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The three-article dissertation draws on qualitative data collected through a participatory design research framework. The abstracts below detail the analysis of the collected body of work from this study.

1. Making Practice Matter: A Year Long Curriculum for Social Justice Teacher Educators
   In this book proposal I suggest an innovative method of cultivating equity commitments in practice-based teacher education. Specifically, I propose a book that tells the story of collaboratively designing social justice teacher preparation with pre-service secondary teachers in English Language Arts and Social Studies. This book is designed for teacher educators, including curriculum and clear and accessible approaches to the development of social justice teacher dispositions and practice.

2. Behind the Curtain: Structuring Preservice Teacher Education for Social Justice Teaching Identities
   In this article, I report findings from a study of an innovative approach to social justice teacher education in which I collaboratively designed and taught a humanities practice-based, teacher education course called “Studio.” Drawing on research on anti-oppressive practice and theoretical work on the dialogical self, I followed one candidate through a yearlong process of co-designing and participating in Studio. Throughout this study, I analyzed how video recordings of Studio class activities, candidate audio journals, and video recordings of Studio co-design meetings offered a complex mix of discursive opportunities that allowed one candidate to create and improvise as they co-negotiated and narrated their own development as a social justice educator.

3. She is White but Not Really White: Using Audio Journals as a Form of Critical Reflection in Preservice Teacher Education.
   The purpose of this article is to highlight audio journals as a reflective practice within social justice teacher education as a way for candidates to question their assumptions around oppressive structures within and outside of schools. In examining how one candidate spoke about her experiences in her practicum site, I analyzed how ideas around race, ethnicity, gender, and ability were negotiated and explored. Throughout this article, I argue that in order to move candidates from passive observers to critical agents who dissect how power indexes and is indexed through learning, it is important for candidates to have a flexible and individualized way to reflect on who they are as social justice teachers and who they want to become.
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CHAPTER 1
RESEARCH PROBLEM

“If you have come to help me you are wasting your time. But if you have come because your liberation is bound up with mine, then let us work together.” These words, attributed to Aboriginal activist Lilla Watson, serve as an important admonition to those of us who identify as educators for social change. They call into question existing notions of teaching for social justice that argue for a primarily White, cis-gendered, female teaching force to “understand” oppression. Instead, Lilla’s words imply that the preparation of teacher candidates (TC) needs to cultivate a belief that complicity in oppression is against everyone’s self-interest. Yet, to truly imagine how to develop a teacher education program around these ideals is complicated. According to Kumashiro,

we do not want to be the same, we also do not want to be better (since any Utopian vision would simply be a different and foretold way to be, and thus, a different way to be stuck in a refined sameness); rather, we want to constantly become, we want difference, change, and newness. And this change cannot come if we close off the space-between (2000, p. 46).

In this view, it isn’t enough that teacher candidates become allies in the fight for justice. They need to also continuously and iteratively challenge their conceptualizations of justice and self, and reflect on how their experiences and positionality shape and reshape their interpretation of teaching, oppression, and practice.

As teacher educators, it is tempting to envision ourselves as being critically conscious. Yet, “even teachers with expressed interest in social justice education fall prey to stereotypes and deficit thinking…No-one is immune” (Picower, 2007, pg. 14). Thus, teacher education inspired
by a social justice orientation should be seen, “...less as a triumphant charge from oppression to liberation, and more as a scaffolding of a difficult entry into a new and still imperfect discourse” (Francis & Hemson 2007, p.100). It seems that to learn about oppression and even to be aware and critical of our own complicity and collusion with oppression will not automatically lead us to liberation. Rather, teacher education programs need to not only push candidates to confront deficit orientations towards students and families, but also accept responsibility for combating educational and societal injustices as teachers (Portilio & Malott, 2011). Without attending to candidates’ social justice development, Teacher Education Programs (TEPs) risk educating teachers who will perpetuate oppressive school practices and policies (e.g., Palmer & Mendard-Warwick 2012). To address the development of social justice teachers, innovation in teacher education programs should consider discursive opportunities that invite candidates to conceptualize teaching as a political act and to challenge and reconsider their beliefs around effective teaching.

**Proposed Study**

In this study, I investigated the development of preservice teachers, and specifically, the kind of environment or experiences that invite secondary humanities candidates to consider being socially just. During the 2015-2016 school year, I collaboratively designed a practice-based methods course with secondary humanities candidates. The course, called Studio was designed as a collaborative, improvisational space where pre-service teachers attended to the development of embodied practices—designing and rehearsing the social, cognitive, and emotional dimensions of becoming social-justice educators. Drawing on theoretical frames rooted in social justice like the concept of critical stance (Lewison et al, 2008; Scherff, 2012), as well as anti-oppressive pedagogy (Kumashiro, 2000), I designed Studio with candidates to weave
in reflective and performative processes alongside an iterative analysis of practice, and self.

Through the development of the curriculum of Studio, I expanded upon notions of co-design as a form of teacher professional development (Voogt et al., 2015), specifically theorizing the co-design process as a teacher education practice and a possible structure within social justice teacher education (SJTE). Recognizing that many researchers in teacher education collaboratively design research through either research practice partnerships or curricular co-design (e.g., Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Cobb, 2000; Severance, Penuel, Sumner & Leary, 2016; Coburn, & Penuel, 2016), in this study, I conceptualized co-design as a research methodology as well as a teacher education pedagogy and a process for candidates to contribute and reflect on their own development.

In the Studio curriculum, a critical stance towards practice was approached through designing inquiry opportunities for candidates to propose practices to discuss, to break apart, and to perform. Through a critical stance towards practice, Studio participants were invited to develop a social justice teaching literacy and to weave reflection and alternative ways of being into their conception of teaching and learning. Through anti-oppressive pedagogy, candidates were encouraged to not only engender but to expand upon notions of the critical stance to include 1) teachers speaking back against “common sense” reforms such as scripted curriculum and standardized testing (Kumashiro, 2007); and 2) teachers connecting their role as educators to larger social justice movements (Cochran-Smith, 2004). This conceptualization, defined as an anti-oppressive stance within this study describes a way to conceive of a social justice teaching identity. Further, since candidates in this study were designing practice, specifically considering their development of an anti-oppressive stance, Studio was also designed around literature that addresses social justice within Practice Based Teacher Education (PBTE). In this study, by
PBTE I mean experiences where candidates engage in teacher practice, both by performing instructional activities and analyzing them. Encouraging both candidates and teacher educators to push back on current conceptualizations of preparation, practice, and social justice through co-design, I can see conversations around practice in future research aligning differently depending on domain-specific perspectives. Making explicit how power and knowledge is shaped and shapes the social interactions of teachers and teacher educators is a fundamental next step in the research on social justice teaching and teacher education.

In this study, I analyzed candidates’ discursive practices (e.g. Fairclough, 1992) during both the co-design process and their participation in the Studio course. I examined the extent to which candidates I studied developed an anti-oppressive stance across multiple preparation contexts, embodying and testing new ways to support both an anti-oppressive stance towards practice and teacher education pedagogy within PBTE. In Studio, candidates were invited to engage across discursive spaces often absent from traditional teacher preparation experiences or programs. Candidates engaged in inquiry, attempting to reason and argue for particular interpretations of social justice practice and to evaluate complex actions and decisions in the context of their future classroom. Through co-design and inquiry, the goal was to engage candidates in real world puzzles—destabilizing their preconceptions around both practice and justice, and establishing a need to reconsider each in light of the other. In relation to these points, I investigated the following research questions: 1) How can co-designing a practice-based teacher education (PBTE) course with secondary humanities pre-service teacher candidates invite discursive spaces of engagement that support candidates in developing an anti-oppressive stance in practice? 2.) In the Studio context, how does the process of co-designing a methods course relate to how teacher candidates conceptualize and perform social justice teaching
identities 3) and what tools and processes designed with the Studio course support candidates in enacting social justice practice?

In the following section, I will describe the importance of social justice teacher education, teaching, and teachers and how they are approached in the literature. First I draw on research in social justice teaching, and describe the justification for developing social justice educators. Next, I detail how social justice teachers are defined within educational research and explain how I conceived of social justice teachers within this study. Finally, I describe how co-design as a method within SJTE can support the development of social justice teachers and programs.

The Importance of Social Justice Teacher Education

By the year 2020, students of color are projected to comprise almost half of all school-age youth (Gollnick & Chinn, 2013). Currently, children from racial and ethnic “minority” groups are actually the majority of students in several states and many urban areas (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012) while approximately 21 percent of the US population older than age 5 speaks a language other than English at home (ProQuest Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2014). Yet, despite the increasing cultural and linguistic diversity of our schools, the overwhelming majority (more than 80 percent) of general and special education teachers are White and monolingual (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012).

The examination of the differences between today’s teachers and students on the basis of race, ethnicity, language and socioeconomic background serves as an impetus to interrogate how race, class, gender and language biases affect teacher preparation and practice. It speaks to the importance of ensuring that new, White monolingual teachers are immersed in frameworks that will facilitate their support of students whose identities differ from their own. For example,
although some teacher educators have attempted to infuse culturally responsive strategies (Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2000; Sleeter, 2008) in their programs to help students develop critical consciousness, researchers have argued that for these efforts to be effective White teachers must examine how Whiteness perpetuates racial supremacy in schools across the United States (Chubbuck & Zembylas, 2008; Matias, 2013). Thus, teacher educators have an important role in developing curricula that address the concepts of White privilege in relation to systemic oppression. As Alsup (2006) explained, teacher education programs are spaces where future educators should begin developing their professional identities. Although racialized and gendered identities should be included in this argument, teacher candidates may not have explored their identities in this manner prior to enrollment and with humanities content specifically. As one element within a larger process of deciphering what it means to be a social justice educator, addressing teacher identity in these ways can give White preservice teachers an opportunity to reflect on how their identities are tied to the systemic oppression of minoritized groups.

Although Teacher education programs and school districts across the US face the challenge of helping White monolingual teachers gain the skills needed to teach all students effectively (Banks et al., 2005), they also need to consider the way in which programs recruit and prepare teachers of color (Achinstein et al., 2010). Alongside a curriculum addressing identity in relation to practice, teacher education programs need to consider the positive impact of having candidates that reflect the racial, cultural and/or linguistic background of their future students (Villegas & Davis, 2008). Further, they need to engage in a process of reflection and redesign, actively recognizing their failure to support candidates of color and ultimately prepare them to teach all students through social justice practice (Tellez, 1999). It should not be taken for granted
that all preservice teachers of color recognize or understand oppressive structures, even in relation to their own lived experiences (Brown, 2014). Rather, programs that are designed around social justice practice, must intentionally prepare all candidates – including those of color – to recognize and work actively against oppression. One approach is to unearth the experiences facing candidates of color across all different races within teacher education programs. To document the invisibility (Nguyen, 2008), the isolation (Sheets & Chew, 2002), and marginalization (Frank, 2003) of candidates within teacher preparation has the potential to address how teacher education programs are designed around and for Whiteness.

One of the many benefits of collaborative design is that it engages candidates in an unearthing process, providing teachers a way to call their own lives and the lives of others into dialogue. For example, in Studio candidates were encouraged to discuss their race and ethnicity in relation to their social justice teaching identity, and to grapple with how their racial, ethnic, class, and gender identity influenced their conceptions of ability, learning, and school. When designing, rehearsing and reflecting on practice, candidates were challenged to conceive of pedagogy in relation to their own experiences with schooling and their own conception of self. Rather than only defining practice by considering the identities of their students, candidates were encouraged to question what was normalized within a practice, and how their own identity influenced the implementation of instructional activities. Further, by iteratively reflecting on their own identity, and designing their preparation around each other, candidates were also forced to take ownership for their colleagues experience in the program by designing for it.

**Social Justice Teacher Education**

According to Cochran Smith (1991) teachers and teacher educators who work towards justice “must name and wrestle with their own doubts, must fend off the fatigue of reform and
depend on the strength of their individual and collaborative convictions that their work ultimately makes a difference in the fabric of social responsibility” (p. 285). This process towards an equity-oriented practice is not a linear trajectory but rather an amalgamation of planned and unpredictable forces that produce emergent transformations and unexpected outcomes. In the process of becoming social justice teachers, candidates, along with theories, tools, disciplined practices, and content, are in a constant state of relational flux. In other words, they are muddled together in unexpected ways that are situated in a larger cultural context and shaped by the contingencies of time, place and context. There is no panacea for teacher education. We cannot rid ourselves of oppression; rather we must learn to name it—to critique ourselves and to revise.

The ‘social justice educator’ emerges from preparation as unfinished. At most, they are trained to simply recognize and interrupt oppression. I believe that through the design of teacher education coursework, that addresses the complexity of becoming a social justice teacher, teacher educators and teacher education programs can demand more, moving past disruption and into practice. In this study, for example, the use of co-design during teacher preparation provided a discursive opportunity for candidates to both discuss oppression and practice as well as to design ways to expand upon their own preparation. The impact of such positioning on teacher candidates influenced the interactions, perspectives, and experiences of not only individual candidates but also teacher educators (Bullough & Draper, 2004; Ellsworth, 1997; van Langenhove & Harre, 1999). Through my study, I hoped to trace how such repositioning may contribute to views of social justice teacher development as a fluid and dynamic process, influenced by existing notions of self as well as external forces related to one’s positioning in broader society.
A fundamental shift in teacher education means a reframing of whose knowledge and expertise “counts” in the preparation of new teachers (Zeichner, Payne & Brayko, 2015). Educational researchers have historically taken up the idea of knowledge and expertise around what novice teachers need to know and be able to do (e.g., Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005), who should be prepared as teachers (e.g., Villegas & Irvine, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2004) and how this preparation should occur (e.g., Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004; Hollins & Guzman, 2005). Very little attention, however, has been given to the issue of whose knowledge is privileged within teacher education (Zeichner, Payne and Brayko, 2015, Cook-Sather, 2009, Cook-Sather, 2007). For example, preservice teachers rarely, if ever, contribute to the structure or curriculum in their programs. Their perspectives on practice and social justice are largely ignored. While numerous studies focus on the impact of teacher education programs on teacher candidates (Bullough & Baugh, 2008; Capraro, Capraro, & helfeldt, 2010; Conroy et al., 2013; Cuthrell et al., 2014; Sterrett & Bond, 2012), these studies primarily emphasize what teacher candidates know rather than think about effective pedagogy. Furthermore, the scholarship that does analyze candidates’ perspective on social justice teaching and learning (e.g., Brass & Webb, 2014; Kidd, Sanchez, & Thorp, 2008), fail to imagine what would happen if candidates had substantial input into their own development. By incorporating preservice teachers’ beliefs about effective teaching and co-designing their preparation with them, it is possible not to just expand upon traditional notions of preservice teacher education and social justice teacher practice, but to reimagine them.

Although, over the last decade, there has been an increasing emphasis on “social justice” as a theme in teacher education, as a movement it lacks a concrete definition of how it is conceived and applied (e.g., Forzani, 2014; Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Lahann, Shakman, &
Terrell, 2009; Crowe, 2008). Some programs emphasize teachers’ beliefs and identity while others focus on curriculum. Although there are a few programs that highlight community partnerships or other structural innovations (e.g., Murrell, 2001; Quartz, 2003; Seidl & Friend, 2002), most concentrate on altering curriculum within traditional programs (Zeichner, 2006). “Teacher education for social justice” is conceptually ambiguous with variation in theoretical perspectives and instantiations (Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Lahann, Shakman, & Terrell, 2009). This ambiguity is related not only to the variability in approaches but also to the fact that in many programs the notion of “social justice” exists in name only (Grant & Agosto, 2008). Without particular characteristics that embody social justice teaching, or a teacher education pedagogy designed to engender social justice practice, the concept of “justice” has the potential to become diluted or co-opted.

On the other hand, by constructing visions of justice-oriented teacher education with preservice teachers in context, and avoiding prescriptive, decontextualized “how to” steps for becoming a social justice educator, it is possible to define social justice in ways that matter to both preservice teachers and their future students. In this study I analyzed the potential of social justice teacher education when it is collaboratively designed with candidates, encouraging an iterative evaluation of justice and practice. I believe that one way that we challenge the ambiguity around social justice teacher education is if we recognize the importance of locally situating preparation, and positioning candidates as responsible for their own transformation.

**Social Justice Teachers**

As Cochran-Smith et al. (2009) explain, ‘teaching for social justice [is] an activity with political dimensions in which all educators are responsible for challenging inequities in the social order and working with others to establish a more just society’ (p. 352). The role of the teacher in
SJTE is to actively confront inequity, specifically focusing on the betterment of society (Freire, 1970; Lipman, 2004; McDonald, 2007). Thus, social justice teacher educators must first support students in becoming aware of social inequality and then challenge them to take responsibility for combating inequity within schools and society (Giroux, 1988; Schey & Uppstrom, 2009). It is important to note that this process is not done through critical theory alone. Teacher educators emphasizing social justice frameworks must consider not only how candidates enact justice-oriented practice in the classroom but also how they ideologically conceive of justice outside of schools (Giroux, 1988; Kincheloe, 2005; Montano et al., 2002; Marshall & Anderson, 2008).

The role of the teacher inside the classroom “is to equip students with the knowledge, behavior, and skills needed to transform society into a place where social justice can exist” (Westheimer and Suurtamm, 2008, p. 590). In SJTE within schools, teachers themselves are not necessarily defined as activists, but rather focus on encouraging students to create societal change (Ayers, Quinn, & Stovall, 2008; Christensen, 2009; Freire, 1970; Tan, 2008).

While some social justice education literature addresses how teachers engage in communities (Duncan-Andrade, 2010), or collaborate with other teachers to improve their critical practice (Oakes & Rogers, 2006), most focuses on teachers’ pedagogical practices. Yet, since part of becoming a social justice educator is recognizing that classrooms are reflections of broader societal injustice (Mikel & Hiserman, 2000), teachers are not only teaching about issues, or developing their students as activists, but taking on the role of activist directly (Picower, 2012). As Montano et al. (2002) argue, ‘many social justice educators are, in fact, teacher activists in political and social movements working to bring about changes in educational policies that they perceive to be unjust’ (p. 265). Therefore, in developing social justice teachers, we have to begin to understand not simply what candidates do in the classroom, but how they
understand systems of oppression and how they engage in activism in their everyday lives.

I understand educator experience and educator identity as key components to the development of teacher practice. Further, I define the practices of teaching as connected to the identities and commitments of those who enact them. To examine our social identities, we first have to recognize how they have been socially constructed. As educators we might not even be aware of the fluidity of our identities in relation to society or the ways that they are “fixed” by others and institutions. For example, as candidates become exposed to new theories or perspectives in teacher education programs, they view these through their already developed, well-established systems of knowledge and beliefs about teaching (Furlong, 2013; Taguchi, 2007). I view teacher education as a continuous process of unpacking and repacking what is already socialized, believed, and learned. Teacher education is not about exposure; it is about relating candidates’ experiences to other ways of thinking, and constructing new transgressive ways of being. These, in turn, need to be deconstructed and reconsidered again and again, as a continuous self-reflexive process (Taguchi, 2007). Becoming a teacher is about the process of un-inscribing and re-inscribing meanings (Green & Reid, 2008); it is about the mind-body in motion (Phillips, 2010) with learning being defined as unlearning (Cochran-Smith, 2003). In this study, examined one context in which these views of teacher education were purposefully integrated into the goals and processes pursued with candidates.

In order to offer responsive teacher education that acknowledges teacher preparation as an iterative process, it is important to understand in more detail who our students are when entering teacher education as well as who they are shaping themselves into (Anspal et al., 2012; Beauchamp and Thomas, 2009; Furlong, 2013; Lamote and Engels, 2010). Informed by poststructuralist theorizations, I highlighted both the multiplicities and the complexities of
teacher identity. I wanted to challenge the assumption that there is a singular ‘teacher self’ or an essential ‘teacher identity’ reified by popular cultural myths about teachers and teaching (Britzman, 1986, 1991). Although this study examined how teachers shaped and were shaped by the experiences of co-designing a secondary humanities methods course, I do not purport to identify the origin of identity. I view my investigation into teachers’ developing social justice practice and identities as a way to support teachers in taking up nuanced considerations of how their beliefs, experiences and identities intersect to form their future teaching selves.

Drawing on studies that explore how teacher candidates employ intersecting discourses as well as their subject positions to construct an idea of an “effective” teacher (Bloomfield, 2010; Lamote and Engels, 2010; Schultz & Ravitch, 2013), I looked at the formation of a teachers’ identity as a “discursive accomplishment” (Zembylas, 2003b), shaped in relation to norms, expectations, emotions and experiences (Aldenmyr, 2013). In this study, the use of co-design during teacher preparation provided a discursive opportunity, allowing pre-service teachers to engage in spontaneous and self-generating conversations about their teaching selves in relation to anti-oppressive practice. Co-designing preparation with candidates held the possibility of creating and inviting discursively diverse spaces of engagement.

**Significance of the Research**

In this study I sought to add to the research base on co-design as an innovative form of social justice teacher education pedagogy in a secondary humanities program. While researchers have examined co-design as a form of learning (e.g., Penuel, Roschelle, & Shechtman, 2007; Voogt et al., 2011; Voogt et al., 2016), there is limited research on co-design as a tool for developing social justice teachers. The collaborative, designed-based instruction can challenge university instructors and teacher candidates to re-think traditional teacher preparation.
frameworks aimed at understanding social justice practice and the development of social justice educators. Furthermore, with the development of an anti-oppressive stance towards practice as the suggested innovation of the co-design process, this study is in conversation with literature on social justice teaching and teacher education as well as practice based teacher education. Co-design as a pedagogical approach in preservice teacher education presents an opportunity to disrupt existing paradigms around teacher education and create a space that connects social justice frameworks, practice based approaches, and co-constructed knowledge. Co-design as a model reaches outside the boundaries of what currently exists in university-based teacher education, drawing on various fields that have defined learning as a collaborative process.

Through my research, I attempted to conceive of co-design as a teacher education practice that captures the complex and messy nature of educators’ experiences and emotions as they try to teach in just ways. I conceived of co-design as situated in a poststructuralist framework in which oppression is viewed as intersectional and situated. Co-design, for example, involves relinquishing control so that candidates and teacher educators can learn from uncertainty and crisis in order to trouble existing knowledge. The implication of this research is that educators cannot be told how to work towards social justice but have to build such knowledge through interaction. I argue that the conception of co-design with attention to a post-structural framing provides such interaction. It is in conversation with research on teacher education that encourages candidates to challenge hegemonic beliefs (Asher, 2007; Boler & Zemblas, 2003; Boylan 2009; de freitas 2009), and with research on collaborative design that conceives of participant identity as central to design (e.g. Holland & Lave, 2001; Holland & Leander, 2004; Lee, 2001; Medin &Bang, 2014; Nasir, Rosebery, Warren, & Lee, 2006; Wortham, 2004; 2006).
In the subsequent chapter, I detail my conceptual framework. First, I describe the framework I used to understand the development of secondary humanities social justice teachers throughout the co-design process, which includes elements of critical stance, and anti-oppressive pedagogy. Second, I define and outline elements of how these frameworks informed the co-design of Studio. Following the conceptual framework, I review the relevant literature in practice-based teacher education and co-design and explain how each body of work informed my study.

In the third chapter, I detail the research design beginning with the methodological framework, using components of participatory design research (PDR). I describe the context of the study, the participants, and the sites, before explaining the study design and my role as both the instructor and researcher. Drawing on existing teacher education pedagogies, I describe individual components of the design structures and how they invited students to engage across discursive spaces that encouraged reflection, inquiry and analysis of both justice and practice. I conclude the research design with information regarding data collection and data analysis processes.

In chapter four through six I provide a brief summary of the findings including an example of how practice was both defined and enacted throughout Studio and information regarding the three article approach to my study. Chapter four presents a book proposal titled, “Making Practice Matter: A Year Long Curriculum For Social Justice Teacher Educators.” The proposal includes two chapters that introduce a yearlong curriculum of Studio. In this chapter, I detail my journey from a teacher to a teacher educator, exploring how I defined practice across context and time. The majority of this journey includes the daily curriculum of Studio and my experience co-designing and facilitating the course. The fifth chapter titled, “Behind the Curtain:
Structuring Preservice Teacher Education for Social Justice Teaching Identities,” analyzes one students’ experience during Studio, considering his development as a social justice educator across various engagements. Finally, in the sixth chapter titled, “She is White but Not Really White: Using Audio Journals as a Form of Critical Reflection in Preservice Teacher Education,” I study one Studio component closely, investigating how one student used audio journals to reflect on the process of becoming a social justice educator.

CHAPTER TWO

CONCEPTUAL FRAMING AND RELEVANT LITERATURE

Informed by theoretical perspectives of a critical stance and anti-oppressive pedagogy, Studio was designed to support the development of an anti-oppressive stance towards practice. Co-design can be seen as a process that enables this critical exploration, encouraging candidates to reflect on practice as well as the oppressive nature of schooling. According to scholars who have studied critical stance, when candidates are encouraged to think alternatively, they are encouraged to live in the tension(s) of inquiry, and to try on new identities (Scherff, 2012). This process of identity development is viewed as a fluid and dynamic process, influenced by existing notions of self as well as external forces related to one’s positioning in broader society.

Through a critical stance becoming a teacher means that preservice candidates critique not only existing structures in schools but also their own preparation. It is through self-examination, inquiry, and dialogue that candidates take on a critical stance; yet, it is through the application of anti-oppressive pedagogy that preparation programs acknowledge that inquiry and conversations are not enough if the intention is to actively challenge oppression. Anti-oppressive teaching involves exploring the insights and changes made possible when hidden ideologies become central to one’s teaching. As a result, teaching becomes much more uncertain,
uncomfortable, paradoxical, critical and centered on oppression in our everyday lives (Kumashiro, 2002). Not unlike social justice teacher education, anti-oppressive education has multiple approaches that often embrace variability and contradiction. As an approach, it problematizes its own perspectives. What anti-oppressive stance provides to the conversation of SJTE is that it advocates for an iterative deconstruction of the concepts of both social justice and practice and even challenges how candidates are reflecting and inquiring about their identity.

Through co-design, an anti-oppressive stance becomes the product of teacher education with new debates, new ideas, and opportunities emerging to rethink how we do things in classrooms. Such discursive innovation specifically in the context of teacher education demands an epistemological shift, providing a space for the emergence of new ideas and new ways of being a teacher and student. Undeniably, the development of an anti-oppressive stance will cause pain and evoke “crisis” (Kumashiro, 2002), but through co-design it may also open space for the untold stories. Instead of framing teacher education as practice-based, as critical, or as anti-oppressive, it holds all three of these approaches to teacher education dialectically. Co-design may offer an opportunity for teacher educators and candidates to push past tired frameworks and into a challenge: to see through the systemically oppressive categories that have been put in place and to re-design them.

In this section I describe in detail how I conceived of an anti-oppressive stance towards practice. First I explain the components of a critical stance towards practice as well as the characteristics of anti-oppressive pedagogy that were relevant to this study. I then describe how each theoretical framework supplements the other, and may be useful in defining what it means to become a social justice educator. Guided by the conceptual framework, I then review the research on practice based teacher education (PBTE) and the research on co-design, including
the background of co-design, its components, and the ways in which co-design supports
candidate development. In the following diagram I illustrate how I conceived of co-design as the
vehicle in which critical stance, anti-oppressive pedagogy and practice come together to form an
anti-oppressive stance towards practice.

Figure 1. Bridging the conceptual framework and literature review

Building a Critical Stance for Teaching

A critical stance is the core of an instructional model of critical literacy and “consists of
the attitudes and dispositions we take on that enable us to become critically literate beings”
(Lewison et al., 2008, p. 13). The following four dimensions of a critical stance represented in
Figure 2 are as follows: Consciously engaging; entertaining alternate ways of being; taking
responsibility to inquire; and being reflective. The application of the concept of critical stance to
the development of SJTE provides a concretized framework for imagining what it means to
develop into a social justice humanities teacher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consciously Engaging</strong></td>
<td>● Goes beyond just answering the question through compiling texts to a thoughtful collection of texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Questions what is commonly viewed as natural and recognizes power relationships that privilege certain people over others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Reframes the issue and modifies the student’s cultural model(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Recognizes how we support or disrupt the status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Is aware of the options we have in interpretation, response, and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entertaining Alternate Ways of Being</strong></td>
<td>● Creates and tries on new or secondary discourses or identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Engages in risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Uses the tension of what is not working as a central part of inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● See the inquiry project as a tool of power, an artifact that can actually be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taking Responsibility to Inquire</strong></td>
<td>● Gains knowledge from multiple and contradictory perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Engages in a cycle where new knowledge provokes new questions and where new questions generate new knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Reframes schooling (directly, through questions, and indirectly through experiences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Moves beyond initial understandings and pushes beliefs out of resting places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being Reflective</strong></td>
<td>● Is aware of own complicity in maintaining the status quo or systems of injustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Actively and systematically questions and evaluates critical literacy practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Uses dialogue and debate with others to use self and others to outgrow oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Re-theorizes assumptions, beliefs, and understandings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Engages in praxis (reflection and action) generating theory as intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2. Four dimensions of the critical stance (Scherff, 2012).*

In the development of a critical stance, teachers must learn to adopt a method of sociopolitical analysis; that is, to question assumptions regarding school policies that reinforce inequalities. Consequently, programs should prepare preservice teachers to entertain new ways of being critical and “to know the text and context” (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 11). As Shor (1992) noted the relationship between becoming “critical” and the basis of democracy:
Questioning socialized values in dialogue means expelling thought and language from their unexamined nests in consciousness, placing them on the table for critical scrutiny. This process gives students a chance to exercise choice, which is a foundation of democracy. (p. 133)

A critical stance should equip preservice teachers with the knowledge to fight for resources so that all students are provided equitable opportunities to reach their full potential. This means that preservice teachers learn to challenge and question power. Furthermore, preservice teachers need to set high expectations that all students can learn, while also believing in each student’s worth and ability. Finally, teacher preparation for social justice teaching should support candidates to teach lessons that facilitate critical thinking and to design curriculum for social transformation (e.g., Applebaum, 2009). In essence, in taking responsibility to inquire, candidates are encouraged to move beyond initial understandings by asking questions, interrogating the everyday, and viewing learning and knowledge as dynamic processes. Candidates are also encouraged to challenge their beliefs, and engage in a cycle where knowledge is produced, consumed, and questioned (Lewison et al, 2008). The responsibility to inquire also challenges students to engage in inquiry around their own positionality and how it operates to maintain and reify oppressive systems. Candidates are expected to question and examine normative discourses around teaching while also iteratively deconstructing internal conceptions of teaching and learning.

Critical stance is useful in categorizing elements of a social justice teaching disposition, encouraging English and History teachers to choose complex and diverse texts, to speak about power in relation to language, and to evaluate normative interpretations of literacy. Nevertheless, it is still possible for a teacher to meet all the requirements of a critical stance
towards inquiry and manage to perpetuate oppression in their classroom. In simpler terms, a critical stance is not enough. Candidates can consciously engage, recognizing privilege and systems of oppression without ever really examining their own Whiteness and their own privilege. Taking responsibility to inquire can challenge teachers to move past deficit perspectives of their students while simultaneously failing to change their practice. A critical stance towards inquiry is crucial in demanding that reflection becomes core to practice, but not unlike other social justice approaches, it cannot be viewed as a checklist or a trajectory. Viewing the act of teaching through a critical stance can be defined as “teaching through an inquiry context” (Wilhelm, 2009, p. 36). In other words, teachers adopt conceptualizations of justice through a process of reflection, continuously challenging the teacher they are being and becoming.

Although the concept of critical stance serves as both an ideological and practical approach to teaching in the humanities, Kumashiro (2000) argues that we “need to make more use of poststructural perspectives in order to address the multiplicity and situatedness of oppression and the complexities of teaching and learning” (p. 25). In order to understand how critical stance as a theoretical approach can work in tandem with a more partial, feminist and iterative approach to practice, I also draw on Kumashiro’s (2000) concept of anti-oppressive pedagogy.

**Anti-oppressive Pedagogy**

Kumashiro (2004) defines anti-oppressive teaching as a process where teachers work, paradoxically with knowledge, that is, to simultaneously use knowledge to see what different insights, identities, practices, and changes it makes possible while
critically examining that knowledge (and how it came to be known) to see what insights and the like it closes off. (p. 8-9)

Central to Kumashiro’s (2015) tenets of anti-oppressive teaching is the understanding that the actual practice of anti-oppressive teaching is always in need of being problematized. “No practice, in and of itself, is anti-oppressive. A practice can be anti-oppressive in one situation and quite oppressive in another. Or it can be simultaneously oppressive in one way and anti-oppressive in another” (p 15). Thus the fluid, context-specific, and highly subjective nature of practice makes it clear that anti-oppressive teaching is not an achievement as much as it is a process that requires constant reflection.

With links between feminist, critical, multicultural, queer, postcolonial, and other movements toward social justice, anti-oppressive education fails to propose a concrete definition of either practice or justice. Rather, in conversation with critical stance, it negotiates the meaning of the concepts of social justice, inquiry, reflection and practice. Rather than encouraging candidates to simply develop agency around social change or a realization of their role within oppressive systems, anti-oppressive education argues for candidates’ responsibility for both internal and external reflection and analysis. With no consensus on how to teach in anti-oppressive ways, it requires educators, in all stages of development, to be continuously reflective about how any perspective on teaching and learning is and should be “partial” (Kumashiro & Ngo, 2007). An anti-oppressive stance encourages an approach to SJTE that defines the importance of reflection and inquiry in the process of becoming a teacher while arguing for deliberate action against oppression by both teachers and teacher educators alike. According to Kumashiro (2000),
what is produced or practiced as a safe space, a supportive program, a feminist pedagogy, or a culturally relevant pedagogy cannot be a strategy that claims to be the solution for all people at all times, but rather is a product or practice that is constantly being contested and redefined. (p. 30)

Like anti-oppressive practice, candidates’ approach to practice remains incomplete, with candidates always in the process of becoming. There is no end goal. There is only the hope that through engagement in anti-oppressive frameworks, candidates will leave an education program with the tools and desire to continuously reflect, feel, and imagine their curriculum in the lives of the other.

According to Kumashiro (2000), the four primary approaches that educational researchers have taken in both conceptualizing the nature of oppression as well as the curricula and pedagogies within social justice teacher education are: Education for the Other; Education About the Other; Education that Is Critical of Privileging and Othering; and Education that Changes Students and Society (Kumashiro, 2000). In order to address the multiplicity and situatedness of oppression and the complexities of teaching and learning, Kumashiro argues that teacher educators need to use an amalgam of these four approaches within teacher preparation. Further, in order to consider the effect of anti-oppressive pedagogy as both content and method within social justice education, it needs to be examined, critiqued, and open to revision. In the following section I describe the four approaches of anti-oppressive pedagogy presented by Kumashiro. Yet, I expand upon these approaches in considering how they function to complement a critical stance towards practice.
Bridging Two Theories: An Anti-Oppressive Stance Towards Practice

According to hooks (2003), “Whenever we love justice and stand on the side of justice we refuse simplistic binaries. We refuse to allow either/or thinking to cloud our judgment. We embrace the logic and emotion of both/and. We acknowledge the limits of what we know” (p.10). In the spirit of creating a both/and space, I situated the following conversation within the scholarship and theoretical lenses described above. In the following section, I discuss how I drew on the areas of both critical stance and anti-oppressive pedagogy to articulate the framework guiding my study and the collaborative design work I took up with teacher candidates. As mentioned above, I refer to this approach as an anti-oppressive stance. In deciphering what each theoretical framing affords the other, I describe how the development of a critical stance can attend to some of the constraints of anti-oppressive pedagogy. When considering the four approaches to anti-oppressive pedagogy, for example, it is useful to consider how candidates might take up these approaches in ways that may essentialize or oppress future students. Moreover, by detailing how the elements of a critical stance can address these problematic interpretations, it is possible to conceive of a framework that also suggests a process of teacher development.

The first approach of anti-oppressive pedagogy, education for the other, essentially views the school as a harmful and marginalizing space. However, by constructing the other as outside the norm, and learning about oppressive structures, candidates often focus exclusively on the negative experiences of othered individuals (Kumashiro, 2000). Consequently, in bridging concepts of anti-oppressive pedagogy with critical stance, it is important to engage candidates in inquiry that challenges deficit framing of othered communities. In developing a critical stance, for example, candidates were encouraged to entertain alternative ways of being. When
considering this in relation to education for the other, candidates were challenged to practice empathy and imagine ways of understanding privilege that is both critical and humanizing. They consciously engaged with education for the other, not through simply thinking of culturally relevant books or pedagogy, but through iterative reflection on their own interpretation and response to othered communities.

The second approach that Kumashiro (2000) identifies in examining the curricula and pedagogies within social justice teacher education focuses on the need to create awareness and knowledge about the other. As he explains, knowledge of the other has historically been partial and often based on normative ideologies, delivered through the ‘hidden’ curriculum. To counter this he notes that, “educators should be critical of the curriculum, encourage students to be critical too and integrate otherness throughout the curriculum not just in a ‘special section’ about the other” (Kumashiro, 2000, p. 33). The problem with this approach however, is that candidates tend to view this process as filling a gap in existing knowledge, instead of an opportunity to disrupt existing paradigms or systems of belief to which they adhere (Kumashiro, 2000, p. 34). For this reason, connecting anti-oppressive education with a critical stance challenged candidates to take responsibility for inquiring about other perspectives, to reflect on the ways in which the story is always partial, and to imagine ways of being excluded, silenced, invisible, distorted and marginalized within their own stories. Through both anti-oppressive pedagogy and a critical stance, candidates actively reflected on how their stories both disrupted and privileged, as well as how their attempts at educating themselves about othered communities were frequently superficial.

The third approach, education that is critical of privileging and othering, involves unlearning what was previously learned as official or normative (Kumashiro, 2000, p.37).
According to this perspective, learning about the dynamics of oppression also involves learning about oneself and becoming critical of oneself (Kumashiro, 2000, p.37). The implication is that educators cannot simply teach anti-oppressive ideology, but they must embody it themselves as a way of seeing their own approach to students and teaching. Kumashiro (2000), however, identifies several difficulties with this approach. First, the notion that oppression is structural in nature may lead candidates to believe that oppression has the same general effect on everyone. Consequently, candidates may present their own experiences as equivalent to that of their students, ignoring how race, gender, sexuality and ability intersect in regards to oppression.

Second, the goals of "consciousness-raising" and "empowerment" assume that knowledge, and even critique lead to personal action and social transformation. Ultimately, it is possible for candidates to engage in self-reflection without ever really committing to tangible action. Finally, by advocating a critique and transformation of hegemonic structures and ideologies, those who are traditionally marginalized may remain as outsiders, called upon as "experts" to speak for their own positionality. Education that is critical of privileging and othering can unfortunately be seen as designed for a White, cis-gendered, heterosexual male audience.

Adopting a critical stance towards practice requires or invites candidates to question this embodiment of anti-oppressive pedagogy. While taking responsibility to inquire through a critical stance candidates asked the following questions: How are we unlearning? How are we critiquing ourselves? What are the contradictions in the way that we describe practice and learning? Where can we see ourselves practicing multiple identities? In connecting the third approach to anti-oppressive practice with critical stance, candidates were encouraged to actively unlearn behaviors and ideologies that are inherently oppressive. This process required candidates to iteratively discuss their positionality and experiences within schools. Furthermore, it invited
candidates to question their own approach to transformation and oppression, by asking them to reflect on their notion of privilege and oppression. Essentially, a critical stance towards this approach implied that critique is always partial.

The fourth approach is education that changes the self and society. According to Kumashiro (2000):

- critical pedagogy needs to move away from saying that students need this/my critical perspective since such an approach merely replaces one (social hegemonic) framework for seeing the world with another (academically hegemonic) one. Rather than aim for understanding of some critical perspective, anti-oppressive pedagogy should aim for understanding for effect by having students engage with relevant aspects of critical theory and extend its terms of analysis to their own lives, but then critique it for what it overlooks or for what it forecloses, what it says and makes possible as well as what it leaves unsaid and unthinkable. (p. 39)

This implies that during preparation, candidates need to look beyond what is being said, to listen for the silences and identify the contradictions in their knowledge. Through their preparation process candidates iteratively discussed a desire to ignore certain things. In addressing this fourth approach through a critical stance, candidates were encouraged to critique their own design and their instruction and to ask the following: What are we ignoring? What is limited in our approach? What is uncomfortable? What do we leave unsaid? It wasn’t enough that candidates were both evaluating society and themselves but they must also iteratively deconstruct their own preparation and understanding of equity, justice and practice.
The development of a theory of anti-oppressive pedagogy in relation to critical stance is crucial in supporting teachers in developing nuanced considerations of their positionality in relation to oppression and their future teaching selves. Echoing Lincoln and Guba (2003). “There is great potential for interweaving viewpoints, for the incorporation of multiple perspectives, and for borrowing or bricolage where borrowing seems useful, richness enhancing, or theoretically heuristic” (p. 259). A critical stance provides a pragmatic approach to social justice teaching education while anti-oppressive pedagogy demands deliberate attention to oppression and to action.

