



VCU

Virginia Commonwealth University
VCU Scholars Compass

Theses and Dissertations


Graduate School

2019

Democratic Education and An Urban Teacher Residency: A Case Study

Bryan P. Arnold
Virginia Community Colleges

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Secondary Education Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education and Teaching Commons](#)

© The Author

Downloaded from

<https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd/6056>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact libcompass@vcu.edu.

Running head: DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION AND AN URBAN TEACHER RESIDENCY

Democratic Education and an Urban Teacher Residency: A Case Study

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University.

By

Bryan P. Arnold

Bachelor of Arts in History, Wittenberg University, 2007

Master of Education in Educational Leadership, Miami University, 2012

Director: Hillary Parkhouse, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, Department of Teaching and Learning,
School of Education

Virginia Commonwealth University

Richmond, Virginia

December, 2019

© Bryan P. Arnold 2019
All Rights Reserved

This dissertation is dedicated to:

My wife Jennifer, who is my world

And to my kids Malachi, Isaiah, and Shiloh, who are my inspiration.

Acknowledgments

Being able to sit down and write the acknowledgments for my dissertation is the most surreal and exciting part of this adventure. I am beyond grateful and humbled by the continuous support and encouragement I have received from so many people throughout this process. First, I want to thank my committee and my chair Hillary Parkhouse. Hillary, I struggle to find the words to describe the deep gratitude I have for all the support and guidance I have received, even from a distance, not only on this project but through my program. You have helped me find my voice and continued to push me toward my goals while encouraging me to care for myself and my family. Thank you. I am thankful for Kurt Stenhagen who brought to the surface my passion for democratic education. Kurt, anyone who has the privilege of sitting with you in conversation knows they will learn, be challenged, and be stirred to think about how we can make education better. It has been an honor to sit and learn from you. I am also thankful for Kathy Hytten who, similar to Kurt, brought to life my interest and passion for democratic work. Kathy, thank you for the work you have done and the simple, but deep ways you welcomed me and showed me how to enjoy the journey. Finally, I would like to thank Jesse Senechal for his methodological wisdom, which makes every project so much better, but also for providing multiple opportunities for growth, learning, and advancement in my doctoral work. Jesse, your wisdom and vision for education is rich and inspires people to action, thank you. I still cannot believe I had such an amazing committee, thank you from the bottom of my heart.

I know my success on this journey would not have been possible without the support of so many people throughout this program. For so many reasons there is no way I could have made it through without my cohort. To all of you, thank you for the laughs, venting sessions, trips to Greenbrier, cheerleading, and above all your friendship, especially for the new guy from

Ohio. To my professors, thank you for pushing me to see beyond myself and be a person of action and change.

To my community both in Richmond and Columbus, your support of me but more my family was incredible. East End Fellowship, you became our family away from family as you welcomed us, supported us, and inspired us to what true community can look like; you will always hold a special place in my heart. To Dusty Miller, this is all your fault, but thank you for being a mentor and a role model for me. To the Martin family, especially Matt, you are a true friend no matter the distance, thank you for always making the time. My RCKG originals, your love and support as we transitioned back to Ohio made it possible for me to keep my sanity and finish. Let's keep working to reconcile this world.

I truly do not know how anyone could complete a doctorate without the love and support of family. Although I know it was not easy for us to move hundreds of miles away, you all continued to show unwavering love and support. Ryan, Sara, Morgan, and Ben, you have always shown interest in my learning, classes, and writing and this encouraged me and did more for my confidence than you will ever know. Also, thank you for caring for my family so well through this journey and always, I love you. Erin, Justin and kids, thank you for cheering me on, even if we were really far away, I love you. To Char, thank you for making the trips and for your willingness to support me, and really us, in any way we needed, I am forever grateful.

Mom and Dad, oh where do I begin? You have always and continue to be some of my biggest cheerleaders. You taught me to never quit, always show up, and that I could accomplish almost anything I put my mind to. Thank you, those lessons have been key to my success in life and through this program. Anyone who knows you knows that you are two of the most giving,

generous, and steady people and I know your support in every way you gave it made this dream possible. I hope you know how much I love you and how beyond proud I am to be your son.

Malachi, Isaiah, and Shiloh, you inspire me to stand, to fight, and to be better every day. I know you don't fully understand the sacrifices you made so I could pursue this dream but thank you for trusting daddy and mommy. I pray you know the love I have for each of you and the pride I have in my ability to be called your father. Here is the good news, I'm done and I will be home all day and we can go to the park WHENEVER you want. I love each of you with all my heart.

Jen, my love, you are a blessing I thank God for each and every day. I know that I would not be able to write this acknowledgment without you believing in me, supporting me, and encouraging me, through it all, to pursue my dream. You make me a better husband, father, son, teacher, and man. Jen, you are and have been my rock through all of this. This is as much your accomplishment as it is mine. Thank you for always believing in me, listening to my heart, and for pushing me to reach for my dreams. I love you and am so in love with you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	9
Abstract and Keywords.....	10
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	12
Rationale for Study of Problem.....	14
Statement of Purpose.....	16
Research Questions.....	17
Methodology.....	18
Summary.....	19
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	20
Democratic Education.....	21
Overview and History.....	21
Democratic Education in Urban Settings.....	25
Operationalizing Urban Education.....	25
Democratic Education in High-Needs Urban Settings.....	27
Studies of Democratic Education in Urban Settings.....	29
Urban Teacher Residency.....	35
Overview and History.....	35
Democratic Education, Social Justice, and Urban Teacher Residency.....	38
Critical Inquiry.....	41
Associated Living and Collaboration.....	42
Student Voice and Student-Centered Curriculum.....	42
Retention.....	45
Diversifying the Teacher Workforce.....	46
Conclusion.....	47
Chapter 3: Methods.....	48
Qualitative Case Study.....	48
Research Site.....	49
Program.....	50
Participants.....	52
Researcher Positionality.....	56
Data Collection.....	59
Participant Recruitment.....	59
Teacher Interviews.....	60
Program Administrators.....	61
Course Instructors.....	61
Program Documents.....	62
Data Analysis.....	63
Limitations.....	65
Chapter 4: Findings.....	69

Democratic Habits Within the MATR Program.....	70
Value Reflected in MATR Staff Beliefs and Program Documents.....	70
Cohort and Cohort Seminar.....	74
Coursework.....	78
Mentorship.....	82
Alumni and Residents Exhibiting Democratic Habits.....	87
Developing Citizens.....	87
Social Justice.....	91
Professional Relationships.....	95
Pedagogy.....	98
Student-Centered and Culturally Relevant Instruction.....	99
Activities.....	104
Non-Democratic Habits.....	108
Classroom Management.....	108
Direct Instruction.....	111
Possible Barriers to Democratic Habits.....	114
Barriers Seen by Program Instructors.....	115
Barriers Seen by Resident Alumni.....	117
Other Barriers.....	118
Professional Barriers.....	120
System Barriers.....	124
Summary.....	130
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	134
Synthesis – What Was Seen, Why Is It Happening, and Why Is It Not.....	135
How Is Democratic Education Happening?.....	140
Recommendations.....	142
Program Recommendations.....	142
Research Recommendations.....	147
Conclusion.....	148
References.....	151
APPENDIX A- MATR Resident Interview Protocols.....	168
Time 1.....	168
Time 2.....	170
Time 3.....	172
Time 4.....	174
APPENDIX B- MATR Program Administrators Interview Protocol.....	176
APPENDIX C- MATR Program Instructors Interview Protocol.....	178

List of Tables

1. Table 1. National Center for Teacher Residency Principles.....51
2. Table 2. Resident Participant Placement and Completed Interviews.....54

Abstract

DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION AND AN URBAN TEACHER RESIDENCY: A CASE STUDY

By Bryan P. Arnold, Ph.D.

