International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research
Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 105-123, March 2017

How Cooperating Teachers and Interns Understand "Teaching for a Better World" During Internship

Twyla Salm, PhD and Val Mulholland, PhD
University of Regina
Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada

Abstract. This study utilized a descriptive questionnaire to determine how interns and cooperating teachers translate the faculty's expectations for teaching for social justice into practice during internship. The following research questions were formulated to guide the study: what are the similarities and differences between the intern's and cooperating teacher's receptiveness to teaching for social justice during in internship? And, how do interns and cooperating teachers differ in their perception of being controversial and integrating world views and perspectives in content and instructional approaches during internship? The participants included 142 cooperating teachers and 54 interns. Just over half of the cooperating teachers described their interns as either rigorously or actively finding some opportunities to teach for social justice. And, even though over a third of the interns reported that they were either rigorously or actively integrating some opportunities, it is notable that fewer interns than cooperating teachers were certain that they were teaching for social justice. The site of greatest tension between interns and cooperating teachers appeared to be in relation to discussing personal biases and what it means to be intentionally controversial.

Keywords: teacher education; social justice; internship.

Introduction

Like other teacher education programs across North America, our faculty has collectively made a considerable effort to better prepare teacher candidates to teach diverse learners within the contemporary context and to attend to social justice issues in education with more rigor and intention (Mills & Ballantyne, 2016; Edge, 2015; Attwood, 2011). Under the rubric of "teaching for a better world," our faculty's mission statement to "inspire and transform" education indicates the intent to fully integrate of social justice into the entire program, not in particular courses. Several new Education Core Studies with a distinct social justice orientation have been developed to realize the changes envisioned by our faculty in the renewal process. Although exploring colonialism, racism and indigenous knowledge in education (Dion, 2009; Earick, 2009) is a primary focus of our teacher education programs, analysis of other "isms" such as sexual

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

orientation, ableism, and sexism are part of the mandate. Set within an anti-racist/anti-oppressive framework a significant component of our program aims to help interns raise questions about oppressive structures and systems that continue to marginalize some while advantaging others. In an effort to encourage coherence in our program and to establish a tangible connection between course work and the major practicum experience, the evaluation tool for the mandatory 16 week internship has also been revised. The changes to the evaluation tool reflect substantial requirements for the interns to demonstrate anti-racist and anti-oppressive teaching in their final practicum.

Although the Faculty offers a unique three-day in-service opportunity for all cooperating teachers and their interns in which new aspects of the program are addressed, the adoption and implementation of the anti-racist and anti-oppressive methods that interns are expected to demonstrate in the field-placement is often poorly understood, if not resisted by co-operating teachers (authors, 2015). The task of evaluating interns in areas related to social justice poses a considerable challenge, even for the cooperating teachers who are recognized models and advocates in this area. For cooperating teachers who are unfamiliar, consciously or unconsciously resistant to anti-racist and anti-oppressive pedagogies, the task of creating an environment conducive for intern growth in anti-oppressive pedagogy has proven to be a considerable challenge. The purpose of the study is to determine how interns and cooperating teachers translate the faculty's expectations for teaching for social justice into practice during internship.

The Challenge of Praxis: Connecting Social Justice to Field Work in Teacher Education

Universally, interns regard the major practicum as the most important element of their degree and the nature of their relationship with the cooperating teacher as critical to their success (Pitt, Dibbon, Sumara, & Wiens, 2011). Therefore, attending to the ways that cooperating teachers support interns to excel and teach in socially just ways in field placements is critical to all teacher education programs interested in making this paradigmatic shift (Sleeter, 2008; Marx, 2006; Mills & Ballantyne, 2016). Anti-racist approaches which interrogate racist assumptions that are deeply embedded in curricula and schooling (Cochran-Smith, 2000) and anti-oppressive research which attempts to disrupt social norms that marginalize some groups and privilege others (Kumashiro, 2009; Ladson-Billings, 2005) ought to be central features to teacher education programs committed to social justice (Matias, 2016). In other words, part of teaching for social justice requires that teacher candidates have the opportunity to identify sources of inequities and examine how dominant discourses privilege whiteness as invisible and often exempt from scrutiny (Terwillinger, 2011; Matias, Montoya & Nish, 2016). It appears that these kinds of opportunities are most likely to happen in foundations courses where pre-service teachers may be engaged in critical activities such as counter-narratives or autobiographies (Convertino, 2016). Such in-class experiences, however, don't necessarily translate into a change in ideology (Mueller & O'Connor, 2007). Additionally, there are very few studies that research the actual practice of interns when they work for social justice in classrooms (Cochrane-Smith, Davis & Fries, 2004; Mills

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

& Ballantyne, 2016). And, even the few studies that have studied interns in practice concluded that they were not always able to help interns create meaningful change in their conceptualizations or teaching practices (Ah Lee, 2011; Larkin, Maloney, Perry-Ryder, 2016).

