

“It Doesn’t Feel Like a Natural Fit”: Co-operating Teachers Account for Their Evaluation and Assessment of Pre-service Teachers’ Efforts to Fulfill Social Justice Indicators

Valerie Mulholland, Twyla Salm

University of Regina

Teacher education has long been troubled by the problem of reconciling what happens in course work with how that learning is taken up in practicum experiences. Our faculty asks co-operating teachers to account for interns’ professional growth by the extent to which the interns meet the requirements of the Internship Placement Profile (IPP). The study focuses on the eight IPP items which relate directly to “teaching for social justice.” The theoretical framework draws upon the literature of anti-oppressive/anti-racist pedagogies. Co-operating teachers and interns are expected to rely on the field manual that lists descriptors for each item of the IPP to assess growth and to set goals. The objective to understand how co-operating teachers perceive their intern’s ability to teach for social justice and reach their final evaluation was modified to reflect the finding that cooperating teachers were sometimes less familiar with these principles than were the interns.

La formation des enseignants a depuis longtemps été affectée par le problème qui consiste à concilier le travail en classe et l’application de cet apprentissage pendant les stages. Notre faculté demande aux enseignants coopérants de rendre compte du développement professionnel des stagiaires en notant la mesure dans laquelle ceux-ci répondent aux exigences du profil du stage (Internship Placement Profile -IPP). Cette étude porte sur les huit items du IPP qui touchent directement l’enseignement qui vise la justice sociale. Le cadre théorique puise dans la littérature des pédagogies anti-oppressives/anti-racistes. L’on s’attend à ce que les enseignants coopérants et les stagiaires évaluent la croissance et fixent des objectifs en s’appuyant sur le manuel qui contient la liste de descripteurs pour chaque item du IPP. L’objectif touchant l’évaluation par les enseignants coopérants de la capacité des stagiaires d’enseigner la justice sociale a été modifié de sorte à tenir compte de la constatation que les enseignants coopérants connaissaient parfois moins bien ces principes que les stagiaires.

Teaching for social justice (SJ) has been front of mind in our Faculty of Education since 2009, when a program renewal process resulted in revised undergraduate degree programs informed by anti-oppressive/anti-racist pedagogies, a change the faculty has described as “teaching for a better world.” Situated in a small western Canadian city, the university grapples with the legacy

of colonization that displaced Indigenous peoples, the Dakota, Lakota, Nakota and the Cree, when the waves of largely European white-settlers arrived in the late 1800s. The ongoing effects of colonization are acute, and the faculty intentionally sought to redress historical injustices through renewal. In that spirit, the faculty has endorsed two principles identified as essential for teacher education programs committed to social justice: a. that anti-racist approaches which interrogate racist assumptions are deeply embedded in curricula and schooling (Cochran-Smith, 2000; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012); and b. that anti-oppressive research which attempts to disrupt social norms that marginalize some groups and privilege others ought to be central to our work (Garrett & Segall, 2013; Kumashiro, 2015; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). Theoretically, this orientation is informed by emancipatory, critical theories, including Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Critical Social Theory (CST). Leonardo (2009) writes:

Critical teaching in this sense means the ability to apprehend the dialectical relationship between the objective and subjection nature of oppression. That is, part of defining oppression as the subversion of essence means that oppression must be socially pervasive ... In saying this, pedagogues recognize that racism is not the problem of white supremacist fringe groups, but a general institutional arrangement created between whites and people of color. (p. 19)

Recognizing and responding to oppression underlies the renewed program of the faculty. Our goal is to support pre-service teachers to translate the theoretical framework that informs the four-year program into their emerging practice during the internship and beyond.

As Mulholland and Salm (2015) have written, having faculty on board for systemic change does not mean that partners in schools share the same perspectives and understandings, much less goals for pre-service teachers (PST) whom they mentor. The attitudes and practices of co-operating teachers are not an additive component (Bennett, 2012), but rather an essential element of achieving the paradigmatic shift that teaching for social justice imagines. Therefore, all students, who in our faculty are predominantly white, middle-class youth, take core courses in which they learn to identify sources of social inequity and examine how dominant discourses privilege whiteness as invisible and are often exempt from scrutiny (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Milner & Laughter, 2015; Terwillinger, 2010). Expecting interns to successfully synthesize theory and practice to achieve a goal determined by a teacher education program is not without complication. Competing understandings of language and concepts and individual desire to perform well on an evaluation may impede efforts to “teach for social justice” (Castro, 2010). Further, Riley and Ungerleider (2008) and Ryan, Pollock and Antonelli (2009), among others, have recognized that pre-service teachers encounter barriers outside coursework which stymie efforts to change practice. Therefore, we see engagement with co-operating teachers as an important aspect of fully realizing the faculty’s goal to “teaching for a better world.” We cannot do this without them.

Teacher education has long been troubled by the problem of reconciling what happens in course work with how that learning is taken up in practicum experiences. Our faculty asks co-operating teachers to account for interns’ professional growth by the extent to which the interns meet the requirements of the Internship Placement Profile (IPP). The study focuses on the eight IPP items which relate directly to “teaching for social justice.” Co-operating teachers and interns are expected to rely on the field manual that lists descriptors for each item of the IPP to assess growth and to set goals.

What follows is a qualitative case study that focuses on how co-operating teachers account

for their PST's efforts to fulfill expectations specifically related to social justice. The literature review summarizes the theoretical framework of the teacher education program at the centre of the study, and is followed by an explication of methodology and methods of data collection and analysis. The findings are reported in thematic categories. The paper concludes with a discussion of implications for teacher education programs with similar aspirations.

Literature Review

The theoretical framework for this study draws on the literature of anti-racist and anti-oppressive pedagogy related to teacher education. The current climate of accountability in our jurisdiction demands that we assess the qualities we expect PSTs to develop during the course of their internship placements, hence our study of how the eight overtly SJ items of the 44 competencies on the IPP were taken up by cooperating teachers. We address two fields that paradigmatic change of this nature requires: anti-oppressive/anti-racist approaches to teacher education; and the epistemology of ignorance in education. The first was anticipated in the original ethics proposal; the second added after we gathered the data and recognized that claiming a position of ignorance (Caldéron, 2011) was at work in the participant responses.

Teaching for Social Justice: Anti-Oppressive/Anti-Racist Approaches.

Ladson-Billings (2005) identified that her team, Education, was not alright because it was "all white." Our team is no different. The "white fact" is recognized as a significant challenge as teacher education programs in the United States and Canada attempt to provide meaningful opportunities for candidates to situate their work in relation to complex historical, cultural, political, economic and social contexts (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Holloway & Gouthro, 2011; Kaur, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Sleeter, 2008). Arguably, middle-class, white pre-service teachers often interpret their experiences through a particular cultural frame or lens which makes it difficult for them to construct culturally responsive curriculum or develop appropriate instructional and interactional patterns (St. Denis & Schick, 2003). They often perceive diversity as a deficit positioning and have low expectations of students who are different from themselves (Cochrane-Smith, Davies & Fries, 2004). For example, the vast majority of PSTs in our faculty are monolingual English speakers who have difficulty recognizing the linguistic funds of knowledge of multi-lingual students whose variety of English is different from the teacher's.

