher gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (n=93)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (n=155)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25 years old (n=86)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years old (n=83)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 years and older (n=77)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, these average scores are also maintained when the data is disaggregated by gender and age; Average scores are 3.9 for males vs. 4.0 for females and average scores are 3.9, 4.0, and 3.9 for teacher candidates in the following respective age groups 22-25, 26-35, and 36 years or older (Table 4.7). A subsequent statistical analysis was used to compare the means of different independent samples and to test whether the differences between the means are statistically significant (Table 4.8). When tested for significance using a one-way ANOVA, the 20-item TMAS indicates statistically significant differences < .05 level between Black and White
teacher candidates. The 9-item subset of TMAS and the practices items showed no such significance.

Table 4.8

*TC one way ANOVA results: X denotes significance difference at 5%*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20-item TMAS</th>
<th>9-item TMAS</th>
<th>TMAS practices items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>41-80</td>
<td>0-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-80</td>
<td></td>
<td>41-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100</td>
<td></td>
<td>81-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 also shows that for the population of teacher candidates in this study, the 20-item scale had a Cronbach alpha coefficient (measure of internal consistency) of .83 above the 0.7 – 0.8 threshold recommended for Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. Based on this and the generally high average scores for all the teacher candidates (between 3.9 and 4.1) on the original 20-item measure, nine questions that were extracted from the instrument in an attempt to capture more nuanced information about the group’s sentiments and beliefs. Specifically, items (1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 19) which focus on beliefs were also analyzed separately. A Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was used again to assess how well the items selected correlate with each other (this was done for TMAS for both teacher candidates and cooperating teachers). The coefficient alpha on the 9-item TMAS scale for teacher candidates is .74, also above the .7 threshold. These results support the validity of the 20-item TMAS and the 9-item scale within the current population of teacher candidates. It is suggested, however, that another test is needed of a larger group of teacher candidates for the findings for the 9-item TMAS to be valid.
Table 4.9

*Teacher Candidate Survey: TMAS Cronbach’s Alpha*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Candidate Data</th>
<th>Cooperating Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-item scale</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-item scale</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional analysis of the TMAS data focused on classroom diversity indicates that White teacher candidates with the largest percentages of students of color in their classrooms (high-diversity classrooms) have higher average scores on the TMAS than do their White counterparts with lower percentages of students of color in their classrooms. Nonetheless, Black teacher candidates who responded, regardless of whether they were in classrooms with low-, medium-, or high-diversity classrooms, had higher average scores and therefore seemingly higher levels of awareness and comfort with diversity (Figure 3).

*Figure 3.* Teacher candidates average TMAS score by teacher race and classroom diversity.
Table 4.10

*Teacher Candidate Survey: 20-Item TMAS Total Score Means and Standard Deviations (By Race & Classroom Diversity)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-item TMAS</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>78.69</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By race &amp; classroom diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81.90</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>77.98</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80.86</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>77.79</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78.58</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79.84</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; 0-40%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82.50</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; 41-80%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>82.20</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; 81-100%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>81.43</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; 0-40%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77.21</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; 41-80%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77.96</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; 81-100%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78.97</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race &amp; 0-40%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79.45</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race &amp; 41-80%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race &amp; 81-100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.33</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 reveals that when looking at the 20-item TMAS by means and standard deviations (by race and classroom diversity) it appears that white teacher candidates again fall below the mean of 78.69 (77.98), while Black teacher candidates and “Other” race teacher...
candidates fall above the mean. There are higher levels of consistency around the mean for respondents who identify as Black. For White teachers the standard deviations are higher.

Table 4.11

*Teacher Candidate Survey: CRP/Cultural Competence Modelling by the Cooperating Teacher*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By response category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring /Teacher Dispositions</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/Planned Experiences</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate/Physical Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse/Instructonal Conversation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy/Instructonal Practices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociopolitical Consciousness/Multiple Perspectives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement &amp; Collaboration</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Practices</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional findings are the result of an analysis of responses in the final section of the teacher candidate survey (Table 4.11). Specifically, in the *My Classroom* section of the survey, teacher candidates are first asked whether their cooperating teacher models culturally responsive pedagogy (Item 35) and then, if so, to describe the ways that the cooperating teacher does so (Item 36). 82 of the 249 teacher candidates indicate that their cooperating teacher models culturally relevant pedagogical practices (33%) and provide examples. Of these 82 responses, only 76 provide enough detail to enable a clear determination of which of the eight CRIOP pillars these practices fall within. An example of a practice modeled by a cooperating teacher
which was difficult to code is provided here. Specifically, one teacher candidate writes that his
or her cooperating teacher, “Understands that our students comes from all different backgrounds
and respects it”.

In such an instance, it is difficult to determine a specific practice being described. A few
of the examples are difficult to make sense of for different reasons. While they appear on the one
hand to offer examples of culturally responsive pedagogy, they simultaneously provide
information which in one instance, may signal lowered expectations and in the second may are
just difficult to follow. These examples follow: “My CT provides lots of ways for students to
present their answers. He rarely gives out lots of homework because of the home environment
which our students live in. The second teacher candidate writes, “Real world problems are
changed to reflect examples and situations related to the students’ lives and cultures. She
addresses different grooming needs”.

It is also important the note that some practices (21 or approximately 28%) described by
teacher candidates, straddle two categories. For example one teacher candidate writes, “She
ensures the equitable use of classroom resources, spaces, time, etc.; she engages in open
discussions led by students about a variety of topics; and is welcoming of additional resources
(paraprofessionals, translators, etc.)” In this case, the teacher candidate provides both an
example of a cooperating teacher who not only implements culturally responsive practices
aligned with the climate/physical environment pillar, but one who also employs strategies
within the discourse/instructional conversation pillar (Indicators 2 &3- The teacher builds
upon and expands upon student talk in authentic ways and the teacher shares control of
classroom discourse with students). Other examples practices that overlap two categories
follows: 5- caring/curriculum, 2- caring/family, 1-curriculum/assessment, 4-
Of the remaining responses, the vast majority (39%), are examples of **curriculum/planned experiences** followed by examples of **caring** practices (17%) employed by cooperating teachers. Also significant is the finding that within the **curriculum/planned experiences** and the **caring/physical environment pillars** culturally responsive practices can be understood to lie on two opposite ends of a continuum. Two examples from the **curriculum** pillar provide an example. While one teacher candidate shares that his/her cooperating teacher employs the following practice, “*Celebrating MLK Day and Black History Month, watching movies with Black actors in prominent roles*” another writes of the cooperating teacher, “*She relates to the students in a cultural way by understanding them. She gives background information about other cultures to help students understand other cultures better and she allows students to share their cultures with the class so we can all learn about it together*”. This pattern can also be found in the responses that have been coded within the remaining six pillars as well.

Finally, the analysis of the examples of cooperating teachers’ culturally responsive teaching practices, shared by teacher candidates,’ reveals that few responses provided fell within the remaining categories. Specifically, assessment (1), sociopolitical consciousness/multiple perspectives (1), discourse/instructional conversations (6), climate/physical environment (2), family involvement/collaboration (0), and pedagogy/instructional practices (2).
Table 4.12

*CROIP Item-Level Breakdown: Teacher Candidate Report on Cooperating Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Teacher Candidate report on Cooperating Teacher</th>
<th>Cooperating Teacher self-report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Yes</td>
<td>% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 shows teacher candidates responses to eight items, drawn from the Culturally Responsive Instruction Observation Protocol (CRIOP). Currently in the process of being validated by researchers Powell & Rightmyer CRIOP is an observation tool that has been used to both provide professional development and to assess teachers’ use of culturally responsive practices within classrooms. Teacher candidates are asked to provide a “yes” or “no” response to following mandatory questions (items 35 & 37-43) regarding whether their cooperating teacher engages in the identified culturally responsive practice. These CRIOP-aligned questions (Items 35 & 37-43) are delineated below.
35. Does/Did my CT model culturally responsive pedagogy? *
37. Does/Did my CT have high expectations for all of his or her learners? *
38. Does/Did my CT attempt to establish genuine partnerships with parents and caregivers? *
39. Does/Did my CT genuinely believe that parents were doing the best they could for their children? *
40. Does/Did my CT uses students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds to facilitate learning*
41. Does/Did my CT support students in thinking about and questioning why things are as they are? *
42. Does/Did my CT encourage students to investigate and take action on real world problems?*
43. Does/Did my CT actively challenge and discuss negative stereotypes? *

An item analysis reveals that greater than 50% of teacher candidate respondents feel that their cooperating teacher does not have high expectations of their students (53%). Another 55% also feel that their cooperating teacher does not incorporate students’ language and culture to support their learning. By contrast, a large majority (76% and 70% respectively) feel that their cooperating teacher builds genuine partnerships with parents and other caregivers and believe that their cooperating teacher provides opportunities to investigate and take action on real world problems.
Cooperating Teacher Survey Findings

Table 4.13

Cooperating Teacher Survey: Teacher Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total participating teachers</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By state:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By race:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (including multiracial &amp; Asian)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Teacher Candidate mentoring experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First time mentor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses of the Cooperating Teacher Survey are shown in Table 4.13. Sixty-seven of approximately 110 cooperating teachers responded to the Cooperating Teacher Survey (60.9%). For the same reasons stated in the analysis of the teacher candidate survey, fewer responses are from New Jersey cooperating teachers (19%), while 21% of responses are from Indiana, 28% are from Michigan, and 31% of the responses from Ohio. Again, females comprise the overwhelming percentage of respondents (72%) and Whites are the largest percentage of respondents by race (81%). The numbers of cooperating teachers who identify as Black or Other (including Asian and multiracial cooperating teachers) are 10% and 9% respectively. Twenty-
seven percent of the responding cooperating teachers also indicate that they are first-time mentors.

Table 4.14

*Cooperating Teacher Survey: Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Professional Development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Professional Development</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General PD only</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and Diversity PD</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84% of the cooperating teachers also indicate that they have participated in professional development for their role working with teacher candidates (Table 4.14). Of this group, 45% have participated in general professional development while 39% indicate that they have had specific professional development focused on race/cultural diversity/cultural competence/multiculturalism. Only 16% indicated that they have been provided with no professional development.
Table 4.15

*Cooperating Teacher Survey: Classroom Diversity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other race teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information about the demographics of cooperating teachers’ classrooms is provided in Table 4.15. The data reveal that the classrooms in which they teach are fairly evenly distributed with relatively equal percentages of cooperating teachers in high-need classrooms at three levels of...
diversity. Specifically 31% of cooperating teachers are in low-diversity classrooms (40% or less are students of color), 36% are in medium-diversity classrooms (percentage of students of color is between 41 and 80%), and the remaining 33% of the cooperating teachers are in high-diversity classrooms (80% or more students of color). With respect to race, 37% of white cooperating teachers are in classrooms that have 40% or fewer students of color. By comparison, 17% of other race teachers teach in similar classrooms and no Black cooperating teachers teach in these environments. Black cooperating teachers in this sample who teach in high-diversity classroom (81%- 100% students of color) do so at more than three times the rate at which White cooperating teachers do (86% and 24% respectively). In addition, other race teachers teach in high-diversity schools at slightly more than two times the rate of White teachers as well.
### Table 4.16

**Cooperating Teacher Survey: TMAS Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average TMAS score</th>
<th>20 items (100-point scale)</th>
<th>9 items (45-point scale)</th>
<th>20 items (Likert scale)</th>
<th>9 items (Likert scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All teachers (n=67)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By teacher race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (n=54)</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (n=7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (n=6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By classroom diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By teacher gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (n=19)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (n=48)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No PD (n=11)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General PD only (n=30)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and diversity PD</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings about the cooperating teachers’ responses to TMAS items are shown in Table 4.16. On the TMAS section of the survey (20 items), the average score of all cooperating teachers is 3.8 with regard to their appreciation and comfort with diversity. When disaggregated by race, Black cooperating teachers fall higher than the average score at 4.1 and cooperating teachers who identify as “Other” fall slightly below the average score at 3.7. Cooperating teachers in more diverse classrooms also perform above the average score while cooperating teachers in the least diverse classrooms have scores below the mean score of all teachers (3.7). On the 9-item scale
(which was intended to focus more narrowly on cooperating teachers’ beliefs), respondents have even higher average scores across the board with the exception of cooperating teachers in low-diversity classrooms whose average scores remain at 3.7.

Table 4.17

Cooperating Teacher Survey: Average TMAS Scores by Race and Classroom Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>0%-40% students of color (n=20)</th>
<th>41%-80% students of color (n=21)</th>
<th>81%-100% students of color (n=13)</th>
<th>0%-40% students of color (n=0)</th>
<th>41%-80% students of color (n=1)</th>
<th>81%-100% students of color (n=6)</th>
<th>0%-40% students of color (n=1)</th>
<th>41%-80% students of color (n=2)</th>
<th>81%-100% students of color (n=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White teachers</td>
<td>74 (9 items)</td>
<td>77 (9 items)</td>
<td>78 (9 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 (9 items)</td>
<td>37 (9 items)</td>
<td>36 (9 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7 (20 items)</td>
<td>3.9 (20 items)</td>
<td>3.9 (20 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8 (20 items)</td>
<td>4.1 (20 items)</td>
<td>4.0 (20 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>85 (9 items)</td>
<td>82 (9 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 (9 items)</td>
<td>38 (9 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 (20 items)</td>
<td>4.1 (20 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 (20 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65 (9 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 (9 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 (20 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 (20 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76 (9 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39 (9 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8 (20 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8 (20 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 shows the TMAS (20- item scale) scores for cooperating teachers when disaggregated by race and level of classroom diversity factors, White cooperating teachers with the fewest percentages of students of color in their classrooms, perform below the average score. Other race cooperating teachers perform markedly lower with an average TMAS score of 3.3, however, it must be noted that in this case the sample size is one. Black cooperating teachers perform above the average score when in medium and high-diversity classrooms. Those scores are 4.3 and 4.1 respectively.
The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the 20-item Cooperating Teacher TMAS is .73. When looking at the subset of only nine items, the measure of internal reliability is .60 which does not meet the threshold of internal consistency. Unfortunately, these results do not support the validity of the 9-item Cooperating Teacher TMAS within the current population of cooperating teachers (Table 4.18).

Table 4.19

*CT one way ANOVA results: X denotes significant difference at 5%*

A one-way analysis of variance on the 20-item TMAS for cooperating teachers reveals statistical significance at < .05 level for Black cooperating teachers who work in in high-diversity classrooms. On the subset of nine items (beliefs) statistical significance was found for Black cooperating teachers in both medium and high-diversity classrooms (4.18).
Table 4.20

Cooperating Teacher Survey: CRP/Cultural Competence Modelling for the Teacher Candidate (self-report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>By response category</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caring /Teacher Dispositions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum/Planned Experiences</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate/Physical Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse/Instructional Conversation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy/Instructional Practices</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociopolitical Consciousness/Multiple Perspectives</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Involvement &amp; Collaboration</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combined Practices</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the Teacher Candidate survey, the final section of the Cooperating Teacher Survey poses questions about the types of culturally responsive pedagogical practices modeled by cooperating teachers. Categorization of these responses is shown in Table 4.20. Specifically, cooperating teachers were asked to respond to the following question. “I actively model culturally responsive pedagogy for the teacher candidate” (Item 34). If they responded in the affirmative they were asked to “Please describe the ways in which you model culturally responsive pedagogy or cultural competence for your student teacher” (Item 35). Thirty-five cooperating teachers provide examples about the kinds of culturally responsive practices they model for teacher candidates. Of these 35 responses, only 26 are aligned with the CRIOP pillars. It is difficult to determine the meanings of nine responses. For example, one cooperating teacher writes, “Working with ESL students”, while another writes, “In attitude, speech and action”. Both responses offer no concrete information about the specific practices in which they engage.
Again there are also one or two responses that again, may in fact provide non-examples of culturally responsive pedagogy. One such example follows: "There is much group work and hands on work. I also told the student teacher that when you are working with different cultural groups, you should not be surprised if certain situations come about. I told her that this is how I handle students, this is how I handle parents, but I also ultimately told her that she would be making decisions on her own on how to deal with the different cultural groups. Tone of voice, choice of words, choice of correction for kids doing things not correctly, the way you talk to parents...It's all included in the culturally responsible realm". Of the remaining responses, 4 were examples of practices that straddled two pillars (2 caring/curriculum, 1 climate/discourse, and 1 sociopolitical consciousness/family). As was the case in the teacher candidate survey, the majority of the responses provided fell within the pillars of caring and curriculum. Specifically, of the 26 responses, 70% fell within the caring and curriculum pillars. In the first example, the cooperating teacher provides an example of caring. The cooperating teacher writes, "I use down time between classes to engage in conversations with students about their interests and lives. I allow students to be creative during projects and choose from a myriad of options to display their knowledge. I do not force students to conform to a set behavior as long as the environment is conductive to learning". In the second example another cooperating teacher provides an example of the culturally responsive use of curriculum. The cooperating teacher writes, "I try to incorporate cultural diversity in my room......use it in my story problems and anything I can do in my lesson plan to pull in different cultures/ethnicities. I show an interest in students' cultures by asking them questions and showing a genuine concern for them. I gave a scholarship that was designed for a Latino student who wanted to become a math educator". Finally, like the Teacher Candidate Survey findings, there are few examples of culturally relevant practices
aligned to the assessment practices, classroom climate/physical environment, family involvement and collaboration, pedagogy/instructional practices, discourse/instructional conversations, and the sociopolitical consciousness/multiple perspectives pillars.

Table 4.21

Cooperating Teacher Survey: CRIOP Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of CRIOP questions answered &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
<th>% &quot;Yes&quot; (8 items)</th>
<th>% &quot;Yes&quot; (4 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All teachers (n=67)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By teacher race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (n=54)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (n=7)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (n=6)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By classroom diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color (n=21)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color (n=24)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color (n=22)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By teacher gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (n=19)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (n=48)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By PD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No PD (n=11)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General PD only (n=30)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and diversity PD (n=26)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the CRIOP questions posed of the teacher candidates which asked that they evaluate their cooperating teacher’s use of culturally relevant pedagogy, the CRIOP questions posed of the cooperating teachers asked that they self-report and indicate whether they used culturally relevant practices. The findings, which can be found in Table 4.21, reveal differences by race and level of classroom diversity. On average, White cooperating teachers responded yes
to 83% the seven items posed, while Black cooperating responded yes to 88% of these items. Teachers in classrooms with the lowest percentages of students of color answered yes to only 79% of the items, while those in classrooms with the highest percentage of students of color responded affirmatively to 88% the eight items. When analyzing differences between responses by participation in professional development for the cooperating teacher role, those who had not participated in professional development indicated that they utilized 89% of the practices asked about, while those who participated in professional development which included professional development on diversity responded affirmatively to only 82% of the items.

These percentages were even lower when narrowed to a subset of four questions that were identified to have a more specific focus on the kinds of practices in which they engage with students of color (one of the specific foci of this study). All teachers responded affirmatively to 72% of the items, white teachers 70% of the items, and Black teachers 75% or the items. Again, teachers in classrooms with the lowest percentage of students of color responded affirmatively to 63% of the items (where they responded 79% affirmatively to all eight items). There were striking differences in the percentage of affirmative responses to the subset of 4 items (teaching practices) when taking into account participation or non-participation in professional development (both general professional development only and general and diversity professional development). For those cooperating teachers who received no professional development, 77% of the items were responded to affirmatively, while affirmative responses were lower for those cooperating teachers who indicated that they had received professional development. 72% of the items posed had affirmative responses for those who received general professional development whereas only 69% of the items were responded to affirmatively for those cooperating teachers who had professional development focus on diversity/culturally responsive pedagogy.
Table 4.22 provides yet another analysis of the responses of cooperating teachers to the CRIOP aligned-questions. The table provides information about the responses when disaggregated by both race and level of classroom diversity.

Table 4.22

*Cooperating Teacher Survey: Percent of CRIOP Items Answered "Yes" by Race and Classroom Diversity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% &quot;Yes&quot; (8 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color (n=20)</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color (n=21)</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color (n=13)</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color (n=0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color (n=1)</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color (n=6)</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other race teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color (n=1)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color (n=2)</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color (n=3)</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.23

Cooperating Teacher Survey: Number and % Yes on Each Item by Teacher Race and Classroom Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Teacher race</th>
<th>Classroom diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White (n=54)</td>
<td>Black (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23 provides an item analysis of cooperating teachers’ responses to the CRIOP aligned items. In all cases item 4 ("My students' parents are doing the best they can for their children?") was the most likely of the practice-specific items to be answered with a “no” response. Among white cooperating teachers, 31% responded “no” to the item. 43% of Black cooperating teachers also answered “no”. Analysis by level of classroom diversity reveals that only 58% of cooperating teachers in medium-diversity classrooms (41-80% of the students are students of color) respond affirmatively to this item.

The item analysis also reveals that beyond the fact that all cooperating teachers (at all classroom diversity levels) maintain that they high expectations for students, there are three additional culturally responsive practices in which 90% or more of all cooperating teachers indicate that they engage. These areas include: building genuine partnerships with parents and
caregivers (91%), teaching students to question the world as it is (94%), and enabling students to investigate and take action on real world problems (96%).

