

TEACHER EDUCATION FOR RACIAL KNOWLEDGE: INSTITUTIONAL AND
PEDAGOGICAL CHALLENGES FOR DEVELOPING RACIAL KNOWLEDGE

Lisette Nnenna Enumah

A DISSERTATION

in

Education

Presented to the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania

in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2019

Supervisor of Dissertation:

Abby Reisman, Assistant Professor of Education

Graduate Group Chairperson:

J. Matthew Hartley, Professor of Education

Dissertation Committee:

Abby, Reisman, Assistant Professor of Education

Edward Brockenbrough, Associate Professor and Calvin Bland Fellow

Howard Stevenson, Constance Clayton Professor of Urban Education; Professor of Africana
Studies

TEACHER EDUCATION FOR RACIAL KNOWLEDGE: INSTITUTIONAL AND
PEDAGOGICAL CHALLENGES FOR DEVELOPING RACIAL KNOWLEDGE
COPYRIGHT

2019

Lisette Nnenna Enumah

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The greatest praise and thanks go to God. Through highs and lows, God has been the source of strength that makes everything possible. He had a plan that made this both an academic and a spiritual journey, and I couldn't be more grateful for what a gift it has been. One of the greatest blessings has been the opportunity to complete this process with other amazing women with whom I could share the excitement and the challenges of this work: Chy McGhee, Augusta Irele, Autumn Griffin, Laronnda Thompson, Haley Pilgrim, and Christiana Kallon. Our conversations have allowed me to bring my whole self to my work and to know that being critical in this process makes it better, even when it's hard. You made it okay to laugh and cry, and you challenged and inspired me to do good work. I felt understood without always needing to explain myself. Thank you to these amazing and brilliant women, who kept me sane and made me better. I love y'all. And to so many other friends at Penn and elsewhere who gave me feedback on my work, or who just got me away from work and helped me to live a balanced life: thank you for getting me here. To my church family, thank you for supporting me and for continually reminding me of the purpose of all of the work that we do, helping me to remain Christ-centered in my work and able to find peace throughout this process. To my family—Mom and Dad, Ti and Doug, Sam & Rashmi, and Zach & Emnet—you all supported me in so many different ways, and as you know you are the most important people in my life. And to Eliza and Dezi- thank you for lighting up my life during the writing years ☺. So much *life* happened in the years that I was in school and worked on this dissertation, and I'm

grateful for loving and learning and just being with all of you through all of it. I love you all so much.

And to my committee: Dr. Abby Reisman, Dr. Ed Brockenbrough, and Dr. Howard Stevenson, I am so deeply thankful for your support. You all have helped me in different ways to reach this milestone, and even as you have witnessed my various moments of self-doubt you have bolstered my confidence with your support for my work and for me. Howard, you helped me make it through my first year and even become excited about being a scholar; you helped me to see myself as someone that could belong in academia. Ed, my experience has truly been transformed since you came to Penn, and you have created opportunities, advocated for me, and been such an important mentor to me. And Abby: words cannot express how grateful I am for the support you have provided for me since my first days at Penn. I didn't know exactly what an advisor was supposed to be, but I know that you have supported me in ways that so far exceed what I could have imagined. I am so incredibly thankful for you and I truly could not have done it without you. You believed in me when I didn't, and you helped me find the confidence to share my ideas. Thank you for everything.

ABSTRACT

TEACHER EDUCATION FOR RACIAL KNOWLEDGE: INSTITUTIONAL AND
PEDAGOGICAL CHALLENGES FOR DEVELOPING RACIAL KNOWLEDGE

Lisette Nnenna Enumah

Abby Reisman

This qualitative study explored the practices of teacher educators (TEs) who teach about race and racism. Through interviews, focus groups, and artifacts from teaching, TEs reflected on their teaching goals, pedagogical practice, and successes and challenges in teaching for racial knowledge. Three key findings emerged. First, I examined tensions that emerged for TEs who teach about White supremacy from within White supremacist institutions. Drawing primarily from Mills' (1994, 1999, 2015) and Leonardo's (2004) theoretical constructions of White supremacy, I proposed a framework for the logic of White supremacy and used this logic to analyze the emergent tensions identified by TEs in the study. Second, I analyzed TEs' use of racial-emotional pedagogy to support novices' ability to attend to racialized emotions. Drawing from research on racial literacy (Guinier, 2004; Stevenson, 2014; Twine, 2004), emotional literacy (Goleman, 1995; Salovey & Maher, 1990), and pedagogies of discomfort and empathy (Boler, 1999; Lindquist 2004; Zembylas & Papamichael, 2017), I used racial-emotional pedagogy as a framework to describe teacher educators' pedagogical strategies for supporting teachers development of knowledge and skills for attending to racialized emotions in their practice. Finally, with critical perspectives on institutional diversity discourse (Berry,

2015; Iverson, 2012; Patel, 2015) as context, I examined how TEs seek support within institutions of higher education and found that TEs' social identities were important factors that influenced how they engaged with professional networks as a supportive tool for the work of teaching teachers about race and racism. Implications for both teacher educators as practitioners and for teacher education programs are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
References	16
WHITE SUPREMACY IN TEACHER EDUCATION: BALANCING PEDAGOGICAL TENSIONS WHEN TEACHING ABOUT RACE	21
Theoretical Framework	24
Method	39
Findings	44
Discussion	65
Appendix	72
References	75
RACIAL-EMOTIONAL PEDAGOGY IN TEACHER EDUCATION	81
Theoretical framework	84
Method	94
Findings	101
Discussion	122
Appendix	128
References	136
SEEKING SUPPORT IN TEACHER EDUCATION FOR RACIAL KNOWLEDGE: THE ROLE OF PROFESSIONAL NETWORKS AND SOCIAL IDENTITIES	143
Theoretical Framework	149
Method	159
Findings	163
Discussion	181
Appendix	187
References	190
CONCLUSION	198
References	203
APPENDIX	204

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Participant Demographics.....	39
Table 1.2: Sample In Vivo Codes (First Cycle Coding).....	73
Table 1.3: Second Cycle Coding: Codes/Code Categories.....	74
Table 2.1 Participant Demographics.....	95
Table 2.2: Scenario Ratings.....	132
Table 2.3: Second Cycle Coding: Racial-Emotional Pedagogy.....	134
Table 3.1. Participant Demographics.....	161
Table 3.2: Types of Support for TEs.....	176

INTRODUCTION

2019 is a year of anniversaries. It marks the 400th anniversary of the arrival of the first Africans to be brought to the United States as slaves, beginning centuries of racial violence and the fight for equal protection under the law that continues now in the 21st century (Hannah-Jones, 2019). And in 1989, after decades of advocacy by Indigenous peoples, South Dakota became the first state¹ to pass a resolution marking the second Monday in October as Native American Day in anticipation of the beginning of their “Year of Reconciliation” in 1990 (AP, 2012; Giago, 2011). Thus, we mark this 30th anniversary as an acknowledgement of perhaps the United States’ most gruesome legacy, its attempted genocide of Indigenous people (Brayboy, 2013; Tuck & Yang, 2012). And 2019 is the 5th anniversary of a wave of violent deaths that shook this nation: the deaths of Eric Garner (age: 43), Michael Brown (age: 18), and Laquan McDonald (age: 17). Police violence against Black people led to a series of protests and elevated the Black Lives Matter movement, which had been founded the year prior (Black Lives Matter, n.d.).

The co-incidence of these anniversaries reminds us that this nation was created by racial violence and has been sustained by it. Yet even as we recall these harsh histories, there are those who envision pathways to a less violent, more equitable future, and this fight for justice presses us forward. For example, the Movement for Black Lives (M4BL) puts forward a policy agenda that, in addition to their well-recognized advocacy against mass incarceration and police violence, responds to historical systemic disinvestment in the education of Black children (M4BL, n.d.). This public dialogue about the need for

¹ Berkeley, CA was the first city to celebrate Indigenous People’s Day in 1992. As of 2019, six states and 130 cities have officially recognized this holiday in addition to or in place of Columbus Day (Murphy, 2019).

schools to support Black children and other children of color aligns with calls in educational research for justice-oriented approaches to education. Tuck and Yang (2018) write about social justice in education:

It is the only part that makes any part of education matter ... Social justice is not the other of the field of education, it *is* the field. There is no future of the field of education without the contributions of people who are doing their work under the rising sign of social justice. There is no legitimacy to the field of education if it cannot meaningfully attend to social contexts, historical and contemporary structures of colonialism, white supremacy, and antiblackness. Social justice is not the catchall; it is the all. (p. 5)

Thus, it is with conviction about the gravity of this work that education scholars make the case for the importance of attending to race and social justice in schools.

Yet bringing racialized content into (a) K-12 schools or (b) teacher education remains a contested practice. For K-12 curriculum, the relevance of race to educational goals has not been articulated in a way that has proven convincing enough for educators and administrators. In other words, the “demographic divide” (Valencia, 2010) and so-called “achievement gap” (Ladson-Billings, 2006; Horsford & Grosland, 2010) are, alone, insufficient evidence that attention to race and racism has educational utility (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2018). For teacher education as a field, conceptions of why and how race matter for schooling remain vaguely defined and programmatically siloed, and very few content methods courses in teacher education programs systematically address these questions (Milner et al., 2013). Thus, to meaningfully address race and racism in schools, we must re-assess: (a) goals for K-12 students and schooling; (b) program structures to support teaching teachers about race; and (c) approaches to research on teacher education that attend to the pedagogical practice of

teacher educators in this field. This study engages the perspectives of teacher educators (TEs) in hopes of gaining insight for directions for future research and reform related to teaching teachers about race and racism.

Framing the Study: Racism and White Supremacy in Schooling

The idea that race matters for schooling in the United States is not new. Quite famously, W.E.B. DuBois wrote in 1903 that the problem of the twentieth century would be “the problem of the color line.” Since then, countless scholars have raised important questions about racism as it operates in the United States, and many turned specifically to the public education system as a root cause of persistent inequality between racial groups (Bell, 1980; Woodson, 1933). Although the “problems of the color line” in 2019 are different than the ones DuBois was grappling with in 1905, questions about racial hierarchy, access, and opportunity along racial lines remain at the center of educational research agendas. As we reflect back, it is clear that DuBois was right to identify the problem of the color line, and it is perhaps even clearer that this “problem” has not been solved. As an example, in the twenty-first century, it is not merely a coincidence that DuBois, Woodson, and Bell do not appear with great frequency on university syllabi anywhere outside of Black Studies programs (Christian, 1988). The systems of exclusion and miseducation that existed in early 20th century American schools remain firmly in place, still, in 2019.

For the past half-century, deficit-perspectives of students and communities have located the “problem” of schooling as a lack of achievement by children of color—an “achievement gap”—that positions students of color as performing poorly in comparison

to their white peers² (Horsford & Grosland, 2013). The “achievement gap” narrative that gained traction in the post-*Brown* era is based in achievement on standardized exams that shows differential outcomes between racial groups and has been attributed to a range of factors and stakeholders, from students’ family income level and family background to teacher quality and the racial composition of the school (Coleman et al., 1966; Ladson-Billings, 2006). It has more recently been reframed as an “opportunity gap,” which focuses on the differences in access to the types of resources that support educational achievement and lead to differential performance on assessments such as standardized state exams (Scott & Quinn, 2014). Understanding and responding to the gap has guided the work of education policymakers and researchers in significant ways, including influencing the reauthorizations of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2002 and Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015 (USDOE, 2017), and it remains a popular framing for new theories of how to support Black students’ achievement.

While the narrative of the “achievement gap” has framed much of the work around race and equity in education in recent decades, more recently it has been critiqued as a deficit framing of students of color. Calabrese Barton and Berchini (2013) acknowledged the achievement gap as a reality but were critical of the concept as a deficit framing of what urban students lack instead of the knowledge they bring into the classroom, and Horsford and Grosland (2013) argued that the “achievement gap”

² Most commonly, comparisons of student achievement are based on standardized exams and are drawn along racial and economic lines (Horsford & Grosland, 2013), although other axes for analysis are utilized (for example, using college matriculation as a metric for measuring outcomes, or using immigration status as a category of analysis). This “gap” has been documented for many years, and in some years or by some metrics it has decreased, while by other metrics it has remained the same (Tate, 1997).

narrative racialized students' achievement in a way that perpetuated a myth of Black inferiority (p. 154). The authors explained that this narrative of Black inferiority has a "deep and unrelenting history" that dates back several centuries and was used to justify slavery and legitimize a racial hierarchy. In its more contemporary form, the authors suggest, the achievement gap narrative has normalized the branding of Black educational inferiority without appropriately contextualizing the phenomenon in a history of American race and racism. In other words, attention to the achievement gap focuses us on the wrong problem. Ladson-Billings (2006) suggests we reframe the "gap" as an "education debt" and describes the cumulative effects of lack of structural investment in public education in economic, sociopolitical, and even moral terms. Rather than looking at yearly achievement, an "education debt" considers how differential investments in educational systems can accumulate over time to produce a growing debt over time. The core critique across these studies is that a focus on differences in students' academic outcomes makes invisible the systems that perpetuate differential access and takes away responsibility from the individuals who sustain those systems. Understanding the agency that teachers and schools have in both acknowledging and addressing these systems and individuals requires a critical sociopolitical consciousness, which has been described as being able to critically examine and critique political, economic, and social forces that influence society (Freire, 1970; Ladson-Billings, 1995). Approaches to educational research and reform that do not take into account broader sociopolitical systems and forces are insufficient for analyzing the types of complex interactions that occur in schools.

Defining racism in education: A CRT Perspective. This dissertation study examines the work of teaching teachers about race and racism, and for educational research, critical race theory (CRT) has been transformational in providing a theoretical framework that puts race at the center of critical analysis of schools. CRT takes a core assumption that racism exists and is a normal and ever-present part of American life. With that as a starting point, CRT examines how race and racism interact with other sociopolitical, cultural, and economic forces in the lives of teachers, children, and families in schools. Thus, CRT provides the guiding theoretical frames for this dissertation study.

CRT originated in legal studies, and seminal work by Derrick Bell (1980, 1989, 1992) describes how racism is perpetuated through social institutions through both laws and social practices. CRT in education proliferated in the late 1990s as scholars applied the lens of CRT to educational institutions specifically. The application of CRT to education was motivated by its emphasis on critical perspectives towards myths of objectivity, meritocracy, and democratic ideals that undergird American social institutions broadly and certainly schools specifically (Milner & Howard, 2013; Yosso, 2006). Ultimately, a set of CRT “tenets” became frequently cited by CRT scholars:

1. The centrality and intersectionality of race and racism;
2. The challenge to dominant ideology;
3. The commitment to social justice;
4. The centrality of experiential knowledge;
5. The interdisciplinary perspective. (Solórzano, 1997, p. 6-7)

A CRT analysis of educational systems emphasizes the power relations that uphold racial hierarchies (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001) and highlights racism as both an institutional and an interpersonal phenomenon (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). CRT is also well known for its emphasis on counternarratives and a commitment to experiential knowledge and elevating the voices of people of color (Crenshaw, 1991; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

Thus, I draw from CRT scholars in defining key terms related to race and racism that guide this dissertation study. One of the major challenges of this particular subfield of teacher education is that there is no shared vocabulary to describe how race and racism influence schools, even as contemporary reform in teacher education points to the need for shared vocabulary (Grossman et al., 2009). Discursive choices are particularly significant for teaching about race and racism; scholars have described a range of ways that associated terminology (“diversity”, “inclusion”, and “intersectionality,” for example) has been co-opted in ways that actually are counterproductive for addressing race and inequality (Iverson, 2007; Patel, 2015). Of course, there is no consensus as to what constitutes “race” and “racism,” or who can be “racist,” let alone how those phenomena relate to schools, and, it is important to note that one aim in this project was to remain open to participant conceptions of theories of race and racism. Still, I have provided here definitions of “key terms” to make transparent the theoretical foundation of my approach to the study of race and racism.

Race. Defining race remains not only an intellectual project but also a political one. In the social sciences, there is broad consensus that race is a social construct.³ Milner (2017) defines race as “constructed physically, contextually, socially, legally, and historically” (p. 78). Even with wide agreement that race is socially constructed, meaning it has no “real” basis in biological human differences, scholars also agree that it has real roots and consequences for our social and political lives (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Omi & Winant, 1994) and has been described as an “organizing principle of domination” (Picower, 2009, p. 198). Ideas about what race is have varied greatly over time; at some points in history, a biological or fixed conception of race has dominated, while at other times, as in the contemporary moment, more sociocultural understandings of racial categorization carry weight (Omi & Winant, 1994).⁴ For this study, contemporary understandings of *race* as: 1) socially constructed (Omi & Winant, 1994; Solórzano, 1997); 2) not biologically real (Appiah, 2006; Fullwiley, 2008); and 3) a reflection of distribution of power and privilege through racialized hierarchy (Brayboy, 2013; Cross, 2005; Hoyt, 2012; Tatum, 1997), are utilized as a theoretical starting point for research design and data analysis.

Racism. Lani Guinier defines racism as “the maintenance of, and acquiescence in, racialized hierarchies governing resource distribution-has not functioned simply through evil or irrational prejudice; it has been an artifact of geographic, political, and economic

³ It is worth noting that a debate about race as a biological construct remains active in the natural sciences (Fullwiley, 2008; Spencer, 2012, 2014), despite wide consensus in other fields that race is not biologically real. The sociopolitical consequences of this debate for public health, medicine, and broader public policy issues are also central to this scholarly debate (Duster, 2015; Glasgow & Woodward, 2015; Hardimon, 2013).

⁴ As an example, there has been as much iteration of racial categories on the U.S. Census as there are contemporary racial categories on the Census, and the U.S. Census Bureau engaged in testing to consider further revisions to the 2020 Census, although ultimately they did not make significant changes from the 2010 Census to the 2020 Census (Pratt, Hixson, & Jones, 2015).

interests” (p. 98). More succinctly, racism is frequently defined as “prejudice + power” (Tatum, 1997). While debate ensues about whether or not people of color can engage in racism (Omi & Winant, 1994; Kendi, 2016), many critical race scholars affirm the notion that marginalized and oppressed people cannot engage in racist behaviors based on the consequences of racial hierarchy. Solórzano (1997) describes racism as having four characteristics: “(1) it has micro and macro components; (2) it takes on institutional and individual forms; (3) it has conscious and unconscious elements; and (4) it has a cumulative impact on both the individual and group (p. 6). This definition of racism points to multiple “levels” of racism, with special emphasis on the interaction between individual and institutional racism. Across these definitions, we see attention to the consequences of racial hierarchies as distributors of unequal access to power and privilege.

White supremacy. Increasingly, *White supremacy* as a term is commonplace in popular discourse (Chait, 2017; Newkirk, 2017). In 1997, Mills described White supremacy as the “unnamed system that has made the modern world what it is today” (p. 1). While, in the contemporary landscape, naming White supremacy is much more common, it remains true that White supremacy shapes our modern world, and it is perhaps also true that a deeper understanding of the function of White supremacy and its consequences for our everyday lives are less well understood. King and Smith (2005) describe White supremacy as supporting racial orders which “have often served vicious economic exploitation ... [White supremacy] provides a framework to organize empirical evidence of the extent and manner in which structures of racial inequalities have been

interwoven with economic as well as gender and religious hierarchies and social institutions” (p. 75). This definition highlights the extensive impact of White supremacy and the interconnectedness of this political system with other systems of political domination and oppression. For the purpose of this study, this understanding of White supremacy is a useful framework to understand mechanisms and consequences of racism within educational institutions.

I’ll also note that, while I do not dive deeply into theoretical perspectives on *resistance* and *social justice*, I use these terms to signal perspectives, both practical and theoretical, that aim to reject, resist, and otherwise work in opposition to White supremacy. Tuck and Yang (2018) write that, while *social justice* is a term in educational research that often lacks specificity, it is also “a way to mark a distinction from the origins and habits of almost all disciplines which emerged in the 19th and 20th centuries and are rooted in colonialism and white supremacy” (p. 4). Thus, throughout this dissertation, I refer to TEs who teach about race and racism as “justice-oriented,” with reference to this general proposition.

Teacher education for racial knowledge. In this study of teacher education about race and racism, I inquire about the practices and experiences of teacher educators who teach about race and racism. Across the three papers in this dissertation study, I describe this work as “teacher education for racial knowledge.” The term *racial knowledge* has been used in education literature in different ways, most commonly in recent years in teacher education literature that examines the experiences of teachers and teacher candidates as they develop racial knowledge. I lean on conceptualizations of

racial knowledge in the literature, such as Leonardo's (2008) *White racial knowledge*, and draw also from articulations of racial knowledge particular to teaching and pedagogy, such as Demoiny's (2017) *historical racial content knowledge* and Chandler's (2015) *racial pedagogical content knowledge*. In her study of pre-service elementary teachers of social studies, Demoiny finds that even teachers with a desire to teach about race sometimes lack "historical racial content knowledge" and she underscored the importance of teachers' development not only of *beliefs* that support culturally relevant practices but also of a specific body of content knowledge to support that practice. Chandler's (2015) *racial pedagogical content knowledge* combines concepts of racial knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge to describe the skills and knowledge that teachers need to engage racialized content and racial moments in their work. Some scholars also have referred to "critical racial knowledge," integrating critical social theory and conceptions of racial knowledge and tying together tenets of critical race theory and racial literacy (An, 2017; Crowley, 2016; King, 2016). Across these definitions and descriptions of *racial knowledge*, patterns emerge in how racial knowledge is conceptualized in the literature. These definitions point to racial knowledge as incorporating cognitive frames for understanding race; racialized historical knowledge; and embodied, lived experiences related to race. Drawing from this literature, I define *racial knowledge* as both historical racial knowledge and knowledge of contemporary sociopolitical and cultural racial issues and, in reference to teaching, the race-related knowledge and skills a teacher will need to develop critical consciousness, build relationships with students/families of color, and respond to racially stressful classroom situations in a moment.

The Present Study

The broader dissertation study was motivated by three core lines of inquiry about teacher education for racial knowledge. First, I wanted to understand what TEs viewed as the *purpose* of teaching about race and racism. Second, I wanted to develop a better understanding of what *theory of learning* guided TEs' approaches to instruction. Finally, I was interested in learning more about specific *pedagogical strategies* that TEs' utilized that supported their goals and aligned to their theory of learning. Overall, these lines of inquiry guided this phenomenological study of how teacher educators teach about race and racism. Starks and Trinidad (2007) describe phenomenology as that which involves "close analysis of lived experience to understand how meaning is created through embodied perception ... [it] contributes to deeper understanding of lived experiences by exposing taken-for-granted assumptions about these ways of knowing" (p. 1373). A phenomenological lens provided a purposeful frame for research design focused on developing rich understanding of the experiences of TEs.

Paper one: Contextualizing the work of teaching teachers about race. The first paper contextualizes the work of teaching teachers about race and racism. Using Mills' (1999, 2005, 2015) and Leonardo's (2004) articulations of the characteristics and dimension of White supremacy as a core framework, and building off of work that identifies operant mechanisms of White supremacy in teacher education, I first outline a framework for the logic of White supremacy and then use it to examine the emerging tensions experienced by TEs in their own practice. These findings explore the challenges

of balancing the tensions that arise for TEs as they simultaneously teach teachers to disrupt White supremacy while working from within White supremacist institutions.

Paper two: Pedagogical strategies for teaching teachers about race. The second paper examines classroom level practices of TEs for teaching about race and focuses on findings related to racialized emotion (Matias & Zembylas, 2014; Bonilla-Silva, 2019). I develop the construct of *racial-emotional pedagogy* to examine the pedagogical strategies of TEs as they support teacher-candidates in learning to attend to both students' emotions and their own emotions using a racial lens.

Paper three: Supporting teacher educators who teach about race. The final paper explores how institutions can provide support for TEs who teach about race. Drawing from the narrated experiences of TEs at different institutions, I provide a comparative analysis of TEs' perceptions of various forms of professional support related to their work in teaching about race and racism.

Across these three papers, I seek evidence of shared experience and also evidence of variance from TEs' experiences at different institutions.

Research methods. Methodologically, phenomenology guided the research design and the construction of protocols. I drew also on grounded theory methods to refine and revise the research design as new theory emerged from participant data throughout data collection and analysis. Grounded theory has been described as useful to bridge the gap between theory and practice and increase the relevance of research (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), and this study attempts to address a gap in educational research and practice in teacher education for racial knowledge.

For this study, participants were recruited using recommendations via snowball sampling, and in selection, I attended to participants racial and gender identities in an attempt to develop a participant panel with some racial and gender diversity, given evidence in the literature that documents relationships between teacher educators' own racial identities and students' responses to faculty based on these identities (Howard, 2017; Matias, 2013). I did not limit participation based on years of experience, as I was interested in TEs' beliefs about and possible disruptions of traditional conceptions of expertise in teaching. Recruitment of participants with a range of experience offered diverse perspectives on the power dynamics that influence teacher education about race, and while I am interested in knowledge and expertise, I am not committed to the idea that those with the highest institutional status have the most expertise in disrupting White supremacist educational institutions. In a sense, then, recruiting a diverse set of participants with varying levels of expertise was both a likely outcome of the study and a useful one for examining notions of expertise within the field. In collecting data for the study, I used multiple methods to develop a rich portrait of TEs' instructional goals and practice, including classroom artifacts, interviews, and focus groups. All protocols were piloted with two diversity/equity experts (Ravitch & Carl, 2016), and insights from these interviews contributed to the conceptualization of the project and data collection process. For practical reasons, including lack of access due to institutional review board requirements or scheduling, some participants did not submit either classroom artifacts or classroom videos. Weick (2007) notes that "it takes a complicated sensing device to

register a complicated set of events” (p. 16), and I have utilized a variety of methods for data collection to attempt to honor the complexity of this work.

References

- An, S. (2017). Teaching race through AsianCrit-informed counterstories of school segregation. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 12, 210–231.
<http://doi.org/10.1108/SSRP-05-2017-0023>
- Appiah, K. A. (2006). How to decide if races exist. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 106, 363–380. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9264.2006.00202.x>
- Black Lives Matter, n.d.). Available from <https://blacklivesmatter.com/herstory/>
- Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93, 518 – 533. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-594X.2007.00242.x>
- Brayboy, B. M. J. (2013). Tribal Critical Race Theory. In A. D. D. Lynn, Marvin (Ed.), *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education* (pp. 88–100). New York: Routledge. <http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203155721.ch6>
- Bureau, U. S. C. (2017). *Research to improve data on race and ethnicity*. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://census.gov/about/our-research/race-ethnicity.html>
- Calabrese-Barton, A., & Berchini, C. (2013). Becoming an insider: Teaching science in urban settings. *Theory Into Practice*, 52(1), 21–27.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/07351690.2013.743765>
- Chait, J. (2017, September). Donald Trump, White supremacy, and the discourse of panic. *New York Magazine*, 1–14.
- Chandler, P. T. (2015). *Doing race in social studies: Critical perspectives*. (P. Chandler, Ed.). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Christian, B. (1988). The race for theory. *Feminist Studies*, 14(1), 67.
<http://doi.org/10.2307/3177999>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241–1299.
<http://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Cross, B. E. (2005). New racism, reformed teacher education, and the same ole’ oppression. *Educational Studies*, 38(3), 263–274.
http://doi.org/10.1207/s15326993es3803_6

- Crowley, R. M. (2016). Transgressive and negotiated White racial knowledge. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 29, 1016–1029. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2016.1174901>
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: an introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Demoiny, S. B. (2017). Are you ready? Elementary pre-service teachers' perceptions about discussing race in social studies. *Multicultural Education*, 24(2), 25.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1903). *The Souls of Black Folk*. Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Fullwiley, D. (2008). The biological construction of race: “admixture” technology and the new genetic medicine. *Social Studies of Science*, 38, 695–735. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0306312708090796>
- Giago, T. (October 1, 2007). Native American day came without a shot fired. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved September 10, 2019, from https://www.huffpost.com/entry/native-american-day-came_b_66642?guccounter=1.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record*, 111, 2055–2100. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109336543>
- Guinier, L. (2004). From racial liberalism to racial literacy: Brown v. Board of education and the interest-divergence dilemma. *The Journal of American History*, 91(1), 92–118.
- Hannah-Jones, N. (August 14, 2019). Our democracy's founding ideals were false when they were written. Black Americans have fought to make them true. *The New York Times*. Retrieved September 10, 2019, from <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/08/14/magazine/black-history-american-democracy.html>.
- Hood, J. (2011). Orthodoxy vs. power: The defining traits of Grounded Theory. In *The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory* (pp. 151–164). Sage Publications. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781848607941>

- Horsford, S. D., & Grosland, T. J. (2013). Badges of inferiority. In *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education* (pp. 153–166).
<http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203155721.ch11>
- Iverson, S. V. (2007). Camouflaging power and privilege: A critical race analysis of university diversity policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(5), 586–611. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X07307794>
- Kendi, I. (2016). *Stamped from the beginning: the definitive history of racist ideas in America*. New York: Nation Books.
- King, D. S., & Smith, R. M. (2005). Racial orders in American political development. *American Political Science Review*, 99(1), 75–92.
<http://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055405051506>
- King, L. J. (2016). Teaching black history as a racial literacy project. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 19(6), 1303–1318. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1150822>
- Ladson-Bllings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 3–12.
<http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X035007003>
- Ladson-Bllings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a Critical Race Theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47–68.
<http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033007003>
- Leonardo, Z. (2008). Reading Whiteness: Antiracist pedagogy against White racial knowledge. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Justice in Education* (pp. 231–248). New York: Routledge.
<http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203887745.ch28>
- The Movement for Black Lives (n.d.). Available at <https://policy.m4bl.org/>
- Matias, C. E., & Zembylas, M. (2014). “When saying you care is not really caring”: emotions of disgust, whiteness ideology, and teacher education. *Critical Studies in Education*, 55(3), 319–337. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2014.922489>
- Mills, C.W. (1997). *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Milner, H. R. (2017). Race, talk, opportunity gaps, and curriculum shifts in (teacher) education. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 66, 73–94.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/2381336917718804>

- Milner, H. R., Pearman, A., & McGee, E. O. (2013). Critical race theory, interest convergence, and teacher education. In M. Lynn & A. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education* (pp. 339–354). Routledge.
<http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203155721.ch25>
- Newkirk II, V. R. (2017). The language of White Supremacy. *The Atlantic*, 1–9.
 Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/10/the-language-of-white-supremacy/542148/>
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (2d ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Patel, L. (2015). Desiring diversity and backlash: White property rights in higher education. *The Urban Review*, 47(4), 657–675.
- Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined Whiteness of teaching: How White teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 12(2), 197–215. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13613320902995475>
- Pratt, B., Hixson, L., & Jones, N. (2015). *Measuring race and ethnicity across the decades: 1790-2010*.
- Press, A. (2012, October 12). South Dakota celebrates Native American Day. *Rapid City Journal*, pp. 8–10.
- Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2016). *Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Scott, J., & Quinn, R. (2014). The politics of education in the post-Brown era: Race, markets, and the struggle for equitable schooling. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(5), 749–763. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X14551983>
- Solórzano, D. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical race theory, stereotyping, and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 24(3), 5–19.
[http://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-4765\(04\)00066-9](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-4765(04)00066-9)
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 23–44.
- Southern Poverty Law Center (2018). *Teaching hard history: American slavery*. Montgomery, AL: Shuster, K.

- Spencer, Q. (2013). Biological theory and the metaphysics of race: A reply to Kaplan and Winther. *Biological Theory*, 8(1), 114–120. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s13752-013-0095-1>
- Spencer, Q. (2014). The unnatural racial naturalism. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, 46(1), 38–43. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsc.2014.02.005>
- Starks, H., & Trinidad, S. B. (2007). Choose your method: a comparison of phenomenology, discourse analysis, and grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17(10), 1372–1380. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1049732307307031>
- Tatum, B.D. (2003). *"Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?": and other conversations about race*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor, 1(1), 1–40.
- Tuck, E. & Yang, W. (2018), *Toward What Justice? Describing Diverse Dreams of Justice in Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Valencia, R. R. (2010). *Dismantling contemporary deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Weick, K. E. (2007). The generative properties of richness. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 14–19.
- Woodson, C.G. (1933). *The mis-education of the Negro*. Washington: The Associated Publishers.
- Yosso, T. J. (2006). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69-91. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006>

WHITE SUPREMACY IN TEACHER EDUCATION: BALANCING PEDAGOGICAL TENSIONS WHEN TEACHING ABOUT RACE

Abstract

Using Mills' (1999, 2005, 2015) and Leonardo's (2004) articulations of the characteristics and dimension of White supremacy as a core framework, and building off of work that identifies operant mechanisms of White supremacy in teacher education, the author first proposes a framework for the logic of White supremacy as consisting of three core concepts: 1) the logic of *racialized distribution of power* and an unequal distribution of material resources; 2) the logic of *intentional White ignorance and historical erasure*; and 3) the logic of *dehumanization of people of color* through violence and White cultural hegemony. This framework is used to examine the emerging tensions experienced by TEs that arise as they teach teachers to disrupt White supremacy while working from within White supremacist institutions. Tensions related to the racial distribution of power focused on a) offering *differentiated support* for TCs of color and b) *facilitation of classroom discourse* during moments of racial tension. Tensions related to White ignorance and erasure centered around (a) making decisions about *knowing "when to push"* against White students' resistance and (b) *decentering Whiteness* and introducing counternarratives. Finally, tensions related to dehumanization of people of color focused on identifying effective pedagogical strategies for *challenging deficit ideologies*. Implications for teacher education pedagogy and research are explored.

Research on teacher education has uncovered important insights about both how and why to teach teachers about race and racism (Banks, 2013; Cochran-Smith, 1991, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1995, 1998; Nieto, 2003). In university-based teacher education (UBTE) programs, teachers frequently learn about core concepts related to race and racism in what are often called “social foundations” or “multicultural education” courses or a correlate “diversity and equity” course or track in alternate certification routes (Gorski, 2009; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Milner & Howard, 2013). In research on these types of courses, critical scholars have developed lists of key tenets or core concepts in an attempt to identify foundational principles that make manageable and scaffold teachers’ developing knowledge about theories of race and racism (Gay, 2010; Gorski, 2009; Howard, 2003; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Across these syntheses, one core understanding is that racism in schools operates at both institutional and interpersonal levels, and that these levels of racism are simultaneous and interactive, which is broadly characterized as the political system of *White supremacy*.

At the same time that research on teacher education has been evolving in its examination of how to teach teachers about White supremacy in schools, a growing body of research on institutions of higher education (IHEs) has explicitly examined IHEs as White supremacist institutions (Hayes & Jaurez, 2012; Patel, 2015; Stovall & McGee, 2015). Research on IHEs is important for teacher education because many teachers are still trained in traditional university-based teacher education programs (Ingersoll, Merrill, & May, 2012), and this literature explores how the core commitments of White supremacy as a political system are sustained at IHEs. These institutions maintain racial

hierarchies and conceptions of White cultural dominance, sustain the marginalization of racial minorities, and ensure or exacerbate unequal distribution of material resources along racial lines (Hikido & Murray, 2015; Patel, 2015; Iverson, 2007, 2012).