Agreement exists in the anti-oppressive/anti-racist literature that teacher education programs must find appropriate ways to "bridge the chasm" between those with and those without social, economic and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986); determining how to do this work has been more challenging (Cochrane-Smith, 2004). Many teacher education programs claim to work towards social justice, but according to Reynolds and Brown (2010) not many programs are doing it well. The failure is characterized by a lack of coherency within the program (Cochran-Smith et al., 2008); the predominance of homogenous white candidates (Sleeter, 2008; Zeichner, 2009); and the candidates' stated affinity for and propensity to acquire technical skills (McDonald & Zeichner, 2008). This last point in particular is a significant impediment for our context given that we have intentionally moved from a technical-rational positioning to an overtly SJ orientation (Duckworth & Maxwell, 2015).

We are not without hope. As Nieto (2013) reminds us, the relatively recent appearance of terms such as discourse (Gee, 2006), habitus and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986), hegemony

(Gramsci, 2012) and power and privilege (Foucault, 1980) are much more commonplace in the literature than before the “anti” approaches were taken up seriously in teacher education programs. The goal for teacher education, she suggests, is to build critical minds and a capacity for hopefulness (Nieto, 2013) which necessitates transformative practice that reconceptualizes curricula, content, evaluation and relationships and all aspects of pedagogy (Ambe, 2006). Resources developed specifically for the use of teachers in the field, such as *Everyday Anti-Racism* (Pollock, 2008) and *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice* (Adams, Bell & Griffin, 2007) offer “how to” guidelines to assist PSTs identify and analyze oppressive structures and systems, reflect on their own positionality and consider ways of being agents for change. Somewhat subversively, these resources respond to the PST’s desire for technical skills cited earlier (McDonald & Zeichner, 2008). Presuming that we accept these approaches as consistent with notions of social justice, how these intentions manifest in teacher education programs vary.

After completing a broad analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi, Gorski (2009) suggests that teacher education programs provide a wide range of approaches to multicultural teacher education (MTE). MTE is included in this discussion because of its place at the anti-oppressive/anti-racist table; for many teacher educators, the SJ journey began with MTE. Nevertheless, the approaches described along the spectrum, even the most critical, merely represent the intentions of the course syllabi and not necessarily transference to practice (Gorski, 2009). Our renewed teacher education programs aspire to the latter stages of the spectrum which accounts for our earlier assertion that to synthesize theory and practice is not without complication.

Anti-oppressive/anti-racist pedagogies contest the technical-rational approach to teaching by introducing race, class and gender to the pedagogical playing field. Theoretically, power and privilege disrupts the technical-rational assumption that a social interaction such as teaching can be neutral. In our milieu, the faculty recognized that:

conversations about race and racism in teacher education contexts often miss the mark because they fail to make clear ... the concept of power, rushing instead down the blind but familiar alley of colorblindness and multiculturalism, both of which protect white racial knowledge by neutralizing the role of power and reframing race as a sanitized discourse of culture or difference (Galman, Pica-Smith, & Rosenberger, 2010, p. 227).

Ostensibly, anti-racist approaches which interrogate racist assumptions that are deeply embedded in curricula and schooling (Cochran-Smith, 2000) and anti-oppressive approaches which attempt to disrupt social norms that marginalize some groups and privilege others (Kumashiro, 2009) ought to be central features to teacher education programs committed to social justice. As stated in the introduction, part of teaching for social justice requires that teacher candidates be taught to identify sources of inequities and examine how dominant discourses privilege whiteness as invisible and are often exempt from scrutiny (Darling-Hammond et al., 2005; Marx, 2006; Terwillinger, 2010). Such opportunities more often occur in courses traditionally constructed as theoretical rather than practical. MTE content, however, does not necessarily translate into a change in ideology (Mueller & O’Connor, 2007), much less in practice. Unlearning, it appears, is as challenging as learning.

Traditionally, a narrow technical focus based on specific competencies and performance skills has overshadowed the need for PSTs to engage in critical and culturally responsive pedagogy in practice. Another tension is the trend to more practice-based teacher education,

which in its technical approach to teaching excludes elements related to cultural competency and critical social action (Zeichner, 2012). The perceived chasm is exacerbated when field placements (internships) are merely “add-ons” to course work and are disconnected from tenured faculty involvement (Zeichner, 2010). At best, the quality of internships tends to vary widely in scope and efficacy; they can be structured quite haphazardly for convenience, without intention. Quality of programming is also dependent on the way the cooperating teachers are recruited, the extent to which they are guided and supported and the degree to which expectations placed on both the cooperating teacher and the intern are articulated (Darling-Hammond et al., 2005). Exemplary programs, as described by Darling-Hammond et al. (2005), recruit cooperating teachers who have a sophisticated way of thinking about teaching, a refined practice, and where university faculty can work in a reciprocally beneficial way with them to ensure “practices that are theoretically rich but also eminently practical” (p. 154). Our faculty has the advantage of a three-day internship seminar that is mandatory for all co-operating teachers and interns prior to the 16 week field experience. The curriculum for that seminar was revised to reflect the new focus of anti-oppressive/anti-racist pedagogy.

Even though many teacher education “teams” may be “all white,” including our faculty, over the last decade there has been considerable effort devoted to better preparing teacher candidates to teach diverse learners and to attend to social justice issues (Ah Lee, 2011). Similar to other programs, we too have been attentive to the call to reinvent and reinvigorate critical antiracist multicultural education (Attwood, 2011). A review of the literature reveals there are very few studies that research the actual practice of PSTs as they work for social justice in classrooms (Cochrane-Smith et al., 2004). And, even the studies that did focus on PSTs concluded that they were not always able to create meaningful change in their conceptualizations or teaching practices (Ah Lee, 2011). Echoes of the aspiration to synthesize theory and practice are everywhere.

Epistemology of Ignorance

Understanding ignorance as an epistemological position is useful for unraveling how “not knowing” can be constituted as justification for “not doing” in all types of activities in education, not least in SJ pedagogies. Most often understood as a pejorative term, ignorance is commonly associated with lack of education or cultivation. An examination of the root word of ignorance, to ignore, alters the meaning while not absolving the ignorant of responsibility. To ignore may seem more benign compared to willful resistance to knowing or being aware. Calderón (2011) argues that “epistemologies of ignorance are commonplace, indeed normalized ways of knowing and not knowing” (p. 107) in education. In this study, several teachers claimed to “not know” about various aspects of the relevant SJ items on the IPP, including culturally responsive management, Indigenous ways of knowing and colonial history, and at least obliquely offered this lack of knowing as either a gap or a reason for not being able to adequately judge the student’s performance on the IPP. Therefore, a review of the epistemology of ignorance is included in the framework of the study.