The gap between what happens in course work and how it is taken up in practicum experiences has long plagued teacher education (Pitt et al., 2011), even when the focus was technical-rational. Traditionally, a narrow technical focus which is based on specific competencies and performance skills has over shadowed the need for interns to engage in critical and culturally responsive pedagogy in practice (Jackson, Green, Martin & Fasching-Varner, 2016). The trend to more practice-based teacher education which in its technical approach to teaching excludes elements related to cultural competency and critical social action, further exacerbating the issue (Zeichner, 2012). The gap becomes even more pronounced when internships are merely "add-ons" to course work and are disconnected from tenured faculty involvement (Zeichner, 2010). At best, the quality of internships tends to vary widely and can be structured quite haphazardly for sake of convenience. Quality is also dependent on the way the cooperating teachers are recruited, the extent to which they are guided and supported, and degree to which expectations are placed on both the cooperating teacher and the intern (Darling- Hammond, 2006). Exemplary programs recruit cooperating teachers who have a sophisticated way of thinking about teaching, a refined practice, and where university faculty can work in a reciprocally beneficial way to ensure "practices that are theoretically rich but also eminently practical" (Darling-Hammond, 2006, p. 154). Although our program recruits many outstanding cooperating teachers, the scale of our program does not permit every intern to be mentored by a cooperating teacher that is theoretically rich in social justice pedagogy.

Even under less than ideal conditions, the primary purpose of a practicum experience in a teacher education program is for the interns to have an opportunity to practice, take risks and explore and breathe life into the course concepts in a K-12 classroom. It is this kind of carefully coordinated practical opportunity, supported by quality feedback and mentoring, that leads to deeper learning and prepares the intern for complex teaching practices (Schultz, 2005; Darling-Hammond et al, 2005; Zeichner & Conklin, 2005). However, if cooperating teachers do not have the capacity to provide feedback that does little more than support token activities that merely recognizes or celebrates diversity, the opportunity to explore and practice social justice approaches to teaching may be lost for the individual intern.

Providing feedback that eventually culminates in both formative and summative assessment is one of the primary responsibilities of the cooperating teacher in the practicum relationship; however, the quality of the feedback can be questionable. After completing a comprehensive literature review on cooperating teacher participation in teacher education, Clarke, Triggs & Nielsen (2013) concluded that cooperating teacher feedback is often problematic because it is "narrow, particularistic and technical" (p. 13). One might safely describe it as idiosyncratic. These researchers also noted that they were surprised to find so little research which has focused on the cooperating teacher's role in evaluation given the significance of this responsibility.

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

Evaluation of Social Justice Competencies in Internship

The researchers would not argue that the Likert scale used on our faculty's internship evaluation template represents exemplary practice, much less within the social justice framework the faculty purports to value. That said, the Likert scale form is the evaluation tool accepted by our faculty, and has the enthusiastic support of our stakeholders which include the Ministry of Education, and most importantly the school divisions in which our internship experiences occur. It is not an exaggeration to say that the evaluation form at the centre of this paper is a venerable tradition with our stakeholders. Therefore, the Likert structure of the evaluation form remained intact and the faculty attempted to integrate social justice assessment into the evaluation template. Theoretically, the tenets of anti-racist and anti-oppressive pedagogy ought to be integrated into all aspects of teaching and not appear as isolated concepts on a Likert scale. We are not so naïve to believe that specifically naming particular competencies in "teaching for a better world" ensures social action or engagement with these ideas (Maloney & Perry-Ryder, 2016). Having the social justice items included on the evaluation template, however, does demonstrate their importance in the same way that technical skills such as lesson planning and classroom management are acknowledged on the template. By naming aspects of social justice pedagogy the faculty effectively threw down the gauntlet to those who resisted the change in focus "teaching for a better world" represents.

In our teacher education program the interns are prepared in their course work to understand what is expected of them in their field-placement and they ought to have acquired multiple ways of demonstrating each social justice competency prescribed on their evaluation tool prior to the major practicum. At the very least, the concepts and language of social justice pedagogy are infused in course content across all four-years of their teacher education program. Nevertheless, we are in the early days of a new program so we recognize that research is necessary to understand how interns interpret the social justice components of the evaluation tool. Furthermore, we do not know how cooperating teachers interpret social justice aspects of the evaluation given the intermittent relationship we have with individual cooperating teachers. Faculty who supervise internships have the opportunity to observe the dynamics at work in classroom where interns are placed, but systematic collection of these impressions are anecdotal at best.

Although faculty members serve as advisors, liaise with schools and may be perceived as source of academic and practical support by some, their influence and authority can be quite minimal. Certainly, in our program, faculty advisors have some influence but no substantial power because cooperating teachers have the primary responsibility for evaluation. Zeichner & Liston, (1985) categorized the discourse of faculty advisors post observation conferences into four types: factual, prudential, justificatory and critical. The latter two types, justificatory and critical, open spaces for interns to consider the rationale for their pedagogical decisions and to encourage alternative and critical perspectives; however, cumulatively these types only represented 11.9% of the

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

discourse. Even faculty advisors that are highly invested in providing quality feedback to the intern are challenged to do so when evaluation tools are reduced to checklists that reinforce teaching as a set of technical elements to be mastered. In this way, we recognize the limitations of our evaluation tool and the processes that we have used to train cooperating teachers in its use.

Bates & Burbank (2008) concluded that when faculty advisors perceived the intern as having general competence in the technical aspects of teaching, feedback then shifted focus to individual learning needs of a culturally diverse classroom. However, if the intern was perceived to have weak technical skills, feedback focused on specific technical performance standards. While most programs involve a faculty advisor in some capacity, the quality and quantity of involvement and feedback varies widely and the ultimate impact of this feedback is largely unknown. According to Zeichner (2010), "interns and their cooperating teachers are often left to work out the daily business of student teaching by themselves with little guidance and connection to campus courses, and it is often assumed that good teaching practices are caught rather than taught" (p.91). By providing course work in social justice and by naming social justice competencies on the evaluation template, our faculty deliberately staked out an initial step in valuing and promoting anti-racist and anti-oppressive pedagogy. The next step was to develop a deeper understanding of the context in which these competencies are being interpreted.

Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:

1. What are the similarities and differences between the intern's and cooperating teacher's receptiveness to teaching for social justice during in internship.
2. How do interns and cooperating teachers differ in their perception of being controversial and integrating world views and perspectives in content and instructional approaches during internship.

Method

This study utilized a descriptive, anonymous questionnaire to determine how receptive interns and cooperating teachers were to teaching for social justice during internship in a teacher education program. The participants of the study included 142 cooperating teachers (51% of population) and 54 interns (20% of the population). All of the cooperating teachers and interns were invited by email to respond to an online questionnaire after the completion of the sixteen week internship. The questionnaire questions were derived from the requirements outlined on the intern's final evaluation template, which is called the Internship Professional Profile (IPP). Successful completion of all 44 items on the IPP is required to pass internship. Of the 44 items listed on the IPP, eight items specifically refer to issues of social justice and demonstrate the necessity to become competent in this area as well as in other more traditionally valued skills such as daily planning and instructional competence. This study is specifically focused on developing a deeper understanding of the eight items on the IPP that refer to expectations for teaching for social justice.

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

In order to establish face and content validity the questionnaire was reviewed and refined by two researchers specializing in the area of teacher education and social justice. There was no reliability of the instrument established since the questionnaire was specifically designed for a particular context. However, the language and content of the questionnaire was derived from the IPP, the evaluation template, which is familiar practice to the cooperating teachers and the interns. Also, the IPP, along with the companion descriptors and instructions for evaluation were explained during an intensive three day internship seminar orientation. During this seminar cooperating teachers and interns have the time and opportunity to develop some competency and common understanding of the terms and purpose of the evaluation. Therefore, the potential for a common and deeper understanding of the language of the questionnaire may have been indirectly enhanced by the internship orientation program. One open-ended question at the end of the questionnaire was also analyzed by manually coding for emerging themes using Strauss and Corbin (1990) constant comparison method.

Limitations

For good or ill, respondents represent a spectrum of attitudes to and understanding of social justice at work in the field. Even though the return rate on the questionnaire was high, we know that we do not have the full picture. Anecdotally, returning interns report that many cooperating teachers tell interns not to worry or bother about the social justice aspects of their work. We do take satisfaction knowing that by making social justice competencies part of the conversation during the seminar, very few evaluations are returned marked "Not Applicable" in these categories as once was the case. We recognize, too, that indicating fulfillment of a particular requirement may not be indicative of full understanding.

Findings

The results will be reported in two categories that relate to each of the two research questions. The first research question asked: what are the similarities and differences between the intern and cooperating teacher's receptiveness to teaching for social justice during in internship? There were five questions on the questionnaire that contributed to a deeper understanding of research question #1. In the first question, the participants were asked to select one of six possible responses that best represented how they made sense of the items on the IPP that related to social justice. In other words, they identified the degree of intern participation in teaching for social justice.

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

Table 1: Comparison of intern and cooperating teacher's response to the extent intern's engaged in teaching for social justice.

	f-%	CT	IN
Intern engaged in rigorous action related to social justice issues	f %	5 3.52	2 3.70
Intern found some opportunities to integrate social justice issues into teaching	f %	67 47.18	18 33.33
Intern and cooperating teacher discussed social justices issues regularly	f %	22 15.49	10 18.52
Intern & teacher discussed social justices issues only in the context of completing evaluation templates	f %	28 19.72	11 20.37
Intern found it difficult to integrate social justice issues into teaching	f %	30 21.13	7 12.96
Intern mostly did not integrate social justice issues into teaching	f %	11 7.75	6 11.11
Total		142	54

f: frequency, % percentage
CT: cooperating teacher: IN, intern

As Table 1 demonstrates, just over half of the cooperating teachers described their interns as either rigorously or actively finding some opportunities to teach for social justice. And, even though over a third of the interns reported that they were either rigorously or actively integrating some opportunities, fewer interns than cooperating teachers were certain that they were teaching for social justice during internship. There was, however, greater consistency between the cooperating teachers and the interns who engaged less with social justice issues. Approximately, one quarter of the interns (24.07%) and cooperating teachers (28.88%) agreed that interns either found it difficult or did not integrate social justice issues into teaching. A possible explanation for the discrepancy between cooperating teachers and interns' perceptions of engagement may be related to their interpretation of the term *rigorous* social justice action. Given the currency and the intensity of the intern's course work related to social justice, it is possible that the interns held high expectations for possible internship competencies in social justice. The cooperating teachers may have been more generous with their interpretation of an activity that might be perceived by them to be within the realm of social justice. Their generosity may be rooted in the belief that any overture in a social just direction should be rewarded (Moffett & Yunfang, 2009). Given the intensity of the intern's education in this area, they may have a broader perspective of what is possible than do their mentors. Additionally, the researchers queried whether the advanced social media networking between the interns might have been more vigorous than with the cooperating teachers and may have contributed to a higher standard of social justice competencies. This type of social sharing may have afforded the interns greater insight into practices of their peers, as reported in social media networks, especially by those who were excelling. Without similar networks in which to compare their interns' level of social justice

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

engagement, the cooperating teachers might have been satisfied with relatively superficial efforts. More research in this area is warranted.