Teacher education is situated at the nexus of these two bodies of research. Particularly for justice-oriented teacher educators (TEs), tension emerges as (TEs) themselves are working to disrupt social inequity from within White supremacist institutions and under policies and practices that sustain systemic racism. Furthermore, it is within this context that teacher educators who teach about race and racism support teachers in learning about these very systemic forces. Thus, TEs who teach social foundations courses are uniquely positioned: tasked to teach teacher-candidates (TCs) about White supremacy, they are also working within and navigating the challenges of White supremacist institutions. The aim of this study is to better understand how teacher educators who teach about race and racism balance these tensions. Here, I propose a framework for the logic of White supremacy and use it to examine the narrated experiences of teacher educators in a cross-institutional qualitative study. The research questions for this study are:

1. What tensions emerge as TEs teach about White supremacy from within White supremacist institutions?
2. How do TEs navigate such tensions?

Certainly, teacher education research has progressed in its critical attention to the role of Whiteness in shaping teachers' learning experiences (Hyttén & Warren, 2003; Matias, Henry, & Darland, 2017; Picower, 2009). However, more work is needed that

explicitly examines how White supremacy as a political system influences the experiences of teachers and teacher educators even as, or perhaps precisely when, teacher educators aim to disrupt patterns of inequality by building teachers' racial knowledge. Explorations of the role of individual relationships to Whiteness, divorced from broader systemic forces in teacher education, will benefit from critical evaluation of White supremacy as a sociopolitical force that affects teacher learning.

Theoretical Framework

Defining White Supremacy

In recent years, we have seen a shift in the frequency with which contemporary public discourse makes reference to the broad systemic forces of racism and White supremacy as global, political systems of significance. Indeed, as White supremacy has entered popular discourse, it has become a useful tool for teachers and teacher educators to discuss and make sense of race and racism both broadly and in the specific context of schools. While the term "White supremacy" is utilized with some frequency in common political analysis, it often lacks deeper meaning in these contexts. Theoretical formulations of White supremacy (e.g., Mills, 1994) offer a political and systemic theory of racial hierarchies as a complement to existing and often vague discourse on racism, but White supremacy often now functions as synonymous with *racism*, *discrimination*, *hate crimes*, *bias*, or even simply *Whiteness* (Newkirk, 2017). In other words, as popular media gives increasing attention to issues of social justice and equity, these issues are also sometimes conflated as a single issue. Given the power and, importantly, the sustenance of this political system over time (Leonardo & Harris, 2013; Mills, 1994), we

need to develop a more complex understanding of the term. That is, if we are going to use the term to describe what is happening in our society, it seems useful to also have a sense of what we mean when we say “White supremacy.” This need for greater definitional clarity for the term White supremacy is particularly relevant in teacher education, where scholars have called for more shared vocabulary to support novices’ development of professional practices (Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009), and research on social justice teacher education suggests that lack of shared meaning for “social justice” terminology is a common issue for teacher educators (Conklin & Hughes, 2016). More research is needed in teacher education that explicitly defines White supremacy and offers clear conceptions of curricular or pedagogical connections to the term for teacher education courses.

Charles Mills is well known for his work in developing a theoretical construction of White supremacy. In his *Racial Contract* (1997), Mills describes White supremacy as “the unnamed political system that made the modern world what it is today” (p. 1). Mills describes White supremacy as a global political system of racism, one in which there is “a particular power structure of formal or informal rule, socioeconomic privilege, and norms for the differential distribution of material wealth and opportunities, benefits and burdens, rights and duties” (p. 3). Mills’ description of White supremacy includes a few key characteristics. It is broad, intersectional, and politically significant across a number of social axes, namely race and class. He names an explicit connection to socioeconomic privilege, which highlights the intersectional complexity of White supremacist mechanisms, subjects, and consequences. In other words, while White supremacy is

primarily a racial project, it is also inextricably linked to the distribution of material wealth, and, as we see in the racialized history of the United States, the resulting convergences and divergences of interests across racial groups draw out class tensions built into a system that preserves the interests of White elites at the expense of all others (Crenshaw, 1991; Gillborn, 2006; Milner, Pearman, & McGee, 2013). One well-known articulation of this phenomenon is DuBois' *Black Reconstruction in America* (1935), in which he outlines the role of access to property, political power, and material resources in shaping Black-White relations in the post-Civil War era. Understanding the aims, sustenance, and mechanisms of White supremacy requires recognition of this connection between distribution of material resources and the preservation of racial hierarchy (Leonardo, 2004). Mills also highlights that White supremacy operates both formally and informally. That is, the politics of domination can be both explicitly engrained within a system and also enacted more informally by people within that system. Broadly speaking, Mills points here to White supremacy as a political system that underwrites what Collins (2000) refers to as a "disciplinary" domain of power, which is a form of power that is sustained through adherence to rules and regulations that are set and enforced by a dominant social group.

Mills describes White supremacy as a far-reaching political system with complex and intersectional operant mechanisms. In this sense, it is both quite easy to name the many instantiations of White supremacy and quite difficult to articulate its form. Many scholars have outlined characteristics and core features of White supremacy (Gibbons, 2018; Gillborn, 2006, 2016; Leonardo, 2004; Mills, 1997; Smith, 2012). In the sections

below, drawing from and synthesizing a body of critical scholarship that defines and describes characteristics and features of White supremacy as a sociopolitical system, I propose a framework for the logic of White supremacy as consisting of three core concepts: 1) the logic of *racialized distribution of power* and an unequal distribution of material resources; 2) the logic of *intentional White ignorance and historical erasure*; and 3) the logic of *dehumanization of people of color* through violence and White cultural hegemony. I use the term “logic” to describe the operant mechanisms of White supremacy because it is often noted that White supremacy persists in patterned ways across physical space and over time, even as the form or function may shift and adapt to particular contexts. Thus, there is an underlying “logic” that sustains the sociopolitical system of White supremacy even as its specific form changes over time. Drawing heavily from critical race scholarship, I propose the logic of White supremacy as a necessary conceptual framework for analyzing the work of teacher education because theories of White supremacy emphasize White racial domination as a *political system* with *self-sustaining* mechanisms that make it *historically continuous*. Understanding the political, systemic, and sustained nature of racism and White supremacy in teacher education is a necessary analytic lens for making sense of the complex work of teaching teachers about race, White supremacy, and social justice in education. This paper aims to demonstrate how these concepts appear in the context of teacher education.

The Logic of White Supremacy

Racialized distribution of power. While “White supremacy” describes a political system that prescribes social status explicitly along racial lines, theories of

White supremacy quite explicitly engage the interdependence of White supremacy and other systems of social domination, with special emphasis on capitalism, colonialism and slavery, and patriarchy (Paris, 2019; Smith, 2012). In particular, recognizing the connections across these systems, while also parsing the underlying logics that distinguish these systems, is important for understanding the deeply rooted and expansive impact of White supremacy as not only a system of racial hierarchy but also one that reinforces domination through classed and gendered power. Its ties to settler colonialism, which Tuck and Yang (2012:5) describe as “appropriation of Indigenous life and land” that “insists on settler sovereignty” over the colonial context, also highlight the relationship between White supremacy and the dispossession. Indeed, Patel (2015) writes that “Whiteness, and more specifically White settler colonialism, is intimately tied to other forms of oppression, in fact is dependent on them” (p. 659). This *racialized distribution of power* has also been conceptualized as “Whiteness as property,” most famously by Cheryl Harris (1993). Whiteness as property, an oft-cited concept in critical race theory scholarship, makes the argument that White supremacist logic has supported White domination through the conferral of property rights to White people and the barring of property ownership to people of color. In other cases, people of color have themselves been cast as property of White people, the most obvious case being chattel slavery of African-descended people in the Americas. Through these systems of racialized property ownership that reinforced racial hierarchy, a racialized distribution of power was continually reinscribed. Harris (1993) makes the case that Whiteness as property persists through legal legitimation, even as it changes form over time. Other

critical scholars make similar arguments about the ways in which White supremacy reinforces White domination through inequitable and unequal distribution of power and material resources (Alexander, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1998, 2011). This concept of unequal access to power and material resources, and in particular its persistence even as it changes form over time, is a core component of the logic of White supremacy.

In the context of educational spaces, Whiteness as property has been conceptualized in relation to discursive power and cultural capital because these forms of power are leveraged for access to material resources and physical property. In their study of Whiteness in teacher education, Hytten & Warren (2003) focus on the “political and social power of whiteness” (p. 67). The authors write, “whiteness was a discourse of power that worked to maintain power imbalances” and that this discourse is taken up not only by White students but also by students of color. They argue they need an “alternative vocabulary for how whiteness manifests through discourse” to examine the political and social power of Whiteness as it is taken up in their class and used to sustain racial hierarchies.

“Diversity discourse” in higher education also has been critiqued as a tool used to perpetuate the marginalization of communities of color while sustaining unequal access to material resources and even physical spaces at IHEs. Patel (2015) writes:

Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) display ideologies of diversity explicitly and also manifest less seemly logics of capitalism, entitlement, and status. College campuses are not unique in these displays, but they offer a productive focus precisely because of their visible position in the nation’s discourses of meritocracy, upward mobility, and multiculturalism. In other words, education is and represents property, and more specifically in the US, white property. (p. 658)

Patel argues that a core characteristic of Whiteness as property is that stratified property rights are “protected for whites and inaccessible to people of color” (p. 660). While Harris’ conceptualization of Whiteness as property often focuses on material stratification of property rights as codified through law, a similar conceptualization of White entitlement emerges in IHEs conceptualizes of the discursive power of Whiteness in IHEs.

Whites’ intentional ignorance and historical erasure. White supremacy also requires White people to subscribe to “an epistemology of ignorance” (Mills, 1997, p. 18). In describing the Racial Contract, Mills writes, “On matters related to race, the Racial Contract prescribes for its signatories an inverted epistemology, an epistemology of ignorance ... producing the ironic outcome that Whites will in general be unable to understand the world they themselves have made” (Mills, 1999, p. 18). This *intentional ignorance* makes possible a kind of innocent subscription to domination and privilege without accountability. Mills suggests that being constructed as White or “achieving Whiteness” requires a kind of cognitive model that “precludes self-transparency and a genuine understanding of social realities” (p. 18). He explains, “One has to learn to see the world wrongly, but with the assurance that this set of mistaken perceptions will be validated by white epistemic authority” (p. 18). Leonardo (2004) argues that even contemporary discourse about White privilege perpetuates and obscures patterns of White racial domination. He writes:

Whites daily recreate [White domination] on a personal and institutional level ... Domination is a relation of power that subjects enter into ...it does not form out of random acts of hatred, although these are condemnable, but rather out of a

patterned and enduring treatment of social groups. Ultimately, it is secured by a series of actions. (p. 139)

Briefly, then, White supremacy sustains itself by investing White people in a logic of domination that they do not understand. This ignorance results from patterned engagement in actions of evasion and self-deception that lead to a misinterpretation of the world.

Whites' intentional ignorance has also been conceptualized in relation to resultant silences and silencing that occur in multiple ways. Picower (2009) describes how White people engage in self-silencing as self-protection and that this form of silence is a tool of Whiteness. In his articulation of "White racial knowledge," Leonardo (2008) describes these maneuvers as "invoking race." He explains, "Whites know when to invoke race in a manner that maintains their 'innocence.' In fact, it is at this point when White racial knowledge mysteriously transforms into racial ignorance. Whites suddenly become oblivious to the racial formation" (p. 238). Thus, White silence is theorized as a symptom of intentional ignorance. Garrett and Segall (2013) describe White ignorance as "inherently active" and resistance to race talk as a form of defending the self in response to difficult knowledge. The authors argue for the utility of conceptualizing ignorance not as an "empty well" but instead as an active negotiation and defense mechanism by Whites. These critical scholars and others focus on how White ignorance and silence operate as tools of Whiteness to perpetuate White domination.

Critical race theory (CRT) scholars also point to recurrent silencing of people of color as a consequence of White supremacy and the patterned historical erasure of the narratives of people of color. This erasure is frequently referred to as a "master" or

“dominant” narrative that reinforces a skewed version of history, one which excludes not only the voices of people of color but also the history of White complicity in violence against and exploitation of people of color (Brown & Au, 2014; Chandler, 2015; Huggins, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Stovall, 2005). King (2016) describes this erasure in schooling as “marginalizing knowledge,” a process in which “racism through black history is presented as progressive and as a solved problem” (p. 1305) and historical and social realities, including institutional racism, are largely ignored. These types of erasures are widely documented in educational research on K-12 schools but also are not limited to schooling (Paris, 2019). In her framework for the “refusals” of White supremacy,⁵ Gibbons (2018) names the refusal to listen, resultant silencing, and the refusal to acknowledge history as core features of White supremacy. She describes these refusals as underpinning a widespread “lack of empathy and denial of experience and voice” (p. 738). CRT scholars recommend the use of counternarratives as a way of speaking against the master narrative and resisting this pattern of silence (Esquivel et al., 2002; Milner, 2008; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Overall, it is evidence that silence and silencing, in ways that deny the experiences of people of color both in the present and through history, are symptoms of White ignorance and historical erasure as a core logic of White supremacy. It is worth noting that ignorance, erasure and silence operates in complex ways across racial lines. In this sense, it is worth returning to Leonardo’s (2004)

⁵ Gibbons’ (2018) five refusals of White supremacy are: “(1) First, refusing to acknowledge much less reckon with the depths of violence inflicted upon body, mind, and soul; (2) Second, clinging to the privileges emerging from a racialized hierarchy and blocking the voices that call into question those privileges, which are also defined by class and gender. (3) Third, evading the weight of history instead of actively coming to terms with the different ways in which our past continues into the present. (4) Fourth, denying responsibility for white supremacy’s spatial consequences, where a refusal to share space and resources deepens inequalities and maintains both white ignorance and dominance. (5) Fifth, refusing to get down to roots—to acknowledge structure and grapple with the exploitative nature of capitalism and the centrality of racial logics in capitalist development that has ensured the longevity of both economic exploitation and racism” (p. 733)

argument that domination is recreated through patterned, daily actions and to consider the ways in which Whites' intentional ignorance has been theorized as active--as *refusal*, as *invoked*, as *erasure*.

Dehumanization of people of color. A third organizing logic of White supremacy is dehumanization of people of color – what Smith (2012), drawing from Said (1978), refers to as “Orientalism,” which marks the West as superior to an “‘exotic’ but inferior ‘Orient’.” The threat of dehumanization is both violent and cultural. Orientalism, Smith argues, provides the rationale for marking certain people as inferior such that they are a “constant threat,” and this threat provides the “anchor for war” (p. 2). Gibbons (2018), drawing from Mills, also names the “refusal of the humanity of the other and a willingness to allow violence” (p. 729) as a core characteristic of White supremacy as one of the five “refusals” of White supremacy. Often sanctioned by the State or other political structures, the violence of White supremacy can be expansive and extreme.

Gibbons explains,

This violence can come whether or not you struggle or stay silent, whether or not you stand or run ... It is freedom from this level of violence that separates one race from all the rest, marking how whiteness gives a kind of freedom, safety anonymity, and comfort unavailable to others. (p. 735)

Gibbons also notes that this violence is connected to other aspects of White supremacy, such as capitalist oppression.

Critical Race Theory (CRT), which evolved from critical legal studies, examines how dehumanization has manifested historically as a consequence of White supremacist political and cultural forces, particularly in the U.S. context. For example, Leonardo (2004) refers to the drafting of the Constitution as something that, though touted as

offering legal protection for all people created as equal, was informed by the forces of slavery, patriarchy, and industrial capitalism. Under these conditions, he writes, “‘humanity’ meant male, white, and propertied” (p. 139). Drawing from Bell’s (1992) theory of racial realism, which asserts that racism is endemic in U.S. society, some CRT scholars highlight the ways in which “colorblind” approaches to education policy and schooling have sustained racial inequalities. In other cases, scholars argue that state-level policies contribute to the perpetuation of violence against children of color in schools (Dumas, 2018; Gillborn, 2016). In many of these cases, violence against Black children has been linked to racial bias or racial fear, and education researchers have made the case for the need for more humanizing views of children of color (Dumas & Nelson, 2016; Duncan-Andrade, 2009; Huerta, 2011; Matias & Allen, 2016).

The notion of dehumanization has also been applied in contemporary discourse. In a 2018 MSNBC special program on racism in America, Harvard professor Tim Wise situated issues of police violence in a broader discourse around White comfort, violence against black people, and White supremacist cultural logic. He explains, “White America has been raised to believe ... that Black lives matter less than White comfort” (MSNBC, 2018). He goes on to explain that, when White Americans call the police on their neighbors for “suspicious” behaviors, “what you are saying is ‘my discomfort with you right now is worth more than the potential that your life could be snuffed in 10 minutes.’ Until that stops, nothing is going to change.” Wise highlights contemporary tensions around incidents in which White people called police officers to investigate black neighbors for non-criminal behaviors (Molina, 2018; Pager, 2018). The persistence of

police violence against Black people and the notion of White comfort over Black lives describes a contemporary instantiation of violent dehumanization of Black people; while Gibbons uses historical examples from the 19th and early 20th centuries to make concrete the conception of violent dehumanization of Black people, the logic of dehumanization has been sustained over time. Indeed, as Mills (1994) argued, while White supremacy changes form across time and space, its fundamental function does not, as we see here.

In addition to physical violence against people of color as a foundational tool of White domination, cultural conceptions of people of color as inferior have also reinforced dehumanizing views of racial groups to sustain White supremacy. Specifically, cultural dehumanization of people of color occurs through White cultural hegemony and the projection of White norms as “normal” in contrast to cultural norms of communities of color as deviant, abnormal, or inferior (Gillborn, 2006; Haynes, 2017). Bonilla-Silva (1997) explains how this notion of normalcy is connected to racial hierarchy and describes the cultural hegemony of Whiteness as sustained in the racial structure through privileges such as being granted “higher social attributes” and being given the ability to draw both social and physical boundaries in society. In terms of White cultural hegemony, we see concrete examples of these social and physical boundaries through representations of race and beauty in the media, a recent surge in incidents of Blackface videos and re-popularization of minstrelsy, and contemporary and historical critiques of elite social institutions that remain segregated and exclusively White. The reification of the learned cultural value of Whiteness is increasingly contested in popular media but remains a dominant force and a central organizing logic that sustains White supremacy.

Pedagogical Tensions in White Supremacist Institutions

In the context of the ubiquitous sociopolitical forces of White supremacist logic, it is important and ambitious for TEs to teach about White supremacy. It is both ambitious and inherently tense, because TEs teach from within the very system they aim to disrupt. I focus here on IHEs and teacher education as White supremacist institutions to highlight the complex work of pedagogical decision-making in teacher education, particularly for teacher educators who teach about race and racism. We know that classrooms are spaces that cultivate White supremacist logic, which Haynes (2017) names as characterized by discourses of normalcy, innocence, advantage and privilege. Hughes and Giles (2010) write that much of what is considered “normal” on college campuses are symptoms of systemic racism. They remind us that many of the status symbols at “good” institutions also coincide with racism, sexism, and inequity. These critical scholars suggest that disrupting White supremacist logic in higher education is fraught even within classrooms that explicitly aim to engage in anti-racist work. Thus, interrupting expectations of what is “normal” in university classrooms raises questions, tensions and dilemmas for teacher educators.

We also know that teaching itself always already involves making complex and challenging pedagogical decisions (Clark & Peterson, 1986). In every moment, teachers make decisions: about who to respond to or not respond to; where to move or not; whether to press forward with a lesson as planned or respond to newly assessed student needs in the moment. Lampert (1985) suggests that we consider these decisions as “dilemmas” and teachers as dilemma managers, acknowledging that there are no easy

choices in the work of teaching. Lampert also points out that, while teachers' pedagogical decisions are often viewed as "dichotomous alternatives," it is more often the case that teaching dilemmas are not easily resolved because they highlight conflict between teachers' multiple instructional goals. Ball (2018) refers to the kind of in-the-moment decisions teachers must make as "discretionary spaces," when teachers decide whether and how to respond to students, both as individuals and as a class. Ball argues that "macro-structures" often play out in the "micro-moments of teaching," when both teachers' experiences with racism/oppression as well as normalized institutional values inform their choices in the moment. Thus, these moments are both deeply informed by context and deeply personal. Indeed, Lampert also makes the case for decisions in teaching as "deeply personal" not only because teachers must identify and solve problems in their classroom but also because the work of teaching "involves the additional personal burden of doing something about these problems in the classroom and living with the consequences" of these choices over time (p. 180).

Thus, TEs who teach about race are, like all teachers, faced with pedagogical dilemmas that require them to engage deeply personal understandings of their own classrooms and contextualized relationships to their institutions. We see one example in Hytten and Warren's (2003) study of the persistence of Whiteness in their teacher education classroom. In their work, they examine how, even as they aim to "move toward understanding the complexities of racism" (p. 66) with their teachers, Whiteness persists in the teacher education space. They identify "discourses of whiteness" through which their students persist and resist further engagement. The authors suggest that TCs' usage

of these discourses can be “both enabling and disabling,” walking “the fine line between productivity and resistance” (p. 69). Their work demonstrates how a “discursive perpetuation of whiteness” might occur even for TEs and TCs consciously engaged in an anti-racist curriculum. Like Hytten and Warren, Marx (2004) argues for more research in teacher education that engages with these tensions and complexities. Marx agrees that White racism is deeply entrenched in society and in teacher education, and, while ultimately she was enthusiastic about the progress and insights of her White students, she at times found herself struggling with her own complicity in perpetuating White racism. In early stages of her study, she questioned how to create “warm, workable relationships” with teachers that support “a productive, critical exploration of whiteness and white racism” without offering a “protective shield that would enable me once again to put off an uncomfortable discussion that would problematize and confront whiteness and white racism” (p. 37). Marx urges teacher education researchers to continue to meet the challenge of confronting the effects of racism and Whiteness in our practice. The dilemmas highlighted in these studies offer practitioner perspectives on how daily decisions might contribute to the perpetuation of Whiteness even in spaces that are designed as anti-racist, and the authors point to a need for more research that examines these tensions more explicitly. To improve as researchers and practitioners, teacher educators must continue to engage critically with these complexities to make sense of the pedagogical tensions that they may be experiencing in those spaces as student-teachers.

Method

The participants in this study were part of a larger phenomenological study of teacher educators who teach about race and racism. Drawing from this larger study, this study is a qualitative interview study with sixteen TEs.

Participants

Sixteen TEs for this study were recruited using recommendations via snowball sampling, to produce a panel of diverse teacher educators. All TEs had experience teaching about race in predominantly White teacher education programs. This study did not focus on the experiences of TEs who worked at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) because of an expected difference in institutional history and student demographics, although future studies of this nature might include or exclusively examine this TE population. To recruit participants, recruitment emails were sent out through education networks to solicit initial recommendations, and recommended experts were invited to complete a selection survey and to recommend additional participants. Selection criteria were that TEs must (a) be teacher educators with experience teaching in predominantly White teacher education programs; (b) work with undergraduate, graduate, and/or in-service teachers; (c) support teachers in urban contexts; and (d) hold core instructional goals related to race/racism. Core instructional goals for the course were assessed through self-report using an interest survey. The demographic characteristics of the TEs in this study are summarized in the table below.

Table 1.1 Participant Demographics.

Name*	Gender	Race	Years Exp.	Institution Type	Status	Primary Course(s) Taught
Ashley	F	W	2	Public	Adjunct / Ph.D.	Diversity & Equity

					Candidate	
Brian	M	W	8	Private	Adjunct	Diversity & Equity
Catherine	F	W	7	Public	Clinical	Diversity & Equity Math Methods
Diane	F	W	5	Public	Adjunct / Ph.D. Candidate	Diversity & Equity
Frederick	M	W	10	Public	Tenured	Diversity & Equity English Methods
Haley	F	B	11	Public	Tenure-track	Diversity & Equity
Ian	M	B	6	Private	Tenured	English Methods
Joanne	F	W	16	Public	Tenured	Diversity & Equity
Kelly	F	W	2	Public	Adjunct	Diversity & Equity
Kia	F	B/W	6	Public	Tenure-track	Diversity & Equity
Molly	F	W	10	Public	Tenured	Diversity & Equity
Nick	M	W	29	Public	Tenured	English Methods
Paul	M	B	6	Private	Tenure-track	Diversity & Equity
Rose	F	W	21	Public	Tenured	Social Stud. Methods
Sam	M	W	5	Public	Tenure-track	Social Stud. Methods
Terri	F	W	17	Private	Tenured	Diversity & Equity Social Stud. Methods

*All names are pseudonyms.

In the final participant pool, 12 of 16 TEs identified as White and 4 identified as Black (1 of whom also identified as biracial Black/White); 10 TEs identified as women and 6 as men. The average number of years of experience was 10 years. Twelve of 16 TEs taught at traditional public universities and 4 taught at private universities. Three of the sixteen TEs for this study taught at Hispanic-serving Institutions (HSIs). The universities at which they taught varied greatly in program structure, from student demographics to how the programs were structured. As noted in the final column, the majority of participants taught courses related to “Diversity and Equity.” These courses, often titled something related to the “Social Foundations Of Education” or “Equity In Schools,” typically covered content related to core equity issues in K-12 schools such as segregation, achievement/opportunity gaps, and school discipline. TEs often also taught about social

identities including race, gender, sexuality, and language, and sometimes including other identities such as religion or nationality. While some TEs described having some course content prescribed by their schools or state, most had at least some autonomy to make decisions about how to structure these courses, what topics to cover, and what curricular materials to use. Almost half of TEs also identified as teaching methods courses in which race and racism were core instructional goals with teachers. In these courses, some TEs described integrating discussions about race throughout their course while others described incorporating specific units that focused more on topics such as culturally relevant approaches to the discipline. Of the 6 TEs who taught methods courses, 3 taught both types of courses.

Data Sources

Each TE who participated in the study completed two interviews, each approximately 75 minutes in length. In total, 49 hours of individual interviews were collected and transcribed across sixteen TEs. The core content of interviews included: a life history narrative, with explicit emphasis on personal racial identity development; discussion of workplace context; and descriptions of classroom experiences, including debriefing specific classroom artifacts and narrated examples of general practice. Classroom artifacts were submitted by TEs and used to triangulate data from interviews. TEs submitted a course syllabus and at least one assignment, and they were invited to submit other materials that they use to support teacher learning about race and racism.

Finally, focus groups were used to examine how interactions between TEs either altered discourse or opened up new conversations. In this case, focus groups created an

opportunity to revisit questions that TEs themselves raised during their individual interviews about teaching phenomena. Focus groups in this study were created through heterogeneous grouping, and placement into focus groups was criterion-based with the aim of offering diverse perspectives within each group (Ravitch & Carl, 2016) and to avoid the issue of underdisclosure (Morgan & Hoffman, 2018). In total, 3 focus groups were conducted, and each of the focus groups had 3 TEs, for a total of 9 TEs in the focus groups. A semi-structured protocol was used based on themes that emerged from individual interviews (see Appendix A). For example, one participant asked, “Is my own Whiteness preventing me from pushing people harder in thinking about racism and privilege than I would otherwise?” (Diane, Interview #1), and this theme of “pushing” students appeared across multiple interviews and was therefore raised in the focus group interviews.

Data Analysis

Data was coded iteratively during data collection using open analytic coding methods (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). Initial in vivo codes were developed using inductive coding methods. Descriptive codes were also applied to sections of participant narratives identifying any mention of commonly used terms such as “Whiteness,” “racism,” and “White supremacy.” During a second round of coding, themes were identified and used to finalize code categories through an iterative coding process. The final codebook included 7 code categories: *TEs’ instructional goals*, *TEs’ pedagogical strategies*, *Theories of Teacher learning*, *Vision/Purpose*, *Personal Histories*, *Racial Knowledge*, and *Context*. Each code category had subcodes, and in total, there were 74 codes. The

findings from this study are drawn from the “TEs’ pedagogical strategies” (TEP) code category generally and to the specific subcodes related to “pedagogical decision making” and to “pedagogical tensions” identified by TEs as they narrated their classroom experiences. Pedagogical tensions were identified as moments when TEs explicitly referenced “tensions” or otherwise identified challenges or uncertainties that signified weighing issues in opposition in their instruction. Examples of such signifiers included discussions about their “struggles,” “limitations,” “hopes,” and/or a sense that their work is “ongoing” or “unfinished” (Appendix B). These codes were reviewed in relation to descriptive codes for Whiteness and White supremacy to identify patterns in TEs’ experiences of pedagogical tensions related to White supremacy. All data was coded using the Atlas.ti software, which made it possible to identify themes across classroom artifacts, memos, and interview transcripts.

Validity

This study was part of a larger qualitative, phenomenological study that examined the phenomenon of teaching teachers about race and racism. Though the findings are not generalizable, they offer insight into an important phenomenon through detailed exploration of the narrated experiences of participants. Reliability and validity of the study was enhanced by having a sample of 16 participants who were recommended by other teacher educators in the field through snowball sampling. Data was triangulated across interviews, focus groups, and classroom artifacts. I also engaged in reflexive memoing on both themes as they emerged during data collection and on researcher

positionality and how my own biases and assumptions might influence data analysis and representation of findings.

Findings

The tensions identified by TEs aligned to the logic of White supremacy framework in that they described tensions related to a racialized distribution of power, White ignorance and erasure, and the dehumanization of people of color. Tensions related to the racial distribution of power focused on a) offering *differentiated support* for TCs of color and b) *facilitation of classroom discourse* during moments of racial tension between White TCs and TCs of color. Tensions related to White ignorance and erasure centered around (a) making decisions about *knowing “when to push”* against White students’ resistance and (b) making instructional decisions about *decentering Whiteness* and introducing counternarratives. Finally, tensions related to the dehumanization of people of color focused on identifying effective pedagogical strategies for *challenging deficit ideologies*.

Racial Distribution of Power: Emergent Tensions in Facilitating Classroom Discourse

TEs acknowledged and responded to racial power dynamics within their classroom, and most commonly, the tension identified by TEs for facilitating classroom discourse was negotiating the *different needs* of White TCs and TCs of color, particularly when *managing discursive space in moments of racial tension*. These points of tension highlighted questions about the racialized distribution of power in their classrooms.

Different needs for TCs along racial lines. Most (75%) TEs in the study identified the different needs of White TCs and TCs of color as a source of tension that comes up in their classes. It challenged them specifically in terms of racial distribution of power because of their views of how Whiteness took up space in the classroom and the resultant decisions they needed to make to support both White TCs and TCs of color. Situating these decisions in an understanding of racial power, TCs viewed the different needs of their TCs as an important instructional consideration in their teaching. They offered examples of moments that challenged them and of the factors they considered in making decisions during these moments. TEs shared questions and considerations that guided their current practice as they continued to explore instructional approaches for supporting the varied needs of TCs from different racial and cultural backgrounds.

TEs noted that TCs' racial identities were important for how they facilitated discussions in their teacher education classrooms, and differentiation for White TCs and TCs of color was noted as a specific need. In part, differentiation was a concern for TEs in the ways it required a consideration of their own power and positionality in relation to TCs. In some cases, their own racial identities informed questions about supporting the needs of White TCs and TCs of color. Some White TEs raised questions about how the existing teacher-student power relationship between them and their TCs might reify Whiteness, and they grappled with how to support and instruct TCs of color while also disrupting notions of White authority. For Brian, who had been teaching for eight years, the needs of TCs of color in the program were especially important because they often expressed feelings of isolation and frustration due to the overwhelming Whiteness of the

program, but he did not always know how best to support them. Brian described the tension in this way:

I've struggled with what it means to be a White teacher educator of aspiring teachers of color—so how to balance having knowledge about race and racism conceptually that not all of the aspiring teachers of color have ...and also recognizing that they have a knowledge from lived experience that I do not have at all. And finding that balance between how this is mutually reinforcing rather than ... me being too tentative about sharing what I do know. (Interview #1)

Brian also shared that a general challenge he was working through in his practice was how to productively use feedback in his course, because in responding to his students he felt that “there are some things you just must know in order to not reproduce inequities with your students” (Interview #2), but he was trying to find the right approach to “critical questioning” that would move beyond just saying “that’s not true” and better support his students in “developing conceptual understanding.” For supporting his TCs of color specifically, he struggled to identify his role in challenging those perspectives.

Other TEs described this tension in terms of “internalized” racism and oppression. Haley, a Black woman who has been teaching for eleven years, said that for her TCs of color, internalized oppression often manifested as some of the same teacher practices as White TCs’ issues of internalized White superiority. Still, she said, White TCs typically need more racial identity development than their peers of color, which necessitated differentiation. Like Haley, Joanne identified internalized oppression as an issue for TCs of color and noted her desire to provide differentiated support for TCs because, as she explained, “the process is not the same for everybody” (Interview #2). Joanne, a White teacher educator working in an urban teacher education program, noted the importance of assessing TCs’ differential needs in general, and she expressed concern about

“alienating” TCs of color in teacher education programs that focus primarily on preparing White teachers to teach students of color. She referred several times to the need to differentiate support for White TCs and TCs of color and said she is still trying to figure out “how we do this” (Joanne, Interview #1). TEs identified engaging TCs of color in recognizing and critically reflecting on internalized racism as a specific form of differentiated support needed in their courses.

Managing discursive space during moments of racial tension. A majority (12/16) of TEs shared at least one example of a time when they or their students experienced racial stress (Stevenson, 2014) during a classroom discussion. In these moments, TEs had to make decisions about how to facilitate classroom discourse, and they described weighing the consequences of their choices in relation to the racial identities of their students and to discursive power dynamics. Kia, a biracial (Black/White) woman who taught at a public university, raised questions about how to navigate these moments of tension. Kia described “balancing tensions” in her class:

In teaching about race it's like balancing a lot of tensions. And so a tension is, what kinds of comments are allowed and can we explore, and then the tension for this is that I don't want to close, to shut somebody down so that they're never going to engage, but at the same time if something is a harmful statement or is going to, that there's some harm there, I want to address that. ... So how do I keep people engaged but not let harmful things go unaddressed. (Interview #2)

Here, Kia was referring to how she makes decisions about intervening when a White TC might say something that could be experienced as harmful by TCs of color in her class. She noted that she doesn't want her White students to shut down and never engage. Knowing that silence is a “tool of Whiteness” (Picower, 2009) used to maintain and enact dominant White racial ideologies, it seems that Kia was trying to preempt this move. And

yet Kia was also mindful of the need to support TCs of color who might experience harm from their peers' comments and also a need to cover essential curricular content with efficient pacing. Primarily, this was an issue of temporality, as she questioned whether or not allowing comments to go unaddressed in the present might create greater instructional possibilities in the future and whether the risk of harm to TCs of color in the present can be weighed against the potential benefit of White TCs' later learning. The tension raised by Kia here underscores the logic of White supremacy as always reinscribing racial domination and harm towards people of color, and Kia questioned her role as a facilitator in disrupting that harm.