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2019.

Director: Hillary Parkhouse, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Department of Teaching and Learning,
School of Education

Over the course of American schooling scholars note that democratic education and citizenship have not been abandoned, but perhaps marginalized or pushed aside, as test scores and achievement have become the most desired outcomes. Democratic education must move out of the margins and into high priority. The current political climate of increased division and divisiveness could not illustrate this need any more. Another well-documented challenge within the American educational system, particularly in high need areas is the need for highly qualified teachers. Urban Teacher Residency (UTR) programs have offered a possible solution to this growing problem in recruiting, training, and retaining highly qualified teachers in urban settings. UTRs are designed to alleviate one of the longstanding education challenges of both, quality and quantity of educators within some of the most underserved schools. While the rise in teacher residency programs, particularly in urban settings, and the marginalization of democratic education may seem unconnected, an effort to illuminate their potential relationships guides this study. Qualitative case study methodology (including analysis of program documents, interviews with teachers, and interviews with staff) was undertaken to understand the inclusion of democratic habits in one UTR, as well as the resulting enactment of democratic education by the UTR residents and alumni in one UTR, Mid-Atlantic Teacher Residency (MATR).

Findings reveal the use of democratic habits by the residents and in the MATR program was mixed. Democratic habits of associated living, collaboration, student voice, critical inquiry, and student-centered learning were the most prevalent through the MATR program components of coursework, mentorship, and the cohort during the residency year. As teachers, the resident alumni exhibited democratic habits through their professional relationships and attitudes towards student-centered instruction, particularly through the use of activities. A few of the alumni exhibited aspects of democratic education through their discussion of social justice and their commitment to citizenship development. Overall, however, limited evidence of a commitment to democratic education was present in the data, which may be in part due to the program's relatively low emphasis on democratic education. Other barriers that emerged in the data included: classroom management struggles, administrative support and policies, a lack of promoting democratic education through the program, a disconnect from the residents' coursework to their classroom practices, and being new teachers. While it does not appear that MATR or other UTRs are currently foregrounding democratic education or democratic principles, I close by discussing why UTRs should emphasize democratic education and offering suggestions for how they might do so.

Keywords: *democratic education, urban teacher residency, urban education, teacher preparation, teacher professional development, citizen development*

Chapter 1: Introduction

Since the establishment of the American education system, the purposes of education have been debated, with priorities shifting with the cultural realities of the time (Rothstein, Jacobsen, & Wilder, 2008). Labaree (1997) noted over the last century—with it intensifying since the 1980's— a movement away from an educational system that saw education as a public good, preparing citizens or training workers, to one that centers on the needs and desires of the individual through seeing education as a private good. The latter values gaining credentials to achieve social mobility, which is based in competing for social position. This is not to say that schools should not work to educate the future workforce but that the focus and goals of education have shifted to be more about individual success than the public's. With that, one problem facing urban schools, in particular, is the dramatic abandonment of the democratic purpose of school.

More than two decades later, scholars note similar trends: democratic education and citizenship have not been abandoned, but perhaps marginalized, as test scores and achievement have become the primary measure of a school's quality (Hyttén, 2017; Schneider, 2017). There are a number of factors including, but not limited to, testing culture, rise of accountability, lack of resources, and deficit-thinking that have pushed democratic education to the side. It is a belief of many educators—whether spoken or unspoken—that preparing students in these contexts forces citizenship development to become a tertiary aim (Au, 2007; Au & Apple, 2010).

The current political climate of increased division and divisiveness could not illustrate this need any more. A 2017 PEW Research Center poll found that partisan divide has grown wider since the 1990s and is the widest since the civil war (Pew Research Center, 2017). Additionally, two polls conducted in the later part of 2018, one by *USA TODAY*/Suffolk

University (Page & Theobald, 2018) and the other by *NBC News/Wall Street Journal* (Murray, 2018), found that Americans tend to only agree on one thing: that the nation is divided. These polls illustrate that many Americans can sense, particularly since the 2016 presidential election, that there has been increased divisiveness and political polarization. At the same time, Pew (2018) found that Americans are still optimistic about the importance of the American democratic system. While there was an overwhelming sense of optimism around American democracy, a significant majority of people support making extensive changes to the current iteration of American democracy and the connected political system. As a result of this political reality and the marginalization of citizen development, democratic education must move out of the margins and become a high priority in American schools.

One key factor in developing democratic citizens is the need for this to be done by highly qualified teachers. However, the need for highly qualified teachers is a well-documented challenge within the American educational system (Berry, 2005; Boyd, Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2002). This need results from a combination of factors: an aging teaching population (Goldhaber & Walch, 2014), high teacher turnover rates (Ingersoll, 2001, 2003, 2004; Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013), the lower numbers of people entering the field (Flannery, 2016), and the fact that roughly one-third of teachers leave the profession within the first three years (Barnes, Crowe, & Schaeffer, 2009). These realities are more pronounced in urban, high-needs schools—districts where more the 50% of teachers leave the profession within five years (Barnes, Crowe, & Schaeffer, 2009) and where 20-25% of teachers leave each year (Ingersoll & Perda, 2009). Not only is this turnover expensive for districts, it is leaving low-income minority students, often with some of the highest academic needs, to bear the burden of these problems (Ingersoll, 2001) as teacher

attrition can negatively impact student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Urban Teacher Residency (UTR) programs have offered a possible solution to this growing problem in recruiting, training, and retaining highly qualified teachers in urban settings. UTRs are designed to alleviate the longstanding education challenge of ensuring the most underserved schools have sufficient quality educators (Berry, Montgomery, & Snyder, 2008).

Rationale for Study of Problem

Since their inception in the early 2000s, UTRs have been on the rise as a way to recruit, train, and retain teachers in hard-to-staff schools. For a district to implement an UTR, a great deal of commitment of both time and resources is needed. As a result of this commitment, as well as an interest in understanding the efficacy of this particular teacher preparation model, there is a significant amount of research that has been done on the effects of UTRs. UTRs tend to espouse social justice orientations, although no research has been done on the connection between UTRs and democratic education. However, UTRs are well positioned to address the lack of democratic education in urban schools because of their orientations toward social justice, their guiding principles, and the structure of the preparation model.

Democratic education and UTRs are two unique areas within education that may not seem connected. However, understanding their alignment could be of critical importance to the students and communities that UTRs are designed to support. In reality many urban schools tend to be undemocratic spaces. Urban schools have become places of control over both teachers and students (Lipman, 2009; Monahan & Torres, 2009). One type of control is intellectual, which is a result of the accountability movement and teaching to the test, standardizing and narrowing curriculum, and moving away from student-centered instruction back to more direct instruction (Gilliom, 2009; Lipman, 2009, 2003). Students' bodies are also being policed and controlled in

most urban schools through zero-tolerance discipline policies, increased police presence in schools, and increased surveillance through metal detectors, pat downs, resource officers, and cameras (Gilliom, 2009; Monahan & Torres, 2009).

The marginalization of democratic education in urban schools is particularly problematic given that most urban schools are undemocratic spaces. Schools play a role in developing civic engagement among adolescents (Torney-Purta, 2010). Students that attend schools that offer civic training or emphasize democratic actions, such as voting, are more likely to participate civically later in life (Barrett & Brunton-Smith, 2014). For a democracy to operate from its intended strengths and to maintain our democracy for all, we must prepare and educate all students to be democratic citizens.