**Power and Positioning in Co-designing an Anti-oppressive stance**

Moving towards an anti-oppressive stance is not painless and is never complete. hooks (1994) talks of the pain involved in unlearning oppressive ideologies, quoting one of her students who describes their experience as follows: “We take your class. We learn to look at the world from a critical standpoint, one that considers race, sex and class. And we can’t enjoy life anymore” (p. 42). Discussions on race and racism, specifically focused on teaching identity, are frequently associated with a feeling of guilt or frustration from preservice teachers. Therefore, there is discomfort and resistance to the pain that might come with an anti-oppressive approach.

The use of co-design as a teacher education pedagogy is a potential response to such discomfort. Through collaborative design, candidates are exposed to the relationship between role taking and power (Bourdieu, 1989), adding complexity to the ways that they view how practice is defined and enacted. Further, by contributing to their own preparation, candidates are able to view their transformation as a choice, rather than as an imposed process. Social justice education is not about a course, or even a particular experience, but about individual actions and conversations that contribute to the process of unlearning (Kumashiro, 2000). Through co-
design, the participants design their interactions and their content. The identities involved in both the design and instruction shape discursive engagement, and either contribute to or limit how deeply candidates reflect on their development as social justice educators.

For post-structuralist theorists such as Barthes (1973), Derrida (1973) and Foucault (1972), language doesn’t consist of so many labels for the various objects and events that already exist ‘out there’ in the world. Rather, in an act of radical inversion, they saw language – or discourse – as something that serves to constitute or bring the world into being. As Foucault (1972) famously declared: ‘Discourse constructs the objects of which it speaks.’ Co-design promotes a new discourse within teacher education, constructing anti-oppressive practice around how candidates engage in the design of their own preparation, inspiring novel and imagined ways of speaking, existing and being.

Co-design engenders the performance rather than the description of language (Butler, 1990). It serves the ‘action-orientation’ (Heritage, 1984) of discourse, to see what is designed and how candidates conceive of practice. The co-design process around an anti-oppressive stance ensures that power and conversations around power are infused into how students iteratively define the way that they view themselves as anti-oppressive educators. There is no one-way to predict how candidates’ pre-established beliefs will interact with their experiences. Co-design embraces this complexity, encouraging preservice teacher education to allow for multiple entry points and identities. Although candidates may enter teacher education with fully formed beliefs around social justice and practice, they can choose to engage in conversations around those beliefs at their practicum site, during design or the inquiry process. Candidates’ discursive patterns around social justice practices become malleable, bending and responding to how they choose to engage and design their preparation.
Literature Review

Theoretical work on critical stance, and its connection to anti-oppressive teaching, offers an interesting point of departure for examining much of the recent research that has tended to dominate thinking about the nature of teacher education, as well as what constitutes innovation in the preparation of young teachers. The following organization of research on teacher education emerged as most informative. In this section, I begin by reviewing the research on practice based teacher education (PBTE), specifically highlighting how practice has been taken up and defined in university-based programs. Further, in alignment with my conceptual framework, I also review literature that addresses social justice teacher education within PBTE. Next, I briefly review the research on co-design, including the background of co-design, its components, and the ways in which participatory approaches inform co-design. Finally, I discuss this body of research as it draws on the key components of my conceptual framework to explore the ways in which practice is conceived within Studio in alignment with the practice based movement.

“Practice” in Practice-Based Teacher Education

Deborah Britzman (1991) claimed that the notion of ‘practicing teaching,’ which now goes under various names such as ‘student teaching,’ ‘teaching apprenticeship,’ and ‘classroom practicum’ can be described as the state where a teacher’s world, experiences, beliefs, and dilemmas become a resource (p. 14). Many proponents of traditional preparation programs have long argued for “practice-based” teaching training that extends Britzman’s resource view of teaching and advocates for learning to focus directly on the work of teaching. In these efforts, candidates are encouraged to spend more of their time in schools, either through teaching residencies or university-based partnerships.
The increased attention to the clinical dimension of teacher education and the popularity of practice-based teacher training reflected in Britzman’s above appraisal foreshadowed a shift in not only the physical location where teacher education courses occurred, but also influenced how educators were attempting to define practice-based teacher education (PBTE). For instance, merely locating a course at a P-12 setting does not necessarily ensure that a given program is actually practice-based. Some courses that are, in fact, defined as practice-based continue to meet in a traditional university setting, but make use of expert schoolteachers through virtual platforms in order to support instruction (Pointer-Mace, 2009). Still other courses use the concept of authentic expertise to integrate university supervisors, and both school and community-based educators into the university classroom (Zeichner, Payne, & Brayko, 2015).

One of the major issues facing PBTE is that it is highly varied in its characteristics and quality (NCATE, 2010; NRC, 2010). As the above examples suggest, the frequency and quality of supervision and mentorship, the degree of connection between the clinical experiences and coursework, and even the quality of school placements varies greatly within and across programs (Grossman et al., 2009; Zeichner, 2010). To this point, despite the focus on the practice-oriented content or the authentic context of learning, effective teaching practice within PBTE remains ambiguous.

Although the majority of university-based teacher education programs with school-university partnerships are described as “practice-based,” there remains a disconnect between the strategies and curriculum encouraged in their coursework and the practices observed and enacted within school placements (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Ball, Sleep, Boerst, & Bass, 2009; Janssen, Grossman, & Westbroek, 2015; Grossman et al., 2009; Grossman & McDonald, 2008; Lampert et al., 2009; Lampert et al., 2013; McDonald, et al., 2013; Windschitl et al., 2012). For example,
cooperating teachers may not be privy to the specifics of the university methods and foundation courses, and the instructors on campus often are unfamiliar with the everyday school practices used in their partner schools (Levine, 2010). Even if there is curricular alignment between university courses and the classrooms where preservice teachers are placed, teaching candidates rarely get the opportunity to reflect on those practices (Darling-Hammond et al., 2005). Except for a few assignments situated within the field experience, teaching candidates and cooperating teachers are left to the daily work of teaching, assuming that good “practice” happens through exposure (Darling-Hammond, 2009; Valencia et al., 2009).

Despite the challenges facing PBTE, recent scholarship has highlighted the importance of authentic practice and observation in the preparation of teachers. For example, Horn and Campbell (2015) describe a 6-year design experiment conducted in a university secondary mathematics methods course. In order to address the importance of providing partnerships with children and classroom teachers, they examined the use of a pedagogy called mediated field experience (MFE), where candidates applied concepts introduced through coursework to classroom observations and facilitated debriefs with classroom teachers. Through their analysis, they argued that MFE’s allowed candidates to connect the ecologies of classrooms and the complexities of practice with the instructional moves and activities necessary to teach mathematics. Ultimately, while the definition and location of PBTE remains varied, the importance of context in conceptualizing practice remains central (McDonald, Kazemi, and Kavanaugh, 2013).

One of the challenges in defining practice within PBTE is that despite its complexity, teaching appears to be misleadingly simple. By the time teacher candidates enroll in a teacher licensure program, they have had at least 12 years to apprentice into the practice of schooling
and to develop attitudes about “effective” teachers and teaching (Lortie, 1975). These experiences leave an enduring mark on candidates (Bird, Anderson, Sullivan, & Swidler, 1993; Doolittle et al., 1993; Doyle, 1997; Lermen, 1997), cementing beliefs about the teaching profession that persist throughout their training and into their teaching career (Doolittle et al., 1993; Lermen, 1997; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984; Taylor & Sobel, 2001). These attitudes can influence their preparation to become an educator, believing that their own approaches to instruction will mirror those of the teachers in whose classrooms they have vicariously prepared to teach (Doyle, 1997; Holt-Reynolds, 1992). With a disconnect between the representation of practice occurring within university preparation programs and the real experiences occurring at school sites, individual interpretations of practice remain solidified. Therefore, the conversation around practice needs to be expanded past location or process and more specifically grounded towards candidates’ enactment of “effective” teaching.

**The “Core” Practices in PBTE**

One of the efforts in practice-based reform centers on defining the “core” or “high leverage” practices necessary for effective pedagogy (e.g., Ball & Forzani, 2009; Ball, Sleep, Boerst, & Bass, 2009; Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009; Kazemi, Lampert, & Franke, 2010; Lampert & Graziani, 2009; Zeichner, 2012). These scholars are shifting their focus towards examining how preservice teachers learn core practices (Levine, 2010; Singer-Gabella, 2012) and also how teacher educators implement pedagogies to support them (McDonald, Kazemi, & Kavanagh, 2013). According to McDonald et al., (2013), core practices are “specific, routine aspects of teaching that demand the exercise of professional judgment and the creation of meaningful intellectual and social community for teachers, teacher educators, and students” (p. 378). By offering a conceptualization of teacher preparation designed around a
“common language,” McDonald et al., argue for the aggregation of knowledge about teaching and teacher education pedagogy that could move the concept of practice forward.

By designing opportunities for candidates to “approximate” practice either through modeling or rehearsal, scholars argue that candidates are exposed to the intricacies of practice that require technical knowledge about how to teach (e.g., Grossman et al., 2009; Lampert et al., 2013; McDonald et al., 2013). Furthermore, in this approach, teacher educators use video annotation and artifacts to represent and decompose practice, requiring candidates to dissect instructional activities and strategies in various contexts (Blomberg et al., 2013). For example, in their study Ghousseini and Sleep (2011) introduce the concept of “making practice studyable” through the following five categories: 1) engaging the context; 2) providing insight into student thinking; 3) orienting to the instructional context; 4) providing lenses for viewing; and 5) developing a disposition of inquiry. In their study, these categories are applied in an elementary mathematics methods course, ultimately finding that the definition of practice needs to move beyond representation. Ghousseini and Sleep (2011) argue that “making practice studyable is itself a practice; it is the work that professional developers and teacher educators (including cooperating teachers) do to mediate learning in and from practice” (p. 159). The process of identifying and specifying practice requires candidates and teacher educators to experiment. They must attend to context, and expand upon the observable. Researchers leading the conversation on core practices conceptualize practice as deeply rooted within and attending to the cultural framework of individual communities. Learning, as defined by the researchers taking up this charge, occurs within and across disciplines and is couched within equity discourse. As McDonald, et al. (2013) describe, their approach to core practice attempts to make the invisible work of social justice, visible.
Social Justice and Core Practice in PBTE

Despite the call for social justice within core practices, there remains a tangible divide between research on practice-based teacher education and research on social justice. Dutro and Cartun (2016) argue that “We need to think about the extent to which critical theoretical perspectives on race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, accountability, and market-based reforms and their intersections are explicitly part of the conversation about what is core to practice” (p. 3). Terms like “core” and “social justice” afford a level of flexibility and complexity in both design and application with PBTE. However, one of the issues is that the literatures don’t often cite one another, so SJTE doesn’t necessarily address the challenges of PBTE and PBTE remains ambiguous regarding critical frameworks.

Although recent scholarship in PBTE seeks to address the well documented disconnect between university teacher preparation and schools (e.g., Janssen, Grossman, & Westbroek, 2015; Lampert et al., 2013; McDonald, et al., 2014; Windschitl et al., 2012), most teachers, trained in these programs, generally are not fully prepared to work in complex urban settings (Helfeldt et al., 2009). Core practices and other movements in PBTE fail to consider either the high concentrations of poverty or the racial and ethnic heterogeneity that is present in many urban districts (Hollins, 2012). According to McDonald et al. (2013), the move towards core practices is an attempt to build a “simple framework, applicable across contexts” (p. 381). Yet, the theoretical perspective grounding core practices defines learning as collective activity mediated by individual and institutional histories as well as conceptual and material tools (Rogoff, 1997; Wenger, 1998). It is not explicit about combating oppression. Without systematically examining the types of experiences instrumental in contributing to combating
inequity, approaches like core practices are in danger of perpetuating them (Kidd, Sanchez, & Thorp, 2008).

Social justice education (SJTE), on the other hand, looks towards specific pedagogy or frameworks to imagine the form that “social justice” and “urban training” could take. Drawing on culturally relevant and responsive teaching, multicultural pedagogy and anti-oppressive pedagogy (Banks et al., 2005; Gay, 2000; Kumashiro, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Sleeter, 2008), social justice educators pay little attention toward practice-focused pedagogy or core practice criteria. The specific goals and outcomes of justice-oriented teacher education remain context specific (Zeichner, 2012). With multiple instantiations and theoretical framings (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009; Zeichner, 2006), SJTE is focused on supporting teachers across contexts and disciplines to combat educational and societal inequities (Jones & Hughes-Decatur, 2012). SJTE falls underneath the practice-based teaching umbrella since there is a systematic approach to improving candidates’ ability to enact social justice practices. However, instead of emphasizing particular instructional activities or even criteria, SJTE centralizes justice and equity and allows for variation in how it is taken up, named and defined.

One of the major obstacles in understanding how social justice teaching and core practices fit within the practice-based teacher education movement is that all of these initiatives lack concrete definitions of how they are conceived and applied (e.g., Forzani, 2014; Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Lahann, Shakman, & Terrell, 2009; Crowe, 2008; Damon, 2005). In many examples, core practices can appear to ignore critical frameworks present in SJTE, failing to be explicit about the philosophical origin of social justice education (McDonald & Zeichner, 2009) and thus superficially addressing issues of power and privilege (Ghiso, Spencer, Ngo, & Campano, 2013; Nieto & McDonough, 2011). Scholars also warn that because SJTE lacks
clearly defined practice and thus outcomes, it risks being co-opted by other reform movements (Cochran-Smith, et al., 2009). Both of these areas of research claim to influence how candidates are prepared for a diverse landscape. Although practice-based teacher education on a whole claims to attend to the complexity of practice, it is in the convergence between social justice teacher education and core practices that a new conversation about practice and teaching emerges.

Drawing on Conklin’s (2008) vision of compassionate, critical, justice-oriented teacher education and Grossman et al.’s (2009) framework for teaching professional, relational practice, Conklin and Hughes (2016) chose to situate themselves in the messiness of the intersections between initiatives. They analyzed and highlighted the practices used in two different urban teacher education programs that provided a vision of equitable, intellectually challenging teaching and learning. According to their framework social justice practices in teacher education (1) facilitate the development of relationships and community (2) honor preservice teachers’ lived experiences and existing attitudes, (3) introduce preservice teachers to multiple perspectives of viewing the world, and (4) provide a vision of equitable, intellectually challenging teaching and learning (p. 1). In the study, teacher educators not only identified core practices but also modeled them as teacher education pedagogy. Practices were represented, decomposed and approximated (Grossman et al., 2009) for teacher candidates. Although the focus of the article was on teacher education pedagogy, they also examined preservice teacher assignments, participation, and interviews to paint a complete picture of how modeling social-oriented practice influenced candidates.
This study used core practice criteria to draw artificial boundaries around SJTE. Those boundaries represent one of the few attempts at experimenting with new ways of teaching and new ways of training. Conklin and Hughes recognize the innovative nature of their approach:

We are parsing and naming fundamentally messy, human, complex, relational practices—an activity that is in itself contradictory. However, the stakes are high for what could be accomplished through this work: the possibility of generating more equitable, intellectually challenging learning opportunities for all students, which is why these efforts seem a worthy enterprise. (p. 50)

What is unique within Conklin and Hughes (2016) approach to core practices is their attempt to model compassion and love for teachers alongside high leverage practices. Compassion, they argue, is a way to insert critical frameworks and justice into a technical conversation about practice. Naming social justice teacher education as loving and combining it with criteria for enacting practice is a revolutionary step towards creating definitions without mechanizing or diminishing the act of teaching. Like Ghousseini and Sleep’s (2011) work of making practice “studyable,” Conklin and Hughes make the work of compassion a practice itself. They challenge what it means to define practice in relation to justice.

**An Anti-Oppressive Stance Towards PBTE**

Drawing on the work of Conklin and Hughes (2016), I argue that in order to define practice within the education of future teachers and to centralize social justice within practice-oriented teacher preparation, we need to not only address the definition of both practice and justice within PBTE, but also the process of approximating and decomposing practices that occurs within PBTE programs (Grossman et al., 2009). Various educational researchers who
advocate for practice-based approaches in teacher preparation conceive of practice as something that:

(1) Occurs with high frequency in teaching, (2) TCs can begin to master, (3) TCs can enact in classrooms across different curricula or instructional approaches, (4) Are research-based and have the potential to improve student achievement, (5) Allow TCs to learn more about students and about teaching, and (6) Preserve the integrity and complexity of teaching (Grossman et al., 2009; TeachingWorks.org, 2013).

While I agree with this conception, considering myself in conversation with teacher educators who view the elicitation of student ideas, and leading a discussion as crucial practices (Grossman, Hammerness, et al., 2009; Windschitl, Thompson, Braaten, & Stroupe, 2012), I also believe that we need to expand upon this criteria, involving TC’s in the construction of practice. I would argue that the following should be included in the definition of practice: 1) Is enacted with the purpose of developing equitable community, relationships, and learning, and 2) Is reflected upon by candidates and teachers as something connecting to their identity and individual goals.

The expansion of the definition of practice to include equity and individual perspective is an attempt to add clarity to how teacher educators understand and implement practice in situated teacher education courses. While some teacher educators have suggested ways that teacher education might draw on a concretized definition of practice (Fogo, 2014; TeachingWorks.org, 2013; Windschitl et al., 2012), details of course design have remained largely unexplored. Although there are several examples of practice-based redesigned courses (Ghousseini & Sleep, 2011; Lampert et al., 2013; McDonald et al., 2014; TEDD: The Design, 2014; Windschitl et al.,
2012), they have mostly been focused on science and mathematics. Examples of redesign are fewer in English-language arts and in Social Studies. This study addresses this gap by situating itself within Social Studies and English teacher preparation and defining practice within these disciplines as central to program redesign.

In the design of Studio, the notion of practice was contained within discipline-specific instructional activities (IA) (Lampert et al., 2013). Since the course was designed with secondary humanities candidates, the exploration of practice was often situated within a routine that could support later classroom enactment. Thus when defining practice, it was important to consider the discipline, the identity of the participants, and their actions towards social justice. These considerations vastly changed how the practice was both preformed and decomposed. Rather than aiming for replication of expert practice, practice was viewed as inherently complex and improvisational (Lampert, Beasley, Ghousseni, Kazemi, & Franke, 2010). It was rooted in the lived experiences of teacher candidates and their students, and it was always in conversation with equity.

For the purpose of this study and the design of the Studio course, candidates approximated practice in ways adopted by many educational researchers within the PBTE movement (Core Practices Consortium, 2014). Specifically, candidates experienced McDonald et al.’s (2013) learning cycle, consisting of four phases in which different dimensions of approximation of practice are implemented to learn core practices. However, in Studio the decomposition and recomposition (Grossman & McDonald, 2008) of multiple core practices situated justice at the core. The current scholarship on PBTE focuses less on how particular recompositions (for instance framing multiple core practices around the development of an anti-oppressive stance) affect the learning of individual practices (Janssen, Grossman & Westbroek,
In this study, instead of highlighting the instructional moves present within a specific practice, decomposition and recomposition occurred around such concepts as humanization, challenging power, de-socializing from hegemony, and building towards something new. Students decomposed practice considering justice, and recomposed various practices in relation to their own anti-oppressive stance. In Studio, developing an anti-oppressive stance towards practice situated justice as the container for social justice teacher pedagogy.

**Co-design and Anti-Oppressive Stance in Practice Based Teacher Education**

In order to support an anti-oppressive stance towards practice, considering existing approaches to core practice and social justice, the design of Studio also proposed an iterative process of critique and inquiry in social justice teacher education. The application of co-design within PBTE, for example, encouraged candidates to not only practice instructional activities and routines that had relevancy in public schools but also rehearse ways to challenge them. The co-design model comes from the Scandinavian tradition of participatory design (e.g., Björgvinsson, Ehn, & Hillgren, 2010; Hillgren, Seravelli, & Emilson, 2011). This tradition has a commitment to equity and to transforming systems (Penuel, 2015). Yet, not unlike the core practices movement, design research has been criticized for its apolitical application in education reform (Philip et al., 2017). However, like the core practices movement, design research and specifically co-design hold great possibility when combined with critical frameworks. In their recent article the Politics of Learning Writing Collective (2017) describes a “disjunction between the Learning Sciences and political concerns, explor[ing] how the Learning Sciences might more meaningfully engage with the political dimensions of learning” (p 2). I argue that co-design itself addresses the political dimensions of practice by allowing candidates to define and design practice in relation to their teaching identities.
Through the co-design process, candidates were in conversation with efforts in practice-based reform centering on defining the core or high leverage practices necessary for effective pedagogy (e.g., Ball & Forzani, 2009; Ball, Sleep, Boerst, & Bass, 2009; Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009; Kazemi, Lampert, & Franke, 2009). Rather than questioning how they could implement particular strategies or activities, candidates re-designed practice in relation to their own identities and their imagined future classrooms, often implementing innovative considerations of practice. Furthermore, by designing practice while considering their development of an anti-oppressive stance, candidates spoke back to research that links student achievement to teacher preparation (Henry et al., 2013, 2014) and were in conversation with scholarship that attempts to centralize equity (Ball & Tyson, 2011; Brass & Webb, 2014; Ghiso, Spencer, Ngo, & Campano, 2013; Nieto & McDonough, 2011).

“Co-design” is used synonymously with collaborative design since it is characterized by design collaborations between researchers and teachers (Penuel et al., 2007; 2015; Swan et al., 2014, Voogt et al., 2015), between teachers and students (Broderick, 2014), teachers and school staff (D’Amico, 2005; Shapiro & Wardrip, 2011; Shrader et al., 1999), and even between disciplines (King et al., 1989; Kwon et al., 2014; Carr, 1997). Co-design is seen as both a method within Design Based Implementation Research, Participatory Design Research, and Research Practice Partnerships (Fishman et al., ND) and as a research methodology on its own (Penuel et al., 2007). Ormel et al. (2012) use the term “co-design” repeatedly to refer to researcher-participant collaboration, while Voogt et al. (2015) wrote of co-design as a means of professional development where teacher learning is central. Penuel and Roschelle (2006) define co-design as “a highly-facilitated, team-based process in which teachers, researchers, and developers work together in defined roles to design an educational innovation, realize the design in one or more
prototypes, and evaluate each prototype’s significance for addressing a concrete educational need” (p. 1). They go on to explain the following characteristic features of co-design.

1. Co-design takes on a concrete, tangible innovation challenge.
2. The process begins by taking stock of current practice and classroom contexts.
3. Co-design has a flexible target.
4. Co-design needs a bootstrapping event or process to catalyze the team’s work.
5. Co-design is timed to fit the school cycle.
6. Strong facilitation with well-defined roles is a hallmark of co-design.
7. There is central accountability for the quality of the products of co-design (Penuel & Roshelle, 2006, p 3).

Expanding on this conceptualization, I define co-design within practice-based teacher education curriculum as a collaborative process in which teachers and teacher educators work together to iteratively design curricular innovations within teacher education. Although there are defined roles for teachers and teacher educators within the co-design process, it is not a “fully democratic process” since accountability and ultimate responsibility for quality and decision-making rests with teacher educators (Penuel & Roshelle, 2006). Consequently, the role of the teacher educator within the co-design process is crucial. As the lead facilitator, the teacher educator must have an understanding of the imagined outcome of the design. In this study, for example, I needed to have a clear picture of what a candidate working towards an anti-oppressive stance looked like. Without this image, the engagement in design, and specifically the iterative redesign would be unsuccessful. In the process of co-design, candidates engaged in specific instances of co-creation (Sanders & Stappers, 2008) by taking on a concrete and tangible
innovative challenge defined by their understanding of both teaching and learning. Candidates were simultaneously designing and learning about foundational concepts within social justice teacher education. Through co-design, to effectively support candidates, teacher educators must take on the dual role of co-creator and instructor. This duality also serves as a model for candidates within the co-design process.

Consistent with my theoretical framework, I envision the application of co-design to be a vehicle for anti-oppressive stance towards practice and a process in which candidates are encouraged to challenge dualist and dichotomous stances towards becoming a social justice teacher. As a result, rather than defining candidates as either a student or a teacher, just or unjust, their ‘teaching identity’ was viewed through an ongoing process of negotiation across discursively diverse instructional spaces. The process of co-design in preservice teacher education addresses the gap in the current literature, namely, the teacher educator identity shifts associated with redesigning teacher education programs (Urban Teacher Residency United, 2015). Furthermore, through anti-oppressive practice, I argue that the critical application of co-design with teacher education can challenge candidates to re-consider traditional notions of critical pedagogy as well as their own perception of teaching, learning, and self.

A tenet of co-design that is particularly relevant to the development of anti-oppressive stance towards practice is the “(re)iteration” of product and process over the lifetime of a study (Ormel et al., 2012). Continuous iteration is essential to co-design because, as Penuel et al. (2007; 2015) and Voogt et al. (2015) explain, co-design is a process that requires inquiry and experimentation prior to product development. “Interventions themselves are rarely static; their design continues to evolve in and through the implementation and scale-up phase as researchers learn from practitioners’ experience and in response to varied contexts” (Datnow, 2002; Peurach
& Glazer, 2012). Additionally, co-design is dependent upon relationships, and so requires time to redesign as boundaries diminish and roles become more defined (Penuel et al., 2015; King et al., 1989). Through the process of co-design in Studio candidates were able to iteratively design and enact curriculum relevant to their own identity development. Even though candidates designed their curriculum as educators, and participated in that curriculum as students, their role as designers remained constant. Candidates’ experiences as students were used as data for future designs, and thus they were encouraged to constantly reflect on how curriculum influenced their understanding of social justice practice and their development as social justice teachers.

The co-design process centering an anti-oppressive stance towards practice ensured that power and conversations around power were infused into how students iteratively defined the way that they viewed themselves as social justice educators. As such, it is a proposed method for social justice teacher education and practice based teacher preparation. It is my belief that through co-design candidates may be able to see their students as co-collaborators in the teaching process in the same way their teacher educators saw them as co-collaborators in the process of becoming teachers. Co-design has the potential to create a structure in which candidates are supported in their journey towards social justice pedagogy and are able to, in turn, create those experiences for their future students. To “trouble educational research” we need to “loo[k] beyond the theories and methods that we already know” (Kumashiro, 2002, p. 9). We need to risk feeling uncomfortable and unsure. We need to place students and candidates at the center of practice allowing them to co-create the next steps.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the co-design process of a secondary humanities teacher education course. As the below research question indicates, I examined how participation in co-design related to the way in which candidates discussed and engaged with practice and justice, particularly defined through anti-oppressive stance (Kumashiro, 2000; Lewison et al., 2008). Through qualitative data collection and analysis, I tested, revised, and refined my conjecture that the co-design process for an anti-oppressive secondary humanities course supported teachers’ development of an anti-oppressive stance. Throughout the iterative design process, I investigated the following research questions: 1.) How can co-designing a practice-based teacher education (PBTE) course with secondary humanities pre-service teacher candidates invite discursive spaces of engagement that support candidates in developing an anti-oppressive stance in practice? 2.) In the Studio context, how does the process of co-designing a methods course relate to how teacher candidates conceptualize and perform social justice teaching identities 3) and what tools and processes designed with the Studio course support candidates in enacting social justice practice?

In the following section I elaborate on my methodological framework, describing the application of participatory design research within teacher education. Specifically, I explain how co-design fits within a participatory design framework, and supports critical frameworks through the phases of design within this study. Next, I explain the study contexts, participants, the
contexts of data collection and the analysis process. I conclude with a description of integrity, describing my dual role within Studio, and the way in which I connected with participants.

**Methodological Framework**

This study draws on growing research in the field of education with a method called participatory design research (PDR) (Bang & Vossoughi, 2016). PDR emerges from and reflects different research traditions (Bell, 2004), especially design based research (DBR) (Brown, 1992; Cobb, Confrey, diSessa, Lehrer, & Schauble, 2003; Sandoval & Bell, 2004), design-based implementation research (Penuel, Fishman, Cheng, & Sabelli, 2011; Penuel, Coburn, & Gallagher, 2013), formative interventions (Engeström, 2010; Engeström, Sannino, & Virkkunen, 2014; Sannino, 2015), social design experiments (Gutiérrez, 2008; Gutiérrez & Vossoughi, 2010), researcher–practitioner partnerships (Coburn, Penuel, & Geil, 2013), and community-based design experiments (Bang, Medin, Washinawatok, & Chapman, 2010; Bang, Faber, Gurneau, Marin, & Soto, 2015). There is also a resonance with bodies of work that deliberately attempt to challenge how roles and relationships are conceived within the research process such as participatory action research (Fine et al., 2003; Whyte, 1991), collaborative action research (Erickson, 1994; 2006), youth participatory action research (Cammorata & Fine, 2008; Kirshner, 2010; Mirra, Garcia, & Morrell, 2015), and decolonizing methodologies (Paris & Winn, 2013; Patel, 2015; Smith, 1999; Zavala, 2013).

As Bang & Vossoughi (2016) note, “PDR maintains a commitment to advancing fundamental insights about human learning and development through explicit attention to what forms of knowledge are generated, how, why, where and by whom” (p. 174). For example, within a PDR paradigm, the relational, pedagogical, and design-based activity of researchers themselves is part of what is studied (Bang et al., 2010; Vossoughi & Escudé, 2016). In Studio
for example, I analyzed the co-design process, and the Studio course itself, but also considered my role as an instructor, collaborator and participator. Throughout Studio, for example, the domains of “researcher,” “theorist,” “designer,” “teacher,” and “student” were nebulous categories, allowing for candidates to take on each role, often simultaneously during the design process. These “role re-mediations” represent key forms of participation within PDR that are distinct from other forms of DBR (Bang & Vossoughi, 2016). Given the increasing attention to the ways in which social positioning impacts learning and knowledge construction (e.g. Holland & Lave, 2001; Holland & Leander, 2004; Lee, 2001; Medin & Bang, 2014; Nasir, Rosebery, Warren, & Lee, 2006; Wortham, 2004; 2006), Studio design drew on a range of theoretical lenses (e.g., racialized, gendered) when considering student positioning during the design process.

**Participatory Design Research and Co-design**

According to Booker, Vossoughi, & Hooper (2014) “the wedding of interdisciplinary theories (e.g. sociocultural and cognitive), with interdisciplinary methods (e.g. ethnographic, design-based, and computational) allows for ecologically grounded empirical research that can effectively take up politics that permeate learning both as practice and becoming” (p. 2). PDR utilizes theories of change to test and refine interventions. As a methodology it challenges researchers to iteratively examine their epistemologies, and it holds potential for radical revision of traditional paradigms. PDR holds possibility for defining transformation within SJTE to consider both the traditions and history of teacher education and social justice alongside possible innovation.

In this study in order to analyze how co-design fosters the development of an anti-oppressive stance towards practice, considering research traditions and sensibilities that use co-
design as a design method, I drew on scholars that regard the participation in the co-design process as a process that supports teacher learning (Ormel, Roblin, McKenney, Voogt, & Pieters, 2012). Specifically relevant to my study is literature that views co-design as professional development to enhance curriculum development and innovation (e.g., Penuel et al., 2007; Simmie, 2007; Voogt et al., 2011). For example, in my study, I considered how Voogt and colleagues (2015) theorize co-design as teacher professional development, while also encouraging the candidates in Studio to design their own learning.

Voogt and colleagues encouraged teachers to imagine dilemmas and new practices for engaging their students. Through their participation in the study, teachers “assumed more and more the responsibility for determining how the participatory learning and assessment activities could be enacted in these particular classes” (Voogt et al., 2015, p. 268). In Studio, candidates gradually developed responsibility for not only defining the practices necessary to be an equity focused teacher, but also the iterative reflective processes that are associated with an anti-oppressive stance towards their development. Candidates were developing professionally, but rather than enacting their designs on their students, they designed, implemented and engaged in the practices themselves. One challenge in co-design is that while design-based research may involve teachers to varying degrees, the literature does not specify how to “motivate, support, and empower teachers in these participatory contexts” (Couso 2016, p. 53-54). I argue that having candidates experience their own designs is one way to involve candidates as equal partners in the conceptualization of practice. In supporting candidates to develop into social justice teachers, it is crucial to motivate candidates to not only participate but to design and iterate on their own development.
By using a PDR framework, this study considers Voogt and colleagues (2015) approach to co-design for teacher development, and expands upon it. Candidates were positioned as designers of their own preparation while also encouraged to consider their design in relation to social justice and transformative change within society. They were key collaborators within the design process, and also iteratively reflected and analyzed their participation to inform their design decisions. Drawing on a PDR framework within co-design recognizes knowledge as political and contested. In the design process, I invited dialogue about practice, challenging the disconnect between theory and practice that is often present within teacher preparation. By drawing on the lived experience of candidates and myself, we were drawn toward political interpretations of practice asking questions about the process of learning and becoming social justice educators.

The overall approach to co-design in this study involved both direct and indirect involvement by candidates, with some candidates reflecting on their artifacts and experiences from the Studio course and designing the curriculum for the following week, and other candidates providing feedback through *Audio Journals* and in class debriefs. Since the candidates in the first semester of Studio were instrumental in the design of the course, the problem of practice was broadly pre-defined and based on student experiences. According to Edelson (2002),

…design researchers proceed through iterative cycles of design and implementation, using each implementation as an opportunity to collect data to inform subsequent design. Through a parallel and retrospective process of reflection upon the design and its outcomes, the design researchers elaborate upon their initial hypotheses and principles, refining, adding, and discarding—gradually
knitting together a coherent theory that reflects their understanding of the design experience. (p. 106)

The phases of design work in this study emphasized iterative and paralleling opportunities for candidates to inquire, refine, add, and discard ideas of social justice teaching practice. As noted in figure 3 below, at the beginning of the course, candidates were introduced to the study and the course structures through an orientation. With my support, they developed an essential question for the course and defined key terms such as anti-oppressive practice, oppression and justice. Candidates were not expected to come to a concrete definition of any concepts presented during the orientation, but rather were encouraged to define key terms in relation to their own experience with schooling. As candidates began the design process they critically inquired about the teacher they wanted to become, and how this conception was both matched and mismatched with their current preparation. This process was rooted in critical reflection. Candidates also developed a working theory of anti-oppressive practice through inquiry and conversations around Kumashiro’s (2002) four components of anti-oppressive practice. Candidates used their conceptualization of practice and anti-oppressive pedagogy to design the course, experience the course as both students and facilitators, and also critically reflect on both their designs and their experiences throughout the program. With the exception of the introduction to the program, all other phases of design work were repeated bi-weekly for a total of 32 weeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Design</td>
<td>● Revisit the Studio proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation and the</td>
<td>● Describe how to introduce the initial problem to all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second week of Studio</td>
<td>● Propose activities to explore important concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the</td>
<td>● Participate in an orientation upon entry in the Secondary Humanities program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program and to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| study | ● Discuss definitions of oppression and justice  
● Define anti-oppressive practice  
● Develop the essential question for the course  
● Collaboratively set norms |
| Engaging in critical inquiry around practice* | ● Reflect on affordances and constraints with coursework in the program  
● Reflect on affordances and constraints of the practicum experiences  
● Describe personal experiences as students in schools  
● Describe goals for their development of teachers |
| Develop a working theory of anti-oppressive practice* | ● Reflect on and design curriculum related to education for the other  
● Reflect on and design curriculum related to education of the other  
● Reflect on and design curriculum related to education that is critical of privileging and othering  
● Reflect on and design curriculum related to education that changes the self and society. |
| Design* | ● Reflect on Audio Journal suggestions  
● Discuss experiences in practicum  
● Describe insights in Studio class online  
● Write lesson plans for the following week |
| Experience* | ● Decompose practice in Studio Class Online  
● Decompose practice in Studio Class onsite  
● Rehearse practice in Studio Class onsite  
● Describe theory and lesson design through program coursework |
| Reflect: Developing a Critical Stance* | ● Reflect on practicum through an Audio Journal  
● Reflect on practicum during Studio Design  
● Reflect on practicum during Studio Class Onsite  
● Reflect on practicum during Studio Class Online |

*Indicates Phases that are repeated

Figure 3. Phases of design work

Study Context and Participants

The reflective phases represented in figure 3 illustrate the process of designing Studio with candidates. In the following section, I describe how Studio as a course was initially conceptualized and designed prior to the co-design process. I explain the study context, its participants, and my role as researcher, collaborator, and participant within the Studio course. I
specifically detail the clinical experiences associated with Studio, and how Studio was implemented alongside other university coursework.

Studio was conceptualized in response to qualitative interviews conducted in a doctoral level teacher education course at a university in the mountain west, as well as my own personal experience as a supervisor and instructor within the licensure program. While teaching a reading methodology course, I began to collaborate with incoming and existing teacher candidates to design a space that was responsive to candidates’ feedback and attitudes about their clinical experience. I asked the candidates in my reading course to imagine how their preparation could improve. I spoke with the dean, other faculty members, and alumni, and I started to design a course that would address candidates concerns with their clinical experience.

Participants who were interested in course design, and who had already participated in the first semester of their program, met three times prior to the start of the semester to develop a scope and sequence for the Studio course. At the beginning of this process I emailed all former students to gauge interest in the design process. The following students participated in the first three design sessions: A black male named Amilcar, a Latinx female named Gina, a White male named Dan, and four White females named Kylie, Jamie, Samantha, Hannah, and Kathy.\(^1\) The students were primarily enrolled in the Masters Plus part of the licensure program. I was personally close with all of the students involved and I considered myself a mentor and a friend to each participant.

As a co-design study, students continued to develop, test, and refine their proposed curriculum. The initial design team designed the first two weeks of the Studio course in August 2015, and iteratively re-designed and tested the curriculum with other participants until May

\(^1\) All names are pseudonyms
2016. They co-designed the orientation and argued for ways to introduce the purpose and proposed structures of the Studio process. During the orientation, candidates were interested in unearthing students’ questions about teaching and learning and wanted all candidates to be able to hold individualized definitions of key concepts. Thus, anti-oppressive practice, justice, and oppression were discussed rather than defined. There were a total of 10 design team meetings during both the fall and spring semester, with students also providing feedback on the course through audio journals and surveys.

The Sites

The Studio course took place within the Secondary Humanities Licensure Program at a university in the mountain west. This program provides a provisional license in Secondary (7-12) English Language Arts or Social Studies. To be eligible for licensure, candidates must successfully complete all academic and field experience requirements, pass a state-approved licensure exam, complete student teaching, and received a highly qualified score on the edTPA. In this state, teacher licensure is structured around a degree plus licensure framework. Undergraduate students who plan to pursue careers as secondary teachers may complete the teacher certification program in conjunction with their bachelor’s degree. The program requires 37 semester hours of education (EDUC) coursework in addition to students’ content-area major requirements. If students enter the licensure program as graduate students, they can either work towards a post-baccalaureate degree or a master's degree. The requirements for a post-baccalaureate degree are the same as the undergraduate licensure program. In order to receive a master's degree, students complete an additional nine hours of coursework, as well as a comprehensive MA exam. Undergraduate, post-baccalaureate and graduate students take the majority of classes together.
Practicum Description

In addition to coursework for the Secondary Humanities licensure program, candidates were also expected to participate in extensive clinical experiences including practicum and student teaching. Practicum experiences are shorter periods (2-8 hours/week) and are co-requisite with specific education courses. Student teaching is full-time (45-50 hours/week) for 16-18 weeks and occurs after students have completed all other coursework. The practicum experiences are designed to give candidates guided experiences working with youth in schools and in informal learning spaces. Practicum experiences are collaboratively developed with program faculty, the Director of Clinical Experiences, and teachers/leaders in partner schools. Through these experiences candidates (1) engage with youth, (2) observe and interact with teachers who model high quality instruction and respectful interactions with youth, (3) understand how schools are organized as workplaces, and (4) practice and receive feedback as they develop and refine their repertoire. Experiences are aligned with specific courses; thus, the goals of each course inform decisions about school contexts and models for working with teachers in schools.

The Studio course fit into the preservice teachers’ practicum schedule. Preservice teachers participated in a block practicum where they attended various university courses that were aligned with an existing practicum and a school partnership. Teaching candidates involved in the EDUC 5355/5364 English and Social Studies Methods Courses attended a school-based practicum experience one day a week for seven hours and a studio experience for two hours later in the week. EDUC 4295/5295 Secondary Reading and Literacy and EDUC 4342/5342 Writing for Humanities Classrooms had practicum both on Tuesday and Thursday for eleven hours a week. In this practicum experience the Studio course took place at the school placement.
Table 1

*Studio and practicum schedule for the Studio co-design project*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester in the Secondary Humanities Program</th>
<th>Name of the University Course</th>
<th>Practicum</th>
<th>Studio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester 1</td>
<td>Secondary Literacy Block Practicum</td>
<td>7 hr. Field experience at the local middle school partnership</td>
<td>2 hr. field experience 2 hr. Studio course at the middle school partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2</td>
<td>Methods Courses including English Methods, Social Studies Methods and Differentiation</td>
<td>7 hr. Field experience at the local middle school partnership</td>
<td>2-2.5hr. Studio at the University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

*Alignment between practicum and coursework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 4112</td>
<td>Informal Learning and Tutoring</td>
<td>Candidates spend one afternoon per week working with youth in an after school informal learning program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 4295/5295 Reading Methods</td>
<td>Local Middle School</td>
<td>First year secondary students in the program that are both in the reading and literature course attend practicum two days a week at Casey Middle School. They spend one day observing, tutoring and teaching and another day rehearsing, planning, and reflecting during the Studio experience on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 4342/5342 Literacy Block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 4023/5485 Secondary English Methods</td>
<td>Local High Schools</td>
<td>Both the English and Social Studies component of the methods course attend practicum one day a week at a local high school and one day a week at the university. The practicum experience allows for observation and teaching at the local site and mentored rehearsal, planning and video annotation during a studio experience on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 5355 or 5368 Secondary History Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants

Preservice teachers’ participation in the study was constituted through their membership as a student in the Secondary Humanities Teacher Education Program. Preservice teacher were not “recruited” into a special program or project. Nor did I offer a curriculum that differed from their everyday instructional practice. At the time of the study there were two separate cohorts enrolled in the Studio course for the 2015-2016 school year.