Terri, a White woman who had been teaching teachers for seventeen years, shared that in one case she received pushback from her students for the way she managed racial tension during a class discussion. They were discussing microaggressions and whether or not calling someone by the wrong name was a microaggression, and a White woman in her class said something dismissive: "I don't see why it's a big deal,' or something like that," Terri said (Focus Group). After this comment, a Black woman in the class stood up and left the room, and the White woman "got all teary" and said she didn't understand her offense. Later, the Black woman and other White TCs in the class criticized Terri for not doing more in the moment to hold the White woman accountable for her dismissive comment. About the incident, Terri reflected:

I think it's a good example of how in that moment, I feel the pull between pushing the White student who says something and holding her hand and walking her along in a direction where she needs to go. ...The feedback from this woman of color, this Black woman, was, you were holding her hand, like what the heck?! You can't hold somebody's hands when they say something like that. I mean she didn't use that language, but, you know. (Interview #1)

Terri's role as a facilitator was challenged because her students viewed it as her responsibility to manage the way that White TCs' discursive engagement affected class dynamics. In terms of a racialized distribution of power, Terri struggled because she felt that this moment required her to balance offering even somewhat passive support for the White student at the expense of other students and particularly the Black woman in the class. Terri said that she learned from this incident and decided to offer a new set of "ground rules" that might attend more meaningfully to the balance of racialized power in the classroom. She explained:

One of the things that I learned from that is, now when we talk about ground rules and expectations I say, if you need to leave the room, it's perfectly okay. Quite honestly, I'd rather have a White woman leave and come back then sit there and cry and pull all of us over in that direction, and I certainly want the people of color to be able to leave the room. So I feel like that was a big lesson. (Interview #1)

For Terri, a new set of ground rules both disrupts the discursive power of "White women's tears" (Accapadi, 2007) and might allow TCs of color to feel validated in their choice to disengage from racially tense moments in a way that traditionally classrooms do not often create space for. Terri also acknowledged that she sometimes felt better equipped to support White teachers and that she worried that her TCs of color are not getting what they need from her class. She explained, "talking to mixed groups is challenging" because "I don't want the people of color to have to listen to the White people, including me sometimes" (Interview #2).

These tensions highlight the complexity of navigating racialized power dynamics in the classroom when facilitating discussions. These TEs both named the challenge of

managing discursive space for TEs of color and White TCs, but they describe their decision-making differently. Kia remained unsure, and in her wrestling highlighted how she viewed these decisions about facilitating discussions as reflective of larger questions about the consequences of engaging White students and harm towards students of color. Terri also identified these moments as balancing tensions, but in creating a rule that aimed to alleviate future tensions she inadvertently introduced new issues of access to power for her students. On the one hand, her “ground rules” could be a source of agency for TCs of color, but they also introduce questions about differential access to material and cultural resources for TCs of color. Because Terri and her TCs were negotiating both physical and discursive access to the classroom, this incident recalls critical race scholarship highlighting White entitlement in IHEs and questioning a “discourse of access” (Iverson, 2012) for students of color as one that camouflages the perpetuation of racial hierarchies. Still, Terri’s aim for these new “ground rules” was to disrupt the discursive power of a White woman being able to cry in class and “pull all of us over in that direction.” In facilitating discussion, her goal was to resist existing racial power dynamics in her class. This incident presents a clear dilemma and demonstrates the complex nature of negotiating racialized power for students in White supremacist IHEs. Considering multiple factors that influence access to power as influential for navigating the racialized distribution of power often left TEs with more questions than answers about how to effectively disrupt existing racial hierarchies while supporting both White TCs and TCs of color in their classes.

Tensions Related to the Logic of White Ignorance and Historical Erasure

TEs in this study noted a range of ways that White ignorance manifested in TCs' behaviors. This assessment of their TCs was evident in the way they described TCs; several TEs used the word "ignorance" to describe teachers, while others referenced ways in which they addressed content or issues that their students "didn't know." For TEs, addressing White ignorance created pedagogical tensions because it required balancing both the ways that Whiteness takes up space and is centered in classrooms and the ways that White silence can be used as a tool to avoid confronting racism and White supremacy. This tension was often framed as "*knowing when to "push."*" In terms of navigating this tension, TEs described making *curricular choices* related to decentering Whiteness and using counternarratives of people of color that historically had been erased in dominant narratives (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002; Milner, 2008). They weighed the importance of decentering Whiteness and elevating the voices of people of color on the one hand and, on the other hand, centering Whiteness in an attempt to critically confront White racism as instructional goals that both worked towards disrupting White ignorance and historical erasure. While this tension remained unresolved, TEs described how they made decisions around these tensions.

White defensiveness: Knowing when to "push." TEs described a desire to respond to White students' defensiveness, increase their critical consciousness, and address White ignorance. They described the challenge of knowing when to "push" White students at the risk of students "shutting down." These decisions were fraught as TEs described considering issues such as students feeling nervous, fearful, angry, or

resistant. Diane was a White TE with six years of experience, and she raised questions about finding a balance:

A lot of white students get super defensive. And they push back a lot. And it takes this balance that I continually struggle to find. Well, there's a lot of balances. But it's, you know, how hard do you push people? ... People are really defensive. A lot of pushback. And knowing that right level of pushing so that they start to think critically versus pushing so hard they shut down. Right? (Interview #1)

The central tension for Diane and others is whether or not “pushing” is actually productive for White TCs’ learning. The goal is that they begin to “think critically,” but Diane and others described defensiveness as a barrier to learning. However, TEs also were worried that *not* pushing represented instructional failure as well. Diane said she also frequently asked herself, “Am I pushing people enough? Is my Whiteness preventing me from pushing people harder in thinking about racism and privilege than I would otherwise?” (Interview #1). Thus, this feeling of knowing when and how “hard” to “push” emerged as an important pedagogical tension. Like Diane, Paul, a Black teacher educator with six years of experience, said that it was important for TCs to be pushed but acknowledged that he had not found the balance yet. He explained:

Classes about race and racism in teacher education should be agitating courses; they should be courses where people are a little bit uncomfortable. ... I think I make my courses around race and racism too comfortable for White people. I can get better at being more disruptive for my White teacher candidates around race and racism. They're very good at talking about theory; they can report back to me what race and racism *is*, and what racial identity development *is*, still leaving my class with some clear biases. (Interview #2)

Paul’s comment suggests that perhaps challenging White ignorance requires not only access to historical racial knowledge and theories of race but also some “agitating” or “disruptive” experiences.

Addressing Historical Erasure Through Curricular Choices. TEs navigated questions about knowing when to push their White students through purposeful planning and curricular choices. In many cases, TEs' described these choices in relation to managing this balance of pushing students but keeping them engaged. This attentiveness to White ignorance and defensiveness was an attempt to find this balance, but several TEs raised questions about ways in which White ignorance might be sustained through curricular silences. They considered how Whiteness showed up in their own curricular choices. Even as TEs frequently used texts written by scholars of color and engaged counternarratives as outlined above, several TEs expressed skepticism about the Whiteness of their programs and curricula. Although a critical examination of Whiteness challenges White ignorance, it also re-centers Whiteness, perhaps perpetuating the historical erasure of people of color. The move to de-center Whiteness, then, resists this pattern, but raises concerns about whether White people will be able to avoid confronting their ignorance through purposeful silence.

Haley described making decisions about when and why to “push” students. She remembered a moment in a class discussion about racial identity when one of her students offered what she described as a “colorblind” response, and, she said, “I remember thinking in that moment, ‘This isn't the moment to push’” (Focus Group). She explained that because she had been building a relationship with the student and would continue working with him for several more weeks, she wanted to leverage their “longer relationship” rather than push in that moment. She then used the time before the next week’s class to reflect and adjust her lesson plan; she said she wanted to think not just

about him but to do something that would be “instructive for all of my students” (Focus Group). Haley’s reflection here highlights the way that an in-the-moment decision—in this case, Haley’s decision not to “push” the student—also can be part of a broader process of critical reflection and the management of a pedagogical dilemma over time. In this sense, we see Haley using her understanding of White supremacy and a framework of resistance both in a “discretionary moment” (Ball, 2018) and in a more sustained process of “dilemma management” (Lampert, 1985) as she balances the needs of one student’s “colorblind ideology” with the needs of the rest of her class. Her purposeful planning is a response to this emergent tension, demonstrating how a critical racial lens informs these decisions but also how her choice is a response to her own negotiation of questions about sustaining and disrupting White ignorance.

Catherine, a White woman who taught in an urban teacher residency program, raised similar questions as she reflected on student feedback at the end of the semester:

Some of the students wrote in their course evaluations that they felt like, even though a lot of what we did was focused on pointing out anti-Black racism ... in some of the course feedback, students said it still felt like a very White-centered class. So, my colleague who kind of planned this course out, I asked her... she was like, “Well, if that's how they felt, then maybe they're right.” You know? Maybe it still wasn't enough; maybe the course still was a little bit aimed towards, okay hey White people, here's how to not be racist when you're a teacher. (Interview #2)

The TCs’ critique and Catherine’s reflection point to uncertainty about how course content may have inadvertently sustained White dominant narratives instead of challenging them. However, it is also worth noting that the TCs’ critique of the course as too “White centered” minimally indicates that Catherine’s TCs’ have a level of critical consciousness which would encourage them to make such an assessment. In this sense,

this critique might also be understood as one indicator of the success of her curriculum; Catherine's curricular choices here are an example of the type of pedagogical decision-making that requires teacher educators to hold, together, and in tension, the instructional utility of decentering Whiteness as a tool of resistance and centering Whiteness as, also, a practical pedagogical tool.

Like Catherine, Brian also questioned the Whiteness of his curriculum. Because his teachers are almost all White, he saw utility in providing curricular resources that offered critical perspectives on Whiteness, but worried that these choices might ultimately mean the program felt like it was “for” White teachers only. Brian explained:

Without making an assumption that this class is for White student-teachers... I remember us having conversations about, what texts are we choosing? And what audiences were assumed, were those texts assuming? And even just thinking about the language that we use in terms of, when is this a “we” as future teachers, and when is it a, “for those of us who are White future teachers,” and “for those of us who are aspiring teachers of color”? (Interview #1)

On the one hand, Brian noted that the teachers in his class come in with varying levels of “racial knowledge” and that he was strategic about which terms and concepts served as entry points to discussions about racism. Still, he questioned whether his curriculum was White-oriented in a way that sent an implicit message about “who the program is for.” He worried that even attempts to raise White TCs' critical consciousness were ultimately reinscribing a message of the devaluation of people of color.

Many TEs described efforts to decenter Whiteness by teaching historical racial knowledge through counternarratives. They introduced counternarratives both through experiential knowledge of people of color—i.e., bringing colleagues and community members in as guests, or bringing TCs to community events—and through secondary

sources in their curriculum. Sam described a lesson where he introduced the concept of racial realism through a group activity where teachers examined and sorted a set of images that presented both a story of racial progress and one of racism unresolved in the history of the United States. Teachers in Joanne and Catherine's classes attend workshops that teach them about their local communities in ways that provide a localized racial history that presents critical perspectives about racial and economic inequality in their school communities. Catherine explained that the session they attended described how redlining had impacted their city and focused on issues such as privilege and wealth inequality. In their debrief, she explained, they discussed "what's our country founded on, what are our schools founded on, and how does that relate particularly to the inherent Whiteness in teaching and to our Black students" (Interview #2). Like Catherine and Joanne, a majority of TEs described engaging outside resources or colleagues to underscore the importance of challenging dominant narratives.

Dehumanizing People of Color: Emergent Tensions in Challenging Deficit Thinking and Developing Coping Strategies

For the TEs in this study, dehumanization of people of color most commonly manifested through TCs' deficit ideologies about students and communities of color. TEs identified deficit thinking as a common issue in their classrooms and often described it as a "challenge" or "struggle" to know how to *challenge TCs' deficit perspectives* of students and communities of color. To navigate this challenge, TEs developed *coping strategies* to regulate their responses to TCs' deficit ideologies. TEs showed variance in

the extent to which responding to TCs' deficit ideologies influenced their pedagogical decision-making.

Being responsive to TCs' deficit thinking. Thirteen of 16 TEs in the study identified "deficit" thinking as an issue that comes up for their students. This presented a tension for some TEs, who were sometimes unsure of how to most productively respond to these expressions of deficit thinking. Sometimes, they were managing their own emotional responses in these moments out of a sense of intolerance for TCs' views. TEs described trying to implement pedagogical strategies that challenged TCs' deficit thinking, and most TEs described at least one specific activity or curricular resource that they used specifically to challenge deficit thinking. For these TEs, tensions or challenges typically emerged during lesson implementation, as TCs responded differently to these activities and resources. For example, Rose and Molly both described doing versions of a "community study" that drew from Moll's (1992) concept of funds of knowledge. While the specific structure of their assignments was a bit different, both Rose and Molly wanted TCs to develop more asset-based perspectives of students' communities and see "the richness" that exists already in these neighborhoods (Rose, Interview #1). Rose said that TCs often "don't even have that language" around realizing that they had a deficit lens towards communities of color, and countering those perspectives, particularly because TCs weren't even aware that they had them, was one of her biggest challenges. Molly described making modifications to her assignment over the years in an effort to address some issues she had identified over the years. One aspect of the assignment she adjusted was the way that she utilized a community study of nearby suburban schools in

conjunction with a community schools observation. Her aim in doing a comparative analysis was for TCs to develop their critical, systemic lens as they learned more about school resource allocation, school segregation, and systemic inequality. However, she said that she worried sometimes that if they didn't develop a critical perspective, they might simply see assets in the suburbs and deficits in their community. Overall, she found this assignment useful for challenging deficit ideologies but continued to make modifications over time. Joanne also described assignments that she used to try to address TCs' deficit perspectives of students and families. She said that she "just became kind of sickened by the deficit ways that my students thought about and talked about their students" (Interview #2). She developed an assignment to "try to figure out how to interrupt that" that required her students to write observations about their students, and in its earlier iteration, she said, it was "just a laundry list of deficits." At that time, she felt the assignment was not effective; when TCs submitted their observations, Joanne would return them with critical feedback, and they would be "mad" and "defensive." She continued modifying the assignment and added components that she felt were more effective in challenging students' deficit perspectives:

I added the empathy journal component, which is where I have them do the observation and then I have them try to imagine that same period but from the students' perspective. Like, why the student might be rolling around on the carpet—what might they be thinking? Just to try and empathize with the student a little bit. (Interview #2)

In addition to the empathy journal, Joanne continued to modify the assignment to challenge her TCs' deficit ideologies through skits and critical reflection. She found these later iterations of the assignment to be more effective. These examples demonstrate that

TEs design assignments to challenge deficit thinking but must continually modify them as they navigate the difficulty of responding to and resisting dehumanizing perspectives about students and communities of color.

For about one third of TEs (6/16), their own emotionality was also part of the challenge of facing TCs' deficit ideologies in class. Haley, for example, explained:

You're going to have to be ready for when a White student says some stuff that's a little out of pocket and it pisses you off. ... How are you going to be able to create a space where your emotion is not going to get in the way of the active conversation? Or, are there moments when showing some emotion actually is instructive for your student? (Interview #1)

She shared that these questions had been on her mind for much of her teaching career, particularly in relation to her identity as a Black woman. Like Haley, Catherine said that responding to TCs' problematic or racist comments was sometimes a challenge for her. When asked about the challenges of teaching courses about race and racism, Catherine said that her "first challenge has just been me" (Interview #2). She shared a story about a student in her class, a White male student, who made a comment revealing misconceptions about rates of drug and alcohol abuse in Black and brown communities. Catherine acknowledged that her own emotional response was one of her first challenges in supporting him. She said she knew that she was "the first filter to anything people might learn" from her. Catherine expressed a desire to "put the emotion to the side, or something—not let that get in the way" (Interview #2). She said that sometimes she got "angry, really angry" and that she didn't feel she had great strategies for navigating these emotions. She said, "I get angry, and then I have to calm down or I have to figure out a way to work around the anger that I'm feeling. So that's the first challenge." While she

did not name it as such, she seemed to be in search of approaches for a pedagogy of empathy (Lindquist 2004; Zembylas & Papamichael 2017) with her TCs.

Joanne also acknowledged that she sometimes responded emotionally to TCs' comments. She described at times feeling "disgusted" by their deficit thinking and said that, especially early in her career, she would hear comments from students and afterwards be thinking, "I can't believe she said this! Listen to what happened in my class today; can you believe she has the nerve to say that?" (Interview #2). Joanne described these experiences as feeling "caught up" in TCs' comments. However, Joanne shared that over the years, her experience as an educator and researcher supported her in developing "a schema" for responding to these moments over time and feeling more prepared to engage analytically in these moments at this point in her career. She said she felt she was able to be more analytical now and "hear the comments, not as messed up things people are saying, but to categorize it and analyze it in terms of, this is what they know, this is what they don't know, this is the strategy to move them on this continuum" (Interview #2).

For Paul, being able to "deal with" what White students said in class was sometimes challenging, and leveraging his curricular resources became an important tool for him to be able to manage those moments in the classroom. As a Black professor, he thought it was useful to maintain a relatively "neutral" tone and not "exhibit that you'll go in on a student if they say something crazy" (Interview #2). He explained:

It's just hard for me to have conversations about race because they're emotionally triggering. ... I sometimes, I somehow create a space where I feel like my White students feel like they can say whatever they want to say, however they want to say it. Which you want to create. But then when they say stuff, you got to deal

with it. And that sometimes require you to call them out on something that they say, and I'm not as strong. So what I'll do is, "How would Omi and Winant respond to this?" (Interview #2)

Having strong curricular content was helpful because he could pull it into a class conversation to respond to White students' comments in the moment. He gave an example of what that might look like in his class:

You know, they'll start with, "He's 4 years old, but he's so much bigger than all of the other kids in my class, and I have to keep him from the other students, and he thinks I don't like him—" Or—"I don't like him." So they'll say this about a 4-year-old Black boy... then it's like, oh, I just read this article where we talked about so much of how we perceive Black boys as adult men, and we're controlling their bodies. (Interview #2)

He shared that prompts such as "How would Omi and Winant respond to this?" or prompts that opened the discussion back to the class ("What do others think about that?") were sometimes sufficient to push students to rethink their comments, particularly in relation to ideas presented in curricular materials. Across these examples, TEs identified deficit thinking as an issue for their students, and they were able to engage various pedagogical strategies to try to challenge deficit ideas. Still, they also were open in acknowledging the tension they experienced in managing these moments, whether it stemmed from their own emotions or from uncertainty about the effectiveness of their approach. TEs expressed complex views of the ways in which conceptions of race and racism were relevant for managing these classroom decisions but sometimes struggled to identify an approach that they felt was most effective.

TEs' develop coping strategies for responding to TCs' deficit ideologies. In addition to identifying pedagogical strategies to support TCs in shifting to more asset-based orientations towards students and communities of color, TEs described a need to

develop their own personal coping strategies for responding to TCs' deficit ideologies. Most commonly, TEs coped by engaging *asset-based thinking and humanizing perspectives* of White TCs to negotiate the emotional tension that emerged in response to TCs' deficit ideologies. Specifically, by challenging notions of Whiteness as "superior" to other cultural norms and elevating perceptions of the social and cultural norms of people of color, TEs attempted to support their teachers in resisting dehumanizing views of people of color. These efforts focused on helping TCs draw connections between individual or micro-level cultural practices and broader institutions or historical patterns that connected these practices to White supremacy as a larger structure.

Some TEs described wanting TCs to see students of color as "human" or to "humanize" their students and framed these goals in terms of challenging White cultural hegemonic norms. For example, Joanne articulated a need for more humanizing approaches to work with students. She taught elementary school teachers, and she encouraged them to spend more time trying to build authentic relationships with students. She explained, "They're so worried about having control and making sure that the kids are doing what they're supposed to be doing. Which is pretty White behavior" (Interview #2). These teachers, she explained, often only interacted with children for disciplinary infractions, or they even acknowledged being afraid of interacting with certain children. In those cases, Joanne said, one of her main goals was for the TCs to "humanize" the children and learn about who they are through conversation. She noted that sometimes TCs struggle to build relationships with students and tell her "oh, it's because I'm White." In our interview, she expressed to me that she does not think children dislike

their teachers simply because they're White; rather, she said, "you're doing things that are enacting Whiteness in such a way that the child doesn't like you; they don't not like you just because you're White" (Interview #2). Here, Joanne articulates the way that Whiteness is not simply embodied but is also practiced and enacted by teachers through, for example, controlling behaviors.

Some TEs also demonstrated a strong asset-based lens towards TCs—both White TCs and TCs of color. This orientation served as a coping strategy in response to TCs' deficit ideologies. Part of this orientation was informed by an understanding of White supremacy as a violent system that harms both people of color and White people in ways that can be dehumanizing for all. A majority of TEs, almost 2/3, described systemic racism in terms of violence and harm towards students. The specific term "harm" was referenced by half of TEs, and related terms such as "violence," "damage," "hurtful"/"hurting," and "dangerous" were used to describe schooling experiences. TEs categorized "harm" as occurring at multiple levels and emphasized the interplay between institutional harm and interpersonal harm. This naming operated as a coping strategy because it provided a humanizing view of both White people and people of color in a way that pushed against dehumanizing cultural norms of the logic of White supremacy.

Some TEs focused this description of harm on the impact and violence of White supremacy towards students and communities of color; for example, Kia noted that for some of her TCs of color, there is perhaps a process of "healing that they need to do from having been part of a damaging system" (Interview #1). Other TEs also extended their articulation of violence and harm to an explanation of how White supremacy harms

everyone, including White people. Haley explained that she views her work as fighting alongside her White TCs against the violence of a White supremacist system. This orientation towards her students and the impact of the system of White supremacy informed her ability to take a more asset-based view towards White TCs. She said that she knows she must “brace myself for potential pushback” from TCs but knows “that this is what it's going to take if I want to develop my students' socio-political consciousness” (Interview #1). For Haley, even resistant White students are also both hurt by and, she hopes, fighting against the violence of a White supremacist system:

I think that yes, there is resistance [from some White teachers], but I think that I try to frame it for my students—maybe for myself first and then for my students—as, instead of me seeing this as you being a resistant person, I try to frame it as, we're all in this together to figure out how to fix this racism problem. We've all been affected by it, and it has all hurt us in different ways—even White folks, right? So if I get you to believe that racism hurts everyone, through readings, through conversations, through looking at different data, looking at different pieces—then we're all fighting this fight. Even though it's hurting me differently than it's hurting you, it's still hurting us in different ways. And so how can we instead all figure out this thing together? And so now I'm no longer fighting you, the resistant student, I'm fighting how you are being affected by this structure. ... I also think that I'm constantly thinking about the students that they're going to eventually interact with. And so I think my asset-based thinking is also rooted in my urgency for the experiences that the children in my students' classroom are going to have. (Focus Group)

Nick also was quite explicit in naming White supremacy as something that affects White people too. Nick explained that teaching about the violent implications of Whiteness for White people was important in his class. He explained:

We have all these White teachers then, who think that to get smarter about race is to get smarter about people of color, right? ... The real problem is they have to get smarter about themselves ... and they have to get smarter about the system that we're in. And so in some ways I'm just doing something very obvious. I'm saying racism is a White problem, and White people take up a social role in our society, and that social role gives them benefits, and it damages them. It really, it hurts, it

hurts White people to do this, both on a dehumanization level—that it dehumanizes you to participate in violence against other people—but this system also is not set up actually for most White people either. (Interview #1)

This orientation towards a White supremacist system was significant in not positioning White people and people of color as in opposition and in not positioning White people as always the oppressor, or only the oppressor. By framing Whiteness and White supremacy as a broadly oppressive and violent system, these teacher educators prepare their White teachers to understand their role, as Haley describes it, as fighting together against this structure to support the students in their future classrooms. These two orientations together – understanding schools as sites of harm for students of color, and understanding schools as sites of harm for all students including White students – provide a humanizing view of both White people and people of color in a way that pushes against dehumanizing cultural norms of the logic of White supremacy.

Discussion

The findings in this study enrich our understanding of pedagogical decision-making in the context of teacher education about race and racism. Working simultaneously within and against injustice while aiming to support students in developing critical capacities will always be an aim of justice-oriented teaching and, thus, a core tension of this work. The work of these TEs demonstrates that pedagogical decision-making in teacher education must also consider the ways in which White supremacist institutions operate to inform teacher educators' decisions. The logic of White supremacy frames a set of pedagogical tensions that are especially relevant for teacher educators whose core instructional aims for teachers are related to teaching about

race and racism. Specifically, White supremacy is sustained through a logic of racialized power hierarchies, White ignorance and erasure, and dehumanization, and this logic manifests not only in IHEs as politicized institutions but within individual classrooms. Leonardo (2004) describes White domination as recreated through patterned and repeated actions, but just as White supremacy can be sustained through repeated actions, so too can it be resisted. The teacher educators in this study demonstrate that they balance these tensions in their practice through making principled decisions that take into consideration a framework of resistance and issues of temporality and individuality.

Teaching requires making decisions constantly, and all of these decisions have equity implications for teachers and students. Before, during, and after instruction, educators must make choices about how to respond to their students. This study was an attempt to look closely at how teacher educators make pedagogical decisions and to zoom in on the role of White supremacist logics as a lens through which these educators examine and assess their own pedagogical choices. The TEs in this study grappled with emerging tensions related to racialized power in their own classroom and raised questions about how to offer differentiated support for White TCs and TCs of color; they engaged with questions about the balance between critically engaging Whiteness while also elevating counternarratives in the curriculum; and finally, they confronted TCs' deficit ideologies and developed various coping strategies to manage their own emotions as they developed pedagogical approaches to challenge deficit thinking. Their experiences showed them weighing considerations such as temporality, physical space, and the needs of students as individuals and as a whole group. They faced challenges around notions of

comfort and safety in making decisions about their students' needs, and the tensions highlighted here recall ongoing debates in critical theories of race and Whiteness.

Leonardo (2004) wrote:

As long as Whites ultimately feel a sense of comfort with racial analysis, they will not sympathize with the pain and discomfort they have unleashed on racial minorities for centuries. Solidarity between Whites and non-Whites will proceed at the reluctant pace of the White imagination. Insofar as White feelings of safety perpetuate a legacy of White refusal to engage racial domination, or acts of terror toward people of color, such discourses rearticulate the privilege that Whites already enjoy when they are able to evade confronting White supremacy. (p. 150)

This question of temporality—the “reluctant pace of the White imagination” against an urgency and “refusal to wait another day” (Dumas, 2018, p. 40)—remains a core tension in working to disrupt White supremacy. The TEs in this study demonstrated a willingness to engage with this and other tensions and also acknowledged that such tensions frequently remain unresolved. They described pedagogical strategies that they used to challenge White supremacist logics but also pointed out when these approaches had limitations or unintended consequences.

Furthermore, TEs' narrated experiences underscored that the component logics of White supremacy are deeply interrelated. As TEs' struggled to engage students or know when to “push” against deficit ideologies, they also engaged questions about White ignorance at the same time; as they considered discursive power along racial lines in their classroom, they also had to consider the role of dehumanizing narratives and harm towards TCs of color as a potential issue in their classrooms. Broadly speaking, an unequal racial distribution of power is sustained through White ignorance and historical erasure, which creates the conditions to perpetuate dehumanization of people of color—

and the cycle sustains itself. In other words, one of the core challenges of disrupting White supremacy is that its component functions are not easily isolated or identified, but rather continue to mutually reinforce one another. Because White supremacy has been a historically continuous political system with self-sustaining mechanisms, one cannot necessarily identify concrete teaching practices that are quite clearly anti-racist without considering how these practices fit into a broader sociopolitical system. All of our instructional practices have consequences for individuals, for the class, and within a broader sociopolitical system. The TEs in this study demonstrate how important it is to have both deep racial knowledge and pedagogical knowledge to be able to make decisions that take these considerations into account.

Implications

As we seek to support teachers in learning about the role of race and racism in schools and to become agentic in disrupting forces of systemic inequality in schools, it is imperative that, as teacher educators, we can also reflect about how we ourselves engage in similar equity dilemmas within our own institutions. Like K-12 schools, institutions of higher education sustain inequality, and as practitioners within these institutions we are constantly faced with decision points and dilemmas during which we can either resist or sustain the status quo—that is, resist or sustain White supremacy. This paper demonstrated the ways that TEs in this study described their own pedagogical decision making within their classrooms and how they viewed these decisions in relation to race, racism, and White supremacy. While their experiences are not generalizable, they provide

some insight into how teacher educators experience and navigate the complex and multi-layered forces of teacher education as a White supremacist institution.

Using the logic of White supremacy as a framework for analyzing the work of teaching underscores the interplay between classrooms and classroom context. While much has been written about context as significant for teaching and learning, particularly as relates to equity in education, more research is needed to explicate how social context informs teachers' in-the-moment pedagogical decisions. Specifically, we need a research agenda that explicitly interrogates how educators navigate the dilemmas and tensions that arise when instructional goals related to equity come into conflict with the systems and structures that perpetuate racism and sustain White supremacist cultural norms. While this study focused on the specific work of teacher educators, the types of tensions examined here are relatable for educators anywhere who seek to do justice-oriented work from within unjust educational systems.

It would be overly simplistic to suggest that teaching about racism from within White supremacist institutions is itself an anti-racist act of resistance. Indeed, Dumas (2018) reminds us that "racial justice" work in education often is not designed to end injustice because "that is not what an antiblack society is interested in" (p. 31), and that ultimately "the only thing that can affect Black freedom is the death of whiteness, the end of the Master" (p. 43). Still, despite critiques of gradualism and reformism from within, I believe we can move in the direction of revolutionary justice when we engage in the kind of authentic and critical reflection that we see from the practitioners in this study. Teacher educators with a deep knowledge of White supremacy as a political system who

use that knowledge not only to develop curricular goals for teaching about racism but also to critically reflect on pedagogy and positionality will continue to challenge these institutions in deeper and more disruptive ways. I believe these findings have utility for teacher educators who, like Dumas, “imagine how we might bring this whole thing down, and rejoice in these possibilities” (p. 42), and who hope that this work generates radical action within the academy and among their teachers.

Because these teacher educators aim to teach teachers explicitly about racism, White supremacy, and managing pedagogical dilemmas related to equity, there is a layered complexity to the way that they must draw distinctions, both in their own practitioner reflection and for their TCs, between their own teacher education pedagogy and the way they teach TCs to attempt to do similar work in their K-12 classrooms. In other words, as they offer explicit instruction to TCs on how to support critical consciousness raising for K-12 students and engage in equity advocacy in K-12 schools, they also model instruction in critical consciousness raising and engaging in equity advocacy in IHEs. The teacher educators in this study demonstrate that critically reflective practice and navigating equity dilemmas are as important for TEs as they are for K-12 teachers who seek to resist racism and White supremacy in schools. Existing research tends to focus on the need to support teachers in this sort of critical reflection, and my recommendation would be to also provide programmatic supports for teacher educators to engage in collaborative professional development to examine and discuss the role of White supremacist forces in teacher education programs. Teacher educators who teach about race and racism have identified dilemmas at both the classroom level and

programmatic level that are related to the broader logic of White supremacy, and as a field teacher education will benefit from more critical engagement with these issues.

The teacher educators in this study express a desire to disrupt the power and sustenance of White supremacy, describe specific actions they take to engage in resistance from within White supremacist institutions, and yet also reflect critically about how their pedagogical decisions might be implicated in maintaining these very systems. These narratives offer important and nuanced representations of the pedagogical tensions that arise when working both within and against White supremacist institutions. This critical reflection, I think, is perhaps one of the best models for teachers of critical race praxis; it demonstrates the kind of critical wrestling with equity dilemmas that, as one participant described it, shows that we are not perfect, but aware. It is reminiscent of the tension in acknowledging Bell's theory of racial realism and his call to accept both the "futility of action" and conviction that "something must be done" (1993, p. 587); i.e., working within and against White supremacist institutions is, of course, inherently tense. The findings here demonstrate that an open engagement with these tensions through critical reflection can be productive for teacher educators.