Writing about ignorance in education, Alcoff (2007) draws on the work of other scholars to categorize three main types: “a. ignorance that flows from our situatedness as knowers; b. ignorance related to specific aspects of group identity; c. ignorance as an effect of structural oppression, develops a structural analysis of the ways in which oppressive systems produce ignorance” (pp. 40-41). All three are applicable to our study. Alcoff argues, “ignorance is

contextual, but there are patterns of ignorance associated with social and group identities” (p. 47). In our study, the participants are members of a social group situated in a particular place and share identities as mentors of new teachers. The third category, referring to “a structural analysis of the ways in which oppressive systems produce ignorance as one of their effects” (p. 41) may play a role in the participants’ desire to remain innocent of historical wrongs by maintaining a position of relative authority or superiority. Clearly, privileging Western epistemologies and organizing hierarchies in schools depends on a structural process that protects the dominant way of knowing. Alcoff writes,

cognitive norms that produce ignorance as an effect of substantive epistemic practice are those that naturalize and dehistoricize both the process and product of knowing, such that no political reflexivity or sociological analysis is thought to be required or even allowable. (p. 56)

We do not argue that ignorance is consciously taken up as a mantle to deliberately obscure historical and contemporary oppression rampant in our colonial context; we see ignorance as a mode of protecting the powerful from being accountable to the legacy of our history. Given the history of this place, the discussion of ignorance must include the concept of colonial blindness. Calderón (2011) states that,

Epistemologies of ignorance offer educators a strong pedagogical opportunity to explore, for instance, historical narratives. We cannot continue to rely on the typical methods offered by [multicultural education] as this simply adds content onto an educational paradigm that relies on ignorance, indeed colonial blind discourses. (pp. 123-124)

Contemporary schools house the vestiges of the colonial apparatus employed to subdue existing populations and make possible the ascendancy of white settler populations. To feign ignorance of “what went on out there” (Said, 1993) is more serious than a factual gap in understanding. As Tuana (2004) writes, “Ignorance should not be theorized as a simple omission or gap but is, in many cases, an active production. Ignorance is frequently constructed and actively preserved and is linked to issues of cognitive authority, doubt, trust, silencing, and uncertainty” (p. 195). Ignorance, then, can be understood as an epistemological stance.

Britzman (1998) refers to this stance as a passion for ignorance “made when the knowledge offered provokes a crisis within the self and when the knowledge is felt as interference or as a critique of the self’s coherence or view of itself in the world” (p. 118) Settlers actively maintain their passion for ignorance or colonial blindness because understanding the reality of Canada’s history of colonialism is a direct challenge to how white settlers view Canada and their place within it. Regan (2010) identifies the “settler problem” in Canada that is characterized by “denial and moral indifference” (p. 35) to the brutal realities of the colonial history, an ignoring of the past. Susan Dion (2009) studied teacher resistance to Indigenous pedagogy and observed:

Teachers often say to me, almost pleadingly, that they don’t know what to teach. Recognizing that their position of ignorance is complicated by “the incapacity—or refusal—to acknowledge *one’s own implication* in the information” (in Felman, 1982, p. 30, italics in original), makes simply providing material about First Nations post-contact experiences an insufficient response. (pp. 61-62)

Furthermore, Dion (2009) refers to Felman’s call for teachers to develop an “original-learning disposition” to meet the challenges of anti-oppressive/anti-racist pedagogy. Alsup and

Miller (2014) take up disposition in their critique of the checklists used to assess teacher-candidates, a system eerily similar to the IPP that is at the foundation of this study. They write, "let's face it: checklists are much easier to assess and report in a numerical, aggregated table than deeply held, sometimes messy subjectivities" (p. 201). We are aware of the inherent contradiction of attempting to use a technical-rational assessment tool such as a Likert scale of our IPP to assess the attributes of anti-oppressive/anti-racist pedagogy. A disposition for social justice may be the essential element for the pedagogies advocated for in this paper and the larger work of the faculty which produced the program and us. The literature review of this study illustrates that even when items on an evaluation checklist drive a research project, it is not that simple. How the agents involved in these processes are disposed to act, to interpret and to implement ideas are not easily assessed, accounted for or changed.

Methods of Data Collection and Analysis

The larger study for which data for this paper were collected was a mixed methods case study (Creswell, 2014; Stake, 2005), an appropriate methodology for research that addresses a particular problem bound by space and time. Data were collected over a period of one year. The descriptive quantitative data of part one provided a picture of participants' view of the language and concepts used in the IPP and their internship training seminar, both of which are designed to support faculty initiatives (Salm & Mulholland, 2017). The qualitative data set of part two gives voice to teachers who participated in both aspects of the study.

Our faculty's mission to "inspire and transform" education indicates the intent for full integration of social justice into the entire program, not just in isolated courses. Arguably, then, all 44 competencies of the IPP ought to be informed by social justice pedagogy and principle (Kelly & Brandes, 2010), and may well be in certain instances. We do not vigorously defend the current form of summative evaluation, which uses a five point Likert scale, as exemplary assessment practice; rather, we acknowledge that faculty members have not successfully challenged its use, nor has an alternate method seriously been contemplated since the IPP has been enthusiastically endorsed by our stakeholders for more than 40 years. The eight items that use social justice language to explicitly impart faculty intentions to both the evaluator and the PST are therefore the focus.

Theoretically, the interns are prepared in their Education Core Studies (ECS) course work to understand what is expected of them in their field-placement and they ought to have acquired multiple ways of demonstrating each competency. The concepts and language used on the form and field experiences handbook are at least broadly familiar to them. At the same time, until we surveyed PSTs and co-operating teachers in part one of this study, we had only anecdotal inklings of how interns interpret the SJ components of this evaluation tool when in the field (Salm & Hulholland, 2017). The interviews reported in this paper take up the challenging question of how the cooperating teachers' interpret the evaluation criteria that assess how well interns were able to translate the faculty's expectations for teaching for social justice into practice during the internship.

Data Collection

All co-operating teachers who participated in the on-line survey were contacted subsequently in the late spring by an e-mail that included the interview questions and invited to participate in

30-60 minute interviews. We relied on demographic information to select ten participants evenly distributed between rural and urban, elementary and secondary, male and female, with experience ranging from less than five to more than 25 years of classroom experience, for the interviews. The end of the school year is not an ideal time to approach teachers (all of whom had already mentored an intern in their classroom and completed an on-line survey during the school year) to participate in an interview. Consequently, interviews were conducted in a variety of locations, on-campus, in schools or by phone, reflecting not only the rural and urban locations of teachers' home schools but also our effort to respect their busy end-of-year schedules.

The interviews were an opportunity for the researchers to probe for deeper understanding using what was learned from the on-line data of part one, and for co-operating teachers to expand upon their perceptions of the "changes happening in the Faculty." We asked each to comment on the eight items on the IPP that focus on social justice pedagogy and structured the interviews accordingly. Specifically, the eight items are: exhibits knowledge of social/historical contexts of injustice/inequality; fosters a climate of care for all; recognizes and addresses inequitable classroom relations; uses multiple perspectives, including Indigenous ways of knowing; provides Treaty Education; fosters collegial relationships consistent with principles of equity, fairness and respect for others; and values and plans for diversity within the classroom, the school and community. The items are not lumped together, but rather are dispersed throughout several categories of the IPP. The items are abbreviated versions from the Field Experiences Manual, which provides descriptors that articulate "what the item looks like in practice" at the unsatisfactory and outstanding levels. As with all experiences mediated by language, between the item and description, ample room exists for divergent interpretations.

Data Analysis

The interviews were transcribed by a third-party; the authors compared the transcripts to the original digital recordings for accuracy. The transcriptions were interpreted using a version of thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis seeks to analyze the underlying ideas and beliefs evident in the data, in this case, the conversations between teachers and researchers. Thematic analysis allows the researcher to "see something that had not been evident ... [to] perceive a pattern, or theme, in seemingly random information" (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 3). After the initial review of the transcripts, we agreed to organize notable passages according to three categories: resistant, neutral and supportive of SJ pedagogy (as represented by the items intended to measure student performance). Initially, this appeared to be a manageable method for organizing the volume of data we had collected because each participant expressed opinions and experiences that "fit" across categories. Not a single participant, it should be noted, fell exclusively into a single category. Major changes often elicit strong reactions; the anti-oppressive/anti-racist framework used in the study and which supports the program being investigated predicted resistance. This is an example of a theory-driven approach for initial coding (Boyatzis, 1998) which constructs minimal organization to encourage subsequent analysis. The decision to not present individual personas, but rather to focus on the themes originated with the approach. We accept that discourses speak through bodies (Gee, 2006); the participants were discursively produced in this social context, and their words represent common discourses at work in this society.