Additionally, the American democratic system seems to be at a critical point. For instance, voting rights have been challenged and limited in places such as Georgia (Kauffman, 2018) and Florida, (Fineout, 2019), Russia interfered in the 2016 presidential election (Mueller, 2019), and there is consistent attack on the media by the President (Sullivan, 2019). Public schools appear to be contributing to this problem as there has been the continuous move away from democratic education and civics within public schools for decades (Lipman, 2009, 2003). Democratic education has never been as robust an aim within classrooms as it should be (Hyttén, 2017). Focusing on civics, citizen development, and democratic education in public schools is needed now more than ever.

UTRs seem well-positioned for strengthening democratic education in urban schools. UTRs often work with some of the most vulnerable, marginalized, oppressed populations, who at the same time are part of the most disenfranchised and politically marginalized groups. Since social justice education includes democratic principles and UTRs

tend to espouse social justice orientations, UTRs are most likely already promoting democratic habits. Social justice education can act as a bridge to emphasize democratic education in these spaces. Additionally, a key component of a UTR is a full year apprenticeship in which the resident teacher is paired with an experienced mentor teacher (Berry et al., 2008a; Berry et al., 2008b; NCTR, 2018b, Zeichner & Bier, 2018). This relationship is deeply connected to the democratic habits of collaboration (Beane & Apple, 2007; Gutmann, 1993; McAvoy & Hess, 2013) and associated living (Dewey, 1916) as the two shared in the reflexive learning process (Goodwin et al., 2015; Silva et al., 2014). Along the same lines, another key component of the UTR model is having the teachers in a cohort (Guha et al., 2016; NCTR, 2018b; Silva et al., 2014). The cohort model helps build a democratic-style community. It allows the teachers to share their experiences with other teachers, gives them a space to use their voice, collaborate, and possibly engage in critical inquiry about their contextual teaching realities. The UTR model is also set up so the teachers take their master's level courses while they are teaching (NCTR, 2018a). This allows the curriculum and courses they are taking to be student-centered, so the residents can help guide their own learning as needed, based on the realities within their teaching classrooms. Student-centered curriculum and learning help to empower students to be agentic and use their voices (Beane & Apple, 2007; Hytten, 2017; Wood, 1992, 1998). Although UTR mission and/or vision statements typically do not emphasize democratic education, it appears that UTRs may be well-suited to align with democratic education.

Statement of Purpose

America is becoming more divided at the same time that democratic education is being marginalized in America's schools, particularly in urban schools. Given that UTRs are a growing model for teacher preparation, it would be beneficial to examine the intersection of

UTRs and democratic education. The purpose of this study is to understand the enactment of and possibility of democratic education as it pertains to urban education, particularly relating to teachers that have been trained through an urban teacher residency.

The UTR literature base has been growing since the origination of UTRs 15 years ago, moving from mostly theoretical and conceptual to more empirical scholarship. The studies have mostly been about the building of, and theory behind, UTRs, and the success of the UTR programs. There have been no studies on democratic education in UTRs. In fact, there have been a limited number of studies on democratic education in urban settings during the decades since UTRs came into existence. As a result, an examination of the connectedness of democratic education and UTRs, as well as understanding the role that democratic education already plays or could play in UTRs is warranted as there appears to be a major gap in the literature. More importantly this research is needed because preparing agentic democratic citizens is of critical importance to continuing democracy in America, and UTRs appear to be well-suited to advance democratic education.

Research Questions

In this study, I try to understand the role democratic education plays in one UTR teacher preparation program. My research questions are:

1. What role does democratic education play in the UTR program?
2. Do UTR residents and alumni exhibit democratic education habits or principals, and if so, in what ways?
3. What barriers, if any, impede residents and alumni from practicing democratic habits?

Methodology

A qualitative case study was utilized for this study. Qualitative methods were well-suited for this study as they allow for a depth and richness in data collection that is based on the context of the study. Additionally, as I was interested in understanding the phenomenon of democratic education within one UTR, qualitative methods were appropriate (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). As I examined one specific UTR, Mid-Atlantic Teacher Residency (MATR), a case study approach was the most fitting. A qualitative case study is appropriate when the context and phenomenon are deeply intertwined, as is the case with the phenomenon and contexts being studied here (i.e. democratic education in the context of urban schools) (Yin, 2014). Furthermore, the contextual reality that MATR occupies is essential to understanding the teachers and democratic education, thus making a case study appropriate and useful.

This study utilized semi-structured interviews, document analysis, and secondary data analysis. Two cohorts of teachers were the main participants through secondary interview data. The teachers were interviewed up to four times as a part of a larger program evaluation study. Their completed interviews--two from their residency and two from their first-year of teaching--were coded inductively and deductively and analyzed. In addition, two key MATR program administrators and four course instructors were interviewed once each to understand their perceptions of and possible enactment of democratic education. Each of these individuals held some level of influence over the program and the teachers' development, so it is essential to understand their perceptions of democratic education as it pertains to the development of urban teachers. Finally, some key program documents were analyzed. Three types of documents were collected: the program handbook, the gradual release calendar, and the course syllabi for the courses taught by the four instructors interviewed. These documents were given to each of the

teachers and had the possibility of influencing their dispositions and expectations as teachers. Additionally, multiple memos were written during the coding and analysis process. All data was analyzed using constant comparison methods to allow for themes to emerge from the data and triangulation of the data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Summary

This study explored the role of democratic education, or lack thereof, in one urban teacher residency, MATR. It sought to understand the perceptions of key stakeholders in the program toward democratic education and thus the program's orientation toward democratic education. While there is an adequate amount of literature on UTRs in general, this study fills a hole in the UTR and democratic education literature base, as well as adds to the understanding of UTRs. This qualitative case study explored teachers' and other key MATR stakeholders' perceptions of democratic education in order to understand the current and possible future espousal of democratic education within UTRs.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter I review the literature that is pertinent to democratic education and urban teacher residencies (UTR). To start, I review the conceptual literature on what democratic education is, both historically and in contemporary contexts. As the American educational system has put so much value on test scores, particularly in math, science, and English (Ravitch, 2016), there has been a shift away from democratic education and civics curriculum, even to the point of marginalization (Levinson, 2010; Hytten, 2017). Assessment of school quality has become closely tied to test scores thus influencing the focus and demands placed on schools (Schneider, 2017). As a result, schools that tend to have low test scores shift their focus to improving their scores, and this can mean that non-tested areas can become secondary or completely done away with (Ravitch, 2016; Schneider, 2017). Schools in urban areas tend to score lower; thus there is less space for anything outside of what will help increase scores, including democratic education.

With this being a reality, I address why democratic education is needed in urban settings and what value it would be to the students and professionals in these contexts. Furthermore, to help elucidate the possible value of democratic education within urban schools, I will operationalize urban education, as it is often a term couched in racial and class stereotypes (Chou & Tozer, 2008). Then literature on democratic education within urban settings will be reviewed; this is because no literature could be found that focused specifically on democratic education within UTRs. Next, I will move into reviewing UTRs, starting with the historical and conceptual foundations as a way to understand how they have grown in popularity and to illuminate what uniquely makes a program a UTR. UTRs tend to foreground social justice education as a part of their program. Social justice education and democratic education are closely associated but

distinct. Therefore, I will discuss the connections between social justice, democratic education, and how UTRs' adherence to social justice provides a bridge for foregrounding democratic education.