Table 4.24

*Cooperating Teacher Survey: CRIOP Total Score (% "Yes") Means and Standard Deviations (by race & classroom diversity)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-item CRIOP</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By race &amp; classroom diversity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-40% students of color</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-80% students of color</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% students of color</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; 0-40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; 41-80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; 81-100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; 0-40%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; 41-80%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; 81-100%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race &amp; 0-40%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race &amp; 41-80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race &amp; 81-100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A final analysis was conducted using the CRIOP responses because of the relatively high scores on the TMAS and seemingly little difference in the responses by race and classroom diversity level. CRIOP findings were also reviewed to determine whether any differences could be found with regard to standard deviations by item, race, and classroom diversity. This data can be found in Table 4.24. The findings again reveal very little by way of differences.
Interview Findings

Program Director Interview Findings

Program Goals-Nine interviews were conducted with program directors of eight programs. In one instance, the program director felt that it was critical that I also speak to a colleague who is instrumental in leading the clinical program. The findings from my interviews with program directors begins with a presentation of what is understood about their stated goals for teacher candidates preparing to teach in high-need schools with significant populations of students of color. These articulated goals assist in better understanding subsequent program director interview findings.

Analysis of the interview transcripts reveals that while each program has a stated commitment to preparing candidates for high-need schools with large populations of students of color and many focus on culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) during coursework and in initial field experiences, it is not the norm among these programs to explicitly cite, prioritize, or embed culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) within the student teaching experience. Where CRP was an explicit featured in program goals, program directors explained, it can be found in course readings, initial field work experiences, and in the conversations in which teacher candidates engage during their courses. While one director cites CRP as a priority goal (ET) and another explains that “the program handbook provides evidence of the program’s focus on CRP (NG); a third describes CRP as an element of the curriculum after first highlighting the program’s social justice framework (YC). Specifically, she shares that in addition to an emphasis on beliefs and value systems, they are working aggressively to move beyond beliefs and values to push teacher candidates to actively engage culturally responsive pedagogy.
In interviews with the directors of these three programs, Ladson-Billings, Delpit, Gay, Banks, and Villegas and Lucas are cited as influencing their work with teacher candidates. However, no specific examples are provided nor is there any discussion of specific competencies with which teacher candidates are expected to demonstrate effectiveness. Moreover, two of these three programs, share that there is no commonly held framework used by program faculty to support teacher candidates’ understandings of culturally relevant pedagogy. By contrast, the third program, however, has a singular framework, utilized by the entire school of education. Moreover, unlike the other programs within this study, faculty at this institution have been working together over the past few years to refine their understanding of culturally responsive pedagogy and their evaluation of teacher candidates’ use of it in their clinical settings. What was most clearly explicated regarding program goals for these three programs is that all have profound commitments to social justice and preparing future teachers who can think beyond the immediate and think about being advocates who can actually enact an agenda and stride towards social justice and equality (YC).

While only three of the eight programs have more clearly detailed focus on culturally responsive pedagogy in their broader programs, among all of the programs (including those already described), there is clear evidence of a more general commitment to supporting teacher candidates’ comfort and facility with diversity in the student teaching experience. Consequently, program directors provided multiple examples of clinical experiences intended to facilitate deeper understandings of—and comfort with—diverse student populations. Most frequently, they used the terms reflective practitioner or effective teacher to describe the practices that teacher candidates were being taught, and asked to implement, within courses and clinical placements. They emphasized preparing reflective practitioners who saw the intersections
between culture, teaching, and learning (JD). One clearly explained the importance of reflection saying, across the board, we really want our students to know their strengths and their weaknesses and also to really examine their practice. Teacher candidates get really intense work on this. Don't blame the victim. If they're not getting it, it's not the students' fault (NG).

As stated previously, it was not uncommon for faculty within a program to have differing frameworks for supporting teacher candidates to work in high-need schools with significant populations of students of color. In describing the varying faculty frameworks at her institution, one director explained: I'm not sure the faculty would give the same answer. Our program intent is the broad term called the reflective practitioner and that's what our framework is and our vision and mission statement are all around reflective practice. I would say all of us share the view that that reflective practice means knowing who you're teaching and preparing to teach the students you have, not necessarily the ones you wanted. I think that they would talk about it in terms of being effective teachers (NG). Another reiterated the importance of reflection, commenting that, primarily we are about ensuring that our students have the skills and knowledge and the dispositions for working with any student, wherever he or she is…Culturally competent begins with a highly critical self-reflective process about one's own cultural self and acknowledging that the differences amongst students are important. Those differences shouldn't affect anyone's expectations of their achievement. We want them to think more about what are the skills and the knowledge that students are bringing with them and value where each student is. A recognition that students come with different levels of readiness, interest and abilities and those might be aligned or might not be aligned with the way that, that school organizes learning or the curriculum materials themselves or the way that they think about their own teaching practice. I think there's also an ownership piece with that, which is as the educator, you have to
make very thoughtful pedagogical decisions based on the needs of your students and seeing them as developing human beings (YC). This director expressed great confidence that she was doing her best to help teacher candidates see themselves by utilizing varied disruptive experiences and forcing teacher candidates to question their assumptions and notions of privilege and entitlement. Nonetheless, she described some teacher candidates as remaining at a fairly low level in terms of their cultural proficiency. Not stated, but implied, was that despite this low level of cultural proficiency, some teacher candidates are still able to complete program requirements, thus enabling them to teach. She concluded by remarking, I have to say that that work is ongoing (YC).

Generally, it wasn’t an emphasis on preparing teacher candidates to use culturally responsive pedagogy, but broader goals that were invoked during the interviews. Many cited their preparation program’s conceptual frameworks, which to varying degrees stressed preparing 21st century teachers with knowledge of who your students are, how to connect with them, and knowledge of content, assessment, and research (JD). The sentiment of one program director is reflective of a number of the interviews with program directors: We want our fellows to be able to lead the classroom. We want them to be knowledgeable and proficient. We want them to be able to make learning authentic ... at their high-needs school that they would be working at. We want them to be able to connect with those students (DG).

There was widespread acknowledgement that teacher candidates (and particularly those with science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) backgrounds) would be disproportionately white and thus would need to better understand schools, communities, and the relationship between them (NY). One director stated that the program goal was to get these folks that are going to be primarily from middle class white backgrounds to understand the context
and the communities that they're going to be serving (NY). This program director described providing teacher candidates with specific learning experiences to force them out of their own experiences, comfort zones, and orient and prepare them for the clinical experience. Other directors described similar efforts to facilitate cultural competence, including establishing familiarity and comfort with students; enabling new communication styles; and building awareness and listening skills. One specifically stated we believe that those types of skills are going to help them no matter where they're going to and in what setting. We work a lot on communication skills and being proactive and so a lot of our assignments in the field experience involve interviewing or shadowing teachers and/or students (NG).

There were also those who stated that faculty colleagues were less likely to emphasize culturally responsive pedagogical skills over general teaching skills. As one director explained it, the school’s religious mission supported the belief that teachers prepared for high-need settings were taught to take a more holistic approach. We tend to use more of that [religious] language that's more broad, but certainly would encompass culturally responsive pedagogy. Regardless of where that person's coming from, you need to understand where that person's coming from, what context they are in, so you have to understand all these things about a person before you can fully try to educate them (NY). Another took this further, speaking about going beyond the acknowledgment of ethnic and cultural differences I just want to say that nothing can replace being a good teacher. Sometimes we get lost in the buzzwords and we might very much differ on this opinion. It's very important that they have good understanding of their subject matter. And a good understanding In terms of how to connect these kids, in general. And I think we should be color blind (AT).
In sum, in only three of the eight programs was there explicit emphasis on preparing teacher candidates to enact culturally responsive pedagogical practices. More importantly, attentiveness to race was noticeably absent from my interviews with program directors. Only one of the nine freely addressed race as a critical factor in the preparation of teacher candidates to work effectively with students of color in high-need schools. This program director, a biracial woman, is adamant that race must be a point of discussion within the preparation program. Consequently, goals within this program have been articulated as supporting teacher candidates in: understanding themselves as raced persons; developing relations with others across racial lines; and understanding the institutionalized ways in which students suffer along racial lines (UN). This interviewee’s colleague added that they were deeply invested in preparing candidates who might not have attended schools like the ones that in which they would be working and that they were preparing these teacher candidates to develop the social consciousness and the cultural competence to work with students not like themselves (MC).

**Findings of CRP in Field work.** As previously stated, diversity coursework is a nearly universal expectation within teacher preparation programs; and particularly so in the preparation of teachers for urban schools. So too it seems are pre-student teaching field work assignments and experiences that seek to immerse students within high-need and diverse school settings. Thus, while deep understanding of racial inequities and culturally responsive pedagogy are not stated goals for most of these programs, commitments to preparing socially-just teachers has resulted in attempts to shore up cultural competence preceding the student teaching placement. Experiences provided for the teacher candidates in this study included, but are not limited to: producing classroom and community maps, working with students in community-based programs, and observing classrooms and classroom routines. In addition, it was also common for
these teacher candidates to seek and identify the strengths (assets) and challenges within a school district. The rationale for such an assignment is for the teacher candidate to acknowledge that both exist while simultaneously considering the question, ‘How will I address the challenges and continue to build upon the strengths’ (JD)? Another routinely assigned paper is the “cultural journey paper” in which teacher candidates write about their own cultures and backgrounds, including where they started in their understanding of culture while also providing a reflection as to where they are now (UN).

Teacher candidates are also frequently asked to gauge the ways in which their cooperating teachers are meeting the needs of all the students and how classroom management strategies take shape. Teacher candidates are expressly tasked with considering how teachers enact inclusive and socially just frameworks and whether they see evidence and can provide specific examples that this is or is not in fact that kind of a classroom (YC). If in fact, teacher candidates do not see evidence of socially just frameworks they are asked what they would want to see that isn't there. Similar field work experiences were described by another program director who also asks teacher candidates to observe classrooms and schools to assess issues of equity. This program director also described the assignment as one in which teacher candidates were to spend time in classrooms observing and capturing evidence. In this iteration of the assignment teacher candidates are asked to assess, who's participating and who's not, who's being asked questions, who's responding. We then encourage them to engage in different ways of viewing the data they have collected. One of the lenses we have them look through is that of race, who's being called on and not being called on, who's volunteering, who do the pictures look like when they are manufactured? Whose work is getting displayed? Are there mass-produced posters that are in the hall? What's the tone of the posters in the halls or in the classroom? Do the classroom
rules, do they start with don't statements or do they start with we statements (JD)? Yet another assignment required by this program requires teacher candidates to review local media sources to assess the ways in which the school is represented.

For one program director, the program’s focus on preparing to teach students of color began during the recruitment of teacher candidates. *I was very clear with them that we are expecting teachers to be social change agents in this program, that you’re not just becoming a science teacher that you are becoming a social changer* (UN). Teacher candidates participated in four two-week rotations. Rotations included working with students: at a museum-based science camp, at an inner-city program that teaches students how to code switch, and at a community-based summer camp which primarily serves the Latino and Black community teaching code-switching, and finally they conducted observations in [City]. Teacher candidates in this program were responsible for writing critical incidents on a weekly basis which included descriptions of how they felt during "ah-ha" moments. Specifically, they were asked to describe *what did they learn in the moment during which you were crossing lines of difference, and how does that make you feel* (UN)? In this program, teacher candidates were also expected to have deep knowledge of district and school-level student achievement data and get to know their students in very specific ways which would result in the creation a culturally responsive lesson plan.

In describing one of the pre-requisite courses taken by the teacher candidates, one of the program directors described the objectives of the course as preparing teacher candidates to: *integrate higher order thinking within their classrooms, provide more rigorous science instruction for all learners, promote scientific inquiry, increase engagement among students; and most notably, to increase the desire of students of color to enter the STEM disciplines* (JD).
An example of one assignment from this class is a report disaggregating student achievement data within their placement school district.

Of the various field experiences described by the eight programs, one was unique. The "Brothers of another Color" collaboration between the program and a clinical placement site developed in 2009, enabled teacher candidates to work side-by-side with young men of color in a partner school. The roles of teacher candidate and student were reversed. Students were experts and teacher candidates were novices tasked with learning from the students about their lives-their likes and dislikes, successes and challenges, and their desires expectations for their education. The program director explains that through this experience and their ongoing discussions in their “Critical Conversations in Education” course, teacher candidates are given the opportunity to develop cultural competence.

In contrast with the above examples of field work intended to support teacher candidates’ abilities to develop cultural competence and/or utilize culturally relevant pedagogy, one program director indicated that culturally responsive pedagogy and special education experiences were intertwined. The rationale for this is the higher percentage of students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) within these classrooms (MQ). In addition, there is the firm belief within this program that the pedagogical strategies utilized with special education learners would support the teacher candidates’ understandings of the nature of other learners. In this program, teacher candidates are also afforded opportunities to provide homework assistance to and conducting interviews with youngsters in the local Upward Bound program. This experience is then juxtaposed against their coursework which focuses on a range of differences, including sexual differences and things like that (MQ). The program director found it difficult to provide specifics about how field work was preparing teacher candidates for success in this area. She
said, *there are things about getting to know your students and things like that, but whether it's culturally based. In some of these schools there is no way that it couldn't be culturally based* (MQ).

**Recruitment.** The manner in which these programs recruit cooperating teachers is, first and foremost, heavily dependent on district protocols. In instances where universities work directly with schools they do so happily, and where possible, they build upon long-standing partnerships with teachers, schools, and the school district to reach out to a pool of teachers who have been vetted and have performed well in the past. This was the case for just three of the programs. In one particularly strong partnership specially identified “clinical faculty/master teachers” (teachers and/or administrators in the school district) recruit cooperating teachers from within the school and district. Where newer partnerships are forming and there is less familiarity with the teaching pool, recommendations are made by a wide variety of individuals including principals, curriculum specialists and others. As the relationships solidify, selected cooperating teachers are used to provide subsequent recommendations.

Nevertheless, in other districts, district protocols require program leaders to work through the human resources department and/or other district offices which, in turn, canvass schools and/or make final decisions about appropriate candidates and provide a list of “qualified” cooperating teachers from which the university can choose. A second example of a district-controlled and formalized process for recruiting cooperating teacher includes a two-tiered process in which the first stage is a review of an application by human resource personnel and subsequent consultation with a school principal. A third program director explained that in the search for cooperating teachers there is intervention by both curriculum specialists and principals in the two school districts with which she partners. In the first district, teachers are invited to
attend an orientation program. Anyone who attends the initial meeting has been deemed to be of “good quality”. In the second district, all teachers are able to attend orientation sessions, however, intervention by curriculum specialists, means that ultimately only a subset of those teachers who attend an orientation session are eligible to become cooperating teachers. For this program, the difficulty of recruiting cooperating teachers is further increased due to the desire to place multiple teacher candidates within a school. In this case, recruitment efforts which are led by the school district must also take into account the need to identify school sites in which the entire school culture is one of a teacher preparation.

A second program director who also needed to recruit within two districts also described markedly different approaches to the recruitment of cooperating teachers. While both were district- controlled processes, she divulged that one district’s is very challenging. Particular frustration resulted from working with this district office to identify cooperating teachers because it's such a densely administrative district that it was hard to get to the right people and then to get access into classrooms (MC). The program director noticeably contrasts this experience with her experience in a second district. She explained an administrator who sort of facilitated bringing the program into the district, was wonderful; very open to meeting with us, and very hands-on. She made suggestions and I believe that she also asked department chairs who they would recommend, so access there was really easy. While also an example of a district-driven process, still another program director, engages in similarly stress-free recruitment processes. Her experience is decidedly more collaborative as the superintendent and curriculum supervisors are actively involved as partners in discussions about the recruitment of the cooperating teachers. Consequently, the program director and the district curriculum supervisors collaboratively make decisions regarding potential cooperating teachers.
Selection Criteria. When pressed about the criteria used to select cooperating teachers, program directors often said that they were looking for the district’s and/or schools’ “best teachers”. In almost every case, selected cooperating teachers were expected to have a Master’s degree, solid knowledge within their content area, and three years of teaching experience. Beyond this though, program directors had differing priorities—at times constrained by logistics.

Competence was frequently invoked as a selection criterion. In choosing from among cooperating teachers who previously worked with the university, a program faculty member stated that she was looking for “competent” CTs. So competent, meaning that I believe that they were effective teachers, given how they talked about their practice, mainly, because I hadn’t actually seen all of them actually teaching. So a lot of it was based on how I heard them talking about teaching, how I heard them working with their teachers, how they interacted with the group, that they seem to add valuable input (MC). Having had the opportunity to visit a potential CTs classroom (which was not always possible) she stated she is one of the teachers that I felt was competent based on other factors. She was strong in the classroom, and her students were all on task during the lesson, her lesson was very engaging and was targeted on the objective. So not only was it something where students were all engaged, but they were all also saying the right stuff and asking the right questions, that made me feel like they were working effectively towards the objective. In this instance, the program director prioritized the ability of the cooperating teacher to enact important mentoring skills as well as pedagogical skills. Honestly, the biggest thing that I was looking for with the teachers was that ... like I said, they were engaging, thoughtful about their practice, were able to talk about their practice, were able to talk about being a learner, and being able to tell somebody else how they're still learning. So I was not explicitly looking for the type of teacher I was expecting my teachers to
be. Another was similarly interested in selecting individuals who saw themselves as learners. 

No one is perfect... that everyone seems to evolve (JD).

In keeping with the focus on effective pedagogical practice, one program leader stated her desire that cooperating teachers integrate inquiry within their pedagogical practice, and it would be great if it [the lesson observed] had some sort of inquiry to it. However, I know that that's not something I would see necessarily in every lesson, but I would hear them talking about ways in which they attend to something or not in their classroom (UN). Her colleague echoed the inquiry criterion adding that potential cooperating teachers need to be open to an inquiry style of teaching, which is, really, the aim of the academic section of the preparation while also seeking to identify the potential CT’s teaching philosophy and general dispositions around their students, around urban education (MC).

Other program directors prioritize cooperating teachers who are able to create and maintain positive classroom environments. One explained that he conducted multiple classroom visits in search of effective cooperating teachers. Specifically, during his visits, he sought to determine, what does this teacher look like with the students and does it look like a positive environment? Even if the classroom may not be setup very well for science and those kinds of things, what does that relationship look like with his/her students (NY)? When unable to visit classrooms himself, he tasked recommenders with assessing the quality of the potential cooperating teachers’ relationships with students. He lamented the frequency with which he visited classrooms in which he saw just poor examples of them [teachers] being able to respond to adolescents generally and minority adolescents more specifically. A second also noted that rapport and classroom climate were important criterion for selection which was handled by her district partner. Accordingly, the cooperating teachers recommended by the district are those
teachers with few discipline referrals. They are people that are effective with the population in the building. They know how to work with the population and they're not sending them to the office. They know how to build community in the classroom and they know how to address issues so that they don't escalate. By way of example, she described mentor as being authoritative; students don't view him as a threat but they also don't often walk over the line (NG).

Keeping in mind the role of some districts in both recruiting and selecting cooperating teachers, in some places there was clarity around the criteria used for selection, while in others, beyond the pre-requisite Master’s Degree and three years of satisfactory teaching experience, it was far less clear what criteria is used. For example, as reflected in an earlier recruitment example, when selection was carried out by district staff (including curriculum specialists and principals) anyone who attended an orientation meeting of CTs was already deemed to be of “good quality” (MQ). In this instance and in others, the program had no specific details as to the characteristics of “good quality”. At other times, the criteria for selection is known to program directors and the term “qualified” indicates a range of potential cooperating teachers including those with one or more of the following characteristics: teachers with tenure; teachers who have not hosted a teacher candidate in the preceding semester; or teachers with satisfactory evaluations. Two such examples follow: When we're [both the program and the district] thinking about dynamic teachers or individuals if we were to go through the Danielson process ... which one of these teachers would be in the 3/4 range of the scales (JD). Another program director also explained the use of teacher evaluations in the criteria identified by the school district. She explained they are also looking for master teachers that have been either identified as highly effective. They will never place, allow us nor do we want to place with anybody that's been deemed ineffective or low performing or like that. They're always placed with high performing
teachers for their mentors for the most part because the district is afraid if they put one of our interns with a marginal teacher, then the students will suffer even more (NG).

Partnerships. Regardless of who controls the recruitment and selection of the cooperating teachers all programs cite particularly close and fruitful relationships with school districts. These relationships tend to extend across several years and, at times, were the result of collaboration on joint projects. One particularly significant relationship involves a program that was instrumental in the development of the district’s teacher evaluation framework and has also collaborated with the district on multiple mutually beneficial Teacher Quality Partnership grants. A second strong partnership, mentioned earlier in this section, employs district-based clinical faculty who recruit and select cooperating teachers. This program director stated, without our clinical faculty, we would not have any idea of who we were getting in terms of cooperating teachers. Because they know the teachers in their building and they are teacher leaders themselves, they then know who the master teachers are (ET). Yet another illustration of the strength of some of these relationships is provided by one of the programs which have strong ties with its districts. The program maintains these relationships by agreeing only to place teacher candidates who have familiarity with the districts’ instructional frameworks and priorities.

Again, even in the instances in which selection of the cooperating teachers is closely monitored and/or regulated by the school district there are strong partnerships. One program director explained that once the district narrows down the list of CTs, program staff are able to request an exception should they determine another teacher to be a better candidate. In this instance too, the university has established a school-university partnership team which meets three times a semester and is comprised of a district representative, collaborating teachers, field
supervisors and the program coordinators who closely monitor placements and to assess effectiveness and to determine necessary changes to the clinical structure.