Each researcher reviewed their own interviews first using this method, after which the

interviews were exchanged and the process repeated to develop the final major themes. We compared which passages we had determined independently were significant and together arranged the excerpts in columns. Thematic analysis is "a method for identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data. It minimally organises and describes your data set in (rich) detail; however, it also often goes further than this, and interprets various aspects of the research topic" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 6). Having two researchers working with the same data set strengthened the integrity of the method; someone was always available to point out the discrepancies, the unchallenged assumptions and the gaps in understanding. Consequently, we developed a system of thematic mapping which provided a useful way of understanding the vast amount of collected data and to represent the same to others.

Findings for Teaching and Teacher Education

The IPP is the primary method of holding students and co-operating teachers accountable for fulfilling the mandate of the teacher education program in all its aspects, not just SJ pedagogy. Therefore, at this stage of program implementation, the interpretation of the IPP is a useful site of knowledge production since all parties, interns, co-operating teachers and faculty advisors, must engage to some degree in its use. In this section of the paper, we present the findings by reporting what teachers said in response to the questions (see Appendix A), with the following supplementary questions:

1. Comment on any of the language that is used in the following eight items. Are there ways to clarify any items?
2. Are the descriptors useful to interpret the intern's knowledge and use of social justice pedagogy?
3. Are there ways to improve these items or the evaluation instrument, the IPP?

Although we might have organized these data by reporting commentary on each of the items in succession, to avoid repetition and to some extent tedium, we present key passages that illustrate perspectives on the items in the previously described categories: resistant; neutral; supportive. Suggestions for improvement or clarification were imbedded in the perspectives and are represented separately.

Similarly, we have elected not to use pseudonyms for the participants, or indeed as alluded to earlier, to make any effort to represent "individuals" as stand-ins for particular points-of-view or discourses at work in our culture. Although all participants could be categorized as white settlers, we did not seek to make that demographic detail the basis of our analysis. To do so would have required an account of how an individual may have been resistant to some aspects of the change in teacher education, while supportive of others. We did not set out to reconcile individual contradictions, but to identify how the SJ items on the IPP may be understood, not to illustrate or interpret individual experience. Therefore, the findings are presented across thematic categories of being resistant, neutral and supportive of faculty initiatives, followed by suggestions for improvement of the assessment process.

Resistant: "It doesn't seem like a natural fit"

From the on-line survey data of part one (Salm & Mulholland, 2017) of the study, we expected resistance to the SJ initiatives of the faculty in the interviews. What follows is not an exhaustive

listing of the expressions of resistance, but rather representative quotes that exemplify the forms and scope of resistance within the category. Admittedly, the boundaries between resistant and the desire to maintain neutrality is nuanced, and to some extent dependent upon the speaker's verbal facility and intellectual dexterity. Within the category of resistant are three sub-categories: a. "fit" and political correctness; b. concern for student welfare and career development; c. don't know enough about content to judge (ignorance).

First, the question of "fit" preoccupied the participants across the spectrum of opinion or disposition, from resistant to supportive. The notion is exemplified in the comment, "It doesn't feel like a natural fit," which we used as our title of the paper. Perhaps predictably, many appealed to a sense of natural law to define and defend their positions. Whether referring to culturally responsive pedagogy, Treaty Education or Indigenous ways of knowing, several participants expressed concern about "fit" and the extent to which it was "natural." For example, one teacher said,

I think it's perfectly valid to bring that [Indigenous ways of knowing] up in some themes and in some contexts. I think it's also possible to stretch it too far, and try to find ways of incorporating that into contexts that is not a natural fit.

Similarly, another participant said,

in units or in context, where that would naturally come up ... it just says, that you naturally 'center it [knowledge of historical injustice]'.... Again, it's bringing a political agenda to every issue ... we need to not be simply individuals that are here to propagate social agendas, even if it's a valid one. If it's getting to the point that it's permeating areas that it doesn't *naturally fit*, it's starting to get silly.

We italicize "naturally fit" as a visual cue to remind the reader that the participants were from a variety of distinct locations; this was not talk picked up in a common staffroom at lunch.

Another sub-theme that we came to see as related to "fit" and natural justice was overtly expressed as concern, as illustrated by:

I think the whole emphasis on social justice ... I think is way over the top. I think it's way—it's just such this politically correct agenda that we—you know, it kind of makes being a white Canadian evil, you know, you're a bad person if you're white Canadian because you're this and that, these bad things that have happened in the past. So it just kind of propagates white guilt, which I don't think is healthy. I don't think it does anybody any good.

References to politically correct modes of speech and thought were summoned in resistance to changes more generally. In this quote, several points of resistance are named openly. Similarly, a more nuanced version of a similar idea is reflected in, "I think we need to be careful of teachers becoming agents of promoting socially politically correct social agenda, despite the fact that they might be valid." Objections to politically correct modes of speech and thought were marshaled in resistance to changes for all of the SJ items.

Resistance to changes in the teacher education program was also exhibited in terms of concern for the new teacher's welfare and career prospects. Resistance camouflaged as altruistic concern. Social Justice pedagogies are seen as potentially dangerous, not a suitable pursuit for a beginning teacher. For example, "What I'm concerned with is we're setting the interns up for something that they're not equipped to deal with...but asks them to use this method at a very

fragile point in their career, I think it is dangerous.” In addition to positioning the intern as vulnerable, the IPP was also challenged by the statement, “I think that’s [intentionally controversial] almost an unfair expectation. That’s a big risk to take. Students come in with their own perspective.” The nature and extent of the risks attached to the item “intentionally controversial” were not articulated, which may be a failing of the follow-up questions. Presumably, being identified as controversial makes the new teacher a less desirable “hire” than is a more compliant one. That is conjecture; no participant expressed the risks in concrete terms. The resistance could be summarized with the comment, “What I’m concerned with is we’re setting the interns up for something that they’re not equipped to deal with...I’d say were sending the lambs to the slaughter by encouraging them to be in any way controversial.” Teaching is assumed to be bland and within the margins.

The last sub-category in resistance we have described as “not knowing enough to judge the item” or ignorance. One participant described the difficulty of evaluating the SJ items in this way:

My problem with this and not a problem with the descriptor, but is that sometimes I think many of us don’t know what culturally responsive management approaches are. I assume that the interns take classes on this. I would say it’s difficult for us to evaluate. I can think now like given the things we talked about here, I could sort of make some ... but it would be good to have some examples. I’d really love some examples of specific cultural ... culturally responsive management.

On one hand, the honesty and candor revealed in the statement is to be valued; knowing that you do not know is surely an important first step in learning. There are other examples, such as, “I find that it’s somewhat confusing [Indigenous ways of knowing] and would love some specific more concrete example and maybe split it up. This is confusing to me.” If these quotes were in response to a teacher having been assigned a new course to teach, the reaction to the confusion would be fairly straightforward—do some research.