Democratic Education

Overview and History

Much of democratic education theory stems from Dewey's overarching belief that "a democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experiences" (1916, p. 86). He goes on to describe in some detail that:

The two elements in our criterion both point to democracy. The first signifies not only more numerous and more varied points of shared common interest, but greater reliance upon the recognition of mutual interests as a factor in social control. The second means not only freer interaction between social groups (once isolated so far as intention could keep up a separation) but change in social habits-its continuous readjustment through meeting the new situations produced by varied intercourse. And these two traits are precisely what characterize the democratically constituted society (1916, p. 86).

The criteria that Dewey points to are foundational to the pedagogic practices and curriculum of democratic education. Since Dewey's time, scholars have continued to theorize democracy, democratic education and citizen development, but most have built on or expounded upon the Deweyan idea of associated living. Building on Dewey's ideas of democracy, prominent democratic scholar Stitzlein (2014a) saw the following as democratic habits: "citizenship as fate, collaboration and compromise, deliberation, analysis and critique, and hope" (p. 79). These habits are needed to nurture citizenship in students and should be practiced "alongside equality, communication, participation, and inclusion" (p. 79). Beane (2005) defined democracy as

people living together in equitable, just, enriching, and fulfilling ways. Neumann (2008) saw democracy as an agentic journey in a pluralistic society that is about advancing liberty, justice, equality, and improving human welfare and the environment. Similar to Dewey, in these cases, democracy is defined through interaction among citizens in order to share their experiences.

Dating back to the founding of the United States, Thomas Jefferson saw education as essential to a strong democracy (Williams, 1967). This sentiment has not changed, as over the years a number of scholars have called for preparing students to become democratic citizens through democratic education (Beane & Apple, 2007; Dewey, 1916; Gutmann, 1999; Hytten, 2017; Meier, 2003; Stitzlein, 2014a; Wood, 1998;). Along the same lines, many of these scholars acknowledge that democratic habits and/or dispositions must be learned (Beane & Apple, 2007; Hytten, 2017; Meier, 2003; Stitzlein, 2014a; Wood, 1992) for students to become agentic democratic citizens conscious of the world around them through their awareness of social, political, and economic problems (Dewey, 1938). Hytten (2017) noted that “for Dewey, democracy and education are intimately and reciprocally related” (p. 9). Schools become the location that allow for dispositions, habits, and values to be learned. Without schools and educators taking up this charge and making democratic education foundational, our democracy would fail (Dewey, 1938).

Democratic education is intended to give students an opportunity that they may not have elsewhere to associate with and find common interest among peers with differing beliefs and opinions. Ideally, democracies allow for pluralism; for a democracy to work, differing groups must learn to cooperate and collaborate. Creating an environment that encourages collaboration and cooperation is an integral part of democratic education (Beane & Apple, 2007; Gutmann, 1993; McAvoy & Hess, 2013). Having students engage in communicated experiences (Dewey,

1916) allows them to recognize that there are others who think and believe in similar ways to them—that they have common interests. At the same time, the sharing of experiences allows for engagement between people and groups that have varying beliefs. Ideally, out of this engagement comes an appreciation of difference or tolerance (Gutmann, 1993).

Collaboration and cooperation are difficult if the students either feel as though they do not have a voice, or that they cannot use the voice they do have. As teachers step aside and let the students' voices carry as part of decision-making, the classroom environment starts to mirror a democracy (Hyttén, 2017; McAvoy & Hess, 2013). This act by the teacher most often must be a conscious one, but as it happens more frequently and the students' voices rise, an environment of freedom can begin to develop (Meier, 2003).

At the same time, democratic education calls for giving students space to question the world around them (Westheimer & Kahne, 1998). Questioning as part of democratic education develops habits of inquiry (Beane & Apple, 2007; Hyttén, 2017; Meier, 2003; Westheimer & Kahn, 2004). Having curriculum and instruction based on inquiry of societal realities should then require students to develop critical thinking habits (Beane, 2005, Hyttén, 2017; Meier, 2003). Through the development of their voices and thus a climate of freedom, students can begin the process of critical inquiry. Critical inquiry causes them to question, examine, and reflect on the beliefs of those with whom they are now sharing experiences, and this should include self-inquiry. Additionally, democratic classrooms give students the space to engage in problem solving through critical inquiry that questions the realities and structures of society (Meier, 1995; Westheimer & Kahn, 2004; Wolk, 2007).

Democratic education works to foster a safe place for thinking, reflecting, and questioning what is known and accepted in society (Beane, 2005; Journell, 2016). Simply put,

democratic education is about developing a justice-oriented, agentic, participatory lifestyle (Hyttén, 2017). Engaging students gives them permission to question, inquire, be critical, and act democratically, in ways that traditional activities and strategies, such as not talking while receiving direct instruction, may not.

Whether or not the students agree as they share their viewpoints, they learn the art of consensus making. Consensus is critical for democratic societies and classrooms as it places the focus on the common good instead of authoritative majority group rule. Democratic education forefronts consensus building out of a sense of responsibility to care for the common good (Beane, 2005; Hyttén, 2017). Collaboration, cooperation, voice, and inquiry allow for common good consensus to happen by working through the pluralism democracy encourages.

All of these habits and dispositions are couched in the idea that democratic education curriculum should be student-centered (Beane & Apple, 2007; Hyttén, 2017; Wood, 1992, 1998). This is based on the premise that, in a democracy, power is shared and both individual and group voices should be protected. Focusing on freeing and empowering student voice through student-centered activities that value the students', experiences and realities, aids in their willingness to work collaboratively toward the common good.

For democratic education to happen, it needs to be embraced by educators. It is not enough to only have student-centered curriculum; a democratic environment needs to be cultivated for habits and dispositions to be developed. In this model, teachers go from being experts to facilitators and co-learners. They move beyond top-down, formulaic pedagogy and practice to creating classrooms and schools that are communities of active learners who are agentic and justice-oriented (Hyttén, 2017; Meier, 1995; Westheimer, 2015). In advocating for democratic education, Wood (1998) and Beane (2005) move beyond classroom- and teacher-

focus, to developing democratic schools. These schools work at macro levels to develop citizens through the engagement of all stakeholders: administration, teachers, and students.

Democratic Education in Urban Settings

Operationalizing urban education. UTRs have a specific focus on *urban*, but this term is rarely defined or operationalized (Milner, 2006, 2012; Williamson, Apedoe, & Thomas, 2016). In its simplest form, urban is used as a geographic indicator to differentiate densely-populated centers from suburban and rural areas. These terms are often as a way to describe the context of an area as well as their geography. Often the term, urban, is used less a geographic indicator but as coded language for demographic characterization of the certain people and communities (Foster, 2007; Noguera, 2003). These groups are typically poor and non-white and are viewed from deficit-based, disadvantaged, racist, and oppressive lenses (Chou & Tozer, 2008; Milner, 2006, 2012; Reich, Stemhagen, & Siegel-Hawley, 2014; Williamson et. al, 2016). Because of these realities it is imperative that *urban education* is operationalized for this study, in order to avoid assumptions and bring clarity to the context and usage of the term. For me, the urban education context is multifaceted and denotes the geography and student population, as well as the systemic realities within which these schools are situated. I am aware that the term urban can elicit negative or deficit connotations but that is not my intention as I operationalize urban education.