The cohort enrolled in EDUC 4295/5295 Secondary Reading and Literacy as well as EDUC 4342/5342 Writing For The Humanities Classroom in the spring of 2015 had twenty students with seven male students and thirteen female students. The majority of students identified as White, with three of the female students identifying as Latinx and one male student as African. In this cohort there were six students who were enrolled in the Secondary History Program, and fourteen students in the Secondary English Program. Ten students were enrolled as Masters students and ten were enrolled as undergraduates. This cohort participated in the study for the 2015-2016 school year.

At the beginning of the study during the spring of 2015, there were fourteen students enrolled in both EDUC 5355/5364 English and Social Studies Methods Courses who also participated in Studio. This cohort had only one male student and thirteen female students. Thirteen students identified as White and one female of color identified as Latinx. In this cohort three students were enrolled in the Secondary Social Studies program and eleven were enrolled in the Secondary English Program. Six students were enrolled in the masters program, one student was enrolled in the post bachelorette, and seven were enrolled as undergraduates. Since this cohort participated in the initial design of studio during their second semester of the
Secondary Humanities Program, data was collected on this cohort during the fall 2015 semester only. Figure 4 is a visual representation of candidate participation in Studio.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset Information for Participants in Studio</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Cohort</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 Male</td>
<td>1 White</td>
<td>1 Secondary English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12 White Students</td>
<td>10 Secondary English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Latinx Student</td>
<td>3 Secondary History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Cohort</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7 Male</td>
<td>6 White Students</td>
<td>4 Secondary English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 African Student</td>
<td>3 Secondary History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>10 White Students</td>
<td>10 Secondary English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Latinx Students</td>
<td>3 Secondary History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researcher Role

In this study I was a researcher, facilitator, instructor, and learner. This was purposeful. First, by constantly negotiating multiple perspectives, candidates were encouraged to also embrace the multiplicities of identity, and to find a balance between being a student, teacher and designer throughout their experience in the course. Second, without positioning myself as a learner, “the quality of the teaching and learning materials designed, the research results obtained and the possible sustainability of the experience in a design research study [were] potentially diminished” (Couso, 2016, p. 48). In developing anti-oppressive frameworks, teacher educators need to be willing to engage in the same uncomfortable process of unlearning. As a White woman, working with both White students and Candidates of Color, I needed to position myself as inexperienced in regards to oppression and even towards certain perspectives of the world. However, at the same time, I had to demonstrate my willingness and experience with reflecting
on my positionality and my privilege. I do not view myself as a novice in regards to thinking about systems of oppression or even in reflecting on how my gender, race, ethnicity, ability, affluence and religion interact with such systems. However, my Whiteness, especially within a teacher education program, must be constantly named, and my authority on oppression questioned. The benefit of co-design is that I relinquished my control over the curriculum and positioned candidates as experts. The tradeoff, of course, is that sometimes less sensitive or critical perspectives were highlighted and privileged during design. However, if I was not a learner throughout the Studio experience, I was maintaining normalized approaches to teacher preparation. In Studio and the design process, I was a participant observer (Spradley, 1980), with my participation varying according to the type of interaction I was having with candidates. I was actively involved in inquiry and reflection, while also paying specific attention to interactions, discourse and candidate development.

In the following section, I explain the structure and the process of Studio. However, within this description, I do not address how my role within Studio design added complexity to the study and influenced the possibility of re-contextualizing the pedagogy and curriculum. When describing Studio, I explain how candidates reflected, rehearsed, and designed practice, but I fail to mention how both the instructor facilitating the design, and their relationship to the students present in the course shaped every component of the design. The development of anti-oppressive stance towards practice requires learning to unlearn for both candidates and teacher educators (Kumashiro, 2000). The collaborative design of an anti-oppressive stance incites dialogic epistemology, requiring candidates to listen to alternative perspectives and recognize the impact and limitations of their own take on the world. This process can either challenge participants to critically inquire and weave in their conception of anti-oppressive practice into
their development, or it can reinforce myopic and one-dimensional approaches to social justice teaching. The effect of collaborative design relies on the people in the room.

Like the variation present in social justice teaching and practice, the implementation of co-design within social justice teacher education will look and feel different across contexts. Even fidelity to the structures described below can still produce varying results. The description below is meant to describe a possible roadmap for implementing co-design within teacher education and to consider an anti-oppressive stance towards practice as a potential outcome of engaging in this work. It is not describing a one-size-fits-all approach to social justice teacher education, but is encouraging teacher educators to work and live within contradictions and to embrace uncertainty (Allan, 2004; Jones 2012).

**Contexts of Data Collection: Studio**

Within this section I specifically address the contexts of data collection by detailing the overall process of Studio, as well as describing how candidates both designed and participated in the course. Next, I describe the participant structures of Studio and how they were designed at the beginning of the Study, prior to the co-design process. All of the structures described below were presented to candidates at the start of Studio and were iterated on during the design process.

Pre-service candidates designed the Studio curriculum by initially developing a semester-long essential question addressing issues of power and equity in the classroom. On the first day of Studio class, this essential question was introduced as a way to encourage candidates to view “teaching through an inquiry context” (Wilhelm, 2009, p. 36). By strategically designing the essential question around challenging oppression, Studio was grounded in the development of an anti-oppressive stance, thinking both reflectively and reflexively about their responsibility to constantly inquire and challenge inequity (Lewison et al., 2008, Kumashiro, 2000). Candidates
collaboratively designed the essential question together, using the question to drive conversations around practice and the design of the curriculum. The collaborative articulation of the essential question encouraged candidates to center their inquiry on the same question, and to challenge individual interpretations of practice and preparation. An example of the class essential question developed during this study is as follows: How do we create an anti-oppressive classroom culture that engages students in difficult conversations around race, ethnicity, class, gender identity, religion, ability and joy?

Using an online video annotation tool, candidates centered their inquiry process using weekly annotation of videos of their cooperating teachers and their own teaching in various practicum sites. Through an online discussion that took place before the weekly workshop session, candidates bridged their personal questions with a whole class focus on equity. At the beginning of each workshop, teacher candidates discussed one video relevant to their essential question, designed individual teaching practices using a theme generated from the video annotation, rehearsed the practice with peers, and received whole class and small group feedback. Since candidates were placed at various practicum sites throughout the area, they applied both the online conversation and the onsite rehearsal to their individual contexts, with some teachers immediately either observing or enacting the practice, and others continuing with the practice in online conversations. As a co-design experience, all candidates had the opportunity to provide weekly feedback on the structure and efficacy of the course by either attending weekly design meetings and/or recording an audio journal with their suggestions.

The Structures of Studio

In the following section I describe the overall structures of the Studio course that I designed through initial conversations with faculty, staff, and candidates in the Secondary
Humanities Program: The Studio Course Onsite and Online, Studio Design Team Meetings, Audio Journals and Clinical Experiences. These components were not initially co-designed with candidates, but rather were proposed as a possible structure. Candidates iterated on these components throughout the co-design process. The components highlighted in red in figure 5 were voluntary, while the elements in White were mandatory for all candidates. The clinical experience was already central to the design of the Secondary Humanities licensure program. Thus, while the actual Practicum site was central to design of Studio, it was a structure that was set in place by the university and not a component that was subject to re-design by the candidates or myself. Consequently, in our analysis, Practicum served as a “text” in which the other spaces were centered around rather than as a separate curricular structure. As a “text” that was reflected upon in Audio Journals, Studio Class, and Studio Design Team Meetings, candidates were able to iteratively design around a key structure within practice-based teacher education. The following section will not specifically describe the clinical experiences of candidates, but instead will explain how the other three components of the Studio design process draw on and expand upon notions of PBTE, as well contribute to candidates approach an anti-oppressive stance.
Figure 5. The components of the Studio design process

Online Annotation

In this study, candidates were placed in schools for 1-2 days a week and were asked to perform under realistic pressures and experiences and to capture those experiences in video. Positioned as experts, candidates had complete autonomy regarding what they captured, either reflecting on their own or their cooperating teachers’ practice. They were then asked to explain their video relative to the class essential question, focusing both on the representation of practice, but also how the practice reinforced or challenged inequitable structures in schools. While away from their placements, candidates’ facilitated discussions using an online video annotation software called TALENT to asynchronously discuss practice with their colleagues, closely analyzing both novice and expert pedagogy, specifically focusing on issues of equity. Studio was designed to allow candidates to introduce as well as facilitate analysis of instructional activities. As the instructor in the course, I participated in the online conversations but never introduced particular videos for analysis or prompted analysis. Positioning candidates as teachers throughout
their preparation encouraged their responsibility for inquiry, and reflection. They designed their own experiences and thus reflection on practice was not about how the literature or their instructors defined practice, but instead was about their own conceptualization of effective teaching.

Through TALENT, students centered their inquiry process using weekly annotation of videos of their cooperating teachers and their own teaching in various practicum sites. At the beginning of each Studio class, teacher candidates discussed one video relevant to their essential question, designed individual teaching practices using a theme generated from the video annotation, rehearsed the practice with peers, and received whole class and small group feedback. For example, during a conversation online, candidates discussed the complexity of engaging all students in a class conversation around the text without simply calling on all students. In Studio Class we analyzed a video of a cooperating teacher leading a conversation about a scholastic magazine article. The candidates selected several short excerpts or articles and co-designed ways to engage all students in conversation around the selected text. They rehearsed their instructional activities and debriefed with the whole class in relation to the essential question. Since candidates were placed in a variety of classrooms, they applied both the online conversation and the onsite rehearsal to their individual contexts, with some teachers immediately either observing or enacting the practice, and others continuing with the practice in online conversations. Anti-oppressive stance towards practice was encouraged both with and without the facilitation of teacher educators.

Through the use of video, candidates, who are less apt to discuss practice in class, or volunteer to rehearse, are able to participate, and often lead complex conversations about pedagogy and practice when interacting online. Research indicates that video annotation
contributes to preservice teachers’ learning (e.g. Bower, Cavanagh, Moloney, & Dao, 2011; Rosaen, Lundeberg, Cooper, Fritzen, & Terpstra, 2009). Thus, as a foundational component of Studio, candidates were encouraged to use video annotation to address the class essential question around equity as well as view the process as a pedagogical approach in their own classroom.

Empirical research on the use of video annotation within teacher education highlights how video annotation can encourage reflection (e.g. Video Clubs in Sherin & Van Es, 2009). For example, in their study of the use of video in teacher education, Lee and Wu (2006) found that student teachers were able to reflect more thoroughly on their teaching, identifying areas for improvement within their own practice. Furthermore, student teachers were also willing to collaborate with their peers, exchanging teaching experiences and providing feedback. Drawing on this scholarship, I adopted video analysis as a central process within the Studio course, as a way to encourage candidates to iteratively examine practice. However, although there is research on video annotation in relation to teacher learning, there is a dearth of literature in using video annotation to develop candidates’ social justice dispositions. Thus, video analysis was suggested as a structure within Studio to provide candidates with real world textual examples of practice. Furthermore, candidates were encouraged to consider their own positionality in relation to teachers and students portrayed in the videos, and to evaluate their own beliefs and responses to the practice.

The use of video annotation and the essential question in Studio Class was established as a way for candidates to analyze oppression, their identities, beliefs and practice. In the beginning of Studio, I proposed the use of video annotation through an essential question as an adaptation of McDonald and colleagues’ (2013) cycle for collectively learning to engage in an authentic and
ambitious instructional activity. This cycle, presented in figure 6 below, focuses on the development of particular practices by 1) introducing candidates to practices as they emerge from either clinical experiences or through coursework, 2) preparing candidates to enact those practices, 3) requiring them to enact the practices in real-world settings, and 4) then revisiting enactment through analysis (McDonald et al., 2013, p. 5). The cyclic nature of the process enables teacher educators to begin instruction in any of the four quadrants. For example, although in Studio, candidates began with an essential question, candidates could then choose to first view a representation of practice through video or modeling, or begin designing and rehearsing their own practice based on their initial conceptualization of the essential question. Although the structure of video annotation and the clinical nature of Studio drew on research on core practices (e.g., Ball & Forzani, 2009; Ball, Sleep, Boerst, & Bass, 2009; Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009; Kazemi, Lampert, & Franke, 2009), Studio was designed with an intentional desire to expand on notions of core practices, specifically focusing on weaving in an anti-oppressive and critical framework. While still holding onto traditional instructional activities such as leading conversations around a text, the Studio curriculum encouraged candidates to also consider how instructional activities were designed for the other, about the other, how the curriculum critiqued the process of othering, and how it argued for change of the self and society (Kumashiro, 2000). The practice remained, but it became rooted in not just learning the content, but oppression.
Figure 6. Cycle for collectively learning to engage in an authentic and ambitious instructional activity (McDonald et al., 2013)

Onsite Practice

Similar to the online video annotation component of Studio, the Studio Class was a place for candidates to dissect practice. The discursive nature of this space revolved around the instructional activities and strategies discussed or analyzed from the practicum experience. During the first class, when candidates collaboratively designed the essential question, we also discussed the possible structures for dissection and enactment of practice. As a whole class, candidates discussed how they wanted to analyze videos from the previous week, and how they wanted to practice the instructional activities present in those videos. Candidates agreed that they wanted the opportunity to have exposure to different structures before re-designing the elements of the course. The first two weeks of class was subsequently designed to expose candidates to different ways of analyzing videos as well as rehearsing. Throughout the class, candidates were able to perform the actions of both teaching and justice in the classroom context. Through rehearsal, candidates acted out scenes and instruction as their future teaching selves and possible
future students while simultaneously reflecting on their performance both during rehearsal and in the videos recorded at their practicum sites. In one two-hour time slot candidates negotiated their various identities around a single concept—how you embody an anti-oppressive stance.

Over the course of the iterative design of the Studio, candidates proposed rehearsal as improvisation. Through candidates design, rehearsal in the Studio space became comparable to a freeze improv game used in theater (Sawyer, 2011). In following the rules of rehearsal, one candidate is expected to begin performing an instructional activity while other candidates engage as imagined students. At any point, if any other participant wants to challenge the approach to the instructional activity, or provide feedback, they can call out “freeze.” However, instead of orally dissecting practice, the candidate takes the performer’s place, choosing to either continue or shift instruction. Discussion occurs at the end of the activity, after several candidates have performed.

Like the introduction and analysis of practice, candidates designed rehearsal to allow for their voice in the choice of the instructional routine and in modeling feedback. The unpredictability of improvisational rehearsal, its randomness and individualization was an innovation designed by candidates. In comparing the space to the ambitious teaching cycle, candidates collaboratively planned rehearsal through their conversations online, and by frequently facilitating conversations around practicum videos. Although candidates were able to teach at least twice at the practicum site, the majority of live coaching happened through rehearsal during the Studio course. Through rehearsal candidates were able to define the practices worth enacting, provide feedback on the performance and articulate their interpretation of anti-oppressive pedagogy. Candidates argued that through improvisation they were able to not
only define anti-oppressive practice, but were able to disrupt notions of practice that they found problematic.

While the concept of improvisation is recognized as an element of multiple professions (Holdhus et al., 2016), there has been little focus on the different characteristics of improvisation within education (DeZutter, 2011; Jarning, 2006). An improvisational approach to rehearsal in preservice teacher education can be viewed as practice with instructional activities as well as the development of an essential professional skill necessary for educators (Lobman, 2011, p. 73; Sawyer, 2011b). By providing insight into how candidates’ interpretation of practice and context can influence enactment, improvisation presents a metacognitive layer to rehearsal. It is through moments of spontaneity that candidates reveal perceptions of themselves and their future students either accepting or challenging conceptions of traditional pedagogy. Educational theory and practice can draw on improvisational practices in the music traditions (Holdhus et al., 2016). Seen “as a kind of creative musical conversation” (Wigestrand, 2006, p. 119) improvisation “gives joy, releases energy, and activates knowledge and reflection” (Alterhaug, 2004, p. 15). In the candidate's’ approach to rehearsal each candidate must give each other space to improvise, at the same time they have a joint responsibility to take initiative and bring the improvisation further into new and unfamiliar directions (Alterhaug, 2004, p. 111). With improvisation, the moments of disagreement move the conversation forward, with each candidate working together for a nuanced understanding of what it means to teach.

With the exception of recent scholarship on Lampert et al.’s (2013) research on the pedagogy of rehearsals, very few programs are fundamentally altering the way that they prepare candidates through rehearsal. Lampert et al.’s (2013) study offered the field a new way to study the pedagogy of teacher education by conducting fine-grained interactional video analysis. The
construction of rehearsal within *Studio Class* aims to build on this research, challenging the concept of rehearsal by re-defining both expert and feedback. With candidates choosing the context of rehearsal, and providing feedback, this study not only responds to the shift towards rehearsing practice but also expands it.

**Audio Journals**

As a co-design experience, all candidates also had the opportunity to provide weekly feedback on the structure and efficacy of the course by either attending weekly *Studio Design meetings*, and/or recording *Audio Journals* with their thoughts and suggestions. It was through both *Audio Journals* and the *Design Meeting* that students suggested changing the structure of rehearsal, advocating for more improvisation and candidate feedback. Typically through *Audio Journals* and *Design Meetings* candidates named and defined practices that emerged from their *practicum* experience or during online conversations. They chose particular videos that they wanted to dissect further in class, and chose a particular strategy, activity or concept that they thought they thought could be designed and rehearsed from the video.

The *Audio Journal* was primarily used as a way to describe candidate reflections and experiences at the practicum site, specifically referencing ideas, concepts or practices they wanted to explore in the course. These journals were individualized, focusing on candidates perceptions of cooperating teachers and students and were individually sent to me. The *Audio Journal*, which was originally designed as an optional component of the course, became widely used. Nearly all candidates’ submitted *Audio Journals* after their weekly practicum experiences. There were no particular guidelines or prompts associated with the *Audio Journal*. I wanted candidates to organically discuss their experiences at their practicum site, and to take
responsibility for their own introspection. After each student reflection, I sent an Audio Journal in response, specifically discussing the contents of their reflections.

Even though the literature looks at reflection in varied ways (Freese, 2006; Moran, 2007; Walkington, 2005; Zeichner and Liston, 1987), there is general agreement amongst teacher educators that it is important for both preservice and in-service teachers to examine their thoughts in order to improve practice (e.g., Artzt & Armour-Thomas, 2002; Margolis, 2002; Mayes, 2001a, 2001b; Moore, 2002; Rock & Levin, 2002; Swain, 1998). However, significant critiques of reflection within teacher education (e.g., McNay, 1999; Smyth, 1992; Zeichner, 1996), argue that reflection is “necessary” but “not sufficient” on its own for quality preservice or in-service teacher development (Day, 1993). Drawing on van Manen’s (1977) hierarchy of reflection of technical, practical and critical reflection, teacher educators’ often incorporate reflective practices that highlight an instrumental analyses of teaching, ignoring issues of social justice. For example, Malm (2009) warns that some type of written reflections such as journaling—common in teacher education—privilege “the technical” at the expense of the personal. The focus on technicality encourages the “how to” of teaching to be reflected upon instead of emphasizing teachers’ beliefs, and positionality. Yet, even if teacher educators implement critical reflective practices, engaging with issues of power and justice, without direct intervention, candidates may use reflection to reinforce racist assumptions (Gomez, 1996).

To address some of the issues with reflection in teacher education, this study tests the conjecture that it is crucial that teachers’ vulnerability be foregrounded in teacher preparation with attention to the emotional dimension of teacher work (e.g., Kelchtermans, 2005, 2009). The emotional parts of teaching are inescapable when working intimately with youth from diverse cultural, ethnic, racial, religious, socio-economic backgrounds. Furthermore, emotion
unavoidably affects teachers’ identities (Kelchtermans, 2007; Beijaard et al., 2004) challenging their conception of the “stories to live by” (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999). According to Korthagen (1993), the type of reflection that is the most useful at engaging teacher emotions is one that provides a mirror. “The idea of a mirror,” he said “is helpful because it makes clear that there are different mirrors” (p. 321). The use of Audio Journals, within teacher education attempts to provide such a mirror, for both candidates but also teacher educators. Through an intimate and confessional nature it has the possibility of centering emotions, allowing for candidates to take on new ways of being while also inquiring about their trajectories as future teachers.

Written dialogue journals have been used as a tool to extend classroom learning, to develop writing skills and to promote critical thinking (Peyton & Staton, 2000). Audiotaped journals, however, have not been as widely adopted, but have gained some recognition in recent years a tool for building teacher–student rapport (Egbert, 1992). Audio Journals are seen as useful for language learning since it allows for more spontaneity and expression on the part of the learner. Although this argument was developed for students and not teachers, oral language is not bound by the same strict rules of coherence and cohesion as written discourse and thus I incorporated Audio Journals into Studio so candidates would be more willing to adopt the language of teaching and to try on the language of justice, with little concern for correctness. Words like heteronormative, cis-gendered, patriarchal, misogyny, and even racism represent a new language for many candidates. Through the use of Audio Journals, I believe that if you want to change the way someone thinks, you need to change the way they speak.

The type of Audio Journal used in this study was an oral dialogue journal, where students told stories while reflecting on their experiences, often negotiating ideas about anti-oppressive
teaching and practice. Through an individualized conversation, candidates spoke directly to me and spent considerable amount of time describing and reflecting on their understanding of oppression, justice, their role as a teacher, and their experiences in a teacher education program.

According to McGrath (1992) oral dialogue journals connect conversation with identity. Through their use, students are able to discuss their own beliefs and insights about topics (Henry, 1996) leading to individualized support from teachers. The literature on oral dialogue journals argues for its use for language acquisition in K-12 schools. No study to date has investigated the use of oral dialogue journals as a tool for critical reflection within teacher education. Research on the use of this innovative instructional technique can provide new insights for critical reflection within teacher education, specifically in relation to developing candidates’ anti-oppressive stance.

**Design Team Meetings**

The Studio Design Team Meetings were structured to feel informal and intimate. All candidates had the opportunity to attend, with the majority of design team meetings during the first semester occurring at my house. Each meeting was focused on planning two weeks of the Studio Course, reflecting on ideas or concepts expressed in journals, their online video annotation and their own experiences at practicum. The informal nature of Studio Design Meetings were part of the design in order to encourage students to share personal stories, revealing beliefs about pedagogy and practice... In the design team meetings, when candidates prepared the structures and activities for the following classes, they were asked to question their behaviors, beliefs, and values (Powell, Zehm, & Garcia, 1996), while reflecting on their progress as anti-oppressive educators. Since, preservice teachers’ beliefs and experiences influenced their instruction and learning (Berry, 2006; Norman & Spencer, 2005), designing instruction in
relation to their own development pushed candidates to confront assumptions. Some teacher educators have asked preservice teachers to write autobiographies and biographies about their students in order to develop understanding of communities different from their own (He & Cooper, 2009; Leftwich & Madden, 2006; Pattnaik 2006; Schmidt & Finkbeiner, 2006; Wake & Modla, 2008). The safe and intimate environment of the design team meetings encouraged this biographical reflection naturally, with students making sense of their experiences in schools as individuals. In Design Team Meetings, preservice teachers’ discourse of critical reflection occurred through the design process with candidates recounting autobiographies, experiences, and conversations about practice.

**Designing For an Anti-Oppressive Stance**

The four conceptualizations of anti-oppressive education: education for the other, education of the other, education that is critical of privileging and othering, and education that changes the self and society, guided conversations throughout the various components of Studio. I did not provide literature on anti-oppressive practice to candidates, but instead asked specific questions that both presented and complicated Kumashiro’s (2000) conceptualization. These questions occurred while candidates were designing the curriculum for Studio, during rehearsal, video annotation and in their journals. The overall purpose of questioning was to implicitly engage in challenging candidates’ conception of teaching, practice and self in relation to oppression. Figure 7 illustrates a key tool I developed to encourage candidates to consider how anti-oppressive practice could be framed throughout each component of the Studio experience. The questions for each structure overlap and occur across the Studio experience. The development of a theory of anti-oppressive pedagogy is a crucial component in developing an anti-oppressive stance and thus is part of the product of the design process. Like
conceptualizations of practice, the theory around anti-oppressive pedagogy is iteratively designed both during deliberate design meetings, but also through the reflection that occurs throughout candidate’s preparation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structures of Studio</th>
<th>Possible Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Audio Journals**   | ● Who was included and excluded from instruction?  
                        ● How do we focus on the negative experiences of our students?  
                        ● What is positive?  
                        ● Do our stories tell of experiences that recognize intersectionality?  
                        ● How do we frame teaching and teachers at the practicum site?  
                        ● How do we talk about ourselves?  
                        ● In which ways do we only have part of the story?  
                        ● How are certain identities excluded, silenced, invisible, distorted and marginalized in our stories?  
                        ● In what ways do our stories disrupt?  
                        ● How are we privileging ourselves in the story? |
| **Studio Online**    | ● What practice is being highlighted in this clip?  
                        ● What are you resistant to in this clip? How do you know?  
                        ● When/where do you engage in this clip? How do you know?  
                        ● How do you see, identify or recognize yourself?  
                        ● How does interacting with this clip affect your ideas of what counts as normal? |
| **Studio Design**    | ● What might students feel when__?  
                        ● How do you feel when ________?  
                        ● Where is their room for transformation or change?  
                        ● Who has power and who does not?  
                        ● Where are the silences? What is hidden? What is privileged? What is marginalized?  
                        ● How do your individual goals around justice and practice ignore_______?  
                        ● What are the contradictions in this? |
| **Team Meetings**    | ● How are we unlearning?  
                        ● How are we critiquing ourselves?  
                        ● What is considered normal?  
                        ● What are the contradictions in the way that we describe practice and learning?  
                        ● Where can we see ourselves practicing multiple identities?  
                        ● What are we ignoring?  
                        ● What is limited in our approach?  
                        ● What is uncomfortable?  
                        ● What do we leave unsaid? |
| **Studio Onsite**    |                                                                 |
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Data Sources and Collection

In order to investigate teachers development of an anti-oppressive stance towards practice, I collected and analyzed the following sources of data: Field notes of all teacher and researcher collaborative discussions; field notes of daily university classroom instruction; audio recordings of collaborative curriculum co-design meetings, interviews and audio journals; video recordings of relevant in-class discussion and rehearsal (especially whole-class and small-group discussions); photocopies of relevant classroom artifacts, photographs or written transcription of teacher notes and assignments; and copies of any teacher lesson plans or instructional PowerPoints used in facilitating Studio. The co-design meeting notes as well as the Studio curriculum and artifacts were collaboratively designed with candidates, while other sources of data such as interviews, audio journals, and videos of Studio class were independently collected.

Observations

Observations of classroom activities and teaching practices were both filmed and documented in writing. While I did not take field notes while on site, I did write down student ideas and thoughts while I engaged on site. The videos were not transcribed till after the Studio/practicum experience. Video transcription focused on the following aspects of classroom life: Describing the instructional practices and reflections embodied by both the design team and all teaching candidates; describing the examples of instruction congruent with the anti-oppressive framework as well as state standards; and describing the examples of instruction congruent with core practices. These observations focused specifically on how candidates performed practices and beliefs about teaching and justice, consciously engaging in practices
discusses or rehearsed during Studio. I also examined how candidates tried on various roles across the continuum of settings. I marked whether certain settings encouraged candidates to inquire about oppression, to talk about othering and curricular decisions, or to examine their positionality. Through observations I specifically focused on the embodiment of an anti-oppressive stance, and the negotiations that occurred as a result.

**Individual Interviews with Candidates**

Individual interviews with preservice teachers took place during field experiences, the Studio course, and Design Team Meetings. These took place both weekly and bi-weekly as needed. Interviews were structured as conversations about instructional decisions and designed to help the participants reflect on their practices as they connected to the intersections of anti-oppressive pedagogy, humanities instruction, and state standards. There was no interview script or precise set of questions for these interviews. However, questions tended to focus on learning more about how students (see Appendix A for example interview questions).

Design team participants also conducted interviews of their fellow classmates. The informal interviews were developed in response to the instruction that took place during the week(s) in question and were guided by the research questions. The culture of revision was a major element of the design process. Hence, it was common for candidates to hold informal conversations about their experiences throughout Studio and in the licensure program. These interviews frequently centered on the learning process with candidates describing their development as teachers and as socially just individuals. Due to the duality of their roles as teachers and students they reflected on oppression in schooling as it related to their own education while also reflecting on their concerns for perceived oppression at the practicum site.
Audio Recordings

Audio recordings of design team meetings with preservice teachers took place twice a month for approximately an hour at a non-university location as a part of the co-design process. During these sessions, participants shared instructional experiences associated with their participation in the Studio and field placement, as well as their issues and concerns related to integrating recent approaches to anti-oppressive practice into their lesson design and classroom. They also used this time to share successful classroom strategies that they had witnessed at the practicum site and during Studio and to brainstorm possible innovative instructional practices. Audio recordings of the Design Team Meetings revealed how candidates engaged in sharing and interpreting relevant theories, brainstorming interesting instructional possibilities, texts, and genres.

Artifacts

I generated and gathered copies of written lesson plans or instructional PowerPoint presentations used in teaching after the Studio experience. Copies of these documents were made on-site using a school copy machine. Photographs or written transcriptions of teacher notes used to facilitate the Studio were documented before, during, and after practicum and Studio. The artifacts revealed how candidates were designing teacher education pedagogy for themselves and for their colleagues, and how they were also engaging in their own design. Furthermore, the artifacts provided a link between candidate’s design and their approach to their future classrooms.

Video Recordings

Video recordings of in-class, whole group, and small group discussion and rehearsal occurred one to two times a week in the Studio course as a part of teacher-organized instructional
activities. Discussions were recorded over the course of the study. Not every discussion was recorded. Because I was especially interested in whole and small group discussions focused on instructional design and practice in order to examine how candidates were complicating notions of “core” practices and “justice,” I made my recordings of these sessions. For whole class discussions, a single recording device was used. For small group discussions, individual digital recorders were used in the separate, small group formats. Teacher candidates also recorded their enactment of lessons during their practicum experience.

**Audio Journals**

Individual *audio journals*, while artifacts of the course, served a separate purpose of collecting candidates overall reflections on their experience. *Audio Journals* were a text that documented candidates’ reflection, their responsibility to inquire, their conscious engagement in practice, and their willingness to perform alternative ways of being. Through *Audio Journals* candidates also analyzed their positionalities, their understanding of justice and their learning. Although *audio journals* were not mandatory, they provided valuable insight into the study of candidates’ narratives and ultimately their thinking, culture, and behavior with respect to anti-oppressive practice. The following is a table documenting the frequency in which I collected data.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collected Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview/Audio Recording</td>
<td>1-12 times per candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Recordings of the Design of Studio</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Recordings of the Studio Course</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Addressing The Research Question: Analysis

My overarching research question is as follows: How can co-designing a practice-based teacher education (PBTE) course with secondary humanities pre-service teacher candidates invite discursive spaces of engagement that support candidates in developing an anti-oppressive stance in practice? In order to answer this question, I analyzed the data using my interpretive framework (Cobb et al. 1999). I examined the design team notes and audio recordings, video recordings of the Studio course, the candidates’ audio journals, and reflective debriefs both in class and through candidates participation in TALENT online. In interviews I asked students to describe their reaction and experience with the co-design process as well as their understanding of oppression and their identity as a teacher. I specifically examined patterns between how candidates spoke about practice and justice across the various components of Studio. In order to consider how anti-oppressive stance was developed in practice, I analyzed candidates teach days, their rehearsal in the Studio class onsite as well as their reflections and discussion online. I specifically analyzed audio journals and interviews for candidates’ reflections on practice. Finally, I used Studio Design Team Meeting notes and recordings to gauge how candidates defined practice, what practice they were interested in investigating and how they approached justice in relation to their design.

When examining Audio Journals, videos from TALENT, and audio recordings of the Studio course, I analyzed how various tools and processes engendered an anti-oppressive stance towards practice. The following research question supported my analysis: What tools and processes designed with the Studio course support candidates in enacting social justice practice? For this analysis, I analyzed how and why candidates engaged with various structures. I watched videos of Studio class, tracking engagement with rehearsal, audio journals, and co-design. I also
considered the frequency and content of candidate engagement, including how candidates discussed and approached social justice and practice.

The data that were relevant to understanding candidates development of an anti-oppressive stance in practice also contributed to my analysis of my third research question: In the Studio context, how does the process of co-designing a methods course relate to how teacher candidates conceptualize and perform social justice teaching identities? Rather than looking specifically at how candidates reflected on and defined practice, I analyzed the data in relation to this question by focusing on how students described their beliefs about teaching and social justice in both Audio Journals and Design Team Meetings. I evaluated how these beliefs were both stated in I statements and were expressed through the stories they told about their lives and their practicum site. I also investigated what beliefs were revealed during rehearsal, either while performing or discussing practice.

**Data Analysis During Studio**

Although design research as a methodology is useful for testing educational theories while creating and improving educational interventions, environments, and practices, critiques of design research emphasize a lack of clear standards, arguing the difficulty of building theory while improving program design. Sandoval (2014) proposes the use of conjecture mapping in response to such critiques. Conjecture mapping is an iterative technique for making the goals and theories that guide the design of a learning environment more explicit so that they can be empirically tested and refined. A conjecture map is a working document for specifying design relationships and research goals. By making conjecture maps of theoretical assumptions and structures guiding the Studio design process, I was able to refine exactly what I wanted to test in the research process, and iteratively analyze data throughout the design process. Ultimately, the
specificity of conjecture mapping allowed me to analyze the most important design problems in Studio, while also continuously documenting and refining the theories and principles that affected the design over time. Figure 8 is an example of Sandoval’s (2014) generalized form of a conjecture map that contains six major elements and their relationships including: a high-level conjecture about the kind of learning supported by the design or context, how that learning is reified within an embodiment of a specific design, and the theoretical outcomes generated through the mediating processes.

![Generalized conjecture map for educational design research (Sandoval, 2014)](image)

*Figure 8: Generalized conjecture map for educational design research (Sandoval, 2014)*

In the following section, I describe how I drew on Sandoval’s (2014) generalized conjecture map and Wilkerson’s (2017) iterative conjecture mapping process to examine the iterative and participatory nature of designing Studio with secondary humanities teacher candidates. The conjecture map illustrates my initial approach to the learning environment with specific tools and materials, task structures, participant structures, and discursive practices called *embodiments*. At the beginning of the Studio design process, for example, I conjectured that annotating practice using an online annotation tool as well as reflecting on their practicum
experience through journals would encourage candidates to critically reflect on practice and ultimately lead to the development of an anti-oppressive stance. However, simply providing reflective tools doesn’t lead to the development of an anti-oppressive stance or an expansive view of practice. Rather, it is important to design specific activities or *mediating processes* using the tools and structures in Studio. Thus, I used the conjecture map to predict observable interactions occurring between participants and the designed environment. I also used the conjecture map to analyze conversations and artifacts produced during activities that reflected the extent to which learners engaged in critical thinking and reflection. For example, according to my initial conjecture, I believed that providing opportunities for students to critically reflect, perform, and design practice as well as try on different roles and identities, would support the development of a critical and anti-oppressive stance towards practice. However, in order to gauge the efficiency of my design, I needed to also consider how various tools and the use of those tools in Studio influenced candidate development.

By creating conjecture maps at the start of a Studio design, I was able to surface my assumptions and theories about how learning occurred in the space as well as create a framework for formulating research questions and deciding what key data to collect. My conjecture maps were continuously edited to reflect changes in assumptions and theories as data was collected and as candidates re-designed the tools and structures of the Studio course. The arrows in the example conjecture map below in figure 9 represent the assumptions, ideas, and theories that are open to scrutiny through research.

Throughout the year, candidates participated in bi-weekly iterations on their design of the Studio Course. These iterations occurred for the following reasons: (1) feedback from the candidates in class or through *Audio Journals*, (2) reflections on anti-oppressive practice and
their own experience during *Design Team Meetings*, and (3) my reflections regarding student growth and development. I defined student growth and development regarding candidates’ willingness to take up difficult and nuanced conversations in the course, and their overall participation in the design process. For example, when few students were turning in *Audio Journals* or attending the *Design Team Meeting*, I asked students to problem solve ways to increase their own participation.

Although many of the iterations focused on individual approaches to practice and a theory of anti-oppressive pedagogy, nearly all iterations also included new structures for the Studio process. Figure 9 documents how while candidates were designing the topic for the day, they also were iterating on existing structures and ideas.
Figure 9: Iterative Conjecture Map of the Studio Design Process
Conjecture Mapping as an Analytical Tool

I used the construct of conjecture to demonstrate the theoretical nature of designing a PBTE course with candidates and to frame the methodological issues in both designing and studying the space. Figure 9 represents how the conjecture map was used for the iteration of my research design. The high-level conjecture guiding the initial research plan represents what the co-design and Studio experience afforded candidates in terms of their social justice identity development, specifically their anti-oppressive stance towards practice (Lewison et al, 2008; Scherff, 2012; Kumashiro, 2007). Since candidates both co-designed the curriculum of Studio and engaged in Studio, I used the conjecture map as a tool to analyze the embodiments of both Studio and the co-design process. The embodiment in figure 9 represents the tools, structures, of the course, the components of Studio, how candidates participated in Studio and the co-design process, as well as the discursive spaces that were introduced during the first week of the Studio course. As mentioned above, candidates iterated on the embodiments of Studio either during Design Team Meetings or through Audio Journals, both of which were voluntary. The conjecture map in figure 9 documents the tools and structures I proposed at the beginning of the co-design process, as well as the changes made to the design with candidates throughout the year.

In my initial conjecture, I believed that candidates would perform practices and beliefs about teaching and justice through reflection and design, and then physically enact those practices in Studio. I proposed that the co-design process, which was designed as both a participatory and discursive practice, would allow candidates to ultimately design, approximate and decompose practice. Through co-design, I conjectured that candidates would consider what they had to do as teachers and also who they currently were as students.
The second iteration of the conjecture map, which is bolded in the conjecture map, indicates how candidates’ changed the tools as well as the participant structures and discursive practices throughout the design process and the course. It was mostly the co-designers experiences rather than data from an etic perspective that shaped these changes. After the first month of Studio, for example, candidates argued during the Studio Design Team, that the divide between Studio, coursework and clinical experiences was widening. Furthermore, through Audio Journals and video annotation candidates not present at the Design Team Meetings noted that their conversations in Studio rarely coincided with the reality of teaching or the frameworks presented in their other methods courses. Candidates suggested that using assignments within the course in order to define and rehearse practice could support their understanding of how social justice was being taken up across the university. Furthermore, candidates suggested connecting practices discussed in Studio with a mentor text and a semester long project. A mentor text is a text that both teacher candidates and teacher educators can return to and reread for many different purposes. The candidates argued that grounding rehearsal and design within a text could possibly serve as link to other courses and would ground practice within their disciplines.

Through the proposed introduction of two new tools to the Studio design, candidates also designed new participation and discursive practices, deciding to take more of the facilitator role within the class. During the Design Team Meeting, they argued that their “insider knowledge” regarding their other coursework and their time in practicum would lead to better facilitation. This change engendered a new mediating process by encouraging students to define anti-oppressive practice throughout all of their preparation experiences.

During each Design Team Meeting, I worked with students to examine the intervention outcomes of studio—whether candidates were learning what they were intended to learn, as well
as the observable patterns of behavior predicted by my conjecture map. As the instructor of the course, I worked to support candidates in their development of an anti-oppressive stance towards practice, documenting what tools and structures contributed to development. As the researcher, I also used the concept map to examine the impact of the co-design process on the structure of the course. The concept map provided a tool for documenting changes to the initial design, as well as candidate interpretation of anti-oppressive stance towards practice.