Treaty Education appears in several instances as a site of resistance across the interviews, often invoking student reactions as a justification for questioning the value of the item. “Some students are feeling like they’re being force-fed these issues; valid issues, but to the point that they feel like they’re force-fed issues like Treaty Education and injustice.” Another offered, “Sometimes, it’s creating a backlash.” Specific to Treaty Education, another participant stated: “it’s contrived, if it’s artificial, the kids push back, you know, ‘why are we doing this, like we get it,’ you know, ‘you already covered this with us or somebody last year did it.’” Bringing the story closer to home, another participant cited the experience of their own child:

my son in grade 6 or whatever had a teacher where pretty much two thirds of the year was all First Nations content. And like it just turned his ... like he had no negative attitude prior to that but it certainly turned his attitude negative, because he was sick of it, like enough.

The nature and scope of resistance to changes in the program and IPP can be summed up by this quote regarding Treaty Education and Indigenous ways of knowing:

If you’re dealing with a unit that would deal with, specifically, “Injustice and Inequity”; or if you’re dealing with a unit that would deal, specifically, with “History” or “Indigenous Cultures”; if you’re dealing with a current unit where you’re taking a look at “How various cultures can adapt to contemporary society”; or if you’re taking a look at a particular unit on “Laws and Treaties”; these

units would lend themselves well to this [Indigenous ways of knowing; Treaty Education]. That's quite a small subset of everything that is taught in the school system. If you incorporate, and I think it said, "to center Indigenous Ways of Knowing and Treaty Education," in everything that's taught, again, it's a little ridiculous.

The last word is reserved to an openly resistant participant who saw danger and lack of critical thinking at every turn of the new SJ items on the IPP: "Yeah, and I would eliminate that. It's becoming indoctrination. It's crazy."

Neutral: "To me, it doesn't fit everybody. It fits terrifically in my area ..."

We describe the neutral theme as cautiously supportive, but concerned that technical-rational approaches to teaching, real teaching, might be hampered or worse, neglected, by the new approaches. Perhaps, as Kelly and Brandes (2001) write: "The ideal of teacher neutrality is so pervasive in our society that even when it is recognized as impossible, teachers have the expectation that they should be neutral" (p. 447). The struggles we witnessed in this category, to justify positions, may reflect this discourse of neutrality which disciplines teachers. The neutral responses are divided into sub-themes: a. the limits of disciplinary knowledge; b. concern about teaching skills. Moving uneasily between the two sub-themes is a recurrent concern for fairness by their questions "Is it possible for teachers to do this? Are these reasonable expectations?"

Not surprisingly, perhaps, "fit" was a concern among those espousing neutrality to change. To begin, "To me, it doesn't fit everybody. It fits terrifically in my area, no issues, but I look around the building and I go, it doesn't fit for a lot of people in the building." Neutrality is established from the position of power, "no issues for me, but I see difficulty for others" stance. To position oneself as the august observer making objective sense of the situation, it is possible to say the changes are possible and impossible at the same time. As in the resistant theme, in the neutral theme, "doesn't fit" language was used to express concern for others. The issue of disciplinary obstacles was mentioned by several who claimed the neutral space, as in,

I'm a Social Studies teacher, so exhibiting knowledge of social history context injustice, inequality; most of the time that's not a problem. Even in a couple of courses say like psychology, where it's a little bit of a stretch, and it's still not too far of a stretch. I know when talking with our math and science teachers, they're going well, "how are we supposed to do anything with this whatsoever?" I don't have an answer for them.

Although not a math teacher, another participant commiserates with the hard sciences and math disciplines saying, "A math teacher goes, 'well what am I supposed to do?' We can give you the Land Claims formula and you can use that in your math class...which is very superficial."

Neutrality is constructed by attempting to recognize multiple contested points of view at best, or "both sides" at worst, of a pedagogical issue. In a similar vein, the problem of incorporating multiple world views is taken up in the context of physical education: "I think of phys. ed. teachers dealing with Muslim girls not being permitted to participate in phys. ed. in ways that they would expect." The example the teacher provided is understood as a disciplinary obstacle to be overcome but is nevertheless problematized in the context of SJ pedagogy. Disciplinary obstacles sometimes morph into concern about grade level, as the commonsense assumption that older learners can grasp SJ concepts, but younger children are not predisposed to do so. "As a teacher myself, I found it something way easier to do in grade eight than

sometimes you're doing grade one."

If teaching is conceptualized through the technical rational lens, then content can be divorced from delivery, and a neutral stance achieved. For example,

I don't think there's a clear pair of descriptors [in the handbook] that talk about effectively teaching concepts or teaching skills. And like, to me that's teaching, that's like the bottom level of Maslow's hierarchy of teaching. Like if you can't teach a skill or a concept, it doesn't matter what else you do with technology or First Nations' way of knowing or classroom management. Those things don't matter if you can't help kids get better at the skills in the subject area, or understand concepts that are important.

As in the resistance category, Treaty Education presents its own problem for those claiming neutrality:

When it talks about "consistently and thoroughly integrates historical and social context of injustice," like I say, from a social studies perspective yes, done. I can do that. If you are asking me from a business ed. perspective, I honestly don't know what I would say in an accounting class or an IT class to talk about historical social [Treaty Education].

STEM and business are conceptualized as inherently neutral, with strictly objective content. The notion that the treaty relationship and our historical context imbue major cultural and political institutions, particularly schools, with the responsibility of acting in just ways is not contemplated.

In addition to concerns about the pervasiveness of Treaty Education and its complexity, the issue of hostile response also emerged, albeit in the guise of reportage befitting a neutral point of view. For example,

As a matter of fact, we're starting to see some backlash from some students and families with regards to ... constantly dealing with First Nations issues and Treaty Education. I am not convinced at all that is reasonable backlash but it exists nonetheless.

Another participant operating with similar logic offers a possible explanation for the resistance exhibited by others:

I think the university has done a good job with number 5 "integrates diverse knowledge of multiple perspectives into lessons," but almost too good of a job they are almost forcing the issues Again I don't want them not, but I think I could have had better training when I went through the program then so I'm glad to see it's improved, but they feel like they are to get it into sort of like every second lesson and it doesn't feel like a natural fit.

Here we see the muted echoes of resistance in admitting that interns may be better "trained" at doing this kind of teaching, mitigated by "I'm glad to see it's improved." Although we have attempted to show why neutrality is a difficult position to maintain, for the time being, we shall let the issue of "fit" resonate as we move to the participants who were, at least in the interviews, supportive of the curriculum changes they have experienced through mentoring and working alongside interns produced by the renewed program.

Supportive: “It needs to be the way you’re living and the way you’re teaching here”

Among those participants who were considered supportive of the changes in the teacher education curriculum as represented by the SJ items on the IPP, the issue of “fit” was not summoned with the same frequency to advance or to refute a point. Were this a quantitative study, or one that employed discourse analysis to make sense of the data, this might be significant factor, but it is neither; so we will let that observation fall away as we present the sub-themes of the supportive category: a. the items must be integrated into how we live and teach; and b. this is complicated. We will begin counter-intuitively with complication because the issue of measurement and the IPP recurred throughout the supportive commentary. One participant stated, “I think even cooperating teachers sometimes devalue these [SJ items] because they don’t see that they fit.” We were reminded of the Elliot Eisner quote, “The theoretical windows through which we peer circumscribe that portion of the landscape we shall see” (Eisner, 1999, p. 83). So it is, too, with teachers actively pre-disposed to anti-oppressive/anti-racist pedagogies, which we have referred to as SJ pedagogy.