In an effort to move beyond the generic, simplistic, and coded language around the urban identifier, Milner (2012) suggests one typology with three categories to help better understand the realities of these settings: “Urban Intensive”, “Urban Emergent”, and “Urban Characteristic”. In each typology, the contextual reality of the city, size, population, density, resources etc., are connected to what happens within the schools. The only distinguishing

characteristic of each of these three is the size and density of the population. These typologies still deal with geography but move to show that the urban education context is impacted by the realities of metropolitan areas in which they are located (Milner, 2012). For this study, part of the use of urban is in reference to Mid-Atlantic Teacher Residency (MATR) being located in a mid-sized city that encounters problems with limited resources, which would be classified as Urban Emergent. An Urban Emergent city is one with less than a million people but still has a scarcity of resources along with infrastructure challenges (Milner, 2012).

Urban is a geographic and human descriptor. It allows for understanding the location and who is most likely present in these contexts. Urban is also used as an identifier for the people who occupy these geographic areas. Furthermore, urban communities are and have been ones with distinctive cultures, histories, and context and this can be used to explain the lived experience of those that live in urban areas (Johanek & Puckett, 2007). Urban areas tend to have diverse populations culturally, racially, ethnically, and linguistically (Chou & Tozer, 2008; Hollins, 2012; Matsko & Hammerness, 2014; Milner, 2006). Additionally, as a result of historic and systemic oppression they tend to have high concentrations of poverty, particularly among people of color (Hollins, 2012; Matsko & Hammerness, 2014; Milner, 2006). As a result, the school context is often one that is underfunded, lacks resources, has high attrition rates among teachers, and is steeped in bureaucracy (Hollins, 2012; Matsko & Hammerness, 2014; Milner, 2006). Not all urban schools face the challenges listed above.

MATR is a program that focuses on high-need urban schools, as opposed to the highly-selective, open enrollment schools that also exist in this city. Therefore, to specify which type of urban schools I will be focused on, I will use the commonly used term “high-needs”. Using the term *urban high-needs school* allows for removal of deficit and oppressive coding of the student

and community context and acknowledges that it is the schools and institutions which are failing communities, not that communities are failing themselves. The populations in these contexts are full of value, assets, intellect, and ability, but very often the systems and schools around them are marginalizing and oppressive to them. I agree with urban scholar Craig Peck (2017) in asserting that “urban areas have been, are, and will be the lifeblood of the United States. They are complex places where different people can and do meet, struggle, make democracy over again and again, and aspire” (p. 5). For this study, when I am describing MATR and the urban context in which the study is situated I use the phrase *urban high-needs*, and *urban* interchangeably. In the end, the realities and uniqueness of urban areas may be missed when they are labeled with such a general and loaded term (Matsko & Hammerness, 2014).

Democratic education in high-needs urban settings. Defining a school context as urban and/or high-needs does not imply that it is underachieving or unsuccessful. What is a common reality are the difficulties that students, teachers, and the school community must face regularly, whether they are successful or not. There have been countless attempts to address these difficulties through educational reform that is supposed to produce equality and close the achievement gap (Carter & Welner, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 2013; Ravitch, 2016). While educational reform is nothing new (Tyack & Cuban, 1995), much of emphasis has become about accountability through testing, standardizing and centralizing curriculum (Gilliom, 2009; Tienken & Zhao, 2013). As a result, tested subjects are the ones that receive the most attention and resources. Furthermore, as American schools have shifted from education as a public good to focusing on preparing individuals for social mobility through college and career readiness, schools have moved away from acknowledging and valuing the democratic capabilities of

schools (Labaree, 1997; Mirra & Morrell, 2011; Tienken & Zhao, 2013), particularly in urban settings.

Simply put, schools in America over time have lost their autonomy and become subjects of increased control (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Gilliom, 2009; Lipman, 2003, 2009; Ravitch, 2016). This control is connected to policies around accountability, which is enforced through achievement on standardized tests. As control has increased in a variety of ways, the capacity for democratic schooling and classrooms has all but vanished in low-achieving schools. It is widely known that achievement on these tests is more of an indicator of socioeconomic status and race than learning, but nevertheless these tests and scores have been and still are the main indicator of school quality (Schinder, 2017). Urban high-needs schools typically receive lower test scores and thus end up being the location of top-down, authoritative control and bureaucracy as a way to increase achievement.

This controls plays out in a variety of ways. First, it often leads to narrowed curriculum (Gilliom, 2009; Lipman, 2003; Putnam, 2015). This can take the form of fewer course options, a focus on remediations, less rigor, and teaching to the test (Lipman, 2003; Tienken & Zhao, 2013). Connected is the standardizing of the curriculum at both state and national levels. Standardizing curriculum can mean ignoring the realities--cultural, racial, ethnic, linguistic—of the students who are consuming it and limiting what counts as official knowledge (Apple, 2001; Lipman, 2009; Valenzuela, 1999).

The controlling of students' bodies and actions has become increasingly prevalent in urban schools. This is a result of the disparate effects of urban education reform on poor students of color and the zero tolerance discipline policies. Therefore, democratic education gets crowded out for these policies. The surveillance of and disempowerment of students is much

more of a reality for those attending urban schools than suburban or rural schools (Gilliom, 2009; Lipman, 2009; Monahan & Torres, 2009). Control and surveillance have taken the form of harsher discipline, increased police presence in schools, students being searched (Lipman, 2009; Monahan & Torres, 2009), and even the school-to-prison-pipeline (Fasching-Varner, Mitchell, Martin, & Bennett-Haron, 2014). Furthermore, Lipman (2009) acknowledged that “educational practices that promote social discipline through the autonomous, self-regulating individual are being supplemented or replaced by practices that coerce, threaten, and reduce possibilities for critical and independent thought” (p. 171). As the urban school context continues to be a space of disempowerment and centralized control through accountability and surveillance, they have become undemocratic spaces and are in turn undermining our democratic society (Apple, 2009; Lipman, 2009; Moses & Rogers, 2013). In the end, the most obvious way to move away from the undemocratic reality of urban schools is to foreground democratic education.

Studies of Democratic Education in Urban Settings

I conducted a review of literature to determine the role democratic education is currently playing in urban schools, if any. As no studies of democratic education within UTRs were found, my follow-up search included peer-reviewed empirical articles that focused on democratic education in an urban setting. I included only those that were published since 2000, as this time frame correlates with the start of UTR programs (Guha, Hyler, & Darling-Hammond, 2016; Silva et al., 2014). Any article that the author(s) identified as focusing on democratic education and an urban setting were included. In an attempt to gain the richest picture of the current use of democratic education in urban schools, the search was purposefully broad. Nevertheless, only thirteen articles were found and all were qualitative in their methodology. Most of the studies did not identify a specific qualitative method. Of those that did specify their approach, three

were case studies (Bickmore & Parker, 2014; Friedman, Galligan, Albano, & O'Connor, 2009; Marri, 2010), two were ethnographies (Silverman, 2012; Seher, 2013), and one was action research (Flynn, 2009).

In the urban democratic education articles analyzed, multiple themes emerged. First, most of the studies focused on classroom practices using democratic pedagogy and their effects. Democratic pedagogy, such as student-centered teaching practices that focus on shared authority, student voice, and drawing on students' lived experiences, were used in a variety of content areas such as music education (Silverman, 2012), science (Basu & Barton, 2010), English (Flynn, 2009; Seher, 2011), social studies (Bickmore & Parker, 2014; Marri, 2010), and a credit recovery second chance class (Marri, 2010). Hantzopoulos (2015) focused on how students, past and present, understood their experience in a democratized school. This was the only article that looked at both the macro (school level) and micro (classroom level) influence of democratizing education. The dispositions and skills that were developed in this school were aligned with the learning that happened in the singular classroom experiences.