The second question that contributed to understanding the similarities and differences between the intern and cooperating teacher's receptiveness to teaching for social justice during in internship asked the pair to identify the degree to which interns ought to be expected to exhibit knowledge about historical and social injustices and inequities. (See Table 2).

Overall, we were encouraged by the results in this section. The majority of cooperating teachers (62.85%) and interns (66.04%) stated that exhibiting knowledge about historical and social injustices and inequities is a priority or a reasonable expectation. Given the limitations of the questionnaire, we are not sure what they think constitutes historical and social injustices and inequities. This query warrants further investigation in another study. Given, for example, that a third of interns and cooperating teachers selected "maybe – in some settings" – we wonder if some participants believe that learning about historical and social injustices is only warranted if the participants live within a particular demographic or geographical area which is recognized as a site of historical injustice (St. Denis, 2011). Within the context in which the study is set, the social and economic disparities between white-settler and Indigenous peoples are readily apparent. As a demographic category, Indigenous people experience higher rates of unemployment, poverty and other social ills, including under-funded schools on reservations (Palmater, 2011). However, some of our teacher education students grew up in relatively racially homogenous communities dominated by white-settler populations. It is conceivable that participants from such communities may not believe that learning about historical injustices applies to their context. In fact, they often say as much. Although our course work has attempted to disrupt this myth, a third of our interns continue to be tentative about the necessity to exhibit knowledge about historical and social injustices (Tupper & Cappello, 2008). Clearly, we have more work to do in this area. While a small percentage of cooperating teachers (4.29%) and (1.89%) interns reported that this competency was not a reasonable expectation, we aspire to 0%. We are hopeful that resistance to acknowledging our shameful past and complex present will decline over time.

We were also encouraged by the cooperating teacher's overall response. We know the kind of social justice concepts that are taught in our course work to the interns and we expected a positive response in this area. It is difficult, however, to know the quality and extent of cooperating teacher professional development beyond the in-service we provide through the internship seminar. The data suggests that some cooperating teachers have received a similar type of professional development that supports a greater understanding of historical and social injustices and inequities. This alignment with our field partners is promising.

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

Table 2: Comparison of Responses: Need for Interns to Teach Historical & Social Injustices Inequities

	f-%	CT	IN
Yes –this is a priority expectation	f	31	9
	%	22.14	16.98
Mostly- this is a reasonable expectation	f	57	26
	%	40.71	49.06
Maybe – in some settings this might be reasonable	f	47	17
	%	33.57	32.08
No – this is not a reasonable expectation	f	6	1
	%	4.29	1.89
Total		140	53

f: frequency, % percentage
CT: Cooperating teacher, IN: intern

The next three questions posed to the participants explored injustices and inequities relating to ways interns had the opportunity to explore sexism, racism, and ableism during internship. Specifically, the questions asked: in your setting, do interns find multiple ways to explore injustices related to sexism, racism and ableism? (See Table 3).

Of the three "isms" in play, both cooperating teachers and interns suggest that interns are the least likely to explore issues related to sexism. Similarly, ableism was just marginally more likely than sexism to be explored by interns. Racism, however, was highlighted much more frequently as the most likely issue to be explored by interns, according to both interns (68.52%) and coops at (80.44%) respectively. The researchers were somewhat surprised by the discrepancies between the "isms." While our teacher education program intentionally emphasizes race issues, sexism and ableism are also part of the social justice agenda. This data suggests that sexism may not be taken up with the same vigor or purpose as the other isms in our courses. Comparatively, cooperating teacher participants selected responses in the "true range" (definitely, mostly and somewhat) more often than did the interns. This difference may be, at least in part, attributed to the age and experience of the teachers who may be more familiar with ways sexism can be taken up in classrooms or indeed, they may have had actually experienced sexism. Given that there are plenty of ways sexism can be enacted in school settings, we wondered if the participants, particularly the interns, resisted challenging sexism in their classroom because it was "too close to home". We recognize that statistically there are more women than men engaged in teaching as profession. The legacy of colonization in a white-settler society is the discourse associated with the "good woman," a salient figure in the settlement saga. Van Kirk (1980) and Erickson (1995) studied the roles of white women in the "civilizing" of the west, as partners to the men who "broke the land" but also as the virtuous school marms who taught the values and language of the Empire to non-English settler children and especially aboriginal children. Christian churches are implicated in this Grand Narrative too, but the good woman fits in easily there. She is busy saving those who might not even want saving. The echoes of the good colonial woman discourses persist in many contemporary quarters, not least in schools (Staples, 2010). Couple this history with the backlash to more

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

current waves of feminism, and as repugnant as identifying as a racist may be to our participants, it often proves more palatable that being identified as being oppressed because or gender, or worse, a feminist. Given that the vast majority of our students are white and more than half are female, they might have a greater affinity to "help out" a racialized population, a social positioning that fits more comfortably with the discourse of the "good woman" (Gambhir, Broad, Evans & Gaskell, 2008). Indeed, sexism might have more direct impact on their lived experience and consequently be more difficult to address (Hossain, 2015). We wondered if challenging sexism disrupts their identity more dramatically and produces a discomfort they have not been adequately prepared in their course work to recognize and resist.