Despite these many examples of strong partnerships with school districts; including opportunities to meet with principals and school district administrators, there were challenges to these relationships. Already noted was the heavy bureaucracy in one district. However, for another program, a particularly strong partnership is hampered by the many competing priorities of their struggling school district. As such, despite collaborating closely on the selection of mentors during the early years, more recently this program has needed to rely more heavily on initially selected mentors to bolster its ranks of cooperating teachers. This program director noted, the district was very helpful but we now just sort of pick up on what the strengths were among the mentors we have found (NY).

**Evaluation of CTs.** For the most part, program directors describe very informal evaluation practices related to the work of the CTs. Beyond the few programs which ask teacher candidates to provide feedback on their cooperating teachers, none had any additional formal structures in place to evaluate the quality of support being offered to the candidates. Moreover, only one of the eight programs formally assessed the cooperating teachers’ use of culturally responsive pedagogies. In this program, once a semester, teacher candidates assess their cooperating teacher on the following areas of their practice: lesson plans, teaching methods, materials and resources, technology, classroom management, classroom interaction, individual needs and multicultural awareness, attitude, and communication and mentoring practice. This feedback from candidates is collected and analyzed over time.

In the other programs, in which teacher candidates provided evaluations of their cooperating teachers, feedback sought was more open-ended evaluations. Among other
questions, directors asked teacher candidates to assess what candidates learned from their cooperating teacher. Specifically, informal survey questions included: *Did you get the kind of help in mentoring that you expected from that cooperating teacher? What would be different (YC)?* Even at this site, which employed clinical supervisors to monitor placements, clinical supervisors were not tasked with the formal evaluation of the cooperating teacher, but rather provided an additional set of informal feedback about each of the cooperating teachers.

The following statement is more reflective of the informal nature of evaluating cooperating teachers. *It's informal in the sense of I just work with them. A lot of these people I've worked with for years so it's just a matter of ... I know their styles because I sat in their classroom for so long. When I see a red flag or there's sometimes when we do the interview process and I'm thinking this person won't work or it's just informal I guess is the easiest way to say it* (LQ).

Other areas informally assessed by programs include the openness and willingness of CTs to let the teacher candidates teach in ways that differed substantially from their own teaching, and their ability to communicate their concerns to candidates. One program director remarked *we don't want somebody that just sends their grade to the student's face and then bitches about them in the teacher's lounge* (NG). This program director is particularly interested in the quality and consistency of feedback for both teacher candidates and program leaders. *I think our best mentors are the ones that pick up the phone and call me or drop me a note saying, ‘Ezra doesn't seem quite with it today’.*

When pressed, program leaders also shared that it was these informal evaluations which they relied upon when making decisions as to whether or not to end relationships with cooperating teachers for whom they had multiple negative reports. *When we have more than a*
couple of times that a candidate has not recommended that this person be a mentor again. When the district offers just that person, we usually turn it down (NG). Despite having had to end relationships on multiple occasions, in no case did program directors use more formalized evaluation techniques themselves (nor did they appear to have asked this of their clinical supervisors or other university personnel) to assess the experiences being provided to teacher candidates. Most surprisingly, in more than one instance, program directors indicated that despite seeking feedback about CTs from the teaching candidates, they felt it inappropriate to evaluate the CTs in their roles.

One program served as an outlier with regard to formal feedback. While the program is described here, the formal structure is not yet in place. Instead, program leadership is presently rethinking the evaluation of the cooperating teachers to focus more squarely on the quality of support being given to the TCs. There are a couple of different ways that we’ve approached it. We’ve tried to triangulate it, so the first thing we did was, in December, we asked the resident fellows to complete a survey about their CT, and there were some pretty hard-hitting questions, like, What's the quality of the feedback you've been receiving? "How often are you being observed?" "How often are you co-teaching with them?" "How often are you taking the lead in teaching?" Really quantifying what their experience has been, and then leaving sort of an open-ended area for them to express whatever it is that's going on. The second piece of that, which I've just collected, I've taken a similar kind of document and reformatted it and sent it off to the CTs. They are doing a self-evaluation, yes. I'm going to take that information, put it together, and then we [colleague] are going to meet, and the 2 of us are going to collaborate in putting it all together and writing up an evaluation of each one (MC). While still in the early stages of development, the evaluation of cooperating teachers is viewed as important and is
being carefully considered. Consequently and a more formalized cooperating teacher evaluation process will result.

**Monitoring Placements.** While formal evaluations of cooperating teachers are limited, the mechanisms for monitoring the clinical placements provided to teacher candidates were more prevalent. In only one instance are district/school-based clinical faculty charged with the responsibility of monitoring placements. *Our clinical faculty monitors out in the schools. They keep an eye on what's going on with the clinical placement. If there are any issues between the cooperating mentoring teacher and the student teacher, they are the first level to help negotiate that. They help the student teacher navigate the school, set up any additional observations, that sort of thing that they need to do. They're the liaisons and they work directly with the cooperating teacher. They’re also the ones who help make the specific placements and they’re the active point person also for the student teacher. We also know that there's a need for advocacy there many times and so the university supervisor is that liaison* (ET). More commonly university personnel (either the program director or other clinical staff) are responsible for observing teacher candidates in classrooms several times a semester. These individuals are also charged with assisting when ruptures emerge in the relationships between teacher candidates and their cooperating teachers. The individuals tasked with addressing these ruptures were often described as being particularly skillful at being able to mediate difficult relationships and/or observe potential issues and give feedback. *That's why I stayed in school so much in the fall, making sure there was no conflict. But if this were to happen, we'd have to have a conversation with the administrator and the teacher, per se* (EH). Another indicated that if the collaborative teachers have any issues, that's when they call me and I'll come in outside of those times and work with teacher candidates and teachers (LQ).
In what are particularly intensive clinical placements, supervisors are in classrooms almost daily. *I would say, anywhere from one to four times a week.* Between two of us, there's probably someone in the classroom in that particular teacher's classroom, on a weekly basis. Sometimes every other week, if we feel the collaborating teacher's really strong. Formal visits in this institution take place once a semester with candidates receiving one from at least two different faculty members (UN). In these instances, program faculty feels the need to see firsthand what is happening in the placement rather than relying solely on the perceptions of the teacher candidates or cooperating teachers. One director explained her need to take notes and ask reflective questions which promote conversations. *I always see myself as that third part the communication and as a support for mentor and the protégé in their relationship* (JD).

While each program showed significant commitment to visiting and monitoring placements, visits were predominantly focused on *seeing how things were actually going, in the relationship between the co-teacher and the [teacher candidate]. Whether they are actually adjusting, whether they had an engagement with the students in the classroom- just to get a head start in case there were and potential problems or challenges that they were experiencing* (EH). The focus of these visits was largely on the work of the teacher candidate. Participants confirmed that the majority of the time, they meet solely with the teacher candidate to determine the status of the placement. At times, however, the cooperating teacher is invited to join the conversation and share their feedback. One of the program leaders acknowledged the tension. *I like to get the Fellow (teacher candidate) alone. The collaborative teacher can be a little too invasive. Other times, if needed, I will do it with both. For instance, the goals, I like to have both people there so that we can be on the same page. I like to have the teacher there when we're talking about things that are going well because sometimes the fellows (TCs) are humble and*
they can't think of what they're doing well. The teacher helps them remember, oh, that's right. You're doing this and this and this and this (LQ).

As indicated previously, one program is working to strengthen their evaluation process for cooperating teachers. As part of this process, they are also attempting to finalize a formative assessment system that will fulfill two important goals. First, it will provide more timely information about the progress being made by the teaching candidates. Second, and more importantly, for the purposes of this study, they have determined the importance of the cooperating teacher in the formative assessment system. That's what we're doing, and also, in conjunction with that, I did a workshop with our collaborating teachers on collecting evidence of teaching. Yvonne's just scripting a lesson, so coming up with these handy-dandy little tools, any gathering tools that are not obnoxious and difficult to use, and including video, and then ...

When I meet with them, or the collaborating teachers meet with them, we have collected evidence of teaching, so that's what we talk across. The other thing that we've done is we've put that field work tracker inside a folder that's on Google Drive ... The CTs can see it, all of the faculty members can see it, and the residents can see it. Along with the field work tracker, a folder for their lesson plans, and a folder that includes all of their formal observations. Then, on Google, their lesson plans, because everything is on Google Drive, we have our collaborating teacher. By 8:00 on Thursday, the resident fellows have to submit their plans for the following week, and by 12:00 noon, Saturday the collaborating teachers have to comment on them (MC).

**Modelling of CRP by CTs.** Only four program directors were able to provide concrete examples of culturally responsive practices modeled by cooperating teachers. These program directors were able to share examples of cooperating teachers who enacted pedagogies which ensured safe spaces in which students could learn and recognized that difference and its value in
the learning environment. These cooperating teachers were also attempting to validate students, in a way that doesn’t make anyone feel uncomfortable (YC). Specific practices ranged from simple to complex. Specific examples include providing and/or supporting K-12 students in learning about their history and challenging teacher candidates in very pointed ways about their sense of privilege and entitlement (YC). Examples of the culturally relevant pedagogies utilized and modeled by cooperating teachers and spotlighted by program directors follow.

One program director shared that it was only after seeing his students’ reactions to and the movie Selma and engaging students in a follow-up discussion about the civil rights movement, that one of her teacher candidates understood the importance of such opportunities. The teacher candidate had been particularly distressed about the interruption in learning caused by viewing the film. His mind was profoundly changed, however, when he understood how little the students knew and understood about the time frame. She recalled, He was glad that students had the opportunity to see the movie and have a new understanding of the time period (DG).

Another highlighted a cooperating teacher who spoke with his teacher candidate about the rich sources of information that students bring to school. This understanding that students are coming in with ... They're not coming into class as a blank slate (MC). This particular CT also skillfully explained to the teacher candidate that in addition to the knowledge students bring with them they also occasionally bring their troubles and that there should be recognition of that fact.

The program director continued, For example, a student comes into class, puts their head down: does the teacher go over and confront them, and, in a sense, humiliate them in front of everyone? No, the teacher takes the student aside or whispers softly something to them, gives them an opportunity to respond, doesn't ... So the approach is not confrontational. In such instances, teachers understand that there are other factors at play and will provide the space and care
needed to support the student (MC). Other examples shared included pedagogical decisions that illustrated the teacher’s high expectations of his or her students. Another cooperating teacher, described by this program director provided students with frequent opportunities to work in homogeneous or heterogeneous groupings such that students can work collaboratively and democratically. She explained that the teacher makes these decisions purposefully so that he/she is, focused on supporting those students who need it most while simultaneously trusting those students who need very little support to work independently.

A second program director highlighted one cooperating teacher as being particularly skillful at using culturally responsive pedagogies. The teacher, a petite, blonde White woman is described as having interactions with students that are “like mothering”. These kids come to class and they perform for her. She doesn’t have a quiet classroom and does not try to confine them, but she has that balance I think some of them just have without knowing they have it. There are things that she’s doing that makes her connect with students and also have expectations and that they will do what she asks them to do (LQ). A third program director shared that her best cooperating teachers were good at sharing information about significant places and spaces that lie at the heart of a community. Cooperating teachers then used this knowledge to support both the academic and non-academic needs of the students. The program director also maintained that particularly good cooperating teachers also help teacher candidates to identify individuals and support networks that can serve as untapped sources of important information about issues with which students are grappling. Specifically, the program director underscored that often it is the non-pedagogical K–12 school staff that have the most information about students. She provided as an example a cooperating teachers who recently shared with a candidate, ‘the hall monitors know more about what’s happening with Norman and Benno, so go find out because Gerald's
been out of it this week’ (NG). The teacher candidate assigned to this cooperating teacher also commented that as a result of his newly emerging relationships with cafeteria staff, he was able to get to a couple of kids through the cafeteria ladies. His subsequent relationship with these ladies resulted in cafeteria staff’s messages to students to take it easy on the teacher candidate or specifically to chill because he [the teacher candidate] was cool (NG).

On the other hand, it was more difficult for some program directors to quickly pinpoint and highlight examples of culturally relevant pedagogy and more than one lamented over the many teachers whom they had seen during their search for cooperating teachers that engaged in practices that were decidedly not culturally relevant (NY). Another also struggled to give specific examples that she had seen or heard about at the classroom level but instead described the two sites at which teacher candidates were placed as utilizing culturally responsive practices at the school level. Her examples stress one principal’s focus on having teachers consistently communicate messages of success to students (ET) and a second who assigns STAR groups (a group of 25 students) to each of his teachers with the expectation that they will guide and mentor their charges over the course of their middle school years.

One discussion with a program director is worthy of attention. Due to district restructuring, a teacher candidate who had been working well (with a cooperating teacher skillful at culturally responsive pedagogy) in an all-male STEM honors classroom, had to be placed elsewhere. Despite the challenge of the placement the cooperating teacher said she was just not letting go and just not giving up as she worked to develop the boys’ confidence. The teacher candidate ultimately landed in a classroom with a cooperating teacher considerably less able to model culturally relevant pedagogy. When asked to provide culturally responsive pedagogy examples in the new placement, the program director explained, I've seen more overt practices in
...in regards to culture ...and in regards to very honest dialogue in [the previous placement]. In this new setting, I would find it more... I'm going to use the term universal (JD). The program director further described all that the initial pair had been doing together to support the students. The cooperating teacher and teacher candidate had come up with great “teachables from trashables” ways to demonstrate that I don't have to have the fanciest lab equipment to teach basic concepts in biology to my students. He [the TC] even referenced that today- that he actually used recyclables because he's now transitioned into another placement, and he ended up using recyclables for an experiment. The program leader continued that's the kind of resilience that I'm looking for and that they're going to continually reflect on...that instead of complaining about the students, turn that mirror to yourself. What have I done? Have I done everything possible to promote an environment of equity as well as high expectations for all of my students and articulate that with my families? Unlike in the teacher candidate’s previous placement where his cooperating teacher was modelling culturally responsive pedagogy, in this subsequent classroom he is modelling what he knows about CRP for his cooperating teacher.

**Frequency and Discussion of CRP by CTs.** The nearly universal response, when asked about the frequency with which race emerged as a topic of discussion with their cooperating teachers, was, *rarely, if ever.* When pressed, it became clear, however, that these discussions did occur- but rarely were named. Various patterns emerge. Some indicated that race is never discussed and there is little or no need for the discussion. Others took the approach that the very nature of working in a high-need school with large populations of students of color means that there is no need for such a discussion. And, finally, there are those who recognized that explicit conversations do not take place, but instead, coded language is frequently used by cooperating teachers.
Of the program directors who insisted that conversations about race never came up (DG), there were those who explained that the very nature of the work of mentors and teachers in high need schools with large populations of students of color make it a moot point. One program director revealed that the cooperating teachers’ many years of experience meant that race and diversity were rarely discussed instead they were grappling with other aspects of the role. I would say these days it doesn't come up a lot, because I think most of our cooperating teachers have been doing this quite some time, so it's more natural in their modeling for their fellows, so usually the kinds of things that are coming up in these conversations deal more with their role as a mentor and how do they transition from being that teacher of students to now teaching these pre-service teachers. At least, that's where my conversations tend to focus (ET).

While two program directors also said that no conversations about race take place, examples provided by each reveals that race indeed emerges in their conversations with cooperating teachers and teacher candidates. However, the discussions were coded and racial implications unacknowledged. The first stressed that she had never engaged in conversations about race with the cooperating teachers, she also readily acknowledged that the cooperating teachers frequently used deficit language in their discussions with the teacher candidates. Cooperating teachers at one of her sites, specifically the one with the least percentage of students of color, often commented well these kids aren't ... I can't ... We can't assign homework because we can't expect to get it back. We can't give them a textbook because we can't expect to see them back. They might be gone for two weeks and we don't get the book back (YC). This director stated that she took particular pains to challenge these pronouncements during sessions alone with the teacher candidates.
Likewise, the second program director also explained conversations about race rarely take place before revealing having also frequently overheard conversations and advice from cooperating teachers that included cautions to be mindful of home environments when designing plans. *They'll [CTs] articulate their frustration about work habits and/or inaccessibility to technology for some students once they leave the high school.* Consequently this PD and her colleagues were challenging cooperating teachers to increase their pedagogical bag of tricks. Specifically they were being encouraged to consider flipped classroom models and inquiry designs. The program director admitted to meeting with resistance. For the teacher candidates though, she continued to push and prod *Yes you need to be mindful of those things; however, that should not keep you from having expectations of the kids and being very intentional with your planning, which goes back to always bringing them back to prior learning. You understand the resources. You understand access issues. You understand roles and responsibilities of our students once they leave the school. How can you still stimulate and empower our students to take responsibility because that is also what is necessary for post-secondary education* (JD). In neither case did these program directors explicitly bring race to bear as an underlying factor in their discussions with cooperating teachers or teacher candidates.

The outlier, however, is one program that acknowledges it is struggling to determine how to tackle this issue more directly. The director disclosed that their *cooperating teachers had so much experience as teachers themselves in an urban high-need district that there was an innate awareness of what it takes to work in such an environment.* Nevertheless, the cooperating teachers were increasingly challenged by and critical of teacher candidates who they deemed unable to understand the context in which they had been placed. In this case, the program director, along with colleagues, is *working collaboratively with the cooperating teachers to*
identify ways in which they might sensitize the teacher candidates to their context (UN).

Important to note in this case, however, that there is an assumption here that the extensive experience of the cooperating teachers implied that their own assumptions didn’t also need to be interrogated.

**Cooperating Teacher Interview Findings**

Table 4.25

Cooperating Teacher Interview Participant Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Subject(s)</th>
<th>Years teaching</th>
<th>Years mentoring experience</th>
<th>Previous mentoring experience</th>
<th>School demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NJ (LD)</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Biology (Academic/Honors/A.P) Honors Genetics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40% 27.5% Black 12.5% Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI (LZ)</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Biology/Anatomy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH (KP)</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>10th Grade Bio/Honors Bio</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Semester</td>
<td>75-80% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN (CU)</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Bio/Advanced Bio</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>98% Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic information about the four cooperating teachers that were interviewed is found Table 4.25. The cooperating teachers interviewed for this study are females over the age of 36 years with between nine and twenty years of teaching experience. Three of the four are White and the fourth is Black. All also teach a variety of high school biology courses. Two of the cooperating teachers have three years of mentoring experience within the state-based nationally administered teacher preparation program and two have only been mentoring within the nationally-administered state based during the current year. Three also have previous mentoring experience lasting between one semester and seven years.

Three of the four cooperating teachers have classrooms with high percentages of African-American/Black students (98%, 70%, and 90%). The fourth classroom has a lower percentage of
students of color (40%), and a greater number of Hispanic students (12%). Also, despite the preponderance of Black students in three of the schools, there is still variation amongst the schools, nonetheless. For instance, one has a particularly large special education population. *We have a large IEP, special learning disabilities group. At least 30% of the 10th grade that we teach has IEPs. We have about 160 students that we see during the course of the day. We have one class in which 51% of the students are Special Ed. The rest are anywhere from 30% up, I think the lowest we have is 9%. There is Special Ed in every class* (KP). Of the two schools with an approximately ninety-eight percent Black student population one also had *a small percentage of students that are mixed race, Hispanic or white* (CU). The second school with a 98% Black student population is also said to have *a small group of students who are White and some of Middle Eastern descent* (LZ). Finally, the school with the lowest percentage of Black students (and student of color generally), is surrounded by several high poverty districts and a nearby army base which results in greater socioeconomic diversity (LD).

**Selection Criteria.** The cooperating teachers interviewed are largely unsure of the specific reasons for their selection but surmise that it is the result of long-standing partnerships with universities and/or individual faculty members or their work within school districts- one is a highly regarded within the school district for her teaching and professional development skills. Two of the cooperating teachers were specifically tapped by staff in their respective districts. One of these two was also selected based on her teacher evaluation scores. For one, a previous school administrator, the role of cooperating teacher was also contingent on participation in mandatory professional development aligned to the program’s commitment to a co-teaching model of student teaching.
Compensation. Stipends for their work as cooperating teachers ranged from $600.00 - $2,000.00 per student teacher. However, this amount might be slightly skewed because one of the participants chose not to reveal the exact amount of the stipend she receives from the program. It is important to note, that while appreciative of the financial compensation, cooperating teachers were not motivated by it. Two, in particular were adamant that the professional development afforded them and the opportunity to learn new ideas were equally important incentives. The cooperating teacher compensated least for this work remarked, *I think I make $600 a year in terms of money, but I also get new ideas from my student teachers, which is fabulous, because you know you are in your room and a lot of times you don't get to go and see other teachers teach. So I get P.D., 600 bucks, and new ideas from my student teachers* (LZ).