Second, teachers and scholars examined whether students' democratic dispositions and skills developed as a consequence of implementing democratic education. In some instances, students had their voices empowered through their ability to choose their education and experience (Basu & Barton, 2010; Seher, 2011; Silverman, 2012) and through being heard (Flynn, 2009; Hantzopoulos, 2015). Additionally, the researchers found that students were part of more contested discussions and thus grew in their ability to dialogue with others (Bickmore & Parker, 2014; Hantzopoulos, 2015; Seher, 2011; Silverman, 2012). Additionally, inquiry or asking critical questions, was exhibited in students (Basu & Barton, 2010; Bickmore & Parker, 2014; Seher, 2011). Finally, a sense of community and common good was developed in a few

different instances (Basu & Barton, 2010; Hantzopoulos, 2015; Seher, 2011; Silverman, 2012). At the same time, many of the researchers noted that dispositional development was limited or stifled as a result of the lack of broad, long-term developmental support and opportunities outside of the classroom or school to cultivate these democratic habits (Hantzopoulos, 2015; Marri, 2010; Seher, 2011).

Third, teacher experiences, roles, and development were highlighted in many of the studies. The discussion of teachers ranged from a focus on teacher identity development (Mirra & Morrell, 2011) to development and implementation of democratic pedagogy (Basu & Barton, 2010; Bickmore & Parker, 2014; Silverman, 2012;). Friedman et al., (2009) is unique; the authors found that teachers' voices were excluded from discussions around mandating democratic education in the classroom, and, as a result, four teacher subcultures emerged. Those four subcultures were: compliance, noncompliance, subversion, and democratic inquiry and practice. Furthermore, the authors found that mandating democratic education in the classroom can do more harm than good by creating environments where teachers resent democratic education and, as a result, neglect to teach democratic dispositions, or teach them incorrectly. Mirra and Morrell (2011) also focused solely on the development of teachers and found that they need to be in community for learning and engagement to happen. A few of the student-focused studies also examined the role of the teacher, and all but one assessed what the teachers were doing as overwhelmingly positive (Basu & Barton, 2010; Seher, 2010; Silverman, 2012). Bickmore and Parker (2014) found that the teachers were one of the biggest obstacles to sustained democratic critical dialogue or inquiry about diversity or equity in the classroom. This was mostly due to curriculum restraints, but also because of feelings of inadequate preparation for—or an unwillingness to engage in—these conversations. The role teachers played in the

studies varied, but nevertheless the findings are informative. They illustrate the influence teachers can have over developing democratic classrooms, particularly in an urban context.

A few of the articles focused on democratic education from a macro level, both school and district. Trujillo, Hernandez, Jarrell, and Kissell (2014) were the only scholars that examined only district-level factors related to democratic reform policies in Oakland, CA, with no attention to school-level factors. They found that the subjectivity and history of various stakeholders were more predictive of the acceptance and understanding of the new democratic-equity-minded district reforms than the merits of the reforms were. Overwhelmingly, school-level use of democratic education was the focus of studies examining macro contexts.

Carlson (2005) described a democratic educational renewal at an urban high school in Cincinnati, Ohio. This renewal was based around an opportunity to reinvigorate the school and teachers with the democratic purposes of school through a pilot interdisciplinary project. The team of teachers, which included math, English, science, social studies, special education, and home economics, that developed the project desired greater autonomy and power over their work as a way to build sustained personal relationships with the students in the hopes that it might lead to higher test scores. The author found that the democratic discourse eventually became overshadowed by maintaining student surveillance and discipline, accountability, district level leadership shift to 'corporate' reform policies of high-stakes testing and quantifying outputs, and the division between regular teachers and the interdisciplinary team. This division amongst teachers was based on differing beliefs about learning and the students they were serving. The teachers committed to democratic education were seen as the other by their colleagues. They were portrayed as elitist, idealistic, and their students were seen as low achieving with problem behavior. As the interdisciplinary unit became more accepted and normalized into school and

district hegemonic reform discourse, it was seen as “a more effective form of surveillance and management of student bodies, and a more effective means of producing desired test outcomes” (p. 41). Ultimately, the interdisciplinary unit lost its connections to democratic education.

Similarly, Hantzopoulos (2015) shared the experiences of students and teachers in a small democratized high school in New York City with a mission of democratic engagement. She found that the use of critical democratic education created a culture of respect in which students learned to negotiate, remake, and advocate for their agency, but once they left the school they felt their activism and sense of agency constrained. The alumni acknowledged the difficulty in replicating the community and environment of their high school. For example, alumni shared how their school experience made them more aware of social issues, such as poverty and discrimination, but felt as though they were powerless to act and their voices were limited by the institutions they were now involved in.

Seher (2013) examined how a principal enacted her school’s democratic education mission and found three main results. First, the principal used discipline as a way to work towards the students becoming self-governing and responsible participants of the community and she did this through enforcing consequences to teach them right from wrong. While this discipline was aimed at being and was seen by the principal as culturally relevant to the students lived experiences, in actuality it limited democratic participation of the teachers as the principal enforced the school norms in isolation. Second, the school was described as being based around culturally relevant modes of teaching and leading as it centered the students’ lived experiences through the use of relevant and connected content and skills. Third, she worked at creating a sense of urgency to meet the school’s mission of promoting skills for democratic citizenship.

The contextual spaces within which these schools in these studies were situated also played a role in the implementation and cultivation of democratic education.

Finally, these articles discuss the role that the urban context played in the implementation of democratic education. The discussion of the contextual realities took a variety of forms and depth. In the most simplistic forms, discussions were brief and consisted of general descriptions about the school setting and the student population but did connect the contextual realities to the outcomes of the study (Flynn, 2009; Friedman et al., 2009; Mirra & Morrell, 2011; Seher, 2011). In almost every case, the author was sure to mention the city in which the school was located and all cities would be considered large urban cities. A few of the studies centered the localized experience as a key variable and explanation for study outcomes (Carlson, 2005; Hantzopoulos, 2015; Marri, 2010; Seher, 2013; Trujillo et al., 2014). Many of the studies found democratic education as not only a positive way of influencing the schools, but they made recommendations for implementing democratic education in their contexts as well as in similar urban settings (Basu & Barton, 2010; Hantzopoulos, 2015; Marri, 2010; Seher, 2013; Silverman, 2012). Specifically, these authors saw democratic education as empowering and transformative (Silverman, 2012), agentic (Hantzopoulos, 2015; Mirra & Morrell, 2011), community building (Trujillo et al., 2014), a way of overcoming deficit thinking (Basu & Barton, 2010; Marri, 2010), and humanizing (Hantzopoulos, 2015). Carlson (2005) was unique as his study experience was particularly bleak, but he still saw democratic education as a source of hope even after he described how the efforts and pieces of democratic education that had been initiated were co-opted because of the contextual realities within the school. These studies reveal that it can be difficult for urban schools to implement democratic education as a way of cultivating democratic environments.

It is often difficult for urban schools to implement thriving or lasting environments of democratic education due to a number of constraints. One constraint is around the focus on policy implementations such as prioritizing discipline in order to manage and surveil student bodies (Carlson, 2005; Seher, 2013), quantify outputs (Carlson, 2005), and curriculum restraints (Bickmore & Parker, 2014, Mirra & Morrell, 2011; Seher, 2011; Silverman, 2012). Administrators were sometimes also a constraint as they were undemocratic (Silverman, 2012), controlling (Carlson, 2009), and working in isolation (Seher, 2013). There was also limited buy-in from teachers due to resentment or negativity toward democratic education (Bickmore & Parker, 2014; Carlson, 2005; Friedman et al., 2009). Another constraint was a lack of teacher preparation for communicating with diverse student populations (Bickmore & Parker, 2014; Mirra & Morrell, 2011). Now I turn to UTR literature to examine how this teacher preparation model may allow for greater implementation of democratic education.