**Data Analysis After Studio**

Along with revisiting my conjecture map, I analyzed data by summarizing my initial impressions at the end of each note from the design team meetings. In this analysis I included, key themes, issues, and questions that emerged from the design work. I summarized my overall feelings from class, and *Audio Journals* in relation to candidates design conversations and decisions in memos. Throughout the design and teaching process, I also wrote weekly memos as I began to reflect on the data, notice patterns, and/or formulate ideas. In each memo I wrote not only about emergent themes, but also my own development as an anti-oppressive teacher. I reflected on how I personally engaged in the framework and encouraged candidates to do the same. Through this process, I struggled to capture the structure of individual and collective engagement in Studio in isolation from my history with the participants, as well as their history, identities and experiences. So many moments seemed to evade description. I wanted to avoid the implication that anyone becomes an anti-oppressive teacher or even that they master anti-oppressive practice rather I believed that we are always in the process of becoming. Consequently, deciphering how individual tools and structures afforded particular approaches to an anti-oppressive stance in candidates was considerably challenging.
While data were analyzed with candidates during the course in Design Team Meetings, Data were also analyzed after candidates were no longer students within the Studio course. I used the constant comparative method of data analysis (e.g., Strauss, 1987) examining how the candidates discussed, reflected and interacted around anti-oppressive practice. While some audio and video recordings were transcribed, I used qualitative analysis software called MAXQDA that allowed for coding audio and video files without transcription.

Two primary coders, another doctoral student and myself, coded the entire corpus of data. In sharing our approach to coding the data, disagreements were resolved with the help of a third party familiar with the study when discontinuity occurred. A doctoral candidate and I began with an initial set of codes developed using grounded theory (see Appendix B for initial codes). Drawing on the four components of a critical stance and characteristics of anti-oppressive practice, data were analyzed using the constant comparative method (e.g., Strauss, 1987), mapping how the candidate consciously engaged in, inquired and reflected upon, and performed ways of being across the components of Studio (see Appendix C for example code book). Through a recursive examination of the data, we named, categorized, and subcategorized key themes from the data in relation to the approaches to both critical stance and anti-oppressive practice. We then mapped the constitutive relations between and among these categories and examined individual codes in an effort to reveal interactional patterns. For example we asked: How did conscious engagement interact with reflection? How did candidates consciously engage with education for the other? These interactional patterns revealed discursive practices (e.g. Fairclough, 1992), demonstrating some of the ways that the participants produced, reproduced, and transformed their knowledge, their perspectives regarding teaching for social justice, and the way in which they “tried on” and explored alternative identities within both co-design process
and the Studio course. These discursive practices were then categorized by the Studio context, investigating how specifically tools and process influenced discursive engagement. For example, we cross-examined candidates autobiographical descriptions within Audio Journals, rehearsal and co-design. We explored how Audio Journals were used to design and both critically reflect, while also noting how ideas around race, ethnicity, gender and ability were negotiated and explored by candidates within and across these spaces. Finally, by studying how candidates discursively engaged with practice, we analyzed participation in rehearsal during the Studio course, specifically the way in which candidates took up varying approaches to rehearsal.

**Issues of Integrity in the Research Process**

According to Bang and Vossoughi (2016), “an important dimension of PDR is the extent to which the historical genealogies of equity-oriented work, including theoretical developments, social movements, and the evolution of methods, are reflected in researchers’ sensibilities and made explicit in the analysis” (p. 176). In this section, I explain how throughout the analysis process of this study, I considered my role as a researcher and instructor in this study as it influenced the ways in which I collected and interpreted data as well as how I interacted with the participants (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2014). Rather than employ the term “validity” related to these issues, I opt for the term integrity to better align with and reflect the conceptual lenses and critical goals of my study. Through the design process I took into account how my beliefs, values and disposition were useful in creating complex and meaningful relationships with candidates. I was careful to understand the relationships in the co-design team as complex and constantly evolving to more fully comprehend the research process and my role in it. As a researcher, teacher, friend, collaborator, and mentor, I took on multiple roles, often simultaneously, and frequently shared my interpretations of data with candidates during the
design process. After Studio, I worked with another doctoral candidate to analyze data, asking her to not only consider candidate participation across Studio structures, but to analyze my own engagement in Studio and with the data.

**Findings**

Studio began as a response to candidates describing a disjuncture between the practices and philosophies they encountered in university courses and those they encountered in K-12 classrooms. In particular, candidates expressed frustration with the “theoretical and impractical” social justice approach that they experienced at the university but never saw enacted in schools. Yet, when Studio began, rather than trying to conceptually bridge the framework and practices presented in the university with those from candidates’ clinical experiences, I focused on co-design to encourage candidates to develop their own conception of practice and justice, and to use all of their preparation experiences to design a teaching identity and sense of self.

Throughout this process, candidates were able to take on multiple roles, engage in genuine inquiry, and argue for particular interpretations of anti-oppressive pedagogy. With co-constructed engagements and interactions, there was no one trajectory for a class, and consequently knowledge, expertise, and ultimately identity were revealed and challenged in spontaneous, self-generating ways. Since co-design encouraged candidates to define what type of anti-oppressive teacher they wanted to be, each candidate had a different path. Some candidates worked on developing concrete and tangible practices, while others focused on challenging their beliefs about schooling. There were even some candidates who repeatedly engaged in the process through resistance, never truly questioning their preconceptions. Where a candidate ended up after a year of Studio was primarily dependent on where they felt that they needed to go. Thus,
the development of an anti-oppressive stance towards practice appeared as a continuum, revealing the entanglement between myself, a candidate's' identity, their beliefs, and design.

The development of anti-oppressive stance goes beyond pedagogies and curricula. It is both a discursive and experiential process. Each discursive engagement of Studio encouraged candidates to ‘try on,’ and in many ways, perform different aspects of their beliefs and teaching identity. Through analysis of candidates’ discourse within each component of Studio, findings indicate that the type of interaction in Studio influenced the way in which candidates explored previously held beliefs and thus developed their own anti-oppressive stance towards practice. Furthermore, each discursive engagement worked collaboratively with each other—even building on concepts and design—to weave a tapestry of practice, adding texture to flexible repertoires of anti-oppressive approaches and perspectives.

The discursive opportunities provided by Studio can be brought to light by following the chosen practice for each week. In the following section, I provide such an example. I trace one practice across the three distinct Studio engagements in order to illuminate how various interactions worked both independently and in collaboration to support candidates’ development of an anti-oppressive stance. I then use this descriptive process to introduce the three papers that I wrote based on the data collected and analyzed during the Studio design experience.

**The Practice of Facing Fear**

By allowing candidates to choose the instructional activity, the practice, and to model feedback during Studio, candidates were able to expand upon traditional definitions of what it means to teach and to weave anti-oppressive practice into traditional methodology. As mentioned above, not all students engaged in performance, but everyone contributed to analyzing practice on the TALENT platform, and brought their analyses and suggestions to rehearsal.
These suggestions often contradicted normalized approaches to pedagogy, with candidates arguing for an amalgamation of both traditional and radical methodologies.

During one Studio class, a White female candidate in her early twenties named Sasha brought up an issue of “classroom management,” while collectively discussing a practicum video. She explained that during the previous week in practicum, she had two male students sexualize her in front of the entire class. Although the Studio video illustrated a textual conversation around “The Outsiders” by S.E. Hinton, and the Studio activity was focused on questioning during textual conversations, Sasha made a pedagogical connection to her recent experience. “What if you want to center student ideas in a discussion, but students respond to your question in inappropriate ways?” (Observation, October 2015). The class remained silent, waiting for her to explain. After she recounted the incident, a White woman in her early twenties named Laura responded in a hushed voice. “That is my worst fear.”

The conversation moved forward, with candidates no longer focusing on questioning, but instead considering how questioning could lead to dehumanizing behavior. In the conversation, candidates provided ways to diffuse the interruption and to challenge dehumanizing moments in the classroom. A few candidates stopped discussing practice or even student behavior, and began to question Sasha about her feelings of safety. With a shift in the conversation, the focal practice in Studio became about fear, and the power of confronting and naming fear. With a personal, emotional, and vulnerable moment, the candidates encouraged the practice of confronting fear to remain present in Studio for weeks to come.

The following day, a White male candidate in his late twenties named Tim sent me an audio journal focusing on building classroom culture. He stated,
I think the best way to address [classroom culture], not the best way, a way to address it would be to start with fears. You know, what are your fears as a teacher and for some that could be being sexually harassed, verbally, or a student, for whatever reason trying to be physical. For me, specifically, a big fear is not knowing the content. We talked about this before in terms of praxis, you know, things like that.

Tim did not directly reference the conversation in class the previous day, but nevertheless he provided a direct suggestion around addressing fear in the Studio curriculum. In this example, Tim couched his story of “fear of the praxis” with our shared narrative about the Studio course. He recommended that we should continue a conversation around fear in Studio to support candidates in addressing personal challenges in becoming anti-oppressive teachers.

Later that week, during the design of Studio, we discussed the conversation around fear that occurred during the course and I shared how the theme of fear had also entered audio journals. Collectively, we decided to annotate a video from practicum that showed a class that appeared “out of control,” with the candidates agreeing that the practice for the week should be defined as “facing fear in the classroom.” One candidate suggested that we could start class by having students anonymously place their fear in a hat (in a form of a scenario) and then have students volunteer to rehearse and then dissect the practice.

In this particular design meeting, candidates began to share their own fears in order to imagine how this activity might land on their colleagues. A Latinx candidate in her early twenties named Gina mentioned being fearful of welcoming students back into the classroom after an extended absence. Other candidates responded by providing examples of how their cooperating teachers at their practicum site welcomed students back into their classroom after incarceration. In the middle of the conversation, Gina interrupted, explaining a similar story that
involved her sister. She explained that her sister has been hospitalized for an eating disorder and after eight weeks was returning to class. She began to cry. She explained how no teacher mentioned her sister’s extreme weight loss to her family, and how the situation was ignored. In response, an African male candidate in his late twenties named Amilcar began to reflect on the design of Studio, not in terms of future classrooms, but with regard to the classroom culture of Studio. He stated,

that worries me… It makes me feel like we all know that we all carry stuff, Yet we are all in this room all year and no one knows anything and things happen.
What we do know is that we don’t [know]. We know that this going on in the general society around us. Why is it that when we come to class I am supposed to let that go, if we know? If I had like a life that people have, when I walk into the class, why am I supposed to then pretend?

While designing Studio, candidates considered what it meant to address fear as a practice.
Unlike other approaches to analyzing and dissecting practice, candidates explored classroom interactions, but mostly focused on their emotional responses to those interactions, and their own experiences during their preparation. It mattered to examine how to lead a conversation around a text, or to invite a student into the classroom after a prolonged absence, but in order to truly comprehend the complexity of practice, candidates needed to couch the instructional activity in their own lives, and the emotional impact of teaching.

During the subsequent Studio Class, candidates engaged with the selected video and the fear activity designed the previous week. In class, I facilitated a conversation around responding to fear as an act of anti-oppressive pedagogy. Candidates rehearsed their fears, choosing to either
openly express their fears or to rehearse anonymous fears provided by the scenarios. The rehearsal topics included: supporting students who don’t speak during discussion, engaging with students who are disruptive, and inviting students who were absent for long periods of time back into the classroom. Tim chose to practice his fear of “not knowing” the content in front of students, while Sasha facilitated a parent-teacher conference with a linguistically diverse family.

In the following weeks of Studio, candidates would sometimes reference fear while dissecting practice. Naming and confronting fear became a practice for anti-oppressive teaching, but also provided important language for talking about the purpose behind a particular practice and the consequence of enactment. Since the practice around fear was organically and collaboratively created by candidates, it remained present within the Studio course and was even referenced after students went into student teaching. Several months into the student teaching semester, a White female candidate in her early twenties named Suzy emailed me:

I have a student who’s been absent for 2+ weeks now, who was very boisterous and engagingly oppositional in the first few days of class. He just came back today, and my first reaction when he walked in was to say, "Hey! You've graced us with your presence!" I realized that I had met his return with this snarky, patronizing judgment that made the class immediately unwelcoming. I feel shitty about doing it, especially since an apology won't rewrite that moment. But I at least recognized the mistake.

Suzy never participated in the design of Studio, and was often quiet during the Studio Class. She didn’t rehearse when we focused on fear. Further, welcoming a student back after a prolonged absence was never described as a main practice in the Studio course.
Yet, by focusing on students’ fears, and allowing for the personal and the emotional to become central to practice, it left a lasting impression.

**Overview of Three-Article Approach**

In understanding how candidates developed an anti-oppressive stance throughout the co-design process, I traced the conception of particular practices, and how candidates engaged in those practices across Studio engagements. The example of fear above provides a snapshot for this analysis. The collected body of work for this study represents a deep dive into these Studio interactions and explains how candidates engaged in rehearsal, audio journals, and the design of Studio.

In order to capture the complexity of co-designing a practice-based course with candidates, I created a curriculum guide for teacher educators, detailing the way that practice was both defined and enacted through the yearlong Studio experience. Like the example of fear above, the curriculum guide tells the story of Studio, describing the components or engagements, and provides concrete examples of curriculum. Throughout this guide, I give an account of how practice was both conceived and enacted by candidates and how the co-design process influenced their engagement with anti-oppressive pedagogies. I explain how candidates analyzed and enacted practice in Studio, how they reflected on that practice in audio journals, and how they designed each Studio course in relation to those interactions.

I begin the curriculum guide with a series of stories about my own journey with the concepts of justice and practice. I do so, to humanize the curriculum, implying that Studio was about what candidates did in the course and throughout the design process, but also who they were. In the second paper, I build on the curricular guide and the importance of individual identities in designing practice by analyzing how one candidate conceptualized and performed
social justice teaching identities across and within Studio engagements. The development of an anti-oppressive stance was analyzed by looking specifically at how one candidate’s social justice dispositions seemed to be linked to the discursive processes through which he voiced, rehearsed, and evaluated beliefs about justice, practice, and his own preparation. Throughout this article, I argue that in order to prepare teachers to weave critical, anti-oppressive frames within their future pedagogy, the process of becoming a teacher needs to continually be re-conceptualized as an experience that involves much more than learning how to manipulate discrete instructional strategies and practices in fixed contexts. Instead, social justice teacher preparation might more accurately be viewed as the complex, contingent, and emergent process through which teachers-in-preparation call their own lives and the lives of others into dialogue.

Finally, in the third paper, I dive deeply into a candidates negotiation process, specifically highlighting the use of “audio journals” as a reflective practice, exploring how candidates utilized them to identify and question their assumptions around teaching and learning within and outside of schools. In examining how one candidate spoke about her experiences in her practicum site over a one-year period, I analyzed her development of a critical stance towards practice. Further, I propose the use of audio journals as a teacher education practice to unearth candidates’ internal negotiations around justice, practice, and self. Throughout this article, I study the role of reflection within the curriculum process, centralizing reflection as key to both co-design and equity-oriented teacher preparation.

Taken together, this body of work looks at teacher preparation as contextual, individual, and deeply personal. By detailing the curriculum and analyzing individual candidates discursive interactions throughout the process of Studio, I provide an explanation of both the design and impact of anti-oppressive teacher education. As a teacher education pedagogy, co-design
supported interactions and engagements that led to candidates reflecting on their own identities, and their future identities as teachers. Like the variation present in social justice teaching and practice, the implementation of co-design within social justice teacher education looks and feels different across contexts. Even fidelity to the Studio design can still produce varying results. The curricular guide and the subsequent articles are meant to describe a possible roadmap for implementing co-design within teacher education and to consider an anti-oppressive stance towards practice as a potential outcome of engaging in this work. It is not describing a one-size-fits-all approach to social justice teacher education, but is encouraging teacher educators to re-conceptualize what it means to prepare future equity-oriented teachers.
CHAPTER 4

ARTICLE ONE

Making Practice Matter: A Year Long Curriculum For Social Justice Teacher Educators

I am proposing the publication of a book focused on innovative methods of cultivating equity commitments in practice-based teacher education. Specifically, the book tells my story of collaboratively designing social justice teacher preparation with pre-service teachers. This book will be designed for teacher educators, including example curriculum and clear and accessible approaches to the development of social justice teacher dispositions and practice. In the following section I will include the book proposal titled “Making Practice Matter: A Year Long Curriculum for Social Justice Teacher Education,” and two completed sample chapters that will link to the Studio curriculum.

I have spent my career as an English teacher, teacher educator, and researcher working in the field of social justice teaching and teacher education. For the past 13 years, I have had an educational journey that took me around the world: from private international schools educating the elite, to orphanages educating the marginalized, and to charter schools advocating social justice curriculum. My journey has been circuitous and eclectic. It has carried me through countless programs and multiple countries. It has pushed me to redefine teaching for myself and has led me to work with pre-service secondary teachers and to imagine teacher education practice in relation to equity. This book would reflect this journey, specifically recounting my experience collaboratively designing social justice teacher education curriculum with pre-service teachers.

I am compelled to write this book for selfish reasons. As a teacher educator, I wanted to find a curricular text for supporting the development of social justice pre-service teachers,
specifically those focused on teaching secondary English Language Arts. Yet, while there are several texts used in teacher education programs focused on social justice teacher education, and secondary literacy instruction, they are usually written for novice teachers, providing activities, strategies or descriptions of how to support their future students. I have yet to find an accessible and useful text designed for practicing teacher educators to support the design of courses and their students’ experiences with practice in schools. I fervently believe that the lack of clarity around teacher education pedagogies contributes to the de-professionalization of teachers. How can we advocate for the elevation of teaching as a profession, if the definition of effective teacher education is still vague? I hope that this book serves to combat this phenomenon.

In response to the lack of practical resources for teacher educators, I designed a practice-based course collaboratively with secondary English and Social Studies candidates addressing ideas around social justice practice. I documented this process and the subsequent curriculum. I believe that this curriculum would be extremely useful for teacher educators who are interested in imagining new and innovative ways of preparing future teachers. While the curriculum is geared towards preparing English and History teachers, I believe it can also be re-contextualized for all teacher educators interested in preparing social justice teachers. Moreover, I think the story of building the curriculum, including the voices of pre-service teachers, encourages a complicated and nuanced framework to consider social justice practice and pedagogy.

I envision a manuscript of 200 to 250 double-spaced pages. It will be written in a narrative structure, including the perspective of a few teacher candidates involved in the development of the course. As mentioned above, I have written the majority of the curriculum, but if this proposal is accepted, I plan to write the corresponding story. I have permission from teacher candidates to publish their work. I am currently in the process of writing this book and
Proposal

Introduction

The book will begin with a brief story describing the development of my understanding of social justice practice throughout my teaching career. I recount my ten years as a secondary ELA teacher in the United States and abroad, and detail how I began to inquire about effective teaching across contexts. In my introduction, I also explain that when I left the classroom for graduate school, I was shocked by the sudden expectation that I was “qualified” to be a teacher educator. With an exploration into what it takes to prepare social justice teachers, I end my introduction with a synopsis of what I had learned as a secondary ELA teacher and what I felt I still needed to know.

Chapter 1: The Design of Studio

Chapter one describes the story of developing a collaboratively designed course named Studio. Since the curriculum was designed in response to students’ needs, it was also developed with them. Students had weekly input into how the course was approached and could attend monthly design meetings. In this chapter, I detail the structures and tools of the course, the design meetings, and describe the social justice framework. In the following chapters, I include lesson plans, suggested materials, and reflections by students who were involved in both designing and participating in the course.

Chapter 2: What is Anti-Oppressive Practice?

Chapter two focuses on the beginning of the course. In this chapter, I give a narrative account of how candidates responded to the framework of the course and their role in their own
preparation. The first semester of the course was designed to introduce candidates to social justice approaches in education and basic lesson design. Most important to the design of the first semester was the engagement in introspection and reflection. In this chapter, I explain the overall intention of the first semester around the concept of anti-oppressive practice and recount how candidates responded to the co-design process.

- Launch: Challenging Conceptualization of Schooling, Learning, and Self
- Lesson 1: Introducing an Anti-oppressive Framework
- Lesson 2: Introducing Co-design as a Form of Anti-oppressive Practice

**Chapter 3: What is Considered Normal in School?**

Chapter three defines social justice practice within schools. In this chapter, I explain how candidates identified and analyzed the routines, procedures, and norms at their practicum site, and imagined ways of designing anti-oppressive classrooms and schools. During this part of the Studio curriculum, candidates began to explore the process of becoming anti-oppressive teachers by evaluating approaches to classroom management and school culture.

- Lesson 3: The Norms of Schooling
- Lesson 4: Challenging the Norms of Schooling
- Lesson 5: Creating Routines and Procedures to Challenge Oppression

**Chapter 4: How Do We Design Our Anti-Oppressive Practice?**

In chapter four, students reflect on lesson design, assessment, and backwards planning. In this chapter, I argue for the importance of students familiarizing themselves with pedagogical resources while simultaneously challenging traditional methods and frameworks. I detail how candidates confronted existing beliefs around teaching and learning by redesigning elements within lessons and common ELA and Social Studies assessments.
Lesson 6: Lesson Design and Anti-oppressive Practice

Lesson 7: Challenging Lesson Design

Lesson 8: Formative and Summative assessment

Lesson 9: Assessment and Objectives

Lesson 10: Challenging Assessment

Chapter 5: How Do We Practice Anti-Oppressive Pedagogy?

Chapter five provides an example of how to involve candidates in their own assessment. I explain how candidates used the redesign process in chapter four to discuss and assess their own progress as anti-oppressive educators. Drawing on material experienced in the first ten lessons, students suggested using both performance and reflection to gauge their growth throughout the semester. Through this process, I explore how candidates enacted anti-oppressive teaching identities, and also reflected on their design process.

Lesson 11: Backwards Designing Into Anti-oppressive Practice

Lesson 12: Reflection and Redesign in Planning

Lesson 13: The Redesign of Practice: Anti-oppressive Performance

Lesson 14-16: Rehearsing Anti-oppressive Practice

Chapter 6: How Do I Perform Inquiry-Based Anti-Oppressive Teaching?

Chapter six introduces the second semester of the course. During the second semester, candidates designed Studio around relevant practices that they interpreted as essential for anti-oppressive teaching. Candidates still explored the re-design of curriculum, but focused more specifically on providing new information, questioning in the classroom, and guided instruction. The goal of the second semester was to support candidates in finding practices that resonated with their conception of anti-oppressive pedagogy and to analyze those practices in relation to
their beliefs, values, and identities. Chapter six introduces this pedagogical shift and argues for a more complicated approach to practice in relation to justice. This chapter is broken into the following three sections:

- Core Practices
- Teaching For Equity
- Collaborative Design and Innovation

Chapter 7: Where Have We Gone and Where are We Going in Studio?

Chapter seven describes how candidates engaged in the co-design process. During this part of the curriculum, I asked students to reflect on their experiences in the course by analyzing artifacts and videos. Through this process, candidates reviewed how they conceived of routines, procedures, and lesson design in the first semester, and reflected on their semester assessment. Candidates then dissected the impact of collective reflection on classroom culture, not only considering their development as teachers, but the success of the course.

- Launch: Inquiry and Redesign
- Lesson 17: How Do You Design Your Classroom?
- Lesson 18: How Do We Re-design Collaboration in Our Space?

Chapter 8: How Do We Directly “Teach” Students to Both Question and Learn?

Throughout chapter eight, I explain how candidates explored various approaches to direct instruction. In the following lessons, candidates analyzed how direct instruction was used throughout Studio, practiced direct instruction, and subsequently either adopted or re-designed the practice based on their own conception of anti-oppressive teaching.

- Lesson 19: How Do We Place Students in The Center of Assessment?
- Lesson 20: How Do We Decipher The Culture of Teaching and Learning?
Lesson 21: How Do We Actively Challenge The Existing Culture of Teaching and Learning?

Chapter 9: How and Why Do We Question?

In chapter nine, candidates examine how questioning was used throughout the first semester to support their development. Candidates discussed the purpose and the technique of questioning, examined the types of questions that occur throughout instruction, and practiced questioning to gauge student understanding, experience and engagement.

Lesson 22: How Can Questioning Support Instruction and Justice?
Lesson 23: How Do We Value and Apply Student Knowledge?

Chapter 10: What Language Do We Use to Question?

To expand upon questioning, chapter ten focuses on the discourse of teaching. Collectively, candidates described the vocabulary of anti-oppressive pedagogy and examined how vocabulary is tied to formatively assessing students, determining background knowledge, as well as supporting students with inquiry and content. Students engaged with overall concepts of discourse and vocabulary instruction, while considering how to apply those concepts to critical and textual conversations.

Lesson 24: How Do We Use Language to Examine Schools, Teaching, Learning and Justice?
Lesson 25: What is The Language of Questioning?
Lesson 26: How Do We Lead Students in Questioning?

Chapter 11: How Do We Guide Students in Both Questioning and Learning?

In chapter eleven, candidates used the analysis of direct instruction, questioning, vocabulary, and textual conversations to enact guided instruction. This chapter describes how to support
candidates in practicing with their future students, weaving content, skill, and critical frameworks into modeling. Rather than focusing on guided practice exclusively in terms of skill, candidates examined how to facilitate critical thinking while honoring student knowledge and experiences.

- Lesson 27: How Do You Guide Students in Learning and Questioning?
- Lesson 28: How Do You Center Students Through Practice?

**Chapter 12: How Do I Perform Inquiry-Based Anti-Oppressive Teaching?**

Chapter twelve explains the summative assessment of Studio. Like the first semester assessment, it is collaboratively designed with candidates. However, rather than focusing on their growth as anti-oppressive educators, the assessment explores candidates’ readiness for student teaching. This chapter is written from the perspective of two candidates, describing their experience in the course, and how they felt that it prepared them for the reality of schools.

**Chapter 13: Conclusion**

To conclude the book, I go back to my understanding of practice and effective teaching. I describe what I learned as a social justice teacher educator, and what I am still learning. Written as a series of vignettes, this chapter mirrors the introduction. Throughout this chapter, I reflect on the difference between preparing teachers and teacher educators, and describe the importance of considering the difference between teacher practice and teacher education pedagogy.

**The Process of Learning To Teach**

**Arizona**

It was seven in the morning. I had been at school since six, prepping for an optional early morning English class for students who felt that they needed extra support. Several students had arrived and were sleepily talking in the back of the room. One student was sitting on the carpet,
eating hot Cheetos and smearing the neon orange residue on the floor. I looked around the room, sipping my coffee slowly, waiting for the last few students to come in. I smiled, proud that so many of them had gotten up before seven in the morning to be there. It was my first year teaching, and as I looked around the room I knew with unrelenting certainty that with the right amount of effort and love, I could support all of my students.

With seven students in attendance, I started the class. “Today we are going to revisit some of the goals we set at the beginning of the year. I want us to think about where we were and where we are going. Consider how much you have learned in such a short amount of time.” I grabbed a marker, poised at the Whiteboard, waiting for the students to list off all of their achievements. A student named Angelica raised her hand first, “I feel like I am not getting better. I still have a D in your class.” There were nods of agreement. Another student, speaking in Spanish, described a sense of frustration with all of her classes. “No puedo participar en nigun clase. Nadie esta tratando ayudarme.” I sat down in front of the class and listened, feeling disheartened. I couldn’t disagree with them. Even though we had worked together for nearly an entire semester, and I could see their improvement, they were continuing to fall behind in all of their classes, including my own. Despite my best efforts, there remained a stark disconnect between what my students needed and what I was able to provide, both inside and outside of my classroom.

With only a brief pause, I moved forward, believing that my forced enthusiasm could push through anything, even systemic inequity. I reminded students that progress was slow, but that by simply coming to this early morning class, they had already transformed. I cheered loudly, “Si Se Puede.” Two students rolled their eyes. Another student distractedly doodled on her notebook. At the time I interpreted these behaviors as signs of frustration with progress, or
even with my behavior. Now, looking back, I wonder if it was more frustration with not being heard.

As I nervously transitioned to another activity, I put the following statement on the board: *How do you create a picture in your reader’s mind?* I looked around the class. “Does anyone have an answer? How can we write so that our audience can visualize our ideas?” No one responded. I pushed forward. “Here is an example. What if I said, Mary is tired. What would you think?” No one answered. “But what if I said, Mary moved into the classroom like a slug, barely lifting her head. Which sentence is more visual?” No one answered. I wrote both example sentences on the board. “Raise your hand for the sentence you think paints a picture in your mind.” I pointed to the first sentence. One student raised his hand. I pointed to the second sentence. Three students raised their hands. The majority of the class looked around confused. “Okay team. How about we just try it out? I let out a nervous laugh. You have sentence starters in front of you. I want you try and make a simple sentence into a descriptive sentence.” I smiled, holding up the handout that was on each desk. Several students picked up their pencils. Other students quietly talked. Ignoring students hesitation, I started to walk around the room, encouraging students to work.

I sat down next to a student who had just arrived to the school the previous week. He smiled at me, remaining silent. His paper was blank. I leaned over. “Can I help you with anything?” He stared at me, confused. I tried the question again, in my broken Spanish. “Puedo ayudarte con algo?” He responded, but in a completely different language. Another student called from across the room. “Yo, miss, he is from Indonesia. He is not Mexican. We don’t know what he speaks.” I blushed. I felt embarrassed for assuming his identity. I felt even more embarrassed that a student was speaking about him as if he wasn’t there. I pointed to the example
on the board and tried explaining again in English. I noticed that my speech had changed. I was speaking loudly, enunciating all of my words. He looked at me blankly. I wrote down an example sentence on his paper. “What words could you add to this sentence to make it more descriptive?” I asked, pleading, knowing that all of my students were listening. He still didn’t respond. The student behind him tapped me on the shoulder. “Miss, he usually just looks at picture books until Ms. Right comes and gets him.” Ms. Right was the ELD teacher, who worked with all of the linguistically diverse students in the school. I nodded. I went to the back of the room to find a book that would fit his needs. I had nothing. I decided to go to the computer and search languages spoken in Indonesia. I felt a sense of anxiety. I wanted to prove that I could help. As I was trying to find a relevant text online, the bell rang. Students filed out of the classroom quickly, without a single goodbye.

That day, I left the class feeling an overwhelming sense that I was missing something. I didn’t really know how to help my students while also teaching them. And just like that, I realized that my practice was falling short, and that my love and devotion simply wasn’t enough.

Thailand

Two years later I walked up four flights of stairs to my new classroom. All of my students were waiting outside silently, standing in a line. I took my high heels off in front of the door and bent down to pick up a fresh box of milk cartons for the afternoon snack. I bowed. “Good morning class.”

“Sawadeeka Teacher Mary.” The students welcomed me in unison and marched into the classroom, also leaving their shoes at the door. They stood at attention at their desks as the Thai national anthem played on the loudspeaker. “Take your seats,” I stated while grabbing students’ reading folders out of a large crate. I stood at the front of the room and asked students to take out
their required textbook. “Today we are going to read a story about a young boy named Jason who has had to overcome tremendous odds in order to reconnect with his family. We are going to annotate the text. Circle any words that you don’t understand, underline words that are important to the story and write questions that you have in the margin.”

I started to read, walking around the room in my bare feet. I looked down at a marker that was underneath the Whiteboard, and tapped it with my foot. Two students noticeably cringed. I made an apologetic face, forgetting about the cultural stigma of feet. I paused, bent down and picked up the marker, placing it on my desk. I looked around the room. All of the students were writing on their copy of the text. Their names were visibly taped to the front of their desks. In Thailand, specifically in international schools and settings, all students were given English nicknames because it was believed that their Thai names were too difficult for foreign teachers or visitors to pronounce. These names were usually random English words like Helicopter, or shortened versions of their Thai names like Prawng.

A student named Poon was staring out the window. Even when students were “off task,” they were never disruptive. I gently placed my hand on his shoulder. He shyly smiled and immediately started underlining words haphazardly. As I started reading again, a female student named Earth raised her hand and asked, “what is a bum bag?” I laughed. I actually wasn’t sure. “I think it is like a fanny pack.” Everyone looked around confused. “It is like a little pack that you wear around your waist. Usually older women or nerds wear them in the United States. I think a bum bag is the British version.” I held back laughter. If I had said bum bag two years earlier, all of my students would be on the floor laughing. Now, all of them wrote down my explanation without incident. A student named Jump had written the word nerd in the margin with a question mark. As I continued reading, another student whispered a question to his friend
in Thai, asking about the word cheeky. I heard the exchange but continued to read. This was a common hurdle within this school, and particularly within my class. I was expected to teach British texts that not only had slang, but also contained White, cheeky, young British boys engaging in conversations and activities—usually having to do with cafes and boats—that were completely foreign to my students.

Students read English texts with diligence, annotating and asking questions, but the majority of students couldn’t comprehend what they were reading. I was convinced that their comprehension was more related to their background knowledge, and less to do with decoding and vocabulary recognition. Yet, the school had no other texts, and thus reading a short story about a young boy became more about explaining British culture and less about engaging in the lives of others.

After we finished reading, the bell rang for our milk break. The students filed outside in the hallway in their bare feet, and drank their milk, quietly chatting. When I had first arrived at the school, this process baffled me. It wasn’t until months later that I learned that milk companies in the United States had campaigned fiercely in Thailand, convincing schools that milk was essential for the health of their students—no matter that it was nearly impossible to find milk in Thai food, or that the majority of the students’ parents had never consumed dairy products. Within our school, milk consumption was mandatory, with teachers watching over students ensuring that they had finished a large plastic bag of the precious liquid. My students were in the sixth grade, and I myself was lactose intolerant. Thus, I never really enforced milk time, secretly considering the strange and pervasive impact of colonialism on education.

After fifteen minutes, the students filed back into the classroom for their Friday reward. Each Friday I promised students that if they finished reading about Jack, or Jason, or Giles, and
their adventures on dingies they could choose a free time activity. Every Friday, without fail, they chose to watch videos of Mr. Bean. Mr. Bean, while popular in Britain, was not a character that I was exposed to in the United States. He is an actor who rarely speaks and instead tells stories through physical comedy. He is an older British man who wears funny suits and is always engaging in everyday situations in a ridiculous and comical manner.

As I watched Mr. Bean spill soup on his date and catch his suit on fire, I sat back in wonder. All of my students were laughing and engaged—a stark contrast to our reading time. I knew so little about their world. Everything in the classroom, from my body, to the texts, to Mr. Bean was reflective of a different culture. I started to think back to my classroom in the United States, considering how the culture of schooling was far more invisible than it was to me now. Never once did it occur to me to think about the privileging of English, even within my optional English course. I never considered the cultural mismatch between the texts and the conversational topics I chose, and students lived experiences. Being in a country that was so obviously different from what I had experienced before, and reading texts that were linguistically and culturally foreign to both me and my students, gave visibility to the impact of power, Whiteness, language, and culture on practice.

Laughter erupted in the room. Mr. Bean had fallen down again. I found myself laughing along. I wondered if Mr. Bean could represent the process of learning how to teach. To the layperson, Mr. Bean is simply getting dinner. Yet, when engaging in this seemingly everyday process he is met with unexpected, dangerous, and comical challenges. As the bell rang, and students waited by their desks to be released, I looked down at my bare feet. If I felt ill prepared before, like something was missing, I now understood that I hadn’t even started to uncover the complexities around what it meant to teach.
Bolivia

Years later, I was sitting on the grass in front of my classroom, surrounded by a stack of student essays. I was once again barefoot. The sun was setting, and almost all of the faculty had left for the day. The school was located on the second highest point in Cochabamba, Bolivia, providing an incredible view of the entire city. Looking to my left, I was able to see the statue of Cristo de la Concordia (Christ of Peace), the second largest Jesus statue in the world. To my right, I could see La Cancha, the largest open-air market in the Americas. I was surrounded by beautiful flowers, and was drinking a coke. I normally didn’t stay late enough to see the sun set, but today I was asked to wait for the new Quechua teacher, Tica. My task was to make sure she didn’t take a taxi home alone, as women were always encouraged to travel in packs for safety. I sipped my coke slowly, reading through another essay on Fahrenheit 451—a text required for 9th grade English. I could hear a conversation from an open window in an office nearby. Tica was speaking Quechua defensively. I could hear the principal in his deep southern accent, “I need you to speak English.” He sounded exasperated and tired. Several adults were speaking both Spanish and English. A translator was in the room, but spoke in hushed tones. I tried to go back to my essay, focusing on how a student was comparing Fahrenheit 451 to political propaganda, but I found my attention pulled to the conversation pouring through the window. Early that day several students had thrown eggs at Tica, yelling racial slurs. There had been recent legislation passed establishing Quechua as one of the official languages in Bolivia. However, it was primarily the indigenous population that spoke Quechua and racism made for divisive debate about the policy. The hiring of a Quechua teacher was mandated by the state, and parents and students were vocally opposed to learning the language. When Tica arrived, parents protested and students were disrespectful. Over the past week, students had ditched her class in protest and
had received an F on all of their missing assignments. In retaliation, students had waited until after class and ambushed her, throwing rotten eggs and screaming.

The school served students from the most elite families in the country, including both politicians and top ranking military officers. The students were all Bolivian nationals, but received a high school certificate from both Bolivia and Arizona upon graduation. Students felt protected by their economic status, and attacked Tica with impunity, not bothering to cover their faces or hide their identities. Tica was in the office now with their parents, deciding on the appropriate punishment. The sun was nearly set, and the wind had picked up. I started to pack up my stuff, feeling a sense of dread. Tica and I had the same students. When I found out what they did, I felt such a deep sense of anger and confusion. I never imagined that any of my students were capable of such vitriol. I was also astounded by their self-righteousness and lack of remorse. As I collected my shoes and started to head into my classroom in search of a sweater, Tica called my name. “Mary, lista?” She was standing in front of the office with the parents and the principal still inside. Her face was red as if she had been crying. We walked to the taxi silently. I wanted to ask her what happened, to comfort her, and to let her know I was on her side. However, I didn’t speak Quechua and my Spanish was still really weak. “Esta’s bien?” I leaned over and touched her arm. She didn’t respond. As we drove to her house, she cried.

The next day I went to her class early to check in with her. The principal was there, cleaning out her things. “Where is Tica?” I stood in the doorway, carrying a morning snack from the cantina. “She is taking a leave of absence.” He was piling several books, and a coffee mug into a box. He looked up and with a dismissive tone asked, “Do you need something, Mary?” I shook my head and walked away.
Following Tica’s departure, I remained at that school for over a year. We never hired another Quechua teacher. We never talked as a staff about the incident, or addressed the racism within the school. Her room remained empty, a constant reminder of the school’s disregard for not only the legislative mandate, but also their teachers. All of the students involved in the attack were in my 8th grade English class the following year. It wasn’t easy to forget. It also wasn’t easy to understand. Teachers were forbidden to discuss the incident with the students, and I felt a constant sense of bewilderment and frustration that such dehumanization occurred without any real consequence. I found it difficult to treat the students involved with the same love and affection as before, mostly due to a sense of shame that my language, and my identity were privileged and valued within the school, while others remained subject to oppressive ideas and actions.

Throughout the year, I intentionally introduced activities and texts that focused on identity and language, provoking conversations around the importance of compassion. Since many of my students had drivers and personal shoppers, they had never ridden a bus, or visited La Cancha. Thus, I planned descriptive writing field trips to encourage them to observe, reflect on, and humanize communities that they typically avoided. I realize now that my practice was unconsciously affected by Tica’s experience. Rather than considering students’ language development, I was more concerned with how they perceived and valued various languages, and associated their perceptions with power and oppression. As a White American citizen, my methodology was never questioned. When I brought poems in Quechua and Spanish into my classroom, no one batted an eye. As I dramatically altered the curriculum, I also began to overcompensate for my own identity. I found ways to separate myself from privilege, while also continually naming the privilege of my students. Deep down, I knew that my Whiteness and my
ethnicity were the reason I was never challenged on my approach. Eventually, I began to feel a tremendous amount of guilt for only focusing on equity as it related to the lives of my students. I found myself explaining the importance of self-reflection around privilege and power to my students without ever really looking into myself, or challenging systems I benefited from. I knew that I needed to include critical reflection in my practice, and needed to work for a school that actively encouraged reflection around Whiteness and privilege. I left Bolivia knowing that I needed to name and analyze power within my practice, but also needed to be held accountable in the process.

Before Bolivia, I knew that practice needed to account for students’ native language, and that it needed to involve culturally relevant interactions, texts, and frameworks. I was exposed to the power my nationality and language had on my interactions and my success in the classroom. Yet, it wasn’t until Bolivia that I started to realize that effective teaching practice had to involve the process of iteratively examining all of those aspects of teaching through the lens of the cultural and the political nature of our schools. Most importantly, we had to critique our positioning within all of those systems and processes that impact our teaching and our students. Practice wasn’t transferable, or measurable. It not only mattered how you taught and what you taught, but where.

California

It was 11:30 in the afternoon. I was standing in the hall waiting for students to meander in after lunch. I leaned my back against a mural that I had painted two years earlier with the school’s first class of graduating seniors. It was a picture of a phoenix rising from the ashes. “Yo Maaari Jaane,” my student Alfredo sang as he walked passed, giving me a high five. He had
taken my freshman English class twice, and lovingly referred to me as Mary Jane, establishing his self-proclaimed love of marijuana. I smiled. “See you later Alfredo?” He turned around, “if you are lucky!” He walked away laughing.

The hall was clearing out, when I saw my student Eliza. She had just returned after having her first child. “Eliza, you are back.” I moved toward her and hugged her tightly.

“How are you feelin, mamma?” I knew that she had complications during the birth, and I was worried that she might be returning too quickly. She was one of my best students, and she was worried about falling behind. “I am okay. Tired, but good.” She leaned in and hugged me again.

“Mary, you smell good.” She laughed loudly.