Evaluation. Echoing the findings of the program director interviews, each cooperating teacher is also unsure of whether and/or in which ways they are being evaluated. They indicated that if an evaluation was occurring it is likely being done informally. All four also share that classroom visits and observations made by university personnel are largely focused on assessing the student teachers’ progress. One stated, *I don't really know. I know I evaluate them [teacher candidates], and I'm sure they go to class and talk about what I'm doing. They discuss it in their classes. But a formal evaluation...I never get any feedback from them, if they do it* (LZ). In the one instance in which a slightly more formalized observation process was described by a cooperating teacher, she qualified that the evaluation is focused of the level and quality of collaboration between herself and the teacher candidate. She stated, *I think they're looking at how we interact* (CU). In this instance too, no feedback was provided about the content and/or quality of the support she is providing to her teacher candidate.
Professional Development for the Role. Three of the four cooperating teachers have received professional development for their role—slightly lower than the larger group of cooperating teacher survey respondents 84% of whom indicated they have received professional development. The professional development depicted by interviewed CTs includes highly specific topics such as co-teaching and working with adult learners workshops mandated for one; more general topics such as having difficult conversations for others, and one explained that the professional development sessions offered were administrative in nature. *I think we've had maybe about two or three of them so far this year focused on administrative aspects such as the paperwork* (LD). While poverty and “approaching low socioeconomic groups” were addressed during CT professional development sessions, beyond generic sessions on engaging student learners (which was described as *keeping your audience in mind* and *understanding kids as individuals* (LZ), none described participation in professional development focused squarely on culturally responsive pedagogy or elements therein.

Instructional Philosophy. When asked to describe their instructional philosophies cooperating teachers provided differing philosophies about teaching and learning. Two focused heavily on content and/or preparation for work or the future. *I try to prepare them for the next step. I'm focusing on college and career readiness...I try to get them to focus and articulate on what are your plans so that you can start thinking about how you can apply what you're learning in the classroom to real life, or definitely what you plan to do next* (CU). In addition, the importance of increasing scientific literacy amongst students was offered by the second cooperating teacher. *My instructional philosophy is increasing scientific literacy, not specifically teaching them biology. That sounds kind of strange ... students do not know that they are specifically going into biological sciences as a major in college, don't feel like they have*
anything to relate to the subject. It becomes really difficult to teach it to them, especially when we get into higher concepts or a lot of detail. I approach it as, this thing is new in science and this is why it's really cool. This is why it applies to you or could apply to you in the future (LD).

The remaining cooperating teachers, while also focused on student learning, spoke differently about their instructional philosophies choosing instead to first prioritize personal connections, engagement and relevance. The first was adamant that relationships were critical. A lot of, I think, what I do is that building relationship part. Sometimes I feel that is more important than the actual content. If these students that we have, if they decide they don’t like you, they'll take the F. They'll think that will hurt the teacher. I don't like that teacher, I'm not doing anything for him, and they'll sit in class and do nothing. They will take the F and they don't see that they're only hurting themselves. Relationships are very important where we're at (KP). The second, stated as a given that all students could learn before remarking, It's just a question of making it relevant, rigorous and interesting. And so, I am very, very big on engagement piece. I do sort of "edutainment"...we have a blast, and we do things that are the required things to learn, but we at least take it through the lens of why the hell should I care? Why should I know this? Why is this important? How does this apply to my real life? And so, we do a lot of focus in that area, and that engages them, interests them, and then their mind is open to receive and to explore different ideas (LZ).

Perceptions of Student Ability. Two of the cooperating teachers, rather than first describing the assets and funds of knowledge students bring to school with them, the cooperating teachers’ descriptions of their students’ academic abilities focused first and foremost on what students were unable to do and the skills they did not have (Gonzalez et al., 2013). They don't come with a lot of science background knowledge (CU). In addition, three of the four
cooperating teachers shared that many students were struggling readers with *fairly average skills* (CU) to *I'll say some read at middle school grade to about tenth grade* (LD). This cooperating teacher added that the students were *just as able but they either don't have any confidence or they were raised or conditioned to believe that they're not good at science for whatever reason* (LD). Even one of the two cooperating teachers who prioritized student relationships, began by detailing what the students were unable to do. The honors students in her school were described as struggling readers. She also added *the majority is usually at or below grade level, so it makes it difficult as far as using ... We don't use an Honors textbook, because the reading level is so hard.* This cooperating teacher further added, *other things I notice too, is the vocabulary. It's basically a lot of it's all the kids here and I think it is more poverty issues maybe. They're not exposed to vocabulary like I was growing up. The parents don't read to them* (KP). It was also not uncommon during these interviews to hear cooperating teachers share that student work habits outside of the school were poor. *They don't really have strong study skills outside classwork. You can get them to do things in class reasonably, but as soon as they leave the classroom, you cannot be confident that they'll be able to do things on their own for whatever reason: family life, friends, being able to properly manage time, or just in general they reach a difficult part in the homework so they shut down* (LD). The outlier in my interviews adamantly stated the following. *Best in the city, that's for sure. You have to test to get in here. So, and if you don't toe the line, they actually can put you out. So, they are certainly capable of a great deal. Some of them are under a lot of stress because we know they are capable of a lot, and we ask them for a lot. But they are amazing.* More important, however, considering the selective context in which this cooperating teacher works was her additional unprompted remark,
However, I've taught in other areas of the city, and those kids were just as capable. They just weren't always as expected to do so much (LZ).

**Needs and Practices.** Asked to describe whether students of color had particular needs or to describe any specific teaching practices they utilize, issues related to classroom management and procedures within the classroom environment emerged. These cooperating teachers noted varied considerations about how and in what ways to respond to behavior or incidents and the need for consistent procedures and routines. One maintained *there are just some things that you got to overlook and not respond to right away. ... I would say there needs to be ... I want to use the word ‘grace’ ... For instance, this morning, some of the coin that's used, just the general noise level of the class. You have to take some of that into account as you plan lessons* (KP). In addition, two cooperating teachers provided a list of carefully structured and directive instructional techniques including: note-taking techniques (CU), guided lectures (KP), vocabulary development exercises (KP), and the need for scaffolding (KP).

On the other hand, the instructional techniques described by two of the cooperating teachers exemplified high expectations, rigor, and relevance while also keeping in mind some of the conditions with which students must contend. In addition, these two cooperating teachers were able to speak in more nuanced ways about providing needed instructional supports students learning while simultaneously expecting them to do their best work. One of the two insisted that students take ownership for their own learning and demonstrate mastery in the learning process. *Then we use a strategy ... We're calling it self-paced. You're trying to make the kid responsible and shift ... toward their learning. We're even going to try to do something where they have to show that they know. My focus is to show me what you know* (CU). This particular cooperating teacher also saw the need for maintaining rigor. *I try not to water it down too much. That's*
number one. I don't know if that's a strategy. I try to use different strategies. You've still got to
teach the same standards, so how you get a kid to recognize some material that you're trying to
introduce and the worth of it isn't seen. You know you've got to make it relevant, so you try to
attach some relevance to it, constant reminders to stay on task, let whatever ... Usually there's
some kind of drama happening outside the classroom that comes in the classroom. But anyway,
we are trying to keep all that at a minimum so that we can focus on what the objective or the
outcome is (CU). Further discussion revealed frequent use of online materials to support student
learning because students had limited opportunities to get out; including to the national park
despite its close proximity. The upcoming ecology unit meant that a trip to the park was non-
negotiable. We're going to work it out so they can make a real world connection to what we're
talking about in ecology (CU).

The second cooperating teacher, who also maintained particularly high standards of her
students, also provided a rich description of a recent activity that was engaging, relevant,
community-focused, and provided students with opportunities to choose the ways in which they
could reveal content mastery. We did some fresh water things and the students, they got to
choose. Some of them wrote letters to different people about our fresh water. Some of them
decided they were going to do a poster campaign around the school. I thought the cutest little
thing was "tap it, don't cap it". It was about drinking the water because tap water here is
wonderful. We have great water. There is no reason to have bottled water here. Yeah, we're
really good on taking and doing an action project at the end of our thing (LZ).

Defining, Discussing, and Modeling CRP. During interviews with cooperating teachers
about their discussions with their teacher candidates about culturally relevant pedagogy, it
became clear that there was little or no familiarity with culturally relevant pedagogy and
relatedly only surface-level understandings of culturally responsive pedagogy in practice. In trying to feel their way around the term cooperating teachers generally defined culturally responsive pedagogy in the following way, *it means that you're aware of their culture, and you blend it in, you work it in, you are certainly not offensive* (LZ). A second cooperating teacher was sure she had learned the term during her own teacher preparation studies and defined culturally responsive pedagogy similarly, *I think culturally responsive ... I think the way that they were teaching it in the academic sense was applying pieces of their culture into our lessons, so that the lesson is relatable to them. She then added, in the academic sense, it's very difficult for that to be realistic because if I'm applying it to one culture, then I'm losing other cultures. I try to find more student universally-adolescent, life-cultural references. I find that that matches my lessons better on a realistic level* (LD). She then provided an example of a recent lesson led by her teacher candidate. She described the lesson as *lecture-style, but with guided questioning about the scientific method that was related to music. The music was more urban driven, so Meghan Trainor was one of the examples* (LD). Describing her own approach to vocabulary, this cooperating teacher explained, *I try to use language that resembles the language that the students use. I do bring up vocabulary that's in their textbooks because it's important that they learn that vocabulary, but then, as I speak, I translate that vocabulary. I'm constantly giving synonyms and context clues to help them use those high-order words. I encourage them to use it too, so it's speaking like a ghetto scientist. That would be an example. It's just kind of showing that we view scientists and see them as demagogues, so they speak higher than us. They always look like they're very polished and very sophisticated people. They're certainly smarter than us, so therefore, I can never be a scientist* (LD). A third disclosed, *I remember a few years ago they were talking about Ebonics and everything was Ebonics. I don’t know if you have to then stick
straight to that. I think there’s a balance. I think they need to see that you understand and are aware of their culture, but yet they also need to understand that there is more than just this city (KP).

When provided with a more comprehensive definition and explanation of culturally relevant pedagogy, cooperating teachers asserted that some of their teaching might be defined as culturally relevant, however, there was hesitation and ambivalence with regard to its importance and place in within their teaching. The cooperating teacher with the most familiarity with the CRP argued, *I guess, if you're using the traditional effects of culturally responsive teaching and perhaps maybe then … The idea is that may be cultural responsive teaching is too limiting* (LD). Instead, she and others emphasized differentiation in general and the importance of meeting the needs of *all* students. She explained that she emphasized relevance in her discussions with teacher candidates. *We talk a lot about how as you're presenting material, you don't have to give them everything, and they really don’t care about what you did when you were in school and how you remember. Keeping the information, and then giving them ways to work with it to learn it* (KP).

The cooperating teacher whose teaching is most highly aligned with the breadth of instructional practices deemed culturally relevant explained her heavy emphasis on relevance. *I have emphasized the importance of the driving question. Why are we learning this? Why do I need to know this? What am I ultimately going to be able to do with this information? The relevance and definitely the rigor are important. They know that I believe our kids are really intelligent. It's in our day-to-day conversations, and as we plan the lesson plans, it's definitely embedded and woven into our conversations. Why do I need to know this* (LZ)? In addition, this cooperating teacher who also conveyed the importance of relationships and engagement when
describing her instructional philosophy asserted, *I'm pretty sure we fit within the description, but it's not my goal to fit within the description, it's my goal to teach every student and make them love it and encourage their love for it. So I think we fit in the definition, but that's not necessarily my goal* (LZ). Instead, she explained that she considers what students know, what they need to know based on state and district standards, and what interests them. *And so I guess that's cultural, but if I look at what might actually interest them and what areas they're deficient in, for example, they don't always know where their food comes from. They have a great disconnect between, you know there is a food justice issue of course in the area. Fresh fruits, fresh vegetables, there is certainly a lack of that. And so, we have a garden. That's how we are learning about osmosis, diffusion and capillary action because how does the water get into the root, how does it get up the stem? And then we actually grow this stuff, and I just blow their minds by grabbing fruit or vegetables out of the ground and just eating it right there. They are like ‘you're going to eat that'? I'm like ‘yes, where do you think it comes from'? So they are interested in it. They do need to get outside more often. It's relevant to their environment. Cultural, I don't know if it's relevant to their culture exactly, so much as to their environment and their experience or lack of experiences* (LZ).

**Discussions about Race.** Finally, in spite of the large numbers of students of color in their schools and classrooms, the cooperating teachers also maintained that issues of race and diversity were rarely discussed. Instead, three of the four shared their belief that race wasn’t a critical issue for their work with students and two of these were adamant that it was poverty that was truly the defining issue. When pressed about whether these issues were discussed with their teacher candidates, one cooperating teacher responded, *it’s so interwoven. I know just this past week, I think it was, maybe last week, we had a conversation about how it just seems like they're*
so lazy they don’t want to do their work. I’m like, well, why should they? Most of these kids are 2nd or 3rd welfare generational poverty. Why would they want to go to work when they can stay home? We had a little bit of talk that way. You have to show them. Each day, there’s something that we’re talking about whether it’s a cultural thing. I don’t know it’s really hard for me to tell what is just cultural and what is just teaching practice (KP). Another also focused on poverty noting that her teacher candidate was particularly sensitive to students in financial need—poor kids. She explained I don’t know if it comes up point blank. If it did come up in our conversation, it’s more around kids ... Let’s say for instance there may be a kid that is talking about what he does at night after school. We may address this kid isn’t going home. He’s going out with who knows, you know, and is not supervised by the parents. One kid we were concerned about being back on Monday after having whatever little supervision and out on the street doing whatever over the weekend. It might be around those kinds of cultural issues rather than specifically race. Does that make sense (CU)?

The following excerpt from my interview with one cooperating teacher is particularly instructive. Okay, that topic does not come up that much. We teach everybody. We believe everybody can learn, and we proceed just teaching everyone. We do talk about variety of students as people. So [student] was having a rough time. We talked about what might be going on in his life, but not because he was African-American. No, just because he was a person in our class who we needed to take care of. I think actually the issue of poverty is something... is the most powerful and influential. Yes, absolutely, more than race. Because there is the hunger, all the negative things that come around with poverty, your hunger, your abuse situations, drug addictions that they are experiencing. The post traumatic syndrome of seeing people killed and houses burned and crazy things of that nature. That applies to, we have one student, [XX], she's
white, and one student, [XX] who is from the Middle East, it absolutely applies to them as much. And well, in fact, they might be dealing with issues of being a minority in the classroom themselves. I actually was a minority in going to this school as a Caucasian person, and so I know that they are experiencing some situations as well. But the real thing to look out for is that hunger, distress of various types that would go with post traumatic distress disorder. And we are always on the lookout, and my student teacher is really, really in tune to this. We have a girl wearing gloves a lot. And I thought maybe a fashion trait, no, she was cutting. And she was on top of that. I was very impressed with that (LZ).

Teacher Candidate Interview Findings

Table 4.26

Teacher Candidate Interviews- Participant Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Subject(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>22yrs</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Biology (Academic/ Honors/A.P) Honors Genetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Biology/Anatomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>10th Grade Bio/Honors Bio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>22yrs</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bio/Advanced Bio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher candidates interviewed in this study are those paired with the cooperating teachers who were also interviewed. As such, all are also in high school biology classrooms. Three of the four teacher candidates are White and the fourth is a Black male. This subset of
teacher candidates interviewed included two males and two females. All graduated from college within the past decade (Table 4.26).

**Challenges.** Among the classroom challenges cited by teacher candidates were a lack of morale and motivation among students and the lack of resources available in their schools. *My goal is to kind of get people, my students, interested in science but there are just so many students who fail and have to retake classes, or they're used to having failed classes. You get a lot of morale issues especially in the academic science classes* (KQ). Two also discussed their fears and concerns about classroom management. *So that's mainly what I'm working on here, figuring out that dynamic, and a lot of my issues are about how I discipline the kids and when is an appropriate time to use different types of discipline, that's what I'm focusing on right now* (NR). One TC described her experience as both challenging and rewarding. Speaking specifically about behavior she said...*Sometimes knowing what to do with behavioral problems. I feel like sometimes it's hard, as just a first year teacher or someone going into the field, to know what exactly is going on and how to deal with certain behavioral problems, or to handle certain situations appropriately, or what works or what doesn't work yet* (FS).

**Successes.** For these teacher candidates, success was a combination of the strong relationships they have fostered with their students, student interest in the material, and student content mastery. *I think the most success I've had is just really building these relationships with the students. Now I have students who are coming up to me and telling me that I'm doing a great job and I get to see them every day really understanding the material”* (NC). Another TC shared the following remarks made recently by one of his students, *"Oh, this is- Okay so this is science. This is cool”* (KQ).
Cooperating Teachers’ Expectations. The expectations held by cooperating teachers of their students are mixed. Two shared that their cooperating teachers had decidedly high expectations. Of these, one candidate maintained that the bar was set high for students but that there was also motivation and encouragement to support them. Students were expected to come to class with completed work or receive a zero grade. Only advanced notice and legitimate excuses are tolerated. She shared, *we try to work with students to be fair and honest and so ... but I guess also setting high expectations, saying that we are going to learn all this material and always saying like ... giving motivation and encouragement, saying like, You guys are doing great, this material might be challenging but you guys are really understanding it. She's always giving encouragement* (FS). The second explained *I believe that we motivate them and push them to do the best they can. Even students who are probably classified more in the low ability. Maybe it's not the same amount as the high achieving person in the classroom but it could be that they improve X amount. Or that they are working to learn something else about the content they didn't know before Sometimes that drives those students crazy 'cause we won't leave them alone ‘cause they just want to relax and we're like, ‘No, you're not here to relax. You're here to learn’* (NC). This teacher candidate also shared that the CT was often focused on goals for students. *One question she always asks the students is ‘What is your goal after high school? What is your plan after high school’? It doesn't matter if they're going to say, College, or if they're going to say, Career. Having them have a plan. Making sure that they realize that life after high school is coming before you know it. What do you plan on doing? I've heard her tell students, ‘Why are you going to do that? You're smart enough that you could be doing X,Y,Z’ or, ‘Yeah, that's a really great plan for you even if it's not college’* (NC).
On the other hand, the remaining teacher candidates felt that the CTs expectations weren’t as high as necessary. One said, *okay, so we have talked about it a lot particularly because I had an honors class. I mean I have classes that are not honors. So I kind of got the feeling that the honors were definitely held to a higher standard. That is very true. Honestly, I had some concerns with that because that class was so much less diverse it typically is, than the other classes. So that kind of bothered me. When we talk we say that both of the classes have to understand the material. It's just going to take longer in the other class to get there than the honors class. And they also actually split biology into two semesters instead of one semester for it. So the honors class is one semester of biology and the academic classes are split into two, in order to get them through the material at a slower pace. But in general I would say that the expectations seem to be lower for the academic classes. And then I would say that's how a lot of the teachers feel* (KQ). The second teacher candidate stated that the [academic] expectations are not as high but that students are expected to get to class and complete the work (NR). By contrast, this teacher candidate noted that the cooperating teachers’ expectations for behavior were high. Consequently, her experience seemed to be one of potentially mixed messages, as is evident from the following quote. *There are a lot of behavioral expectations that they aren't disruptive in class, and we give them one homework assignment each week and we expect it to be done in a timely manner. We do know that a lot of our academic classes have a high population of I.E.P. students and so we have to adjust a little bit, how we grade certain things, grade their work compared to a regular student. But I would say [cooperating teacher] has told me, we don't lower the bar for them, we expect them to meet us at a certain point and if they don't meet us at that certain point then they don't get the grade that they just want to get from sitting around* (NR).
Cooperating Teacher Pedagogy. In at least one to the classrooms, the cooperating teacher’s expectations for students were mirrored in her pedagogical approaches which are described as more inquiry based for the honors students and much less inquiry-based for students in the academic classes. *I think she believes if we are more rote, we just get through this material more. The way it was presented to me is that you have to- This is what she told me that you have to present to them at face value. You can't give them all different types of examples, and things like that. You just need to give it to them in a more straight forward way* (KQ). The others however, described pedagogical approaches which prioritize group work and attempt to keep direct instruction to a minimum. Three teacher candidates describe examples of teaching that included: collaborative group work, kinesthetic experiences, hands-on learning, discussions that enabled students to pose questions as well, projects, and labs. *We kind of work to do just a kind of a variation of things, really trying to get the students really active in their learning. We try to give them as many projects or labs as possible. We also have a clicker response system in our classroom* (NC).