Among the resistant and neutral participants, the item that asks cooperating teachers to rate the ability of interns to be intentionally provocative caused the temperature to rise in the conversation, literally and figuratively. Not so with the supportive category, even those who taught in contexts with disciplinary obstacles and age limitations that the other categories identified as impediments to meeting expectations implicit in the IPP. A participant explained that initially some items were ignored for fear that grade one students were too literal, but upon reflection said,

Now I see a lot more how it could be done, particularly with ableism and some of the gender. The “pink for girls, blue for boys” are opportunities to be controversial about it at a level kids can understand. There are ways. I just didn’t see it because it was easy to say, “Well, they’re six. You can’t be controversial, you’ll confuse them.”

This example encapsulates the general stance of the supportive participants: let me think this through; how can I reach the children/students where they are; how can I make this work? The supportive comments generally positioned the intern as a colleague, as a co-learner in the classroom context. For example,

This year was a real learning experience for me as well, both myself and Teresa [pseudonym] actually went on First Nations workshop training, Treaty training When we came back to address the other world views, it was all fresh in our heads ... had we not done that, I think we might have had a bigger problem in the context that we are in.

Two features stand out in this perspective: recognition that continuous learning is or should be a norm and that context must be considered. Contrast this positioning to the earlier iterations of not knowing what terms meant or what the concept might look like in a classroom. There is indication that co-operating teachers continue to compare their own training to that of the interns, even when the philosophy of the renewed IPP is openly embraced. To illustrate,

I want to say, I was very excited to see it included and to see the university moving more in that way. I know even when I started, so I was an intern five years ago or six ... I think it’s a great move in the right direction. It’s just hard to measure sometimes on an IPP.

This observation brings us to the crux of the matter. How can a supportive stance reconcile the expectation to measure performance on isolated items on an assessment instrument?

The participants were not without ideas to make sense of what the IPP appeared to them to require of interns. They began with questions about self and about their practice. For example, "What does this look like in grade one?" another said, with reference to the intern's planning to meet the SJ expectations,

But is their planning respectful and open to things, like are they planning in a very heteronormative context when we're looking at families, for instance. And in grade one so much of the curriculum looks at all about me, self-identify, family identity. Are they able to sort of work beyond their own context?

Cumulatively, the participants in this category provided a manifesto for culturally responsive teaching characterized by the following questions taken from the research conversations:

Are you working in a very positive frame of mind? Are you working in a strength base? If you're starting from that framework, I think you are going to be responsive in general. I don't know exactly what the university is looking for when you say culturally responsive classroom management.

Similarly, another asked:

You want people who are well rounded and you want people who are questioning. The way I'm delivering content and the way I'm working with children is meeting everyone? Is it working? Am I doing the same thing all the time? And is that unintentionally excluding anyone from accessing that information and just accessing their classroom community?

Amongst other of its virtues, these responses also capture the reflective practice that so many teacher education programs purport to espouse.

The supportive stance was not without complication; it was not all sweetness and light. As an example, addressing the challenge of teaching about racism in grades K-5, one said,

Probably ableism is the most visible [with K-5]. I find racism itself ... it's a difficult one to teach.... The kids don't self-identify. I had a class tell me once that I was Cree because I knew Cree and none of them were.

The issue of age and intellectual maturity was problematized in this quote:

Six year olds don't have the mental constructs to deal with these [sexism, racism]. I find if you try you're diluting it to the point where it becomes then problematic in itself because you're dividing into black and white very, sometimes problematic categories. Who you are, who you are not.

Enthusiasm and empathy do not erase the inherent density of the big "isms" that populate the professional literature of SJ pedagogy. One teacher said about culturally responsive teaching, "Equitably, I think the equitably versus equally is where it's really key there. That descriptor is one of the most important understandings working with kids and recognizing your own biases." In a pithy summary of the same descriptor, another said, "Cultural awareness does not mean

you've been to one pow wow."

Not unexpectedly, within this framework, Treaty Education was not met with the same trepidation as in the previous categories by the participants recognized as supportive. From a very pragmatic perspective, as illustrated by: "lots of kids sing 'O, Canada' and they know that they live in [redacted]. They know the name of their town. Those are all political entities. It might be about talking about 'we are in Treaty Four'.... You're not just treaty if you have a treaty card;" and "When you're teaching your address include Treaty Four Territory as part of it." To a more philosophical stance, "I think the most important thing is to show the students how it affects them and to help them understand how important the treaties are.... It needs to be the way you're living and the way you're teaching here." The elegance and simplicity of these words captured the approach embodied in this category.

Suggestions for Improvement: "It's what you are prepared to admit that you don't know and what you want to know."

At the end of each interview, participants were asked to suggest improvements to the IPP. That feedback is summarized in this section, divided into three subsections: language; professional practice; and specific aspects of anti-oppressive/anti-racist pedagogy (Treaty Education and ableism). In retrospect, the first two were to be expected; the third falls within anti-oppressive/anti-racist pedagogies, and to some extent illustrates the concerns of the specific teachers who volunteered for part two of the study.

Language. Several participants zeroed in on language as a barrier in the assessment process, as evident in the range from "eliminate those little bits of vagueness or jargon or whatever," to "when it talks about consistently and thoroughly integrates...how is that judged?" An example of jargon, "You know, 'structural exclusionary practices' is maybe a bit jargon-y. You know, what do you really mean here?" Another suggested, "I think many of us don't know what culturally responsive management approaches are. I assume that the interns take classes on this. I would say it's difficult to evaluate." A participant balked at the terms "local and global context" saying, "I'm not really clear. I have a hard time wrapping my mind around that. To evaluate an intern on that. I kind of cut it off and go with the first part. Just a language thing." One could argue that the troubling of terms in use reveals a conceptual divide between the participants and the academy. Faced with the work of teaching five hours a day, five days a week, arguably, does not leave time and energy to consider structural exclusionary practices, whether the desire to do so is present or not.

Indigenous ways of knowing appear to present similar challenges to some of the participants. For example,

I wrack my brain to think "what are the Indigenous ways of knowing?"... Is it using a variety of instructional approaches? I don't know that I know specifically what those are.... Is that Indigenous? I don't know. I don't know what that means.

Again, when considering when a teacher could use "I don't know" as a rationale for not doing something mandated in the classroom, there are very few examples that come easily to mind.

Professional practice. For evaluation of all items, several of the participants recommended "concrete examples" and better descriptors for each item, so that one perceived aspect of ambiguity could be removed from the process of evaluation of the internship. One

teacher asked, "What does this look like in grade one?" Another, referring to Indigenous ways of knowing, said, "not the traditional way of knowing. I find that it's somewhat confusing and would love some specific, more concrete examples and maybe split this up." In a similar vein, one participant observed,

I think if it gave specific descriptors as to what some cultural response is or some differences might be in the way you treat or manage students based on their culture, I think that might be a little more useful.

Several commented on the limitation of having specific descriptors for either end of the spectrum between "not meeting expectations" and "outstanding." One said specifically, "you have two descriptors; you have the excellent, you have the unsatisfactory. There's nothing in-between ... the in-between is up for your guess and my guess. That doesn't work."