Urban Teacher Residency

Overview and History

Teacher residency programs have emerged as a result of calls for improving teacher preparation through better field experience and deeper connections between theoretical lessons learned via coursework with those field experiences (Barry, 2005; Zeichner, 2002, 2013). UTR programs are designed to recruit, prepare, and retain quality teachers in high-needs urban areas (Barry et al., 2008a). These programs are specifically designed to marry theory and practice to give teachers a highly clinical experience. UTRs are relatively new. The first programs started in the early 2000s, with the Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL) in Chicago and the Boston Teacher Residency (BTR) (Guha, Hyler, & Darling-Hammond, 2016; Silva, McKie, Knechtel, Gleason, & Makowsky, 2014). The number of UTRs has continued to grow over the

last two decades. The National Center for Teacher Residencies (NCTR), formerly Urban Teacher Residency United, lists 28 different residency programs around the United States as of 2018 (NCTR, 2018b).

The UTR model is one that is distinct from what Zeichner (2013, 2018) calls traditional and accelerated/early entry programs. Traditional programs focus on learning theory through coursework. Students have field experiences sprinkled throughout their program and courses, with their program culminating in a roughly 12-week student-teaching experience (Zeichner, 2013; Zeichner & Payne, 2013). This is still the most common teacher preparation model, as about 80% of teachers are prepared this way (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2018).

Unlike traditional teacher preparation models, UTRs offer full-year apprenticeship experiences and graduate-level education content (NCTR, 2018b, Zeichner & Bier, 2018). As stated above, the design can look different, but before entering the classroom, all new resident teachers take summer classes in preparation for their residency year (Zeichner & Payne, 2013). The residency year is a year-long apprentice-style experience alongside a mentor teacher. At the same time as their residency experience, residents take graduate-level education courses in the hope that the theory and course content can inform and be informed by their classroom experiences in high-needs, urban classrooms (Berry et al., 2008b; NCTR, 2018b). Once they have completed the residency year, residents are hired within the same district and expected to teach within the district for 3-5 years (NCTR, 2018b). This commitment comes with a stipend and most or all funding for a master's degree. Often during their induction period, new teachers are still supported by a mentor teacher, a coach, or a mix of the two, but this varies by program (Berry et al., 2008a; Berry et al., 2008b; NCTR, 2018).

UTRs differ from other residencies in that they use the context as content (Hammerness & Craig, 2016; Hammerness, Williamson, & Kosnick, 2016; Matsko & Hammerness, 2014; Williamson, Apedoe, & Thomas, 2016). This model provides opportunities to learn through practice about the context of the classroom, the school, and the community, so residents can succeed and ultimately stay longer in these often hard-to-staff settings. The residency-in-context allows the future teacher to begin the induction process from day one: they learn district and school policy, while also learning the history and realities they are and will be teaching in, all while being supported by an experienced teacher. For this to work, a strong partnership between a university and local school units is essential, and this is a key component of UTRs (Berry et. al, 2008a; Berry et al., 2008b). As UTRs are uniquely characterized by their focus on particular urban contexts, they can look different from one another in their implementation and design.

Policy and funding support for UTRs has grown since their inception. As a result of the passage of the Higher Education Opportunity Act, UTRs gained millions of dollars to continue and develop new UTRs (Sawchuck, 2009). Since 2009, over 143 million federal dollars have been devoted to developing new UTR programs (Sawchuck, 2011). On top of federal funding, private donors such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Kellogg Foundation have given to specific UTRs or the NCTR in order to specifically support work being done in high-needs urban areas (NCTR, 2015, 2017). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) includes language about supporting teacher residency programs in general, and includes funding for residencies. As part of their ESSA plans, 15 states and the District of Columbia included residency programs as one of their ways to improve teacher effectiveness (NCTR, 2018a). With the growing popularity of and support for residency models, it is important to investigate the

potential they offer not only for better preparing and retaining teachers, but also other potential impacts such as their effects on the schools and classrooms alumni enter.

Democratic Education, Social Justice, and Urban Teacher Residency

Literature about democratic education in urban teacher residency programs is essentially nonexistent. While there is some empirical work around democratic education in urban settings, it is scarce. On the surface, it is easy to see that democratic education is not a focus of UTR programs and thus not being examined in UTR literature. The Los Angeles Urban Teacher Residency (2018) was the only program of the 28 I examined to explicitly mention democratic education, which is part of their aim in fostering equitable learning. But upon further analysis it can be seen that there are areas, habits, or skills that UTRs exhibit that strongly align with democratic education.

UTRs tend to frame the training of their teachers through social justice. It appears that democratic education and social justice education overlap, yet they are distinct. Often when social justice is being defined or framed, democratic principles are incorporated in the definition (Michelli & Keiser, 2005; Murrell, 2006; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012; Sibbett, 2016; Stenhagen, 2016; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). For example, Hackman (2005) wrote that “social justice education encourages students to take an active role in their own education and supports teachers in creating empowering, democratic, and critical educational environments” (p. 103). Furthermore, in their review of social justice literature, Hytten and Bettez (2011) laid out how social justice education is grounded in democratic education. They also noted that there is no consensus on how to define social justice. Both social justice and democratic education are foundationally about improving society and working toward equity and equality. Social justice focuses on empowering students to challenge and overturn inequitable social arrangements

(Hytten & Bettez, 2011; Stemhagen, 2009, 2016). Furthermore, social justice is working toward eliminating hierarchies and shifting power dynamics in order to liberate and empower those who have been marginalized, oppressed, or silenced. In pursuit of these goals, social justice education may at times involve some limits on the agency of some individuals, in order to elevate marginalized voices, whereas democratic education would pursue the common good through stronger promotion of agency (Stemhagen, 2016). Democratic education focuses on empowering students to be agentic participants in order to make the public stronger (Hytten & Bettez, 2011). Additionally, democratic education emphasizes working toward the greater good or the common good through collectivism and shared authority which fosters choice and care (Fraser, 1990; Mirra & Morrell, 2011; Scott & Stuart Wells, 2013). In the end, social justice is an arm of democratic education as it exhibits democratic ideals and is framed using democratic principles (Michelli & Keiser, 2005; Murrell, 2006; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012; Stemhagen, 2016). Democracy is the end goal of both but social justice cannot be achieved without democratic principles, whereas democratic education is possible without social justice. Through collectivism and empowered agentic citizens oppression, privilege, and power dynamics can be challenged in a way to level the playing field. Some have argued that democratic education has become less robust in its discussion of challenging power, privilege, oppression, systemic issues, and being transformative (Grioux, 2016; Hytten, 2017; Sibbett, 2016). As mentioned earlier the current political climate and dismantling of democracy in the United States illuminate the need for refocus on a robust democratic education. If, as according to Hytten (2017), social justice is an inherently democratic value, then democratic education needs to be more explicitly a part of teacher learning and development, particularly within UTRs as they often espouse social justice.

A simple search of many of the prominent UTR programs' websites, such as Boston (BTR), Chicago UTEP, LAUTR, San Francisco, Seattle, and Urban Teachers, quickly reveal their use of the term social justice. Since social justice is seen to encompass democratic principles (Hyttén & Bettez, 2011; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012, Westheimer & Kahne, 2004), one could conclude that the residents of these programs are being introduced to any number of democratic habits, such as critical inquiry, using their voices, or being empowered agents of their own education. At the same time, it is not enough to rely solely on social justice frameworks to impart democratic principles; even though they overlap, they are different. It would be extremely beneficial for programs to focus on both, and not one over the other, as this would allow for them to act as complements.