Persistence. Motivational talks, private conversations, group discussions, and the involvement of other school-based staff, specifically coaches, were among the strategies used by cooperating teachers to support the academic persistence of their students. *We give a lot of motivational talks in the classroom, there's been many times where she'll get the group, address the class and say ‘Hey guys, we're really not getting our homework in time’ or whatever the topic may be, or if there's a particular couple students who are really falling behind we will have a private conversation with that student, a lot of times we'll call the parents, get the parents involved so that they know we care, that we want them to succeed, we want them to meet these expectations and get the grades that they deserve, because we know that they're capable of*
earning those grades, it's just a matter of motivating them. We try to find things that we know will help to motivate the students. A lot of them play sports, so we might call the coach and say Hey, so-and-so is not stepping up their game in class, and we try to get their mentors involved (NR). In describing the manner in which her cooperating teacher supports student persistence, there was an acknowledgement that the cooperating teacher works hard to make sure that the students master the content. However, she was also very cognizant of the frustration felt by the cooperating teacher. Despite the frustration, the CT offers students opportunities in the morning and at lunch to see her if they have any questions. A second teacher candidate also shared that the cooperating teacher avails herself to students not just during class but throughout the school day. So I feel like there is opportunity for them to meet us and go over things if they are not understanding it, or make up their work, and we're pretty clear about expectations (FS). A third explained, I would say that for all the students she has high expectations of them, they are there and they can achieve as much as possible. A lot of our students really kind of struggle with the, I'm from a poor neighborhood, or, I'm African-American so I don't know why you're expecting me to achieve the same pace that other people have achieved. I think that her experiences in her life, and then also just growing up in the area, kind of helps her show them like, No, you can achieve just as much as a white person or just as much as someone from a rich neighborhood (NC). Contrasting these examples of supporting student persistence was the experience of one teacher candidate who maintained that the espoused beliefs of his cooperating teacher are not aligned with the actions. I would say that my cooperating teacher does believe in the concept of academic persistence or that the students can get the material, just the approach is different. But I honestly think that the degree to which that is implemented is less than [she says] she feels about it (KQ).
**Defining CRP.** Although their definitions of culturally responsive pedagogy were somewhat limited, teacher candidates were able to provide examples of the practices being employed. Beyond relating learning experiences to activities within the community and/or the school, two cooperating teachers were said to be modeling important culturally responsive teaching practices. The first described the participatory nature of the classroom *we want to make sure everyone's participating. We usually have students call on other students with their hands raised, like one student answers and they call the next person* (FS). She also shared that she had learned the importance of closely reviewing curriculum and testing materials to identify concepts with which students might be unfamiliar. *She will pick out vocabulary that she knows our students won't know. It's a cultural thing; for instance, we were doing DNA, and they talk about cattle a lot, and the kids don't really get it because they're not in a farming type of environment. We had to teach them a little bit about the cattle to get them to understand the question. I know, she absolutely knows the kids, she knows what kind of backgrounds they come from, she knows what they have access to, what their home lives are like, she knows the kids backwards and forwards, and she is, aside from being a teacher, as a person she's very aware of people's differences, and she's very accepting of them, and she welcomes the diversity* (FS). The second explained that his cooperating teacher was particularly good at relating to the students and providing concrete expectations about their preparation for the world *after they leave these school walls*. He also added that initially, as a White male who wasn’t from the area, he was unsure of how the students would relate to him. *I was really surprised to see that with the help from [CT], really just showing me that they're going to connect to you one way or another. You just have to kind of be open with them and really allow them to ask you questions. One thing she told me about at the beginning of the year was... I was getting my desk set up and I had my*
pencils and I had my stacks where my papers would go, and she's like, Where's the picture of you and your family? Or, Where's this? I thought about putting that on the desk. She was like, Just having that can let the students bring something up with you, or let them see that you're a person. Just her kind of telling me that it doesn't have to be things like race that connects you or things like age or where you're from, it could really just be just opening yourself up and letting them ask you a question. Or asking them questions too (NC).

Conversations about Race. Teacher candidates explained that conversations about race, diversity, and culturally relevant pedagogy rarely took place in their discussions with cooperating teachers. One teacher candidate said that it didn’t occur frequently and it wasn’t a focal point. I wouldn't say that it comes up often I mean we're aware of it but I don't think we really focus on that a lot. The only time we've really talked about race and culture really was at the beginning of the year, when she was kind of describing what the school was like. And now, it's a matter of here's our kids, and what can we do to help them through this part of the curriculum. So it's more just, the kids are the kids, and we go from there. She further explained that she realizes the importance of putting your all into every single day, and just treat everyone the same, just no matter what. And just trying to come up with rules and a routine that everyone can just do it and understand it, and everyone is just treated the same (FS). While also stating that race doesn’t frequently come up, a second teacher candidate divulged that in the few times it had, the experiences were discomforting. He then clarified that when he had been initially presented with the list of names of students in his fifth block class; his cooperating teacher looked at the list of names and said, Oh, boy you’re going to have the ghetto class. Or whatever, like based on their names. So it does come up, yes, but not only in the most positive ways I would say (KQ).
Learning from Cooperating Teachers and Readiness to Teach in Similar Contexts.

Nonetheless, when asked what they have learned about working in high-need schools with significant populations of students of color and whether they feel prepared to successfully teach in similar classrooms, responses were mixed. The lone teacher candidate who had uncomfortable conversations with the cooperating teacher (though indirectly) notes that, in spite of deeply enjoying his placement, feels fairly strongly that he has learned little about working effectively with students of color in high-need schools. He stated, *I would say no. I'll get most of that just being there and being on my own. My cooperating teacher is teaching a lot but not in cultural competence or anything like that they're teaching. Nothing like that, no.* He further added *I was learning more of that in my initial placement* (KQ). Another teacher candidate was slightly more confident but admitted she was still struggling to determine how she will manage behavior problems that will likely occur. *I've heard on multiple occasions, 'If you can teach here, you can teach anywhere!' But the kids themselves, I've noticed a lot of them just want attention, and maybe they're not getting that outside of school, but I think that a lot of the behavior problems stem from that. So if I can give them the attention, maybe not every day, but just give them a little pep talk here and there, then I'll be okay, and I think I'm learning a lot of, like I told you, the behavior stuff, which is an issue for me and learning how to gain respect in the classroom is really important as well, and I think all the activities and the teaching part itself is not quite as important, considering what I've learned here. It's more of, how do I interact with the kids that I'm not going to, you know, think I'm angry or something like that. So that's kind of what I'm picking up here, and so I think that I've learned a lot about the differences between my upbringing and what they're going through, and I've not come from a high-needs school, so this*
has been an eye-opening experience. It's been a really good experience and I think I'll take a lot away from it, in my own classroom next year (NR).

Interestingly, one of the teacher candidates signaled his confusion towards the conclusion of the interview when I asked what more he wanted me to know. Based on his comments it became clear that issues of race and diversity had been discussed on many occasions, just not openly with his cooperating teacher (the sole Black cooperating teacher in the study). Instead, these conversations were being held among his peers after seminar class when they seemingly felt more able to engage in more honest discussions. He shared, another thing everyone talks about is not being colorblind and not ignoring race, but at the same time avoiding the whole stereotyping situation where you're giving so much into the theory that you say, this type of child likes this type of learning so I'm only going to do that type of learning. [We] have had a couple discussions after classes where we're like I just want to treat my students like people. I don't understand why you have to be so cautious. If you treat them like people you should be covering both of those things. You should not be being stereotypical but you should also be taking enough culture in. That's something that we've kind of found entertaining and kind of confusing as to why there’s so much focus on that when they could just be focusing on treating their students as people- as individuals (NC).

Observation Findings

The first of four observations (two per teacher candidate/cooperating pair) took place on March 16th. During the first visit, I spent the entire school day (7:20 a.m.-2:20 p.m.) with the cooperating teacher and student teacher and also observed their planning conference. After the first visit, I made the decision that during subsequent observations, I would focus my collection
of field notes on classrooms in which the teachers had the largest numbers of students of color. During these observations, field notes were taken in my research log with a specific focus on identifying, capturing, and placing practices within the eight pillars delineated in the CRIOP (Assessment, Caring and Teacher Dispositions, Classroom Climate/Physical Environment, Curriculum/Planned Experiences, Discourse/Instructional Conversation, Family Involvement and Collaboration, Instructional Practices/Pedagogy, and Sociopolitical Consciousness/Multiple Perspectives). Through observations of class sessions and participation in planning meetings I was able to witness the practices employed, hear what the teacher candidate and the cooperating teacher were considering for subsequent teaching, and hear rationale for some of their pedagogical decisions. The data collected was reviewed and analyzed on multiple occasions during the data collection process and my research log was used to determine potential future questions and to note areas which required further clarification. Finally, during the days on which I visited, the student teachers at both sites were leading the classroom instruction.

Observation Site #1 (Monday, March 16, 2015 and Wednesday, March 18, 2015)

PTHS is a comprehensive 9-12 high school located in the northern portion of the county and sits in one of the largest municipalities in the state. The township in which the school is located is adjacent to both a former and a current army base. As a result, many residents in the town are military personnel and the school has a large population of military children. The school itself is a massive two-story structure in excellent condition. Statistics as of October 2014 specify an enrollment of 1,040 students in grades 9 through twelve. There are 320 students in the ninth grade, 276 in the tenth grade, 226 in the grade eleven, and 218 in the twelfth grade. The school has approximately 120 staff members which include: 110 teachers, nurses,
librarian, psychologists, social worker, learning disabilities specialists, speech language specialists, guidance counselors, and the student assistance counselor. The school’s website states,

PTHS is dedicated to providing unique learning experiences to meet the individual needs of all of our students. We encourage the development and implementation of curricular and co-curricular programs that address our students’ interests. In addition, our award-winning JROTC program and a full range of interscholastic athletic programs provide students with opportunities for success both in and out of the academic arena. We are proud of the establishment and continued growth of our specialized learning academies. These specialized learning academies provide motivated students with a focused, yet comprehensive, high school education, in their area of interest. PTHS prepares all students to reach their highest potential, providing a challenging curriculum and employing strategies for improving and accelerating the learning process.

(Http://pths.pembschools.org/site_res_view_template.aspx?id=3cacc5bc5818-47d7-b372-a97b7a2bc053)
DAY 1 (Monday, March 16, 2015). Lessons on the first day of observation were focused on enabling students to determine how cell structures determine their function. During the period, students rotated through six stations representing categories that would be covered by an upcoming exam. Stations focused on: Microscopy and scanning electron microscopy, the cell membrane, cell theory, cell structures, diffusion and osmosis, and passive vs. active Transport. Students were tasked with collaboratively completing the station activity, checking the answer key, and discussing answers with their lab team. During the wrap-up, students were asked to fold a piece of paper into thirds and label one third “Don’t Study Much,” “Study Thoroughly,” and “Spend A LOT of time on this”. They then used the study guide to assign each topic to one of the categories. Students were then asked to use the document to guide their study for the exam. The lessons taught during the remainder of the day were largely similar in content.

DAY 2 (Wednesday, March 18, 2015). On the second day of observation, the lessons were focused on the biological traits passed from one generation to the next. The teacher’s objective was that students would be able to represent the stages and processes of meiosis. He shared as examples a rap, song, poem, or story and emphasized that a particularly important element of the assignment was creativity. Students were then shown example of a story book, a You-tube video, and the beginning of the teacher’s own lyrics. Students were then given time to choose pairs, determine what their product would be, and to share their thinking and receive specific feedback from another pair. The lesson concluded with students continuing to work on their projects and incorporating the feedback received.

Analysis of field notes taken during my observations at the school and participation in the planning sessions with the first teacher candidate and the cooperating teacher pair reveals that the
teacher candidate was particularly competent in employing the multiple elements described within the assessment (3), and care (4), pillars (as delineated within the CRIOP tool). The teacher candidate engaged in practices within these pillars in multiple instances over the course of the two days. By contrast, while he also engaged in practices described within the pillars of climate (2), discourse/instructional talk (1), and pedagogy/instructional pedagogy (2), he did so to a lesser extent. Holistic scoring based on classroom observations and planning discussions between the cooperating teacher and the student during the two days follows.

Table 4.27

*Observation Site #1: Holistic CRIOP Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI Pillar</th>
<th>Holistic Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. ASMT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. CARE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. CLIM</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. CURR</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI Pillar</th>
<th>Holistic Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. DISC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. FAM</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. INSTR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. PERSP</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment.** In this area the teacher consistently gave clear and direct feedback. He spent time with groups of students across the two days giving specific feedback as they engaged in their lab assignments or other group-based activities. In addition, he provided multiple ways within the lessons for students to show that they understood the content. Students were also able to choose the ways in which they could best share their understanding of the content. Finally, the teacher candidate provided opportunities for students to self-assess and identify both content they had not yet mastered and content with which they had great comfort.
Care. Both teachers (cooperating teacher and the teacher candidate) and students had particularly good relationships. During both formal and informal discussions, there was an atmosphere in which it was evident that students and the teachers felt respect and connections to one another.

Climate. The overwhelming majority of student work took place in either partnerships or in pairs. The teacher candidate had students move their seats and belongings to ensure that this occurred.

Discourse. Relatedly, the teacher candidate provided structures (procedures within lab activities, etc.) which would promote student talk and learning from one another.

Pedagogy/Instructional Practices. Two of the indicators within this pillar address opportunities for collaboration and student choice in content and assessment methods. While collaboration was particular evident, choice in assessment was limited.

Finally, during one of the planning sessions, the cooperating teacher noted that she wanted the teacher candidate to work on ensuring that students were actively involved in their own learning and not simply relying on him for information. She stated, “They should try to help each other. You don’t want them to rely on you. Help but step back a bit. Constantly put it back on them. You don’t want to be the sage” (Day 2, KC).

Observation Site #2 (Thursday, March 26, 2015 and Thursday, April 2, 2015)

The school is located in the northeastern section of the state and in the fifth largest school district. CLCE is a 9th through 12th grade school with an enrollment of 898 students and approximately 75 staff members. Having been previously located at another site, the new state-of-the-art campus was opened on September, 1, 2010 as a community learning centers (CLC). The CLC, as envisioned by the school district, serves students during the school day and makes
numerous programs available to community members in the evening and on weekends. Unlike the dark and dreary conditions of many schools that serve poor students and students of color, the school environment is bright and well-equipped with technology.

CLCE, one of nine high schools in the school district (only two of which are CLCs), boasts a number of accomplishments for its various programs including recognition for its Marine JROTC program and a first place finish in the state Engineering and robotics competition. Program offerings include career education certification programs (welding, automotive, hospitality/restaurant management, e-commerce/marketing, information technology/networking, and engineering and robotics) as well as academic preparation programs (A.P. courses in American History, Biology, Calculus, Chemistry, English, and European History). Honors courses are also offered. The school identifies its goal as “High quality learning by all”.

**DAY 1 (Thursday, March 26, 2015).** On my first day of observation at CLCE students were on the second day of a four day lesson focused on identifying the structure and function of cell organelles. The teacher candidate reminded students that on that day they would design a 3D model of an organelle, and that ultimately, they would build a whole-class 3D cell model. During my observations of the teacher candidates’ classrooms over multiple periods, students worked in groups to build organelle models utilizing the materials that they had previously asked the teacher to gather. The teacher returned student worksheets that had been collected the previous day, discussed the available supplies and students began building their 3D models. Approximately seven minutes before the bell for each class, the teacher candidate signaled that it was time to begin cleaning up the classroom.
DAY 2 (Thursday, April 2, 2015). The teacher candidate’s lessons on the second day of observation were focused on cell structure and function. Students had concluded their research on various human organs, and designed specialized cells for the organ they selected. During the periods observed, students were given the opportunity to return to their groups and organize their thoughts before their presentations were to begin. Each group presented their designs as others watched and the teacher candidate posed questions. Again, students in different classes were taught the same lesson.

Analysis of the field notes taken at the second school site reveals that this teacher candidate most utilizes the practices within the pillar of classroom caring/teacher dispositions (3) and classroom climate/physical environment (3) delineated in the CRIOP tool. Holistic scoring based on my observations during the two days and further details follow.

Table 4.28
Observation Site #2: Holistic CRIOP Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI Pillar</th>
<th>Holistic Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. ASMT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. CARE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. CLIM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. CURR</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI Pillar</th>
<th>Holistic Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. DISC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. FAM</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. INSTR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. PERSP</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation Scores for the second observation site can be found in Table 4.28.
Care. Both the cooperating teacher and the teacher candidate embodied the various indicators of related to classroom caring/teaching dispositions. Throughout classes and between classes it was clear that’s students and teachers had strong relationships. Both remembered birthdays and special talents held by particular students, differentiated their management techniques as necessary, and demonstrated high expectations for student behavior and social interactions without being overly rigid. There was also an attempt to maintain high expectations.

Climate. As was the case in the first school site, the overwhelming majority of class time enabled students to partner or in pair as they engaged in learning the content matter. Both the teacher candidate and the cooperating teacher actively encouraged students to work together.

Pedagogy/Instructional Practices. While two of the indicators within this pillar address opportunities for collaboration and student choice (specifically the choice of organs and organelles), as was the case at the first observation site, the teacher candidate did not employ other examples of CRP that fall within this pillar.

While there was great commitment to fostering classroom spaces in which students and teachers both felt respected and connected to one another and there was and ethic of care, largely absent from the practices of these classrooms was similar consistent attentiveness to assessment practices, curriculum/planned experiences, discourse/instructional conversation, pedagogy/instructional practices, and sociopolitical consciousness/multiple perspectives. This finding is consistent with responses to the responses to the survey questions posed in the My Classroom section of the teacher candidate surveys and the My Teaching Practice section of the cooperating teacher survey (questions 35 & 36 and questions 34 & 35 respectively). The items ask teacher candidates first whether their cooperating teacher models culturally responsive pedagogy (Item 35) and if so, to describe the ways that the cooperating teacher does so (Item
36). The questions are similar for the cooperating teachers. “I actively model culturally responsive pedagogy for the teacher candidate” (Question 34) and “Please describe the ways in which you model culturally responsive pedagogy or cultural competence for your student teacher” (Question 35).
Chapter 5: Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

The participants in this study, program directors, teacher candidates, and cooperating teachers who provided responses to surveys, engaged in interviews, and allowed me into their classrooms to conduct observations, are all dedicated professionals committed to the education of diverse populations of students. Nonetheless, what is clear is that few of these programs have explicitly focused on recruiting selecting, or preparing cooperating teachers who can model culturally responsive practices for teacher candidates who will spend, in this case hundreds of hours, in their classrooms watching their every move and attempting, in many cases, to replicate their practice.

In many ways, this study’s findings echo, in part, what King & Butler (2015) found in their recent study about the prominence of diversity curricula in teacher preparation. Specifically, the researchers were interested in determining “how well TEPs [teacher education programs] address diversity and multiculturalism within their curriculum” (p. 46). To do so, they studied 14 southeastern teacher preparation institutions and focused specifically on the undergraduate level to determine “the level of cultural exposure each program provided to pre-service teachers” (p. 47). The researchers find, as did I, that diversity curricula is both commonplace and greatly varied (King & Butler, 2015). Moreover, the researchers also “found that approximately “71% of the state’s colleges of education require students to take significantly less than one-fourth of their classes on diversity/multiculturalism”. Similar to King & Butler’s (2015) findings about the unevenness of coursework in diversity across programs, this study finds that there is also unevenness in the studied programs’ preparation of teacher candidates to enact culturally
responsive teaching in fieldwork at large and in student teaching specifically. Further, while their commitments to social justice are necessary and admirable, they are insufficient.

The current study is not intended to devalue the work of cooperating teachers, their commitments to students, or the difficult work they do with students on a daily basis. These individuals are critical to the field of teacher preparation and do the work of mentoring future teacher with little acknowledgement of the fact that when they do this work well- they are essentially creating two lesson plans daily- one for the students and one for teacher candidates. Instead, the goal of this study is to understand whether and to what extent teacher preparation programs recruit, select, and prepare cooperating teachers to employ culturally responsive practices; to understand whether the individuals selected for the role are communicating and practicing high expectations and persistence for students of color; to gauge the attitudes and their attitudes and philosophies they hold about teaching students of color.

Research Question 1: How do educator preparation programs (EPPs) select cooperating teachers (CTs)?

- What standards are delineated?
- How are they applied?
- Who controls the selection process?
- Is professional development (PD) provided for CTs, and is it a requirement?
- How are cooperating teachers evaluated and how are the evaluations used?
- Are cooperating teachers appointed as clinical faculty?

The findings are clear that the recruitment and selection of CTs is complex in nature. Program leaders must carefully juggle numerous competing priorities; particularly if the process is one which is controlled by the school district. In Chapter Four of this study, each program director shares the various processes, strategies, and criteria used to attract qualified/competent cooperating teachers. In most cases, the school district controls the process to some extent. One program director who stated it best revealing that her process involved talking to people from
either the district and/or the principals, so a lot of it started from nominations, and then observations, along with the criteria (UN). It is rare that program directors took or were given the opportunity to visit classrooms to see first-hand teaching and the interactions between students and teachers. Naturally recruitment is also logistical in nature. Final decisions about recruiting and selecting cooperating teacher is also reliant on the interplay of subject, grade level (middle and/or high school), proximity, and the need to ensure there are enough cooperating teachers. Unfortunately, because of this complexity, the abilities of cooperating teachers to employ and model culturally responsive practices, rarely is a goal (if at all).

Fortunately, in most cases there are standards for recruiting and selecting cooperating teachers (minimally they include three years of teaching and a Master’s degree) and professional development for the role is indeed offered by the programs- but not necessarily mandated. Only in one instance was professional development of cooperating teachers focused on culturally responsive pedagogy.

However, in some instances, and likely more often than many want to admit, choosing cooperating teachers becomes an act of who can do the least harm. Honestly, it's the end of the day. Part of it was also just desperation, like we needed someone (UN). Most concerning, about the selection of cooperating teachers is that once selected, with the exception of one program currently in the process of rethinking its evaluation process for CTs, what little evaluation there is of cooperating teachers is merely informal. Programs make no attempts to provide formal or even purposeful feedback on the work that cooperating teachers are doing with teacher candidates. Instead, they focus heavily on the relationship between the two, which is necessary but insufficient if the goal is to prepare capable and effective teachers for any school much less
oft-challenging high-need school with large populations of students of color that are largely crippled by limited resources and high teacher attrition.