The problem of adapting the items within disciplinary (at the secondary level) and grade level (at the elementary) emerged from the data. While some asserted that "in social sciences and English, there is a level of overlap between our two areas, I admit," meaning that within the Humanities notions of inequity, justice and history were a more "natural fit," and consistently resistant to how science and math left a blank. Regarding STEM subjects, one participant said, "it simply doesn't apply to what we're teaching." Several suggested that co-operating teachers be free to pass over the items that did not appear to apply, to fit, within disciplinary boundaries. Expressing concern for the intern's welfare should items be left not rated, one participant suggested that at the internship seminar the co-operating teachers should be told that if an item does not fit within a discipline, there should be "an acceptance of some of these just aren't going to be rated and that's not a reflection on the intern." This stance was consistent with an underlying suspicion of SJ items in general, as reflected by, "I think it's getting to the point where, perhaps, we're trying to force these issues or agendas into every subject area." The confidence that knowledge can be categorized and accessed according to traditional, Western systems was not challenged in this data set, at least not by participants. Implicitly, Western knowledge was neutral. The solution to this barrier seemed obvious to one participant: "Your simplest [solution] from the high school teacher's perspective is make an IPP that fits, okay, here is the social sciences IPP, there is the French, or even if you grouped a couple together like science and math." It should be noted that from the perspective of the faculty members charged with the responsibility of translating the language of the IPP for consumption and use of practitioners in the field, the suggestion to create additional instruments did not seem to be the easiest fix on the horizon.

Specific aspects of anti-oppressive/anti-racist pedagogy. Suggestions for improvement of the IPP evaluation document ranged from recommending that an IPP be developed for every subject area to more subtle critiques, as evidenced by: "I could name colleagues that accommodate diversity versus colleagues that actually value diversity. They're two different things." As the earlier reference to confusion about the meaning of Indigenous ways of knowing hinted, the theoretical framework that informs the IPP was identified as a barrier for its effective use in evaluation. Several of the participants, with varying degrees of discomfort, recognized their own lack of knowledge or understanding when interpreting the SJ items, as illustrated by earlier excerpts from the transcripts already cited in this paper. In this last section under suggestions for improvement, the vacuum of theoretical engagement will be explored. Discussion of items related to Treaty Education (mandated in the Province of

[redacted] since 2008) was quite similar among participants; most said they did not know enough about the topic to feel confident. One participant said, “We try to find as many ways to incorporate First Nations and First Nations world views into a lot of what we did, even though just outside of Treaty Education. That will be one thing I will add there.” Essentially, that is the basis for Treaty Education, so it is unfortunate that a working knowledge of that pedagogy has not been effectively introduced to a school in which it is mandated. Nevertheless, the capacity to ignore Treaty Education, akin to just not fitting within disciplinary constructs, may be widespread; consider the following: “Right now it’s [Treaty Education] put off to the side. It’s almost hard to find the outcomes, if you look online.” Apart from the technical barriers, that are access to measurable curricular outcomes as in the last example, several participants appeared to suggest that Treaty Education was intended for schools with First Nations students. For example, “In our situation, it’s quite easy. The culture is there already with the diverse world view. We have the First Nations and the First Nations”. Although referring to culturally responsive pedagogy, the next participant made a connection to the limitations of Treaty Education from her/his perspective:

In regard to schools that don’t have much of, necessarily, a native content, maybe they’ve got a lot of students from Philippines or Ukraine and other areas, I don’t know that the way it is addresses that kind of a context either. You know?

Implicit in these points-of-view is the stance that the culture of the students determines the content and the learning in a school. “Getting to the point,” one said,

In my situation that’s too hard for me to do. To be honest. To expect it of an intern wouldn’t be fair ... we just evaluated how well she could really ... the Treaty Education to the students’ lives as she taught it. She was very effective.

Following that line of argument, if a school were exclusively white-settler, then abandoning all of the SJ items would be justified because the traditional practices and curriculum are culturally responsive, by virtue of intent and design.

Herein lies a problem of significant magnitude if the faculty expects the interns to enact an anti-oppressive/anti-racist teacher education curriculum and for their field evaluation to reflect that outcome. Quite poignantly, one teacher said, “Do I have an extensive knowledge of treaty education? No. We were given a book. We were given some in-service but it’s so sporadic. I know that’s not the University’s job to educate our teachers.” Perhaps not, but the insights teachers provided the researchers in this study suggest that making the shift, the critical turn, from a technical-rational approach to teacher education to a program that insists that pre-service teachers be evaluated on their ability to actualize that program will take more than changing the core courses in the program and making adjustments to the IPP. Co-operating teachers will need to be conversant in the theory that informs the program and its expectations if things are to be “all right.”

Conclusion

Overall, the implications for teacher education within our faculty are: continued emphasis on building capacity in the field through use of the internship seminar; increased attention to using

the IPP during ECS courses so that pre-service teachers are prepared to answer co-ops' questions like "what does this mean?" Caldéron's (2011) theorizing on the foundations of epistemological ignorance is useful in understanding participants' reactions to faculty initiatives; she writes, "much of education research, literature and practice blindly incorporate colonial ontologies through what I refer to as colonial blind discourses" (p. 109). The dual needs of co-operating teachers for further professional development opportunities within this epistemology and of the faculty to engage in refinement of the attendant language of the IPP seems in order. The fact that there are not SJ items in every category of the IPP may work to reify the impression that some areas of teaching are neutral, just "good teaching" and in effect are either transcendent or apart from teaching in anti-oppressive/anti-racist ways that our faculty's vision statement, "teaching for a better world" embraces.

More broadly, the implications for what Whipp (2013) refers to as "justice-oriented programs," the findings of this study support her conclusion that we must, "more strategically tailor course work, fieldwork, and mentoring in ways that address the various needs and readiness of candidates to develop ... across the continuum of preservice and inservice teacher education" (p.465). We are none of us exempt from the hard work of social change. We live and work in a post-colonial settler society where, until recently white-settlers represented by the majority of our students and co-operating teachers, have not interrogated their positioning, much less been held accountable for the political-historical systems which benefit them (Regan, 2010). This research is a beginning step in that process. We value the experience of co-operating teachers, upon whom we depend to deliver a successful program, but who have expressed an appetite for more knowledge of SJ pedagogy in their participation in both the field components of our teacher education programs and this study. Their candor, their honesty and their willingness to make themselves vulnerable to the critique of researchers is to be commended. In that respect alone, we must be accountable to them.

Acknowledgements

With appreciation to Saskatchewan Instructional Development Research Unit (SIDRU), University of Regina for funding the study.