Interns may think they can minimize the implications of critical pedagogy because they do not perceive the relationship between racism and their mostly white-settler lives (Stapes, 2010). Approximately, one third of the interns could not find multiple ways to explore examples of injustice related to racism during their internship (See Table 3a). Also, it is possible that some interns (those in the false range: 30.60%) may have felt unable to address race issues if the cooperating teacher did not provide an encouraging environment or may have prohibited certain anti-racist approaches to teaching. Although not ideal, the fact that 69.40% of the interns found multiple ways to explore injustices related to racism is promising. Similarly, the fact that 80.44% of cooperating teachers state that their interns definitely, mostly or somewhat explored issues related to racism during their internship suggests to us that the majority of interns are able to connect some social justice course work with their field placement practice.

Cooperating teachers also responded more frequently (75.19%) than interns (55.10%) that there were multiple ways to explore examples of injustices related to ableism (See Table 3a). The assumption here is that teachers perceive more opportunities than interns to disrupt practices and beliefs that assign inferior worth to students who have developmental, emotional, or physical disabilities. It is possible that interns have more difficulty identifying less overt disabilities and therefore, perceive they are meeting a wider spectrum of needs than they are actually doing (Lyons, 2013). Also, inclusion is a named focus in many school divisions and the interns may be aware of many visible and tangible efforts that directly challenge ableism. From that perspective, interns may have focussed on the positive advances and neglected to notice the gaps in services, skills or attitudes that foster ableism. Because almost half of interns cannot identify ways that they can address ableism, our teacher education program may need to improve how we prepared pre-service teachers in this area.

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

Table 3: Cooperating teachers responses to: Interns Have Multiple Ways to Explore Sexism, Racism and Ableism

	f-%	DT	MT	ST	SF	MF	DF	T
Interns Have Multiple Ways to Explore Sexism	f %	21 15.00	35 5.00	43 30.71	16 11.43	26 18.57	4 2.86	140
Interns Have Multiple Ways to Explore Racism	f %	38 27.54	34 24.6	39 28.26	19 13.77	2 1.45	6 4.35	138
Interns Have Multiple Ways to Explore Ableism	f %	25 18.25	31 22.6	47 34.31	21 15.33	1 0.73	12 8.76	137

f: frequency, % percentage
DT: Definitely true, MT: mostly true, ST: somewhat true, SF: somewhat false, MF: mostly false, DF: definitely false
T: total

Table 3a: Interns responses to: Interns Have Multiple Ways to Explore Sexism, Racism and Ableism

	f-%	DT	MT	ST	SF	MF	DF	T
Interns Have Multiple Ways to Explore Sexism	f %	3 5.77	8 15.38	19 36.54	6 11.54	10 23.00	6 11.54	52
Interns Have Multiple Ways to Explore Racism	f %	8 14.81	14 25.9	15 27.78	5 9.26	7 12.96	9 9.26	54
Interns Have Multiple Ways to Explore Ableism	f %	5 9.26	12 22.2	13 24.07	8 14.81	12 22.22	4 7.41	54

f: frequency, % percentage
DT: Definitely true, MT: mostly true, ST: somewhat true, SF: somewhat false, MF: mostly false, DF: definitely false
T: total

The next set of questions responded to query posed in research question #2: how do interns and cooperating teachers differ in their perception of being controversial and integrating world views and perspectives in content and instructional approaches during internship?

In this question, participants were offered four responses to the question: should interns be purposefully controversial as they integrate world views into their teaching? (See Table 4). More interns (16.67%) responded "yes – interns ought to be regularly controversial" than cooperating teachers (8.03%). However, there was general agreement between the cooperating teachers (66.42%) and interns (70.37%) that "maybe – if it fits the content" interns should be controversial. Similarly, 15.33% of cooperating teachers stated that "they were not sure" and 9.96% of interns responded the same. Only 3.70% of the interns stated "no, interns should avoid controversy" whereas 10.22% of cooperating teachers stated interns should not be purposefully controversial.

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

Table 4: Comparison of Responses: Interns Ought to be Controversial

	f-%	Yes	M	NS	No	Total
Should interns be purposefully controversial as they integrate world view into their teaching?						
Cooperating Teacher	f	11	91	21	14	137
	%	8.03	66.42	15.33	10.22	
Intern	f	9	38	5	2	54
	%	16.67	70.37	9.96	3.7	

f: frequency, % percentage
Y: Yes – regularly controversial, M: Maybe – if it fits the content, NS: I am not sure, No – they should avoid controversy

There appears to be some alignment in the expectation that interns ought to provoke some controversy in teaching for social justice given that two-thirds of teachers and interns indicated that they were at least contemplating being controversial as they integrated world views into their teaching. It is also reasonable to assume that they knew that challenging oppressive norms is often met with resistance (Matias, Montoya & Nishi, 2016). In this question, the discrepancy between the cooperating teachers and the interns appeared wider at the extreme ends of the Likert scale. Since more interns than teachers agreed with being controversial, we speculate that they understood from course work that controversy is a necessary part of challenging oppressive norms and worked towards that end. Being controversial was not presented as an undesirable space, and being neutral was cast as an unachievable. Alternatively, cooperating teachers may have felt the need to be protective of their interns, shielding them from some of the unpleasant consequences that can come from sparking controversy. Since 87.04% of the interns said "yes or maybe" to being controversial, the message in our program about the necessity to challenging oppressive norms appears to largely be accepted. Perhaps, the next step for our program is to assist more cooperating teachers to learn how they can be supportive of this sometimes contentious instructional competency. Ostensibly, just because interns said they ought to be controversial does not mean they necessarily realized that value in their teaching.