“Thanks, I guess.” I looked at her curiously. “What do I normally smell like?” She looked through her purse and pulled out her phone. “Miss, it is not what you normally smell like, it is what White people smell like. You do not smell like most White people. They smell like sweat and patouli oil.” She leaned forward and showed me a picture of her roommates at the hospital—all of them White. “I just spent a lot of time with White people, and they nasty!” She laughed. I awkwardly smiled. “Well, I am excited you are back. Let me know if you need anything.” I turned and walked towards my classroom, confused by the interaction.

We didn’t have any bells, so when I entered the room, I pointed to the quote on the board. “When you guys are ready, respond to this quote. How does this quote reflect the essential question we have about the danger of a single story?” I sat down at my desk and watched some students begin to write, while several students continued to chat. I was thinking about Eliza. What made her think that I wanted to be separated from my Whiteness? I stood up and started to walk around the room to check on student progress. One student, Sam, was drawing on his neighbors arm. “Sam, let’s get back to work.” I motioned to the board. He didn’t look up.
“One second, I am almost done,” he replied while continuing his artwork. Another girl named Catalina was watching YouTube videos of Robin Thicke on her IPhone. “Mary, you would hate this video, it is super misogynistic.” She said, without putting her phone away.

“Well, why are you watching it then? Please put that away and respond to the quote on the board.” I was impressed that she had used the term misogynistic and mentally reminded myself to refer back to her comment during class discussion. When fifteen minutes had passed and students were about to share their ideas, two students came into the classroom. “Miss we are so sorry we are late. We ate that Chinese food downstairs and now our stomachs are all messed up.” The class erupted in laughter. The school was located on top of a Chinese restaurant and my room smelled constantly like chow mien. It was a running joke for students to guess what was on the menu by the smell that wafted through the floor. “Okay guys, sit down please.” I started to collect student ideas about the quote. “What are people thinking?” Sam raised his hand, and started speaking without being called on. “I think the danger of a single story connects to the police. The police do whatever they want, killing whoever they want, because everyone believes their story. Our stories don’t matter.”

I paused, wondering how to respond. I knew that the police had murdered Sam’s cousin three weeks earlier. His comment resonated with our essential question, but was somewhat disconnected from the quote. “So when we talk about crime, it is dangerous to only consider one perspective?” I looked around the room, hoping that other students would give their opinion. “Yeah, but also if everyone believes a story, then you can get away with a lot.” Sam was leaning forward, looking around the room for support. “Okay, so perspectives influence power. Interesting, do we agree or disagree with Sam?”
Sara raised her hand, “I mean, I agree, but White folk don’t commit as many crimes, so there might be some truth to the story. Police are here to protect us and all police are White.” I paused and looked around the room, waiting for a rebuttal. Sarah’s comment wasn’t out of the ordinary. As a rule, we named and talked about race, ethnicity, class, and gender. Yet, Eliza’s comment stuck with me. I suddenly felt ill equipped to address the conversation. How do I talk about this issue without implying than I am not White? How do I address Sam’s anger without ignoring my complicity within systems of oppression? Is it possible to do that while also emotionally connecting with my students? I had never felt more different from my students. I was the only White person in the room, a fact that had never truly bothered me before. The students were now arguing with each other over police brutality and White crime. I let the conversation flow without interruption, imagining how the conversation would shift if I had a different identity. One student called across the room. “Dude, Mary, have you ever been pulled over by the cops?” The classroom was quiet. I leaned against the back of the White board, my purple cardigan wiping off a part of the quote. I felt compelled to be vulnerable, to explain how conversations around power are both liberating and potentially painful. I noticed I was sweating. I took a deep breath. “Well,” I started hesitantly. “Nah, she is hella White!” A student interrupted, yelling from the back of the room. The classroom was filled with laughter once again. I smiled. At the beginning of my career, I never thought I would have to practice talking about my experiences with the police, or the source of my body odor. I never conceived that I would have to talk with students about the murder of their loved ones, or trauma. When I defined practice, it was devoid of the emotion and vulnerability required to teach. Being White, and what that meant in relation to my student’s lives was never a component of my English methods course. As students laughed, mocking me
for my identity, I knew that the practice of teaching should mirror the practice of living. There was no one-way to live. It all depended on the story of those involved.

**The Practice of Teaching**

After nine years of teaching, I left the classroom with more questions than answers. Teaching in Arizona uncovered a weak spot in my practice and in my preparation. I was never prepared to support linguistically diverse students, and believed that working in schools abroad would equip me with specific pedagogy to do just that. What I discovered was something more complex and personal. I certainly learned more literacy practices and strategies to support emergent bilinguals, but I also became both a teacher and student of language. The more I struggled with Thai and Spanish, the more I internalized the emotional impact of building relationships in a foreign language. I started to imagine how empathy and experiences contributed to effective pedagogy and to a more nuanced understanding of literacy. At the beginning of my teaching career, I measured my ability to teach by my students’ success on traditional assessments. Later, I started to realize that awareness of identity, culture, and beliefs were crucial in not only defining effective teaching but enacting it. After several years teaching, I began to internalize the relationship between power, identity, and beliefs and was more personally aware of the political nature of teaching and learning.

It wasn’t until I left the United States to work in a different country, in a different system, that I realized that there were countless ways to define effective teaching. Suddenly, the importance of my race, ethnicity, and gender to my job were starkly apparent to me. It mattered that I was American and White when I applied for international positions. It mattered even more that I was a native English speaker. In Thailand, the absurdity of an American woman teaching a British curriculum to Thai students, illustrated the impact of never considering students’
identities when developing and implementing curriculum. My story and the stories of my students began to matter. In Bolivia, the violence I witnessed from students against a way of speaking, and a way of being, paralleled the violence many immigrants feel within the US education system. Through the process of situating myself as a linguistic and cultural outsider, the hidden curriculum became a little less hidden. The larger societal influence on pedagogy and practice was central to the conversation.

When I finally made my way back to the United States, I was surprised to realize that in many ways, I was always an outsider. Not unlike the majority of White female teachers in schools serving communities of color, my race, ethnicity, and language was different from that of my students. While abroad, this difference was made apparent in nearly all interactions, but naming difference seemed almost controversial in the United States. Although I spoke about equity with my colleagues, it always felt uncomfortable addressing identity and power, specifically in terms of naming Whiteness. I even felt my own hesitation, and discomfort, when I talked about what it meant to be White, cisgendered, heterosexual, middle-class, or female. By the end of my classroom experience, I was starkly aware of what I didn’t know. At the same time, I was convinced that most of those lessons I had gleaned across those places and spaces of teaching could have been learned before I entered the classroom. I wanted to examine the possible ways we could support pre-service teachers in complicated notions of practice, specifically surrounding equity. I believed that if I had considered language, identity, and power differently, I may have been more effective with all of my students. I returned to graduate school in search of answers. Although I had worked as a literacy coach in several schools, I considered

2 Cisgendered can be defined as: denoting or relating to a person whose sense of personal identity and gender corresponds with their birth sex.
myself a stranger to the research and strategies supporting pre-service teachers. I was excited to apprentice into teacher preparation, and hopefully gain insight into why I had always felt I had been underprepared in my own teacher education program for the realities of the classroom.

**Becoming A Teacher Educator**

During my first week of graduate school, it came to my attention that the process of becoming an effective teacher, while nebulous, was far more concretized than the process of becoming a teacher educator. There was no formal apprenticeship available. There wasn’t even a description of the skills, knowledge, or experience necessary to support novice teachers. It was assumed that experience teaching made one sufficiently qualified to prepare the next generation of teachers. At the beginning of my second semester, I began to teach a reading methods course in the Secondary Humanities program. The course was connected to a clinical practicum experience. As the instructor, I was expected to both teach the course and to support students in the field at the local middle school. Although I had experienced practicum as a pre-service teacher, and supported student teachers in my own classroom, I still felt insecure defining effective practice for my students, especially around issues of equity. I felt confident as a teacher, and knew that while I was always learning and growing, I had the skills necessary to teach children. Yet, those skills didn’t all come at once. It was a slow maturation, an almost invisible progression.

By the time I was asked to teach preservice teachers, I knew what I didn’t know. What I *did* know, felt natural, like an extension of who I was, and, thus, difficult to articulate to novice teachers in my course. It felt impossible, and even problematic, to deconstruct my identity into discrete skills. How can you teach someone to build authentic relationships or value students’ lived experiences? I knew that what worked for me was contingent on who I was as a person,
and realized that in many ways teacher preparation was rooted in a process of becoming. The more I brainstormed how to teach effective practice, the more I realized that teaching and teaching about teaching were completely different skills.

I started to understand how and why teacher education programs relied so heavily on observation. Watching someone teach allowed candidates to both interpret and individualize practice, and to visualize the type of teacher they wanted to become. Yet, as some researchers of teacher education have emphasized, observation alone fails to create a space for candidates to explore the experiences and beliefs they bring to their current context (Darling-Hammond, 2006). By the time teacher candidates enroll in a licensure program, they have had already apprenticed into the education system and way of communicating and being. Consequently, they have already developed beliefs and a language around “effective” teachers and teaching and “effective” students and learning (Lortie, 1975). These experiences have the potential to leave an indelible mark on candidates, cementing beliefs about the teaching profession that persist throughout their preparation and into their teaching careers. Thus, the problem with using observation as the primary mechanism for learning is that without a framework, and a discussion of practice in relation to power, candidates can easily mirror oppressive pedagogy (Kumashiro, 2000). Ultimately, when considering teacher education, there is a need to engage teacher candidates in exercises that explicitly recognize and overcome how they have been apprenticed into a way of interpreting teaching and learning (Grossman, 1991).

Throughout the semester, teacher candidates frequently expressed a concern that there was very little time to reflect on their experience in the classroom and also rehearse and discuss instructional practices outside of the classroom setting. Moreover, they noted that examples of social justice practice were rarely actualized in school settings. One student questioned the
reality of social justice practice, imagining equity in schools as much more of a theoretical endeavor than a practical one.

In response to these criticisms, and my own hesitation around developing successful teacher education pedagogy, I began to collaborate with incoming and existing teacher candidates to design a space that was responsive to their feedback and attitudes about their clinical experience. I wanted to return to school to find a way to prepare teachers for the complexity and uncertainty of social justice teaching. I realized that if I went back in time, I would have benefited from a program that challenged me to ask questions, to dissect what I believed about teaching and learning as a practice in and of itself. I didn’t think about power, or identity, or language, or even love when I started teaching. Imagine what I would have come to understand if that was my starting point. Because I viewed my knowledge around teaching to be intimately linked with my identity, I knew that I couldn’t simply transmit this information to candidates. I needed to involve candidates, to find out who they were and what kind of teacher they imagined themselves to be. I needed to develop trust, and to ground preparation within practice. I didn’t become the teacher I was through a class, or a conversation. I built a practice, my practice, through vulnerability and hardship. In order to get students to know what they didn’t know, I knew they had to be involved, and they had to experience moments that would challenge them to reflect on their beliefs about education. I also knew that becoming an effective teacher educator was not something I could accomplish alone.

**Designing Teacher Education**

Months later, I was designing curriculum for a practice-based teacher education course with teacher candidates. While I hadn’t solved my hesitation around being a teacher educator, I had moved forward with a way to work with candidates to design their own preparation. For
nearly two months, English and Social Studies candidates had been meeting bi-weekly to propose ways to learn about social justice practice.

We were meeting at my house and I had cooked a frittata while several students were sitting around my dining room. A recorder sat in the middle of the table and everyone huddled close together, eating and chatting. A White woman in her thirties, started the design conversation. “We are exposed to a lot of information, every week. We need more time to go in depth.” Another candidate, a black male in his twenties, agreed and suggested having small groups for rehearsal. One White candidate in his thirties suddenly changed the conversation. “You know, I didn’t know that this was a social justice program. No one ever told me. I was surprised when everyone started talking about social justice. At first it was hard, and now I am on board, but I just think that is strange.” Another candidate leaned forward and started to laugh. “Are you serious? That explains so much!” Everyone agreed, and started to talk about their initial ignorance about the social justice nature of the program. I deliberately let the conversation flow without facilitation. When there was a pause I asked. “What about our class? Is there a social justice framework? Do we talk about social justice?” A candidate immediately replied. “No. We never talk about it.” A younger Latinx woman, around 22 years old said, “I disagree, everything we do is about race.” I leaned back in my chair and listened as another candidate chimed in. “I don’t think so, I think in our other classes we talk about social justice and in this class we practice it.”

“Exactly,” said a White 22 year-old woman and the only undergraduate present at design that week. “We practice it, thus it is part of it.” The conversation eventually led to ways that the social justice framework could be more “explicit.” The candidates suggested that the course needed to be more focused on structured practice. Instead of having them rehearse a new practice
every week based on their individual work, they wanted to design the course around a specific text. They believed that an anchor text that highlighted social justice themes would serve to ground the work in critical conversations while also allowing for annotation, direct instruction, and rehearsal to have more fluidity. I was struck by this sudden shift in the design of the course. I honestly thought that having more autonomy within the space would encourage students to take up instruction in more flexible and improvisational ways. While that was still happening in the class, what they were asking for in regards to the curriculum was more structure, and direct instruction. They were asking for an external text to guide conversations and design. The overall sentiment from the design meeting was that co-designing their own course was difficult when they still struggled with basic concepts around practice and justice. In their own way, the candidates argued that they were not ready to take on design without more exposure to teaching and a more explicit social justice framework. To them, the process of becoming an equity-minded teacher was about concrete practice, facilitation, and a clear commitment to social justice.

Studio

It was May 2015 when I sat down with students to design a practice-based course that approached their interpretation of effective preparation. In many ways, the meeting was serendipitous. When I started working as a teacher educator, I knew that both my students and I needed to engage differently, but I didn’t know where to begin. At the same time, the dean of the program was responding to criticism regarding clinical experiences and approached me with the possibility of a new collaborative course called Studio.

When it was originally conceived, the associate dean of teacher education at the time imagined a space where pre-service teachers and professors could go and “try on” ideas around
social justice practice and rehearse various instructional activities. She suggested that we create a Studio-like space where candidates could choose to drop in to attend to their confusion, struggles, and personal interpretation of practice. At the time, I had the luxury of also being a student, and I knew that while candidates would appreciate the creation of the space, very few would utilize it. In response, I suggested embracing the possibility of inviting candidates to contribute to their own preparation and I proposed a course where candidates could create and design new ways of teaching and learning. I wanted to keep the name Studio, to embrace the conception of teachers as artists, and practice as both a science and an art. The hope of Studio was to expose candidates to the structures, and existing elements of effective social justice teaching while allowing them to create unique interpretations. I argued that through exposure to the nuances of the craft of teaching, candidates would be able to analyze the talent of the individual educators they observed while also honoring them as fallible, and complicated professionals. As artists, teachers’ work is consumed publically, and thus Studio was also originally designed around public performance, inviting candidates to witness the rehearsal of practice. Rather than try and package what I had experienced as a teacher or to repackage research around what already existed regarding practice, I wanted to engage in inquiry, privileging a sense of ownership and agency that gives teaching worth.

The innovation of Studio argued that collectively, teacher educators and teachers should study our craft, dissect the scientific nature of our work, and provide novel and individual approaches towards practice. In regards to equity, I also had to consider the elements and structures that have been used in the past to teach for social justice. Consequently, the definition of practice, and the focus on equity were mutually exclusive—to define teachers as artists and as scientists, I also had to consider them activists. As Montano et al. (2002) argue, ‘many social
justice educators are, in fact, teacher activists in political and social movements working to bring about changes in educational policies that they perceive to be unjust’ (p. 265). Therefore, in developing social justice teachers, teacher educators had to begin to understand not only what candidates do in the classroom, but how they understand systems of oppression and engage in activism in their everyday lives.

In Studio, educator experience and educator identity were viewed as key components to the development of teacher practice. I define the practices of teaching as connected to the identities and commitments of those who enact them. As candidates become exposed to new theories or perspectives in the course, they view these through their already developed, well-established systems of knowledge and beliefs about teaching (Furlong, 2013; Taguchi, 2007). Thus, Studio was designed as a continuous process of unpacking and repacking what was already socialized, believed, and learned. While I was still figuring out what it meant to be a teacher educator, I knew that teacher education was not about exposure. It was about relating candidates’ experiences to other ways of thinking, and constructing new transgressive ways of being. Studio was proposed as a context in which these views of teacher education were purposefully integrated into the goals and processes pursued with candidates.

In order to offer responsive teacher education that acknowledges teacher preparation as an iterative process, it was important to understand in more detail who our candidates were when entering teacher education, as well as who they were shaping themselves into (Anspal et al., 2012; Beauchamp and Thomas, 2009; Furlong, 2013; Lamote and Engels, 2010). I wanted to challenge the assumption that there is a singular ‘teacher self’ or an essential ‘teacher identity’ (Britzman, 1986, 1991). The teachers that came before me and the communities in which I
worked shaped my different teaching selves. By collaboratively designing with students, I would be shaped again, hopefully into a social justice teacher educator.

To define the process of working towards social justice teaching and learning, I drew on theoretical frames rooted in social justice, specifically, the concept of anti-oppressive pedagogy (Kumashiro, 2000). Through this framework, I designed Studio with candidates to weave in reflective and performative processes alongside an iterative analysis of practice, and self. In the Studio curriculum, anti-oppressive practice was approached through designing inquiry opportunities for candidates to propose practices to discuss, to break apart, and to perform. Through anti-oppressive pedagogy, candidates were encouraged to not only engender but to expand upon notions of social justice pedagogy to include 1) teachers speaking back against “common sense” reforms such as scripted curriculum and standardized testing (Kumashiro, 2007); and 2) teachers connecting their role as educators to larger social justice movements (Cochran-Smith, 2004).

Central to the tenets of anti-oppressive practice is the understanding that the actual practice of anti-oppressive teaching is always in need of critique. As Kumashiro explains, “No practice, in and of itself, is anti-oppressive. A practice can be anti-oppressive in one situation and quite oppressive in another. Or it can be simultaneously oppressive in one way and anti-oppressive in another” (Kumashiro, 2015, p 15). Therefore, the fluid, context-specific, and highly subjective nature of practice makes it clear that anti-oppressive teaching is not an achievement as much as it is a process that requires constant reflection.

Rather than encouraging candidates to simply develop agency around social change or a realization of their role within oppressive systems, anti-oppressive education argues for candidates’ responsibility for both internal and external reflection and analysis. With no
consensus on how to teach in anti-oppressive ways, it requires educators, in all stages of development, to be continuously reflective about how any perspective on teaching and learning is and should be “partial” (Kumashiro & Ngo, 2007). Ultimately, candidates’ approach to practice remains incomplete, with candidates always in the process of becoming. There is no end goal. There is only the hope that through engagement in anti-oppressive frameworks, candidates will leave an education program with the tools and desire to continuously reflect, feel, and imagine their curriculum in the lives of the other.

Educational researchers have taken four primary approaches in both conceptualizing the nature of oppression as well as the curricula and pedagogies within social justice teacher education: Education for the Other; Education About the Other; Education that Is Critical of Privileging and Othering; and Education that Changes Students and Society (Kumashiro, 2000). These four conceptualizations guided the curricular decisions throughout Studio. Yet, rather than asking students to read articles focusing on anti-oppressive practice, I used anti-oppressive pedagogy as a theoretical compass for the design of the Studio curriculum, my facilitation, and my development as a social justice teacher educator.

During each Studio session, I facilitated conversations around practice and equity by implicitly addressing the type of education we were proposing. I highlighted power and oppression, deliberately attending to the identities in the room and our preconceptions. While anti-oppressive practice was woven throughout Studio, it was internalized mostly through my understanding of teacher education pedagogy, and through my desire to consider how to best support and prepare social justice teachers. Like the educational philosophies of practicing teachers, I envisioned anti-oppressive pedagogy to be first distilled through my practice, influencing the learning of teacher candidates. Since the design of Studio was about figuring out
how to develop the dispositions and actions of social justice teachers, I believed that to expose teachers to anti-oppressive approaches, I had to first start with myself. I had to recognize that I was still learning, and that I too required revision. I felt that through anti-oppressive practice it was possible that by asking students where they had been and where they were going, I too would find my path.

The Beginning

I wasn’t surprised by how excited candidates were for the idea of designing their own preparation. Whenever I asked students to give input into the classroom, I was always met with enthusiasm. I was, however, surprised by the suggestions students made, and the type of learning they wanted to engage in. While teaching high school in California, for example, I taught a student designed creative writing course. When I asked students what kind of writing they wanted to learn, they repeatedly mentioned the importance of learning grammar rules. When I asked why they felt that was their top priority, many students expressed their individual struggle with grammar and syntax, naming standardized writing as one of their weaknesses. When I approached candidates with the same opportunity, to provide ideas around practice and their development, they too started with what they didn’t know.

The practicum class was huddled in the teachers’ lounge at the local middle school. A White female candidate in her mid-forties raised her hand. “I really think that we need to practice lecturing. In this program, with the emphasis on social justice, it seems like it is bad to lecture at students. But, I see teachers do it all the time. I would love to learn more about how to lecture and be socially just.” Several candidates nodded in agreement. Another candidate suggested learning about classroom management. He was frustrated that there wasn’t a separate class focused on how to develop specific routines and procedures. Several other candidates argued for
more support with lesson design. Together, we continued to brainstorm possible ideas for the Studio curriculum. We had listed over ten themes on the board. I invited all of the candidates to participate in a design process later that week in order to synthesize all of their ideas and design future Studio sessions. I suggested that we meet bi-weekly to revisit the curriculum and re-design. “I will send an email gauging your interest in attending design team meetings. You do not have to participate in these meetings, but I would love you to still send ideas via email or text.” I passed out post-it notes to all of the students. “Before you head to your practicum class, I want you to write down a question that you specifically want to answer about teaching and justice. We will use these questions to figure out our collective inquiry.” A White female student in her mid-twenties raised her hand. “Any question? Can it be really simple like how do I get the class quiet?” The bell rang before I could answer. Middle school students ran down the hallway. “Your question can be anything,” I responded. “Make sure you write at least one before you leave. We will meet again next week. In the meantime, those who are available will design the content of our next sessions.” The candidates collected their bags, talking quietly about their other assignments for their “real” classes. I smiled at one of the teachers who was refilling her coffee mug in the back of the room. “Such enthusiasm,” she pointed in the direction of the candidates. “Yeah, they can’t wait,” I beamed.

The Design Team

During the first design team meeting, I spent the morning cleaning my house, and preparing food. It felt more like I was preparing for a party than a class. It was warm outside, so I set out chairs and food on my patio. I had a nervous energy, double-checking the tortillas and the fruit salad. I was excited to design this course with my novice teachers. I was even more excited to have an opportunity to build close relationships with them. I had only been away from the
classroom for a year but I already missed the relationships I had built with my students. I cared for the candidates that I worked for, but the culture of higher education made it challenging to build intimate relationships. I sat down outside, picking at the breakfast food. I was ready, and I had another 40 minutes before anyone arrived. Two weeks earlier, after our session in the middle school, I had sent out a survey asking candidates to provide dates and times that they were available to design. The majority of them could meet on a Friday. I knew that several candidates who had families, or second jobs were not going to attend these meetings. As I sat staring at a bowl of beans for the breakfast tacos, I considered how the design teams operated to exclude candidates who already faced extra challenges. While the purpose was to engage pre-service teachers in their own education, I may have inadvertently excluded voices that needed to be heard. I sighed heavily. The meeting hadn’t even started and I had already discovered a major flaw. I was about to write down ideas to address this issue when someone knocked on the door.

The first candidate arrived 30 minutes early. He sat on my living room couch as I finished the final preparations for breakfast. He casually talked to me about the success of his semester, his classes, and even his past work as a ski instructor. The conversation flowed easily. I already was feeling comfortable, more enthusiastic for the possibilities of this endeavor than the challenges. When other candidates arrived, they greeted each other with familiarity. I took on the role of host, passing out drinks and directing everyone to the chairs outside. At one point, two of my roommates came down to cook themselves breakfast. One White female candidate in her early twenties laughed. “It is weird to think of you as having roommates. You are like one of us.” I shared a glance with an older candidate who had overheard the exchange. “Yeah, I guess I am.” I laughed lightly. I reached for one of the small plates and started to make myself a taco.
Throughout the day candidates met my roommates’ cat, shared stories from their week in practicum, and argued for different approaches to their own development. I started the meeting by explaining that we were in charge of creating a provisional scope and sequence and structure for the other candidates participating in Studio. “Everything we brainstorm is subject to revision.” I showed students the existing structures that I had developed with the dean. “I think a great way to think about practice is to actually discuss real classrooms and real teachers. One structure that will be important in this course is video annotation. You will record your practicum classrooms each week, choose a short clip from the week, upload it to a video software, and discuss the video online.” A White male student in his mid twenties raised his hand. “You don’t have to raise your hand Jonathan.” I leaned forward and took his plate. “Are you done?” “Yeah. Thanks.” He looked around at the other candidates. “I like the idea of looking at real teachers, and talking about our practicum experience, but isn’t that invasive? I don’t want our practicum teachers thinking we are evaluating them.”

As I put his plate in the sink, I smiled. I had considered this too, and was proud that he was already worried about the professionalization of teachers. “We have already talked to them and they are fine with it,” I responded. “We aren’t evaluating them, we are learning from them. Tell you what, let’s start the filming and then see how it feels. If everyone hates it we will do something else.” Jonathan sat back in his lawn chair and took a sip of coffee from a Darth Vader mug that my husband had brought home from a White elephant party. “Yeah, that makes sense.”

As the meeting progressed, I explained the other major structures of the Studio course. We discussed how we would both analyze videos from practicum as well as rehearse those practices. While I spoke, candidates wrote down questions, concerns and adaptations to the existing structures. The meeting felt informative and casual. After an hour of discussion, we
moved inside. The dishes from breakfast were piled in the sink. We collected in the living room, with several candidates sitting on the floor or the edge of couches. We had an idea for how we would start Studio the following week, engaging students in defining practice and justice. Handwritten post-it notes, and documents lay scattered across the living room table. I looked down at the notes I had taken during the whole class discussion earlier in the week. “Guys, I was wondering how we make sure that everyone feels included. Even if you can’t attend these meetings regularly, I want your ideas to be presented. I am going to ask that everyone submit an audio journal to me including information about his or her week and ideas for Studio. What do you think?”

Students nodded. They liked the idea of audio journals if they were individualized and private. It was argued, however, that they shouldn’t be a requirement. “I want to be able to tell you about the week and make suggestions but I hate forced reflection,” a White female candidate in her early twenties argued. “We have to do that for every course!” Other students chimed in. “Yeah, Mary, I don’t want to sound weird, but I also hate the sound of my voice.” I listened to candidates, and asked the ones interested to try it out and report back their feelings. I explained that both teaching and learning to teach could be an isolating endeavor. With each school that I worked at, I found that conversations with experienced educators helped me to examine my practice. My suggestion around audio journals was an attempt to mirror such interaction and to link reflection with design. Several candidates started packing up. “Sorry, Mary, we got to go.” I looked at my phone. We had already been meeting for three hours. “We are into the audio journal. Let’s see how it goes,” a White male student in his early twenties responded, clearing away the extra dishes. As the last candidate left my house, an alarm sounded on my phone. It
was a reminder to set some sort of closure activity for the day. I laughed out loud. “Well,” I thought, “I liked our ending anyways.”

It was early evening. I was washing the dishes from the meeting, reflecting on the conversation and attendance. It felt like we had accomplished a lot, but at the same time, we had only agreed on the structures that previously were proposed and we designed the first day of the course. I was tired. My hands covered in soap, I started to daydream, thinking back to how many first days I had already had—the first day of teaching, my first day in a new country, my first day as a coach. There was something different about this first day though. The same feelings of uncertainty and excitement were there. Yet, this time, it didn’t feel entirely my own. It felt like my first day as a teacher educator, but it also belonged to my students. It would be their first day too.

The Structure of Studio

We were seated in a makeshift circle in the middle school library. I started out explaining the framework that students had designed in the meeting. “In this course, you will not learn how to be a champion. I am not going to tell how to move your body, or the trick to controlling students, or the best vocabulary exercise. I am going to tell you what I know, but more importantly, I am going to explain how I got here. Last week, you were asked to write down a question that you wanted to answer about teaching and justice. As you can see, we placed all of these questions around the room.” I pointed to the questions around the library. “We are going to use your ideas to design the content of this course. In pairs, consider these questions and craft one question that captures the overall inquiry you see. When you finish, write it on the board.”
Students immediately responded, walking around the room with their markers and notebooks, chatting quietly. I didn’t have a partner, but I participated in the activity. The library was full of middle school students, either checking out books or playing computer games. It was the 6th grade lunch period, and several students looked over at our group with curiosity. As I walked around the room, I recorded students question in a Google doc.

1. How can I be the best teacher I can be?
2. How can you be political without being “political”
3. How do you keep being curious as they grow through your classroom?
4. How do we continue our work as social justice advocates during the first year(s) of teaching? How do we keep ourselves safe during this process? (And hopefully our jobs)
5. What does it mean to exist as a woman of color in a system, which was created to promote Whiteness in a way that pushes against that? How can I voice myself more?
6. What does it look like to be a social justice teacher?
7. How can I encourage understanding and foster a peaceful exchange of ideas and learn together?
8. Who gets to decide who gets to be teachers?
9. What does a social justice classroom look like?
10. How can I become a good teacher in today’s intense political, religious centered world?
11. What does it mean to care about students as individuals?
12. Who should be allowed to teach?
13. How can we be loving and professional teachers? Do we need to be both?
14. How do we call a spade a spade? For example, how do we recognize what is unacceptable, offensive, and call it out while maintaining respect, acceptance and understanding?

15. How can we actually create a safe space for kids and not just hang a poster saying it is a safe space?

16. How can we teach current issues without taking a political stance? Can we effectively teach current issues in the classroom?

17. How can we maintain each students’ dignity regardless of opinion, first impression etc.?

18. How do you protect students’ rights to an opinion while protecting that opinion could potentially hurt?

19. Is it wrong to allow space for alternative opinions as long as they don’t attempt to harm others?

20. What kind of teacher do you want to be?

21. How do you make lessons that include everyone? (ALWAYS)

22. Isn’t identity and belief put together? How do we separate these in the classroom?

23. Why have we been forced to think that politics are the worst taboo in teaching?

24. How do you know your identity can positively shape the classroom and your students?

25. How do I teach social justice matters without bias?

26. Can presenting both sides of the issue be a way to take the edge of a heated issue?

27. What if we do our best to create a safe warm, caring place but fail? If we can’t keep politics out, or in, or if a kid who is struggling doesn’t (or can’t) speak out?

28. How can I use my identity and beliefs together to be an effective and social justice supporter for all students?
29. If you’re a teacher that takes a stance to support students politically how do you keep it up if other teachers or administration put you down? Do you continue?

30. How do we balance the ideas of “identity trumps beliefs with “safe spaces” in classrooms where students/parents/teachers see their beliefs as their identity?

31. How do we convince our students to trust us even if they have different beliefs and views?

32. How do you know if your teaching is effective?

33. How do you be an effective moderator for controversial topics of discussion and maintain a neutral, safe classroom?

34. How can we value student identities first, and our beliefs second?

35. What is the role of political discourse in learning?

36. How do we deflect the inevitable hostility that can arise during these types of discussions?

37. How can teachers use politicization of education to their advantage?

After the silent gallery walk, I put students in groups of three, asking them to combine their question ideas, and come up with one group question. “Use the Google Doc I sent to your email as a reference. Consider the questions you generated in response to your colleagues ideas and create a group question on the bottom of the document.” I gave directions and walked around the room listening to students’ ideas. I projected the Google Doc on the board, so that everyone could see the whole class brainstorming session. The following questions were created from the larger list:

1. As teachers, how do we create safe and effective learning spaces that foster the identity and preserve the dignity of all students?
2. How can we be both effective educators, and advocates for social justice, while maintaining the dignity and individual identities of our students and ourselves?

3. How do we create an all-inclusive environment where everyone feels welcome to share?

4. How do we effectively create a concretely inclusive environment that is supportive of both social justice, and learning?

5. How can we/is it possible to create a safe space where politics and beliefs are allowed to coexist without taking advantage of the discussions?

6. How do you instill social justice in your classroom? How do we become the best social justice teachers?

7. What does it mean to care about students as individuals in a social justice classroom?

The group questions were projected on the board. I stood at the front of the room. “One thing I am noticing, that I am surprised about, is the fact that no one has asked any question about their content. Do you want to include questions about your discipline? You are taking the nature of social studies and a literature class right now, are those included in this list?” One student raised their hand. “Yeah, but aren’t we answering these questions through our content? If I am caring for students as individuals, won’t that look differently depending on who I am and what I teach?” Two students in another group agreed. I smiled. “I think that is a very good point. Okay, let’s keep this list.”

I asked students to vote anonymously on the Google doc for their favorite question and challenged students to revise. The students voted for the following question: As teachers, how do we create safe and effective learning spaces that foster the identity and preserve the dignity of all students? I highlighted the question in blue. “What are we missing? If we ask this question
throughout the semester, will your individual question be answered?” A Latinx student in her
early twenties raised her hand. I think we need to be specific. We have to say the word social
justice. You can answer this question and not teach for equity.” The conversation continued, with
student arguing about the contentiousness of the word “social justice.” I finally settled the debate
by reminding students that because we were engaging in inquiry, our question may change.
Revision was a key part of the process. “I am going to put the word social justice in this
question, we will analyze what we mean by social justice, and decide if it is repetitive to include
it. Does that work?” Several students nodded, while others still appeared frustrated with the
conversation. I rewrote our essential question: As social justice teachers, how do we create safe
and effective learning spaces that foster the identity and preserve the dignity of all students?
“Now, we are going to come back to this question every week. It is going to be the frame in
which you inquire about the complexities of your practicum classroom. As you mentioned,
fostering the identity of students in the classroom is going to look different depending on who
you are, who your students are, and what you teach. We are going to have different answers for
this question ever week. We want to support each other in providing answers.”

This activity, and the structure of the day, was designed collaboratively during the initial
design meeting. Candidates suggested including everyone in design by initially developing a
semester-long essential question addressing issues of power and equity in the classroom. By
strategically designing the essential question around challenging oppression, candidates hoped to
engage in conversations around their responsibility to constantly inquire and challenge inequity.
When the essential question was generated, I read it aloud to the class. “As social justice
teachers, how do we create safe and effective learning spaces that foster the identity and preserve
the dignity of all students? This is a great question. This is a big question. How are we going to
know that we are answering this question? What are you going to see in classrooms that will you
give insight into anti-oppressive classroom culture?” I stood in front of the White board, waiting
for ideas. Two middle school students were playing Minecraft on the computer next to me,
seemingly ignoring our conversation. Candidates began describing different practices they
observed at the middle school. “The other day I saw this really cool thing. The school was doing
this anti-bullying thing, and my cooperating teacher had students write notes about what they
wished their teachers knew about them. I thought that was really cool.” I wrote “encouraging
vulnerability” on the board. “What about wind chimes?” A student suggested from the back of
the room. “One teacher uses wind chimes to call the students’ attention.”

“How about I call that tone setting?” I asked, writing quickly. The student agreed. “What
about our content? Where are we going to see these practices through English and through Social
Studies?” I hoped students would draw on their coursework, naming discipline specific practices
they had already explored. “In the literature class we practiced reading texts in ways that matter.
We had this really cool interactive gallery walk activity and a tableau activity,” a White male
student in his twenties commented. “In social studies we practice project-based teaching. We do
the projects so we can understand how to make them,” another female student added in. I jotted
down ideas until there was no more room on the board. I transitioned the conversation, “So we
have a lot of ways that we have seen teachers answer our essential question. I want to suggest a
way that we are going to take these ideas and answer the question for ourselves.” I projected the
following image on the board.
For the rest of the session, I used the image to describe the components of Studio that we had agreed upon during the design team meeting. There were two processes that were essential to the design of Studio. The first, represented in the image above was the process of capturing and decomposing practice. The second was the collaborative design of the Studio curriculum, explained in detail below. In conjunction with Studio, candidates were placed in schools for 1-2 days a week and were asked to perform under realistic pressures and experiences and to capture those experiences on video. Positioned as experts, candidates had complete autonomy regarding what they captured, either reflecting on their own or their cooperating teachers’ practice. They were then asked to explain their video relative to the class essential question, focusing both on the representation of practice, but also how the practice reinforced or challenged inequitable structures in schools.
While away from their placements, candidates’ facilitated discussions using an online video annotation software called TALENT to asynchronously discuss practice with their colleagues, closely analyzing both novice and expert pedagogy, specifically focusing on issues of equity. Through an online discussion that took place before Studio, candidates revisited the essential question. Sometimes they considered how race was operating at their practicum site. Other times, they were more concerned with the overall classroom culture. Yet, no matter their focus, they explained the classroom in relation to content specific practices. For example, ELA candidates rooted their conversations around race in literature, exploring the identity of characters and the way their cooperating teachers used language to support textual understanding. For Social Studies candidates, they explored the perspectives of history and how their cooperating teachers included various primary and secondary documents to challenge a hegemonic view of people across time. The differences between their content led to more nuanced approaches towards practice, with Social Studies candidates challenging English candidates to consider the historical context of texts and ELA candidates reminding Social Studies candidates to consider the narrative structure of history.

The conversation around practice typically began online. In Studio each week, candidates: 1) discussed one video relevant to their essential question and their content, 2) designed individual teaching practices using a theme generated from the video, 3) rehearsed the practice with peers, and 4) received whole class and small group feedback. Thus, if several students were engaged in a conversation around culturally sustaining text-based conversations, candidates would analyze which practices contributed to culturally sustaining text-based conversations at their practicum site. They would then collectively design a way to enact one or two of those practices, and rehearse. At the end of each class, we would try to go back to the
essential question, considering how understanding the initial practice, within their content area, supported our inquiry. Video annotation and rehearsal embodied the inquiry process within Studio. They were constant structures that were re-designed based on student reflection within Studio and during the design team meetings.

When we talked through this process during the first Studio course, candidates were concerned with capturing the “right” practices. Admittedly, so was I. While I wanted students to examine classrooms in relation to equity and power, I also wanted them to recognize the difficulty of the profession and to honor the teachers that they worked with. Schools can be really dehumanizing spaces. If you examine them in relation to that dehumanization, it is easy to paint teachers and administrators as simply perpetrators of oppression without considering their role within a larger system. I imagined candidates filming me my first year. I shuddered to consider how I would be described. I was well intentioned. Yet, without the right training, I perpetuated problematic ideologies around race, language and identity. In Arizona, I was blind to my Whiteness and to the hegemony of English in a majority bilingual state. In Thailand and Bolivia, I was largely blind to how culture, race, ethnicity, and imperialism operated in my classroom. In California, I was afraid of addressing Whiteness and what that meant for my relationship with my students. In Studio, I wanted candidates to decompose practice in ways that revealed all of our blind spots, making it safe to express our fears. I wanted to treat both teachers and candidates with compassion, imagining myself in every classroom and within every activity.

Yet, it was only the first day. There was only so much we could do. We talked through ways of examining practice as suggestive rather than evaluative, and as a deeply personal and individualized endeavor. “I think it is important that we are cautious,” I said, pointing to the questions on the diagram. “This is why we are going to ask questions rather than making claims.
We are going to consider practice in relation to our identities, our own preconceptions of what is ‘normal’ in teaching and learning. We are going to talk about the teachers you work with as mentors, recognizing that we never become a social justice teacher. Rather, we are always in the process of reflecting and re-designing. It is a process not a product.” I looked around the room. I could still sense hesitation. I knew we would have to come back to this framing and that I would also struggle viewing classrooms with love instead of judgment. I realized that in order to position practice as the heart of our work in Studio, I needed to model the reflection and iteration required. “We will have this conversation a lot,” I said smiling. “We are just going to have to practice it.”

The Co-Design Process

The second process essential to the design of Studio was incorporating student feedback and design into the course. Collectively, we decided to hold design team meetings every two weeks. The meetings would focus on choosing particular videos from TALENT that were engaging or thought provoking. Design team members would choose videos that they thought would help them understand a distinct practice or instructional activity. During the design team meeting we would watch the video, decompose the practice and consider what kinds of questions we needed to ask in order to develop into social justice educators. We would then plan out a two and a half hour session, engaging in the video and the practice.