APPENDIX B:
Sample Codes And Quotations

Table 1.2: Sample In Vivo Codes (First Cycle Coding)

Code	Description	Example(s)
“harm”	TE describe schools as sites of harm, hurt, trauma, etc.	<p><i>“It’s figuring out how to best facilitate within the context of a teacher preparation course. They’re very sensitive things to talk about because, you know, these are very central parts of people’s identities that are fundamentally being challenged as historically having inflicted harm.”</i></p> <p><i>“The woman and man who were leading this [PD] kept being like, stop, particularly you White people that come and work with kids of color: you’re hurting our kids by not dealing with your own shit. It was very much like, stop hurting our kids. You need to deal with this. And that stayed with me.”</i></p>
“counter-narratives”	TE describes using “counter-narratives” as a pedagogical strategy or names the importance of counternarratives/counterstories or challenging dominant narratives	<p><i>“One of the units is about “challenging history” and character, meaning kind of with a double meaning. So, “challenging” like the dominant that we often find in textbooks, and then “challenging history,” so, challenging that, but also thinking about the challenges that can come up in the class with when we teach and there are all of these issues, you know, about voices that are highlighted and voices that are deliberately excluded.”</i></p> <p><i>“They’re sort of counter-narratives that do two things: they show resistance, sort of more violent resistance to struggle, not as much the kind of Civil Rights march that you think of but the more militant resistance; and then also the kind of persistence of, here’s essentially a Klan rally in 2017, and here’s a young black man being essentially strangled by the police, caught on camera. So just showing that the stuff is still there.”</i></p> <p><i>“English language arts is all about sharing and experiencing stories. Right? And so if you can do that and you can experience somebody else’s story and then you can bring counter-stories into the classroom and you can teach kids or facilitate kids telling their own stories in different ways.”</i></p>
“White supremacy”	Descriptive; TE references “White supremacy” explicitly	<p><i>“Thinking about how White privilege and White supremacy operates in a particular context is also a very important piece of understanding race and racism; it’s not just about how oppression affects people of color, which is really important, but also how White supremacy operates and how White privilege operates to maintain the system of oppression.”</i></p> <p><i>“So the student might need a conversation to learn to reflect about how Black Lives Matter isn’t—it’s about the experience of black people in the context of a racist society suffused with white supremacy, which operates in a way to affect Latino students, Muslim Students, Vietnamese students, and White students, too.”</i></p>

Table 1.3: Second Cycle Coding: Codes/Code Categories

Code/Code Category	Description	Example(s)
“Teacher Education Pedagogy” (TEP)	Code Category for pedagogical strategies identified by TEs as used in teacher education	<p><i>“We had a Socratic seminar about it. ... We discussed it afterwards, we found that our residents were still discussing it, because we asked them to make connections to the students they taught over summer, in summer school. And we asked them to make connections, like what, which, how do you see these capitals exhibited by the students that you teach?”</i></p> <p><i>“So they can be self-aware of their own experience around race and racism to then design or develop lesson plans or establishment instructional strategies that mitigate the ways, the negative ways in which their experiences of race might harm the students that they teach. ... That involves lots of case studies with students around issues of race; reflective writing about past experiences of their own race-based experiences; it is exposing them to the best of what's out there on different understandings of race and racism.”</i></p> <p><i>“With the ‘silent conversation’ there were different quotes and questions, and one of them was about, ‘what is racism,’ or something like that, I remember. ... I chose to do a silent conversation because I wanted to give people processing time to be able to articulate their views. I also wanted—I knew that it was going to be a tough conversation for people for a number of different reasons. ... We did come back and open it up, but I wanted people to get some ideas out first in that written format.”</i></p>
TEP: Decision-making	Within TEP category, TE references making a decision or describes considerations for making instructional decisions	<p><i>“I think how I respond to her would depend a lot on my relationship with her and my just who she is as a person, because I think that this is a moment that can go towards like defensive and shut down or could be a moment for growth.”</i></p> <p><i>“As a result of everything that was happening in [our colleague’s] class, we were like, well we don't know for sure that this is not happening in our class, it just might be that they're not saying anything. ... But just because we haven't heard it doesn't mean that it's not occurred. ... So let's introduce [a new protocol].”</i></p>
TEP: Tensions	Within TEP category, TE references tensions or identifies challenges or uncertainties that signify weighing issues in opposition	<p><i>“I don't know--if you push people so hard, are they just like, I'm being judged and shut down? Is it--I don't know. It's a constant dilemma in my work that I have not solved and probably will never solve.”</i></p> <p><i>“How do I do this in a way that's also engaging for my students, but then also, how am I going to prepare myself for the students that push back. I think those are some of the challenges. And so I think a lot of them are just sort of within me.”</i></p>

References

- Ball, D. (2018). Just Dreams and Imperatives: The Power of Teaching in the Struggle for Public Education. *AERA Presidential Address 2019*. Retrieved August 20, 2019, from <https://deborahloewenbergball.com/news-archive/2018/4/19/deborah-loewenberg-ball-delivers-presidential-address-at-aera-annual-meeting>.
- Banks, J.A. (2013). The construction and historical development of multicultural education, 1962–2012. *Theory Into Practice*, 52, 73–82.
- Bell, D. (1992). Racial realism. *Connecticut Law Review*, 24(2), 363–379.
- Bell, D. (1993). The racism is permanent thesis: Courageous revelation or unconscious denial of racial genocide. *Capital University Law Review*, 22, 571–587.
- Berrey, E. (2015). *The enigma of diversity: The language of race and the limits of social justice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brown, A. L., & Au, W. (2014). Race, memory, and master narratives: A critical essay on U.S. curriculum history. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 44(3), 358–389. <http://doi.org/10.1111/curi.12049>
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1995). Uncertain allies: Understanding the boundaries of race and teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(4), 541–570.
- Coffee, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). Concepts and coding. In *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies* (pp. 26–53). London: Sage Publications.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). NY: Routledge.
- Conklin, H. G., & Hughes, H. E. (2016). Practices of compassionate, critical, justice-oriented teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(1), 47–60.
- Cross, B. E. (2005). New racism, reformed teacher education, and the same ole' oppression. *Educational Studies*, 38(3), 263–274. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15326993es3803_6
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1935). *Black reconstruction in America: An essay toward a history of the part which Black folk played in the attempt to reconstruct democracy in America, 1860-1880*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dumas, 2018. Beginning and ending with Black suffering: A meditation on and against racial justice in education. In Tuck, E. & Yang, W. (Eds.), *Toward What Justice?*

Describing Diverse Dreams of Justice in Education (pp. 29-43). New York: Routledge.

- Esquivel, A., Lewis, K., Rodriguez, D., Stovall, D., & Williams, T. (2002). We know what's best for you: Silencing of people of color. In J. Slater, S. Fain, & C. Rossatto (Eds.), *The Freirean legacy: Educating for social justice* (pp. 207-219). New York: Peter Lang Publishers, Inc.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gibbons, A. (2018). The five refusals of white supremacy. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 77(3-4), 729–755.
- Gillborn, D. (2016). The policy of inequity: Using CRT to unmask white supremacy in education policy. In M. Lynn & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education* (pp. 129–139). London: Routledge.
<http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203155721.ch9>
- Gillborn, D. (2006). Rethinking white supremacy: Who counts in “WhiteWorld.” *Ethnicities*, 6(3), 318–340. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1468796806068323>
- Gorski, P. C. (2009). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(2), 309–318.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.07.008>
- Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., & Williamson, P. W. (2009). Teaching practice: A Cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record*, 111(9), 2055–2100.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109336543>
- Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, 106(8), 1707–1791.
- Haynes, C. (2017). Dismantling the White supremacy embedded in our classrooms: White faculty in pursuit of more equitable educational outcomes for racially minoritized students. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 29(1), 87–107. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1135971>
- Hikido, A., & Murray, S. (2015). Whitened rainbows: how white college students protect whiteness through diversity discourses. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 3324(September 2015), 1–23.
- Howard, T. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory into Practice*, 42(3), 195–202.

- Huggins, N. (1991). The Deforming mirror of Truth: Slavery and the master narrative of American history. *Radical History Review*, 49, 25–48.
- Hytten, K., & Warren, J. (2003). Engaging whiteness: How racial power gets reified in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 16(1), 65–89.
- Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., & May, H. (2012). Retaining teachers: How preparation matters. *Educational Leadership*, 30–35.
- Iverson, S. V. (2007). Camouflaging power and privilege: A critical race analysis of university diversity policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(5), 586–611. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X07307794>
- Iverson, S. V. (2012). Constructing outsiders: The discursive framing of access in university diversity policies. *The Review of Higher Education*, 35(2), 149–177. <http://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2012.0013>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what’s it doing in a nice field like education? *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7–24.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 211–247.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2011). Race...to the top, again: Comments on the genealogy of critical race theory. *Connecticut Law Review*, 43(5), 1439–1457.
- Lampert, M. (1985). How do teachers manage to teach? Perspectives on problems in practice. *Harvard Educational Review*, 55(2), 178–194.
- Leonardo, Z. (2004). The Color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of “white privilege.” *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(2), 137–152.
- Leonardo, Z. (2008). Reading Whiteness: Antiracist pedagogy against White racial knowledge. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Justice in Education* (pp. 231–248). New York: Routledge.
- Leonardo, Z., & Harris, A. P. (2013). Living with racism in education and society: Derrick Bell’s ethical idealism and political pragmatism. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 16(4), 470–488.

- Matias, C. E. (2013). Check yo' self before you wreck yo' self and our kids: Counterstories from culturally responsive white teachers? . . . to culturally responsive white teachers! *Interdisciplinary Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 68–82.
- Matias, C. E., & Allen, R. L. (2016). Do you feel me? Amplifying messages of love in Critical Race Theory. *Journal of Educational Foundations*, 29(1-4), 5–28.
- Matias, C. E., Henry, A., & Darland, C. (2017). The twin tales of Whiteness: Exploring the emotional roller coaster of teaching and learning about Whiteness. *Taboo*, 16(1), 7–29.
- Melnick, S. & Zeichner, K. (1998). Teacher education's responsibility to address diversity issues: Enhancing institutional capacity. *Theory Into Practice*, 37(2), 88–95.
- Michael, A. (2015). *Raising race questions*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Mills, C. (1994). Revisionist ontologies: Theorizing White supremacy. *Social and Economic Studies*, 43(3), 105–134.
- Mills, C.W. (1997). *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Milner, R. (2008). Disrupting deficit notions of difference: Counter-narratives of teachers and community in urban education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(6), 1573–1598. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.02.011>
- Milner, H. R. (2010). What does teacher education have to do with teaching? Implications for diversity studies. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 118–131. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347670>
- Milner, H. R., & Howard, T. C. (2013). Counter-narrative as method: Race, policy and research for teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 16(4), 536–561.
- Milner, H. R., & Laughter, J. C. (2014). But good intentions are not enough: Preparing teachers to center race and poverty. *The Urban Review*, 47(2), 341–363. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-014-0295-4>
- Molina, B. (2018 Dec 20). Cashing checks, napping, more activities leading to police calls on black people in 2018. *USA Today*. Retrieved from www.usatoday.com
- Morgan, D. L., & Hoffman, K. (2018). Focus groups. In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Collection* (pp. 250–263). Sage Publications.

- Newkirk, V. (2017). The language of White Supremacy. *The Atlantic*, 1–9. Retrieved from www.theatlantic.com.
- Nieto, S. (2003). Profoundly multicultural question. *Educational Leadership*, 6–10.
- Pager, T. (2018 Dec 24). A Black man was in his building's lobby. A White neighbor accused him of not living there. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com.
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 85–100.
- Paris, D. (2019). Naming beyond the white settler colonial gaze in educational research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 32(3), 217–224. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1576943>
- Patel, L. (2015). Desiring diversity and backlash: White property rights in higher education. *The Urban Review*, 47(4), 657–675.
- Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined Whiteness of teaching: How White teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 12(2), 197–215.
- Potter, J. (2004). Discourse analysis. In Hardy, M. & Bryman, A. (Eds.), *Handbook of Data Analysis* (p. 607–624). New York: Sage.
- Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2016). *Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sealey-Ruiz, Y. (2011). Dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline through racial literacy development in teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 8(2), 116–120.
- Smith, A. (2012). Indigeneity, settler colonialism, White supremacy. In Martinez HoSang, D., LaBennett, O., & Pulido L. (Eds.), *Racial Formation in the Twenty-First Century*. (p. 66–89). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 23–44.
- Stevenson, H. (2014). *Promoting racial literacy in schools: Differences that make a difference*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Stovall, D. (2005). A challenge to traditional theory: Critical race theory, African-American community organizers, and education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 26(1), 95–108.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20–32.

RACIAL-EMOTIONAL PEDAGOGY IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Abstract

Drawing from literature on emotional literacy, racial literacy, racialized emotion, and pedagogies of teacher education, the author develops the construct of *racial-emotional pedagogy* to examine the pedagogical strategies of TEs as they support teacher-candidates in learning to attend to both students' emotions and their own emotions using a racial lens. I describe: a) how TEs use REP to support teachers' in learning to *attend to students' racialized emotions*, specifically in relation to *critical listening* and *facilitating emotional connections* for students; and b) how TEs use REP to support teachers in *attending to their own racialized emotions*, specifically in relation to *overcoming resistance to critical self-reflection* and developing *principles and considerations* to support racial-emotional pedagogical practice. The strategies that TEs use to support these goals include *using protocols*, *cultivating community*, engaging in purposeful *curricular sequencing*, and using *simulations and rehearsals*. These TEs built bridges between pedagogical approaches that are often viewed as in tension with one another, namely, justice-centered teacher education and practice-based teacher education, and in particular the core practices movement (Philips et al., 2018; Richmond et al., 2019; Schiera, 2019). In teaching about race and racialized emotions, TEs supported teachers in developing dispositions to support responsive pedagogy but also in practicing concrete skills through protocols, rehearsals, and modeling in their own classrooms.

Recently, scholars have devoted greater attention to the role of emotion in the work of teaching and especially in teaching and learning about race (Halberstadt, Castro, Chu, Lozado, & Sims, 2018; Matias, 2016; Shim, 2018). Ample research has shown that factors such as teachers' fear, anger, and implicit biases lead to disproportionate discipline and special education referrals for Black children, resulting in disparities in educational outcomes (Bristol, 2015; Milner & Laughter, 2014; Halberstadt, Castro, Chu, Lozado, & Sims, 2018; Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2002; Stevenson, 2008; Yoon, 2012). Thus, attending to race in teaching is also an acknowledgement of the need for teachers who can build relationships with and respond to students of color with critical empathy, humanizing perspectives, and respect, rather than fear, disgust, and pity (Bartolomé, 1994; Matias & Zembylas, 2014; Warren, 2015).

While research on teacher education about race and racism has always stressed the importance of building relationships, explicit attention to teacher education pedagogies related to emotion represents a relatively recent shift (Grosland, 2019; Matias, 2016; Shim, 2018; Zembylas & Papamichael, 2017). Existing research often stresses the importance of developing teachers' historical racial knowledge with a focus on understanding how systemic racism has sustained opportunity gaps in schools (Banks, 2013; Casey, Lozenski, & McManimon, 2013; King, 2016; Sealey-Ruiz, 2011). Underneath this aim is an assumption that understanding histories of racial oppression might support teachers in developing dispositions of critical empathy and perhaps

mitigate the role of fear, anger, and implicit bias in teachers' interactions with students.

In other words, guiding this approach is an assumption that historical racial knowledge is important for teachers because it supports teachers in engaging with students in more humanizing and supportive ways.

However, this approach has not always produced the desired results. Scholarship on teacher education pedagogy demonstrates that teachers who learn about racism and historical racial knowledge sometimes respond with strong emotions—fear, anger, denial, and resistance (Cross, 2005; Denevi & Pastan, 2006; Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Henfield & Washington, 2004; Matias, 2013)—but do not necessarily shift behaviors or dispositions. Thus, teaching teachers about race and racism requires attention to multiple layers of emotional work, and more work is needed that explores the intersection of race and emotion in research on teacher education. Some scholars have explored pedagogies of teacher education that explicitly consider the role of discomfort, empathy, and other aspects of emotion as significant for teaching teachers about race and racism, and recent scholarship has taken up the concept of “racialized emotions” and the need to acknowledge emotions as racialized in both research and practice (Bonilla-Silva, 2019; Matias & Zembylas, 2014; Zembylas & Papamichael, 2017). Given what we know about the significance of racialized emotions in the work of teaching, there is a need for research on pedagogies of teacher education that might support teacher learning about racialized emotions. This study is an attempt to explore how teacher educators who teach about race and racism incorporate the role of emotion in instructional goal setting and pedagogical decision-making. Using the construct *racial-emotional pedagogy* as a lens of

analysis, I examine the pedagogical practices of TEs who teach about race and racism.

The research questions for this study are:

1. What instructional goals do TEs identify related to racialized emotions?
2. How do TEs use *racial-emotional pedagogy* to support teacher learning about race and racism?

Theoretical framework

Contemporary scholarship in teacher education is beginning to acknowledge the importance of racialized emotions, but more work is needed that offers interdisciplinary perspectives on how race and emotion are related, both generally and specifically for the work of teaching. For this study, building on literature on emotional and racial literacies, racialized emotions, and a growing body of research on pedagogies of discomfort and empathy in teacher education, I propose a theoretical framework for *racial-emotional pedagogy* in teacher education. *Racial-emotional pedagogy* (REP) describes an instructional approach that uses a critical theory of racialized emotions to make pedagogical decisions, both proactively and reactively, by noticing, analyzing, and responding to emotional dimensions of race. This section reviews how these bodies of literature work together to inform a theory of racial-emotional pedagogy.

Emotional Literacy

Emotional literacy, often used interchangeably with *emotional intelligence*, is a construct that emphasizes the skills of appraising, regulating, and utilizing emotion for critical thinking (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008). In Salovey and Mayer's (1990) seminal work on emotional intelligence, the authors defined *emotions* as "organized

responses” that cross boundaries of the “physiological, cognitive, motivational, and experiential systems” (p. 189). *Emotional intelligence* (EI) is defined as “the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (p. 189). The authors suggested that emotional intelligence consisted of three characteristics: (a) appraising and expressing emotion; (b) regulating emotion in self and others; and (c) utilizing emotion adaptively.

The notion of emotional intelligence gained traction in popular discourse largely because of its perceived utility as an explanatory construct and as a measure of individual’s capacity for success. Goleman’s (1995) EI model became widely utilized in corporate circles as “EQ” (“emotional quotient”), a corollary to “IQ,” and this model consists of five traits: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills. Goleman argued that EI is a form of intelligence governed by a distinct part of the brain. Although Goleman wrote that EI can be learned or coached, this conceptualization of EI as an “intelligence” and corollary to IQ was part of its appeal, particularly for corporations, as a quantifiable metric used to assess and compare individuals; intelligence, although it has a wide range of definitions, is sometimes understood as an individual’s “capacity” (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008; Salovey & Mayer, 1990), i.e., as fixed or measurable traits. Alternatively, while the terms are often interchangeable, the term emotional literacy might then be more useful in describing the skills of appraising, regulating, and utilizing emotion as *learnable* skills; literacies are often understood as processes that are learned behaviors or skills. As such, the term *emotional literacy* is more commonly used in educational discourse to describe a similar concept.

Still, given the evolution of these terms, one critique of the uptake of EQ and EI might be connected to concerns about false claims about group differences in intelligence based on measured intelligence. Historically, measures of intelligence such as IQ have been used as tools for marginalization and subordination of certain social groups (Emerson & Murphy, 2014). Critical perspectives on these frameworks advocate for both power analysis and contextualization to meaningfully theorize emotional expression. Boler (1999) specifically critiqued early work on EQ because it lacked a “sociocultural or political analysis” (p. 80). She argued for the “impossibility of generalizing” about emotional expression because of the “historical specificity” with which various societies engage notions of difference across lines of gender, class, and other markers of cultural difference to assign “different emotional rules” (p. 7-8). Boler argued that, while it has been proposed that we might understand emotional skills as “morally neutral,” “emotional literacy skills are in no way neutral” (p. 81). Critical scholarship examining this relationship documents and acknowledges that emotion and emotional literacy can only be understood with considerations of power and histories of oppression and domination in mind. Grosland (2019) wrote, “Emotion is an expression of power, race, racism, and antiracism, expression which includes empathy, the Other as ‘threatening,’ shame, laughter, ‘bad’ feelings, upset, pity, and disgust” (p. 304). Grosland underscored how, by taking into consideration histories of power, racism, and oppression, negative emotions traditionally understood as “instinctive” such as fear or anger are situated within a sociohistorical context in which those feelings are culturally learned along racial lines. In many ways, recognition of this cultural learning is the underpinning of implicit

bias theory, which refers to the automatic and unconscious stereotypes that drive people to behave and make decisions in certain ways (Gilliam, Maupin, Reyes, Accavitti, & Shic, 2016; Staats, Capatosto, Wright, & Contractor, 2015). In recent years, more work has been done to document the way that racialized perceptions of behavior and emotion in schools impact teacher-student interactions. Gilliam et al. (2016) found evidence of elementary school teachers' implicit biases towards Black children, and Halberstadt et al. (2018) found differences in preservice teachers' ability to recognize emotions in Black faces versus White faces. Specifically, they found that emotions in Black faces were less likely to be recognized accurately than emotions in White faces, and that Black faces were more often identified as "angry" than White faces even when they were not expressing anger. While more research is needed to examine the relationship between race, perception, and emotion, these linkages suggest that an understanding of racialized emotions and implicit bias is needed to provide a more complex theory of teacher-student interactions. Certainly, then, a critical view of EI is needed for research on emotion and race. While emotional intelligence and emotional literacy have been useful frameworks for broadening understanding of emotion in general, they are insufficient to understand the complexity of race and emotions in schools.

Racial Literacy

Racial literacy is a construct that has been used across disciplines to offer critical perspectives on power, historical oppression, and institutional racism. Generally, scholars agree that racial literacy has "both micro- and macro-dimensions" (Rogers & Mosley, 2008, p. 108). Guinier (2004) described racial literacy as an interactive process in which

“race functions as a tool of diagnosis, feedback and assessment” (p. 115) to examine the relationship between race and power while also considering variables such as gender, class, and geography. She asserted that, from a racial literacy perspective, race is a socially constructed category that sustains social hierarchies and economic inequalities. Racial literacy requires individuals to be able to “describe, interpret, explain, and act on the constellation of practices (e.g., historical, economic, psychological, interactional) that comprise racism and anti-racism” (Rogers & Mosley, 2008, p. 110). Applied to teacher education specifically, racial literacy has been described as a necessary tool for “self-reflection and moral, political, and cultural decisions about how teachers can be catalysts for societal change—first by learning about systems of injustice and then explicitly teaching their students” (Sealey-Ruiz, 2011, p. 118). Racial literacy requires a deepening understanding of historical racial knowledge that challenges dominant narratives of racial progress and encourages the critical interrogation of inequitable social systems.

A second core component of racial literacy is that it is developed through social interaction. In her study of multiracial families, Twine (2004) defined “racial literacy” as a set of “micro-cultural social processes” that parents use to support children in learning how to “identify and respond to racial hierarchies and resist racisms” (p. 882). These processes included practices such as providing opportunities to discuss race and providing access to cultural knowledge through social interaction with adults of different racial backgrounds. Rogers and Mosley (2008) also highlighted racial literacy as developing interactively. They described racial literacy as “achieved in moment-to-moment interactions” that are “shaped by the historical and institutional frameworks

participants bring with them into conversations” (p. 125), and they name narratives and counternarratives as “tools” of racial literacy.

While literature on racial literacy describes the social nature of racial literacy development, less work has explicitly attended to *emotion* as a component of racial literacy. Some scholars identify emotions and discomfort as conditions pointing to the need for racial literacy, but less work has been done that explicitly identifies emotional literacy and racial literacy as related forms of literacy development, although some scholars have drawn connections between race and emotion. Bonilla-Silva (2019) proposed a focus on “racialized emotions” in sociological research to take into account the ways in which emotions function as part of a “racial economy” that is particular to a racialized world (p. 3). One of the few scholars who bridges this work is Stevenson (2014), who described the need for understanding racial literacy as emotional work. He defines *racial literacy* as “the ability to read, recast, and resolve racially stressful social interactions. The teaching of racial literacy skills protects students from the threat of internalizing negative stereotypes that undermine academic critical thinking, engagement, identity, and achievement” (p. 4). Stevenson’s framework for racial literacy pays special attention to in-the-moment skills that both students and teachers need to successfully navigate racial stress. Stevenson (2015) argued that racial illiteracy is primarily an issue of “knowledge deficits, skill deficits, and fear,” and that even with increasing critical consciousness of social inequality, people need opportunities to practice racial literacy to develop new competencies. He described the need for teachers to support students’ racial socialization in schools, which means that teachers must learn to attend both to their own

emotions and to students' emotional needs. Stevenson's racial literacy framework draws on research on racial stress and racial socialization, which highlights the relationship between emotional literacy and racial literacy as needs in teaching and teacher education. As this small growing body of research provides evidence of the connection between race and emotion in schools, the need to support teachers' professional development related to racialized emotions is gaining attention.

Pedagogies of Teacher Education

Research on pedagogies of teacher education has acknowledged the need for more shared practices in the work of teaching teachers. Specifically for teaching about race and racism, two contemporary trends in research on teacher education are particularly relevant. First, drawing from Boler's (1999) research on emotion, teacher education researchers have taken up *pedagogy of discomfort* as an approach to teacher education that acknowledges and attends to teachers' emotional responses to learning about race. Second, a growing body of research (Kavanagh & Danielson, 2019; Philip et al., 2018; Schiera, 2019) has examined the tensions and proposed points of congruence between social justice teacher education (SJTE) and practice-based teacher education (PBTE). These trends in research on teacher education highlight the small and growing body of research that points to the important of pedagogies of teacher education as "a significant and under researched lever for improving teacher practice both as it relates to social justice and more broadly" (Kavanagh & Danielson, 2019, p. 4). While research on each of these approaches to teacher education pedagogy have developed rich evidence for the potential to support novices' development, questions remain about how these theories of

teacher education pedagogy (PBTE, SJTE, and pedagogy of discomfort) are or can be connected in practice.

Increasingly in research on racial literacy in teacher education, attention to emotion has been identified as significant for teacher learning (Aggrey, 2003; Grosland, 2019; Ohito, 2016; Shim 2014), with particularly emphasis on the inevitability of discomfort in teaching and learning about race and oppression. Zembylas and Papamichael (2017) wrote that as teacher educators we must “highlight the importance of foregrounding rather than backgrounding attention to teachers’ discomfort and its pedagogical implications in multicultural teacher education” (p. 2). The authors drew on research on a *pedagogy of discomfort* which “recognizes and problematizes the deeply embedded emotional dimensions that frame and shape daily habits, routines, and unconscious complicity with hegemony” (Boler & Zembylas, 2002, p. 108). In addition, the authors suggested the utility of using a pedagogy of discomfort in conjunction with a *pedagogy of empathy*.

This research responds to a now robust body of evidence demonstrating the challenges of teaching teachers about race. Novice teachers, and White teachers in particular, often respond to learning about race with resistance, denial, and feelings of guilt and shame (Cross, 2005; Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Henfield & Washington, 2004; Matias, 2013; Ohito, 2016; Tatum, 1994). In part, this work is uncomfortable for teachers because it challenges “cherished beliefs and assumptions” (Boler, 1999, p. 176). The challenge of changing teacher beliefs is well-documented in educational research; research on teacher education has long explored the relationship between teacher beliefs

and teacher practice and has suggested that beliefs are both not easily measured and not easily altered (Larkin, 2012; Pajares, 1992). In regard to teacher education for race and diversity, scholars have described teacher “dispositions” as “difficult-to-detect belief patterns that are often resistant to external efforts to change them” (Villegas, 2007, as cited in Larkin, 2012). Racial identity development has been utilized as one approach to engaging and even shifting these belief patterns, particularly through the development of positive racial identities (Denevi & Pastan, 2006; Gist, 2017; Michael, 2015; Philip et al., 2017; Tatum, 1992). Attending to teachers’ mindsets, emotions, and dispositions has been identified as one important part of the work of teaching teachers about race and racism.

More broadly, contemporary research on teacher education has also highlighted the need to support novice teachers’ development of teaching practices (Janssen, Grossman, & Westbroek, 2015; McDonald, Kazemi, & Kavanagh, 2013). Given the challenges of assessing and attempting to change teachers’ beliefs, practice-based teacher education (PBTE) offers an alternative focus on supporting novice teachers in developing a foundational set of core practices that improve the practice of teaching (Hiebert & Morris, 2012; Reisman et al., 2018). Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald (2009) characterized core practices as high-frequency teaching practices that allow novices to learn more about students and about teaching while also preserving the integrity and complexity of teaching. For the purpose of teacher education, these practices are also useful in that they are bounded and identifiable and available for analysis and practice. Indeed, PBTE also involves using “pedagogies of enactment” in teacher education, which

include *representations, decomposition, and approximations* of practice (Grossman et al., 2009), and it has been lauded for this attention to the unique pedagogical work of teaching teachers. Building on this work, Kavanagh et al. (2019) developed a model for the unique pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) (Shulman, 1987) of teacher educators and argued that skilled facilitation in teacher education requires PCK that is distinct from the PCK needed for K-12 teacher facilitation. However, justice-oriented education researchers have raised questions about the implications of PBTE for equity work in education and in teacher education specifically (Richmond, Bartell, Carter Andrews, & Neville, 2019; Conklin & Hughes, 2016). Philip et al. (2018) argued that core practices decenter justice through an “oversimplification of practice” and ignore histories of structural oppression (pp. 256-258). More research is needed that explores the pedagogical practices of teacher educators and refines these models for the pedagogy of teacher education.

Together, these literatures make clear that the work of teaching teachers about race must incorporate goals related to both racial literacy and emotional literacy, while also incorporating our growing understanding of the unique pedagogical content knowledge that supports teacher learning and teacher learning about race and racism specifically. *Racial-emotional pedagogy* offers a framework for connecting these bodies of literature. To learn more, we need to better understand how teacher educators who teach about race and racism make pedagogical decisions and what frameworks they draw upon when making decisions. Ball (2018) described this kind of pedagogical decision-making in terms of what she called *discretionary spaces*. For in-the-moment decisions,

Ball argues, teachers use decision-making frameworks to make choices about what to address or not address with students, and how. She makes the case that implicit biases and stereotypes, along with pedagogical content knowledge, school context, and knowledge of students, all inform these discretionary spaces. I propose that racial-emotional pedagogy, which incorporates racial literacy and emotional literacy with pedagogies of enactment, might inform teacher educators' pedagogical decision-making in discretionary spaces in the classroom. This study explores how racial-emotional pedagogy is utilized by teacher educators who teach about race and racism.

Method

Participants

Sixteen TEs participated in this qualitative interview study, which is drawn from a larger phenomenological study of the work of teaching teachers about race and racism. All TEs had experience teaching about race in predominantly White teacher education programs. This study did not focus on the experiences of TEs who worked at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) because of an expected difference in institutional history and student demographics, although future studies of this nature might include or exclusively examine this TE population. The TEs for this study were recruited via snowball sampling using recommendations through a network of educators and an online survey to assess selection criteria. Recruitment emails were sent out through education networks to solicit initial recommendations, and recommended experts were invited to complete a selection survey and to recommend additional participants. Selection criteria included: (a) being teacher educators with experience teaching in

predominantly White teacher education programs; (b) holding core instructional goals related to race/racism; (d) teaching undergraduate, graduate, and/or in-service teachers; and (e) working in urban contexts or supporting teachers who plan to work in urban contexts. Of the 16 participants, 4 were White men, 8 were White women, 2 were Black women, and 2 were Black men. Racial and gender identities were self-identified.

Demographic characteristics of TEs are summarized in the table below.

Table 2.1 Participant Demographics.

Name*	Gender	Race	Years Exp.	Institution Type	Status	Primary Course Taught
Ashley	F	W	2	Public	Adjunct / Ph.D. Candidate	Diversity & Equity
Brian	M	W	8	Private	Adjunct	Diversity & Equity
Catherine	F	W	7	Public	Clinical	Diversity & Equity Math Methods
Diane	F	W	5	Public	Adjunct / Ph.D. Candidate	Diversity & Equity
Frederick	M	W	10	Public	Tenured	Diversity & Equity English Methods
Haley	F	B	6	Public	Tenure-track	Diversity & Equity
Ian	M	B	6	Private	Tenured	English Methods
Joanne	F	W	16	Public	Tenured	Diversity & Equity
Kelly	F	W	2	Public	Adjunct	Diversity & Equity
Kia	F	B/W	6	Public	Tenure-track	Diversity & Equity
Molly	F	W	10	Public	Tenured	Diversity & Equity
Nick	M	W	29	Public	Tenured	English Methods
Paul	M	B	6	Private	Tenure-track	Diversity & Equity
Rose	F	W	21	Public	Tenured	Social Stud. Methods
Sam	M	W	5	Public	Tenure-track	Social Stud. Methods
Terri	F	W	17	Private	Tenured	Diversity & Equity Social Stud. Methods

*All names are pseudonym

Twelve of 16 TEs taught at traditional public universities and 4 taught at private universities. Three of the sixteen TEs for this study taught at Hispanic-serving Institutions (HSIs). On average, TEs had 10 years of experience, with a range of 2-29

years across the sample. The universities at which they taught varied greatly in program structure, from student demographics to how the programs were structured. The majority of participants taught courses related to “Diversity and Equity.” In teacher education generally, these courses are often a singular course within a teacher education program that function as the “multicultural” or “social foundations” course (Gorski, 2009). TEs sometimes noted requirements based on state certification criteria or program-level expectations, but the majority described having a great degree of autonomy over how to structure course topics and curricular content. Because of an expectation that a “diversity and equity” course covers a relatively broad range of topics, including but not limited to race/racism, gender and sexuality, class inequality, and other forms of social marginalization and oppression, there is an expectation that such courses will provide an overview of a range of social issues and historical context. Still, given the breadth of possibility, there was some variance in how TEs approached structuring these courses; while some focused on personal identity development and a micro-level lens on social identities, others took a more structural and historical perspective to emphasize the role of systems and institutions in perpetuating oppression and inequality. Many struck a balance between these perspectives. Besides the “Diversity and Equity” courses, methods courses were also identified by participants as a site for learning about race and racism in teacher education. Six of 16 TEs identified as teaching methods courses in which race and racism were core instructional goals with teachers. As noted in the table, of the 6 TEs who taught methods courses, 3 taught both types of courses.

Data Sources

There were three main data sources for this study: interviews, focus groups, and classroom artifacts. Each TE who participated in the study completed two interviews, each approximately 75 minutes in length. Both interviews used a semi-structured interview protocol (Appendix A). During the first interview, TEs were asked to share narrative descriptions of a personal life history as well as a description of institutional context. The second interview focused on descriptions of classroom experiences, including debriefing specific classroom artifacts and narrated examples of general practice. In addition, the second interview included responses to hypothetical classroom scenarios, which are described in more detail below. Classroom artifacts were submitted by TEs and used to triangulate data from interviews. TEs submitted a course syllabus and at least one assignment, and they were invited to submit other materials that they used to support teacher learning about race and racism. Finally, focus groups were used to examine how interactions between TEs either altered discourse or opened up new conversations. Focus groups were an opportunity to revisit questions that TEs themselves raised during their individual interviews. In total, 3 focus groups were conducted, and each of the focus groups had 3 TEs, for a total of 9 TEs in the focus groups. A semi-structured protocol was used based on themes that emerged from individual interviews (Appendix A).

Scenarios. Interviews for this study also included a review and discussion of three hypothetical scenarios (Protocol in Appendix A; Scenario Transcripts in Appendix C). The scenarios represented conversations that might occur in a teacher education classroom and were developed by the researcher. An initial set of six scenarios were

constructed, drawing from common narratives in literature on teacher education about race and racism and from personal experience. Research on teaching suggests that practitioner articulations of pedagogical decision-making offer insight about teaching expertise (Berliner, 2001; Shulman, 1987). Four graduate students reviewed this initial set of hypothetical scenarios, shared input about what seemed likely and unlikely, and ranked the scenarios they believed to be most relevant to the research questions. After two iterations of feedback and editing, the scenarios were finalized as transcripts. To more actively engage TEs during the scenario-based interview, audio versions of each scenario were created using volunteer voice actors, and TEs both read and listened to the scenarios during the interview. After each scenario, TEs were asked to assess the scenario and describe how they might respond to the scenario. TEs were asked to rate the scenarios on a scale of 1-5, with “1” being something that never occurred in their classrooms, and “5” representing a scenario that was very likely to occur every year in their classroom (Appendix D). Participant ratings are listed in Table 3.2, and overall TEs rated the scenarios as a 3.8, suggesting that these scenarios represent scenarios that are somewhat likely to occur in teacher education classrooms.

Scenario A. In this scenario, two teachers discuss their responses to the experience of being called “racist” by one of their students. It has been documented in the literature that TCs demonstrate a fear of being called “racist” (Pollock, 2008; Stevenson, 2008). The dialogue was written to demonstrate a) resistance to being called “racist” and b) a denial or silencing of the experiences of students of color. At the same time, both

narratives present what are intended to be authentic representations of White teachers' positions of ambivalence (Lensmire, 2010).

Scenario B. Scenario B presents two teachers speaking about the politics of introducing current events, and Black Lives Matter specifically, into class discussions. Scenario B also presents the complexity of pedagogical decision-making in its presentation of multiple issues at once: addressing social issues in the classroom; attention to emotion; addressing multiethnic diversity in the classroom; and/or the question about taking a political stance in the classroom. Considering pedagogical content knowledge as decision-making (Shulman, 1987), this scenario created an opportunity to better understand the types of decisions TEs might make in “discretionary spaces” (Ball, 2018).