References

- Ah Lee, Y. (2011). What does teaching for social justice mean to teacher candidates? *The Professional Educator*, 35(2), 12-31.
- Adams, M., Bell, L., & Griffin, P. (2007). *Teaching for diversity and social justice*. New York: Routledge.
- Alcoff, L. (2007). Epistemologies of ignorance: Three types. In S. Sullivan & N. Tuana (Eds.), *Race and epistemologies of ignorance* (pp. 39-58). New York: SUNY Press.
- Alsop, J., & Miller, S. J. (2014). Reclaiming English education: Rooting social justice in dispositions. *English Education*, 46(3), 195-215.
- Ambe, E. (2006). Fostering multicultural appreciation in pre-service teachers through multicultural curricular transformation. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 22(6), 690-699.
- Attwood, P., (2011). The power of collaboration: Learning to teach antiracist content. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 13(3), 122-129.
- Bennett, S. V. (2012). Effective facets of a field experience that contributed to eight preservice teachers' developing understandings about culturally responsive teaching. *Urban Education*, 48(3), 380-419.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for*

- the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.
- Britzman, D. (1998). *Lost subjects, contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Caldéron, D. (2011). Locating the epistemologies of ignorance in education ideology and practice. In E. Malewski & N. Jaramillo (Eds.), *Epistemologies of ignorance in education* (pp. 105-127). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Castro, A. J. (2010). Themes in the research on preservice teachers/views of cultural diversity: Implications for researching millennial preservice teachers. *Educational Researcher, 39*(3), 198-210.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2000). Blind vision: Unlearning racism in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review, 70*, 157-190.
- Cochrane-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity and social justice in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cochrane-Smith, M., Davis, D., & Fries, K. (2004). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice and policy. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 931-975). New York: Macmillan.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Barnatt, J., Lahann, R., Shakman, K. & Terrell, D. (2008). Teacher education for social justice. In W. Ayers, T., Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 625-639). New York: Routledge, Hoboken.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hammerness, K., Grossman, P., Rust, F., & Shulman, L. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world* (pp. 390-441). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dion, S. (2009). *Braiding histories: Learning from aboriginal peoples' experiences and perspectives*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Duckworth, V., & Maxwell, B. (2015). Extending the mentor role in initial teacher education: embracing social justice. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 4*(1), 4-20.
- Eisner, E. (1999). The art and craft of teaching. In A.C. Ornstein & L.S. Behar-Horenstein (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in curriculum* (2nd ed.) (pp.81-89). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977* (pp. 197-133). New York: Pantheon.
- Galman, S., Pica-Smith, C., & Rosenberger, C. (2010). Aggressive and tender navigations: Teachers educators confront whiteness in their practice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(3), 225-236.
- Garrett, H. J., & Segall, A. (2013). (Re)considerations of ignorance and resistance in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(4), 294-304.
- Gee, J. P. (2006). What is literacy? In P. Vandenberg, S. Hum, & J. Clary-Lemon (Eds.), *Relations, locations, positions: Composition theory for writing teachers* (pp. 29-39). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Gorski, P. C. (2009). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 309-318.
- Gramsci, A. (2012). *Selections from cultural writings*. D. Forgas & G. Nowell-Smith (Eds.), Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Holloway, S., & Gouthro, P. (2011). Teaching resistant novice educators to be critically reflective. *Discourse Studies, 32*(1), 29-41.

- Kaur, B. (2012). Equity and social justice in teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*, 485-492.
- Kelly, D. M., & Brandes, G. M. (2001). Shifting out of "neutral": Beginning teachers' struggles with teaching for social justice. *Canadian Journal of Education, 26*(4), 437-454.
- Kelly, D. M., & Brandes, G. M. (2010). "Social justice needs to be everywhere": Imagining the future of anti-oppression education in teacher preparation. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 56*(4), 388-402.
- Kumashiro, K. (2015). *Against Common Sense: Teaching and learning toward social justice* (3rd Ed.) New York: Routledge.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 47-68.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a 'nice' field like Education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7-24.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). Is the team all right? Diversity and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(2), 229-234.
- Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness, and education*. New York: Routledge.
- Marx, S. (2006). *Revealing the invisible: Confronting passive racism in teacher education*. New York: Routledge.
- McDonald, M., & Zeichner, K. (2008). Social justice teacher education. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp.595-610). New York: Routledge/Hoboken.
- Mueller, J., & O'Connor, C. (2007). Telling and retelling about self and "others": How pre-service teachers (Re)interpret privilege and disadvantage in one college classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 23*(6), 840-856.
- Mulholland, V., & Salm, T. (2015). Looking backward to look forward: The story of interpreting program renewal through the internship seminar. In Thomas, L. (Ed.), *Change and Progress in Canadian Teacher Education* (pp. 136-47). Ottawa: Canadian Association of Teacher Educators.
- Nieto, S. (2013). Language, literacy, and culture: Aha! Moments in personal and sociopolitical understanding. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education [Online], 9*(1), 8-20. Retrieved from <http://jolle.coe.uga.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Language-Literacy-Culture.pdf>
- Pollock, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Everyday antiracism: Getting real about race in school*. New York: The New Press.
- Regan, P. (2010). *Unsettling the settler within: Indian residential Schools, truth telling, and reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Reynolds, R., & Brown, J. (2010). Social justice and school linkages in teacher education programmes. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(4), 405-419.
- Riley, T., & Ungerleider, C. (2008). Preservice teachers' discriminatory judgments. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 54*(4), 378-387.
- Ryan, J., Pollock, K., & Antonelli, F. (2009). Teacher diversity in Canada: Leaky pipelines, bottlenecks, and glass ceilings. *Canadian Journal of Education, 32*(3) 591-617.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Sensoy, O., & DiAngelo, R. (2012). *Is everyone really equal? An introduction to key concepts in social justice education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Salm, T., & Mulholland, V. (2017). How cooperating teachers and interns understand "Teaching for a Better World" during internship. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 16*(3), 105-123.
- Sleeter, C. (2008). Preparing white teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (3rd Ed.) (pp. 559-582).

- New York and London: Routledge.
- St. Denis, V., & Schick, C. (2003). What makes anti-racist pedagogy in teacher education difficult? Three popular ideological assumptions. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 49(1), 55-69.
- Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (3rd Ed.) (pp. 119-150). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Terwilliger, C. (2010). Mapping stories: Taking detours to challenge whiteness. *Making Connections: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Cultural Diversity*, 11(2), 14-25.
- Tuana, N. (2004). Coming to understand: Orgasm and the epistemology of ignorance. *Hypatia*, 19(1), 194-232.
- Whipp, J. L. (2013). Developing socially just teachers: The interaction of experiences before, during, and after teacher preparation in beginning urban teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(5), 454-467.
- Zeichner, K. (2009). *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice*, New York: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and University-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 89-99.
- Zeichner, K. (2012). The turn once again toward practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(5), 376-382.

Valerie Mulholland is an Associate Professor in Secondary English Education at the University of Regina. Her interests include pre-service teacher education, particularly in anti-oppressive pedagogy, and post-colonial theories in education.

Twyla Salm is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education at the University of Regina. Dr. Salm's research interests focus on teaching and learning in higher education with specific interest in developing the professional educator, mentoring and health curriculum change in higher education. She also studies anti-oppressive teacher education and the implications for interprofessional collaboration on school and community health.

Appendix: Interview questions

1. Demographics: Years of teaching? _____ How many interns?
Secondary/Elementary/both
2. What aspects of the IPP do you appreciate? (Why?)
3. What aspects of the IPP are the most challenging? (Why?)
4. How do you interpret the item on the IPP that refers to “culturally responsive classroom management approaches”?
5. How do you interpret the need to address and be “purposefully controversial”?
6. How does Treaty Education get taken up in your school/school division?
7. How does linguistic awareness and flexibility get taken up in your context?
8. Share examples of the way you supported your intern through
 - a. Sharing knowledge about historical and social injustice and inequity.
 - b. Disrupting sexism, racism, ableism, and/or heteronormativity