In the next related question the questionnaire asked "in your internship setting, were you (the intern) able to integrate a variety of world views and perspectives (including indigenous ways of knowing) in content and instructions". This question offered insight into whether interns had the opportunity to teach for a better world, regardless of whether they wanted to or not (See Table 5). The majority of interns stated that they did (44.44%) or sometimes (38.89%) had the opportunity to integrate world views into their teaching. Slightly more cooperating teachers perceived their interns integrating world views, with 60.61% of teachers stating "yes" and 27.27% selecting "sometimes". Given that 83.33% of interns and 87.88% of teachers selected "yes"

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

or “sometimes” we suspect there was relatively high level of acceptance of, at least, talking about our social history. It appears that accepting that there are other ways of knowing is almost normalized in our context. We recognize there are many factors beyond our program/courses that might contribute to interns and teachers acceptance of other world views and culturally responsive practices. Many social institutions, including justice, health and other government services acknowledge Indigenous ways of knowing in our province. For example, in our context, significant changes to language in provincial curriculum documents have also supported this potential paradigm shift. The term ESL has been supplanted by the EAL (English as an additional language) to draw attention to the notion that speaking one language, English, is not the norm in the world beyond our borders. We are not so naive to think that a certain degree of acceptance changes behaviour but if there is less resistance to other ways of knowing, we view this knowledge as a positive step in a potentially less oppressive direction.

Table 5: Comparison of Responses: Interns Integrating World Views and Perspectives

	f-%	Y	ST	R	AN	N	Total
Intern was able to integrate a variety of world view and perspectives (including indigenous ways of knowing) in content and instruction							
Cooperating Teacher	f	60	27	8	4	0	99
	%	60.61	27.27	8.08	4.04	0	
Intern	f	24	21	3	6	0	54
	%	44.44	38.89	5.56	11.11	0	

f: frequency, % percentage
Y: Yes, ST: Sometimes, R: Rarely, AN: Almost Never, N: Never

Table 6 shows the responses to question related to culturally responsive practice and classroom management approaches.The vast majority of cooperating teachers (91.31%) and interns (98.15%) reported agreement in the “true” range of responses related to expectations that interns use culturally responsive classroom management approaches. In other words, almost all the participants agreed with the idea that classroom management practices ought to be conducted in a culturally responsive way. There was, however, greater discrepancy between interns and cooperating teachers’ responses to their own ability to discuss how their own biases influence classroom management expectations. The majority of teachers (88.99%) claimed that they, at the least somewhat, discussed their biases, whereas 71.69% of interns responded in the affirmative range.

Given the power differential between the cooperating teachers and the interns, it was not surprising to us that fewer interns than teachers were able to discuss their biases. We have used some strategies, including the introduction of

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

the Adaptive Mentorship Model (Salm & Mulholland, 2015), in an attempt to support a mutually beneficial dialogue but we recognize this level of discussion is not possible for every pair. The responses to these two questions prompted us to consider how cooperating teachers and interns take up the concept of culturally responsive classrooms and what they talk about when the discuss their biases. Given the positive responses to both questions, interns and cooperating teachers report to believe in these activities but how they engage and interpret these questions warrants further investigation. Some insight into their interpretation of teaching for social justice can be gleaned by analysis of the responses to the open-ended question at the end of the questionnaire.

Table 6: Comparison of Responses: Being Culturally Responsive and Discussing Biases

	f-%	DT	MT	ST	SF	MF	DF	T
Interns should be expected to use culturally responsive classroom management approaches?								
	f	64	38	24	9	2	2	139
	%	46.3	27.5	17.39	6.52	1.5	1.45	
Intern	f	26	17	10	1	0	0	54
	%	48.1	31.48	18.52	1.85	0	0	
You were able to discuss with your coop/intern how your own biases influence classroom management expectations?								
Cooperating Teacher	f	31	56	36	10	1	5	139
	%	22.4	40.5	26.09	7.25	0.72	3.62	
Intern	f	8	21	9	5	3	7	53
	%	15.1	39.62	16.98	9.43	5.7	13.21	

f: frequency, % percentage
DT: Definitely true, MT: mostly true, ST: somewhat true, SF: somewhat false, MF: mostly false, DF: definitely false
T: total

Cooperating Teachers Responses to the Open-Ended Question

The participants were invited to respond to an open-ended question which asked them to make comments that "help us understand how to support cooperating teachers and interns teach for a better world." There were 36 responses that ranged from 20 – 300 words. Many of the comments reflected an

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

affinity to a technical-rationale approach to teaching that is often considered the dominant discourse and consistent with a cultural transmission rather than a transformative paradigm. This question seemed to give the teachers who are resistant or do not understand teaching for social justice an opportunity to share their concerns.