Scenario C. Scenario C presents two teachers who self-identify as a Black male and a White female, respectively. The teachers reflect on how their identity influences their ability to “connect” with students. One central issue in this scenario is the importance of relationship-building as a core component of culturally relevant teaching, (Gay, 2000). Scenario C is also the first scenario to explicitly introduce a TC of color and invites a discussion about the experiences and needs TCs of color, who are underrepresented in public schools (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1999) and who teacher education scholars have identified as often feeling devalued and underserved in teacher education programs (Gist, 2017). Finally, this scenario also differs from the first two scenarios in which the first speaker presents a problem and the second speaker responds to that problem. Instead, the first speaker here self-identifies as Black

and opens up a conversation about his racial identity, and in response, the second speaker redirects the conversation to her experience as a White teacher. The set-up of this scenario “centers Whiteness,” (Matias & Zembylas, 2014), which is a third issue raised for the respondent.

In general, these scenarios were designed to present complex racial moments that mirror actual participant experiences, and to create meaningful opportunities to discuss pedagogical decision-making.

Data Analysis

Interviews and memos were coded iteratively during data collection using inductive analytic coding methods (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). Initial in vivo codes were developed and used to identify themes. These initial codes also included a set of descriptive codes for commonly identified topics. From these initial codes, I developed a new set of code categories, and a second round of coding was used to refine code categories and subcodes. This second round of coding involved iterative application and refinement of pattern codes derived from the initial inductive codes. Ultimately, 7 code categories: *TEs’ instructional goals*, *TEs’ pedagogical strategies*, *Theories of Teacher learning*, *Vision/Purpose*, *Personal Histories*, *Racial Knowledge*, and *Context*. Each code category had subcodes, and in total, there were 74 codes. This codebook was used to re-code the entire dataset. Throughout the process I wrote analytic memos noting emerging themes and reflexive memos about researcher assumptions and potential sources of bias.

The data for this study were drawn from data coded with subcodes related to “emotion” in each of the 7 code categories (See Appendix E). Further, to identify

pedagogical strategies used to support REP, I noted overlap between these primary analytic categories and all of the subcodes in the code category for teacher education pedagogy (“TEP” codes) such as pedagogical activity structures, curricular choices, and use of modeling. I did not use demographic characteristics of TEs (e.g. race, gender) as analytic categories. All data was coded using the Atlas.ti software.

Validity

As a small-scale qualitative study, this study is not generalizable. My hope is that taking an outsider’s perspective and a cross-institutional examination of teacher educators’ experiences enhances the reliability and validity of analysis of participants’ narrated experiences. The 16 participants in this study were recommended through a snowball sampling process, and data was triangulated across three different types of data sources. During data collection and analysis, I wrote reflexive memos to critically examine how my assumptions and biases might inform the research methods and analysis for the study. Though the findings are not generalizable, I believe they can offer insight for teacher education for racial knowledge.

Findings

The findings in this study are divided into two categories that align with TEs’ goals. The first set of findings shows how TEs use REP to support teachers’ in learning to *attend to students’ racialized emotions*. The second set of findings examines how TEs use REP to support TCs in *attending to their own racialized emotions*. The sections below outline these findings, which are broadly organized around TEs’ responses to scenarios

but also include evidence from the interviews. Each of the two sections is divided into subsections identifying both sub-instructional goals and TE pedagogical strategies.

Teaching Teachers to Attend To Students' Emotions

The TEs in this study described the importance of *using race as a lens to attend to students' racialized emotions*. Within that broader goal, TEs identified the goal of teachers developing *critical listening* skills to be able to honor students' experiential knowledge of racism. Second, teachers must not only facilitate curricular connections between the “real world” and their classrooms but also *facilitate emotional connections* between their classrooms and students' lived experiences.

Sub-Goal #1. “Listen and learn”: **Critical listening.** TEs identified *critical listening* as a necessary teaching practice. In responding to scenario A, TEs identified “listening” to the student or “dismissing” what the student said as central issues in the scenario presented. When asked how they would respond to the student, these TEs emphasized the need for listening to, validating, and learning from students' experiences with racism. In several cases TEs explicitly named the importance of the experiential knowledge of people of color, a tenet of critical race theory (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002), as informing their response.

Brian was a White male who had been teaching teachers for eight years. His students were Masters level students and his program prepared mostly White teachers. After reviewing Scenario A, Brian reflected that he viewed listening to students of color as an important goal for White teachers in particular. Brian expressed concern that the teachers in the scenario “discount” students' experiences by “making it a teachable

moment rather than a real moment that the student actually experienced” (Interview #2).

When debriefing an encounter like that with TCs, Brian said, he would want them to learn to understand how to “respond as another human—really listen and learn” (Interview #2). Several TEs suggested that a critical insight from these types of encounters is that, when students vocalized opinions about a teacher’s racist behavior, while it is possible they said it as a joke or just to “push your buttons” (Diane, Interview #2), it is often the case that they have noticed discriminatory behavior before and even considered addressing it.

Catherine explained why she viewed critically listening to students’ comments about their experiences with racism as important. Catherine was a White woman teaching in an urban teacher preparation program, and she previously taught high school math. She shared with me several stories from her own teaching experience that informed her approach to teacher education, including a time when one of her students, a Black girl, had called her racist for not paying enough attention to her group of Black girls. She had apologized to her and followed up to learn more. She developed an action plan that included accountability to that student and to the class to try to offer more equal attention to her students. In the end the student had downplayed her own comment, but Catherine made sure that she knew she took it seriously. Part of Catherine’s impetus for sharing this story with me was that she had actually shared it with her TCs when the topic came up in her teacher education class. They asked how she handled being called racist, and she was able to walk them through her experience, offering a concrete example of instructional possibilities for responding to a comment and how her student responded. Her experience

highlighted critical listening as engaging deeply with what a student is saying, asking questions, and being willing to be vulnerable as a way of validating a student's experience. She explained:

It takes courage for a student to say ["You're racist"] to an adult, much less a teacher. So then as a White teacher in the schools ... it's important to take it seriously and it's valid. When students feel discriminated against, especially by race in school, that's a real thing. That's real. It's not just them being mad. (Interview #2)

While she does not state it specifically, Catherine's argument here aligns with a core tenet of critical race theory in education, which is the centrality of the experiential knowledge of people of color (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). She highlights that "critical listening" requires teachers to think analytically about students' comments and requires a deep interpersonal and also intellectual engagement with students as they share sometimes difficult feedback about their experiences. It's not only listening to their words but also, as Catherine said at one point, really "*hearing*" what they are saying about the school or system with a critically conscious perspective. Molly, a White teacher educator with ten years of experience at a public university, offered a similar perspective on what she hoped teachers would learn about critical listening. She said she hopes her teachers learn to be "curious" rather than reactive in these moments:

I think the big lesson that I've taken from everything that I've read... is just, listen, listen, listen. And don't assume, and be really reflective of your own biases and reactions. And don't ever say you're not racist, because you are. (Interview #1)

Overall, the TEs in the study were quite consistent in emphasizing the importance of critically listening to the perspectives of students of color, particularly on issues of racism and discrimination. Critical listening requires openness to students' perspective and, as

Molly noted here, a willingness to be reflective about how personal reactions influence interpretations of the information a student has shared.

Strategy #1. Using Protocols. Several TEs described conversational *protocols* that they taught and practiced with their students as pedagogical strategies to support teachers in developing critical listening skills.

Terri, a White woman who has been teaching teachers for seventeen years, pointed out that, while a primary goal of hers in the social foundations course is developing “knowledge, skills, and dispositions of being anti-racist,” (Focus Group), there are times when teachers want and need “steps” and “sentence starters.” She explained:

I want to give them words. ... I don't believe in giving people scripts, but people need language. They need the sentence starters, they really do, the White people do. So I want to model for them how to be able to do that without being scared, to be able to open the door to this conversation in a serious way, in a respectful way, in a way that allows them to invite that kid to really have a conversation with them. That's hard for new teachers; they're nervous as heck. (Interview #2)

Terri explained that she offers “language” to help her teachers begin conversations because it serves as a scaffold when their emotionality (their “nervousness”) is a barrier to engaging in race-related conversations. Terri shared a few examples of protocols she uses in her class, such as a “yes, and” activity where they “learn how to listen to each other” (Interview #2). Terri brought listening protocols into her class through the semester to try to combat defensiveness during conversations about race.

While Terri's protocols focused at the level of conversational sentence starters, Catherine described wanting her TCs to have a protocol that they could bring to their colleagues as a tool to continue conversations about equity and justice beyond their

teacher education program. Catherine described a “clearing” protocol that she taught to her TCs through restorative circles. The purpose of the clearing protocol is to “raise any kind of microaggression or micro-assault that came up within the group” (Interview #2), and it can be used in a whole group setting or between two people. It opens with one person asking to “clear” with whoever committed the microaggression. Asking to “clear” with each other is the signal to engage in critical listening. At that point, the first student will describe the microaggression or other issue and explain why they feel it is harmful or problematic. Catherine offered an example:

The clearing protocol might say, “So and so, can I clear with you on something? When you say that since not all my students are Black that I can’t support Black Lives Matter, that makes me feel like you are erasing the lived experiences of your Black students in your class.” With the clearing protocol, they have to kind of repeat back what they heard. “So what I hear you saying is—“Or, “Thank you for—“Well they have to ask for permission to clear first, and then, “Thank you...” (Interview #2)

Catherine went on to describe how the clearing protocol might play out in this particular scenario. Key components of the protocol are that TCs ask permission to clear with each other at the beginning and during the conversation and that they repeat back what they hear to ensure that the person who initiated the “clearing” feels heard and understood by their peer. At the end of the protocol, the second participant is encouraged to ask if there is anything else that the first participant needs to share. If not, that ends the protocol.

These examples demonstrate how TEs use protocols to support TCs in practicing critical listening using authentic examples from their teacher education classrooms or placement sites.

Sub-Goal #2. “Making space”: Facilitating emotional connections. All TEs in the study identified the importance of teachers’ *facilitating emotional connections* for students between their lives outside of school and in the classroom. Broadly, TEs described different ways for TCs to build relationships with students and explained why relationships are important for students’ schooling experiences. More specifically, TEs emphasized prioritizing time to attend to students’ emotional needs within classrooms. In response to scenario B, a majority of TEs expressed the idea that *not* discussing current political events with students sent a message to students that those events and their feelings about those events were not important. One participant, Diane, explained:

Taking five to ten minutes to give space for kids to talk about something like this in their classroom is probably going to make your teaching of calculus more effective... You're demonstrating to your students that you notice these things happening in the news; you know they care about them; and you care about your students enough to leave space for them to talk. And also you are giving them an opportunity to offload some of their feelings about it, so they may be more likely to focus on math, right? Your students are whole people that have lots of thoughts and feelings about things, and acknowledging that, making space for that, is going to make your teaching better and stronger. (Interview #2)

Here, Diane, a White TE with six years of experience, was not necessarily arguing that teachers should find a way to integrate a lesson about police violence into their calculus class, although it is worth noting that other articulations of a vision for culturally relevant teaching might make the case for using BLM as curricular content (Cole, 2017). Rather, *facilitating emotional connections* is unique from, or perhaps a particular facet of, *culturally relevant teaching* (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995) in its attention to students’ emotional needs over students’ academic/curricular needs. While both approaches to cultural responsiveness focus on real world connections to students’ lived

experiences, the emphasis on *facilitating emotional connections* to students' lived experiences is about creating opportunities for students to express or reflect upon their feelings about contemporary events that occur in their communities.

One participant, Brian, referred to this practice as “culturally relevant caring.” Like Diane, Brian emphasized the idea that “students are whole people.” He said, “One way we demonstrate care is by responding and opening those conversations up rather than shutting down. ... How do we make sure this is about the students, not about you wanting to be trusted or wanting to be connected with, but what are the students' wants and needs from you?” (Interview #2). Rose, a White woman who has been teaching teachers for over twenty years, described this practice as foundational for teaching. “If it's on the kids' minds, I don't care what you're doing, because you are not going to be effective no matter what you're teaching if they're preoccupied” (Interview #2). Rose's comment echoed Diane's point. Across conversations with these teacher educators, the goal of facilitating emotional connections was identified as important for attending to students' racialized emotions.

Strategy #2. Modeling cultivating community. *Cultivating community* as a form of *modeling* was identified as a common practice for supporting teachers in learning how to facilitate emotional connections to students' lived experiences. TEs described incorporating opening and closing routines into their classrooms that focused on relationship building, check-ins, emotional wellness, and other forms of “open spaces” that created opportunities for teachers to share experiences and concerns that might be affecting their academic engagement.

Nick taught about Whiteness for many years and modeled this kind of open space for his TCs. He described his “opening meeting” as a space for asking “questions they haven’t had a chance to ask; they can raise issues with things that are going on in the class that they need [or] feel like we need to change” (Interview #2). This broad structure was kind of an “open space,” he said, but it also tended to become a space for emotional work. He described his opening class routine as an opportunity for his TCs to “express sadness and anger” as they tried to make connections between what they learned in class and what they were experiencing in their school placements and in their own lives. While Nick’s opening of class routine was an example of an ongoing structure that supported cultivating community across the entire semester, other TEs provided examples of using beginning-of-semester activities that were designed to build a strong community culture upfront. In several cases, TEs said that part of facilitating emotional connections with students was doing this work proactively and in an ongoing way so as to be able to engage in the difficult work of challenging personal beliefs and biases later in the semester. For example, Catherine described how she and her co-teacher used beginning of the semester assignments to be intentional in cultivating community. One of their TCs’ first major assignments was a personal narrative. For this assignment, TCs described critical issues that happened when they were growing up, particularly around race, but also related to other facets of their identity. The intention, she explained, was to allow them to create “connections across difference” and also to “acknowledge that they are all complex individuals” (Interview #2). For Catherine and her teaching team, it was important to do this assignment at the beginning of the semester, because it was “one of

the first classes that they were talking to each other” and being vulnerable would play a major role in the success of the assignment. To cultivate community and model vulnerability with boundaries, Catherine and her co-teacher read their narratives out loud first. Catherine said that her students later shared that her vulnerability with them made it easier for them to be more open in class. Catherine also described using “restorative circles” throughout the semester as a structure to facilitate positive relationship building and conflict resolution.

Like Catherine, Haley used both opening of class routines and early semester assignments to facilitate relationship building not only for the purpose of strengthening her class community but also to model explicitly for teachers that relationships and vulnerability in the classroom require intentionality. She described beginning each class with ice-breaker style questions designed to help her TCs continue to learn more about each other across the semester, and like Catherine she also used a racial autobiography assignment in the beginning of the semester as a tool for strengthening class community. She emphasized how vulnerability related to race and racism required purposeful planning and explained:

I try to model building relationships with my students as a way for them to think about, oh, wow, I do feel really safe in this class. And I ask them to say, well, what do you think it is that we did to get you there? And you know, a lot of it is that I have them read, they all read their racial autobiography in class. (Interview #2)

As TCs shared their stories, Haley supported them in working together to identify critical themes across their experiences. Both in small groups and as a whole class, TCs shared their racial autobiographies with their peers, which Haley noted can sometimes be a “very

vulnerable piece.” In this activity, Haley supported TCs through purposefully cultivating community and relationships. This type of intentionality made it possible for students to later be more vulnerable and be able to share how their own experiences connect to what they are learning. In her class, teachers learned to facilitate emotional connections because Haley modeled it in her own teaching.

Joanne also supported teachers in developing the skill of facilitating emotional connections through modeling. In her response to Scenario B, she said that she felt her teachers would already be prepared for these types of events because she models cultivating community in her own classroom. She explained:

One thing I typically do is I model this. So often times when these situations do happen, like a police officer being acquitted, I do pull them together, regardless of my subject. And I usually rely on my, what I would want them to do as elementary school teachers. So we'll usually do like a K-W-L about the situation; I'll have them read something about the situation; I'll usually have them do some sort of response or writing with Post-its, and then we talk about it. So in a lot of ways, I've already modeled for them ways that they can respond when these situations happen. (Interview #2)

Later in this conversation, Joanne made clear that “teaching is a political act,” a phrase that came up across interviews with a majority of TEs. By modeling these strategies in her own class, Joanne demonstrated for her teachers how to “respond when these situations happen” in a way that cultivates community and makes space for students to reflect upon their own emotional responses to political and social issues. Diane also made the point that teaching is a political act and noted that teachers sometimes struggle with their role as political actors in a classroom. In her response to Scenario B, Diane acknowledged that the idea of whether or not to present one’s political perspectives was one of the issues at hand, but for her the primary need in this scenario would be “making

space for students to talk.” Diane described how she would handle this situation in her own classroom by modeling a series of questions that she would use with TCs:

Something like, “What would happen if you just ask your students?” Like, this is me prompting questions: “What would happen if you just ask your students: ‘Anybody want to talk about what happened? Anybody have any thoughts and feelings about it? You know, I’ve heard people talking in the hallways that some people are upset about this police officer being found not guilty; I just wanted to leave space for, what did people think about it?’ You can just open up a discussion. (Interview #2)

She explained that this approach would allow teachers to find their own level of comfort with sharing their personal political views while making space for students to reflect on and share their feelings. While Diane was very clear in our conversation that she viewed teaching as a political act, she explained that TCs who have varied levels of comfort with expressing political perspectives in the classroom minimally need strategies to facilitate students’ opportunities for sharing their perspectives in their classrooms.

Teaching Teachers to Attending to Their Own Emotions

Sub-Goal #3. “Taking responsibility”: **Overcoming resistance to critical self-reflection.** One of the most well documented barriers in teaching White teachers about race and racism is what is referred to as “resistance” or “denial,” and in our conversations, all TEs made reference to navigating this type of resistance in their classes. When responding to scenario A, TEs identified “resistance” or “defensiveness” as an issue for the teachers in the scenario. In interviews, TEs identified *overcoming resistance* as an instructional goal.

Kia described openness to critical self-reflection as important for teaching. She explained why she considered it important for them to not be “so tense” about race, “especially if they feel like a racial outsider” at their schools:

So if they're a White teacher teaching in a predominantly Black or Latino community then they just feel very uncomfortable. Sometimes when students will bring up race, like if the student says, “Oh, miss you’re White or something like that.” Calls them White, and they might get very offended and then that can have a whole spiral of consequences for the student if then they punish the student—for saying something which is kind of obvious, right? They take it in a particular way. So yeah, I want them to know that to not do that. (Interview #2)

Kia’s description highlighted the connection between teachers’ racialized emotions and the decisions that they make in a moment – what Ball (2018) identified as discretionary spaces – that have consequential effects on students’ schooling experiences. Kia was clear in stating that teachers need to understand the impact of these decisions. Joanne also identified these kinds of decisions as important for teachers. For her, identifying goals for TCs also depended in part on her assessment of their starting level of critical consciousness, and she differentiated her support for individual teachers based on what she learned about their prior knowledge and experiences in the first few weeks of class. In response to Scenario A, for example, she described how her assessment of the teachers would inform her response to them if they were in her class:

These two teachers are struggling with White fragility... [The second teacher] really used a lot of skills to deflect taking responsibility for how his student might be trying to inform him of ways that he might be being racist. ... I think he's more resistant than she is, because she a couple of times kept saying that she just didn't know what to say ... What would I do if this was in my class? Let me think for a second. It's hard to answer right away because I know that if that happened in my class, I would have known what I've already taught that I would rely upon to help them make sense of that.... My goal would definitely be for them to take responsibility and to recognize that they're responding in very White ways. It's easier with the woman because she said she “didn't know what to say.” So that

gives me an opening to be like, “okay, well, let's think about, you know, wow, it sounds like you were really caught off guard. Let's talk about what happened and how you might be able to respond in the future.” (Interview #2)

Joanne makes clear that her goal for both teachers was the same but that she would use different conversational entry-points based on what the teachers say and do.

In general, in responding to Scenario A, a majority of TEs identified it as likely to occur in their classrooms, and several suggested that teachers needed to prepare themselves for moments like these. Paul, a Black male teacher educator of predominantly White teachers, responded by saying that he would want his teachers to overcome resistance in moments like these because it is probably not the last time that they will be called racist. He said that over time, teachers should learn to recognize the contextual factors that are at play in these moments and become “comfortable with these kinds of incidents coming up” so that they become better at addressing them.

Strategy #3. Curricular sequencing. TEs described the importance of *curricular sequencing* for supporting teachers' development of critical self-reflection. Their curricular sequence reflected both content-oriented goals related to historical racial knowledge and theories of race and racism and the goals related to a theory of teachers' trajectory for attending to racialized emotions. For example, Joanne reflected that curricular sequencing has made it possible for her to respond more effectively to White students' resistance, which previously was one of her greater instructional challenges.

When asked about what she still struggled with, she responded:

I think initially I would have said resistance, but I think I've learned to scaffold my teaching so as to have less resistance, and I think I also, my research has helped to inform me of what the resistance is in a way that allows me to teach to it in a different way. So it's no longer that. (Joanne, Interview #1)

In a later interview, when asked to describe how she makes choices about what to include or not include in her curriculum, she describes these choices in terms of teachers'

emotional responses to the curriculum:

My goal is that they've gotten to a point that they have gone through the guilt and anger sometimes associated with learning about race and it's put them in a place where either they can feel guilt or despair depending on who they are or they can try to do something about it. And so my goal is that they're going to want to do something about it through their curriculum. So that's the groundwork that I try and lay before I get into curriculum design. Because I want them to have that feeling of urgency that, this is bad enough that have to do something, and wow, here's an outlet for me to actually do it. Then if I can get them in that magic moment, then they're so motivated to plan their units." (Interview #2)

What is important about Joanne's description of her curricular sequencing is that she describes her instructional milestones in terms of emotions: moving from "anger" to "guilt" or "despair" which she believes will prompt a "feeling of urgency" and/or "motivation." She describes these processes as related through an instructional sequence and views this emotional development as a necessary scaffold to planning social justice unit plans.

Several TEs also noted that their curricular sequence reflected intentionality around getting to know TCs in the beginning of the semester. When responding to the scenarios, they pointed out that their decisions depended on what they knew about teachers, so it was difficult to make a decontextualized assessment of how to proceed. In that sense, it is worth noting that a theme emerging from TEs' narratives is that identifying pedagogical strategies to support "resistant" TCs hinges largely on knowing and building relationships with them.

TEs also focused specifically on questions about sequencing content in terms of a focus on *individual* and *institutional* levels of racism. Several TEs shared their rationale for or asked questions about whether to “start with the structural” or “dig into the personal” (Diane, Interview #2). TEs presented mixed opinions about whether TCs’ are more resistant when learning about racism if they focus on personal racial identity development before learning about systemic racism rather than the reverse (discussing systemic racism before reflecting on their own racial identities). Some TEs also believed that the relative effectiveness of each approach depended on a TC’s level of critical consciousness. Diane believed that for students who are new to studying race or more resistant to learning about racism, starting with the structural perspective tended to be more effective, because they can identify inequities in the broader system first and then see how it “trickles down” into their lives and students’ lives. Brian took a similar approach, beginning with the “macro” and working his way to “micro” level perspectives of inequality in schools. Sam, who teaches at a predominantly White public university in the southern United States, explained that he also prefers to background personal identity work. As a social studies methods teacher, he foregrounds historical racial knowledge and uses historical perspectives on racial inequality to “shake them loose” and encourage critical questioning. His goal is to show TCs “how our current day arrangements are artifacts” of racism in history, and he said that he thinks “it allows them to understand that it’s not really about them and that “they’re just part of a bigger system” (Interview #1). In his experience, focusing on historical perspectives has been a path of less

resistance for TCs who are new to understanding how race and racism operate socially and systemically.

While these TEs make a case for “starting with the structural,” others emphasize the utility of beginning with personal identity work. Frederick, for example, opened his foundations course with a week on “Identity” before engaging with more systemic level issues in later weeks. As noted above, both Haley and Catherine use a racial autobiography assignment early in the semester to engage their TCs in critical self-reflection. Catherine also described an early semester assignment in which she asked students to read an article about Whiteness and had TCs “situate” themselves in relation to their own racial identity and ideologies about race and culture as a segue into a discussion about White privilege. In both Haley and Catherine’s classes, being able to engage in discussions about systems required ongoing critical self-reflection and identity work. These examples demonstrate that the TEs in this study view curricular sequencing as necessarily responsive to TCs’ racialized emotions and plan purposefully using racial-emotional pedagogy.

Sub-Goal #4: “Principles and considerations”: Developing TCs’ REP framework. Overcoming resistance to self-reflection was identified as important in part because it was a first step towards a broader goal of TCs developing their own REP framework for teaching. In other words, one instructional goal identified by TEs was that TCs would develop a set of “*principles and considerations*” that supported pedagogical decision-making related to racialized emotions; in other words, racial-emotional pedagogy. TEs in the study described this goal in terms of supporting TCs in building a

skillset around noticing/recognizing their own racialized emotions and developing practices or a disposition towards a racial-emotional pedagogy with their students.

For Ian, a Black male who has been teaching teachers for six years, it is important for teachers to be able to engage in a sort of “behavioral check in” that allowed them to “shift” when they recognize that their response to students is not providing useful support. After considering Scenario B, Ian noted that the conversation about Black Lives Matter struck him as a kind of “sloganeering.” About the teacher in the scenario, he asked, “What am I doing that I feel the need to actually say that I feel like these students lives matter and who they are matter, whereas what I'm doing is not actually enacting that?” (Interview #2). Ian suggested that teachers sometimes become engaged in more discursive “short-term” fixes that do not address the need for changes in day-to-day behaviors or in dispositions towards students. He said that teachers need to develop the ability to check-in with themselves in a critically reflective way to consider what their relationships is or is not signaling to students.

Paul also identified the need for teachers to develop “dispositions” that support reflective and responsive engagement with students. When he responded to Scenario B, he explained that he views culturally responsive teaching as developing a set of “principles and considerations” that provide a lens for pedagogical decision-making. When it comes to dealing with racial issues in the classroom and culturally responsive engagement with students, he preferred a sort of principled approach rather than a checklist. In our conversation, he said:

I'm much more in the “considerations” stance around these types of issues. Not the how-to guides. Here are some things to always kind of check in with yourself

about; have you considered X, Y, and Z in each one of these incidences. Because what typically happens is, if you give them a how-to they'll say, "I followed all the steps—he's still running around the classroom!" Right? ... So there's more considerations, questions that I want them to be mindful of as they make choices in their classroom. (Interview #2)

One of Paul's examples was having teachers critical reflect on their disciplinary practices. Rather than telling them exactly what to do, he described asking reflective questions about how TCs engage their White and Black students to uncover practices, points of tensions, and instructional possibilities. Brian, like Paul, noted that teachers often express a desire to know "what to do," and he said that he tried to address that early in the semester by being clear about what they will and won't accomplish in his course:

I tried to head that off at the pass in one of the first classes by saying, these are the three ways I hope this class affects your practice: that you start to develop your personal vision for your teaching that takes into account these larger forces so that your vision can guide your practice; that the course develops critical tools to be able to see things in moments of practice that you wouldn't see without them; ... And then, maybe we could figure out some practices, like actually what you do. But I'm still trying to learn how to... feed into their "I want to know how to do it" without reducing it to, "Okay, here's what you do." (Interview #2)

Brian and Paul emphasized the importance of not turning the work of justice-oriented teaching into a checklist of strategies. As Brian noted, their purpose is more to be able to use these frameworks as "critical tools" that allow TCs to see things in their class that they would otherwise not see.

Strategy #4. Simulation Activities and Rehearsals. TEs named *simulations* and *rehearsals* as pedagogical strategies that support teacher development of this skill. They described simulating school-based experiences to support TCs in practicing the application of racial-emotional pedagogy on a smaller scale while refining pedagogical decision-making skills that attend to racialized emotions.

Joanne gave an example from her class that was an assignment she had modified over time. Her main goal for the assignment was to support TCs in challenging deficit thinking about their students. Originally, she had asked students to submit written reflections about their practice, and she gave them written feedback. In that earlier version of the assignment, she explained, “I would have them write these observations about their students, and it was like a laundry list of problems, just a laundry list of deficits” (Interview #2). Initially, Joanne offered extensive critical feedback on their papers, but her students responded defensively. She realized “it couldn’t come from me, giving them the critical feedback about where they were using deficit thinking; it had to come from them.” She modified the assignment to include more scaffolded opportunities for learning, practice, and reflection, and she integrated “skits” as an opportunity for teachers to practice listening to and participating in conversations that demonstrated deficit-thinking about students and families. She explained why this approach seemed more effective in her class:

What I started doing was I broke them up into groups. I gave each group a different kind of deficit thinking ... They had to make little skits; they would act it out for the rest of the class. Like in the teachers’ lounge or something. And then the other students would have to guess what the deficit thinking was. I think that really helped them because I don't tell them that this is connected to their assignment; I just say, “Today we're going to learn about deficit thinking.” ... Then they do it and then I ask them, “Why do you think we're learning about this today?” And usually somebody will figure it out. (Interview #2)

Joanne said that this assignment became particularly effective because TCs start off excited to analyze deficit thinking in other people’s behaviors—teachers in the teachers’ lounge, for example—but begin to realize that “they’re really doing an assignment about themselves.” In addition to the skits, Joanne had her students analyze a previous student’s

paper (permission given by the student), highlighting and reframing deficit thinking throughout the paper. Following that assignment, the students are tasked to do that with their own papers. Joanne found that this new series of assignments was more effective in challenging their deficit thinking and more closely approximated the type of critical reflection she would want them to do in practice. The new scaffolds including the simulation or “skits” as well as the paper analysis created opportunities for TCs to more authentically practice the skill of challenging deficit thinking in themselves and others.

Catherine also described an activity where her TCs practiced or simulated a conversation that might happen in their schools using the clearing protocol. To prepare TCs to be able to navigate difficult conversations that would up come up in school, especially with colleagues, Catherine developed a lesson in which TCs *rehearsed* “clearing” with one another. She first offered students scripted versions of the protocol that they could rehearse with one another, and then had students volunteer to rehearse clearing with her before practicing with one another. Her hope was that multiple approximations of practice (Grossman et al., 2009) would prepare them for using the clearing protocol in her class or in their own teaching placements. Catherine shared that, at first, the TCs in her class were reluctant to practice the protocol. They said that it felt “forced” and asked her, “Would you really talk to a colleague like that?” and “What if somebody doesn't’ respond to me the way that you’re saying that they should respond?” Catherine and her co-teacher designed scenarios for them to practice clearing with one another:

[My colleague] and I had designed some scenarios for them to go through. ... We talked about things that we'd heard teachers saying about kids in our real teaching

settings. We created these little role plays out of that, and had them act out clearing, being the person who is being cleared with and being the person who was clearing. And they were like, “yeah, but this is just a script and this feels so fake.” And, “I don't even understand how this would work in real life.” So it was a little bit of an uphill battle to get them onboard with using the protocol. So then I gave them a scenario [that] I personally experienced—being cleared with when I was a teacher, a high school teacher. So I gave them the scenario and I had them practice clearing with me. So I told them you know, the thing that I said or the scenario that happened and I said, “Alright, who wants to practice clearing with me?” And we so we practiced going through the language and I was the one that they were responding to or clearing with and then they felt a little bit better. (Interview #2)

In these examples, Joanne and Catherine use simulations and rehearsals to offer a pedagogy of enactment that supports TCs in beginning to navigate racialized emotions as they might arise in their future classrooms. These experiences offer supports for TCs to begin the development and refinement of skills to make decisions using racial-emotional pedagogy in their own classrooms.

Discussion

The findings from this study suggest that the work of teaching teachers about race requires purposeful attention to racialized emotion and that TEs who teach about race have developed pedagogical strategies for this work. These TEs use racial-emotional pedagogy to support TCs in attending to students' emotions and to their own emotions. In their classrooms, they engage TCs in learning about racialized emotions by using protocols, cultivating community, engaging in purposeful curricular sequencing, and using simulations and rehearsals. TEs in this study treat teacher learning about racialized emotions as an instructional goal of significance. In doing so, they develop class activities that have instructional goals related explicitly to teachers' emotional development, and they adjust their instruction based on their assessments of teachers'

emotional experiences in class. These findings thus demonstrate that the work of teaching about race is, like other aspects of teacher education, important pedagogical work. While *what* teachers learn about systems of oppression and histories of race and racism is critically important, these TEs also show that *how* they learn these concepts is equally important.

These TEs also built bridges between pedagogical approaches that are often viewed as in tension with one another, namely, justice-centered teacher education and the core practices movement (Philips et al., 2018; Richmond et al., 2019; Schiera, 2019). In teaching about race and racialized emotions, TEs supported their TCs in developing dispositions to support responsive pedagogy but also in practicing concrete skills through protocols, rehearsals, and modeling in their own classrooms. Thus, on the one hand, they reinforced the principles of “good teaching” of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), focusing in their own practice on building relationships, scaffolding instruction building on TCs’ existing cultural knowledge, and developing TCs’ critical consciousness—and, at the same, time, utilized pedagogies of enactment often encouraged in research on core practices and practice-based teacher education (Grossman et al., 2009). They identified the importance of “principles and considerations” over checklists of strategies, but they also modeled and rehearsed skills in ways that demystified important principles such as critical listening and cultivating community. The notion of demystifying practice is at the heart of practice-based teacher education, but in attending to racialized emotions, must also honor the complexity of teaching about race and racism as necessarily contextualized and always related to issues of power and

privilege. The findings from this study demonstrated that TEs who teach about race and racialized emotions thoughtfully merge these approaches to teacher education in their work.

Implications

Racial-emotional pedagogy as it appeared in these TEs' classrooms demonstrated a pedagogy of teacher education that complicates and adds nuance to how we might understand teaching for social justice in the teacher education space. While practice-based approaches have been critiqued as offering too little attention to justice, and justice-oriented approaches have been critiqued as not attending sufficiently to concrete instructional practices, the evidence from these classrooms suggests that these approaches to teacher education are not necessarily distinct, or at least not always. Teacher educators can engage in practice-based approaches to teaching teachers about social justice, but more work is needed to understand 1) in what ways TEs are supporting teachers in *practicing*, or approximating teaching experiences (Kavanagh et al., 2019) and 2) how a justice-oriented lens prepares teachers to consider context and issues of power, oppression, and broader systemic forces even as they engage in these moments of practice (Philip et al., 2018). Thus, these findings point to the need for deeper engagement with, simultaneously, questions about the equity implications of identifying core practices and questions about the pedagogy of developing TCs' justice-oriented dispositions.

The TEs in this study gave examples of how these pedagogical approaches to teacher education might work together in teaching about race and racialized emotions,

and the racial-emotional pedagogical strategies they used provide an important link between research on culturally responsive teaching and research on pedagogies of teacher education. Perhaps TEs who teach about race are uniquely positioned to shed light on the possibilities for this kind of intersection of justice and practice; they may also have insight about the ways in which attempting to merge these orientations to the work remains fraught. The specialized expertise of TEs who teach for racial knowledge is often marginalized in teacher education programs but needs to be brought to the center of this research agenda. As researchers continue to debate the equity implications of the core practice movement and the practical utility of focusing on teachers' equity dispositions, TEs like the ones highlighted in this study can bring important expertise from their own practical experience in bridging this divide. Thus, this study points to the need for continued research that critically explores these tensions through empirical examinations of teacher education for racial knowledge.