Finally, in only two of the eight programs studied were clinical faculty appointments made. In both instances, the programs were based in private institutions. In the first, the cooperating teachers themselves were not clinical faculty. Instead, teachers and principals within the school district were appointed as clinical faculty and were tasked with actually doing the work of identifying cooperating teachers. These individuals work more akin to clinical supervisors but are full time employees of the school district. The first of the two program directors clearly noted that without these individuals they would not know where to start in identifying appropriate cooperating teachers. In the second instance, the decision to employ cooperating teachers as clinical faculty was done to circumvent the bureaucracy of the school district as it related to paying cooperating teachers. We wanted to find a way because in [State] there was an Ethics Commission ruling about how you pay teachers who are doing this type of work, and so you couldn't pay them if they were doing their work during the day, during their school day and so on. We worked with [City] and with the CEO at the time and also with someone from the union to try and find a way to make this work for everybody, that we could meet what the state wanted. The school district was saying this idea of having a university pay a district and then the district has to figure out how to pay the cooperating teachers and it just didn't seem to work for them. They didn't like dealing with that, and the teachers weren't always getting all the money. What we ended up with, that's one of the reasons we really wanted to make sure that most of our folks had completed a Master's because then we can hire them as adjunct clinical faculty. Once there's an initial selection, initial interest in our program, then they submit all the normal things that a part time faculty member would submit to get hired here. We hire
them as part time faculty with a one credit load each semester. It works out to, if they have a Master's and at least seven years teaching experience they get at this point $975 a semester (NY).

Research Question 1a: To what extent do EPPs select CTs who intentionally communicate and model: high expectations, culturally responsive pedagogy, and persistence of K–12 students of color for teacher candidates (TCs)? And

Research Question 3. How effectively do CTs enact and model pedagogical and non-pedagogical practices that support the success of high-need students of color?

The study findings also indicate that cooperating teachers who responded to surveys, were interviewed, and observed, have very superficial understandings of culturally responsive pedagogy- both its content and purpose. As a result, they are largely unable to provide rigorous examples of culturally responsive practices for teacher candidates. Similarly, the examples of program directors and teachers candidates are also limited. As such, cooperating teachers are unable to intentionally communicate and model culturally responsive pedagogy. Instead, as seen in Chapter Four, the vast majority of culturally responsive practices fall in the CRIOP-aligned areas of care (classroom caring and teacher dispositions) and curriculum (curriculum/planned experiences). For the most part, cooperating teachers clearly articulate high expectations and are facile at utilizing the cultural diversity of the class to support lessons (sometimes in stereotypical ways) but most generally in authentic and meaningful ways. However what they are unable to do fully and consistently, based on observations, surveys, and interviews, insist on high expectations or ensure that curriculum and planned learning experiences include issues important to the classroom, school, and larger community. As a result, there are missed opportunities for learning for students who are most in need of relevance.
The concern of these findings is that seemingly broad social justice frameworks neglect to provide teacher candidates with a wider range of culturally responsive practices they will need to make concrete differences in the lives of students of color; particularly those in high-need schools. Instead, their failure to focus on this area seems to have resulted in no more than surface-level understandings and teaching practices. Based on interviews with cooperating teachers, surveys, and observations it is clear that there is great emphasis on “care” and on low-level “curriculum” adaptations as evidenced by the following quotes from a teacher candidate and a cooperating teacher who respectively said, well, the school I’m at, I guess it's considered the rough school in our district. So I've heard on multiple occasions, "If you can teach here, you can teach anywhere!" But the kids themselves, I've noticed a lot of them just want attention, and maybe they're not getting that outside of school, but I think that a lot of the behavior problems stem from that. So if I can give them the attention, maybe not every day, but just give them a little pep talk here and there, then I'll be okay, and I think I'm learning a lot of, like I told you, the behavior stuff, which is an issue for me and learning how to gain respect in the classroom is really important as well, and I think all the activities and the teaching part itself is not quite as important, considering what I've learned here. It's more of, how do I interact with the kids that I'm not going to, you know, think I'm angry or something like that. So that's kind of what I'm picking up here, and so I think that I've learned a lot about the differences between my upbringing and what they're going through, and I've not come from a high-needs school, so this has been an eye-opening experience (NR). I use every day analogies that address our different cultures and celebrate differences (CT Survey Response).
Not commonplace were the other aspects of culturally responsive pedagogy as theorized by Ladson-Billings, Gay, Villegas & Lucas, Powell et al., or those characteristics laid out by this author at the start of this dissertation and follow again below.

- **Visions of students as able and competent learners**: The teacher understands that all students enter the classroom with deeply-rooted local knowledge and equipped to build on that knowledge as they learn new curriculum content.

- **Achievement-Focused**: Teachers prepare and enact lesson plans and learning experiences that are engaging, rigorous, and couched in how and why it matters.

- **Expectations and Accountability**: The teacher creates a classroom environment in which students are respected and act respectfully and are accountable while simultaneously being cared for in a way that the teacher insists on high levels of success (Ladson-Billings, 2002).

- **Culturally Competent**: The teacher understands, appreciates, and celebrates cultural and linguistic diversity.

- **Deeply immersed within the community**: The teacher builds and develops non-hierarchical relationships with families/guardians and other influential adults in students’ lives and understands that there is much to learn from these individuals.

- **Sociopolitical Consciousness**: The teacher actively supports students of color in understanding that political, social, and structural inequities exist that are intended to negate the inherent worth and worthiness of students of color while reifying notions of white supremacy. The teacher provides students of color with the skills and abilities needed so that they can respond accordingly.

The findings reinforce Ladson-Billings’ belief that, “Even when people have demonstrated a more expansive knowledge of culture, few have taken up the sociopolitical dimensions of the work, instead dulling its critical edge or omitting it altogether” (Ladson-Billings, 2014, p. 77).

Epstein & Gist (2015) provide insight that is helpful in considering the preparation of teacher candidates in the area of sociopolitical consciousness. While their research focuses on the teaching of history, they highlight three teachers who “affirm and extend the understandings of racism which students brought to the study of history and contemporary society” (p. 41). The
teachers studied function as exemplars who engage in developing students’ sociocultural consciousness and actively challenging students’ belief systems. Like Ladson-Billings, Epstein & Gist understand the importance of continually rethinking culturally responsive practice writing that, “culturally relevant pedagogy is a theory in the making, the parameters of which shift and adapt based on particular classroom contexts” (p. 40).

Research Question 2: What are the attitudes and philosophies about teaching students of color in high-need schools held by CTs and how are they conveyed to STs during student teaching? To what extent do they intentionally communicate and model: high expectations, culturally responsive pedagogy, and persistence of K–12 students of color for TCs?

The attitudes and philosophies held by cooperating teachers and their expectations of their students are mixed. Of particular note, is that survey finding in which 53% of the teacher candidates indicate that their cooperating teacher does not have high expectations. Of the seven, CRIOP- aligned questions posed of teacher candidates, only one item (use of culture and language) had a higher frequency of no responses (55%). In contrast, cooperating teachers’ self-report on this item reveals that 69% believe that they have and model high expectations for students.

Research Question 4: Is there evidence that the philosophies, expectations, and teaching practices take root during the student teaching cycle? Is there evidence of transference?

Again, the findings are mixed. As such, it is unclear whether enough evidence exists that the philosophies, expectations and teaching practices of cooperating teachers take root during the student teaching cycle. On the one hand, the culturally responsive practices undertaken by cooperating teachers seem to be those that are also undertaken by teacher candidates. However, when asked whether teacher candidates are learning/will have the skills to be successful on their own in high-need classrooms with significant populations of students of color. 95.6% of cooperating teachers feel that the teacher candidates have the skills needed for success. On the
other hand, only 77.9% of teacher candidates answered similarly. When questioned about what they have learned in their placements about teaching in high-need schools with significant populations of students of color, the responses given by the teacher candidates are fortunately quite positive. Comments from three of the four teacher candidates follow. The first said, I learned what to look for, like what kind of things might be an issue. So it's a matter, for me, of not being aware that there are these issues. Something like that on the test, I wouldn't even think twice because for me, that was something that was common, but I don't realize that some of these kids might not know those analogies or types of things. So I just kind of learned where to look that there might be issues. And then we do come up with something together, if we're going to do an activity we make it relate to something in the community, or something in the school. A second said, I think I realized that it is important to put your all into every single day, and just treat everyone the same, just no matter what. And just trying to come up with rules and a routine that everyone can just do it and understand it, and everyone is just treated the same. The third said, I'm definitely comfortable working with students of color. Especially after this year, one reason why kind of goes back to what I was talking about before is just that I'm now the minority in my classroom, as much as that doesn't happen very often for white people. Not only am I working with colored students on a daily basis, I'm kind of in their shoes that this point (NC). These teacher candidates understand that they need to: (a) be mindful of areas with which students may be unfamiliar and ensure that they integrate familiar sources when teaching new content, (b) treat students fairly and equitably, and (c) have a general level of comfort with students of color. Each of these is an important skill that teacher candidates must have as they move into classrooms of their own. Nonetheless, what is desperately needed by these teacher candidates are more powerful pedagogies that will support student learning. Subjects must be
taught in ways that are relevant while also extending student knowledge. However, equally important, if not more so, are the kinds of teaching practices described by Epstein & Gist (2015), who researched the practices of history teachers who:

moved beyond one-dimensional approaches to culturally relevant teaching which simply affirm students’ racial identities, and instead, fostered a critical consciousness of the structures, assumptions, and normalized practices which construct race and engineer racism. Through a series of readings, films, ethnic profiles and testimonies, in conjunction with strategic opportunities for students and the teachers to critically reflect on and discuss their racial identities, the teachers attempted to enable students to situate themselves in a complex world of racial hierarchies. (pp. 57-58)

and Ladson-Billings (2002) who describes the culturally responsive practices of a teacher who insists on high levels of success.

Limitations and Further Study

The current study has only begun to scratch the surface of this important area of research. However, it uncovers important information for deeper study. It must also be said that while this study triangulates data from three sources (surveys, interviews, and observations), there is still use of a perception data that was critiqued in Chapters One and Two. Future research in this area
should build on the kind of empirical data offered by the classroom observations undertaken in this study. It is recommended that a thorough ethnographic study be undertaken to gather richer data about the modelling of cooperating teachers and their interactions with teacher candidates over an extended period of time; preferably over the course of a full student teaching cycle. Subsequent researchers should utilize the CRIOP or a similarly concrete observation protocol. Another suggestion for future research includes linking cooperating teachers’ surveys with the surveys of teacher candidates and provide further statistical analyses. Finally, this study is focused on traditional teacher preparation candidates in Science and Mathematics, other teacher traditional and alternative teacher preparation programs should be studied as should a range of subject areas. Conducting such a study might provide an opportunity to verify that the findings here are not an anathema.

**Recommendations**

It is clear that much work needs to be done in this area. With regard to the selection of cooperating teachers, more must be done in all instances. It is imperative that these decisions be made purposefully and not left to chance. School districts and universities, each of whom has a stake in the preparation of future teachers, must work collaboratively to prepare future teachers who can succeed with students of color. An excellent model of strong partnerships between schools and universities is the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). The network’s mission is to renew schools while simultaneously renewing teacher preparation institutions. NNER is committed to providing future teachers with high quality learning opportunities and believes that the work is ongoing. In partnership, teacher preparation programs and school districts must delineate robust standards for cooperating teacher selection.
that move beyond years of service, tenure, and a Master’s Degree. This role is far too important for such limited visions of effectiveness. Observations of potential candidates should be undertaken and determinations should be made with regard to whether robust culturally responsive practices are employed.

Furthermore, professional development should be provided and mandated for cooperating teachers in general and in the area of culturally responsive pedagogy specifically. Ball (2009) proposes a four-phase model of generative change for teacher candidates that might also serve as model for the professional development of cooperating teachers in the area of culturally responsive pedagogy. The model is recursive. In Phase 1, reflection is emphasized through the use of narrated personal experiences. In Phase 2, guided introspection asks teachers to identify their role within the teaching and learning community. In Phase 3, internalization is emphasized through critiques of readings and teacher candidates work on increasing their sense of advocacy. In the final phase, teacher candidates engage in the application of their new knowledge while simultaneously continuing to problem solve and engage in ongoing learning. Ball (2009) uses the term generative change:

to refer to a process of self-perpetuating change wherein a teacher’s pedagogical practices are inspired and influenced by the instructional approaches and theory that he or she is exposed to in a professional development program. That knowledge becomes generative when the teacher continues that learning by making connections with his or her students’ knowledge and needs and begins planning the teaching based on what he or she is learning. (p. 48)
This model provides a good example of work that should be done in an ongoing way to support cooperating teachers’ understanding of and implementation of a wider range of culturally responsive practices. Finally, the work of preparing teacher candidates is important and is often done by those individuals in schools who are most dedicated to their practice and thus they frequently have also been tapped to participate in a wide array of instructional activities beyond their individual classrooms. Cooperating teachers, who in fact are doing two important jobs (preparing learning experiences for both student and adult learners, should be remunerated for this important work. Further they should also be formally and informally evaluated and given feedback as to the quality of their work as cooperating teachers.

Unfortunately it would be disingenuous not to acknowledge the policy factors at play that have compounded the university/school relationship and the selection of cooperating teachers. The extraordinary focus on test scores as an evaluation mechanism for teachers and schools can have substantial impacts on the jobs of teachers and principals. As such over the past few years, schools and teachers are increasingly unwilling to turn a class over to a teacher candidate when test scores are on the line. Parents have expressed concerns as well. More and more universities are finding it difficult to find placements for teacher candidates. Conversations about placements and expectations for students teaching must be held between university and K-12 administrators to come to agreements that are focused on the long-term development of an effective teaching corps, rather than on expediency.

Second, an interesting and unexpected finding in my conversations with program directors was that many felt that the work and conversations which they led on campus would mitigate (or ameliorate) the lack of culturally responsive pedagogy that teacher candidates were at times seeing in the field. I strongly disagree. What is needed is greater focus on pedagogy and
specifically pedagogy that will support students of color. “If we are to help novice teachers become good and experienced teachers to become better, we need theoretical propositions about pedagogy that help them understand, reflect on, and improve their philosophy and teaching practice” (Ladson-Billings, 2014, p. 83). I recommend, as do Lynn and Parker (2006), “the development of a critical race pedagogy is a way of addressing inequalities in classrooms as well as providing some information about the best way to move forward in order to transform our classrooms into places where minority students might thrive” (p. 270). The use of critical race pedagogy would force uncomfortable conversations which must be had and support teacher candidates, many of whom have had little exposure to students of color, to become aware of their unacknowledged privileges. Further the use of critical race pedagogy would challenge color-blind and/or race neutral philosophies that have to date not supported the achievement of students of color.

Educator preparation programs must identify or develop a clearly articulated culturally responsive teaching framework to be utilized by all faculty across all program components. This framework should provide a range of specific and concrete culturally responsive teaching practices and should prioritize the following concepts, which based on the current study are rarely focused upon (achievement-focused, sociopolitical consciousness, expectations and accountability, and deep immersion within communities). Programs should also rigorously assess teacher candidates’ abilities to consistently employ these practices.

Finally, because cooperating teachers, teacher candidates, and program directors are reticent to discuss race there are missed opportunities to enact the culturally responsive pedagogical practices described at the start of this dissertation. To be clear there are missing opportunities to support students of color to be academically successful. While many seem
content to discuss social justice, they do not similarly ensure discussions about race. One is left to wonder whether preparing teacher candidates for “social justice”, as currently articulated by some, has not become a mechanism for engaging in more palatable discussions and practices around class and sexuality while obfuscating racial inequalities. “Only by immersing oneself in a racial worldview can educators begin to grapple with the illogics of race parading as natural” (Leonardo, p. 255). These conversations are crucial because as Taylor (2009) writes, “We are hobbled by the paradox of a largely White teaching staff whose practices, consciously or not, contribute to the racial achievement gap yet who are unable to see what they are doing” (Taylor et al., 2009, p. 9). Building on this assertion, I propose that these omitted discussions result in the perpetuation of both the achievement gap.

Discussions of race are also critical because classrooms are not neutral spaces. Using a class-based analysis, Anyon in her work *Social Class and School Knowledge* (1981) illustrates that despite the use of a so-called standardized curriculum, knowledge takes on varying forms in working class, middle class, and elite schools. I would also argue that schools are not neutral spaces, not just as a result of class differences, but also as the result of racial demographics of the students that attend them. For too many students of color, expectations and beliefs about their worthiness and academic abilities mean that they spend hours each day focused on “other peoples” histories and on basic skills. They are given few opportunities to participate in rich learning experiences that will develop and extend their critical thinking abilities and are rarely given opportunities to hear different perspectives about the world around them than a Eurocentric worldview. “Whiteness as hegemony, then, is evident in the knowledge, values, experiences and ways of being valorized in society and in educational settings including (but not limited to) schools and teacher education programs” (Brown, 2013, p.328). Instead, among other
ways that race becomes enacted in classrooms is through the very assumptions of what students are and are not able to do. Leonardo (2013) writes, “racial representation enters many subject areas regarding the assumed cognitive capacities of students” (p. 118). As a result, while Asian students are considered math and science elite, Black students “struggle with math and receive the opposite message (p. 119). While I admire and share Paris’ (2012) call for culturally sustaining pedagogy, I believe the lift of culturally responsive pedagogy is difficult enough and is likely a pre-requisite.
Dear Program Director-

I am a doctoral candidate in the PhD Program in Urban Education at the City University of New York Graduate Center. My area of research is the clinical preparation of teacher candidates for high-need urban school settings with large populations of students of color. This survey is intended to gather information from teacher preparation programs across the country. I am primarily interested in the practices used by teacher preparation programs to actively prepare teacher candidates for success with students of color in high-need schools (i.e. through selecting, supporting, and evaluating cooperating teachers’ work with teacher candidates around issues of culturally relevant/responsive teaching, race, and diversity. For the purposes of my study, “high-need urban schools with large populations of students of color” are defined as schools which receive Title 1 funding and/or exceed 40% of students receiving free or reduced lunch and have a population of students of color that exceeds 40%.

The deadline for completing and returning this survey is February 16, 2015. The anticipated time needed to take this survey is approximately 20 minutes. Should you have any questions, please contact me at watsonaudra@gmail.com or at (609) 213-9490.

Finally, I know that you are busy working with teacher candidates, school districts and schools, I appreciate the time, attention, and effort that you give this survey.

Sincerely,

Audra M. Watson
Level III Doctoral Candidate
CUNY Graduate Center
## PROGRAM INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/University Type:</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research 1</td>
<td>Non-Research 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Geographic Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Student Enrollment ______

Total enrollment in your teacher preparation program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Does your institution have a/any teacher preparation program specifically focused on the preparation of teachers for urban high-need schools?

- Yes ______
- No ______

If there is no specific “program”, are there students who do field experiences in urban high-need schools?

- Yes ______
- No ______

If yes, what is the number of teacher preparation programs focused on preparing teachers for high-need urban schools ______

At what levels are your urban-focused teacher preparation program or programs?

- Early Childhood ______
- Elementary ______
- Middle School/High School ______
Does the urban focused teacher preparation program prepare?
Undergraduates _____ Graduates _____ Both _____

Is an urban placement required of all students?
Yes_____ No ______

CLINICAL PROGRAM DESIGN

Are teacher candidates expected to participate in a clinical experience in order to be certified?
___ Yes   ___ No

Observation hours are defined as those initial hours (prior to formal student teaching) that teacher candidates spend in a classroom observing the various aspects of teaching and learning. In these instances, candidates generally have little or limited interactions with students and may be asked to complete assignments about what is occurring in the classroom. Using this definition of observation hours,
Are Observation Hours mandatory? ___ Yes ___ No
If so, how long is the experience? __________
# of Weeks _____ OR
# of Hours _____

Is Student Teaching mandatory? ___ Yes ___ No
If so, how long is the experience?
# of Weeks _____ OR
# of Hours _____

Diversity coursework (multicultural, culturally culturally-relevant pedagogy or teaching) is often a staple of teacher preparation courses. These courses, when offered, are designed to support teacher candidate understanding of ….Are courses in Diversity (diversity/multicultural/culturally-relevant pedagogy or teaching) pre-requisites for…?
Observation Hours _____
Student Teaching _____
Certification _____

Are courses focused on diversity the result of a state mandate?
Yes ______ No ______

Does your program have requirements embedded within the program to support candidates’ development as effective teachers of students of color in high-need schools?
Yes_____ through:
___ Coursework
___ Clinical (Student Teaching)
___ Observation Hours (Pre- student teaching)
___ Other

No______

Are there explicit expectations (assignments, etc.) that teacher candidates apply what they learn in their diversity course work during:
Observation Hours Yes ______ No______
If yes, please explain how.

Student Teaching Yes ______ No______
If yes, please explain how.

If courses in Diversity (diversity/multicultural/cultural competency/culturally-relevant pedagogy or teaching) are not a pre-requisite for observation hours and/or student teaching, are diversity/multicultural, culturally relevant pedagogy taught in ways other than through coursework?

Yes ______ No______
If yes, Please explain how.