During the first Studio session, I openly expressed my concern around excluding candidates who had outside responsibilities and commitments. Several students agreed. “It is even difficult for people who don’t live in town, and have to commute. We already have to go to practicum,” one candidate argued. In response, I explained the use of audio journals as a possible solution. “If you don’t have a specific practice you want to consider during class that week, you
can still use the audio journal to connect with me, ask questions about your own classroom, or even the program in general.” I tried to sound as enthusiastic as possible, recognizing that like the candidates in the initial design team meeting, I would have resistance to mandated reflection. “It will be entirely optional, of course. I just want to ensure that your voice is heard. If you want something to happen in Studio, and can’t attend the meeting, you can send an audio journal.” I projected the next image on the screen. “Here is how co-design and audio journals might contribute to the design of the space. However, this is simply a proposal, everything is up for revision.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Considerations When Designing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio Course</td>
<td>❑ What happened the previous week?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ Where are we at in our development of our anti-oppressive practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ Where do we still need to go?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ Considering all of the discussions and rehearsal, how are we collectively understanding our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>essential question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Development</td>
<td>❑ How are we looking at ourselves, and our positionalities in relation to practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ How are we challenging dominant narratives of teaching and learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ How are we designing and rehearsing for all students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ How are we designing for everyone in the space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Journals</td>
<td>❑ Do our stories tell of experiences that recognize intersectionality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ How do we frame teaching and teachers at the practicum site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ How do we talk about ourselves?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ In which ways do we only have part of the story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ How are certain identities excluded, silenced, invisible, distorted and marginalized in our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stories?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ In what ways do our stories disrupt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ How are we privileging ourselves in the story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALENT videos and conversations</td>
<td>❑ What might students feel when__?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ How do you feel when _________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ Where is their room for transformation or change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑ Who has power and who does not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is hidden? What is privileged? What is marginalized?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do your individual goals around justice and practice ignore_______?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the contradictions in this?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>Who was included and excluded from instruction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do we focus on the negative experiences of our students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is positive?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What practices are being highlighted on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What practices are invisible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is learning defined?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is teaching defined?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is knowledge defined?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: The Co-design components of Studio

The table above illustrates the tools and structures considered during design. While each design team meeting was focused on planning two weeks of Studio, candidates drew ideas from concepts expressed in the course, online video annotation in TALENT, and their own experiences at practicum. I brought major themes or ideas from the audio journals into the conversation, maintaining the anonymity of the participants. When we discussed various experiences or structures, we did so by asking questions to consider the next step in design. Candidates told the story of practicum, but were challenged to dissect that story in relation to how they were focusing on both the positive and negative experiences of students. When we discussed the videos analyzed in TALENT we also dissected emotion, the interaction between candidates online, and ways to approach the videos with more complexity in the Studio course. As I showed the image to candidates I explained that the Studio design would attempt to synthesize potentially contradictory experiences in schools and coursework. The hope was that through constantly responding to our inquiry, we could re-conceptualize social justice practice.

The Curriculum of Studio
The curriculum of Studio, which is detailed in the rest of this book, is representative of approaches presented across various semesters of the course. By the time I wrote this book, I had facilitated Studio for three years, working with five different cohorts of candidates. Design Teams were formed every semester, allowing each group of candidates to design and redesign their approach to anti-oppressive practice. Each semester students responded differently to video annotation, rehearsal, audio journals, and design. They composed unique and sometimes ideologically opposing questions, changing the overall trajectory of the course. The Studio curriculum below is an amalgamation of these cohorts, drawing on examples of lessons and interactions that provided insight into what it meant to be both a social justice teacher and teacher educator. All lessons provided are situated in the political and cultural moment of the time, with practice, and conversations around justice reflecting pressing narratives and policies. With each chapter I include some backstory to the lessons, describing how and why these particular practices were considered relevant. While there is a sequence to the curriculum, arguing for a possible structure for supporting the development of social justice candidates and teacher educators, this structure should be seen as only one possibility. I will include possible variations for each session, based on the co-design process, and the needs of candidates as well as a detailed description of my own development as a consequence of this work. In the following curriculum I attend to the flexibility and spontaneity of the Studio process. I attempt to illustrate the organic nature of co-design, recognizing that while the curriculum is a useful guide for social justice teacher education, it is the process, the relationships, and the candidates that transform the curriculum into practice.
Practice Within the Curriculum

The studio curriculum below includes lesson steps, suggested materials, relevant handouts, as well as a description of the selected teacher practice for the week. The curriculum is designed for teacher educators with a teacher educator focus and an anti-oppressive approach to each lesson. The curriculum is also broken into phases, including a detailed description of the phase, its assessments, and how the studio structures were utilized throughout. There is a curricular overview for each semester that provides a guide to how practice is both defined and approached throughout the course.

During the first semester of Studio, candidates gradually developed responsibility for not only defining the practices necessary to be an equity focused teacher, but also the iterative reflective processes that are associated with an anti-oppressive approach towards their development. In supporting candidates to develop into social justice teachers, it is crucial to motivate candidates to not only participate in Studio but to design and reflect on their own development. The phases of the first semester curriculum emphasize opportunities for candidates to inquire, refine, add, and discard ideas of social justice teaching practice. Throughout the semester, candidates were not expected to come to a concrete definition of any concepts around social justice teaching, but rather were encouraged to define key terms in relation to their own experience with schooling. As candidates began the design process they critically inquired about the teacher they wanted to become, and how this conception was both matched and mismatched with their current preparation. This process was rooted in critical reflection. Candidates also developed a working theory of anti-oppressive practice through inquiry and conversations around Kumashiro’s (2002) four components of anti-oppressive practice. Candidates used their conceptualization of practice and anti-oppressive pedagogy to design the course, experience the
course as both students and facilitators, and also critically reflect on both their designs and their experiences throughout the program.

Various educational researchers who advocate for practice-based approaches in teacher preparation conceive of practice as something that: (1) Occurs with high frequency in teaching, (2) Candidates can begin to master, (3) Candidates can enact in classrooms across different curricula or instructional approaches, (4) Are research-based and have the potential to improve student achievement, (5) Allow candidates to learn more about students and about teaching, and (6) Preserve the integrity and complexity of teaching (Grossman et al., 2009; TeachingWorks.org, 2013). The studio curriculum expands upon this criteria, involving candidates in the construction of practice. In the Studio curriculum, the following is included in the definition of practice: 1) Is enacted with the purpose of developing equitable community, relationships, and learning, and 2) Is reflected upon by candidates and teachers as something connecting to their identity and individual goals. The expansion of the definition of practice to include equity and individual perspective is an attempt to add clarity to how teacher educators understand and implement practice in situated teacher education courses.

In the design of Studio, the notion of practice is contained within discipline specific instructional activities (IA) (Lampert et al., 2013). Since the course is designed with secondary humanities candidates, the exploration of practice is often situated within a routine that can support later classroom enactment. Yet when defining practice, it is important to consider the discipline, the identity of the participants, and their actions towards social justice. These considerations vastly change how the practice is both performed and analyzed. Rather than aiming for replication of expert practice, it is viewed as inherently complex and improvisational
(Lampert, Beasley, Ghousseini, Kazemi, & Franke, 2010). It is rooted in the lived experiences of teacher candidates and their students, and it is always in conversation with equity.

In the following curriculum, instead of highlighting the instructional moves present within a specific practice, analysis of practice occurs around such concepts as humanization, challenging power, de-socializing from hegemony, and building towards something new. Students decompose practice considering justice, and recompose various practices in relation to their own pedagogy. To support a social justice approach to teaching, considering various approaches to core practices and social justice, the Studio curriculum also illustrates the iterative process of critique and inquiry that students engaged in each week. After each lesson, candidates evaluated the instructional activities and routines they rehearsed in Studio, considering their relevancy in public schools but also rehearsing ways to challenge them.

Overall, the curriculum tells the story of all of the participants in Studio. It summarizes ways that candidates interpreted practice at their practicum site, decomposed practice in Studio, enacted practice during rehearsal and their teach days, and designed teacher education practice to better themselves and each other. The lesson plans play an important part in this story, but the voices of candidates,’ specifically their analyses and experiences do as well. Yet, unlike a typical story, there is no one-way to engage in this curriculum—there is no designated beginning or end. Each lesson works collectively to engross the teacher educator in the complex and visceral experience of listening, honoring, and interacting with candidates to support their development into teachers.
CHAPTER 5
ARTICLE TWO

Behind the Curtain: Structuring Preservice Teacher Education for Social Justice Teaching

Identities

The process of becoming a teacher is nuanced and complex. The process of becoming a teacher who actively fights against oppression is considerably more complex and multifaceted. In developing future critical educators, teacher educators are faced with the dilemma of supporting candidates to not only see themselves as teachers by the end of their preparation, but also, in many ways, as activists (Portilio & Malott, 2011). According to Portilio and Malott (2011), a teacher activist is aware of the sociocultural and sociopolitical realities that impact students in underserved communities and are prepared to pedagogically respond to those realities. With an orientation towards equity, an activist considers their practice as a disruption of inequitable systems and policies.

Yet, to attend to the development of activist teachers, we must first overcome the challenge that preservice candidates are treated and self-identify as both students and teachers. Thus, developing into a teacher requires that individuals learn how to think, know, feel, and act like a teacher (Fieman-Nemser, 2008), while simultaneously maintaining the role of a student. Furthermore, while many teacher candidates may be able to acknowledge the value of multicultural perspectives in the classroom, many have not acquired understanding of the structural and institutionalized inequalities that contribute to student access and achievement (Castro, 2010). Teacher education programs committed to social justice are required to not only push candidates to interpret their learning as both teachers and students, but to define that learning in relation to confronting deficit orientations towards students and families, and accept
responsibility for combating educational and societal injustices (Portilio & Malott, 2011). Without attending to candidates’ identity development in both of these areas, Teacher Education Programs (TEP) risk educating teachers who will perpetuate oppression in their classrooms (e.g., Palmer & Mendard-Warwick, 2012).

In the context of research on how teacher education programs address the complexity of social justice teacher development, this study describes the process of co-designing a course for preservice teachers in Secondary English and Social Studies that attends to some of the complexities associated with enacting social justice pedagogy. Drawing on theories of the dialogical self (e.g., Bakhtin, 1981; Hermans, 2002), I established a new clinical course in the context of a university-based secondary teacher education program. This course, which was referred to as “Studio,” invited candidates to explore and enact teaching identities closely aligned with new forms of social justice teaching. It did so by inviting students to engage in discursive engagements often absent from traditional teacher preparation experiences that tend to privilege reading and discussion over design and enactment. Through their participation and design of the course, preservice teachers were positioned as collaborators and designers of their own preparation, allowing for opportunities to both design as teachers and experience what they designed as students. They were also encouraged to conceptualize teaching as a political act throughout the co-design process and were challenged to reconsider their beliefs around effective teaching and learning.

In this study, I draw on the yearlong experience of a secondary humanities preservice teacher in Studio. This exploration was guided by the following questions: 1) In what ways do preservice teachers negotiate teaching and activist/anti-oppressive identities as part of their participation in a studio-based course that creates and invites discursively diverse forms of
engagement and participation? 2) In this context, how does the process of co-designing a methods course relate to how teacher candidates conceptualize and perform those identities? In exploring these questions, I draw upon an interdisciplinary cohort of research in the areas of Social Justice Teacher Education (SJTE), Practice-Based Teacher Education (PBTE), and theories of the Dialogical Self (DST).

Theoretical Framework and Related Literature

Teacher Identity

The concept of teacher identity has gained considerable attention in studies of contemporary education (see, e.g. Alsup 2006; Atkinson 2004; Cohen 2008, 2010; Day and Kington 2008; and Trent 2011), as educational researchers have increasingly acknowledged that teacher identity plays a significant role in teacher development (Rodgers & Scott, 2008). For example, teacher identity can affect teacher motivation, satisfaction, and commitment (Day et al., 2006). Examining identity provides a possible explanation as to how and why candidates apply preconceived visions of “effective” teaching, (Horn et al, 2008) either adopting or rejecting information based on their beliefs and experiences. Envisioning teacher education pedagogy around the development of teacher identity encourages provocative alternatives to traditional teacher education. It does so by privileging an approach to pedagogy and practice centered on a candidate’s negotiation of self rather than emphasizing a particular strategy or activity.

Developing social justice teaching identities “comes not just from what a person does, or his or her affiliations, but also from what a person believes, what a person values, and what a person wants to become” (Helms, 1998, p. 812). In this study, I aimed to highlight both the multiplicities and the complexities of teacher identity. I wished to challenge the assumption that there is a singular ‘teacher self” or an essential ‘teacher identity’ (Britzman, 1986). For instance,
although this study examines how candidates shaped and were shaped by the experiences of co-designing a secondary humanities methods course, I do not purport to define a sense of fixed identity. I view my investigation into teachers’ developing social justice practice and identities as a way to support them in taking up nuanced considerations of how their beliefs, experiences and identities intersect to form their future teaching selves. Drawing on studies in teacher education that view teacher identity as an ongoing process that forms through dialogues in various contexts and relationships (Akkerman & Meijer 2011; Alsup 2006; Beijaard, Meijer, and Verloop 2004; Varghese et al. 2005), I approach the formation of social justice teacher identity from a dialogical point of view. Thus, I define social justice teacher identity as developing through interchanges between many possible teaching and emerging teaching selves, where various identity positions have their own motivation and expression.

In order to understand how a dialogical approach towards teacher preparation can work in tandem with a more partial, feminist and iterative approach to practice, I also draw on Kumashiro’s (2004) concept of anti-oppressive pedagogy. Kumashiro defines anti-oppressive teaching as,

> a process where teachers work, paradoxically with knowledge, that is, to simultaneously use knowledge to see what different insights, identities, practices, and changes it makes possible while critically examining that knowledge (and how it came to be known) to see what insights and the like it closes off. (p. 8-9)

Central to Kumashiro’s tenets of anti-oppressive teaching is the understanding that the actual practice of anti-oppressive teaching is always in need of being problematized. “No practice, in and of itself, is anti-oppressive. A practice can be anti-oppressive in one situation and quite oppressive in another. Or it can be simultaneously oppressive in one way and anti-oppressive in
another” (2015, p 15). Thus, the fluid, context-specific, and highly subjective nature of practice makes it clear that becoming an anti-oppressive teacher is not an achievement as much as it is a process that requires constant reflection.

With links between feminist, critical, multicultural, queer, postcolonial, and other movements toward social justice, anti-oppressive education fails to propose a concrete definition of an anti-oppressive teaching identity. Rather, in conversation with other approaches to social justice teaching, it negotiates the meaning of the concepts of social justice, inquiry, reflection and practice. Rather than encouraging candidates to simply develop agency around social change or a realization of their role within oppressive systems, anti-oppressive education argues for candidates’ responsibility for both internal and external reflection and analysis. With no consensus on how to teach in anti-oppressive ways, it requires educators, in all stages of development, to be continuously reflective about how any perspective on teaching and learning is and should be “partial” (Kumashiro & Ngo, 2007).

An anti-oppressive teaching identity encourages an approach to Social Justice Teacher Education (SJTE) that defines the importance of reflection and inquiry in the process of becoming a teacher while arguing for deliberate action against oppression by both teachers and teacher educators alike. Like anti-oppressive practice, candidates’ identity remains incomplete, with candidates always in the process of becoming. There is no end goal. There is only the hope that through engagement in anti-oppressive frameworks, candidates will leave an education program with the tools and desire to continuously reflect on their role within oppressive systems and to disrupt inequitable practices and policies.
Dialogical Approach to an Anti-oppressive Teacher Identity

Inspired by the dialogical self-theory (DST) described by Hermans, Kempen, and Van Loon (1992), I explore the development of anti-oppressive teachers across a number of preparation contexts and experiences. Dialogical self-theory provides a sociocultural framework of identity that acknowledges the existence of an embodied and centralized individual self (Hermans, 2002; Hermans et al., 1992). This self may be more accurately described as a collection of relatively autonomous selves, or I-positions, between which the self fluctuates (Hermans, 2002; Raggatt, 2012). According to this theory, an ‘I-position’ of a teacher, “is a particular voice that has been internalized in one's self-presentation” (Akkerman et al., 2012, p. 230). Akkerman and Van Eijck (2013) posit that the I-position connects the concept of voice to a person's identity. In DST these I-positions or selves emerge through historical, cultural, social, and institutional relationships and experiences (Hermans, 2002; Leijen & Kullasepp, 2013).

One way to come to an understanding of the complexity of anti-oppressive teacher preparation is to look closely at the reservations, dilemmas, and uncertainties that teachers experience throughout their preparation. Studying teachers’ self-dialogues reveals the individual identity struggles teachers face in becoming both teachers and activists. In this study, I specifically draw on Akkerman and Meijer (2011) who applied this framework to teachers’ professional identity development by emphasizing three foundational dimensions of identity: Multiplicity and Unity, Social and Individual, and Discontinuity and Continuity. Through this framework, I explore how candidates’ I-positions change in response to the various engagements in Studio. I explore how some I-positions are more dominant or more familiar than others (Hermans, 2003), and how conflicts between different I-positions are indications of a useful and productive interaction towards social justice teaching.
Methods

In this section, I discuss the design and enactment of Studio including the context, participants, data collection, and analysis. Specifically, I detail the structure of Studio in relation to candidates’ enrollment in a secondary humanities licensure program. As an extension of clinical experiences, I also explain how Studio was designed in relation to existing field-based experiences and practice-based teacher preparation frameworks. I conclude with a description of my participants and rationale for focusing my analysis on the experiences of one candidate in this study.

Study, Course, and Curriculum Design

This investigation draws on growing research in the field of education that employs participatory design research (PDR) as a qualitative methodology (Bang & Vossoughi, 2016). PDR emerges from and reflects different research traditions (Bell, 2004), especially design-based research (DBR) (Brown, 1992; Cobb, Confrey, diSessa, Lehrer, & Schauble, 2003; Sandoval & Bell, 2004) and design-based implementation research (Penuel, Fishman, Cheng, & Sabelli, 2011; Penuel, Coburn, & Gallagher, 2013). PDR is also in conversation with bodies of work that deliberately attempt to challenge how roles and relationships are conceived within the research process such as participatory action research (Fine et al., 2003; Whyte, 1991), youth participatory action research (Cammarata & Fine, 2008; Kirshner, 2010; Mirra, Garcia, & Morrell, 2015), and decolonizing methodologies (Paris & Winn, 2013; Patel, 2015; Zavala, 2013).

As Bang & Vossoughi (2016) note, “PDR maintains a commitment to advancing fundamental insights about human learning and development through explicit attention to what forms of knowledge are generated, how, why, where and by whom” (p. 174). For example, within a PDR paradigm, the relational, pedagogical, and design-based activity of researchers
themselves is part of what is studied (Bang et al., 2010; Vossoughi & Escudé, 2016). In Studio for example, I analyzed the co-design process, and Studio itself, but also considered my role as an instructor, collaborator and participator. For example, throughout the Studio process, the domains of “researcher,” “theorist,” “designer,” “teacher,” and “student” were nebulous categories, allowing for candidates to take on each role, often simultaneously during the design process. These “role re-mediations” represent key forms of participation within PDR that are distinct from other forms of design-based research (Bang & Vossoughi, 2016).

For this study, I analyzed data from the Studio course that was co-developed during the 2015-2016 school year. Secondary humanities preservice teachers’ participation in Studio was constituted through their membership as secondary English and Social Studies students in a university-based teacher education program. With two separate cohorts, Studio aligned with the candidates’ practicum schedule where they observed and participated in both a middle school and high school classroom throughout a yearlong clinical placement. The first Studio section was designed with a cohort of twenty candidates in their first semester of the secondary humanities licensure program. For their placement, candidates attended practicum both on Tuesday and Thursday for nine hours a week at the local middle school. During practicum candidates enacted several lessons and assisted their cooperating teachers in daily instruction. Studio took place in the library at the middle school with students attending Studio at times when they were not scheduled to be in their practicum classes.

The second section was designed with candidates enrolled in their second semester of the licensure program and occurred at a local university-based classroom. This cohort had fourteen students. In this section of Studio, candidates observed classes for one day a week for seven
hours across various high school practicum placements. They participated in Studio at the local university for two hours later in the week. Practicum experiences are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Practicum</th>
<th>Studio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester 1</td>
<td>Two-day placement at one local middle school</td>
<td>2 hr. Studio course at the middle school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2</td>
<td>7 hr. Field experience across various high schools</td>
<td>2-2.5hr. Studio at the University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expanding Mediated Practice-Based Through Studio Design**

Although many university-based teacher education programs with school-university partnerships are described as “practice-based,” there remains a disconnect between the strategies and curriculum encouraged in their coursework and the practices observed and enacted within school placements (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Janssen, Grossman, & Westbroek, 2015; McDonald, et al., 2013). Studies have indicated that even if preservice teachers are placed in contexts where there is curricular alignment between university courses and the classrooms where preservice teachers are placed, teacher candidates rarely get the opportunity to reflect on those practices (Darling-Hammond et al., 2005). Evidence of this disconnect exists in the assessment of practice during clinical placements. With the exception of a few assignments situated within the field experience, teaching candidates and cooperating teachers assume that good “practice” happens through exposure (Darling-Hammond, 2009).

In response to this phenomenon, researchers have designed and studied teacher education pedagogies aimed at engaging novice teachers in approximations of practice (Grossman, et al., 2009; Lampert et al, 2013; Lampert & Graziani, 2009), analyzing how mediated fieldwork opportunities effect teacher development (Anderson & Stillman, 2013). My goal was to build on
that attention to mediated practice, by including collaborative planning, rehearsal, video captured enactment, and reflection in Studio. However, though these teacher educator pedagogies and practices move teacher preparation in crucial directions, the curriculum of preservice coursework primarily lies with the teacher educator. Thus, in this study, I analyzed what occurred when teacher candidates took on responsibilities that are typically associated with teacher educators such as collaboratively designing teacher preparation to allow for their rehearsal, reflection, and design of practice. Candidates’ perspectives on their own preparation, and the decisions they made as teacher educators, provide a possible insight into not only how to name and define teacher education pedagogies, but how to enact them.

**Discursive Engagements and The Dialogical Self in Studio**

Studio required that students participate in four discursive kinds of engagements related to their preparation as teachers. These engagements are represented in Figure 1: Rehearsal, the Design of Studio, Audio Journals, and Practicum.

![Figure 1: The discursive engagements of studio](image)
The Studio course, where rehearsal took place, revolved around candidates’ notions of instructional activities and strategies for anti-oppressive teaching. The Studio curriculum was designed by initially developing a single, semester-long essential question addressing issues of power and equity in school classrooms. Using an online video annotation tool, teacher candidates centered their inquiry process using weekly online discussions of videos of their cooperating practicum teachers and their own teaching in various practicum sites. Through rehearsal, candidates acted out imagined instructional moments alternating roles between teaching and being a student for their peers. After their performance, candidates discussed individual variations and instructional approaches. In a two-hour time-slot every week, candidates negotiated their anti-oppressive identities around how to enact the practices necessary to become an anti-oppressive teacher.

Each week, audio journals were used as a way for candidates to describe their reflections and experiences throughout their preparation. Unlike the rehearsal during the Studio course, the reflective journals were voluntary and thus used differently by each candidate. The journals were private, given only to the instructor of the course. In the audio journals, candidates’ often recounted stories of their interactions with students and their cooperating teachers. Through audio journals, beliefs about anti-oppressive teaching were both named and implied, sometimes indexing hegemonic or dominant narratives about students that included subtle or overt deficit orientations about teaching and teachers. Furthermore, the intimate and individual nature of the journals provided insight into the continuity and discontinuity of the possible teacher, student and activist narratives candidates told about themselves.
During the design of Studio, candidates iteratively developed Studio curriculum by incorporating candidate feedback, reflecting on the essential question, practicum, and their extended coursework. The Studio co-designed meetings occurred bi-weekly for approximately two hours. All candidates had the opportunity to attend, with the majority of design team meetings during the first semester occurring at my house. However, like the audio journals, the meetings were voluntary with approximately a third of the students enrolled in Studio participating at any given time. The design meetings were structured to feel informal and intimate. Each meeting was focused on planning two weeks of the Studio Course, reflecting on ideas or concepts expressed in journals, their online video annotation, and their own experiences throughout the program. The informal nature of the meetings was part of the design in order to encourage students to share personal stories that revealed beliefs about pedagogy and practice. In the design meetings, when candidates prepared the interactions and activities for the following classes, they were asked to question their behaviors, beliefs, and values while reflecting on their progress as anti-oppressive educators. Since preservice teachers’ beliefs and experiences have the possibility to influenced their instruction and learning (Berry, 2006; Norman & Spencer, 2005), designing instruction in relation to their own preparation pushed candidates to confront assumptions about teaching and equity. While designing anti-oppressive curriculum for themselves and fellow classmates, they narrated their decisions, infused with personal stories from their everyday lives.

Finally, while the actual practicum site was central to candidates’ reflections in the audio journal, their performance during rehearsal, and their conversations during the co-design of Studio, it was not co-designed by students. As a result, the data from practicum was not directly analyzed for this study. Practicum was designed to give candidates guided experiences working
with youth in schools and in informal learning spaces. Through these experiences candidates worked with students, observed and interacted with teachers, and practiced and received feedback as they developed and refined their repertoires. Various practicums were aligned with specific courses, with the goals of each course informing decisions about school contexts and models for working in schools. Studio fit into the preservice teachers’ practicum schedule, and was aligned with all practicum experiences in the secondary licensure program. Studio was not connected to any specific course.

**Participants**

There were 34 preservice teachers enrolled in Studio during the 2015-2016 school year. The course included students from all regions of the US. At the beginning of the study during the spring of 2015, there were fourteen students enrolled in the secondary licensure program including Studio. This cohort had only one male student and thirteen female students. Thirteen students identified as White and one female of color identified as Latinx. Three students in the cohort were enrolled in the Secondary Social Studies program and eleven were enrolled in the Secondary English program. Six students were enrolled in the masters program, one student was enrolled in the post baccalaureate program, and seven were enrolled as undergraduates. Since this cohort participated in the initial design of studio during their second semester of the Secondary Humanities program, data was collected on this cohort during the fall 2015 semester only.

The second cohort, who participated in Studio for their yearlong clinical experience during the 2015-2016 school year, consisted of twenty students with seven male students and thirteen female students. The majority of students identified as White, with three of the female students identifying as Latinx and one male student as African. In this cohort there were six
students who were enrolled in the secondary history program, and fourteen students in the secondary English program. Ten students were enrolled as masters students and ten were enrolled as undergraduates. The following data represented in the table below was self-reported by students.

Table 2

Demographic Information For Students in Studio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 students</td>
<td>1 Male</td>
<td>1 White</td>
<td>1 Secondary English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12 White Students</td>
<td>10 Secondary English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1 Latinx Student</td>
<td>3 Secondary History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 students</td>
<td>7 Male</td>
<td>6 White Students</td>
<td>4 Secondary English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 African Student</td>
<td>3 Secondary History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>10 White Students</td>
<td>10 Secondary English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Latinx Students</td>
<td>3 Secondary History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though I collected data on the 34 students who attended Studio, in this study, I report on data based on the case study of one candidate named Amilcar "miaʃə lɔɔɔ" Fanon, an African male, who I selected due to his active participation during the co-design process. He was also chosen for his specific positionality, providing a unique opportunity to examine the process of becoming a teacher from a male and African perspective. Amilcar, who was in his early twenties, described how he “want [ed] to teach because the study of the stories that build our world can help us invent new ways of being in the worlds we imagine” (Interview, 2016). As one of the few candidates with prior teaching experience, Amilcar explained that he chose to enroll in a teaching graduate program to learn more about and respond to the way he was encouraged to

3 All names are pseudonyms
teach while he was employed as a full-time teacher at a ‘no-excuses’ urban charter school. Unlike other candidates, Amilcar came to the secondary humanities licensure program with a very concrete desire to change his practice. He wanted his enactment of practice to match his beliefs. This intention influenced Amilcar’s desire to participate in the design of Studio where he described how the process allowed him to “contribute to making the space our own.” As he made clear, “for me, [design] was useful. I think that it is a good teacher skill to develop—to release control.” Amilcar came to the program with a complex understanding of public schools and he readily acknowledged the unique tension between his beliefs around justice and education.

Examining one candidate across discursively diverse kinds of engagements throughout Studio provided insight into the complex and contingent nature of the preparation associated with cultivating a social justice-based teacher identity or disposition. Indeed, it offers initial evidence that envisions the process of preparing activist-orientated teachers as something more aligned with a “discursive accomplishment” rather than a process of equipping possible teachers with a collection of discrete instructional skills (Zembylas, 2003b). It begins to reframe the process of becoming an anti-oppressive teacher as far a more complex experience, shaped in relation to norms, expectations, emotions, and experiences (Aldenmyr, 2013). In this study, the use of co-design during teacher preparation provided a unique discursive opportunity, allowing pre-service teachers to engage in dialogic, self-generating conversations, and performance-based rehearsals about their teaching selves in relation to anti-oppressive teaching practices. Choosing a focal candidate was useful in capturing some of the consequences of such engagement.
Data Collection and Analysis

As mentioned above, this study was a part of a larger investigation of secondary preservice teachers’ participation in an innovative co-designed, teacher education course called Studio. Drawing on one candidate’s experience, I analyzed the following data as they offered insight into the components of Studio coursework in the development of justice-based teacher commitments, as well as the discursive processes that seemed to be integral to the development of these commitments: student-created audio journals (2), audio recordings of the design of studio (15), video recordings of rehearsal (30), and informal interviews (3). In looking at data across these contexts, I relied on critical discourse analysis (CDA), to analyze the ways in which Amilcar’s I-positions were highlighted or obscured through discursive formations (Fairclough 2015; Wetherell, et. al. 2001; and Van Dijk 1993). The goal was not to simply analyze Amilcar’s I-positions or selves that occurred throughout the Studio process, but to understand how his I-positions interrelated with the larger sociopolitical contexts around anti-oppressive pedagogy and practice. Throughout the analysis process, I looked for evidence of voicing (Bahktin, 1981) to provide a tool for understanding and exploring how different perspectives were embedded in Amilcar’s self. For example, Akkerman et al., (2012) interpret Bakhtin's notion of voice ‘as a speaking personality bringing forward a particular perspective of the world’ (p. 229).

Throughout the analysis of data, I considered how Amilcar ‘voices” recognizable types of teaching or activist perspectives throughout Studio, as well as how he revealed values and beliefs in relation to those identities.

According to Bakhtin, Hermans and Kempen (1993) individuals frequently speak the words of the groups or societies to which they belong. For example, Hermans (2001) has conceptualized the dialogical self as an extended 'position repertoire'. The repertoire contains a
variety of interacting 'internal positions' (e.g. I as teacher, I as radical), 'external positions' (e.g. the imagined voice of my cooperating teacher), and 'outside' positions (e.g. friends, families, teacher unions). These voices of Amilcar’s inner others appear in the form of direct quotes, when he gives voice to a specific person or a group (e.g. my cooperating teacher or a student in my class says); in the form of indirect quotes where he references beliefs or values of a person or a group (e.g., my cooperating teacher believes); and as unreferenced quotations where he uses language associated with texts, the teaching profession, or particular courses (Akkerman and Van Eijck, 2013). Throughout my analysis, I analyzed the use of quotations to interpret how Amilcar was making sense of his anti-oppressive teaching identity. I also identified Amilcar’s I-positions mostly as indicated by his use of first-person pronouns and recorded relevant “inner others” in his interactions or dialogues by examining his use of third person pronouns. Finally, I drew on Wortham (2001) to analyze how Amilcar positioned himself with reference to particular voices, coding verbs or adjectives that were used to evaluate the usefulness of these other voices or perspectives as they connected to his own understanding of anti-oppressive teaching.

Findings: The Mediating Teaching Identity

The analysis of Amilcar’s verbal contributions throughout various Studio engagements was intended as a dialogical process. By examining his use of I-positions, or his voices of self, I considered how Amilcar was in conversation with dominant notions about teaching and learning and how he was discursively engaging with concepts presented throughout his preparation. This dialogical approach to identity development supported an analysis that challenged and expanded dualist and dichotomous stances that tend to either emphasize the personal dimension of the self (Freese, 2006) or the professional knowledge teachers need to possess and enact (Beijaard, Verloop & Vermunt, 2000). Rather than defining Amilcar as either a student or a teacher, just or
unjust, the identity he seemed to develop as a teacher might best be thought of as an ongoing process of negotiating and interrelating I-positions across discursively diverse instructional engagements. Much like that described by Raggatt (2012) in their study of integrating a theory of positioning within DST, I highlighted how Amilcar’s self was extended in both space, time and through the processing of positioning. Specifically my findings were organized to highlight some of the complex and interrelated ways that various Studio discursive engagements contributed to the development of Amilcar’s emerging anti-oppressive identity. Through audio journals, rehearsal and the design of Studio, Amilcar continuously attempted to synthesize his different identities, with his beliefs about teaching and activism often at odds. Each structure of Studio provided a different avenue for Amilcar to engage in talk and performance to encounter and explore aspects of the self that pertained to the anti-oppressive teaching identity he was creating.

Teacher and Activist I-positions in Audio Journals: Freedom Dreams and Apathy

Amilcar used the audio journal to interpret the enactment of anti-oppressive practice in the context of public schooling. One of the ways in which he reflected was to detail his experience of participating in the activities and student interactions that took place in his practicum class. For example, in the journal excerpt below (recorded during Amilcar’s second semester in Studio) he tells the story of an activity he participated in as a practicum student. At his practicum site students shared stories in the context of a discussion around “radical self-love,” as defined by his practicum teacher. In this audio journal entry, he described how his cooperating teacher asked students to sit in a circle and told them that the circle represented a kind of “ceremony.” Once his cooperating teacher gave directions for the “ceremony,” students were then invited to tell stories and read excerpts from their writing.
Today in practicum we are doing our activity around the stories we are telling. [My cooperating teacher] did a mini activity around radical self-love and he waited till I could be there for both days so we could share it out. And so I could be there and hear what the students had to say. So, we put them in a circle, told them how the circle represents the ceremony and we all had to be present.

Amilcar reflects on his cooperating teachers’ practice, by including himself in both the directions and the structure of the activity. He says, “we put them in a circle, told them how the circle represents the ceremony and we all had to be present.” Through the use of “we,” he aligned himself with his cooperating teacher, and positioned himself as a teacher in the activity. As he continued to reflect, Amilcar described his opportunity to interact with the whole class as part of the activity. He explained that he started a conversation designed to help the students explore their experience of fear. As he explained in his journal,

The question I asked was, "What are you most afraid of?" The student to the right of me starts off with, “I am afraid of losing everything I have. I am afraid of losing my family and the people I care for.”

Throughout his audio journal, these kinds of narrations were characteristic of how Amilcar talked about classroom teaching and his classroom participation, more specifically. In many of these cases he seems to attempt to either separate himself from the teaching activity by describing his cooperating teacher through third person pronouns, or to unite himself with the instruction through the use of second person pronouns. In this instance, he wavers between first and second person pronouns, always aligning himself with the instruction, but sometimes taking full responsibility for the interactions. For example, when Amilcar described his own participation, moving from using “we” to “I,” he situated himself as the facilitator of the teaching
activity. Further, in his description of the activity, he voices his cooperating teachers’ words like “ceremony” and “self-love” to reinterpret or rename certain classroom activities or events so that they might be understood for their potential alignment with anti-oppressive practices. When Amilcar reflected upon his experience in practicum, he also revealed his various I-positions around being a teacher and an activist.

In this, and subsequent journal entries, Amilcar identified and connected certain classroom activities and human comportments, such as rituals and self-care with a cultural ideal more often associated with an anti-oppressive teacher or activist. For example, in another audio journal that was recorded at the beginning of his first semester in the program, Amilcar described how students’ decisions to engage in classroom behaviors that contradict official or dominate school expectations might be interpreted as a form of resistance to more traditional and oppressive forms of schooling. He explained how simply communicating differently in school and about school, can be viewed as radical.

The dominant coding of school spaces requires us to communicate in ways that are you know, cis-het, White, middle class, so on and so forth. And whenever somebody speaks, or someone behaves, right, because our bodies are our language, so whenever they behave, or they speak through their words and through their persons in a way that counters that, it’s like a disruption of the space.

By voicing words like ‘ceremony” and “radical self-love,” Amilcar chooses to disrupt a more standardized interpretation of leading a classroom discussion. Instead, he frames his journal around the conflict between being a teacher and enacting this role of activist. In this journal, Amilcar presents or formulates a teaching identity that is different from, or perhaps even in
contradiction to, both his personal and activist self. As I show in the excerpt below, the audio journal was a space in which he explicitly grappled with those tensions.

As he continues the story of the sharing ceremony he had participated in that day, Amilcar explained how one student revealed both powerful and traumatic information during the activity. While he believed in providing a space for students to tell their stories, and to be vulnerable, the process felt painful and irresponsible. As he spoke:

I feel like a pain hustler. Like I am out here dealing and trading with people’s pain. That feels irresponsible. What does it mean to go out there with a critical outlook and attempt to build a critical discourse and all that vulnerability we build into it? Which came out through the question. Which came out through the overall activity, but then having that mean something legitimate for their experiences of themselves. Not just having it be a here: “I am going to collect your pain and hustle it out back to you.” Right?

I was wondering what kind of feedback would you give around that? Around valuing stories for the sake of some version of transformation. Something, something like hope. Something that makes it feel like life matters instead of it just dealing back into that space and because that, I mean, and that is how everyone responds right? I still feel like it means nothing if I can’t do anything about it. It just locks us right back into some kind of enlightened apathy. I know this is going on, this is out here, let’s go right back to suffering in silence or whatever. So, what kind of feedback would you give around vulnerability, critical discourse and being a critical witness for the sake of just a tiny bit at least of hope, transformation, justice, you know? I need freedom dreams. We need freedom dreams in these spaces and what does it mean to be able to sustain them in
the sense of actually building like embodied hope? We can actually move in the
direction with these stories so we don’t all just become, we don’t all just end up locked
right back into our apathy.

The audio journal was one of the only spaces where Amilcar openly struggled with the efficacy of anti-oppressive practice within schools. He explored how when attempting to design curriculum with attention to emotion and empathy, it was possible to cause more pain and suffering. The analysis of his audio journal revealed that though he recognizes the need to provide a space for students to reveal self-love and struggle, the space itself was not going to fix the material realities of his students.

This audio journal reveals one of Amilcar’s continuous I-positions as an activist. He is committed and dedicated to naming and combating oppression. His concept of “Freedom Dreams” is repeated, with variation, across contexts. However, it is also in his audio journal in which he reveals the tension between his conception of practice and his conception of justice in the classroom. In the excerpt above, Amilcar’s various I-positions associated with being an anti-oppressive educator are in dialogue. First, he introduces a new I-position as a consequence of critically examining anti-oppressive practice in a real-world setting. As he speaks, he moves his position as an activist, a teacher, and as a student to either the background or the foreground of the conversation.

Amilcar feels conflicted about the enactment of his activist I-position in a high school teaching environment and describes the practice as painful. He characterizes the enactment by voicing oppression. As he states, “like I am out here dealing and trading with people’s pain.” Even though he is placed in a social justice school with a critical educator, Amilcar evaluates the social justice practice negatively, by describing his role in the activity as collecting and hustling.
pain. Initially, Amilcar uses first person pronouns to describe the pain caused by the activity. By using “I,” he claims the emotional experience of that pain. He says, “I feel like a pain hustler;” and “I am out here dealing and trading.” Yet, when he reflects on the consequence of that pain for students, he distances himself, revealing a tension between his understanding of practice and how it is actually enacted. For example, he uses the word “that” to refer to the impact of the activity. He says, “*that* feels irresponsible;” “having *that* mean something;” and “*that* is how everyone responds right?” When Amilcar uses “I,” he positions himself squarely within the practice, as a teacher, and as a participant. Yet, the use of the definite article “*that*” is used while critiquing the experience, with Amilcar taking on the position of an activist.

The tension between Amilcar’s activist and teaching self is fully revealed through his use of quoted speech. He states, “Not just having it be a here: I am going to collect your pain and hustle it out back to you.” Although he repeats the concept of trading in pain, when Amilcar is privileging his activist self, he no longer describes his feelings associated with the process. He doesn’t privilege his teaching self, but rather positions himself as a student within this process. For instance, he uses “you” to seek my perspective as his teacher and mentor when he asks, “so, what kind of feedback would you give around vulnerability, critical discourse and being a critical witness for the sake of just a tiny bit at least of hope, transformation, justice, you know?” In his question, Amilcar is using language associated with an equity-oriented teacher, indexing his knowledge of research around critical pedagogy. Yet, he is also asking for support in the implementation of such theories, unearthing the multiplicity and discontinuity of his identities.

Amilcar believes he is an activist and a teacher, but considers these identities in conflict. He describes teaching through theories, and philosophies, considering himself well grounded in social justice ideas, but disconnected to how they appear in practice. He puts himself in
conversation with existing theories and methodologies for addressing trauma in the classroom by naming “critical witnessing” (Dutro, 2011) and proposes new ways of imagining emancipatory education through his use of “freedom dreams.” In these ways, Amilcar questions how anti-oppressive practice can really combat oppression, and even suggests that it might be co-opted in a way that leads to suffering. Amilcar’s audio journal uncovers a teaching self that not only understands oppressive discourse, but situates this discourse in larger systems, even challenging methodologies that are inherently designed for justice.

Finally, when Amilcar addresses the listener, asking for advice around his experience, he foregrounds both his student and teacher identity within the co-design process. Since the audio journal was used for both reflection and design, he invites his listener into the conversation by ending with “we.” He states, “we can actually move in the direction with these stories so we don’t all just become, we don’t all just end up locked right back into our apathy.” Amilcar ends the conversation with an innovation of self (Hermans et al., 1992). He is still negotiating his understanding of anti-oppressive practice, but he ends his journal with a call to action for both himself and his listener.