The findings from this study also highlighted racial-emotional pedagogy as an approach for supporting teachers in attending to emotion but raised questions about teaching about racialized emotions as itself emotional work. TEs used their classrooms to *model* and provide *rehearsals* for the kinds of racialized emotions that arise in K-12 classrooms, and it seems reasonable to infer that their own authentic emotionality was a part of their engagement with their students in these instructional moments. Thus, considering this pedagogical work as also emotional work raises important questions for future research. We should explore not only how TEs conceptualize a knowledge base for teaching about racialized emotions but also how they emotionally experience the practice

of teaching this content. In other words, there is a distinction between *having knowledge of* racialized emotions and *experiencing* them, and both the knowledge of and the experience are important for understanding how racial-emotional pedagogy is enacted as a pedagogy of teacher education. We consider this work as emotional work, we must also purposefully examine and engage the emotional experiences of teacher educators in this research.

Finally, the significance of this work goes beyond courses about race and diversity. The TEs in this study supported teachers in learning to develop pedagogical strategies related both to their students' emotional lives and to their own emotionality. These strategies are essential because teachers and students are always influenced by their emotional lives in ways that can both support and impede students' academic achievement. Specifically along racial lines, attending to emotion allows teachers to examine the complex ways that power, privilege, and systems of oppression are influencing the micro-moments that occur between them and their students on a daily basis. At the same time, recognizing emotions *in general*—fear and anxiety, as well as excitement and joy—allows teachers to acknowledge that teaching is not only intellectual work but also emotional work. The findings from this study demonstrate that teachers need support for the many ways in which emotions affect their practice, and they need to practice strategies for recognizing and responding to their own and their students' emotions. Racial-emotional pedagogy became useful for TEs in supporting TCs as they learned about the connections between race, emotion, and teaching, but this work should not be relegated to “diversity” classes exclusively. We might consider what message it

sends to teachers when we relegate emotional work to race and diversity classes alone, and also what additional burden it places on these TEs to be the only ones that support teachers in learning and practicing these skills. In other words, what might it look like if teaching for racial knowledge could focus on the specific work of attending to racialized emotions rather than being the only opportunity for teachers to learn to attend to their emotions *at all*? Teacher education programs can learn from the pedagogy of TEs who teach about race and consider how the emotional work of teaching might be integrated across teacher education programs.

APPENDIX C:
Classroom Scenarios

Classroom Scenario A

[Teacher AA]: You know, I was sort of thrown off today because, well, one of my students accused me of being racist. And he sort of said it in a joking way, like, “oh you’re racist miss, you just didn’t call on me because I’m black.” And I was like, wow. I felt pretty upset because honestly I was thinking: I literally am a teacher because I want to fight against oppressive systems. I love my kids, and I am so far from being racist. So I was just really—I didn’t, I didn’t know what to think. I just said something like, “You know that’s not true.” I didn’t know what to say.

[Teacher XX]: I think that they’re really just saying things sometimes without thinking about it. They don’t really know what they’re saying, right? So, like for example, in my situation, I asked, I said, “Do you really mean what you’re saying? Think about what you’re saying right now.” And she said no, forget it Mr. Powers. So I told her like, you have to really think about the words that you’re using carefully, because words have power. Not to say racism isn’t a real thing, for sure it is, just make sure that when you’re calling it out, that you’re really being serious, that you really mean it, so you can actually stand behind what you say. So it ended up being, I think, kind of a teachable moment. So maybe that’s one approach: making it a teachable moment, in the follow-up conversation.

* * *

Classroom Scenario B

[Teacher BB]: Can I ask a question? So, there are times when I really want to make space for my students to talk about what they are feeling, but I don’t know what’s appropriate. Like, two days ago they announced that they found that police officer not guilty, right? I know I really had a lot of feelings about it, and so I wanted to know how my students were feeling...but I also teach math, right? So I wasn’t sure. How do I say that Black Lives Matter in calculus? I didn’t want it to feel forced. Did anyone else feel that?

[Teacher YY]: Yeah, for me, I don’t know. I feel like, regardless of your subject, it’s sort of shaky ground to talk about those kinds of issues. Especially with Black Lives Matter, it’s hard because I do want my students to know that I care about them and they do matter. That’s definitely my position. But I also have Latino students, and Muslim students, and Vietnamese students. Not all of my students in my class are Black, and so I think it’s tricky to focus just on the Black Lives Matter movement. I want to be fair to all of my students and their experiences. And also, I know I’ve heard from other teachers that we really aren’t supposed to show our political perspectives to students.

Classroom Scenario C

[Teacher CC]: I never had any teachers that looked like me. So it was important for me to not just be a Black teacher, but to be a Black man teaching high school math. Because honestly there really aren’t very many Black teachers at my school, let alone Black men. And I know my students notice, because they have said stuff to me about it. Um, I feel like, they have someone they connect—they can connect with, and that is important. So

yeah, it's like, I don't think I realized when I was a kid how important that was to me, but now that I'm on this side of things, I see that it really matters, and it makes me realize even more that I'm needed here.

[Teacher ZZ]: I mean, that's wonderful. But I guess for me, it's been the opposite. I've felt frustrated because I feel like, my students *don't* want to connect with me. I don't know if it's because I'm white, or what. And I'm not saying that they don't like white people or -- I just feel like, I feel like they don't trust me, and I don't know how to show them that I am someone they can trust. And I know we have studied these techniques for how to be culturally relevant and how to build relationships, but it's just not working for me. I'm trying to figure out how to be the teacher they need me to be but also be my authentic self. And not try too hard or pretend to know something about, like, Black culture, when honestly, I really just don't.

APPENDIX D:
Teacher Educators' Scenario Ratings

Table 2.2: Scenario Ratings

TE ID	A	B	C
1	5	4	2
2	4	5	4
3	3	2	3
4	3	5	5
5	5	2	3
6	3	5	4
7	3	4	1
8	3	4	2
9	2	4	3
10	1	3	2
11	4	3	1
12	1	5	4
13	5	5	5
14	5	5	4
15	2	5	5
16	5	3	3
	3.38	4.00	3.19

APPENDIX E:
Code Categories / Sample Quotations

Table 2.3: Second Cycle Coding: Racial-Emotional Pedagogy

Code/Code Category	Description	Example(s)
Racial knowledge	TE describes examples of the racial knowledge teachers need	<p><i>“Usually when you're approaching [a child] it's to yell at them or to correct their behavior; ... You need to do it in a way that they, you're not getting them in trouble. And they're not used to that. And so they are usually surprised at how well the conversation goes.”</i></p> <p><i>“So this is really valuable feedback that the student is giving you, and like honestly treating it as truth, whether or not the kid is really just trying to push your buttons or not, you need to not invalidate people of color's experiences and their perspectives.”</i></p>
TEP (Teacher Educators' Pedagogical Strategies)	TE describes instructional strategies to support TCs' learning	<p><i>“We had a Socratic seminar about it. ... We discussed it afterwards, we found that our residents were still discussing it, because we asked them to make connections to the students they taught over summer, in summer school. And we asked them to make connections, like what, which, how do you see these capitals exhibited by the students that you teach?” (TEP-Activity)</i></p> <p><i>“I just I didn't feel like I had the relationship to be able to push them and to be able to challenge them on their racist thinking. I needed to build a relationship with them to be able to do that.”</i></p>
Instructional Goals	TE describes instructional goals for teachers	<p><i>“I think again a goal is getting them to be more comfortable talking about race and racism with their students.”</i></p> <p><i>“With the students of color... I think that there needs to be more work in thinking about particularly my students who have come through the system that is the way it is. And thinking about maybe healing that they need to do from having been part of a damaging system.”</i></p>
Theory of Teacher Learning	Conceptions of how teachers learn about race and racism	<p><i>“I just I didn't feel like I had the relationship to be able to push them and to be able to challenge them on their racist thinking. I needed to build a relationship with them to be able to do that.”</i></p>
Personal History	Descriptions of personal history	<p><i>“I think I felt that way because of how the schools I went to in my experiences growing up. And feeling like I didn't get a good education and seeing, I know for a fact that in my high school, we were not getting AP classes and stuff ... So for me from day one when I was a teacher, I felt like, this is so critical; everything I do, I should be asking myself, is this the best thing for the students? ... I messed up plenty too, but I just would like to hear that a little bit more from my pre-service teachers, especially after this whole diversity class.”</i></p> <p><i>“The woman and the man who were leading this [workshop] kept being like, stop, particularly you white people that come and work with kids of color: you're hurting our kids by not dealing with your</i></p>

		<i>own shit. It was very much like, stop hurting our kids. You need to deal with this. And that stayed with me.”</i>
Context	Context and demographics as influencing learning goals and teaching practices.	<i>“It’s not that I would teach different content in those two settings, but I think I would have a different, my awareness would be up in a different way to think about how my students are receiving me, thinking about me how I’m interacting with them, how I’m building trust, building relationships.”</i>
Vision/ purpose	Description of purpose of teacher learning for racial knowledge in schools—what it enables, mitigates.	<p><i>“But my goal would be for them to—my analysis is that they’re harming their students by not acknowledging that they are behaving in ways that are racialized with their students of color, and I would want them to be able to recognize that they are reacting from a place of White fragility, and to be able to hear and see it as a gift that their students are helping them to name race for them.”</i></p> <p><i>“I think in an initial important step is to help the teacher recognized currently what dynamics are play around race in schools. White teachers of students of color. And what the experience of students of color have been around that dynamic, which is having to always negotiate their identity or authenticity with an archetype of a good student that’s often in reference to whiteness. And that then makes trust difficult; that makes being seen difficult; it makes building a relationship difficult, because you’re navigating that dynamic.”</i></p>

References

- Achinstein, B., & Ogawa, R. T. (2012). New teachers of color and culturally responsive teaching in an era of educational accountability: Caught in a double bind. *Journal of Educational Change*, 13(1), 1–39. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-011-9165-y>
- Bartolomé, L. (1994). Beyond the Methods Fetish: Toward a Humanizing Pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(2), 173–195. <http://doi.org/10.17763/haer.64.2.58q5m5744t325730>
- Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518 – 533. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-594X.2007.00242.x>
- Berliner, D. C. (2001). Learning about and learning from expert teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 35, 463–482.
- Boler, M. (1999). *Feeling Power*. New York: Routledge.
- Boler, M., & Zembylas. (2002). Discomforting truths: The emotional terrain of understanding difference. In P. P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Rethinking Education for Social Justice* (pp. 107–130). New York: Routledge. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=EtS7DXi-TB0C>
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2019). Feeling race: Theorizing the racial economy of emotions. *American Sociological Review*, 84(1), 1–25. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418816958>
- Bristol, T. J. (2015). Teaching boys: towards a theory of gender-relevant pedagogy. *Gender and Education*, 27(1), 53–68. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2014.986067>
- Casey, Z. a., Lozenski, B. D., & McManimon, S. K. (2013). From neoliberal policy to neoliberal pedagogy: Racializing and historicizing classroom management. *Journal of Pedagogy / Pedagogický Casopis*, 4(1), 36–58. <http://doi.org/10.2478/jped-2013-0003>
- Chandler, P. T. (2015). *Doing race in social studies: Critical perspectives*. (P. Chandler, Ed.). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1995). Uncertain allies: Understanding the boundaries of race and teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(4), 541–570.

- Cole, C. E. (2017). Culturally sustaining pedagogy in higher education: Teaching so that Black Lives Matter. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, 36(8), 736–750.
<http://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-01-2017-0005>
- Conklin, H. G., & Hughes, H. E. (2016). Practices of compassionate, critical, justice-oriented teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(1), 47–60. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0022487115607346>
- Cross, B. E. (2005). New racism, reformed teacher education, and the same ole' oppression. *Educational Studies*, 38(3), 263–274.
http://doi.org/10.1207/s15326993es3803_6
- Crowley, R. M., & Smith, W. (2015). Whiteness and social studies teacher education: tensions in the pedagogical task. *Teaching Education*, 26(2), 160–178.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2014.996739>
- Denevi, E., & Pastan, N. (2006). Helping whites develop anti-racist identities: Overcoming their resistance to fighting racism. *Multicultural Education*, Winter 200, 70–76.
- Emerson, K. T. U., & Murphy, M. C. (2014). Identity threat at work: how social identity threat and situational cues contribute to racial and ethnic disparities in the workplace. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 20(4), 508–520.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/a0035403>
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gay, G., & Kirkland, K. (2003). Consciousness and self-reflection in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(3), 181–187.
<http://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4203>
- Gilliam, W. S., Maupin, A. N., Reyes, C. R., Accavitti, M., & Shic, F. (2016). *Do early educators' implicit biases regarding sex and race relate to behavior expectations and recommendations of preschool expulsions and suspensions?* Yale University Child Study Center. Retrieved from http://ziglercenter.yale.edu/publications/Preschool Implicit Bias Policy Brief_final_9_26_276766_5379.pdf
- Gist, C. D. (2017). Voices of aspiring teachers of color: Unraveling the double bind in teacher education. *Urban Education*, 52(8), 927–956.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915623339>

- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam.
- Gorski, P. C. (2009). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(2), 309–318. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.07.008>
- Grosland, T. J. (2019). Through laughter and through tears: emotional narratives to antiracist pedagogy. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 22*(3), 301–318. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2018.1468750>
- Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record, 111*(9), 2055–2100. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109336543>
- Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching, 15*(2), 273–289. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13540600902875340>
- Guinier, L. (2004). From racial liberalism to racial literacy: Brown v. Board of education and the interest-divergence dilemma. *The Journal of American History, 91*(1), 92–118.
- Halberstadt, A. G., Castro, V. L., Chu, Q., Lozada, F. T., & Sims, C. M. (2018). Preservice teachers' racialized emotion recognition, anger bias, and hostility attributions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 54*(June), 125–138. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2018.06.004>
- Henfield, M., & Washington, A. (2004). "I want to do the right thing but what is it?": White teachers' experiences with African American students. *Journal of Negro Education, 81*(2), 148–161. <http://doi.org/10.3102/00346543067001043>
- Hiebert, J., & Morris, A. (2012). Extending ideas on improving teaching: Response to Lampert; Lewis, Perry, Friedkin, and Roth; and Zeichner. *Journal of Teacher Education, 63*(5), 383–385.
- Janssen, F., Grossman, P., & Westbroek, H. (2015). Facilitating decomposition and recomposition in practice-based teacher education: The power of modularity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 51*, 137–146. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.06.009>
- Kavanagh, S. S., Monte-Sano, C., Reisman, A., Fogo, B., McGrew, S., & Cipparone, P. (2019). Teaching content in practice: Investigating rehearsals of social studies

- discussions. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 1–11. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.06.017>
- King, L. J. (2016). Teaching black history as a racial literacy project. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 19(6), 1303–1318. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1150822>
- King, L. J. (2019). Unofficial and unconventional social studies spaces for students of color. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 43(2), 91–95. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2019.03.001>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that’s just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, 34(3), 159–165. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00405849509543675>
- Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A Critical Race Theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 211–247.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a Critical Race Theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47–68. <http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033007003>
- Larkin, D. (2012). Using the conceptual change model of learning as an analytic tool in researching teacher preparation for student diversity. *Teachers College Record*, 114(8), 1–35.
- Lensmire, T. J. (2010). Ambivalent white racial identities: fear and an elusive innocence. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 13(2), 159–172. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13613321003751577>
- Matias, C. E. (2013). Check yo’ self before you wreck yo’ self and our kids: Counterstories from culturally responsive White teachers? . . . to culturally responsive White teachers! *Interdisciplinary Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 68–82.
- Matias, C. (2016). *Feeling White: Whiteness, emotionality, and education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Matias, C. E., & Zembylas, M. (2014). “When saying you care is not really caring”: emotions of disgust, whiteness ideology, and teacher education. *Critical Studies in Education*, 55(3), 319–337. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2014.922489>
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, 63(6), 503–517. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.6.503>

- Mensah, F. M. (2011). A case for culturally relevant teaching in science education and lessons learned for teacher education. *Journal of Negro Education, 80*(3), 296–309. <http://doi.org/10.2307/41341135>
- Michael, A. (2015). *Raising race questions*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Milner, H. R. (2010). What does teacher education have to do with teaching? Implications for diversity studies. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 118–131. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347670>
- Milner, H. R., & Howard, T. C. (2013). Counter-narrative as method: race, policy and research for teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 16*(4), 536–561. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2013.817772>
- Milner, H. R., & Laughter, J. C. (2014). But good intentions are not enough: Preparing teachers to center race and poverty. *The Urban Review, 47*(2), 341–363. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-014-0295-4>
- Ohito, E. O. (2016). Making the emperor’s new clothes visible in anti-racist teacher education: Enacting a pedagogy of discomfort with White preservice teachers. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 49*(4), 454–467. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2016.1226104>
- Philip, T. M., Rocha, J., & Olivares-Pasillas, M. C. (2017). Supporting teachers of color as they negotiate classroom pedagogies of race: A study of a teacher’s struggle with “friendlyfire” racism. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 44*(1), 59.
- Philip, T. M., Souto-Manning, M., Anderson, L., Horn, I., J. Carter Andrews, D., Stillman, J., & Varghese, M. (2018). Making justice peripheral by constructing practice as “core”: How the increasing prominence of core practices challenges teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 70*(3), 251–264. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118798324>
- Picower, B. (2011). Learning to teach and teaching to learn: Supporting the development of new social justice educators. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 38*(4), 7–24.
- Pollock, M. (2008). *Everyday antiracism: Getting real about race in school*. New York: New Press: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Reisman, A., Kavanagh, S. S., Monte-Sano, C., Fogo, B., McGrew, S. C., Cipparone, P., & Simmons, E. (2018). Facilitating whole-class discussions in history: A framework for preparing teacher candidates. *Journal of Teacher Education, 69*(3), 278–293. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117707463>

- Richmond, G., Bartell, T., Carter Andrews, D. J., & Neville, M. L. (2019). Reexamining coherence in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 70(3), 188–191. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487119838230>
- Rogers, R., & Mosley, M. (2008). A critical discourse analysis of racial literacy in teacher education. *Linguistics and Education*, 19(2), 107–131. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2008.02.002>
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185–211.
- Schiera, A. J. (2019). Justice, practice and the “Real World”: pre-service teachers’ critically conscious visions for teaching amid the complexities and challenges of learning to teach. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 32(7), 929–946. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1609125>
- Sealey-Ruiz, Y. (2011). Dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline through racial literacy development in teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 8(2), 116–120. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15505170.2011.624892>
- Shim, J. M. (2014). Multicultural education as an emotional situation: Practice encountering the unexpected in teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 46(1), 116–137. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2013.834076>
- Shim, J. M. (2018). Working through resistance to resistance in anti-racist teacher education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 52(2), 262–283. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12284>
- Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. In S. Wilson (Ed.), *The wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach* (pp. 219–248). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *The Urban Review*, 34(4), 317–342. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021320817372>
- Solórzano, D. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical race theory, stereotyping, and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 24(3), 5–19. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-4765\(04\)00066-9](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-4765(04)00066-9)
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 23–44.

- Stevenson, H. (2015). Hearing the Lion's Story. *Teaching Tolerance*, 28–30.
- Stevenson, H. C. (2008). Fluttering around the racial tension of trust: Proximal approaches to suspended black student-teacher relationships. *School Psychology Review*, 37(3), 354–358.
- Tatum, B. (1992). Talking about race, learning about racism: The application of racial identity development theory in the classroom. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(1), 1–25. <http://doi.org/10.17763/haer.62.1.146k5v980r703023>
- Tatum, B. (1994). Teaching white students about racism: The search for white allies and the restoration of hope. *Teachers College Record*, 95(4), 462–476.
- Twine, F. W. (2004). A white side of black Britain: The concept of racial literacy. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27(6), 878–907. <http://doi.org/10.1080/0141987042000268512>
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20–32. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053001003>
- Warren, C. A. (2015). Conflicts and contradictions: Conceptions of empathy and the work of good-intentioned early career White female teachers. *Urban Education*, 50(5), 572–600. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0042085914525790>
- Yoon, I. H. (2012). The paradoxical nature of whiteness-at-work in the daily life of schools and teacher communities. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 15(5), 587–613. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2011.624506>
- Young, E. (2010). Challenges to conceptualizing and actualizing culturally relevant pedagogy: How viable is the theory in classroom practice? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(3), 248–260. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109359775>
- Zembylas, M., & Papamichael, E. (2017). Pedagogies of discomfort and empathy in multicultural teacher education. *Intercultural Education*, 28(1), 1–19. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2017.1288448>

**SEEKING SUPPORT IN TEACHER EDUCATION FOR RACIAL
KNOWLEDGE: THE ROLE OF PROFESSIONAL NETWORKS AND SOCIAL
IDENTITIES**

Abstract

This paper explores how institutions can provide support for TEs who teach about race. Drawing from the narrated experiences of TEs at different institutions, the author provides a comparative analysis of TEs' perceptions of various forms of professional support related to their work in teaching about race and racism. TEs varied in the extent to which they viewed their institution as supportive of these goals, and they identified factors that signaled to them that their institution supported teacher learning about race and racism. They described their perceptions of how peers, administrators, and the institution broadly worked towards these goals. First, they identified administrative alignment with social justice goals as a signal of the extent of support for their work. Second, they identified professional networks, both within and beyond their institution, as important tools and signals of support. Finally, TEs described how their racial identities and positional privilege related to tenure status informed their engagement with peers in terms of both providing support to others and seeking support.

Today, in institutions of higher education (IHEs), a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion is commonplace. Increasingly, diversity and social justice goals

have become part of corporate culture across industries, including higher education, but the implications of these espoused aims are less clear (Vertovec, 2012; Dobbin et al., 2011; Modan, 2008). The roots of diversity discourse are in more narrowly defined anti-discrimination work (Vertovec, 2012), but diversity initiatives in organizations have since expanded to include institutional goals that have broader aims around inclusion and social justice. However, these goals often are nested in corporate and financial goals, and at times the corporate and social justice aims of institutions have led to what have been identified as complex and conflicting motivations for institutions (Iverson, 2012; Patel, 2015).

Teacher education is positioned in a unique point of tension in this broader line of inquiry about the intentions and consequences of diversity policies and diversity discourse in IHEs. For decades, educational research has developed an increasing sense of urgency around the need for attending to educational inequity and supporting diverse learners in American public schools, and teacher education has been posited as a potential site for the disruption of these inequities (Milner, 2010; Nieto, 2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). However, teacher education programs have been critiqued as providing inadequate support for teacher learning about diversity, race, and racism (Berchini, 2017; Cochran-Smith, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Marx, 2004; Milner, 2017; Milner, Pearman, & McGee, 2013; Ohito, 2016). Scholars cite the failures of recruitment and retention of teacher-candidates (TCs) and teacher educators (TEs) of color (Ladson-Billings, 1999; Shim, 2014) as well as a lack of meaningful programmatic attention to power, privilege, race, and racism (Cross, 2005) as evidence of inadequate attention to these issues. This

research has made clear that having a stated commitment to diversity and social justice is insufficient for meaningfully supporting TCs' in developing racial knowledge and the skills needed to disrupt educational inequities (Berrey, 2011; King, 2016; Milner, 2010). Such work suggests that both *who* is in the program – i.e., the professional network developed through the institution – and *how* they engage with one another around program goals – i.e., the *organizational culture* and *structure* of the program – are equally as important as making an explicit commitment to diversity and social justice.

Increasingly, researchers have pointed to the need for better professional development for *teacher educators* (TEs) to meet these goals, along with more supportive programmatic structures that can sustain TEs as they develop their professional identities and expertise (Izadinia, 2014; O'Hara & Pritchard, 2008; Richmond, Bartell, Andrews, & Neville, 2019). This literature has acknowledged the need for more research that examines the professional development needs of TEs and the program reforms that best support TEs' development of teaching expertise. This gap in the literature is especially relevant for TEs who teach about race and racism and are often working against the grain in their institutions. Against the backdrop of ambiguous goals related to diversity, race, and inclusion, TEs whose core instructional goals relate to these very concepts might need unique attention. Further, attending to the needs of these TEs should take into consideration other aspects of social identity that have been shown to have relevance for workplace dynamics, such as race, gender, and positional privilege (Emerson & Murphy, 2001; Picower & Kohli, 2017). Thus, this study explores how, in the context of broader institutional diversity discourse, TEs who teach about race and racism identify sources of

support and how their social identities inform their experiences.

The research questions for this study are:

1. To what extent do TEs describe their institution as supportive of the work of teaching teachers about race and racism, and what factors do they identify as supportive?
2. In what way(s) do TEs' social identities affect their perceptions of their institution as supportive?

Literature Review

University-Based Teacher Education Programs for Racial Knowledge

In contemporary teacher education programs, many teachers receive some training related to race and racism, and recommendations for teachers to develop *racial knowledge* are increasingly being taken up in research on teaching and teacher education (Crowley & Smith, 2015; Hayes & Juarez, 2012; King, 2016, 2019; Leonardo, 2008). *Racial knowledge* generally refers to both historical racial knowledge and knowledge of contemporary sociopolitical and cultural racial issues. When used in reference to teaching, racial knowledge is also often a signifier of the race-related knowledge and skills a teacher will need to develop critical consciousness, build relationships with students/families of color, and respond to racially stressful classroom situations in a moment (An, 2017; Anderson et al., 2018); similar skills are sometimes referred to as *racial literacy* or *critical racial literacy* (Michael, 2015; Sealey-Ruiz, 2011; Stevenson, 2014). While a robust body of literature makes the case for supporting teachers' development of racial knowledge (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995, 1999, 2014;

Michael, 2015; Picower & Kohli, 2017; Tatum, 1992, 1994), and despite mounting evidence that race matters in schools (Bristol, 2015; Cochran-Smith, 1995; Villegas & Irvine, 2010), many teachers continue to express reticence to engage in discussions about race (Picower & Kohli, 2017; Sealey-Ruiz & Greene, 2015; Stevenson, 2014; SPLC, 2018). Thus, TEs who teach about race and racism continue to face challenges in practice (Matias, 2013; Howard, 2017; Sealey-Ruiz, 2017).

This disjuncture between the generalized recommendation to attend to race in teaching and the ongoing challenges experienced by TEs in their classrooms has raised important questions about how racial knowledge is incorporated into teacher education curricula in university-based teacher education (UBTE) programs. Critical race theory (CRT) offers a useful analytic lens for these questions. CRT centers analysis of social issues through the lens of race and acknowledges racism as deeply embedded in society both institutionally and interpersonally (Bell, 1980, 1992). CRT scholars have offered recommendations to better support teacher education for racial knowledge that focus primarily on (a) structural reforms at the program level in UBTE programs and/or (b) curricular reforms and critical reflection at the classroom level (Cross, 2005; Lowenstein, 2009; Milner, & Howard, 2013; Zeichner, 2010).

Program reform in teacher education for racial knowledge. In 1999, Ladson-Billings noted that the teacher educator workforce was largely white and monolingual, and these demographics have not changed significantly (USDOE, 2016). She suggested that increasing diversity in teacher education programs would require more clear definitions of “diversity” and more empirical research that examine the academic benefits

of diversity for teachers and students (p. 394). Milner and Howard (2013) argued that attention to diversity also needed to include initiatives related to teacher demographics, and they recommended studying programs that had demonstrated high success rates for recruitment and retention of teachers of color.

Scholars have also pointed to the need for broad restructuring of course sequences in teacher education programs to better integrate content and field experiences related to race, power, and privilege. Many teacher education programs have a single course that addresses topics related to diversity, inclusion, and equity in education (Bennett, 2001; Gorski, 2009), and scholars argue that this approach is insufficient to meet TCs' learning needs related to racial knowledge.

Teacher education classrooms. In addition to program-level examinations of teacher education, a significant body of literature has explored how teachers learn about race in individual teacher education classrooms. Much of this research is done by practitioner-researchers and provides meaningful insight through insider perspectives on both the challenges and the possibilities that exist in the field. These studies offer rich portraits of the experiences of individual teacher educators (TEs), often highlighting the role of program structure and collegial collaboration in either supporting or constraining possibilities for teacher educators. We have learned, for example, that when teacher educators attempt to make the abstract concept of White privilege a concrete reality for White teachers, it connects their identity to issues of oppression and racism, and this can be challenging (Cochran-Smith, 1995; Tatum, 1994). Relatedly, Pollock, Deckman, Mira, and Shalaby (2010) identify common tensions that arise for TCs and suggested that TEs

explicitly name and engage these tensions with their students through critical inquiry.

The need to better support TCs of color has been highlighted in research on teacher education (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2012; Gist, 2017), as well as the role of TEs' own positionality (Matias, 2016; Shim, 2014). More recent research has begun to examine the experiences of teacher educators themselves, acknowledging the importance of attending to the personal and professional needs of TEs to be able to improve teacher education (Matias, 2016; Picower & Kohli, 2017; Zembylas & Papamichael, 2017).

In general, research on teacher education often focuses at *either* the level of the teacher education program as an institution *or* at the level of individual teacher education classrooms. While some studies bridge this divide, few draw explicit connections between individual TEs and the structure of teacher education programs. More research is needed that considers the structure and function of teacher education at both the program level and the classroom level. Understanding the macro- and micro- structures of teacher education are important for making sense of the behaviors and motivations of individual TEs and for developing systems of support that can ultimately improve teacher education.

Theoretical Framework

Research on teacher education is largely focused on how programs can more effectively support and train teachers. Less has been done to explicitly examine the social world of TEs and how their social identities and professional identities affect their experiences as educators, especially for TEs who teach about race and racism. For these TEs, too, the broader organizational culture related to diversity and inclusion might

influence their expectations of the organization and shape their behavior in the workplace, given the content of what they teach. Drawing from social identity theory and organizational studies on diversity in the workplace, I develop a theoretical framework for support factors that are important for TEs who teach about race and racism.

Social Identity in the Workplace: Seeking Support, Affirmation, and Stability

A robust body of research explores the significance of identity for organizational culture, which is defined as a set of beliefs, values, and assumptions that are shared by members of an organization (Schein, 2010). In organizational studies, scholars have explored links between individual beliefs and behaviors and broader organizational culture. Individual identity, which has been described as a “collection of personality traits” and other “core concepts” of the self (Korte, 2007) has traditionally been understood as a primary driver of behavior, but research in organizational studies has also focused on the interaction between personal identity and social identity (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995; Korte, 2007). *Social identity theory* (SIT) focuses on the role of social identities, such as racial or religious identities, in informing individual behavior. SIT describes social identities in terms of “in-group” and “out-group” prototypes and posits that group members are motivated to behave in ways that favor acceptance in and identification with the in-group (Hogg et al., 1995). This motivation stems from a desire for a sense of pride, involvement, stability, and/or meaning (Korte, 2007, p. 170). Thus, through identification of the behavioral norms, patterns of speech, attitudes, and beliefs associated with a particular social identity, an individual begins to “accentuate” perceived similarities between themselves and other group members as well as perceived

differences between themselves and out-group members through a process called *self-categorization* (Sets & Burke, 2000, p. 225). Through self-categorization, individuals develop their social identity and solidify their membership in a social group. Korte (2007) explained that group membership is also not necessarily open to all. He wrote:

Individuals vary in their opportunity to join a group as a function of their readiness and fit... Groups are open to some and closed to others. In the process of categorization, individuals evaluate the accessibility of a group for them and, in turn, are assessed by the group for readiness and fit. One's history, personality, status, and opportunity constrain the choice of groups available. (p. 169)

SIT provides an explanatory framework for understanding how social identities inform individuals' assessments of both the self and of others through the accentuation of perceived norms related to in-group and out-group membership. These processes shape the behavior of individuals.

Social identities thus help explain why individuals at times display unique attitudes or behaviors when their social identities become salient within a particular context (Singh & Winkel, 2011). Shifting behaviors are important for understanding how group-level identities influence work experiences, particularly as work environments become increasingly diverse. Research on identity and organizational culture has examined how power and status mediate social relationships along axes of social difference and influence individual behaviors (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Singh & Winkel, 2011). Scholars have found, for example, that for racial minorities, changes in perceptions of mutual respect and psychological safety in the workplace lead to changes in behavior and shifting attitudes towards the organization (Singh & Winkel, 2011). This

research suggests that attention to salient social identities such as race is important for understanding or even attempting to change individuals' behaviors in the workplace.

In part, this research is useful because it has implications for organizational leaders who seek to increase social cohesion across difference within their organization. Emerson and Murphy (2001) explain that *social identity threat* is when different social groups “experience exactly the same physical setting in psychologically distinct ways because of the sociocultural and historical legacies tied to these groups” (p. 509). For example, the authors described a phenomenon known as lack of *critical mass*, when an organization has very few members of a particular racial group; for racial and ethnic minorities who “are vigilant to underrepresentation” (p. 509), this lack of critical mass is a “situational cue” that signals a lack of identity safety. They argued that stigmatized social groups are able to identify “situational cues” that signal either that their identity is threatened and devalued in the workplace or that their identity will be respected and affirmed. In an environment where the organization lacks a critical mass of a particular racial identity group, the authors suggest that one way managers can signal identity safety and affirmation to members of underrepresented racial groups is to “provide minorities with a broad network of role models, mentors, and sponsors” that help them “feel valued by their organization—and helps them advance” (p. 510). In general, the authors suggest that employers can develop practices that will signal to specific social groups that their identities will be respected and affirmed. Overall, research on social identity in the workplace indicates that group membership is significant for how individuals engage

with one another and also has implications for employers as they manage workplace relationships across boundaries of social difference.

Professional Identity and Professional Networks in Teaching and Teacher Education

While much of the research on social identities has often focused on group identifications such as racial and religious identities, SIT also is used for broader examinations of group differences in power and status, such as workplace hierarchies. Research on *professional identity* as a form of social identity has explored the ways in which individuals develop and modify behavior based on self-categorization related to their professional identities (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009), and professional identity has been defined as “the image with which the individual refers to himself as a professional, and is composed of the set of expectations developed by the individual regarding themselves and their abilities, based on their experiences and personal background, as well as on others’ expectations” (Avidov-Ungar & Forkosh-Baruch, 2018, p. 184). In educational research, studies of professional identity have largely focused on “teacher identity” as informing beliefs and behaviors for teachers in the workplace. Research in teacher education has explored how teacher educators develop their teacher identities in unique ways. Across these studies, professional networks have been identified as important for the development of teachers’ professional identities, as teachers construct identity through social interaction.