Central to their argument was a sentiment that if the IPP included social justice requirements, as one teacher said, "other important content is dropped to accommodate for implementing social justice issues." Similarly, resistance to social justice issues was challenged as part of the evaluation which was sometimes interpreted as "imposing" compliance. A teacher comment illustrates this form of resistance is reflected in: "forcing them [taking up social justice issues] to happen during internship just felt like something we had to do, not something that helps my intern become a better teacher." Another teacher reported that the social justice issues on the IPP were "contrived" and "forced the issue of social justice." In these and similar comments, teachers position themselves secure in their epistemological positioning that education is a neutral act of dependent upon technological skills and procedures. As one teacher explained, "we need to focus on education and not be used by others as a means for indoctrination." Another described teaching for social justice as characterized by "far too much emphasis is being placed on politically correct, fringe issues." This position is difficult to reconcile in the face of irrefutable knowledge that over 40% of Indigenous children live in poverty in our province. Others were more direct, "I would be happy to have the social justice criteria removed from the IPP." While we might argue that some teachers are enjoying a false sense of security with their static positions, our efforts to disrupt their certainty have seemingly created an uncomfortable and unsettling environment for them. Our next challenge might be indeed to consider ways to continue promoting a social justice dialogue within the internship seminar, whilst the cooperating teachers grapple with their discomfort with challenges to their teaching identities.

Part of this education must include helping cooperating teachers understand the structural and systemic nature of oppression. One teacher commented that the questionnaire questions implied that racism and other "isms" in fact, truly exist, even in his/her school. By answering the questionnaire in the affirmative, this teacher reported that we were implying that his/her school "is riddled with examples of discrimination and injustice." What a shock it might be for this teacher to recognize that in fact, all our institutions are implicated in injustices and the opportunity to teach about the injustices permeates all aspects of pedagogy, not just the personal spaces in her/his classroom. As with all transformations, change that involves assisting cooperating teachers as they develop a deeper understanding of teaching for a better world will involve time and fortitude (Mills & Ballantyne, 2016).

Cooperating Teachers Responses to the Open-Ended Question

Almost half (47%) of the interns made comments in this section and their responses ranged from 6 – 200 words. Intern responses for this open ended question did not mirror the teachers' resistance to a more critical approach to teaching, nor betray an unwavering confidence in the technical rationale approach to teaching. The vast majority of comments acknowledged the

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

importance and their desire to teach for social justice, but the interns were more concerned about their competency to engage in meaningful social action. There appeared, however, to be a technical dimension to their call for this competency in their request for more "concrete descriptions and criteria" and "more professional development for [cooperating] teachers." Even though their comments tended to request a desire for more support on "how to do it," there was little question that they ought to engage in teaching for social justice. We are left to wonder what social action and teaching for social justice activities and attitudes were sufficiently developed during internship. A further examination of the ways interns imagine themselves teaching for social justice would augment this data from this study.

Conclusion

The significance of this study is that the results will act as a heuristic to talk about how to move the social justice agenda ahead not only in our Faculty but with field partners. In summary, we found that interns perceived their internship as relatively receptive to teaching for social justice. Similarly, cooperating teachers agreed, at even a higher rate, which we attempted to explicate in our discussion of findings. The site of greatest tension between interns and cooperating teachers appears to be in relation to discussing personal biases and what it means to be intentionally controversial. Both co-operating teachers and interns agreed that integrating a variety of world views in content and instructional approaches, but we are not convinced that such positioning is more tokenism than an indication of shared understanding consistent with the tenets of social justice practice.

Over many years our Faculty has developed a strong relationship with teacher partners in the field. In an effort to continue in a mutually beneficial dialogue about how we move forward together, we will present the findings of this study to the next cohort of cooperating teachers (n=270) and interns (n=270). In our context, we have a forum, the internship seminar, where all cooperating teachers and interns will hear the presentation and discuss the results with us in-person. Just as the interns face trepidation as they aim to be purposefully controversial, we share this apprehension knowing that it will disrupt a normally comfortable and easy relationship between Faculty and field partners. There is some "safety" in critiquing as the participants at the next seminar will not be the same as the population that completed the study. There will, however, be some overlap as there will be many teachers who regularly volunteer and will be returning. Regardless, we are confident that some of the teachers and interns will hear their personal sentiments reflected and analyzed in the study, even if they were not participants. At the same time, much of what we believe to be true reflects quite positively on a population of cooperating teachers and interns that are no doubt struggling alongside us, but also embracing what it means to teach for a better world.

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

References

Ah Lee, Y. (2011). What does teaching for social justice mean to teacher candidates? *The Professional Educator*, *35* (2), 12-31.

Attwood, P. (2011). The power of collaboration: Learning to teach antiracist content. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *13* (3), 122-129.

Bates, A., & Burbank, M.D. (2008). Effective student teacher supervision in the era of No Child Left Behind. *The Professional Educator*, *32* (2), 1-11.

Clarke, A., Triggs, V., & Nielsen, W. (2014). Cooperating teacher participation in teacher education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 84(2), 163-202.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2000). Blind vision: Unlearning racism in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review, 70* (2), 157-190.

Cochrane-Smith, M., Davis, D., & Fries, K. (2004). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice and policy. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. (2nd Ed. pp. 931-975). New York: Macmillan.