COOPERATING TEACHERS/MENTOR TEACHERS

How are your classrooms/cooperating teachers chosen? (Check all that apply)
___ Self-Identified
___ Principal Selection
___ Program Selection
___ District Selection
___ Teacher Candidate Selection
___ Other

Please indicate which of the following are pre-requisites or criteria used in the selection of cooperating teachers. (Check all that apply)
___ Application
___ Recommendations
   by university
   by school-based faculty
   other (please identify)
___ Classroom Observation by Teacher Preparation program staff
Are the program’s requirements different for cooperating teachers in high-need urban schools than for cooperating teachers in other settings?
Yes ______ No_______
If so, how________________

If participation in PD (professional development) is required as a criterion for selection, is culturally relevant pedagogy/cultural competence a topic of the professional development?
Yes ______ No_______

Is ongoing PD required for cooperating teachers?
Yes ______ No_______
If so, is culturally relevant pedagogy a topic of ongoing professional development?
Yes ______ No_______
Dear Teacher Candidate,

No identifying information will be captured nor will this information be published.

I am a doctoral candidate in the PhD Program in Urban Education at the City University of New York Graduate Center. My area of research is the clinical preparation of teacher candidates for high-need urban school settings with large populations of students of color. This survey (20 response items and general demographic questions) and will take no more than 20 minutes is intended to gather information from cooperating teachers and student teachers. For the purposes of my study, “high-need urban schools with large populations of students of color” are defined as schools which receive Title 1 funding and/or exceed 40% of students receiving free or reduced lunch and have a population of students of color that exceeds 40%.

The deadline for completing and returning this survey is February 16, 2015. The anticipated time needed to take this survey is approximately 20 minutes. Should you have any questions, please contact me at watsonaudra@gmail.com or at (609) 213-9490.

Finally, I know that you are busy and have taken on additional responsibilities to support teacher candidates. I appreciate the time, attention, and effort that you give this survey.

Sincerely,

Audra M. Watson
Level III Doctoral Candidate
CUNY Graduate Center
PART I: TEACHER MULTICULTURAL ATTITUDE SURVEY (TMAS) - DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. **GENDER** 
   - FEMALE
   - MALE

2. **AGE**

3. **RACE/ETHNICITY**
   a. AMERICAN INDIAN
   b. ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER
   c. BLACK/AFRICAN-AMERICAN
   d. CAUCASIAN/WHITE
   e. HISPANIC/NON-WHITE
   f. MULTIRACIAL
   g. OTHER

4. **STATE**

5. **TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION**
   - New England
   - Mid-Atlantic
   - Midwest
   - Southeast
   - Southwest
   - Northwest

6. **COHORT**
   - 2009
   - 2010
   - 2011
   - 2012
   - 2013
   - 2014

7. **PLEASE INDICATE YOUR CERTIFICATION LEVEL**
   - Middle
   - High School
   - Other

8. **PLEASE IDENTIFY YOUR SUBJECT AREA.**
   - MATH
   - SCIENCE
   - TECHNOLOGY
   - ENGINEERING
9. I have completed the fieldwork needed for my certification area  
   YES  NO

10. I have taken coursework focused on cultural diversity/multiculturalism.
   No
   1-2 Courses
   More than 2 courses

11. I have completed the fieldwork needed for my certification area  
    YES  NO

12. I have completed my teacher preparation program and am currently a teacher of record. *
    YES  NO

13. I have completed at least… (Please choose the response which best reflects the minimum number of hours you have completed working with students in schools).

   a) 30 HRS (Observation only)
   b) 100 HRS (Observation only)
   c) 220 HRS (Approximately 4 weeks of working with students/STUDENT TEACHING)
   d) 330 HRS (Approximately 6 weeks of working with students/STUDENT TEACHING)
   e) 440 HRS (Approximately 8 weeks of working with students/STUDENT TEACHING)
   f) 660 HRS (Approximately 12 weeks of working with students/STUDENT TEACHING)
   g) No fieldwork completed (I have spent no time interacting with students in schools)

14. The percent of students of color in my classroom is...? *

TEACHER MULTICULTURAL ATTITUDE SURVEY (TMAS)

Use the following scale to rate each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. I find teaching a culturally diverse student group rewarding.
   1  2  3  4  5

16. Teaching methods need to be adapted to meet the needs of a culturally diverse student group.
   1  2  3  4  5
17. Sometimes I think there is too much emphasis placed on multicultural awareness and training for teachers.
   1 2 3 4 5

18. Teachers have the responsibility to be aware of their students’ cultural backgrounds.
   1 2 3 4 5

19. I frequently invite extended family members (e.g., cousins, grandparents, godparents, etc.) to attend parent teacher conferences.
   1 2 3 4 5

20. It is not the teacher’s responsibility to encourage pride in one’s culture.
   1 2 3 4 5

21. As classrooms become more culturally diverse the teacher’s job becomes increasingly challenging.
   1 2 3 4 5

22. I believe the teacher’s role needs to be redefined to address the needs of students from culturally diverse backgrounds.
   1 2 3 4 5

Use the following scale to rate each item.

   1 Strongly Disagree
   2 Disagree
   3 Uncertain
   4 Agree
   5 Strongly Agree

23. When dealing with bilingual students, some teachers may misinterpret different communication styles as behavioral problems.
   1 2 3 4 5

24. As classrooms become more culturally diverse, the teacher’s job becomes increasingly rewarding.
   1 2 3 4 5

25. I can learn a great deal from students with culturally different backgrounds.
   1 2 3 4 5

26. Multicultural training for teachers is not necessary.
   1 2 3 4 5

27. In order to be an effective teacher, one needs to be aware of cultural differences present in the classroom.
   1 2 3 4 5
28. Multicultural awareness training can help me work more effectively with a diverse population.
1 2 3 4 5

29. Students should learn to communicate in English only.
1 2 3 4 5

30. Today’s curriculum gives undue importance to multiculturalism and diversity
1 2 3 4 5

31. I am aware of the diversity of cultural backgrounds in my classroom.
1 2 3 4 5

32. Regardless of the racial and ethnic makeup of my class, it is important for all students to be aware of multicultural diversity.
1 2 3 4 5

33. Being multiculturally aware is not relevant for the subject I teach.
1 2 3 4 5

34. Teaching students about cultural diversity will only create conflict in the classroom.
1 2 3 4 5

PART III:

35. Does your cooperating teacher model culturally responsive pedagogy?
   YES ______   NO _________

36. In which ways does he or she do so?

37. Does/Did my CT have high expectations for all of his or her learners?
   Yes   No
38. Does/Did my CT attempt to establish genuine partnerships with parents and caregivers? *
   Yes     No

39. Does/Did my CT genuinely believe that parents were doing the best they could for their children? *
   Yes     No

40. Does/Did my CT uses students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds to facilitate learning? *
   Yes     No

41. Does/Did my CT support students in thinking about and questioning why things are as they are? *
   Yes     No

42. Does/Did my CT encourage students to investigate and take action on real world problems? *
   Yes     No

43. Does/Did my CT actively challenge and discuss negative stereotypes? *
   Yes     No

44. Did you have or do you feel you will have the skills necessary to work effectively with students of color in high-need schools, as a result of your student teaching/fieldwork experience? *
   Yes     No

Thank You!
Dear Cooperating Teacher,

No identifying information will be captured nor will this information be published.

I am a doctoral candidate in the PhD Program in Urban Education at the City University of New York Graduate Center. My area of research is the clinical preparation of teacher candidates for high-need urban school settings with large populations of students of color. This survey (20 response items and general demographic questions) and will take no more than 20 minutes is intended to gather information from cooperating teachers and student teachers. For the purposes of my study, “high-need urban schools with large populations of students of color” are defined as schools which receive Title 1 funding and/or exceed 40% of students receiving free or reduced lunch and have a population of students of color that exceeds 40%.

The deadline for completing and returning this survey is February, 2015. The anticipated time needed to take this survey is approximately 20 minutes. Should you have any questions, please contact me at watsonaudra@gmail.com or at (609) 213-9490.

Finally, I know that you are busy and have taken on additional responsibilities to support teacher candidates. I appreciate the time, attention, and effort that you give this survey.

Sincerely,

Audra M. Watson
Level III Doctoral Candidate
CUNY Graduate Center
COOPERATING TEACHER DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

**Page description:**
Please use this page to provide demographic information about yourself and your student teacher.

1. GENDER   Male   Female

2. AGE:  25-35  36-45  46-55  56 and over

3. RACE/ETHNICITY:
   - AMERICAN INDIAN
   - ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER
   - BLACK/AFRICAN-AMERICAN
   - CAUCASIAN/WHITE
   - HISPANIC/NON-WHITE
   - BIRACIAL
   - MULTIRACIAL
   - OTHER

4. STATE

5. UNIVERSITY PARTNER GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION
   - New England
   - Mid-Atlantic
   - Midwest
   - Southeast
   - Southwest
   - Northwest

6. The percentage of students of color in my classroom is...? *

7. HAVE YOU WORKED WITH MORE THAN ONE TEACHER CANDIDATE?
   - Yes
   - No

   If you have worked with more than one teacher candidate, please answer questions 8, 9, and 10 keeping your current or most recent teacher candidate in mind.

8. CANDIDATE’S AREA OF CERTIFICATION

9. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE COHORT(S) FOR THE FELLOW(S) WITH WHOM YOU WORKED. Check all that apply.
   - 2009
   - 2010
   - 2011
   - 2012
10. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE TEACHER CANDIDATE'S SUBJECT AREA.
   MATH
   SCIENCE
   TECHNOLOGY
   ENGINEERING

11. TEACHER CANDIDATE’S PROGRAM OF STUDY
   Undergraduate
   Graduate

12. I was provided with professional development in preparation for my role as a cooperating teacher/mentor teacher?
   Yes  No

13. I was provided with professional development focused on cultural diversity/cultural competence/multiculturalism in preparation for my role as a cooperating teacher/mentor teacher.
   Yes  No

TEACHER MULTICULTURAL ATTITUDE SURVEY (TMAS)

Use the following scale to rate each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I find teaching a culturally diverse student group rewarding.
   1  2  3  4  5

15. Teaching methods need to be adapted to meet the needs of a culturally diverse student group.
   1  2  3  4  5

16. Sometimes I think there is too much emphasis placed on multicultural awareness and training for teachers.
   1  2  3  4  5
17. Teachers have the responsibility to be aware of their students’ cultural backgrounds.
1 2 3 4 5

18. I frequently invite extended family members (e.g., cousins, grandparents, godparents, etc.) to attend parent teacher conferences.
1 2 3 4 5

19. It is not the teacher’s responsibility to encourage pride in one’s culture.
1 2 3 4 5

20. As classrooms become more culturally diverse the teacher’s job becomes increasingly challenging.
1 2 3 4 5

21. I believe the teacher’s role needs to be redefined to address the needs of students from culturally diverse backgrounds.
1 2 3 4 5

22. When dealing with bilingual students, some teachers may misinterpret different communication styles as behavioral problems.
1 2 3 4 5

23. As classrooms become more culturally diverse, the teacher’s job becomes increasingly rewarding.
1 2 3 4 5

24. I can learn a great deal from students with culturally different backgrounds.
1 2 3 4 5

25. Multicultural training for teachers is not necessary.
1 2 3 4 5

26. In order to be an effective teacher, one needs to be aware of cultural differences present in the classroom.
1 2 3 4 5
27. Multicultural awareness training can help me work more effectively with a diverse population.
1 2 3 4 5

28. Students should learn to communicate in English only.
1 2 3 4 5

29. Today’s curriculum gives undue importance to multiculturalism and diversity
1 2 3 4 5

30. I am aware of the diversity of cultural backgrounds in my classroom.
1 2 3 4 5

31. Regardless of the racial and ethnic makeup of my class, it is important for all students to be aware of multicultural diversity.
1 2 3 4 5

32. Being multiculturally aware is not relevant for the subject I teach.
1 2 3 4 5

Use the following scale to rate each item.

Use the following scale to rate each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Teaching students about cultural diversity will only create conflict in the classroom.
1 2 3 4 5

34. I actively model culturally responsive pedagogy for the teacher candidate. *
   Yes
   No

35. Please describe the ways in which you model culturally responsive pedagogy or cultural competence for your student teacher.

36. I have high expectations for all of my learners. *
   Yes
   No

37. I attempt to establish genuine partnerships with parents and caregivers. *
   Yes
   No
38. My students' parents are doing the best they can for their children. *
   Yes                                  No

39. I include students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds to facilitate learning. *
   Yes                                  No

40. I support my students in thinking about and questioning why things are as they are. *
   Yes                                  No

41. I encourage my students to investigate and take action on real world problems. *
   Yes                                  No

42. I actively challenge and discuss negative stereotypes in my classroom. *
   Yes                                  No

43. I am confident that as a result of the student teaching experience in my classroom my student teacher will have the skills necessary to work effectively with students of color in high-need schools? *
   Yes                                  No

Thank You!

Thank you for taking this survey. I know that you are very busy and appreciate your time and effort. Your response is very important to me.
APPENDIX D

The Teacher Multicultural Attitude Survey (TMAS)
Copyrighted © 1998 by Joseph G. Ponterotto, Ph.D.

Dear TMAS User:

Enclosed is the TMAS, scoring directions, and the “Utilization Request Form” which must be carefully read, endorsed, and returned prior to TMAS use. It is important to read the following articles or chapters before using the TMAS:


Teacher Multicultural Attitude Survey (TMAS)  
Copyrighted © by Joseph G. Ponterotto, Ph.D.

Scoring Directions as of 11/98

The TMAS gives one total score by summing (or averaging) all 20 items after reverse scoring those items indicated.

The following items are scored as is (1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5)

Items 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18

The following items are reverse-scored (1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)

Items 3, 6, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20

Total scores can then range from 20 to 100 (or if dividing by the number of items [20] to get a Likert-type range mean, from 1 to 5).

Higher scores indicate a more appreciation and awareness of multicultural teaching issues. The TMAS is only meant for large scale mean research at this time, and should not be used in any evaluative way.

For recent validity information on the TMAS contact:

Joseph G. Ponterotto, Ph.D.  
Division of Psychological & Educational Services  
Room 1008  
Fordham University – Lincoln Center  
113 West 60th Street  
New York, NY 10023 – 7478  
(212) 636 – 6480
Teacher Multicultural Attitude Survey (TMAS)

Copyright by Joseph G. Ponterotto et al. (1995)

Please respond to all items in the survey. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers. The survey is anonymous; do not put your name on the survey. Please circle the appropriate number below.

Use the following scale to rate each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I find teaching a culturally diverse student group rewarding.
   1 2 3 4 5

2. Teaching methods need to be adapted to meet the needs of a culturally diverse student group.
   1 2 3 4 5

3. Sometimes I think there is too much emphasis placed on multicultural awareness and training for teachers.
   1 2 3 4 5

4. Teachers have the responsibility to be aware of their students’ cultural backgrounds.
   1 2 3 4 5

5. I frequently invite extended family members (e.g., cousins, grandparents, godparents, etc.) to attend parent teacher conferences.
   1 2 3 4 5

6. It is not the teacher’s responsibility to encourage pride in one’s culture.
   1 2 3 4 5

7. As classrooms become more culturally diverse the teacher’s job becomes increasingly challenging.
   1 2 3 4 5

8. I believe the teacher’s role needs to be redefined to address the needs of students from culturally diverse backgrounds.
   1 2 3 4 5

Use the following scale to rate each item.
9. When dealing with bilingual students, some teachers may misinterpret different communication styles as behavioral problems.
   1  2  3  4  5

10. As classrooms become more culturally diverse, the teacher’s job becomes increasingly rewarding.
    1  2  3  4  5

11. I can learn a great deal from students with culturally different backgrounds.
    1  2  3  4  5

12. Multicultural training for teachers is not necessary.
    1  2  3  4  5

13. In order to be an effective teacher, one needs to be aware of cultural differences present in the classroom.
    1  2  3  4  5

14. Multicultural awareness training can help me work more effectively with a diverse population.
    1  2  3  4  5

15. Students should learn to communicate in English only.
    1  2  3  4  5

16. Today’s curriculum gives undue importance to multiculturalism and diversity
    1  2  3  4  5

17. I am aware of the diversity of cultural backgrounds in my classroom.
    1  2  3  4  5

18. Regardless of the racial and ethnic makeup of my class, it is important for all students to be aware of multicultural diversity.
    1  2  3  4  5

19. Being multiculturally aware is not relevant for the subject I teach.
    1  2  3  4  5

Use the following scale to rate each item.

1  2  3  4  5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20. Teaching students about cultural diversity will only create conflict in the classroom.

1  2  3  4  5

Do you have any thoughts or comments about this survey, or about the research topic?
APPENDIX E
Utilization Request Form

In using the Teacher Multicultural Attitude Survey (TMAS), I agree to the following terms/conditions:

1. I understand that the TMAS is copyrighted by Joseph G. Ponterotto (Ph.D.) at the Division of Psychological and Educational Services, Fordham University at Lincoln Center, 113 West 60th Street, New York, New York 10023-7478 (212-636-6480); Jponterott@aol.com.

2. I am a trained professional in counseling, psychology, or a related field, having completed coursework (or training) in multicultural issues, psychometrics, and research ethics, or I am working under the supervision of such an individual.

3. In using the TMAS, all ethical standards of the American Psychological Association, the American Counseling Association, and/or related professional organizations will be adhered to. Furthermore, I will follow the “Research with Human Subjects” guidelines put forth by my university, institution, or professional setting. Ethical considerations include but are not limited to subject informed consent, confidentiality of records, adequate pre- and post-briefing of subjects, and subject opportunity to review a concise written summary of the study's purpose, method, results, and implications.

4. Consistent with accepted professional practice, I will save and protect my raw data for a minimum of five years; and if requested I will make the raw data available to scholars researching the prejudice construct.

5. I will send a copy of my research results (for any study incorporating the TMAS) in manuscript form to Dr. Ponterotto, regardless of whether the study is published, presented, or fully completed.

Signature: Audra M. Watson
Name: Audra M. Watson
Date: 11/1/14
Phone: (609) 213-9490
Address: 4295 Webster Avenue
Apt. 6D
Bronx, NY 10470

If a student, supervisor/mentor’s name and phone number, affiliation, and signature:

Name: Nicholas Michelli
Affiliation: Doctoral Advisor
Phone: (917) 882-7670

Signature: Nicholas Michelli
Date: 11/1/2014
SESSION ONE: For Cooperating Teachers:

1. What subject(s) do you teach?
2. How many years have you been teaching?
3. How long have you been a cooperating teacher/mentor teacher?
4. Please describe the demographic makeup of your school and classroom?
5. Please describe your instructional philosophy. What do you believe about teaching and learning?
6. Please describe the academic abilities of the students in your classroom.
7. How were you selected to become a Cooperating Teacher? How are you compensated? How are you evaluated?
8. Please describe the professional development that was provided for your role as a cooperating/mentor teacher. Was professional development provided for the role of cooperating teacher prior to getting a student teacher and/or is ongoing professional development provided for your role as a cooperating teacher?
9. In your conversations with the teacher candidate how frequently does the issue of diversity, race, or culturally responsive pedagogy emerge? Please describe the nature of these conversations?
10. What are the specific needs of students of color in high-need classrooms? In what ways are your instructional practices responsive to the needs of these students? Are their particular practices that you utilize in order to support their academic achievement? In what ways have you adapted lessons to meet the needs of students in your classroom?
11. Please describe your understanding of culturally responsive/relevant pedagogy. Do you agree with this teaching philosophy? Why or why not?
12. Is culturally responsive/relevant pedagogy/diversity training/cultural competence a part of the professional development that was or is offered to support your work as a cooperating teacher?
13. Would you describe your teaching practice as culturally responsive? Do you model culturally responsive pedagogy for the teacher candidate? If so, can you please provide examples of the ways in which you model culturally responsive pedagogy for the teacher candidate?
SESSION ONE: For Teacher Candidates:

1. Please describe your experience in working in this school. What specific challenges and successes have you had?

2. What discussions have you and your cooperating teachers had about expectations for student achievement? How would you describe the expectations of student achievement held by your cooperating teacher? Please provide examples.

3. Please describe your cooperating teacher’s pedagogy.

4. Does your CT have high expectations for all of his or her learners? Does your CT ensure that academic persistence on the part of students? Please provide examples of ways in which this does or does not happen.

5. Are you familiar with culturally responsive pedagogy? How do you define it? Have you seen culturally responsive pedagogical practices modeled by your cooperating teacher? If so, can you describe them? What have you learned about diversity/culturally responsive pedagogy from our cooperating teacher?

6. In your conversations with your cooperating teacher how frequently does the issue of diversity/race/class/cultural competence or culturally responsive pedagogy emerge? Please describe the nature of these conversations?

7. Do you feel confident that as a result of your clinical fieldwork that you will have the skills necessary to work effectively with students of color in high-need schools?
SESSION TWO: For Cooperating Teachers:

Questions for the cooperating teacher during the second interview will be largely focused on asking questions which emerge as a result of the observations of his/her classroom or were left unresolved during the initial interview, prior to the classroom observations. In addition, however, I will revisit the following questions:

1. Is there anything that you would now add to your description of your instructional philosophy? What do you believe about teaching and learning?
2. Would you describe your teaching practice as culturally responsive? Do you model culturally responsive pedagogy for the teacher candidate? If so, can you please provide examples of the ways in which you model culturally responsive pedagogy for the teacher candidate?