I-positions are often observed when teachers experience dilemmas (Thomas & Beauchamp, 2011; Pillen, Den Brok, & Beijaard 2013). For Amilcar, the dilemma is watching the enactment of anti-oppressive pedagogy and realizing that in practice, theories of justice often fall short. When Amilcar’s teacher and activist I-positions conflict, the dominance of his activist I-position is negotiated through dialogical relations with that of a teacher I-position, and a position grounded in critical theory. Throughout this negotiation process, he is continuously realigning, examining his different roles. It is through audio journals that he voices the dialogical relations among these roles, putting those tensions around his “selves” into conversation in
important revealing ways. In other words, it is specifically through audio journals that Amilcar
speaks his internal dialogue, attempting to envision what an anti-oppressive teacher actually
looks like. The dilemma he articulates at his practicum site—his sense that a teacher’s expressed
critical commitments are not actualized in humanizing ways—reveals how Amilcar stays in a
productive dialogical relationship where the tensions between teaching and activism co-exist in
an important way.

The Impact of Others on Dominant I-positions: Playful Oppression

In the Studio course, rehearsal provided support to try on beliefs about how to be anti-
oppressive teachers. By rehearsing instructional activities and imagined teaching scenarios free
of the consequential nature of “real” classroom teaching, candidates privileged particular
dominant I-positions that would otherwise be concealed from their teacher educators and
possibly from themselves. During Studio, candidates encouraged each other, as well as the
instructor, to stop instruction and model feedback through performance, expanding upon
traditional definitions of what it means to rehearse. For instance, the candidates modeled
rehearsal after a freeze improv game used in theater. According to the rules that they co-
designed, one candidate is expected to begin performing an instructional activity while other
candidates engage as imagined students. At any point, if any other participant wants to challenge
the approach to the instructional activity, or provide feedback, they can call out “freeze.”
However, instead of orally dissecting practice, the participant needs to take the candidate's place,
choosing to either continue or shift instruction. Discussion occurs at the end of the activity, after
several candidates have performed. During Studio, I would typically begin the performance,
modeling the practice, expecting students to challenge or continue my approach.
The unpredictability of improvisational rehearsal was an innovation designed by candidates, allowing for more flexibility in the way in which candidates presented themselves as educators as well as how they explored the experience of becoming a teacher. The improvisational nature of rehearsal in Studio reveals a possible structure to examine how teacher identity is established and maintained through a dialogical process allowing for the negotiation of selves.

Rehearsal provides a unique opportunity to study candidates’ explicit negotiations and reflections within a social interaction—an interaction that mirrors the social dynamics that they will create and foster as classroom teachers. In this negotiation process, candidates can experience interactions that are either confirming or conflicting with their dominant I-positions experiencing either ‘assimilation’ or possibly ‘disequilibrium’ within the rehearsal space (Hollingsworth, 1989; Holt Reynolds, 1992). In the following excerpt, I explore how Amilcar interprets and evaluates interactions with his colleagues in relation to his teacher, student, and activist selves. Moreover, I consider how his performance within rehearsal encourages assimilation or disequilibrium for other teacher candidates.

During this particular Studio course, I was performing an imagined interaction with students on the first day of class, while the teacher candidates pretended to be high school students. When Amilcar freezes my performance and takes over instruction, he improvises and changes the classroom context and the activity. Without naming his beliefs or intentions, he playfully performs his version of oppressive and justice-oriented teaching.

1. Amilcar: Freeze. I am changing this because…[He trails off.]

2. Sam: Mr. Amilcar? [Sam raises his hand.]
3. Amilcar: [He jokingly points to Sam.] You shut your mouth when you are talking to me! [All of the students laugh].

4. Instructor: Oh [she laughs as well.]


6. Gina: I want to stand next to Mary. [She references the Studio instructor.]

7. Amilcar: Here at revolutionary academy we believe in the future. [Candidates laugh. Amilcar laughs.]

8. Amilcar: Here is what I need you to do. One person steps in the center of the circle. [Gina steps in the center. Amilcar writes the following quote on the board: “I keep a mirror in my pocket so I can practice looking hard.”]

9. Amilcar: I want you to turn to everyone else in the circle and explain to them what you think this means. Who can read this for us? [Amilcar points to the quote written on the board. Students silently read.]

10. Amilcar: Gina can you explain this for me?

11. Gina: Well, I don’t know what this means. [She pauses.]

12. Amilcar: Anyone who wants to help her out can tag her in. [A male student raises her hand and gives Gina a high five. He takes her place in the circle.]

At the beginning of rehearsal, the interaction between Amilcar and Sam indicates how the structure of rehearsal allowed candidates to seamlessly negotiate possible I-positions through play. In a span of seconds, Amilcar performs three to four different I-positions sometimes simultaneously. Amilcar first responds to Sam ’s imagined student identity with a version of his teacher I-position that is meant to be both performative and oppressive. He highlights this by
reminding his audience three separate times that he was “joking.” He then immediately transitions into another teacher I-position, by addressing his colleagues as students and asking them to circle up. He establishes his new I-position in opposition to his “performed” I-position by contextualizing his future teaching self and his students in a school called ‘Revolutionary Academy.’ Even as he takes on the role of teacher, his university student I-position remains constant throughout, as he marks both the oppressive teacher-self and future-self with laughter, reminding all participants of the imagined and improvisational nature of rehearsal.

Amilcar continues to weave in and out of who he is as a candidate and the teacher he is trying to be. As a candidate, he demonstrates an understanding of how certain language influences students by jokingly taking-up problematic discourse and marking this performance as comical. As a teacher, he gives his fellow colleagues instructions and facilitates learning. As the facilitator of the rehearsal, Amilcar voices an interpretation of an oppressive teacher. Other candidates interpret Amilcar’s playful presentation of oppression as permission to follow suit. They assimilate to the interaction, feeling validated in playing oppression. As candidates pretend to be Amilcar’s future students, they “try on” oppressive I-positions indexing humor, while failing to mark the performance as problematic. One candidate named Dan, for example, performed the role of a high school student as he jumped into the circle and read the quote that Amilcar had written on the board: “I keep a mirror in my pocket so I can practice looking hard.” As he stood in the circle, he slouched and put his hands in his pockets. His speech, posture and intonation changed:

Dan: I don’t think it has anything to do with reflection. I think has to do with looking tough and making sure that no one gets yo ass the first day of school. That ain’t happenin.

You guys might try, just warning you. I am going to look hard and you got to look hard
because otherwise you are going to get picked out and they are going to make a fool out of you. You don’t want that. Trust me I have been in this grade three times.

Dan’s intonation, gesturing and chosen language mirrored a contemporary stereotype of a “thug.” Dan was a White Jewish man in his thirties and he typically spoke with authority, choosing to use educational jargon. Yet, when he performs a future student, he uses phrases like, “yo ass” “ain’t happenin,” “picked out,” and “fool.” During his performance, several White candidates laughed while Amilcar immediately tried to get Dan out of the circle. When Dan paused, Amilcar looked around the room, “Tag him if you want to talk. Tag him if you want to talk,” he stated, almost imploring another candidate to step in. When another candidate did, they continued to mirror the playfully problematic nature of the previous performance.

1. Sam: I have to say that I have just been seeing this the whole time. [He references the quote on the board.] I keep thinking is that a mirror in your pocket or are you happy to see me? Kind of what I was thinking.

2. Amilcar: That was a good pun. [This is said with a frustrated tone.]

3. Sam: It wasn’t meant to be a pun. It was meant to be a double entendre.

Even though Dan left the circle, another candidate chose to “act” as a future student while simultaneously performing oppressive beliefs. Instead of describing the meaning of the quote on the board, the candidate references a sexualized joke. However, unlike the candidate before, Sam breaks character, defending his statement as a “double entendre.” This move reveals his student I-position as he shifts to displaying his knowledge. He challenges Amilcar (the “teacher”), and ignores the impact of such a joke on his colleagues. Like Dan’s problematic performance, Sam’s sexist joke was not exactly ignored by candidates (again, there was palpable discomfort from Amilcar and other students) but was also not directly addressed.
The thread of playful oppression, starting with Amilcar’s joke, was taken-up by two White, male candidates to legitimize the voicing of personal, and arguably hidden I-positions. Through the lens of I-positions, the positionality of the candidates, with Amilcar being the only Black male teacher, influenced how candidates felt allowed to imagine and rehearse the “other.” Amilcar can be seen as giving permission for playfully interacting with oppressive language or identities by making those identities a “joke,” distant from the “real” version of their teacher selves. The responses are very different between Amilcar’s “joke” and the two that follow.

Amilcar was noticeably uncomfortable with both Dan and Sam’s statements. When he tries to passively object by asking other students to jump in, or by sarcastically replying to another candidate, he reveals an important and common struggle for candidates teaching towards critical goals. He is grappling with the discomfort and desire to disrupt and his uncertainty regarding exactly how to disrupt. Towards the end of his performance, Amilcar chooses to address both Dan and Sam’s performance by explaining the pedagogical reasoning behind his chosen text and activity. He points back to his attempts to challenge in the moment by framing his performance as a form of student-centered and relevant instruction. He reminds students of the purpose of “revolutionary academy.”

Amilcar: We are here to figure it out together. We have had all these different ways of looking at one line. This is from an artist from the bay area E-40 and the reason why we are looking at this is because in this classroom we are going to be looking at texts and different ways to look at the world…[Amilcar jumps up and screams “revolutionary academy! He shouts. He does the splits in the air. As he jumps, he accidentally kicks Sam in the knee.]
Amilcar marks both the beginning and the end of his performance with an exaggerated, comical discourse. He ends the interaction by reframing the initial joke, not in terms of being oppressive, but by referencing a school context required to combat oppression. He exaggerates not only by verbally shouting “Revolutionary Academy,” but also by jumping and throwing his marker. This exaggeration continues, when Amilcar apologizes for hitting Sam, while his fellow classmates laugh.

Amilcar’s performance indicates how there is not a clear separation between his inner activist and teacher self and the outside world. In his interaction with other candidates, his exaggerated and humorous depiction of both oppressive and social justice teaching, and his aversion to voicing discomfort with their performance reveals his internal conflict. Hermans and Hermans-Jansen (2001) detail how internal and external positions within the self can mutually define one another. For example, while others can come to function as a part of the self—such as cooperating teachers affecting the way candidates describe and enact teaching practices—they can also come to function as defining positions in what is not the self. In the case of this particular rehearsal, we see how candidates, with very different results, adopt Amilcar’s playful oppression. We can also view Amilcar’s reaction, circling back to the context of revolutionary academy, as indication that he is defining his position as an anti-oppressive teacher in opposition to his colleagues. The co-design of rehearsal, particularly the way in which candidates controlled both the structure and the feedback process, opened a space for the performance and analysis of such identities. Like the audio journals, rehearsal during Studio provided a structure for the negotiation of self. Yet, unlike the audio journals, that negotiation was public and often in response to the discussions occurring with candidates throughout Studio.
Society and the Self During the Design of Studio

Amilcar’s experience in rehearsal and his narration in his audio journal reveal how identity is dialogically defined through the inclusion of and contrast to others as representing positions within the self. As Hermans and Hermans-Konopka (2010) emphasize, communities can also contribute to the development of new I-positions through the appropriation of communal discourse. Further, participants can also contribute to the development of alternative I-positions within a community by bridging their own discourse to that of other participants. In this section, I turn to the role of community in Amilcar’s experience. In the case of studio, this process primarily occurred through the collaborative design of the course. The co-design process provided a dialogical space with I-positions reflecting different social or cultural origins.

After candidates’ weekly experience in practicum and in Studio, all candidates had the opportunity to reflect on their learning and to design the Studio curriculum for the following week. During the design of Studio, candidates were able to position themselves as teachers, naming beliefs and rehearsing how they conceived of themselves in the moment. Through this process, candidates highlighted beliefs and experiences that may have been rendered invisible by the audio journals and even rehearsal. In the following excerpt, for example, candidates attempted to design a Studio activity that explored how to welcome students back into the classroom after an extended absence. By reflecting on their field placements and their own interactions with students, candidates decided on the best way to talk about such a nuanced and complicated issue. In the following excerpt, Amilcar problem solves with two other candidates. They discuss how their cooperating teachers at their practicum site welcomed a student back into class after his incarceration.

1. Amilcar: I think, how do, how did your teacher deal with it?
2. Diane: The kids didn’t know.

3. Amilcar: Oh the kids didn’t know.

4. Diane: They may have known but we didn’t talk about it.

5. Amilcar: Oh okay, so no one talked about it. Kids will know.

6. Diane: Kids will know. And maybe I should have talked about it.

7. Diane: I don’t know.

8. Amilcar: So no one just addressed it? Did the teacher address it with the students themselves? Like one-on-one?

9. Diane: With the kid that went to jail?

10. Amilcar: mmm

11. Diane: I asked her what was happening and she had the best answer.

12. She said between social services, the county jail and [the school]—and I kind of expected her to say that we were watching him closely. Instead she said we are putting a giant collective hug around him.

13. Amilcar: What does that even mean?

14. Diane: I thought it was so nice.

15. Amilcar: That actually just scared me.


17. Amilcar: What does that even mean? That is the type of…I don’t know why that hit me kind of weird. [He Laughs.]

18. Diane: It is the perspective of supporting this kid instead of punishing him. And like, we are keeping on eye on you now.
19. Amilcar: I guess. I am thinking a hug ain’t going to fix that. [He laughs uncomfortably.]

20. Diane: Yeah and you are right.

21. Amilcar: But it is better than . . . yeah.

22. Diane: He is probably on probation. What can you do?

23. Amilcar: What can you do? Okay so what does she mean concretely by that? [He references the hug.]

The design team meetings provided a discursive space that allowed Amilcar to bridge the vulnerability and critical perspective that he brought to his audio journal with his performance during rehearsal. Similar to rehearsals, there was hesitation and uncomfortable laughter. Yet, unlike rehearsal, Amilcar directly questioned not only the cooperating teacher’s approach to the student, but Diane’s interpretation of that approach. He wanted to understand how to pedagogically address such a complicated and delicate relationship.

In the middle of the conversation about the student who was incarcerated, Gina, a female candidate, interrupted, explaining a similar story that involved her sister. She explained that her sister has been hospitalized for an eating disorder and after eight weeks was returning to class. She began to cry. She described how no teacher mentioned her sister’s extreme weight loss to her family, and how the situation was ignored. In response, Amilcar’s laughter and performance disappeared. His tone changed as he leaned forward, moving physically closer to Gina.

1. Amilcar: Would you feel like that? You would want a teacher to call and check on her right…would you?

2. Gina: Is that crossing a boundary?

3. Amilcar: Would you feel like it was overreaching?
4. Diane: I don’t know exactly. That is what I was trying to decide. As a teacher would I feel comfortable calling or would I feel comfortable being called?

5. Amilcar: Do I weave those type of things into the class so that I know like what is going on? I don’t just mean in our class, as teachers in our class. I have been in class with you for a while now, did any of us notice? No. Like how real do I make that space and is that like…would I be crossing the boundary?

6. Instructor: I had no idea. [She is speaking to Gina.]

7. Amilcar: That worries me. I would feel responsible, right? Like, in that space, for that … It makes me feel like we all know that we all carry stuff, Yet we are all in this room all year and no one knows anything and things happen. What we do know is that we don’t [know]. I know that this going on in the general society around us. Why is it that when I come to class I am supposed to let that go, if I know? If I had like a life that people have, when I walk into the class, why am I supposed to then pretend?

Gina’s story was not uncommon during the discursive engagement during the design of Studio, with students sharing their stories in order to make sense of pedagogy and practice. It was during these moments that candidates like Amilcar stopped performing, indicating not only their beliefs about teaching and justice, but problem-solving ways to address future and current hurdles and issues. In the exchange above, it wasn’t enough to understand how students who have dealt with incarceration were greeted after a prolonged absence. It was more important to consider how candidates were prepared to humanize themselves and their students. When Amilcar asked, “when I walk into the class why am I supposed to then pretend?” he was challenging both the systemic issues that frame teachers and students in dehumanizing ways, and also his own practice. He also named his beliefs in relation to larger systems and expectations.
The conversations during the design of Studio demonstrate the reciprocity of positioning (Wortham, 2001). For example, Amilcar positioned himself as a teacher educator in response to how he was positioned in the design space. His statement, “I have been in class with you for a while now, did any of us notice?” illustrates how he considered how this actual situation can be taken up as a learning opportunity for the whole class in Studio. By designing his own preparation with his colleagues, he is expected to consider what it takes to develop anti-oppressive educators. Amilcar realizes that there is a conflict between what is espoused in terms of social justice and what candidates and students need. In the relationship between Amilcar’s sense of self and the social context of schooling, his discourse is double-voiced. When he says, “When I walk into the class, why am I supposed to then pretend?” he draws a clear distinction between his voice and the voice of the university and the values it represents. Further, Amilcar reveals his interrelated I-positions, between which his identity as an anti-oppressive teacher fluctuates (Hermans, 2002; Raggatt, 2012). This is clear, for instance, in his use of questioning and his use of “we” in the excerpt above. Like his audio journal, Amilcar is puzzling through an anti-oppressive practice, but is doing so in consideration of his own preparation. He asks Gina’s advice around boundaries and comfort in order to personalize practice. He reiterates his concerns presented in his audio journal around vulnerability being an insufficient tool for anti-oppressive practice. Yet, through his interaction with his colleagues, he reveals his need for an emotional and personal response to this work.

**Implications and Conclusions**

Through my analysis, I propose that a dialogical conceptualization of teacher identity is particularly useful as an analytical framework in studying and developing innovations in social justice teacher education. According to Cochran Smith (1991), teachers and teacher educators
who work towards justice “must name and wrestle with their own doubts, must fend off the fatigue of reform and depend on the strength of their individual and collaborative convictions that their work ultimately makes a difference in the fabric of social responsibility” (p. 285). This process towards an equity-oriented practice is not a linear trajectory, but rather an amalgamation of planned and unpredictable forces that produce emergent transformations and unexpected outcomes. In the process of becoming anti-oppressive teachers, candidates, along with theories, tools, disciplined practices, and content, are in a constant state of relational flux. In other words, they are muddled together in unexpected ways that are situated in a larger cultural context and shaped by the contingencies of time, place and context. There is no panacea for social justice teacher education. We cannot rid ourselves of oppression; rather we must learn to name it—to critique ourselves and to revise.

**Innovation and the Dialogical Self**

Through audio journals, rehearsal and the design of Studio Amilcar engaged in discursive opportunities about his future teaching self in relation to anti-oppressive practice. In his audio journal, for example, he voices the same characterization of an activist that is repeated with variation across contexts. His story of “freedom dreams” indicates a desire to reinforce a particular sense of self that is at odds with how anti-oppressive practice is enacted. Through his journal, Amilcar presents the potential of such reflective tools within social justice teacher education, providing an intimate and relational way for candidates to give voice to their identity construction. The audio journal captures Amilcar’s internal dialogue and his desire to create a dialogical space between different I-positions (Hermans, 2003). Through his journal he was able to convey his beliefs in a venue that feels more unfiltered and authentic than a written reflection might. Within the context of an individualized conversation, he spent a considerable amount of
time describing and reflecting on his understanding of oppression, justice, his role as a teacher, and his experiences in a teacher education program. The analysis of these spoken texts, provides a unique insight into discursive patterns related to candidate’s journeys as teachers and the various, sometimes competing, identities they carry along the way.

Although audio journals provided data on the way candidates interpret and make sense of their various selves, as a tool, it fails to encapsulate the influence of the other on the development of the self. Rehearsal within Studio, however, contains such possibility. The underlying behaviors and thus ideologies of other teacher candidates in response to sanctioned forms of oppression would have remained hidden without the opportunity for spontaneous rehearsal. During rehearsal Amilcar performed versions of both oppressive and anti-oppressive teaching and through his performance he encourages other teaching selves to emerge. Through examining his use of humor in a majority White space, we gain insight into how historical, cultural, social, and institutional relationships and experiences contribute to how teaching beliefs are exposed in ways that the traditional discursive spaces of teacher preparation programs seldom make possible (Hermans, 2002; Leijen & Kullasepp, 2013).

Finally, in the collaborative design of the course, Amilcar adopts his colleague’s emotional response to teacher apathy, and incorporates the emotion into how he critiques his university preparation. Although we see that in his audio journal he provides a personal reflection on teacher practice, and performs such practice through comedy in rehearsal, the co-design space provides a unique opportunity for Amilcar to speak back against ideas and values, in a safe and productive way. It is also one of the few engagements where we see Amilcar adopt the stance of another individual within his expression of self.
The co-design of studio engenders the performance, rather than the description, of language (Butler, 1990). It serves the ‘action-orientation’ (Heritage, 1984) of discourse, as it provides access to what is designed and how candidates conceive of practice. There is no one-way to predict how candidates’ pre-established beliefs will interact with their experiences. The co-design space embraces this complexity, encouraging preservice teacher education to allow for multiple entry points and identities that have to be encountered and negotiated toward a shared curricular plan. Although candidates may enter teacher education with fully formed beliefs around social justice and practice, such as Amilcar, they can choose to engage in conversations around those beliefs during the design process. Candidates’ discursive patterns around anti-oppressive practice become malleable, bending and responding to how they choose to engage and design their preparation.

Co-design has the potential to create engagements and interactions in which candidates are supported in their journey towards anti-oppressive pedagogy and are able to, in turn, create those experiences for their future students. The implication of this research is that educators cannot be told how to work towards equity but have to build such knowledge through interaction. I propose that co-design with attention to a post structural approach to identity provides possibility for such interaction.

Although over the last decade, there has been an increasing emphasis on “social justice” as a theme in teacher education, as a movement it lacks a concrete definition of how it is conceived and applied (e.g., Forzani, 2014; Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Lahann, Shakman, & Terrell, 2009; Crowe, 2008). “Teacher education for social justice” is conceptually ambiguous with variation in theoretical perspectives and instantiations (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009). This ambiguity is related not only to the variability in approaches, but also to the fact that in many
programs the notion of “social justice” exists in name only (Grant & Agosto, 2008). As I have learned through Studio, by constructing visions of justice-oriented teacher education with preservice teachers in context, and avoiding prescriptive, decontextualized “how to” steps for becoming a social justice educator, it is possible to define social justice in ways that matter to both preservice teachers and their future students.
CHAPTER 6

ARTICLE THREE

She is White but Not Really White: Using Audio Journals as a Form of Critical Reflection in Preservice Teacher Education

Practice teaching constitutes a critical and popular component of preservice teacher education (Anderson & Stillman 2011, Darling-Hammond, 2006), with candidates often citing their experiences with practice as both memorable and influential (Grundoff, 2011). Yet, despite its proliferation within teacher preparation, it is often faced with a familiar critique—that there remains a disconnect between the strategies and curriculum encouraged in university coursework and the practices observed and enacted within school placements (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Ball, Sleep, Boerst, & Bass, 2009; Janssen, Grossman, & Westbroek, 2015; Grossman et al., 2009; Grossman & McDonald, 2008; Lampert et al., 2009; Lampert et al., 2013; McDonald, et al., 2013; Windschitl et al., 2012). These “pitfalls of experience” (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985) in learning to teach are possibly exacerbated when candidates are racially, linguistically and culturally different than the students they are observing or teaching. Thus, without attention to critical reflection during clinical experiences, candidates are more likely to define this incompatibility between the university and the classroom and between their identity and the identities of their students in a negative way (Petrone & Sarigianides, 2017). Further, without an opportunity to both surface and critique problematic ideologies and discourses (Barnes, 2016), field experiences may actually reinforce negative depictions of adolescents (Petrone & Sarigianides, 2017) and specifically Adolescents of Color (Muhammad, 2015). Thus, supporting preservice teachers in critical reflection is crucial in both mediating candidates’ clinical experiences, and supporting the development of social justice orientations.
In this study, I suggest that one way to address the need for reflection within teacher education is to encourage teacher candidates to adopt a critical stance towards practice during their preparation (Lewison et al., 2008). Through a critical stance, candidates are encouraged to not only acknowledge but to actively work to dismantle systems of White supremacy, patriarchy, and heteronormativity, among other systems of oppression, in part by confronting their own complicity in such systems. Knowing that developing a critical stance is always a work in progress and never complete, this study discusses interactive audio journals as a novel approach to supporting the practice necessary for teacher candidates to enact their commitments to teaching for social justice.

The use of interactive audio journals was a tool I designed as one component of the secondary humanities licensure program at a large, research-based university. Studying their use was one strand of a larger inquiry on candidates’ experiences in a practice-based course called “Studio,” which I co-designed with teacher candidates. Although audio journals were not required for teacher candidates, the majority of candidates enrolled in the licensure program used the approach on several occasions. In this analysis, I employ a case study approach to explore the use of these audio journals as a form of critical reflection. In analyzing how one candidate spoke about her experiences in her practicum site over a semester, I examine how ideas around race, ethnicity, gender, and ability were negotiated and explored. Throughout my analysis, I make a case for audio journals as a tool for promoting social justice teacher pedagogy. Further, I argue that audio journals encourage a dialogical process for individual teacher candidates and between teacher educators and their students. Since oral language is not bound by the same strict rules of coherence and cohesion as written discourse, teacher educators are able to develop a nuanced and more authentic understanding of how individual candidates are internalizing concepts of
social justice teaching. These journals also support a complex process of reflection that can follow candidates into their future classrooms.

Audio journals have been used as a means for providing feedback on students’ oral skills (Allan, 1991), for building teacher–student rapport (Egbert, 1992), and critical reflection on course content (Dantas-Whitney, 2002). However, no study to date has investigated the use of audio journals as a tool for critical reflection within teacher education, or the development of social justice teacher dispositions and practices. Research on the use of this innovative instructional technique can provide new insights for social justice teacher education curriculum. To address this need in the field, I ask: In what ways do audio journals support the development of critical reflection within preservice teacher education?

**Theoretical Perspectives**

**The Challenge with Reflection in Teacher Education**

There are many approaches to being ‘critical’ with reflection during teacher preparation. Candidates can examine and change very deeply held assumptions (Mezirow, 1991) or they can focus on how power operates both within those assumptions and in the classrooms they observe (Brookfield, 1995). For this article, I define the ‘critical’ within reflection as a combination of both these approaches. I view critical reflection in teacher preparation as the authentic, emotional process of analyzing and evaluating elements of practice in relation to both power and the self, with a specific intent to generate ideologies around equity-based pedagogies.

Although reflection, and critical reflection specifically, has been taken up with variation in the research on teacher education, there is general agreement amongst teacher educators that it is important for both preservice and in-service teachers to examine their thoughts in order to improve their practice (e.g., Artzt & Armour-Thomas, 2002; Margolis, 2002; Mayes, 2001a,
However, in Beauchamp’s (2015) review of the literature on reflection in teacher education, she expresses a concern that there is often a lack of understanding about reflection amongst the scholars that actively promote the reflective process. This lack of clarity around the theoretical concept of reflection can be attributed to a theory-practice gap and in particular the divergent ways that reflection is implemented in practice (Atkinson, 2012; Mena Marcos, Sánchez, and Tillema, 2008).

According to various scholars, reflection in teacher education may not be deeply or effectively woven into teaching practice (Akbari, 2007; Enfield & Stasz, 2011; Otienoh, 2011), suggesting that despite the plethora of research on reflection in teacher preparation, the reflective practitioner may actually be more “fiction” than reality (Atkinson, 2012, p. 189). For instance, with a push towards accountability in teacher education, it is possible for reflection to become a perfunctory assignment, rather than a way that preservice teachers can examine their own development. Thus, when reflection does happen in teacher education programs, it is often viewed as forced or routinized, undermining the possibility for critical reflective practice due to a lack of authenticity (Galea, 2012; Nagle, 2008).

The disconnection between reflection and practice in teacher education can possibly be explained through the use of reflective tools. Malm (2009), for example, warns that some types of written reflections such as journaling—common in teacher education—privilege “the technical” at the expense of the personal. The focus on technicality encourages the “how to” of teaching to be reflected upon instead of emphasizing teachers’ beliefs and positionality. Since the affective domain is closely related to critical issues of power and identity in teaching (Akbari, 2007; Thompson & Pascal, 2012), the lack of emotion in reflection may lead to candidates failing to resonate with the reflective process or to embed reflection into their practice.
To address the theory-practice gap within reflection, and the issue of perfunctory or superficial reflection in teacher education, I suggest that it is crucial that teachers’ vulnerabilities be foregrounded in teacher preparation with attention to the emotional dimension of teacher work (Kelchtermans, 2005). The emotional parts of teaching are inescapable when working intimately with youth from diverse cultural, ethnic, racial, religious, and socio-economic backgrounds. Furthermore, emotion unavoidably affects teachers’ identities (Kelchtermans 2007; Beijaard et al. 2004), challenging their conception of the “stories to live by” (Connelly and Clandinin 1999).

According to Korthagen (1995), the type of reflection that is the most useful for engaging teacher emotions is one that provides a mirror or a process of reflecting back teacher beliefs and practices for the purpose of noticing and observing. “The idea of a mirror,” he said, “is helpful because it makes clear that there are different mirrors” (p. 321). I argue that the use of audio journals within teacher education provides such a mirror, not only for teacher candidates, but also teacher educators. Through its intimate and confessional nature, reflection via audio journals centers emotions, allowing for candidates to take on new ways of being while also inquiring about their trajectories as future teachers. The audio journal is not couched in a particular type of reflection, nor does it view reflection as hierarchical. Instead, it is in conversation with existing literature on reflection within preservice teacher education, expanding notions of reflection as a tool for teacher development.

Audio journals have been interpreted as useful for language learning since audio recording allows for more spontaneity and expression on the part of the learner. Although the (limited) research on audio journals has been focused on K-12 students (e.g., Egbert, 1992), this approach has merit with adult learners as well. Through an unfiltered conversation, candidates
using audio journals may be more willing to adopt the language of teaching and to try on the language of justice, with little concern for correctness. Words like heteronormative, cis-gendered, patriarchal, misogyny, and even racism are often new terms for many teacher candidates. Integrating these terms into teachers’ vocabularies can support changing practices, providing a low risk opportunity for teachers to explore new terms related to social justice and supporting the process of owning the significance of these terms. In order to change the way someone thinks or acts, you must first change the way that they speak. As a tool, audio journals hold the possibility of supporting candidates to use language to construct the world. Through audio journals, candidates hold the power of speaking a transformed world into possibility through shifting their language.

**Reflection for the Development of a Critical Stance**

In my study, I draw on Lewison and colleagues’ (2008) concept of critical stance in order to understand how candidates used audio journals for critical reflection. A critical stance is the core of an instructional model of critical literacy and “consists of the attitudes and dispositions we take on that enable us to become critically literate beings” (Lewison et al., 2008, p. 13). The four dimensions of a critical stance are: consciously engaging; entertaining alternate ways of being; taking responsibility to inquire; and being reflective. The application of the concept of critical stance to the development of social justice teacher education provides a concretized framework for imagining what it means to develop into a social justice teacher. Through this framework, teacher educators can cultivate a “critical literacy of teaching” (Wilhelm, 2009), supporting candidates to develop critical literacy practices with students while simultaneously inquiring into their own pedagogy.

In the development of a critical stance, teachers must learn to adopt a method of
sociopolitical analysis; that is, to question assumptions regarding school policies that reinforce inequalities. Drawing on a critical stance, teacher educators prepare preservice teachers to entertain new ways of being critical and “to know the text and context” (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 11). A critical stance should equip preservice teachers with the knowledge to fight for resources so that all students are provided equitable opportunities to reach their full potential. This means that preservice teachers learn to challenge and question power. Furthermore, preservice teachers need to set high expectations that all students can learn, while also believing in each student’s worth and ability. In essence, in taking responsibility to inquire, candidates are encouraged to move beyond initial understandings by asking questions, interrogating the everyday, and viewing learning and knowledge as dynamic processes. Candidates are also encouraged to challenge their beliefs, and engage in a cycle where knowledge is produced, consumed, and questioned (Lewison et al, 2008). The development of a critical stance challenges students to engage in inquiry around their own positionality and how it operates to maintain and reify oppressive systems. Candidates are expected to question and examine normative discourses around teaching while also iteratively deconstructing internal conceptions of teaching and learning.

A critical stance is useful in categorizing elements of a social justice-teaching disposition, encouraging candidates to choose complex and diverse texts, to speak about power in relation to language, and to evaluate normative interpretations of literacy. A critical stance towards practice is crucial in demanding that reflection becomes core to practice. However, not unlike other social justice approaches, it cannot be viewed as a checklist or a linear trajectory. It follows, then, that viewing the act of teaching through a critical stance can be defined as “teaching through an inquiry context” (Wilhelm, 2009, p. 36). In other words, teachers adopt conceptualizations of justice through a process of reflection, continuously challenging the teacher they are being and
becoming. According to Shor (1992), “questioning socialized values in dialogue means expelling thought and language from their unexamined nests in consciousness, placing them on the table for critical scrutiny” (p. 133). Ultimately, a critical stance can be viewed as a consequence of critical reflection within teacher preparation; it is pertinent to consider the tools and structures necessary to engender such a process, and to qualify teacher development as iterative and always partial.

**Methods**

In this section, I describe how I approached this case study analysis and the larger study in which it is embedded. First, I will detail the overall structure of the initial study to explain how the audio journals were implemented within a secondary humanities licensure program, and how they were used to cultivate a critical stance towards practice. I will then explain how and why I chose a particular participant as a representative of the corpus of data.

In the year 2015, I worked with Secondary English and Social Studies teacher candidates to collaboratively design and teach a practice-based teacher education course called “Studio.” Throughout this study, I analyzed how video recordings of Studio class activities, candidate audio journals, and video recordings of Studio co-design meetings offered discursive opportunities that allowed candidates to design anti-oppressive practices as they narrated their own development as anti-oppressive educators. For the purposes of this paper, I take a deep dive into one element of the Studio course, focusing on how one cohort, enrolled in the Spring 2015 semester of Studio, discursively engaged in designing practice through the use of audio journals.

Throughout Studio, the audio journal was intentionally designed as a voluntary form of reflection, drawing on scholarship that suggests allowing candidates control over their reflective processes can lead to improving reflection within teacher education (Callens & Elen, 2011;
Ramsey, 2010) and support candidates in developing confidence in their decisions (Dyer & Taylor, 2012). The journal was primarily used as a way to describe candidate reflections and experiences at the practicum site, specifically referencing ideas, concepts or practices they wanted to explore in their courses.

Although the audio journal was designed as an optional component of the course, it became widely used. There were no particular guidelines or prompts associated with the audio journal. I wanted candidates to organically discuss their experiences at their practicum site, and to take responsibility for their own introspection. Candidates recorded their audio journals using various programs on their phones. A few students recorded an audio memo and sent their audio journal as an audio text message, while others recorded themselves through their camera on their phone. The majority of students recorded their audio messages using an audio messaging program called VOX.

After each student reflection, I sent an audio journal in response, consistently mirroring their use of either video, audio text messaging, or VOX. I answered candidates’ questions and discussed my thoughts and feelings regarding their narratives. My audio journal response was designed as a form of modeling reflection and relationship building. In conversation with research that advocates for the explicit teaching of reflection (e.g. Ajayi, 2011; Amobi, 2006; Etscheidt, Curran, & Sawyer, 2012; Husu, Toom, & Patrikainen, 2008; Nagle, 2008; Williams & Grudnoff, 2011) and the importance of teacher educators modeling the reflective practice they are explicitly teaching (e.g. Amobi, 2006), I used my audio journal response to relationally facilitate reflection.

Participants

There were 34 preservice teachers enrolled in Studio during the 2015-2016 school year.
At the beginning of the study, during the spring of 2015, there were two separate cohorts enrolled in Studio. In the first cohort there were fourteen students, with only one male student and thirteen female students. Thirteen students identified as White while one female student identified as Latinx. The second cohort consisted of twenty students with seven male students and thirteen female students. The majority of students identified as White, with three of the female students identifying as Latinx and one male student as African.

As mentioned above, for this analysis, I chose to examine the data from the first semester of the Studio course, focusing exclusively on the audio journals recorded by the second cohort. With more participants, more gender, racial and ethnic diversity, and more recorded audio journals, the second cohort provided a unique opportunity to explore the use of audio journals across intersecting identities. Throughout the semester the male participants recorded ten journals and the female participants recorded 38 journals.

For the purpose of this paper, I initially analyze the way in which the twenty candidates used the audio journal to develop a critical stance towards practice. I then draw on data from one teacher candidate—a White, cisgendered female student named Kylie⁴—to illuminate the ways in which candidates negotiated their understanding of equity and practice, and critically reflected on their own preparation. Kylie was chosen because she could be described as “typical” in terms of who makes up the majority of today’s teacher preparation programs (traditional and alternative). Kylie recorded thirteen audio journals, approximately one every week of the semester preceding student teaching. Since the majority of teaching candidates with whom we work are White and female (a common trend across the US), Kylie’s experience with these audio journals can be used to examine how similar reflective practices could be developed in order to

⁴ Pseudonym
address the development of a critical stance in teacher preparation programs at majority-white institutions. The following table represents the body of data analyzed for this article.

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Identified Demographic Information For Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis process

Because the study’s goals center on analysis of the linguistic practices of teacher candidates during their use of oral dialogue journaling, it was designed as a linguistic ethnography. As such, it involved analyzing audio journal for the ideas, messages, values, and beliefs they reflect. Emerging themes were coded in an attempt to identify connections and inconsistencies in relation to the four dimensions of a critical stance. Drawing on critical discourse studies (Chouliakraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 1992; Gee, 1996), I analyzed all 38 journals using the constant comparative method (e.g., Strauss, 1987), mapping how the candidates consciously engaged in, inquired and reflected upon, and performed ways of being across journals. Through a recursive inductive examination of the data, using the qualitative software MAXQDA, I named, categorized, and subcategorized key themes from the journals in relation to critical stance. I first identified emerging themes across all thirty-eight journals (see Figure 2). I then mapped the constitutive relations between and among these categories and examined individual codes in an effort to reveal interactional patterns. These interactional patterns unearthed discursive practices (e.g. Fairclough, 1996), demonstrating some of the ways that participants produced, reproduced, and transformed their knowledge, their perspectives
regarding teaching for social justice, and the way they “tried on” and explored alternative identities within an individualized method of reflection.

The discursive themes across all candidates’ journals included: “Technical Components of Lessons,” “Relationships,” “Teacher Identity,” “Tension and Conflict,” “Emotion,” and “Teacher Beliefs” (see Figure 2). Under each major discursive theme, I also iteratively expanded the coding scheme to develop a second and third set of themes based upon initial analysis, primarily examining the ways that candidates’ were voicing positions in their speech. For example, under the code “Teacher Beliefs,” I explored, whether or not beliefs were “Named,” “Reflected,” or “Demonstrated.” Finally, I considered how all of these themes interacted with the dimensions of a critical stance towards practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergent Themes</th>
<th>Number of Instances</th>
<th>Dimensions of a Critical Stance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Components of Lessons</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Entertaining Alternative Ways of Being—Connecting to a way of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consciously Engaging—challenges how power and identity plays into lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Being Reflective: Uses dialogue and debate with others to use self and others to outgrow oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entertaining Alternative Ways of Being: Creates and tries on new or secondary discourses or identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Identity</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Consciously Engaging: Is aware of the options we have in interpretation, response, and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consciously Engaging: Questions what is commonly viewed as natural and recognizes power relationships that privilege certain people over others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entertaining Alternative Ways of Being: Engages in risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taking Responsibility to Inquire: Reframes schooling (directly, through questions, and indirectly through experiences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection: Is aware of own complicity in maintaining the status quo or systems of injustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension Conflict</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Consciously Engaging: Recognizes how we support or disrupt the status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taking Responsibility to Inquire: Uses the tension of what is not working as a central part of inquiry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the purposes of deeper analysis, I chose two of Kylie’s thirteen audio journals to descriptively analyze, highlighting major themes in relation to the dimensions of critical stance across the transcription and within specific parts of each narrative. The two audio journals, which comprise the body of data described in detail in this paper, were chosen because they were recorded on the same day, received within minutes of each other. They appear to be different versions of the same story. To capture the complexity and nuance to the use of audio journals, I applied the transcription criteria and techniques by Gee (1996). Through this process, I highlighted major themes in relation to the domains across the transcription and within specific parts of each narrative. Breaking the transcription into parts, stanzas and strophes revealed patterns of thinking and insight into meaning making. Without a focus on inflection, the analysis emphasizes narrative structure. Even though I still transcribed how the speaker accentuated particular words, the organization into stanzas encouraged an analysis of how the speaker both adopted and altered quoted speech. Although seemingly the same story of the same event, the transcription reveals a fundamentally different approach to the message of the journal and the way in which the speaker positions herself within it (Bauman, 1986). The following image represents the two journals in their entirety.