Convertino, C. (2016). Beyond ethnic tidbits: Toward a critical and dialogical model in multicultural social justice teacher preparation. *International Journal of Multicultural Education,* *18*(2), 125-142. Retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docv iew/1826541228?accountid=13480

Darling,-Hammond, L. Hammerness, K., Grossman, P., Rust, F., & Shulman, L. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World* (pp. 390-441). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dion, S. (2009). *Braiding histories: Learning from aboriginal peoples' experiences and perspectives*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press

Earick, M. (2009). *Racially equitable teaching: Beyond the whiteness of professional development for early childhood educators*. New York: Peter Lang.

Edge, C. (2017). (Mis)reading the classroom: A two act play on the conflicting roles in student teaching. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 16* (1), 38-56.

Erickson, L. (1995). The interplay of ethnicity and gender: Swedish women in southeastern Saskatchewan. In D. De Brou, & A. Moffatt, (Eds.), *"Other" voices: Historical essays on Saskatchewan women* (pp.27-40). Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre.

Gambhir, M., Broad, K., Evans, M., & Gaskell., J. (2008). Characterizing initial teacher education in Canada: Themes and issues. Retrieved from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/ite/UserFiles/File/CharacterizingITE.pdf

Hossain, K. I. (2015). White privilege: Perceptions of pre-service teachers. Multicultural Education, 23(1), 52-55. Retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docv iew/1826519524?accountid=13480

Jackson, M., Green, D., Martin, L. L., & Fasching-Varner, K. (2016). Band-aids don't fix bullet holes. A response to "we were there too: Learning from black male teachers in mississippi about successful teaching of black students". *Democracy & Education, 24*(2), 6. Retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docv iew/1871575276?accountid=13480

Kumashiro, K. (2009). *Against common sense: Teaching and learning toward social justice.* New York: Routledge.

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). Is the team all right? Diversity and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *56*(2), 229-234.

Larkin, D. B., Maloney, T., & Perry-Ryder, G. (2016). Reasoning about race and pedagogy in two preservice science teachers: A critical race theory analysis. Cognition and Instruction, 34(4), 285-322. Retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docvie w/1871582775?accountid=13480

Lyons, L. (2013). Transformed understanding or enlightened ableism? the gap between policy and practice for children with disabilities in aotearoa new zealand. International *Journal of Early Childhood, 45*(2), 237-249. Retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docvie w/1651857395?accountid=13480

Marx, S. (2006). *Revealing the invisible: Confronting passive racism in teacher education*. New York: Routledge.

Matias, C. E. (2016). "Why do you make me hate myself?": Re-teaching whiteness, abuse, and love in urban teacher education. *Teaching Education, 27*(2), 194-211. Retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview /1826523224?accountid=13480

Matias, C., Montoya, R., & Nishi, N. (2016). Blocking CRT: How the emotionality of whiteness blocks CRT in urban teacher education. *Educational Studies: Journal of the American Educational Studies Association*, *52*(1), 1-19. Retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview /1826519531?accountid=13480

Mills, C., & Ballantyne, J. (2016). Social justice and teacher education: A systematic review of empirical work in the field. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(4), 263-276. Retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docv iew/1871575723?accountid=13480

Moffett, D. W., & Zhou, Y. (2009). Cooperating teacher evaluation of candidates in clinical practice and field experiences Retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docv iew/61840772?accountid=13480

Mueller, J., & O'Connar, C. (2007). Telling and retelling about self and "others": How pre- service teachers (Re)interpret privilege and disadvantage in one college classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, *23*(6), 840-856.

Pitt, A., Dibbon, D., Sumara, D., & Wiens J. (2011). Deans speak out. *Education Canada*, 51(1). Retrieved from http://www.cea-ace.ca/education-Canada

Palmater, P. D. (2011). Stretched beyond human limits: Death by poverty in first nations. *Canadian Review of Social Policy, (65*), 112-127. Retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1240370652?accountid=13480

Schulz, R. (2005). The practicum: More than practice. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *28*(1&2), 147-167.

Salm, T. & Mulholland, V. (2015). Building a sustainable structure to support the Adaptive Mentorship Model in teacher education. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 4* (1), 53-68.

Sleeter, C. (2008). Preparing white teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, Feiman-Nemser, & J. McIntyre (Eds.) Handbook of research on teacher education, (3rd Ed. pp. 559-82). New York and London: Routledge.

Staples, J. M. (2010). Encouraging agitation: Teaching teacher candidates to confront words that wound. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 37*(1), 53-72. Retrieved from

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.

https://login.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docvi ew/222828451?accountid=13480

St. Denis, V. (2011). Silencing aboriginal curricular content and perspectives through multiculturalism: "there are other children here". Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies, 33(4), 306-317. Retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docvi ew/964185008?accountid=13480

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Terwilliger, C. (2010). Mapping stories: Taking detours to challenge whiteness. *Making connections: Interdisciplinary approaches to cultural diversity*, *11* (2), 14-25.

Tupper, J. A., & Cappello, M. (2008). Teaching treaties as (un)usual narratives: Disrupting the curricular commonsense. Curriculum Inquiry, 38(5), 559-578. Retrieved from https://login.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/61973020?accountid=13480

Van Kirk, S. (1980). *Many tender ties: Women in the fur-trade society, 1670-1870*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Zeichner, K. (2012). The turn once again toward practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(5), 376-382.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and University-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(1- 2),89-99.

Zeichner, K., & Conklin, H. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education* (pp. 645-735). New York: Routledge.

Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (1985). Variations of discourse in supervisory conferences. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 1* (2), 155-174.

© 2017 The authors and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.