SESSION TWO: For Cooperating Teachers:

Questions for the student teacher/teacher candidate during the second interview will be largely focused on asking questions which emerge as a result of the observations of his/her placement classroom or were left unresolved during the initial interview, prior to the classroom observations. In addition, however, I will revisit the following questions:

1. Does your CT have high expectations for all of his or her learners? Does your CT ensure that academic persistence on the part of students? Please provide examples of ways in which this does or does not happen.
2. In your conversations with your cooperating teacher how frequently does the issue of diversity/race/class/cultural competence or culturally responsive pedagogy emerge? Please describe the nature of these conversations?
3. Do you feel confident that as a result of your clinical fieldwork that you will have the skills necessary to work effectively with students of color in high-need schools? Why or why not?
APPENDIX G

Culturally Responsive Instruction Observation Protocol

School (use assigned number): ________________ Teacher (assigned number): ________________
Observer: ___________________________ Date of Observation: ___________ # of Students in
Classroom: ________________


DIRECTIONS

After the classroom observation, review the field notes for evidence of each “pillar” of Culturally
Responsive Instruction. If an example of the following descriptors was observed, place the field notes
line number on which that example is found. If a “non-example” of the descriptors was observed, place
the line number on which that non-example is found. Then, make an overall/holistic judgment of the
implementation of the concept, according to the following rating scale:

4 = The classroom was CONSISTENTLY CHARACTERIZED by culturally responsive features
3 = The classroom was OFTEN CHARACTERIZED by culturally responsive features
2 = The classroom was OCCASIONALLY CHARACTERIZED by culturally responsive features
1 = The classroom was RARELY CHARACTERIZED by culturally responsive features
0 = The classroom was NEVER CHARACTERIZED by culturally responsive features

Transfer the holistic scores from pp. 2 through 9 to the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI Pillar</th>
<th>Holistic Score</th>
<th>CRI Pillar</th>
<th>Holistic Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. ASMT</td>
<td></td>
<td>V. DISC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. CARE</td>
<td></td>
<td>VI. FAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. CLIM</td>
<td></td>
<td>VII. INSTR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. CURR</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII. PERSP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## I. ASMT ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

| Holistic score | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI Indicator</th>
<th>For example, in a responsive classroom:</th>
<th>For example, in a non-responsive classroom:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The teacher <strong>gives clear direct feedback</strong></td>
<td>• Teacher writes comments on student work that indicate his/her interest in the work (“Would he really do that?” “I’d like to know more about this …”) • Rubrics for particular assignments are displayed and teacher refers to criteria as students develop their products</td>
<td>• Teacher responds to student work with short evaluative comments such as “good job” or “✓”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The teacher includes <strong>multiple ways to represent knowledge and skills</strong> (all of the language arts, visual arts, music, drama, math)</td>
<td>• Students can demonstrate knowledge in multiple ways (talking, writing, drama, art, etc.) • Multiple assessments are used so students have various ways to demonstrate competence</td>
<td>• Teacher expects students to tell “the” answer • Teacher tells students “the” answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The teacher encourages <strong>student self-assessment</strong></td>
<td>• Students use rubrics to assess their own products • Students are involved in developing the criteria for their finished products (e.g., scoring rubrics) • Students are encouraged to evaluate their own products based upon a pre-determined set of criteria • Peer assessment is used (e.g., peers read each other’s work and comment on it)</td>
<td>• Students expect teacher to know all the answers • Students turn all work into the teacher for a grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The teacher uses <strong>multifaceted</strong> (more than one type of measure), <strong>classroom-based assessments, tied to particular projects</strong></td>
<td>• Authentic assessments are used frequently (e.g., authentic group discussions/conversations, presentations, reading/writing for real audiences, etc.) • Assessments typically involve reading and writing connected text (e.g., running records, journal responses, etc.) • Formal and informal assessments are used to provide a holistic view of students’ strengths and needs</td>
<td>• Students work only on worksheets • Students have a narrow range of options for demonstrating competence (e.g., multiple choice tests, matching, etc.) • Teacher uses standardized testing or constant quizzing; no assessment alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The teacher uses <strong>assessment data that captures individual student learning/thinking</strong></td>
<td>• Teacher uses assessment data to differentiate instruction • Teacher uses formative assessment to provide explicit instruction to students when they need it</td>
<td>• Teacher uses assessment data only to assign grades; data not used formatively to provide explicit instruction when needed • Teacher relies on summative assessments to inform instruction • Formative assessments are too general to capture individual student understanding (e.g. class discussions where only a few students participate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. CARE

CLASSROOM CARING AND TEACHER DISPOSITIONS

Holistic score 4 3 2 1 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI Indicator</th>
<th>For example, in a responsive classroom:</th>
<th>For example, in a non-responsive classroom:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The teacher demonstrates an ethic of care (e.g., equitable relationships, bonding) | - Teacher differentiates management techniques (e.g., using a more direct interactive style with students who require it)  
- Teacher refers to students by name, uses personalized language with students  
- Teacher consistently models respectful interaction with students in the classroom  
- Teacher consistently demonstrates high expectations for student social interactions | - Teacher makes sarcastic comments  
- Teacher promotes negativity in the classroom; frequent criticisms, negative comments, etc.  
- Teacher uses the same management techniques and interactive style with all students when it is clear that they do not work for some  
- Teacher demonstrates low expectations for student social interactions |
| 2. The teacher communicates high expectations for all students | - Teacher differentiates instruction, recognizing students’ varying background knowledge, readiness, language, preferences in learning, interests, etc.  
- Teacher advocates for all students  
- Teacher consistently demonstrates high expectations for all students academic achievement through insisting that they complete assignments, by providing challenging work, etc. (not letting them “get by” even when their home life is difficult) | - Teacher criticizes the student (the person), not the work (the product)  
- Teacher has low expectations (consistently gives work that is not challenging)  
- Teacher doesn’t balance student participation  
- Teacher does not call on all students consistently  
- Teacher ignores some students; e.g., never asks them to respond to questions, allows them to sleep, places them in the “corners” of the room and does not bring them into the instructional conversation, etc.  
- Teacher tends to blame parents/home for lack of student achievement |
| 3. The teacher creates a learning atmosphere in which students and teachers feel respect and connect to one another | - Students do not hesitate to ask questions that further their learning  
- Students know the class routines and are supported by them  
- Students are encouraged to provide peer support and assistance  
- Students are encouraged to respond to one another positively  
- Students are invested in their and others’ learning | - Teacher dominates the decision-making  
- Teacher stays behind desk or across table from students; s/he does not get “on their level”  
- Students are never encouraged to assist their peers  
- Teacher does not address negative comments of one student towards another |
| 4. The teacher actively confronts instances of discrimination | - Teacher confronts students’ biases and acts of discrimination in the classroom actively  
- Teacher encourages a diversity of perspectives  
- Teacher uses a variety of multicultural literature to expose students to a variety of individual experiences and perspectives of people from diverse populations  
- Teacher engages students in critical examination of curriculum content and personal experiences that contribute to equity or inequity among individuals or groups in society | - Teacher appears to have “favorite” students  
- Teacher allows students’ open expression of prejudicial acts and statements toward others in the classroom community  
- Teacher squeezes diversity of opinion  
- Teacher primarily presents content, curriculum, and ideas that are representative of a mainstream middle/upper class perspective(s)  
- Teacher consistently uses literature that only provides positive images of mainstream populations |
### III. CLIM CLASSROOM CLIMATE/ PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI Indicator</th>
<th>For example, in a responsive classroom:</th>
<th>For example, in a non-responsive classroom:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The physical materials and furnishings invite students to use literacy | • Materials are located so that all students can choose them  
• Classroom library includes many books (of all different reading levels) that reflect diversity; books are available and organized so students can find what they need/want  
• Computers are readily available and students use them for inquiry (e.g., to respond to questions they have in a particular content area; to work on self-selected projects)  
• Computer programs are clearly motivating to students and encourage a love of reading/writing | • Books and materials are locked away or cannot be accessed by students without teacher permission  
• Teacher controls most minutes of the day  
• Classroom contains few books that students want to read; students show lack of interest in reading outside of the requirements  
• Computer programs/computer use generally involves “worksheets on a screen” and does not promote student inquiry or creativity |
| 2. The physical materials and furnishings promote shared ownership of the environment | • Rules are co-authored by school, students and teachers  
• Students help make decisions about materials and the environment  
• Everyone has access to materials and groups  
• Everyone shares responsibility for maintaining order in the physical environment | • Teacher dominates; students do not have choice; an autocratic environment  
• Teacher controls student access to materials  
• Classroom is devoid of student influence |
| 3. The physical materials establish an environment that demonstrates an appreciation for diversity | • Posters, bulletin boards, other images reflect human diversity  
• Classroom library and curriculum materials contain multicultural content that reflect the perspectives and experiences of diverse groups  
• Curriculum materials call for real-life examples from students’ experiences | • Posters, bulletin boards, other images do not reflect human diversity  
• Classroom library contains all or nearly all books written by white authors, with white protagonists; very few books reflect human diversity  
• Classroom library and curriculum materials promote ethnocentric positions or ignore human diversity |
| 4. The furnishings allow students to be seated with a partner or group and collaborate or assist each other | • Chairs/desks are arranged to facilitate group work  
• Students can move to areas of the room conducive to their instructional activities (e.g., learning centers, carpet area, classroom library) | • Classroom is arranged for quiet, solitary work only  
• Teacher discourages student interaction |
### IV. CURRICULUM/ PLANNED EXPERIENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI Indicator</th>
<th>For example, in a responsive classroom:</th>
<th>For example, in a non-responsive classroom:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The curriculum and planned learning experiences **use the knowledge and experience of students** | • Students are involved in setting goals for their learning; e.g., KWL, developing self-assessment instruments.  
• Real-world examples that connect to students’ lives are included in the curriculum  
• Learning experiences build on prior student learning and invite students to make connections  
• Examples of mainstream and non-mainstream beliefs, attitudes, and activities are included. | • No attempt is made to link students’ realities to what is being studied  
• Learning experiences are disconnected from students’ knowledge and experiences  
• Students’ and families’ particular “funds of knowledge” are never called upon during learning experiences  
• Teacher follows the script of the adopted program even when it conflicts with her own or the students’ lived experiences. |
| 2. The curriculum and planned learning experiences involve students in literacy for real purposes for real audiences | • Curriculum experiences include inquiry-based reading, writing, and learning  
• Authentic, purposeful reading and writing tasks (e.g., letters or other texts written for real purposes; literacy performances; oral reading to an audience with the intent of informing or entertaining) are integral to the curriculum | • Worksheets and/or workbook assignments predominate  
• Students read from textbooks exclusively and responses to reading are prefabricated end-of-chapter questions, etc. |
| 3. The curriculum and planned learning experiences integrate and provide opportunities for the expression of diverse perspectives | • Texts with protagonists from diverse cultural, linguistic and/or socioeconomic backgrounds, and promotes understanding of a character’s perspective are regularly used  
• Texts are examined from multiple perspectives  
• Opportunities are plentiful for students to present diverse perspectives through class discussions  
• Students are encouraged to challenge the ideas in a text | • Biased units of study that show only the conventional point of view (e.g., Columbus discovered America) are presented  
• No or very few texts are available with protagonists from diverse cultural, linguistic, and/or socioeconomic backgrounds  
• No opportunities is provided for students to present diverse views |
| 4. The curriculum and planned learning experiences **integrate skills and information** | • Skills and strategies are taught in meaningful contexts  
• Children’s own texts are used to demonstrate skills and concepts | • Skills are presented in isolation (never in application to authentic contexts)  
• The adopted reading program is characterized by non-contextual texts (skills in isolation rather than skills within authentic literature) |
| 5. The curriculum and planned learning experiences includes issues important to the classroom, school and larger community | • “Morning message” is used to build community – to teach, inspire, congratulate, communicate, etc.  
• Community-based projects are included in the planned program  
• Students write texts that relate to community issues  
• Students are engaged in learning experiences that develop awareness of and value for individual differences (e.g., within the classroom, school and community) | • Learning experiences are derived almost exclusively from published textbooks and other materials that do not relate to the classroom community or the larger community being served  
• Curriculum presents the belief that there is one best/right way to view issues and individuals |
### V. DISCOURSE/ INSTRUCTIONAL CONVERSATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI Indicator</th>
<th>For example, in a responsive classroom:</th>
<th>For example, in a non-responsive classroom:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The teacher encourages and responds positively to children’s use of home/native language/dialect | - Teacher encourages peer conversation in home language during free time and academic time  
- Teacher allows family stories in home language/dialect  
- Teacher encourages ELL students to communicate with family members in their native language | - Teacher discourages students’ use of home language, even when its use is appropriate to the situational context  
- Discourages ELL students’ use of their native language outside of school |
| 2. The teacher builds upon and expands upon student talk in an authentic way | - Teacher promotes discussion (genuine conversations versus “guess what’s in the teacher’s head”)  
- Teacher elicits student talk, e.g., open-ended questions  
- Teacher listens carefully by demonstrating active listening behaviors and responding appropriately to student comments  
- Teacher allows opportunities to share personal experiences of teacher, students – familiar, interesting topics  
- Teacher promotes extended talk – elaborated inquiry and discussion – not just providing an answer or a fact | - Teacher-student exchanges are typified by IRE discourse pattern (the traditional pattern of teacher-led classroom communication: teacher-initiation, students search for correct answer, teacher evaluates students’ responses)  
- Single answer questions are typical (“guess what’s in the teacher’s head”)  
- Teacher asks mostly closed-ended questions |
| 3. The teacher shares control of classroom discourse with students | - Teacher/students produce discourse together, collaborative  
- Classroom discourse is not dominated by “teacher talk;” teacher “air time” generally no greater than 60%  
- Teacher arranges and supports equitable participation, e.g., wait time, feedback, turn-taking, scaffolding of ideas  
- Students are encouraged to comment on and expand upon ideas of their peers | - No opportunities for extended student talk; talk is dominated by the teacher |
| 4. The teacher provides structures that promote student collaborative talk | - Teacher has structures in place that promote student talk, e.g., think/pair/share, small group work, partner work  
- Teacher institutes collaborative learning to allow collaborative discourse | - No structures in place that would promote student talk (such as working in pairs, groups)  
- Students “get in trouble” for talking about instructional material |
### VI. FAMILY INVOLVEMENT AND COLLABORATION

**Holistic score** 4 3 2 1 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI Indicator</th>
<th>For example, in a responsive classroom:</th>
<th>For example, in a non-responsive classroom:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The teacher establishes genuine partnerships (equitable relationships) with parents/caregivers | • Evidence of genuine partnership (equitable relationships) with parents/caregivers,  
• Parents/caregivers’ ideas are solicited  
• Evidence of conversations with parents/caregivers where it’s clear that they are viewed as partners in educating the student  
• Evidence that the teacher has made the effort to get to know the “whole child” (his/her background, family culture, outside of school activities) by getting to know his/her parents/caregivers | • Parents/caregivers’ suggestions not incorporated in instruction  
• No effort made to establish relationships with caregivers; there’s evidence of a “deficit perspective” in which families and caregivers are viewed as inferior |
| 2. The teacher uses parent expertise to support student learning and welcomes parents/caregivers in the classroom | • Parents/caregivers are invited into the classroom to share experiences and areas of expertise  
• Parents/caregivers’ “funds of knowledge” are utilized in the instructional program  
• Teacher makes reference to parents/caregivers’ careers, backgrounds, daily activities during instruction  
• Parents/caregivers participate in collaborative activities  
• Feedback from parents/caregivers is evident in the classroom | • Parents/caregivers never involved in instructional program  
• Parents/caregivers’ “funds of knowledge” never utilized  
• No evidence of home/family connections in the classroom  
• Parents/caregivers are never invited to participate in classroom events |
| 3. The teacher reaches out to meet parents in positive, non-traditional ways | • Teacher conducts home visit conferences  
• Teacher plans activities at locations outside of school  
• Teacher meets parents in parking lot or other “neutral” locations  
• Teacher makes “good day” phone calls | • Communication with parents/caregivers is through newsletters, where they are asked to respond passively (e.g., signing the newsletter, versus become actively involved in their child’s learning)  
• Teacher conducts phone calls, conferences, personal notes to parents for negative reports only (e.g., discipline) |
## VII. INSTR PEDAGOGY/ INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI Indicator</th>
<th>For example, in a responsive classroom:</th>
<th>For example, in a non-responsive classroom:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The teacher learns with students | • Teacher learns about diverse perspectives along with students  
• Teacher models active listening  
• Students take the role of teacher  
• Teacher uses the inquiry process and learns from students’ investigation | • Teacher is the authority; students listen passively  
• Students not encouraged to challenge or question ideas presented or to engage in further inquiry |
| 2. The teacher allows students to collaborate with other students | • Teacher involves students in collaborative groups, “think/pair/share,” students actively involved in thinking about ideas (student collaboration and response can be embedded throughout explicit instruction)  
• Students discuss books in literature circles where students are given increasing autonomy in the discussions based upon their level of development  
• Includes student-controlled learning groups | • Most student work in the form of isolated seatwork  
• Students are reprimanded for helping each other |
| 3. The teacher uses active, hands-on learning that promotes student engagement | • Teacher uses an investigative (“let’s find out”) process  
• Teacher arranges shared literacy experiences that build a sense of community (e.g. choral reading, partner reading) | • Teacher-dominated lectures with no or very little student interaction throughout  
• Prefabricated worksheets or workbooks  
• Round robin reading  
• Exclusive use of textbooks with no “exploratory” learning |
| 4. The teacher balances instruction using both explicit skill instruction and reading/writing for meaning | • Teacher models and demonstrates expected skills and behaviors and applies new skills to learning context  
• Teacher focuses on meaning; students dialogue about text in order to construct shared meaning  
• Teacher includes learning experiences that allow students to be physically active and involved | • Skill and drill focus  
• Isolated school tasks, disconnected from each other, as well as repetitive and routine |
| 5. The teacher gives students choices in content and assessment methods based on their experiences, values, needs and strengths | • Teacher permits students some choice in assignments, reading materials, etc.  
• Teacher provides students with multiple pathways for demonstrating competence  
• Teacher allows students some choice in the topic of study and ownership in what they are learning | • Dominance of teacher-initiated assignments  
• No variation in assessments (e.g., ELLs are evaluated based upon their writing ability regardless of language proficiency level) |
### VIII. PERSP SOCIOPOLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS/MULTIPLE PERSPECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI Indicator</th>
<th>For example, in a responsive classroom:</th>
<th>For example, in a non-responsive classroom:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. The teacher encourages students to think about and question the way things are</strong></td>
<td>- Teacher encourages students to question the hegemonic social structure (the “way things are”)&lt;br&gt;- Teacher uses critical thinking techniques such as requesting evidence, accepting multiple points of view, respecting divergent ideas&lt;br&gt;- Teacher helps students think in multiple ways and from multiple perspectives (“Are there other ways to think about it?”)&lt;br&gt;- Teacher explains and/or models that there could be multiple answers to a problem/task and multiple ways to find the answers</td>
<td>- Teacher reduces complex content to lists, facts&lt;br&gt;- Teacher engages in mystification in which students are not given the “whole story” in order to avoid controversy&lt;br&gt;- Teacher never engages students in dialogue about the issues being raised in a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. The teacher encourages students to investigate and take action on real world problems</strong></td>
<td>- Teacher addresses real life problems and issues within the students’ communities and respects their “funds of knowledge”&lt;br&gt;- Teacher allows students to write about topics that really matter to them and helps students identify those topics&lt;br&gt;- Teacher encourages students to investigate real-world issues related to a topic being studied&lt;br&gt;- Teacher encourages students to become actively involved in solving problems at the local, state, national, and global levels&lt;br&gt;- Teacher uses literature, learning activities that encourage students to reflect on discrimination and bias&lt;br&gt;- Teacher engages students in identifying and developing solutions that address social injustice(s)</td>
<td>- Teacher does not encourage application to real-world issues; accepts or endorses the status quo by ignoring or dismissing real life problems related to the topic being studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. The teacher actively deconstructs negative stereotypes in instructional materials and other texts</strong></td>
<td>- Teacher discusses biases in popular culture that students encounter in their daily lives (e.g., TV shows, advertising, popular songs, toys)&lt;br&gt;- Teacher helps students to think about biases in texts (e.g., “Who has the power in this book?” Whose perspectives are represented in the text? Discussion and consideration of who benefits from specific beliefs and practices represented in texts.)&lt;br&gt;- Teacher challenges students to deconstruct their own cultural assumptions and biases&lt;br&gt;- Teacher engages students in using literate skills and behaviors to bring about needed changes that benefit underserved and/or marginalized populations (e.g., engage in discourse, activities, and/or acts of social justice)</td>
<td>- Teacher follows the script of the adopted program even when it conflicts with her own or the students’ lived experiences&lt;br&gt;- Teacher accepts information in written texts as factual&lt;br&gt;- Teacher makes prejudicial statements to students (e.g., girls are emotional; immigrants don’t belong here; etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. The teacher instructs students to use different discourse patterns to fit the social context</strong></td>
<td>- Teacher helps students focus on an audience in order to learn about “how language works” in various social contexts (How would I tell this to grandma? To the mayor?)&lt;br&gt;- Teacher uses diverse texts that model and represent a variety of discourse patterns, dialects, writing styles (e.g., topic centered narratives, episodic narratives, etc.)</td>
<td>- Teacher requires students to use the same discourse (standard English) in all social contexts (e.g., lunchroom, playground)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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