Teacher identity as professional identity. Like other conceptualizations of social identities, professional identities provide a shared set of attributes, values, etc. that

“enable the differentiation of one group from another” (Sachs, 2001, p. 153). Sachs (2001) wrote that teachers inhabit multiple professional identities and drew from Wenger (1998) in conceptualizing a teacher’s professional identity as “addressing the social, cultural, and political (micro and macro, individual and group) aspects of identity formation” (p. 154). Cherubini’s (2009) review of research on teacher identity highlights the role of enculturation in defining teachers’ identities. Cherubini cites Fuller (1969) in describing teachers’ professional socialization through a focus on self/professional competence, task/teaching practice, and impact/professional capacity. In addition to research on teacher identities, a growing body of research has explored how university faculty and teacher educators specifically develop their identity in the higher education context. In their review of literature on developing teacher identity in the university context, van Lankveld, Schoonenboom, Volman, Croiset, and Beishuizen (2017) found that several factors either enhanced or constrained university teachers’ identity development. In general, these factors were largely attributed to either organizational culture or institutional systems and structures. Organizational culture was sometimes perceived as constraining the development of teacher identities when universities were viewed as supporting beliefs about the perceived value of research as more important than teaching, or when faculty held a view of universities as organized around a “neoliberal management culture” (p. 330). Institutionalized systems and structures were described as enhancing teacher identity when “quality initiatives” such as awards and centers for teaching excellence were viewed as supporting the development of teacher identities (p. 331), and staff development activities also created capacity and increased

confidence for those who experienced uncertainty about their expertise as educators. In her review of research on developing teacher educator identity, Izadinia (2014) found that the concept of *self-categorization* was useful in understanding TEs challenges in developing a strong teacher educator identity. TEs felt that they needed to also identify as “academics” and “researchers” to be categorized as teacher educators, and uncertainty in recognizing themselves in those ways impeded teacher educator identity formation. More broadly, she found that TEs who felt uncertain in their skills, whether in teaching or in research, also struggled to form strong teacher educator identities.

The role of professional networks for teacher educator identity. Building professional networks was also identified as important for the development of professional identities and teacher educator identities specifically. Izadinia (2014) found that teacher educator identity development could largely be categorized in relation to either “self-support” or “community-support” activities (p. 432). She identified supportive contexts and communities as important for TES’ identity development. Specifically, activities like high quality induction programs, engaging in learning communities, and communal activities such as team planning and informal mentoring increased TEs’ feelings of support and enhanced their identity development. Similarly, van Lankveld et al. (2017) found that the work environment played an important role in either enhancing or constraining teacher identity based on perceptions of peer relationships. Teacher identities were enhanced when peer relationships were “collegial and supportive” and university teachers viewed themselves as “part of a team,” but the development of teacher identity was constrained when peer relationships lacked trust or

were perceived as competitive (p. 330). Overall, these findings suggest that professional networks within the work environment play an important role in developing and sustaining teacher educators' professional identity and feelings of support.

The Role of “Diversity Discourse” and “Diversity Perspectives” for Group Identification

While much of this research on social identity examines the behavior of individuals, these theories are also useful for uncovering insights about organizational culture. The beliefs and assumptions undergirding organizational culture are reflected in individuals' behaviors and can ultimately influence an organization's effectiveness (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Gregory et al., 2009). Understanding the impact of diversity and diverse perspectives on organizations is important for research on social identity and difference, particularly in its implications for organizational leaders who might seek to shift organizational practices related to diversity (van Dick et al., 2008, p. 1483). Ely and Thomas (2001) developed a framework for defining types of organizational “diversity perspectives,” which they define as “normative beliefs and expectations about cultural diversity and its role in their work group” (p. 234). These beliefs and expectations can be both *explicit*, as through written policies, and *implicit*, through assumptions underlying group structures. The authors found that organizations “diversity perspectives” are reflected in individuals' espoused perceptions of the organization and in their behaviors. They named three types of diversity perspectives: “integration-and-learning,” “access-and-legitimacy,” and “discrimination-and-fairness.” The first, an “integration-and-learning” perspective, “links diversity to work processes...in a manner that makes

diversity a resource for learning and adaptive change” (p. 240). Members of organizations that shared this perspective demonstrated an interest in both educating and learning from one another in a way that supports mutual development of “a range of cultural competencies that they can all then bring to bear of their work” (p. 242). The second, the “access-and-legitimacy” perspective, was based on the “recognition that the organization’s markets and constituencies are culturally diverse” which requires the institution to thus match that diversity in an effort to gain access and legitimacy with those constituents. While, from this perspective, cultural identity was a legitimate resource, there was a “relatively narrow definition of the value” of the cultural identities of racial minorities outside of providing access to consumer constituencies (p. 245). Finally, the “discrimination-and-fairness” perspective was characterized by viewing diversity as a “moral imperative to ensure justice and fair treatment” of members of society and of members of the organization (p. 245). This perspective differed from the other two in that there was no link between the value of diversity and work processes, and overall this perspective tended to emphasize colorblind perspectives because of a focus on “equality” and “being fair” to all members of the organization, regardless of identity (p. 246). Thus, even as each view of diversity might project a generalized *explicit* orientation of valuing diversity and inclusion, the differences are highlighted through expectations and behaviors of organizational members. Relatedly, van Dick et al. (2008) describes organizational beliefs about diversity as “pro-diversity” or “pro-similarity.” The authors write that “diversity beliefs” are “the extent to which there is value in diversity (or similarity),” and in this study diversity beliefs were measured in relation to specific

tasks. They found that group members with pro-diversity beliefs favored working in heterogeneous groups over homogenous groups, and the authors believed that diversity beliefs were driven by societal norms and individual prejudices. These constructs of “diversity perspectives” and “diversity beliefs” offer insight into how differences in beliefs about diversity in the workplace are enacted.

In institutions of higher education (IHEs), “diversity” as a concept has been described as intentionally ambiguous in ways that is strategic for these institutions (Berrey, 2015). “Diversity discourse” also has been critiqued as sustaining Whiteness in ways that advance the corporate aims of IHEs but that are actually in conflict with the substantive messages of diversity, inclusion, and social justice. Patel (2015) describes “contemporary initiatives for diversity as... [reflecting] a desire for the appearance of diversity without unseating structural inequity” (p. 658). In this sense, critiques of the use of “diversity” in IHEs have most closely aligned with an analysis of these institutions as utilizing an “access-and-legitimacy” perspective, where diverse individuals are incorporated into the institution in ways that are strategic for the institution but not as individuals that can substantively contribute to the organization (Berrey, 2011). Berrey (2011) writes that often in IHEs, commitments to diversity entail “at once, a focus on race and a shift away from race” (p. 577). Overall, this research suggests that diversity discourse has a significant impact on members of an organization. More research is needed that examines how individuals within an organization respond to, resist, or affirm the messages about diversity that they receive from their organization. In teacher education, this work has special relevance because of the emphasis on education as social

justice work (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002; Milner & Howard, 2013; Picower, 2011). For schools of education and especially teacher education as a field, then, we might expect diversity perspectives to have particular salience. Understanding how TEs' expectation and behaviors reflect these diversity perspectives, or perhaps reflect resistance or challenges to these perspectives, is an important and understudied area of research in teacher education.

Method

This qualitative interview study draws from data from a larger study of the pedagogy of teacher education for racial knowledge. Focusing on the work of TEs who teach about race and racism, this study uses qualitative methods to engage in a cross-institutional examination of teacher educators' narrated experiences teaching about race and racism to understand the role of program structures, professional networks, and institutional power dynamics as affecting TEs' experience of institutional support for their work.

Participants

TEs for the study were recruited using purposive sampling and recommendations via snowball sampling. Sixteen TEs were recruited for the study and represented diversity across a number of axes that were captured through an online recruitment survey. All TEs had experience teaching about race in predominantly White teacher education programs. This study did not focus on the experiences of TEs who worked at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) because of an expected difference in institutional history and student demographics, although future studies of this nature might include or

exclusively examine this TE population. The TEs for this study were recruited via snowball sampling using recommendations through a network of educators and an online survey to assess selection criteria. Recruitment emails were sent out through education networks to solicit initial recommendations, and recommended experts were invited to complete a selection survey and to recommend additional participants. Selection criteria included: (a) being teacher educators with experience teaching in predominantly White teacher education programs; From the participants in the larger study, a smaller sample of TEs were selected for this study who focused specifically on teaching about race, diversity, and social justice in a “foundations” course and were full-time faculty at a university-based teacher education program. Often titled something like “Social Foundations of Education” or “Diversity and Equity in Schools,” these courses cover content related equity issues such as segregation, achievement/opportunity gaps, and school discipline. In a university-based teacher education program, these courses are typically the primary source of information for teachers about issues of justice, equity, and diversity in education. In these courses, TEs typically have autonomy to construct their own syllabus and choose to cover a range of topics related to inequality in schools, diverse social identities, and racism. TEs usually focus on identities such as race, gender, and sexuality. While some TEs described having course content prescribed by their schools or state, most had autonomy to make decisions about how to structure their course. For this study, TEs who only teach disciplinary methods courses and who were not full-time faculty were excluded for analysis in this study to focus on the institutional experiences of isolation for TEs who teach “Diversity and Equity” courses as full-time

members of an organization. Demographic characteristics of participants are summarized in the table below.

Table 3.1. Participant Demographics.

Name*	Gender	Race	Years Exp.	Institution Type	Status	Level of Students ⁺
Paul	M	B	6	Private	Tenure-track	UG
Terri	F	W	17	Private	Tenured	UG / M / IS
Kia	F	B/W	6	Public	Tenure-track	UG / M / MA
Catherine	F	W	7	Public	Clinical	MA
Frederick	M	W	10	Public	Tenured	M
Molly	F	W	10	Public	Tenured	UG / M / MA
Haley	F	B	11	Public	Tenure-track	UG / M / IS
Joanne	F	W	16	Public	Tenured	UG / M

*All names are pseudonyms.

⁺UG – Undergraduate (pre-service teachers)

M – Traditional Masters program (pre-service teachers)

MA – Alternative certification / non-traditional Masters program

IS – In-service teachers

In the final participant pool, 5 of 8 TEs identified as White and 3 identified as Black (1 of whom also identified as biracial Black/White). Six TEs identified as women and 2 as men. The average number of years of experience was 10 years. Six of 8 TEs taught at traditional public universities and 2 taught at private universities. Three of the sixteen TEs for this study taught at Hispanic-serving Institutions (HSIs). The universities at which they teach vary greatly in program structure, from student demographics to program structure; some of these differences in program structure are captured in the final column, which indicates the program level of students that each participant taught. As is evident in Table 1, many teacher educators work with teachers across multiple levels, from pre-service novice teachers to in-service teachers with years of experience.

Data Sources

Data sources for this study include two interviews and classroom artifacts such as course syllabi and assignment descriptions. The first interview, a personal history interview, asked TEs to review their personal and professional trajectories into their current role and to describe their current institution, including descriptions of colleagues, students, and perceived power dynamics within the institution (Appendix A). In the second interview, a teaching interview, TEs described their approach to instruction, including conceptualizations of racial knowledge and strategies for teaching about race and racism. In addition, descriptions of the social justice aims of universities were triangulated through review of public websites of each university.

Data Analysis

Data for this study was coded during two rounds of coding using the Atlas.ti coding software. The initial round of coding was used to identify themes using open analytic coding methods (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). From these initial codes, I developed a new set of code categories, and a second round of coding was used to refine code categories and subcodes. This second round of coding involved iterative application and refinement of pattern codes. One theme that emerged in this round was “Institutional Context,” and data for this study was drawn from this theme. Codes applied for contextual factors included: “institution-diversity”; “power”; “colleagues”; and “program-structure” (See Appendix F).

Validity

For any qualitative study, a range of factors must be considered to assess the quality of the work. Tracy (2010), drawing from the work of many scholars, offers eight

criteria for “qualitative quality,” including *self-reflexivity* and *triangulation*. In this study, I wrote reflexive memos during data collection and analysis to critically examine how my assumptions and biases might influence the research methods and analysis for the study, and I triangulated the data across three different types of data sources. For this small-scale qualitative study, the findings are not generalizable, but my hope is that a cross-institutional examination of teacher educators’ experiences enhances the reliability and validity of analysis of their narrated experiences and can offer insight for teacher education for racial knowledge.

Findings

In identifying sources of support within their institutions, the TEs in this study situated their own work of teaching about race and racism in relation to broader institutional goals related to diversity and social justice. All TEs identified their institutions as having a set of goals related to race, diversity, and social justice, and university “diversity statements” were cross-referenced on the public websites of each university. Across the universities represented in these studies, the public diversity statements were readily accessible, and stated diversity aims were very similar. Schools described themselves as “respecting individuals,” “respecting difference,” “welcoming,” “inclusive,” and “valuing diversity.” Stated aims included goals such as diversifying the workforce and student body, “fostering tolerance” or supporting inclusion, and “pursuing justice.” Websites generally listed links to organizations on campus such as multicultural centers and cultural student clubs, campus events, or other organizations on campus described as supportive resources. For 6 of 8 universities, websites offered links to

official campus policies related to discrimination, bias, and harassment. Three of 8 schools linked to a detailed strategic plan or diversity report developed by the institution with more specific and thorough goals.

TEs varied in the extent to which they viewed their institution as supportive of these goals, and they identified factors that signaled to them that their institution supported teacher learning about race and racism. They described their perceptions of how peers, administrators, and the institution broadly worked towards these goals. First, they identified administrative alignment with social justice goals as a signal of the extent of support for their work. Second, they identified professional networks, both within and beyond their institution, as important tools and signals of support. Finally, TEs described how their racial identities and positional privilege related to tenure status informed their engagement with peers in terms of both providing support to others and seeking support.

The Role of Administration in Signaling Alignment To Diversity Discourse.

While none of the TEs described their administrators as vocally resistant to the espoused diversity and inclusion (D&I) goals of their institution, TEs varied in the extent to which they viewed their organizational culture as in alignment with its espoused aims. About half (4/8) of TEs expressed some skepticism about whether they had support that went beyond discursive or superficial support for teacher learning about race and racism, and they viewed administrators and program leaders as playing an important role in signaling support for this work. The other TEs did feel that they were part of a “team” and felt that administrators and program leadership signaled alignment to shared aims related to teaching teachers about race and racism. These TEs described experiences that

represented “pro-diversity beliefs” (van Dick et al., 2008) and “integration-and-learning” diversity perspectives (Ely & Thomas, 2001), which emphasized the value of diverse perspectives as integral for organizational learning.

Haley, for example, was a Black woman who had been at her current institution for six years. She described feeling that her school was authentically committed to its espoused goals related to justice, diversity, and inclusion. She said that this sense of support became especially salient for her when she began to visit colleagues at other institutions. She elaborated further:

I don't think that the College of education's mission and goals around social justice are unique. But whenever I leave this space, I realize how unique it is. ... The more that I talked to folks in the outside of [our school] ... I think that as a wider university and as a college that folks truly do work towards social justice aims. I think everyone has a different role to play in that work, but I think it's not only thinking about: “How does it play out in our curriculum?” “Who are we having our students read?” “Where we having them learn how to teach?” But also there's some of the larger structural aspects that need to change. (Interview #1)

She described these questions as types of conversations that came up within her department as they considered how to prepare teachers. She also noted that her school had recently adjusted admissions criteria to eliminate some standardized testing requirements, and she highlighted recruitment initiatives that explicitly focused on increasing representation for faculty and students of color. For Haley, these structural changes indicated alignment between institutional diversity discourse and the practices that supported diversity and inclusion goals and also signaled that university leaders understood the need for both stated commitments to justice and to programmatic, structural change. In addition, Haley had a positive experience with her administration on a personal level. She described how important administrative support had been for her

when she first arrived at the school as a program director for one of the teacher education programs that focused on supporting urban teacher preparation. She explained:

[Our dean] is highly supportive of my work. When I came here as a director, it really worked out well that ... I met with [the Provost] monthly. And so I feel like when I see him, he knows me and will ask me questions and will be interested in knowing what do we need to do to improve, you know, the work that [I'm] doing. So I feel highly supported in those ways. (Haley, Interview #1)

She also mentioned that she had a positive relationship with her school dean, and for her, these frequent personal interactions with administrators were useful as opportunities for Haley to share feedback, questions, and concerns about the progress of her program. These relationships also signaled to her that administrators supported her work and were invested in her programmatic and instructional aims.

Other TEs described how they had become involved in leadership roles within their schools and engaged in collective advocacy to actually change leadership structures within their schools. Thus, being able to collaboratively advocate for programmatic change related to race and diversity was identified by some TEs as important for supporting their work. These experiences demonstrated an “integration-and-learning” diversity perspective (Ely & Thomas, 2001) within the organization, where overall the members of the organization shared the belief that diverse cultural experiences enhanced work quality. These TEs played an active role in making programmatic change related especially to demographic diversity, and they felt supported by their peers and administration. Terri, a White TE who had been teaching for seventeen years, described how becoming part of an Equity Committee within her school was an important experience for her in seeing how the institution and school leaders supported her work.

Her dean supported an initiative to provide scholarships that supported the recruitment and retention of teacher-candidates of color, and the Equity Committee was able to advocate for adding a representative from their committee to every faculty-hiring search. But she also noted that when she first arrived at the school, “the dean was not interested, then the next dean was not at all interested in this work; now the dean I’m working with is more interested and supportive. So it’s been a mixed bag” (Interview #1). Terri highlighted that perceptions of school leaders are important for TEs’ perceptions of whether or not their work is supported, and that individual school leaders can play an important role in supporting specific initiatives that TEs’ view as relevant for their work related to teaching about race and racism, such as recruiting and retaining TCs of color. In addition, Terri felt that her own involvement as part of a committee that advocated for change informed her understanding of the extent to which administrators were supporting diversity related goals.

Like Terri, Joanne described the importance of program leaders in reinforcing the social justice agenda of a program. Joanne was a White woman and had been at her current institution for nine years. When she first arrived at the school, Joanne felt that the notably White leadership was a barrier to the systemic changes needed to meet its social justice aims. When Joanne [moved into a more administrative role] *took on more leadership within the urban teacher programs*, she took on the responsibilities of running programs in addition to teaching, and she was able to participate in decisions about how to shift the composition of the leadership team *along with the composition of faculty and mentor teachers in the program*. In this role, she [focused on] *supported the group*

in increasing the diversity of the leadership team, and by the time of our interview, the majority of Joanne's colleagues in program leadership were women of color. For her, focusing on program-level change made an "awesome shift" in her experience. She described advocating for "reshaping who students were, who the faculty were and where we were placing our students in the city" (Interview #1). Joanne felt that the new leadership team, which was predominantly women of color, brought a justice lens as well as knowledge of local schools in a way that was "very powerful." For Joanne, two aspects of her experience validated the school's commitment to their espoused goals related to diversity and social justice. First, she was able to collaborate with peers to engage in advocacy towards a justice-oriented goal—in this case, increasing diversity by shifting the demographics of program leadership, *faculty and mentors* to attract and retain more women of color. Second, having a leadership team comprised primarily of women of color affirmed the "integration-and-learning" diversity perspective; the resultant programmatic shifts that occurred after shifting leadership demographics demonstrated the utility of elevating diverse perspectives. This example shows that explicit support from program leaders for initiatives that align to diversity goals are viewed as signals of support for the work of teaching about race and racism.

In contrast, Catherine described her institution as a place where faculty sometimes faced repercussions or consequences for challenging structures that perpetuate racism and inequity in their work. Catherine was a White woman working at an urban teacher residency program that offered an alternative certification Masters program, and she was one of the TEs who expressed skepticism about the institutional commitment to social

justice. She questioned whether or not the program leaders' goals were in alignment with her and other faculty who worked more closely with teachers directly in schools. She felt that upper-level administrators were disconnected from the issues that teachers faced, and she believed that the administration was sometimes a "big hurdle" if they didn't "want this work to happen, for whatever reason: them not wanting to get sued; or because they don't think it's important themselves" (Interview #2). Catherine highlighted the administration as sometimes prioritizing financial concerns over what she viewed as more equity- and justice-oriented concerns that she and some of her teachers had. Frederick described similar institutional politics at his university. Frederick was a White male who had been teaching at his university for ten years, and he was in a leadership position within his department. Like Catherine, he also critiqued upper level administrators who were responsible for managing diversity initiatives as heavily influenced by financial interests and local politics. Overall, these findings suggested that despite relative consistency around *explicit* social justice or diversity goals across institutions, TEs experienced variance in the ways institutions enacted these goals, and they viewed administrators as having the capacity to signal program alignment to these broader goals through program initiatives, opportunities for collaboration and engagement, and leadership structures.

Drawing Support From Professional Networks: Accentuating Shared Social Identities

TEs varied in the extent to which they identified their peers as a source of support in teaching teachers about race and racism. TEs also identified the importance of building

professional networks with other justice-oriented teacher educators beyond one's own institution through formalized and purposeful collaboration.

Collegial networks within the institution as sources of support. Catherine identified a lack of alignment with her administration, but she frequently described a strong sense of alignment with her colleagues and offered examples of giving and receiving support from her peers. Like her, many of her peers wished that the organization had a “more radical” and “more purposeful” approach to justice-oriented work, and Catherine described these members of the organization as engaged in what she called “creative disruption” to try to challenge the administration to take a more justice-oriented approach (Interview #1). In addition to this broader sense of a shared interest in social justice and equity, Catherine also described how she worked collaboratively with her peers to use a racial lens and a critically conscious lens when making curricular modifications. For her, working with a supportive team gave her the confidence to engage in curricular innovation. Catherine co-taught a social foundations course and co-planned with another team of instructors. One of the teachers, Leslie, who had grown up in the city in which they taught, suggested reorienting their curriculum to focus more on the local history of this particular urban context. Catherine described following Leslie's lead and their collaborative curricular decision-making process:

“In the end I felt like my colleague who made that decision, her name is Leslie, I feel like her making that decision was a really good decision. ... And then the group of us, we really went through and decided, all right, what's our objectives going to be, how are we going to focus on this. But we decided to stick with the, really focusing on the Black community in [this city]. I'm glad that we did that. But it was a challenge for me because I haven't taught diversity classes in that way and I was concerned about leaving people out. And I was a little nervous

too... So yeah, I was really grateful for her, you know, she took the initiative and she put herself out there.” (Catherine, Interview #2)

Catherine went on to share that this move to teaching a course centered on anti-Black racism became an important shift for her in helping her align her curriculum more with her own personal beliefs and teaching philosophy. As a second example, she described how her team planned together to address an issue of racial tension in one of their classrooms. It is also notable that the colleagues that Catherine, a White woman, most frequently cited as partners in her work were women of color: one a Black woman and the other a Latinx woman. Catherine’s positive experience with her colleagues point to her feeling of connection around a strong shared professional identity among her and her colleagues, and her emphasis on the contributions of their diverse perspectives suggested pro-diversity beliefs and an “integration-and-learning” diversity perspective.

Joanne also emphasized the importance of teamwork when describing how she engaged in the work of teaching about race and racism, and she described collegial support in terms of supporting students, collaborating on research projects, and reaching out for support from peers. Joanne said that being part of a team of teacher educators who shared a vision for teachers as critically conscious social justice educators was important to her. She shared an example, when they responded collectively to a student who was struggling with her development of her racial lens. Joanne explained how they approached the situation:

“Her mentor is a woman of color who told us about some of the issues that she was having with her. We were able to sit down with her as a team: her field advisor who has a very strong racial lens, a woman of color; me; her mentor; and the program director; to sit down and actually address it and be explicit and name, like, “what I’m hearing is a savior complex that you’re talking about right now.”

... In my old experience, this would have been an issue between me and the student, and it would have been a she said/she said, and I could have seen her going to my department chair and it becoming a whole thing. And now ... she got feedback from me; she got feedback from her field advisor; she got feedback from the director. ... Something like that *never* would have happened, I don't think, in the main program, you know? It just wouldn't have been enough [to draw attention]. "Is she turning in her lesson plan? Is she doing this, is she doing that?" All of these other things would have allowed her to continue or to get lost, whereas with this team it's like, "nope: it's not going to happen." Yeah, so it's you know, having that kind of backup and support especially, and other people to talk through these ideas. (Joanne, Interview #1)

Joanne went on to describe how their diverse backgrounds and perspectives—as parents, long-time residents of the area, and women of color—further enriched their ability to work together. Like Catherine, Joanne demonstrated a shared professional identity with her peers and a belief in the value of diverse perspectives as contributing to the quality of their work.

Not all TEs experienced high levels of identification with their colleagues. Some TEs described feeling that the collective "commitment to diversity" was not enacted in authentic ways in their colleague's teaching and research. Kia was a biracial woman who worked at a public institution in a large urban context. She described her school as big and bureaucratic, and she also noted that it was primarily a commuter campus and that many of her colleagues did not spend much time on campus. While she did not view this decentralization as a barrier to her work, and she highlighted the institution's "activist ideals" and the diversity of both her students and the faculty, she did raise questions about whether these ideals translated into "deeper" engagement with issues in her peers' classes. She said that, because of the demographic diversity of her colleagues, there were more folks "who are coming from backgrounds where they've dealt with being

marginalized” and thus have “a different understanding about the work,” so she did feel a sense of openness to the work when, for example, she presented at faculty workshops. But she expressed some uncertainty and said, “I get the sense that everybody’s like, sure, this is good, but just not necessarily bringing it into their content” (Interview #1). Kia’s concern was not necessarily an expression of misalignment with her peers, but she did not feel a strong sense of shared identity around the importance of teaching about race and racism.

Molly more explicitly expressed a sense of discouragement and isolation and a desire for a stronger professional network at her school. She said that she “would do better if I had colleagues to talk about these things with” (Interview #1). Molly had been teaching at her university for ten years. It was a large public institution in an urban context, and while she expressed generally positive feelings about her colleagues, she admitted feeling like she was the only one who cared about or talked about these issues. She said, “I don’t have anyone to think with me about what pre-service teachers need to know about these issues; there’s just no one else in the college interested in that” (Interview #1). About her institution, she lamented that “[my university] has no professional development” or that “there probably are [PD opportunities] but I have not” participated. These examples demonstrate that without collaboration with peers around activities related to teaching about race and racism, TEs note the lack of shared professional identity related to justice-oriented teacher education.

“Part of a collective”: External and cross-institutional professional networks. Developing external and/or cross-institutional professional networks, or

becoming “part of a collective,” was identified as an important tool for professional support by 4 of 8 TEs in the study. These TEs described strategies that they used to build cross-institutional connections with peers with shared interests. Notably, 3 of 4 TEs who described being engaged in cross-institutional collaboration were also those who identified as having relatively strong collegial networks within their institutions. In contrast, TEs who did not have strong collegial networks within their institution more often identified other forms of self-support but did not identify cross-institutional collaboration as useful resource for support. In other words, some TEs had multiple forms of community support, while others had none.

TEs in this study who were part of cross-institutional profession networks identified as being part of a formal “collective” or “collaborative” or described their frequent collaborative engagement with other researchers and practitioners with shared interests specifically around race and equity. Frederick, for example, had strong relationships with peers in his department but also developed practices for connecting and sustaining relationships with TEs and researchers across the country. To build his network, he frequently emailed researchers at other institutions after he read an article he liked. “If it’s a useful article, I email them and say, hey, just saw your piece, loved it, can’t wait to use it and cite it” (Interview #1). Like Frederick, Joanne also leveraged her research connections to strengthen her professional network. She described being with the “same crew” at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Annual Conference every year, and said that, as a group:

We have conferences, we go to each other’s conferences, we put on conferences ourselves together, and we’ve developed a shared analysis through that process.

We all kind of rely on each other's scholarship and each other's work. I think that's kind of the number one way that my own professional growth has been shaped. (Interview #1)

Their experiences highlighted how external, cross-institutional professional networks served as a source of support through research collaborations and related professional opportunities, such as conferences and publications. TEs also mentioned TE and teacher networks outside of academia as supporting their work as practitioners and as advocates for social justice more broadly. Joanne referenced her connections to educational justice organizing, and Haley described a range of smaller conferences that tend to cater to teachers of color or teacher educators who focus on urban teacher education. Two TEs had participated in fellowship programs that focused on educational equity in teacher education, and they frequently referenced these programs during our interviews as inspiring their curricular modifications. These examples suggest that external professional networks through educational organizing, conferences and workshops, and small-group collaboration have special utility for TEs who teach about race and racism.

Finally, some TEs explicitly warned against the danger of isolation. Haley, for example, said, "I think I would not be able to do this work as I do it today if I wasn't a part of multiple collectives" (Focus Group). She described these collectives as providing opportunities to be pushed in her reflective practice, to vent, and also offering a space to feel rejuvenated. In contrast, Molly expressed a desire for these kinds of connections but said that she did not know where or how to get more connected to other like-minded TEs. She shared that she had "read about other teacher ed programs where it feels like there's a whole bunch of people working together" and that, while her school had people who

share interests around specific disciplines, she didn't see that same sense of alignment around interest in justice and equity (Interview #1). She added, "I don't really even know where those conversations are." TEs descriptions of their experiences with or desires for collaboration outside of their institution highlight external professional networks as a desired source of support for teaching about race and racism. For these TEs, having a stronger sense of support from within the institution also correlated to being able to identify resources for support in external professional networks (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2: Types of Support for TEs

Name*	Race	Type of Support		
		Administrative / Program Leadership	Collegial (Intra-institutional)	External (Cross-institutional)
Molly	W	o	-	-
Paul	B	o	o	o
Catherine	W	-	+	o
Kia	B/W	o	-	+
Terri	W	+	o	o
Frederick	W	-	+	+
Haley	B	+	+	+
Joanne	W	+	+	+

- o no strong positive or negative association with perceived support
- negatively associated with perceived support
- + positively associated with perceived support

The Role of Identity for TEs

TEs' described how their personal identities informed their perceptions of support within the institution. White TEs who held tenure status described viewing themselves as advocates for other faculty members and engage in helping behaviors for their colleagues. This "advocate" identity was especially relevant for TEs who already had strong intra-institutional collegial networks. For three Black TEs in tenure-track

positions, racial identity was also salient, and they described being viewed as the “race person” within their organization. These TEs responded differently to the experience of being identified in this way and also related their identity as the “race person” to their particular institutional context. Importantly, the Black participants in this study were all in tenure-track positions, so more research would be needed to examine intersections of position and power for TEs with other racial identifications and positional privilege (e.g., Black TEs with tenure status). Overall, the findings from this study based on the experiences of these TEs suggest that racial identity and positional privilege influenced the way that these TEs identified sources of support and engaged with professional networks both as support for others and in seeking support from peers, and that these experiences were context specific.

TEs who identified as White and also held tenure status at their institution explained that they viewed their role as leveraging institutional power to support colleagues, and this was particularly true for TEs who already viewed themselves as part of a strong professional network within their institution. For example, Frederick, who identified the peers in his department as also social justice oriented, described the importance of “strategizing” with his peers who were faculty of color and/or non-tenured faculty around issues of race and justice. He identified the privilege he held as a White man with tenure and felt that it enabled him to “leverage things in a way that allowed space for other people to speak and be heard” (Interview #1). He described this sort of strategizing as both happening in the moment and requiring proactive planning with his colleagues, and characterized these experiences as collaborating with, not speaking on

behalf of, his colleagues of color, in developing strategic plans related to justice and diversity goals. Joanne described similar experiences and acknowledged that part of her ability to engage in this advocacy came from her own positional privilege being a White, tenured professor; she said these identities gave her “institutional power in a way I didn’t have before (Interview #1). She explained that this access to institutional power, in conjunction with the fact that “most of the work that I do is alongside women of color,” were the power dynamics that most enabled her to be part of a team that worked towards the stated social justice aims of the program. This awareness of the way that social identities related to race and tenure status related to power and access within the institution allowed these TEs to advocate for change within the school in ways that might accentuate the similarities between justice-oriented teacher educators and mitigate the potential identity threats for others related to race and positional privilege.

For Black TEs in this study, strategizing took a different form. These TEs described feeling that their peers viewed them as “the race person,” and they responded to this projected identity in different ways. As the only Black woman in her department and one of few people of color, Haley did feel that her racial identity was salient, and she was also aware of the power dynamic of being on the tenure-track. Even in the context of her relatively supportive environment, Haley noted that she felt that she played a particular role within her school:

I realized... I had to learn the culture. And I think that the longer that I've been here the more that I feel...[so] there's identity that you sort of think about within yourself, and how folks around you think about you that sort of informed your identity. And I think that as time has gone by that I realized, yep, I'm going to be the race person in the department. And I'm going to do that to my best ability.

And therefore, that means that I need to be confident no matter where I bring up issues around race. (Haley, Interview #1)

She went on to describe the ways that she tried to be strategic in naming race as an issue in faculty meetings, both being cognizant of and playing into her multiple identities as a junior faculty member, a Black woman, and the designated “race person.” Perhaps differently than her White colleagues, Haley’s identity within her institution was in part informed by “how folks around” her identified her. Notably, because of the relatively strong collegial network at her school, Haley took on this identity as the “race person” and said that doing so was bolstered by having support from peers with similar justice-oriented goals. When she spoke up about race and justice in faculty meetings, she felt supported by these colleagues who often advised and supported her, sometimes leveraging their institutional power based on their race or tenure status. Haley’s experience demonstrates a perhaps unique expectation for Black TEs around being the “race person,” but also the uniquely contextualized way that her professional network at her institution enabled her to strategically respond to this experience and take on this identity with the support of her colleagues.

Kia shared the experience of having been identified by others as the “race person.” She was a biracial (Black/White) woman, and she said that she had previously had professional experiences where “I wasn't trying to do the thing about race and racism, but it's like, oh you're going to do ‘the thing about race and racism.’ There's that idea that people of color can just do that” (Interview #1). However, Kia did not describe her current institution as a place where she felt her racial identity was particularly salient in shaping her colleagues’ perceptions of her as the “race person.” It is perhaps notable that

Kia also described her current institution as more racially diverse than Haley's, and in describing her colleagues, she noted that the demographic diversity of her faculty was something that she appreciated because she felt that her peers were more likely to understand and be open to her work.

Paul also identified himself as being categorized as a "race person" by members of his organization, but he was less certain about his own alignment with this identification and did not identify sources of support within his institution for responding to or negotiating this identity as the "race person." Paul was in his second year at the university, and he said that, being a Black male who taught predominantly White students, "I get why I get hired at most places. Because, you know, 'oh, he's black—he can come in here and teach a course on race'" (Interview #1). Paul shared that it seemed to be an expectation that he taught courses that would challenge his mostly White students about their Whiteness. He felt that this expectation, though not stated explicitly, was one placed on him by his department leaders and administrators. Because he was a younger faculty member on the tenure track, he also viewed these expectations as part of his early career evaluation. Paul elaborated:

In some ways I get evaluated based on my ability to [teach White students about race] well. I don't think they would ever say that, but it's understood that that's going to be vetted in the courses that I teach. And actually they want it, because it's you know, it's part of their kind of moral compass in a teacher education or education studies department. That they don't want to just prepare teachers who think certain ways about communities of color. (Interview #1)

For Paul, then, particularly as a Black male teacher educator, he felt assessed on this role as a "race person," that is, as a TE who teaches about race and racism, and, like Haley, he felt that this assessment was tied to his identity as a Black male. However, unlike Haley,

it generated some internal conflict to be identified in this way, even though he “understood” that it was an expectation. While he did share that he thought being able to teach about race “was why I was hired” (Interview #2), he did not describe having a strong sense of this professional identity or a desire to adapt to this role. He also did not identify any sources of collegial support for strategizing around this identity that had been ascribed to him. Rather, his uncertainty and ambivalence about the role and its expectations led to some frustration. He worried about the role of student evaluations and feared that his course would be either “too comfortable” or too “agitating” for his White students in ways that would negatively impact their evaluation of his teaching and ultimately his job security. Paul said that sometimes he had moments where he felt like, “This is not fun! I don’t enjoy this!” While Paul said that the department administrators “genuinely want to support” his growth and development, he also lamented that their expectations for what he should be aiming to achieve sometimes complicated his ability to define instructional goals for students related to race and racism. Overall, Paul seemed frustrated by the expectation that he would fill the role of being “the race person” in his department, and he also did not seem to identify any notable sources of support for strengthening this identity or fulfilling what he felt were the related expectations of this role.