---

5 Kylie made no indication that she was aware that she sent two different versions
First Journal

Hey Mary, I have to be really honest. I am filming this from a particular angle because I am trying to hide my acne because I look. (She leans into the camera, showing her skin) Looking a little bit, lit bit dead because I am. Just kidding I just haven’t slept in like a week. Today was magnificent. It was my last day with the sunset kids and this is my last practicum recording. Like my last practicum anything before I student teach and that is weird and scary and I don’t want to think about it. So, sort of what I wanted to talk about was that I was thinking a lot today about how you weave in like anti-oppressive ideologies and strategies into your pedagogy without being explicit about it. Because I think based on the notes that they have written me and you know some of the conversations that I had today, I feel like I have done something right. I don’t think any of that right by explicitly being like “Today we are going to be anti-oppressive. There is no. I never did that. But I am thinking about this because I was sort of ruminating on what you asked last night about how I, as a White, cis woman take up these ideas and try to bring them into my pedagogy. And one of my students junior who was an angel on this earth…he was chatting with his friends and they were all talking or something and someone said something about White people and it was kind of off hand. “What kind of White people nonsense is this?” And, he was like, “hey you know Ms. G, Ms. G is a White person.” And he goes, “but she is not like a White person you know? Like you are White but you are not White.” (Laughs) That really made me laugh. I was like, Thank you (laughs) um…cause that sort of indicated to me like I am White but I am not acting like one of those douchebag (pause) White people. I guess. It actually doesn’t make any sense. It makes sense in my head. And like what I think he was trying to say was that he has felt supportive and he has felt seen and I like I am not being oppressive. And that sort of indicated to me that maybe I have succeeded in doing what I was trying to do.

Second Journal

Hi Mary, I am really teary and I have been all day, and I can’t control, um because life is happening to me and I am like super hormonal right now and I am just, everything is getting to me. This is my last practicum reflection at my time at sunset. And it is my last practicum day before I student teach in the fall and that has this very strange finality to it, that it is kind of putting me in a weird mood and I think I might need to umm have some whiskey. Then, Then was Cali’s comment about how I am White. And this really, so all day, so after, after I said bye to you last night I was still kind of ruminating on anti-oppressive practices and the difference between being anti and non and you know how I take these things up as a White, straight cis woman. And, I was sort of thinking about that today. Just kind of poking around with these ideas and something happened. I think we were talking about a sort of element of cultural appropriation and the way that our identity as westerners in the western united states have developed into how many of these things we have taken from other cultures. We were talking about this stuff and someone said something like White people. And something, and Cali goes “Ms. G is White, but you are not a White person. You know what I mean Ms. G?” And at the moment I was like, Okay, I kind didn’t think about it but I was thinking about it in the car and he was like yeah you are White. I mean he was like, yes you are a White woman but you are not a “White person.” You are not behaving like a White person. Equating correctness with Whiteness. At least that is what I took that to mean. You are not behaving like one of these “All lives matter” assholes. Right? So it was sort of interesting moment. It just made me think about when you asked me “what made all of this okay.” What made my positionality in this arena okay? Then I was like, that. That made it okay. Because these kids are sharing parts of themselves with me that they don’t usually share and they are doing it as people of color and members of marginalized communities and they have deemed me worthy to share these things with and be vulnerable with and that really means a lot. And that realization, and I was like kind of driving home (laughs) and then like, like stared off into the distance and I was like, I did something right. Somewhere, somewhere, I did something right. I don’t know what it was or when it was but I did something right.

Figure 2: Two audio journals of the same story
Findings

Kylie’s two journals above are the only example within the data where a candidate told the same story twice. In both journals, Kylie’s reflections were centered on a conversation that she had with one of her students about her Whiteness. Kylie’s recounting, which changes only slightly across the two recordings, reveals her own process of racial and ethnic negotiation. Furthermore, it speaks to the performativity of reflection, especially as an educational requirement. Drawing on concepts of critical reflection within preservice teacher education, the analysis of these journals provides unique insight into the use of this kind of reflection as a pedagogical tool in teacher education. Furthermore, the analysis challenges conceptions of reflection within teacher preparation, arguing for greater awareness of the role of performance and positionality in the process of reflection.

The story of “not really being White,” was Kylie’s first journal on her Whiteness, but she was not the only candidate who chose to use the audio journal for this type of reflection. Kylie used this story as justification of her readiness to do social justice work, but more specifically to teach Students of Color. She positioned herself as vulnerable, sometimes emotional, but in both cases she presented the conversation as an answer to a question that I had posed previously.

The night before she recorded these two audio journals, we had spoken on the phone about an upcoming lesson, and I had asked her about how she felt about being a White, cisgendered, social justice teacher. While at the time, she focused exclusively on the idea of anti-oppressive practice, ignoring the question about her identity; her audio journal provided direct insight into her still nascent understanding of how her Whiteness plays into her pedagogy. These two audio journals represent the interactive component of oral reflection and its’ ability to mirror...
an extended conversation. Kylie is responding to an event, while also drawing on our previous interaction, and our conversations throughout the course. The reflection feels organic, relevant to both Kylie and myself. However, in considering how Kylie’s journals represent a relational interaction, they also unintentionally reveal how reflection, no matter how seemingly organic, is curated, and performed.

In the following section I represent a comparative analysis of Kylie’s two audio journals separated into parts, stanzas and strophes (Gee, 1999). Throughout the comparison, I characterize the narrative structure of the audio journal. The structure is as follows: 1) Introduction of self in relation to the characters, 2) The purpose of recording the journal; 3) The prompt; 4) The event; and 5) The application of reflection. I specifically examine the effect of quoted speech as a device across journals, to make sense of how Kylie was narrating her sense of self, while incorporating the voice of others in that conceptualization. Finally, within each section of the analysis, I reference how Kylie is developing a critical stance towards practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part one: Introduction of Characters and Relationships</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART ONE: Appearance</strong></td>
<td><strong>PART ONE (Emotional)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STROPHE ONE: (Filming)</td>
<td>STROPHE ONE (Can’t control it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANZA 1: (Trying to look good)</td>
<td>STANZA 1 (I’m really teary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hey Mary</td>
<td>1. Hi Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. so um I got to be really honest</td>
<td>2. I am really teary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I’m filming this from a particular angle</td>
<td>3. and I have been all day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. cause I am trying to hide my acne</td>
<td>4. and I can’t control it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANZA 2 (Looking dead)</td>
<td><strong>STANZA 2 (life is happening to me)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Because I look</td>
<td>5. um because life is happening to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Look-look /a little bit/ lit bit dead</td>
<td>6. and I am like super hormonal anyway right now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. because I am /Just kidding</td>
<td>7. and I am just everything is getting to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I just haven’t slept in like a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first part of Kylie’s story serves as an introduction. She speaks to me directly, referencing me by my first name. From there, the stories diverge, with Kylie creating different levels of intimacy. In the first transcript, Kylie sets an intimate tone by referencing her acne, and self-deprecatingly describing herself as “dead.” She also reveals an existing relationship with her audience, showing vulnerability and explaining that she is exhausted. In comparison, the second transcript begins with Kylie being outwardly emotional. She describes being out of control and once again references her body. However, rather than just pointing out superficial blemishes, she internally frames the introduction by calling herself “super hormonal.” Although both the first and second transcript set a personal tone, the second transcript subtly speaks to a commonality between Kylie and myself—she situates her story by indexing gender. The conversational tone of the audio journal is one characteristic that supports its use in social justice teacher education programs, and reveals how conversations around race, class, gender, sexuality and ability become personal, political and embodied. At the beginning of the journal, the existing relationship between speaker and listener alongside the speaker’s own body is highlighted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part Two: The Purpose Behind the audio journal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART TWO: (Practicum)</strong></td>
<td><strong>PART TWO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STROPHE TWO: (emotions)</strong></td>
<td><strong>STROPHE TWO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANZA 3: (The last of everything)</strong></td>
<td><strong>STANZA 3 (Feelings about the last practicum)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. today was magnificent.</td>
<td>8. This is my last practicum reflection from my time at sunset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It was my last day with the sunset kids</td>
<td>9. and it’s my last PRACTICUM day before I student TEACH in the fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. and THIS is my last practicum recording</td>
<td>10. and that has this very strange finality to it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. like my last practicum anything before I student teach</td>
<td>11. that it’s kind of putting me in a weird mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANZA 4: (Not wanting to think about it)</td>
<td>12. and I think I might need to umm have some whiskey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 and that’s weird</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 and scary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and I don’t want to think about it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4: Part Two of Kylies Story*
After situating the story in her body, Kylie introduces the purpose for the audio journal—her last day at her practicum site. Like part one, the transcripts in part two differ by emotion, matching the initial level of vulnerability presented in the introduction. For example, transcript one remains superficial. Kylie immediately describes the day as “magnificent,” specifically referencing her desire to remain on the surface by not “want[ing] to think about” the end of her practicum experience. In comparison, in transcript two, Kylie fails to apply an emotion to her departure, only explaining the “finality” of the situation and her desire to “have some whiskey.” Across transcripts, the purpose of the audio journal remains the same with Kylie telling the story of the “last practicum day before she student teaches.” Furthermore, Kylie ends this section across transcripts by stating a desire to ignore how she feels. In the first transcript Kylie explains that she doesn’t want to think about her “scary” and “weird” emotions, while in the second, she wants to respond to her “weird mood” with alcohol. In both journals, purpose is interwoven with an expressed unwillingness to be emotive, yet, in many ways, the terms of meaning are prefaced, letting the listener know that they can and should “read” emotion between the lines.

A critical stance towards practice is rooted in both who is talking and who is listening, with candidates feeling compelled to introduce themselves in relation to the characters of the story and their audience. By the second part of Kylie’s story, we know that she is a practicum student, is speaking with whom someone she feels compelled to be both physically and emotionally vulnerable, and is telling a story of transition. Her reflection is a story, revealing insights about her beliefs by how she authors her experience.
Figure 5: Part Three of Kylie’s Story

In part three of Kylie’s audio journal, she makes a discursive move away from her emotions to specifically discuss what prompted her reflection. As mentioned above, the audio journals were flexible, with candidates never receiving a specific journal prompt. Yet, in response to this flexibility, candidates often chose an experience or conversation shared with the listener as an entry point into reflection. This method created an ongoing reflective thread and a
much more conversational nature to the journal. In part three, for example, Kylie was "ruminating" on a conversation that we had the previous evening. The term "ruminating" was used in each transcript, providing insight into how Kylie situated herself at the beginning of the journal. Her emotion around leaving the practicum site played into her reflection. She was ready to do this work, and she really loved her students, providing more legitimacy to a theoretical and intersectional reflection.

In part three of Kylie’s audio journals, each transcript has a different narrative structure, shifting the catalyzing event. In transcript one, for example, Kylie immediately makes the reflection about her own curiosity. She says, “I was thinking a lot today about how you weave in like anti-oppressive ideologies and strategies into your pedagogy without being explicit about it.” In transcript one, Kylie’s “thought” stems from her perception of “doing something right.” She justifies her avoidance of direct anti-oppressive pedagogy since she thinks she manages to do it in more subtle ways. It is not until the end of the transcript that Kylie connects her rumination with a conversation around her Whiteness and gender identity. In comparison, in the second transcript, Kylie begins her reflection by talking about “some really awesome thing that happened,” and “what we were talking about last night.” She does not begin with theory or even a question, but instead starts with commenting on the previous conversation.

Kylie’s reflection regarding social justice practice varies across transcripts. In transcript one, Kylie describes anti-oppressive teaching as doing something “right.” She emphasizes the word “right,” repeating it twice. She follows this by changing the tone of her voice, using quoted speech and mocking a direct approach to anti-oppressive practice by saying, “today we are going to be anti-oppressive.” Kylie also situates her positionality not in terms of how she identifies, but in restating my previous question. “I have been ruminating on what you asked me last night
about how I, as like a White cis straight woman.” She speaks of her identity in regards to how she was referred, not in terms of her own identification.

In the second transcript, Kylie reveals not only a shift in content, but also emotion. At the beginning of transcript two Kylie was “emotional,” “hormonal” and “out of control.” Yet, when she begins to explain her reflection, she describes it as “some really awesome things.” Her shift in emotion feels to more closely parallel the first transcript. Furthermore, her concern about doing something “right” transforms into just being “okay.” Paralleling the same structure in the previous transcript, Kylie emphasizes the word “okay” and repeats it twice. Rather than situating her positionality in another conversation she states, “How I take these things up as a White straight cis woman.” By emphasizing the words “how,” “White,” and “woman,” Kylie speaks about practice in relation to her Whiteness and her femaleness, both of which come up later on in the story.

In part three of Kylie’s story we are provided with two examples of a candidate “trying on” the role of social justice teacher. We see her either feeling confident about her ability to take on anti-oppressive practice indirectly—viewing her Whiteness and gender identity as more of a conversation than something connected with her pedagogy—or as struggling with being okay with doing this work as someone who benefits from systems of oppression. There is no way to gauge Kylie’s true beliefs about her identity and her social justice practice; however, her definition of practice in the context of her own identity is a useful reflection. Furthermore, it provides an entry point for a teacher educator to continue pushing on how Whiteness, gender and ability influence a candidates’ ability to combat injustice.

In part three of Kylie’s story, we see how the elements of a critical stance overlap, in revealing and interesting ways. For example, in the first transcript, Kylie is being reflective by
using dialogue and an encounter with her students to express a conflict within herself. She isn’t necessarily consciously engaging with social justice, but rather, is recounting an interaction by positioning herself as already socially just. In the second transcript, however, she is entertaining alternative ways of being by claiming her positionality and explaining her reflection around her own contemplation. Thus, that even though the story is the same, her different approaches and processes of inquiry reveal a willingness to critically examine her disposition.

**Part Four: The Story of Whiteness and Critical Reflection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PART FOUR (White People)</td>
<td>PART FOUR: (The Story of Whiteness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STROPHÉ FOUR (The story of Whiteness)</td>
<td>STROPHÉ THREE: (Cali’s Comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANZA 8 (Junior the angel tells a story)</td>
<td>STANZA 7 (Whiteness and cultural appropriation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. and one of my students junior / who is an angel on this earth ((Bangs on Table))</td>
<td>25 I think we were talking about/ a sort of element of cultural appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. um, he was chatting with his friends</td>
<td>26 and the way our IDENTITY /as WESTERNERS in the western united states /has developed into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 and they were all talking/ or something</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 and somebody said something about White people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANZA 9 (She is not a White person)</td>
<td>27 how many of these things we’ve taken from other cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 and like it was kind of off hand</td>
<td>And we were talking about stuff /and someone said something like White people (laughs) and something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. “What kind of White people nonsense is this?” ((changes voices))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 And, (laughs) um he was like/ “hey but you know like Ms. G is a wh – Ms. Grenie is a White person”</td>
<td>30 and Cali goes / “Mrs. Grenie is White”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. And he goes, “but she is not like a WHITE person you know?”</td>
<td>31 You know what I mean Mrs. Grenie?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANZA 10 (I am White but not White)</td>
<td>32 And at the moment I was like “Okay” ((laughs))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Like he was like/ “you are White, but you are not WHITE” ((laughs))</td>
<td>STANZA 8 (Mrs. Grenie is White)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. That really made me laugh ((laughs))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. um I was like thank you (laughs)</td>
<td>29 and Cali goes /“Mrs. Grenie is White”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. um – cause that sort of indicated to me like I am White</td>
<td>30 and he goes / “but you are not a White person”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanza 11 (Douchebag White people)</td>
<td>31 You know what I mean Mrs. Grenie?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. but I am not acting like one of those</td>
<td>32 And at the moment I was like “Okay” ((laughs))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I mean like he was like, “yes YOU ARE a White WOMAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
douchebag White people
42. I guess that actually doesn’t make any sense.
43. It makes sense in my head
44. And like what I think he was trying to say is that —

STANZA 10 (Behaving like a White person)
37. but you are not a WHITE PERSON
38. You are not BEHAVING like a WHITE PERSON
39. He was equating correctness with Whiteness.
40 or At least that is what I took that to mean

STANZA 11 (Behaving like a political White asshole)
41. “You are not BEHAVING like one of these
42. “All lives matter assholes” ((Uses her hand to make quotes))
43. right? (( Laughs))
44. Um so it was sort of interesting moment

Figure 6: Part Four of Kylie’s Story

Part Four, the event within both audio journals, is similar across transcripts. The primary difference is within the quoted speech that Kylie uses to describe her and her students as characters within the story. In fact, Kylie names the main student something different in each story, changing his identity from Junior to Cali. In transcript one, for example, there is an unknown student who provokes a pivotal conversation. He says, “What kind of White people nonsense is this?” In the second transcript, the student is more benign and anonymous. Kylie doesn’t directly quote the student, and only vaguely references his role in the conversation. In transcript one, Junior is quoted in saying the following: 2.) “Hey but you know like Ms. G is, Ms. G is a White person” 3.) “But she is not like a White person you know?” 4.) “You are White, but you are not White.” Junior repeats the word “White” three times within the transcript, only emphasizing the word when he is describing what Kylie is not. At first, Junior seems to be defending Kylie, reminding the student that when he calls something “White nonsense,” he is in fact speaking about Kylie. Immediately, however he realizes that this description could be seen as insult and takes it back. “She is not like a “White” person,” he defends his statement to his friends. In wanting support for his case, he finally speaks directly to Kylie, including her in the
conversation by using the pronoun “you.” You are White but you are not “White.” He implies that the emphasis he places on the word “White” is indeed negative, and something that no one in the conversation could possibly be. At the end of the exchange, Kylie takes this to mean that she is “not acting like one of those douchebag White people,” and that in fact, she is different.

In the second transcript Kylie places a much larger role in both the stimulation and approval of the conversation. Unlike in transcript one, this feels like a deliberate discursive move—a purposeful addition to the story. She says, “I think we were talking about a sort of element of cultural appropriation and the way our Identity as Westerners in the western United States has developed into how many of these things we’ve taken from other cultures.” She emphasizes the word “identity” and westerner,” setting the stage for the conversation to come.

In this version, Junior (who is now Cali) describes Kylie’s Whiteness with more specificity, including Kylie not as a listener but as a corroborator. He says the following: 1.) “Mr. G is White” 2.) “but you are not a White person” 3.) “You know what I mean Ms. G?” In the second transcript he doesn’t emphasize White, because he creates a separation between White and White person. One is a race, and the other is a type of person. In the second transcript he addresses Kylie when he says, “you are not a White person,” but then specifically asks her to comment on his statement by asking, “you know what I mean?” In response, Kylie then re-voices what she heard Cali saying, still using quoted speech. She quotes the following statements: 1.) “Yes you are a White woman but you are not a White person. 2.) You are not behaving like a White Person. 3.) You are not behaving like one of these “All lives matter assholes” right?

Kylie responds to Cali’s attempt to include her in the conversation. She interprets the interaction, choosing to use his voice, making sense of his two versions of Whiteness. Instead of separating “White” and “White person” like Cali did in the beginning of the story, she makes the
distinction between a White woman, and a White person, emphasizing being a woman over her Whiteness. She expands upon this interpretation, stating that it isn’t about Whiteness, personhood, or womanhood, but rather, “bad” Whiteness is about behavior. Unlike transcript one, Kylie makes this behavior distinctly politicized. Rather than seeing negative Whiteness as “douchebag” behavior, it is more specifically about a political stance. It is about a belief that “all lives matter.” In both transcripts, Kylie indexes either language associated with fraternities and “bro culture” or language associated with a political stance against the black lives matter movement. In both transcripts she equates her students’ description of Whiteness to mean something collectively negative that White people are known to do.

The use of quoted speech is something unique in audio journal reflections. Written reflections rarely incorporate an element of dialogue, especially when not prompted. The audio journal as a tool provides a specific lens to see Kylie’s interpretation of events, without any explicit statement about her Whiteness and her identity as a social justice educator. Her performance of Cali’s/Junior’s comment about her identity illustrates how Kylie believes that not being “White” or seen as a “White person” makes you more effective as an anti-oppressive teacher. In comparing her first and second version of her story, we can see Kylie negotiate the possibility of separating herself from her White identity.

Kylie’s expanded role within the second transcript along with her expression of identity exposes a possible sequence for Kylie’s recordings. It suggests that Kylie possibly recorded the first transcript and then felt the need to tell the story differently, to position her understanding of anti-oppressive practice in more complicated ways. Thus, the thread of “not being White” gains more importance. It exists across transcripts as a common message and idea. Although in the second transcript Kylie attempts to demonstrate more hesitation and humility, using words like
“okay,” and politicizing her classroom curriculum and Whiteness, her understanding of her own racialization remains the same.

Part four of Kylie’s story, specifically in relation to how she choices to both interpret the interaction and name and voice her student, is particularly revealing of how audio journals contribute to the development of a critical stance. It is evident that a conversation around her Whiteness, directed by her students, moves her beyond her initial understanding, pushing her to new and complicated ways of imagining how and why Whiteness can be negatively perceived in teaching. She engages in risk taking, by choosing to reflect on this particular event, and engages dialectically with a tension between who she is as a White woman, and who she imagines herself to be as a social justice educator. While the content of the journal is unique, it reveals a common dilemma within social justice teacher education, with White resistance (Crowley & Smith, 2015) and fatigue (Flynn, 2015) reported as responses to social justice teacher education curriculum.

Part Five: The Impact of Reflection on Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanza 12 (I am not being oppressive)</td>
<td>STANZA 12 (That made it okay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. he’s felt supportive</td>
<td>45. It just made me think about when you asked me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. and he’s felt seen</td>
<td>46. “what made all of this okay? What made my positionality in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. like I am not BEING oppressive</td>
<td>THIS arena okay?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. and that sort of indicated to</td>
<td>47. then I was like, THAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me that maybe I have succeeded in</td>
<td>48. THAT made it okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing what I was trying to do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANZA 13 (Kids sharing made it okay)

49. Because these kids are sharing parts of themselves
50. with me that they don’t usually share
60. and they are doing it as people of color
70. and members of marginalized communities

STANZA 14 (Being deemed worthy is okay)

71. and they have deemed me worthy to share these things
72. with and be vulnerable with
73. and that really means a lot.
and that realization

STANZA 15 (I did something right)

74. I was like kind of driving home ((laughs))
75. And then like ((laugh))
76. like STARED off into the distance and I was like
77. “I did something right

STANZA 16 (Somewhere I did something right)

78. Somewhere, somewhere I did (laughs) something right
79. I don’t know when it was or what it was
80. But I did something right”

Figure 7: Part Five of Kylie’s Story

Kylie finishes the first transcript feeling successful as a social justice teacher. She says that she believes that Junior felt supported and that she had “succeeded.” She does not use quoted speech, but instead focuses on the lesson of the story. In the second transcript she states “THAT made it okay.” She indexes her own story as justification, arguing that not being seen as White made her presence in urban areas “okay.” She describes her students for the first time as marginalized and students of color. She doesn’t immediately claim that she succeeded, but instead puts the measurement of her success in her students’ hands. “They have deemed me worthy,” she states. The second audio journal ends by circling back to her original message—that she was right. She repeats, “I did something right,” three times, sending almost musical or sermonic quality to her journal. At the end of both transcripts, being right is how she defines being anti-oppressive.

Discussion and Implications

Audio journals and Whiteness

This article reports on the use of audio journals as a form of critical anti-oppressive reflection within SJTE. In analyzing one candidate’s embodied memories and experiences and drawing on Gee’s (1999) transcription technique, my initial findings contribute to the body of
literature aimed at understanding how preservice teachers develop identities as social justice educators (Britzman, 2003; Jones, 2009; Rodgers & Scott, 2008). The audio journals analyzed for this paper serve as only one example of how candidates reflected on their positionalities. Unlike other transcripts, the data above is the only example of a candidate recording and submitting the same story twice. Thus, it provides a unique opportunity to examine performance and authenticity in critical reflection—with the similarities between the two journals exposing negotiated beliefs.

In both of her audio journals, Kylie ignores her own ethnicity and fails to acknowledge her racialized self. Kylie’s adoption of an unmarked, normative position allows her to teach ‘Others’ while feeling compelled to erase an unexamined definition of her own Whiteness. In her use of quoted speech, Kylie represent Whiteness as a “mirrored identity” . . . a reflection of everything it is not . . .” (McKinney, 2006, p. 4). In her reflection on her interaction, she reveals the ways in which racialized discourses are always enmeshed with those of class, gender, age and ability, and how, as a White woman, she stands with her students by “not really being White.”

The use of the audio journal within SJTE challenges the silence that exists within social justice teacher education, specifically around complicated issues such as the race and ethnicity of its participants. Audio journals can be seen as engagement with critical issues such as Whiteness, particularly in ways that are individualized and make a difference to each candidate. Levine-Rasky (2000, p. 19) describes such work as “always in tension” since we are attempting to “struggle against the inequities that Whiteness arranges.” While most teachers and teacher educators are both positioned and advantaged by Whiteness, the use of audio journals may provide a unique practice in countering the normalization of such identities.
Reflection and the Development of a Critical Stance

Reflection has too often been presented as a tool in teacher education, rather than as a complex concept that must be deeply understood (Danielowich, 207). Although I am suggesting audio journals as a possible tool within teacher education, I argue that the actual concept itself encourages a dialogical process for individual teacher candidates and between teacher educators and their students. At the end of Kylie’s story, we are not left with a concretized identity as a social justice educator, but rather we are provided with insight into an internal and external negotiation of self. Kylie is able to position herself as both the author and a character within her own development. Rather than imagining the process of reflection as individual, she is building her ideas and her identity in and through relationships. Tessema (2008) states that “reflection is a dynamic, multilayered, non-predictable, social process” (p. 357), suggesting both a tool and process that scaffolds such interaction. Audio journals may provide a window into how teacher educators can design experiences that encourage candidates to challenge deficit views toward their students, and to engage in conflict around complicated notions of justice, teaching and self.

Critical Reflection and Teacher Education Pedagogies

Even candidates who are not deliberately opposed to dealing with racially and culturally diverse issues in education need guidance and support in critiquing and changing thoughts, beliefs, and behaviors related to them (Gay & Kirkland, 2003). One possible way to generate this mentorship around reflection is for teacher education programs to weave in reflective tools and processes within their curriculum, making reflection a central focus of learning to teach. The power of the audio journal in this process lays in its ability to engender personal and inner reflective dialogues. Yet, audio journals also encourage similar dialogues between candidates and teacher educators. Thus, teacher educators’ ability to engage in critical conversations with
candidates about racial and culturally diverse dilemmas in education is a teacher education pedagogy that needs to be cultivated. The practice of critical reflection does not occur in isolation. What we can learn from Kylie’s audio journals is that critical reflection has the potential to transform critical thoughts into transformative practice. Yet, without a personal and emotional interaction with teacher educators, critical reflection can remain in the self, never influencing pedagogy.

**CONCLUSION**

In the context of a diverse classroom landscape, teaching has become simultaneously more complicated and nuanced. As a result, teachers and teacher educators are forced to consider more than “effective” teaching when designing innovative and relevant preparation. The quality of teaching, the ethnicity and gender of students, and the access and distribution of resources continue to occupy discourses surrounding equitable teaching and teacher preparation (Kaur, 2012). Thus, what it means to prepare justice-oriented teachers requires a response to both the political and legislative context of teaching and learning. To remain significant, teacher educators need to embed issues of justice in the knowledge, skills and attitudes of teacher preparation curriculum as well as within their pedagogical approaches (Grant & Agosto 2008). In “Making Practice Matter: A Year Long Curriculum For Social Justice Teacher Educators,” I detail a possible curricular design that encourages both teacher candidates and teacher educators to individualize preparation but to do so by iteratively examining power and privilege in classrooms and beyond.

In “Behind the Curtain: Structuring Preservice Teacher Education for Social Justice Teaching Identities,” the development of anti-oppressive practice is presented as both a process and a product of the Studio curriculum. By examining Amilcar’s experience throughout studio, I
situate teacher preparation as a complex endeavor—one that involves teacher educators having an understanding of their own interpretations of justice and oppression as well as awareness of their students’ lives and perspectives. Through co-design, I proposed a learning environment that incorporated multiple ways of constructing knowledge with contexts that could possibly nurture dynamic interactions and engagements. Ultimately, I considered the consequence of an equity-focused curriculum on one students’ social justice teaching development, and a possible framework for comprehending candidates’ growth in such an endeavor.

Finally in “She is White but Not Really White: Using Audio Journals as a Form of Critical Reflection in Preservice Teacher Education,” I examined how by allowing pre-service teachers to engage in a process of critical reflection through audio journals, I encouraged candidates to reflect upon their own actions, and their definition of practice within a larger social context. According to Cochran-Smith (2004), teacher preparation curriculum needs to consider social justice as an outcome of learning to teach. This implies that reflection, action, and interaction are central to the life of a preservice teacher as they engage with others candidates in context. Through the analysis of Kylie’s audio journals, I consider ways to embed reflection within a equity-focused curriculum and alongside a co-design process.

**Implications for Future Research**

After creating and teaching Studio for the past three years, I now consider myself a teacher educator. Like my experiences as a teacher, the process was slow, filled with moments of self-doubt and self-realization. Also, like my journey in the classroom, my identity as a teacher educator is more connected to realizing what I don’t know than what I do. After three years in Studio, I know that the emotional and relational dimensions of anti-oppressive teacher education need to be considered when describing the possibilities for teacher education pedagogies and
practices. For example, Amilcar’s experience throughout Studio, specifically his willingness to adopt Gina’s personal and emotional account of practice during the co-design process, reveals an important next step in designing preparation spaces that allow candidates to see their identity in the lives of the other. Rehearsal and audio journals during Studio provided a unique site for the internal negotiation of self. Amilcar explored his teaching, activist, and student identities, considering each in light of the other. However, it wasn’t until Amilcar co-designed his own preparation that he willingly incorporated other voices into his interpretation of anti-oppressive teaching. His response to the design process speaks of a need to further investigate when and how candidates are able to empathize during preparation, considering the perspectives of others as their own.

Kylie’s engagement with audio journals expands upon this important inquiry. While Kylie was able to critically reflect on her Whiteness and ability to perform anti-oppressive teaching, she never considered her students’ experiences outside of her own identity work. She explored what it meant to students for her to “not be White,” but never evaluated why students felt compelled to describe her as such. The audio journals, while a powerful tool for critical reflection, failed to encourage candidates to include the stories of others within their own self-reflection. They served the purpose of bringing to light candidates’ internal dialogue, yet as a tool, they never reached beyond the individual.

I think that my dissertation work has provided a foundation for my future scholarship, challenging me to reconsider and re-imagine the dispositions and practices necessary to teach for justice for both teacher educators and future teachers. Through the analysis of both Amilcar’s and Kylie’s experiences, I feel compelled to explore what it means for teachers to become anti-oppressive educators by first analyzing the self, then using their understanding of the self to
imagine the experiences and perspectives of their future students.

Through my dissertation, I have proposed a novel way to engage teacher candidates in their preparation towards an anti-oppressive stance towards practice. While I find incredible potential in such work, I recognize the importance of extending my analysis to describing the teacher education pedagogies necessary for engaging and supporting the preparation of anti-oppressive teachers. While I am interested in considering how these pedagogies develop empathy and vulnerability, I am also intrigued by how teacher educators design and enact discipline specific practices to support candidates in their emotional development. For example, I am curious how English teacher educators design preparation spaces with an attention to their own preparation as teacher educators, using their professional journey as fodder for their practice. Further, with attention to how secondary English teacher educators develop both themselves and future teachers, I hope to eventually follow candidates from their preparation to their classroom, evaluating what effective anti-oppressive teacher education actually looks like in the first few years of teaching.

Studio has served as a vehicle for my own progression as a teacher educator and as a researcher. It is through listening, and working closely with candidates, that I have found ways to bridge my work in the past to who I want to be in the future. Teacher education holds the potential for changing schools and systems, but more importantly, it can shape understandings of what it means to teach for justice and equity, and what it could look like to prepare the next generation of educators.
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Appendix A

Sample Interview Questions

After Field Based Experience
1.) How do you see social justice within your practicum site? What are ways in which you would enhance school culture and practice in order to include all students? What are some real strengths of your practicum site/teacher in terms of social justice?

2.) During the lesson today: Does the teacher provide opportunities for students to apply literacy skills? Do they demonstrate knowledge of content? Do they understand how to develop lessons that reflect interconnectedness of content areas included Math? Is the lesson relevant to students and connect to background and contextual knowledge?

3.) During the lesson today: Does the teacher provide students with the opportunity to work in teams and develop leadership qualities? How so? Does the teacher communicate effectively with clear learning objectives? Does the teacher involve students in monitoring their own learning? Does the teacher evaluate students’ performance based on multiple measures?

4.) During the lesson today: Does the teacher use data to inform practice? Does the teacher implement new ideas? How does the teacher support struggling students?

5.) During the lesson today: How was media/technology incorporated within this lesson? How is technology used in the classroom? What type of technological literacies are encouraged?

6.) What is your role in the classroom? What are you learning? Etc.

During/After Studio Experience
1.) What about video annotation/ rehearsal, etc. allowed you to look at practice in a different way? How does ________ method allow you to advocate for all students in your classroom? How does race, ethnicity, class, gender, etc. connect to the lesson or segment connected? How do you know?

2.) After class today what are you going to change about your lesson? How are you going to change it?

3.) What is an educative assessment for your lesson plan? How do you know?

4.) What would you change about the structure of class today? What instructional strategies were used? What did you see?

After Studio Design Meeting/Reflection:
1.) How did the meeting feel this month? How did reflecting on the course design influence your own practice/lesson design?

2.) What was difficult about using study reflection/data to inform practice? How did the conversation make it easier/harder?

3.) What instructional strategies do you feel are really working/not working?

4.) How are the students taking up social justice? How do you know? What about you? How do you feel like you are taking about social justice?
Appendix B

Initial Codes

Source – descriptors

○ Descriptor then code to categorize it. The conversation and the topic was and the type of communication.
○ Intimacy (You feel like you are in therapy with Mary)

● Conversation Topic
○ Practicum
○ Studio
○ Classes
○ Personal Life connected to topic
○ Personal life not connected to topic
○ Other

● Crisis - Something happened. And because something happened there is a named or demonstrated moment of questioning. What does it mean? Do I want to be a teacher?
○ Named
○ Demonstrated

● Teacher Identity: A stated identity - as a teacher, I am X.

● Teacher Beliefs: Things that student say about what teaching is or is meant to accomplish.
○ Named
○ Demonstrated (Dispositions)
  ▪ Text selection (Social Justice)
  ▪ Topic Selection/Theme (Social Justice)
  ▪ Questioning (inquiry)
  ▪ Discussion (Student Centered)
  ▪ Anti-oppressive practice/Social Justice
  ▪ Discipline
  ▪ Classroom Culture

Reflected

● Mary
● CT
● Other professors

Tension/Conflict

● Emotion - When students say or express that they are feeling the following:
Sad, Angry, Happy, Proud, Conflicted, Stressed, Fearful, etc. (crying)
  • Named
  • Demonstrated

- Relationships
  • Mary
  • CT
  • Students
  • Other professors
  • Colleagues (other students)
  • Family
  • Other

- Technical Components: candidate have to be speaking about technical components of teaching.
  • Routines and procedures
  • Lesson design
  • Strategies
  • Discourse

Teacher Education Pedagogy (What you are doing?)
  1) Vulnerability
  2) Question
Appendix C
Second Codebook

PARENT CODES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation Topic</th>
<th>On Site Practice</th>
<th>Type of Communication</th>
<th>In Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Design</td>
<td>Rehearsal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Annotation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Beliefs about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ teaching and anti-oppressive</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices</td>
<td>with Students,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHILD CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Code</th>
<th>Sub-code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Mary</td>
<td>Words associated with Relationships</td>
<td>The candidate uses words that reveal their relationship with Mary. For example, “I trust you.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Experience</td>
<td>Speaks directly about Mary</td>
<td>The candidate speaks directly about Mary when describing Studio or Teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaks about an experience as a student</td>
<td>Describes what it was like for them in school (k-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks about an experience in their life</td>
<td>Reveals personal information about their life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks about an experience as a teacher</td>
<td>Describes events in the past when teaching in practicum or even volunteering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks about an experience in another class.</td>
<td>Connects to something in another CU class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names an Emotion or feeling</td>
<td>Names an emotion or feeling related to a teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student specifically names an emotion: Fear, Love, etc. when either describing a teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Names an emotion disconnected from teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student specifically names an emotion out of the context of teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching personality and disposition</td>
<td>Students describe their beliefs about teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students describe what they thinking teaching is or how teachers should act, or how they should interact, speak with students and colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students describe who they are as teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students explain who they are as teachers by either describing interactions or specifically naming them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off the script (Swearing, Crying Personal)</td>
<td>Students begin to talk about something seemingly random or disconnected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students describe something random that isn’t personal information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students have emotional “outburst” either with crying or swearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional outburst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>There is a feeling of intimacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We need to describe this…by going through the data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Oppressive Stance</td>
<td>Candidate uses the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to</td>
<td>Candidate specifically makes reference to culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Essential Question: What does it look like to build a joyful classroom culture that addresses Race, Class, gender, Sexuality and Ability?</td>
<td>word culture</td>
<td>Candidates describe issues of equity in their practicum site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates Talk about Curriculum</td>
<td>Candidates describe texts, themes, etc. related to ideas</td>
<td>Students describe moments where they felt emotion, or when they felt like they were being themselves in classes. This could also mean that students are vulnerable or share personal stories and teachers want to deal with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students describe Vulnerability or “Critical Witnessing”</td>
<td>Students describe ways that their CT structures routines or procedures or asks questions or describe their own routines or procedures</td>
<td>Students describe how CT’s or Students or themselves use discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students mention routine or procedures</td>
<td>Students describe discourse in classrooms</td>
<td>Students describe how CT’s or Students or themselves use discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students describe routine or procedures</td>
<td>Students describe discourse in classrooms</td>
<td>Candidates talk about CT. Candidates talk about CT and classroom culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates speak about the CT (Cooperating Teacher) and how they approach this question.</td>
<td>Students reflect on conversations had with CT’s</td>
<td>Students describe approaching conversations with CTs about teaching, equity, culture etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students reflect on conversations they had with CTs</td>
<td>Students reflect on conversations they had with other students in class/outside of class</td>
<td>Students describe hard conversations that occurred with other students in class/outside of class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students reflect on conversations they had with CTs</td>
<td>Students reflect on conversations they had with students</td>
<td>Students reflect on hard conversations they had with students about race, class, gender, sexuality, and ethnicity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Connection to the Essential Question: How do you have hard conversations about race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, etc. | Critical Stance | Consciously Engaging | 1. Goes beyond simply offering texts  
2. Questions what is commonly viewed as natural and recognizes power relationships that privilege certain people over others  
3. Reframes the issue and modifies the student’s cultural model(s)  
4. Recognizes how we support or disrupt the status quo  
5. Is aware of the options we have in interpretation, response, and action |
| Entertaining Alternate | 1. Creates and tries on new or secondary discourses or identities | 1. Creates and tries on new or secondary discourses or identities |
| Ways of Being | 2. Engages in risk taking  
3. Uses the tension of what is not working as a central part of inquiry  
4. See the inquiry project as a tool of power, an artifact that can actually be used |
| Taking Responsibility to Inquire | 1. Gains knowledge from multiple and contradictory perspectives  
2. Engages in a cycle where new knowledge provokes new questions and where new questions generate new knowledge  
3. Reframes schooling (directly, through questions, and indirectly through experiences)  
4. Moves beyond initial understandings and pushes beliefs out of resting places |
| Being Reflective | 1. Is aware of own complicity in maintaining the status quo or systems of injustice  
2. Actively and systemically questions and evaluates critical literacy practices  
3. Uses dialogue and debate with others to use self and others to outgrow oneself  
4. Re-theorizes assumptions, beliefs, and understandings  
5. Engages in praxis (reflection and action) generating theory as intervention |
| Anti-Oppressive Pedagogy | Education For The Other | Candidates describe their lessons in terms of students whose identities differ from their own. |
| | Education About the Other | Candidates are able to describe their lessons in relation to topics, characters etc. that are typically marginalized from canonical pedagogy |
| | Education That is Critical of Privileging and Othering | Lessons and reflections on lessons are critical of how their position as well as their practice privilege and other their students |
| | Education that Changes Students and Society | Candidates describe how their lessons, and their practice are indicative of larger society, either through authenticity or through experiential projects. |

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION:** Technical components of teaching

<p>| Lesson Design | Student talks about Objectives | Students mention or describe or reference to objectives |
| | Students talk about inquiry in lesson plan | Students describe how to access students’ background knowledge and introduce material in an engaging way. |
| | Students talk about introduction | Students describe how to give direct instruction |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students talk about Guided practice</td>
<td>Students talk about ways to facilitate skill development and to gradual release knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students talk about Independent practice</td>
<td>Students talk about ways to facilitate students independently practicing skill or ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students talk about discussion</td>
<td>Students describe ways to lead discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students talk about questioning</td>
<td>Students describe ways to question and get students to question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students talk about assessment</td>
<td>Students talk about either formative or summative assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Students describe activities of teaching, without emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students describe practicum experiences</td>
<td>Students talk about teaching in terms of technical activities or occurrences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>Students describe experiences of teaching or being on site without emotion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>