Discussion

It remains clear that the work of teaching teachers about race and racism is challenging and that UBTE programs need to do more to support TEs who do this work. TEs in this study all saw their institutions as making explicit commitments to diversity

and social justice, but they differed in the extent to which they viewed their schools as truly committed to this work. It is this dissonance that is notable, because they were able to identify factors that they viewed as more or less supportive for their work in relation to these broader commitments to diversity and social justice. TEs identified their administrators and colleagues as playing a role in signaling support for teaching teachers about race and racism, and they looked for evidence of structural changes supported especially by administrators to signal alignment to diversity goals. They described the importance of collaboration with peers both within and outside of their institution as a form of community support that strengthened their shared identity and affirmed their sense of alignment to these goals. Their varied experiences suggested that those who have the strongest collegial networks are also best positioned to access external resources and cross-institutional professional networks for support. Unfortunately, it seems, the more isolated TEs are within their institution, the more isolated they remain; speaking generally, the TEs who felt the most supported identified their institutions as broadly aligned to social justice goals, and those who felt a sense of misalignment struggled to identify sources of support. Of course, these experiences were nuanced and not generalizable, but the findings from this study suggest that some programs are particularly supportive for TEs who teach about race, while others are not. More research is needed that explores the relationship between TEs' utilization of external professional networks in relation to intra-institutional professional support and examines how TEs, particularly those who experience isolation, can be better supported in accessing external resources.

Notably, those who had strong perceptions of support often described experiences shaped by “integration-and-learning” (Ely & Thomas, 2001) diversity perspectives, where their administrators, colleagues, and institutions seemed to share an understanding of the value that diverse perspectives bring to the *core work* of the institution. Diversity discourse has been critiqued as rhetoric that capitalizes on diverse individuals as mere representatives of inclusive institutions without any substantive commitment to structural changes that would authentically *include* those diverse individuals (Berrey, 2011; Iverson, 2012). While this remained true for some TEs in this study, other TEs perceived their institutions as engaged in practices that more authentically included diverse individuals and supported diversity goals. In doing so, these institutions were perceived as supporting the work of teaching teachers about race and racism. This variance was assessed by examining a range of factors, including the extent of structural change, demographic diversity, collegial support, and mutual collaboration and advocacy for justice-oriented goals. Overall, TEs did not describe support for their work in terms of a single strategy or checklist, but it is evident that administrators and colleagues can play a role in signaling to TEs who teach about race and racism that their work is supported and that programs can make concrete structural changes that align to diversity and social justice aims.

Finally, TEs highlighted ways that their own racial identities and tenure status affected how they strategized around seeking or offering support to peers, which underscores the role of social identities in mediating the significance of professional networks and professional identities for TEs who teach about race and racism. While

these findings are specific to the experiences of the individuals in this study, they point to broader implications for teacher education program reform. Even for TEs who share the common goal of teaching for racial knowledge, their experiences of professional support within their institution varied significantly based on their racial identities and tenure status, and perceived support was further moderated by the extent to which they already had access to a strong collegial network of support. Thus, more research is needed that examines how these factors—racial identities, professional identities, and professional networks for support—are interrelated and how we might develop an agenda for programmatic reform that better supports TEs who teach about race and racism.

Implications

These findings have important implications for teacher educators and teacher education programs broadly. For teacher educators, they point to the significance of participating in and building collaborative teams both within and beyond institutions. TEs' varied experiences suggest that, for teacher educators working in programs where they do not feel a sense of institutional support, it is important to seek out opportunities such as professional development organizations, conferences, and other teacher educator collectives that are engaged in similar work. The cross-institutional perspective and the emphasis placed on cross-institutional collaboration by TEs in the study also highlights a need for more research at this grain size in teacher education. Existing research in teacher education largely focuses at the level of a single classroom or single institution, and this approach offers rich portraits of the complexity of programmatic structures and individual teacher education classrooms. However, the findings from this study made

clear that an additional layer of professional interaction occurs across institutions in ways that deeply informs TEs' practice, and more work is needed that examines this additional layer of complexity in teacher education. Collaboration is a core feature of academic work, and future research in teacher education should systematically examine how cross-institutional collaboration is shaping the work of teacher educators.

Finally, the varied experiences of TEs' in this study demonstrate that, for IHEs, we need to learn more about how institutional diversity discourse plays a role in the experiences of faculty and students. Broad critiques of the vacuity of diversity discourse are important to push this conversation forward, and we need continued inquiry to develop nuanced perspectives of "diversity" work at IHEs. Some administrators are making meaningful structural changes at their schools to demonstrate that they understand how to align their programs to the stated diversity aims of their school. In the stories shared here, most of these changes required partnership with people of color and including people of color in leadership to learn from diverse perspectives and make meaningful programmatic improvements. It does not seem coincidental that those individuals who viewed their schools as aligned to social justice aims also described having positive experiences with advocating for systemic changes and initiatives that supported the increased recruitment and retention of teachers and teacher educators of color. Some small shifts in program structure, prioritization, and, perhaps most importantly, structures for professional and collegial support, create the organizational climate that signal to teacher educators who care about teacher education for racial knowledge that their work is important and will be supported. Program leaders and even

individual teacher educators can learn from these examples and consider how we might strengthen our teacher education programs and cross-institutional networks of support to create a culture in teacher education that supports the work of teaching teachers about race and racism.

APPENDIX F:
Codebook / Sample Quotations

Table 3.3: Codes – Institutional Context

Code	Description	Example(s)
Context: Institution- Diversity	References to diversity as concept and ideology within the institution.	<p><i>“teaching these equity and diversity classes often ends up being like, “here’s the day about sexuality, and here’s the day about gender, and here’s a day about language, and social class.” And how that feels both necessary and frustrating at the same time.”</i></p> <p><i>“I would say 60% of our faculty have like an actual something in their research and teaching focus on diversity issues, and then another 20-25% who at least pay lip service to it. They don’t necessarily know what they’re talking about, but at least they’re interested.”</i></p> <p><i>“I think there’s a good amount of people who say, oh, I do this my teaching, but if you really looked and tried to ask them to be specific about how they do it, you know, I don’t know, it might all in might all fall apart.”</i></p>
Context: Power	Description of how power, privilege, and oppression operate within the university as institution – particularly as relates to race, but also in relation to other issues.	<p><i>“And I can even benefit, the university could see me as an asset because I’m a white person who talks about race; that could be something that’s good for them. Like look, we have someone focusing on these diverse issues, a white person, you know? Or, so I could even get benefits from being a racially aware white person, you know?”</i></p> <p><i>“And so the way that that plays out in our department is, if we don’t have much state funding anymore, then tuition is one of the main ways that we generate revenue to keep everything going. And you generate more tuition if you have more students, and so you have to justify everything according to whether this will attract students right? Or compete for students, or—and those sorts of dynamics aren’t very good when you’re trying to figure out like, how do we create different sorts of communities, or how do we work together to take on problems.”</i></p> <p><i>“It’s just the nature of the position, when you don’t have tenure and you’re worried about losing your job, you’re not going to speak up to the dean and say no, I really think we need to do it this way, you know? You’re not as willing to have those kind of confrontational conversations.”</i></p>
Context: Colleagues	Descriptions of colleagues and co-teachers, specific experiences with colleagues/co-teachers, or reflections about how peers influence practice.	<p><i>“Um, well there’s been a lot of turnover in the last couple of years. So some of my really good buddies have left. We’re a predominantly white faculty. We just, you know, it’s pathetic if you ask—I mean, pathetic isn’t the word, it’s really horrible. That there are very few black and Latino faculty on our faculty. More, there are some Asian and Asian immigrant and Asian American faculty. And predominantly white. You know, I like my colleagues.”</i></p> <p><i>“But I think that across the entire university there’s a</i></p>

	<p><i>contingent of faculty, and we sort of all know each other, that when we're talking about social justice we have a particular focus on race. That's across disciplines, across the university. And then I think that there's a larger contingent of faculty that, when they say social justice, they mean all social identity categories, and that they might have a particular one that they focus on, whether it be gender, whether it be disability, whether it be sexuality."</i></p> <p><i>"The last thing I would just say is, this isn't my racial identity but it's my racial identity as a person, a white person who was attempting to take on you know these things in communion with others, right? It also leads to beautiful things then. So I feel like the people I'm working with, the people of color and the white people that I'm working with, I have the chance to have wonderful relationships with them because of that work."</i></p>
<p>Context: Program Structure</p> <p>Description of program structure and aspects of program that influence TE practice.</p>	<p><i>"Okay, the other thing for you to know is that we went from having three courses devoted to social studies to now we basically have one, and that one is now a combination elementary and secondary unless we have the numbers, the enrollment. So I used to, I used to have activities across these three courses, so I could do lots, like I did the opening the textbook activity and that forced them to get multiple perspectives. And I did—and now I'm having to cram a lot into one semester."</i></p> <p><i>"But the challenge for us in teacher ed, as I mentioned earlier is articulating that, codifying, what does that look like in a program? So right, so we just don't want that one multicultural education course, so I know for me it's easier to enter weave it into social studies because for me it's all about race and gender and difference, but we're learning from the students' perspective, they're not always seeing it as a kind of like a through line."</i></p> <p><i>"It felt like the teacher education program placed student teachers less and less frequently at neighborhood schools. And so, they were less and less frequently with schools where the students were all Black, predominantly Black or all or predominantly Latino/Latina."</i></p>

References

- Achinstein, B., & Ogawa, R. T. (2012). New teachers of color and culturally responsive teaching in an era of educational accountability: Caught in a double bind. *Journal of Educational Change*, 13(1), 1–39. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-011-9165-y>
- Allen, A., Hancock, S. D., Starker-Glass, T., & Lewis, C. W. (2017). Mapping culturally relevant pedagogy into teacher education programs: A critical framework. *Teachers College Record*, 119(1), 1–26.
- An, S. (2017). Teaching race through Asian-Crit-informed counterstories of school segregation. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 12(2), 210–231. <http://doi.org/10.1108/SSRP-05-2017-0023>
- Anderson, R. E., Jones, S. C. T., Navarro, C. C., Mckenny, M. C., Mehta, T. J., & Stevenson, H. C. (2018). Addressing the mental health needs of Black American youth and families: A case study from the EMBRace intervention. *International Journal on Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(898), 1–17. <http://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15050898>
- Andreasen, J. K., Bjørndal, C. R. P., & Kovač, V. B. (2019). Being a teacher and teacher educator: The antecedents of teacher educator identity among mentor teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 281–291. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.05.011>
- Atwater, M. M., Freeman, T. B., Butler, M. B., & Draper-Morris, J. (2010). A case study of science teacher candidates' understandings and actions related to the culturally responsive teaching of "Other" students. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 5(3), 287–318.
- Avidov-Ungar, O., & Forkosh-Baruch, A. (2018). Professional identity of teacher educators in the digital era in light of demands of pedagogical innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 73, 183–191. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.03.017>
- Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2009). Understanding teacher identity: An overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 39(2), 175–189. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03057640902902252>
- Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518 – 533. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-594X.2007.00242.x>

- Bennett, C. (2001). Genres of research in multicultural education. *Review of Educational Research, 71*(2), 171–217.
- Berchini, C. N. (2017). Critiquing un/critical pedagogies to move toward a pedagogy of responsibility in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 68*(5), 463–475. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117702572>
- Berrey, E. (2015) *The enigma of diversity: The language of race and the limits of social justice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berrey, E. C. (2011). Why diversity became orthodox in higher education, and how it changed the meaning of race on campus. *Critical Sociology, 37*(5), 573–596. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0896920510380069>
- Bristol, T. J. (2015). Teaching boys: towards a theory of gender-relevant pedagogy. *Gender and Education, 27*(1), 53–68. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2014.986067>
- Center, S. P. L. (2018). *Teaching hard history: American slavery*.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1995). Uncertain allies: Understanding the boundaries of race and teaching. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(4), 541–570.
- Conklin, H. G., & Hughes, H. E. (2016). Practices of compassionate, critical, justice-oriented teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(1), 47–60. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0022487115607346>
- Cross, B. E. (2005). New racism, reformed teacher education, and the same ole' oppression. *Educational Studies, 38*(3), 263–274. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15326993es3803_6
- Crowley, R. M., & Smith, W. (2015). Whiteness and social studies teacher education: tensions in the pedagogical task. *Teaching Education, 26*(2), 160–178. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2014.996739>
- Dobbin, F., Kim, S., & Kaley, A. (2011). You can't always get what you need: Organizational determinants of diversity programs. *American Sociological Review, 76*(3), 386–411. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0003122411409704>
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. a. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*(2), 229–273. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2667087>
- Emerson, K. T. U., & Murphy, M. C. (2014). Identity threat at work: how social identity threat and situational cues contribute to racial and ethnic disparities in the

- workplace. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 20(4), 508–520.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/a0035403>
- Fuller, F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), 207–226.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gist, C. D. (2014). A culturally responsive counter-narrative of effective teaching. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 9(4), 1009–1014.
<http://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-013-9537-0>
- Gist, C. D. (2017). Voices of aspiring teachers of color: Unraveling the double bind in teacher education. *Urban Education*, 52(8), 927–956.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915623339>
- Gorski, P. C. (2009). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(2), 309–318.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.07.008>
- Gregory, B. T., Harris, S. G., Armenakis, A. A., & Shook, C. L. (2009). Organizational culture and effectiveness: A study of values, attitudes, and organizational outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(7), 673–679.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.05.021>
- Hayes, C., & Juárez, B. (2012). There is no culturally responsive teaching spoken here: A Critical Race perspective. *Democracy & Education*, 20(1), 1–14.
- Hogg, M. a., Terry, D. J., & White, K. M. (1995). A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58(4), 255–269. http://doi.org/10.1207/S15324834BASP2402_2
- Howard, T. (2017). In Picower, B. & Kohli, R. (Eds), *Confronting racism in teacher education: Counternarratives of critical practice* (pp. 35-41). New York: Routledge.
- Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory into Practice*, 42(3), 195–202.
- Iverson, S. V. (2012). Constructing outsiders: The discursive framing of access in university diversity policies. *The Review of Higher Education*, 35(2), 149–177.
<http://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2012.0013>

- Izadinia, M. (2014). Teacher educators' identity: a review of literature. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(4), 426–441.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2014.947025>
- King, L. J. (2016). Teaching black history as a racial literacy project. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 19(6), 1303–1318. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1150822>
- King, L. J. (2019). Unofficial and unconventional social studies spaces for students of color. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 43(2), 91–95.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2019.03.001>
- Korte, R. F. (2007). A review of social identity theory with implications for training and development. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 31(3), 166–180.
<http://doi.org/10.1108/03090590710739250>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.
<http://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: a.k.a. the remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 74–85.
<http://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.p2rj131485484751>
- Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A Critical Race Theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 211–247.
- Leonardo, Z. (2008). Reading Whiteness: Antiracist pedagogy against White racial knowledge. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Justice in Education* (pp. 231–248). New York: Routledge.
<http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203887745.ch28>
- Lowenstein, K. L. (2009). The work of multicultural teacher education: Reconceptualizing White teacher candidates as learners. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 163–196. <http://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308326161>
- Marx, S. (2004). Regarding whiteness: Exploring and intervening in the effects of white racism in teacher education. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 37(1), 31–43.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/10665680490422089>
- Matias, C. (2016). *Feeling White: Whiteness, emotionality, and education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Matias, C. E. (2013). Check yo' self before you wreck yo' self and our kids: Counterstories from culturally responsive White teachers? . . . to culturally

responsive White teachers! *Interdisciplinary Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 68–82.

Michael, A. (2015). *Raising race questions*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Milner, H. R. (2008). Critical race theory and interest convergence. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 332–346. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108321884>

Milner, H. R. (2010). What does teacher education have to do with teaching? Implications for diversity studies. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 118–131. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347670>

Milner, H. R. (2017). Race, talk, opportunity gaps, and curriculum shifts in (teacher) education. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 66, 73–94. <http://doi.org/10.1177/2381336917718804>

Milner, H. R., & Howard, T. C. (2013). Counter-narrative as method: race, policy and research for teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 16(4), 536–561. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2013.817772>

Milner, H. R., Pearman, A., & McGee, E. O. (2013). Critical race theory, interest convergence, and teacher education. In M. Lynn & A. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education* (pp. 339–354). Routledge. <http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203155721.ch25>

Modan, G. (2008). Mango fufu kimchi yucca: The depoliticization of “diversity” in Washington, D.C. discourse. *City & Society*, 20(2), 188–221. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-744X.2008.00017.x.M>

Nieto, S. (2006). Solidarity, courage and heart: what teacher educators can learn from a new generation of teachers. *Intercultural Education*, 17(5), 457–473. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14675980601060443>

O’Hara, S., & Pritchard, R. H. (2008). Meeting the challenge of diversity: Professional development for teacher educators. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 43–62.

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

Patel, L. (2015). Desiring diversity and backlash: White property rights in higher education. *The Urban Review*, 47(4), 657–675.

- Picower, B. & Kohli, R. (2017). *Confronting racism in teacher education: Counternarratives of critical practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Pollock, M., Deckman, S., Mira, M., & Shalaby, C. (2010). "But what can I Do?": Three necessary tensions in teaching teachers about race. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(3), 211–224. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109354089>
- Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2016). *Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Richmond, G., Bartell, T., Carter Andrews, D. J., & Neville, M. L. (2019). Reexamining coherence in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 70(3), 188–191. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487119838230>
- Sachs, J. (2001). Teacher professional identity: Competing discourses, competing outcomes. *Journal of Education Policy*, 16(2), 149–161. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02680930116819>
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sealey-Ruiz, Y. (2011). Dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline through racial literacy development in teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 8(2), 116–120. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15505170.2011.624892>
- Sealey-Ruiz, Y. (2017). In Picower, B. & Kohli, R. (Eds), *Confronting racism in teacher education: Counternarratives of critical practice* (pp. 127-132). New York: Routledge.
- Sealey-Ruiz, Y., & Greene, P. (2015). Popular visual images and the (mis)reading of Black male youth: a case for racial literacy in urban preservice teacher education. *Teaching Education*, 26(1), 55–76. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2014.997702>
- Sets, Jan E.; Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology*, 63(3), 224–237. <http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X0629800>
- Shim, J. M. (2014). Multicultural education as an emotional situation: Practice encountering the unexpected in teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 46(1), 116–137. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2013.834076>
- Shim, J. M. (2018). Working through resistance to resistance in anti-racist teacher education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 52(2), 262–283. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12284>

- Singh, B., & Winkel, D. E. (2011). Racial differences in helping behaviors: The role of respect, safety, and identification. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 106(4), 467–477. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1011-x>
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of Whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 94–106. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487101052002002>
- Stevenson, H. (2014). *Promoting racial literacy in schools: Differences that make a difference*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Tatum, B. (1992). Talking about race, learning about racism: The application of racial identity development theory in the classroom. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(1), 1–25. <http://doi.org/10.17763/haer.62.1.146k5v980r703023>
- Tatum, B. (1994). Teaching white students about racism: The search for white allies and the restoration of hope. *Teachers College Record*, 95(4), 462–476.
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837–851. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410383121>
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service (2016). *The state of racial diversity in the educator workforce*. Washington, D.C.
- van Dick, R., van Knippenberg, D., Hägele, S., Guillaume, Y. R. F., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2008). Group diversity and group identification: the moderating role of diversity beliefs. *Human Relations*, 61(10), 1463–1492. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708095711>
- van Lankveld, T., Schoonenboom, J., Volman, M., Croiset, G., & Beishuizen, J. (2017). Developing a teacher identity in the university context: a systematic review of the literature. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 36(2), 325–342. <http://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1208154>
- Vertovec, S. (2012). “Diversity” and the social imaginary. *European Journal of Sociology*, 53(03), 287–312. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S000397561200015X>
- Villegas, A. M., & Irvine, J. J. (2010). Diversifying the teaching force: An examination of major arguments. *The Urban Review*, 42(3), 175–192. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-010-0150-1>

- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20–32.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053001003>
- Wenger, R. (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347671>
- Zembylas, M. (2003). Emotions and teacher identity: A poststructural perspective. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 9(3), 213–238.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/13540600309378>
- Zembylas, M., & Papamichael, E. (2017). Pedagogies of discomfort and empathy in multicultural teacher education. *Intercultural Education*, 28(1), 1–19.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2017.1288448>

CONCLUSION

This examination of pedagogical practices across institutions demonstrated that there are many similarities in the ways that teacher education for racial knowledge occurs across sites. Thus, we see that much can be learned from cross-institutional analysis of teacher educators' experiences and pedagogical practices. A next step would be to continue cross-institutional studies with richer portraits of TEs' classrooms that include more data triangulation, such as videos of classrooms and data from teacher-candidates, including surveys and interviews. Ultimately these studies could also incorporate assessments of TCs' learning throughout a semester to compare TEs' teaching practices with TCs' learning. This research agenda provides one pathway forward for research on teacher education for racial knowledge.

Offering insight for teacher educators as practitioners and researchers was certainly one aim of this project, but these findings also have important implications for programs that should not be overlooked. Across the three papers presented here, there are clear imperatives for university-based teacher education programs to make significant structural changes to better support the work of teaching teachers about race and racism. First, we saw clearly that institutions must be purposeful in supporting those who teach about race and racism by providing access to professional networks and creating environments where the key aims of their work are supported. This support currently exists through explicit diversity goals but must be supported through the practices and organizational culture that demonstrate alignment to these goals.

One important starting point could be a deeper exploration of the role of emotion for teachers broadly, specifically but not exclusively as it relates to race. The TEs in this study engaged in important work supporting teachers to develop their understanding of racialized emotions. This work highlights, however, how little practice teachers get to attend to emotions *at all*. Despite the broad claim that “building relationships” and caring for students is important to the work of teaching, university-based teacher education programs do little to support teachers in developing practices and skills that support emotional health. When teachers enter schools, which are largely institutions that reproduce social inequality and draw attention to the kinds of issues raised in “Social Foundations” courses, their need for emotional literacy and emotional health becomes readily apparent. In other words, the TEs who teach about race and racism are preparing teachers not only for the work of thinking about race in schools but for the work of teaching more generally. To better prepare teachers, teacher education programs need to attend to the emotional work of teaching.

Finding that the TEs in this study were so deeply attentive to emotion was both very important and also, upon reflection, perhaps the only possible route for those who teach about race and racism in deeply meaningful ways. We hold an understanding of our own position within and against White supremacist educational institutions, particularly as educators who carry the responsibility of caring for and supporting the educational development of youth. At the same time, we continue to develop our understanding of the horrific patterns of racist, classist, and gendered trauma that have repeatedly sustained the social reproduction of inequality in ways that make our fight for justice feel both

incredibly important and incredibly overwhelming. TEs who understand these things together know the importance of supporting teachers in acknowledging and responding to their own emotions as part of the work of teaching. Further, as we aim to build the critical consciousness of youth, attending to their emotions too, is a part of that work. Racial-emotional pedagogy builds on an understanding of the nuances of how this emotional work draws on racial histories and the racialization of emotion. The complexity with which TEs in this study and TEs who teach about race and racism engage this pedagogy with teachers is an important contribution to teacher education and should be explored further in research on teacher education for racial knowledge.

This study also offers a hopeful perspective about the role of institutions in realigning diversity perspectives in an institution. The TEs in the study affirmed findings from other contemporary research that show that most IHEs do have an explicit commitment to diversity and social justice. The findings from this study indicate that in at least some cases, teacher educators feel that their institutions are indeed committed to these ideals. The broad skepticism in the field, however, about the authenticity of diversity discourse, suggests that these experiences are not the norm. Teacher education programs can learn from this study and continue to critically inquire about the sense of misalignment between espoused diversity goals and implicit diversity beliefs as they are experienced by members of their institution. If some TEs feel supported in their work as part of a team of justice-oriented teacher educators, we can learn from programs that offer this support.

We also must put these programs, and all of teacher education as a field, in appropriate context. We know that IHEs are White supremacist institutions, and we see through the work of the TEs in this study that trying to disrupt White supremacy as a political system from within White supremacist institutions is inherently tense. TEs who teach about race and racism grapple with these tensions directly in their curriculum and instruction. We can learn from this honest confrontation with the challenge of facing the inherent tensions of anti-racist and resistance work. It often raises difficult questions about our own positionality, identity, and the utility of the very work that we do. But more authentic engagement with these questions presses us towards a criticality that shifts our orientation, perhaps uncomfortably, and requires us to continually reflect on the effectiveness of our anti-racist efforts. As educational researchers, we can be emboldened and inspired by the challenge of finding ways to more authentically engage in the project of dismantling White supremacy, even and precisely as we work from within White supremacist institutions.

While this dissertation study focused on the ways that White supremacy shows up in the daily work of teacher education, its broader implications are in the interconnectedness of all educational work in the larger sociopolitical systems within which we live. One aim of this work has been to illuminate these connections and hold teacher education as a field to a deeper accountability to all of the communities that are affected by our work. If we do not engage our work as social justice work, it has consequences that go beyond the walls of our institutions. We can be committed to justice projects that seek “radical social change” (Tuck & Yang, 2018, p. 9-10) through

social justice in education, but such a commitment requires that we continue to imagine and work towards a vision of something better than what we have. If we are going to move within White supremacist institutions with complicity, we must minimally ask critical questions that point us away from the daily actions that reinvigorate this system and towards actions that could ultimately dismantle it.

References

- Tuck, E. & Yang, W. (2018). *Toward what justice? Describing diverse dreams of justice in education*. New York: Routledge.

APPENDIX A:
Interview Protocols

Interview #1

Background

1. Tell me about yourself. Where did you grow up? What kind of school did you attend as a child?
2. What were the racial dynamics like at your school growing up?
3. What led you to a career in education?

Career Trajectory

4. And how did you end up at your current school?
5. What is your current title, and how long have you been in this role?
6. Could you describe your current role as a teacher educator and how you ended up taking on this work within your school?
 - a. Had you been a teacher before?
 - b. Who do you teach and how frequently do you teach them about race and racism, and in what context?
7. Have you had any professional development related to your role teaching about race and racism?
 - a. If so, where/when and for how long, and how did you get connected to the opportunity?
 - b. Do you wish you had more professional development opportunities related to teaching about race and racism? What would that look like?
8. Anything else you want to share about your pathway into this current role?

Context

9. Tell me more about where you work. How would you describe the school? Its values and mission? Some of the practices and programs that really stand out? How would you describe the students at the school?
10. Tell me about your colleagues.
11. In terms of race specifically, how would you describe your colleagues? Like, are they racially diverse, and are they people that you feel comfortable having conversations with about the content of your work?
 - a. Are there specific people or groups of people that are closer allies for you?
12. Are there any power dynamics worth talking about in your workplace that you feel affect your work?

13. How has your school or institution supported your work in terms of teaching about race and racism specifically?
14. Let's talk a bit about the concepts of diversity and intersectionality in your course. How does race fit in with teaching about other broader diversity/inclusion program goals? In other words, is it also your responsibility to teach about other intersectional identities and oppressions, and how do you do that?
15. To what extent, if any, do you feel your own racial identity, or other aspects of your identity, has any impact on your experience in your workplace? Particularly—again, if at all—in relation to teaching about race and racism and any workplace dynamics that are related to that?
16. Anything else you want to discuss related to your work environment?

Interview #2

Orientation & Background

We're going to talk more about your work now, and I'd like to dive deeper into what exactly you teach, and how you teach it. I'm interested in what you teach about race and racism.

1. What are your instructional goals for [your students / the people you teach]? What knowledge or skills do you want them to walk away with?
2. You have shared with me some of the materials you use to teach about race. How do you make decisions about what content to include and what not to include?

Content & Pedagogy

3. As you know, part of this study is to better understand a construct that might be referred to as "racial pedagogical content knowledge." The idea is that there is an intersection between the knowledge and pedagogical skills needed to effectively navigate racialized content and racial moments as a teacher. It may include both general knowledge and skills as well as discipline specific knowledge and skills. So, a big question here: what would you say are some critical components of "racial pedagogical content knowledge"? That would include both knowledge—the facts and information a teacher needs to know—and skills, or pedagogical practices, needed to be an effective facilitator in a classroom. You can take a few moments to think if you need to, or jot down a few notes.

So far, I have asked primarily about what content you include when you teach about race and racism. I am also very interested in how you teach about race.

4. Are there specific strategies, lesson structures, activities, or projects that you find most effective for supporting adult learning about race and racism?
 - a. Can you give a specific example?
 - b. What resources, texts, or media do you find helpful in supporting these activities?
5. What have you found to be the most common challenges in this work—and how do you combat those challenges? What has been effective for you?
 - a. Can you give a specific example?
6. Have there been any common challenges or problems that you haven't been able to solve yet? Things that keep coming up that you just don't know how to break through?
7. Another challenge that I have noticed could be teachers' struggle to "see" race in some content areas versus other content areas. How do you address that in your

classroom when teachers bring up their concerns about being responsive to race in, say, a science classroom versus an English classroom?

- a. Can you give an example?

Classroom Artifacts

You provided me with some materials from your class, including your course syllabus and several assignment descriptions. I have selected one small section of your syllabus as well as one assignment to review together. I would like for you to narrate for me how you make choices about what your teachers need to learn and what skills they must acquire or demonstrate in terms of learning about race and racism.

8. [Week X] on your syllabus is titled [read from participant syllabus] and you have assigned [course assignments from syllabus]. Can you talk me through the inclusion of “[Week X]” in this course, the required readings for the week, etc.?
9. Let’s turn now to [Assignment]. Can you explain to me your goal for teachers with this assignment?
 - a. What do you hope for teachers to learn from completing this assignment?
 - b. In terms of race and racism, how do you see this assignment contributing to their development?
 - c. What modifications have you made to this assignment over the years, if any?
 - d. What do students usually find challenging about this assignment?
 - e. What are some examples of exemplary student work that teachers have submitted for this assignment in the past?

Classroom Scenarios

Now we are going to walk through three hypothetical scenarios that might occur in a teacher education classroom. I’m going to give you the audio and transcript of the scenario, and I’ll play it through twice. Feel free to annotate the transcript. I’m going to ask you how you would respond to the students on the recording. You can assume that the conversation takes place as part of a large group discussion about classroom experiences during one of your class sessions. After I play it, you can take a minute to put your thoughts together and then we’ll discuss it.

Do you have any questions about what we’re about to do before we begin?

There are three scenarios. I’m going to start with just the first one. Here is the transcript. I’ll begin the audio now. [Play tape for Classroom Scenario A.]

If you need me to repeat part or all of the scenario, you can ask me to do so.

10. So first: how would you describe what is going on here—what would you say are the big issues driving this conversation?
11. How would you respond to these teachers?
12. Would your response be different if you were speaking with them one-on-one, or in a more casual setting?
13. Okay. You completed that task. How was that for you? How did you feel?
14. I imagine that your approach here is informed by a set of goals that you have for your teachers as they develop as practitioners. What would you say are your goals for teacher practice that informed your response here?
 - a. And are there goals that you have in your own practice as a teacher educator that also influenced your approach here?
15. How often would you say something like this happens? On a scale of 1-5, 1 being “never”, like, not going to happen, and 5 being, I see this every year, this happens all the time--how would you rate this scenario?
 - b. Can you give me an example of what this might actually look like in your classroom, or maybe an example of a time when something like this actually happened for you?
16. Any other thoughts?

[Repeat questions #10-16 with each scenario, B-C]

Focus Group Protocol

Thank you for taking time to participate in today's focus group. Today, the group will reflect on and review ideas that came up in the first two interviews—specifically, reflecting on your own pedagogical practices and the classroom scenarios. Then, I'd love for us to share a bit about our professional experiences together. Finally, I will open it up to the group to ask and answer questions about your work.

Introductions

First, I wanted to give you an opportunity to introduce yourselves and share any goals you might have for our time together. Please share your name and any other background information you want to share (it can be just your name). Please also share one goal you have for this conversation – that can be, perhaps, a question you have for the other participants, for example.

Theme I: Push/Pull back

One really common pattern was for folks to talk about needing skills to identify exactly how and how far they could “push” their students. Frequently the term “push” was used to describe this interaction, in fact. I am really interested in understanding this phenomenon more.

1. How do you make decisions, in the moment, about how to push students?
 - a. What factors do you consider when you are making these decisions?
 - b. Can you give an example?
2. Do you plan proactively for navigating this sort of push/pull back dynamic?

Theme III: Discursive choices

From your interviews, it became evident that specific language use is important for what it is you are trying to accomplish with teachers. For example, there is a difference in talking about *race* and *racism* versus talking about *diversity*; there is significance in students developing the comfort to name their own whiteness or be able to use terms like “white privilege” or even “white supremacy.”

1. Are there certain terms that you have started using less over time? More over time? What has inspired those changes?
2. Do you see your own language use translate into changes in teacher practice? Are there particular discursive choices you want to see teachers making in schools?

Theme II: Modeling asset-based thinking

One trend I believe I have observed in the disposition of study participants is modeling asset-based thinking. In other words, you all take an asset-based lens towards your teachers, rather than focusing on what they don't know.

I'm checking in with you about this pattern.

1. Does this identification resonate with you? Would you say you view your students with an asset-based lens?
 - a. If so, is that purposeful?

- b. Has that been an evolution over time for you?
2. Can you think of any specific examples of times when you feel you viewed your students with either asset or deficit based lenses?
3. What do you think is the impact of teacher educators approaching their teachers with asset or deficit based lenses?

Theme IV: Teaching teachers of color

Most of you made note of either working as part of a multiracial team or trying to support people of color as they learn about race and racism. Right now, literature on teaching teachers of color is much thinner and mostly focuses on making the claim that there needs to be research on the work, but does not offer much theory for what that work is or should be.

1. When you think about the work you have done in trying to support people of color learning about race and racism, what would you say are...
 - a. The questions you have for others who do this work?
 - b. The advice you would want to give to others who do this work?

Open

Let's close by opening it to the group for a few questions or comments. [Time limited]
Thank you for your participation. If you are interested in sharing your contact information with one another for continued collaboration, please email me to affirm that you would like to connect with other group members and I will facilitate the connection.