No studies of outcomes of UTRs examined residents' beliefs or understandings about democratic education, but two did examine their beliefs and understanding about social justice. Roegman et al. (2017) and Reagan et al. (2016) found that residents grew in their beliefs about the importance of social justice, but the ability to put those beliefs into practice was complicated and almost nonexistent. As they engaged in implementing social justice practices in their classrooms and schools, the complexity of social justice became a reality. For example, teachers now had the language and conceptual understanding of social justice, but they were often still new to social justice and would make missteps as they struggled to see and understand their students' culture for lesson planning and curriculum development. Their commitment to and view of justice expanded as they started to see the value of diversity and layered systems of inequality and marginalization. At the same time, they were also learning about their own identity and position within these systems and all of this was while trying to navigate being a new teacher. In both studies, the importance of teaching residents about social justice was

framed in the need to maintain and contribute to a democratic society. These studies do show how foundational democratic education is to social justice work, thus UTRs. Five elements of UTRs align with practices of democratic education: critical inquiry, associated living and collaboration, student voice and student-centered curriculum, maintaining a consistent teaching for within schools, and diversifying the teaching force.

Critical Inquiry

UTRs tend to align with social justice in that they train educators to see systems of oppression and marginalization so that they can work to close the gaps that have been created by these systems. The work of UTRs to help residents grow in their understanding of their students' cultures and lived experiences, along with their own, is aimed at shaping the residents to be educators who are allies and advocates for their students and schools (Garza & Warner, 2014; Ramirez, 2017; Reagan et al., 2016; Williamson & Hodder, 2015). This could also be seen as critical inquiry: as the residents examine the context and realities that they will be or are teaching in, they can more effectively meet the needs of their students (Ramirez, 2017; Reagan et al., 2016; Williamson & Hodder, 2015). Along the same lines, the residents work to examine the dissonance and convergence of theory and practice with faculty, staff, and mentors (Anderson-Levitt et al., 2014; Garza et al., 2013). Through this residents are able to bring personal accounts of from their classroom experience as a way to investigate and critique educational theories they have been taught. Klein et al. (2015) conducted Teacher Action Research as a way to increase collaboration and diminish the hierarchical structure in their UTR program. As the programs and residents inquire about and attempt to work against oppression, they are developing democratic habits.

Associated Living and Collaboration

UTRs offer a great deal of ‘associated living’ (Dewey, 1916). Associated living is based on the idea that people interact with and can learn through their experiences with other people. In UTRs, this can be lived out more easily and most commonly through collaboration. For example, Nelson et al. (2014) described the experience of developing and maintaining the UTR partnership in Oklahoma City, and found that trust, collaborative partnerships, shared expectations, and interdependence were critical in the partnership building. One of the key components of the residency model and UTRs is mentorship both during the resident year and through the induction period (Guha et al., 2014; Berry et al., 2008a, 2008b; NCTR, 2018). Mentorship and coaching, which generally happens once the resident becomes a teacher of record, are essentially forms of collaboration, which is a practical application of associated living. The residents work with their mentors/coaches to self-reflect, gain resources, and learn to become a teacher (Gardiner, 2012; Goodwin et al., 2015; Roegman et al., 2017). Along the same lines, residents are generally placed in cohorts with time designated for cohort collaboration (Guha et al., 2016; NCTR, 2018b; Silva et al., 2014). The cohort model allows residents to go through their residencies within a community that is having similar experiences, thus opening up the possibility of learning from, sharing with, and commiserating with one another. Whether or not the collaboration at the various levels of the UTR programs is being framed as a democratic habit, it is something that participants are exposed to a great deal.

Student Voice and Student-Centered Curriculum

Beck (2016) and Gardiner and Lorch (2015) examined how university faculty and staff tried to find more convergence between theory and practice for residents based on their contextual experiences. There are even instances where programs work diligently to help their

residents become more self-aware and conscious of their own and their students' identities and lived experiences. UTRs offer reflexive spaces in university classrooms with faculty (Beck, 2016; Gardiner & Lorch, 2015; Garza et al., 2013) and in school classrooms with mentors (Goodwin et al., 2015; Gardiner, 2012; Roegman et al., 2017) so resident learning can be more individually focused based on the needs of the residents. This reflective practice can help the residents assess both themselves and the school contexts, thus empowering them to use their voices once they become teachers of record.

Democratic education calls for allowing students to use their voices so they can learn to become agentic participants in society. This is often conveyed through the idea of student-centered curriculum (Beane & Apple, 2007; Hytten, 2017; Wood, 1992, 1998). In UTR programs, residents have a variety of opportunities to find their voices and grow in their agency. UTR programs are unique as they have residents learning about and trying to understand the contexts that they will be teaching in as teachers of record (Hammerness & Craig, 2015; Matsko & Hammerness, 2014). Programs often work to help the residents understand their experiences and find ways to support more growth and learning based on the individual realities. Since context is foundational to UTR programs, a few studies focused on residents' contextual understanding. Hammerness and Craig (2016) built on Matsko and Hammerness' (2014) findings that context is not simply one dimensional, but residents should be taught about the differing levels of context, micro to macro, in order to get a fuller contextual understanding. Even though it was found that teaching context was important, Williamson et al. (2016) concluded that being context-conscious can lead to a narrow view of teaching in general. Even within high needs urban areas, no two contexts are the same. As a result, residents may be overly focused on one specific context, thus limiting their abilities to transfer their skills to other

contexts. Lessons and curriculum can be developed or adapted to be relevant to the students when residents understand the contextual realities from which their students are coming and within which their school is situated.

K-12 students were rarely discussed or the focus of any study. Even with that reality, a few studies found their residents growing in their appreciation of the diverse learners they would encounter (Garza & Werner, 2014; Ramirez, 2017; Williamson & Hodder, 2015). At the same time, no study looked at civic development of any of the residents, let alone any of their K-12 students. Williamson and Hodder (2015) examined what residents participating in observational rounds, similar to the medical field, came to understand about the education system and diverse students. They found that residents grew in their appreciation of diverse learners and their strengths as learners through their observational rounds. But the rounds did not guarantee changing deeply held beliefs and misconceptions about students and their lived experiences (Williamson & Hodder, 2015). Similarly, Ramirez (2017) used a project focused on English Learners (EL) to understand the role Culturally Sustaining pedagogy played for residents. He found that teachers' consciousness of EL students' lived experience and culture was raised, previously held views and myths of EL students were challenged, and that student learning was engaged when their cultural reality was part of their learning experiences. Finally, Garza and Werner (2014) found that residents' comfort with diverse students increased as a result of being immersed in an authentic school context experience. At the same time, they had major concerns about the lack of alignment between their residency experience and their coursework, as some of the course content was the same as it would be delivered to typical graduate students and was not adapted to meet the residency goals. The residents were frustrated with the course sequencing as they felt they did not get needed content at appropriate times. Overall, these learning

experiences suggest the importance of student-centered curriculum as a way to empower student voice. Garza and Werner (2014) found feedback from residents as important to improve the residency program and meet its goals. As residents interacted with and developed awareness of the linguistic and cultural realities of EL students they began to empower their students' voices (Ramirez, 2017). Additionally, learning about the lived experiences of their students and their contextual realities lays the foundation for the teacher and student to experience associated living and collaboration. Centering students in UTR studies is an area that would be beneficial and needs more attention, as the students and their learning are central to understanding the effectiveness of the UTR model. At the most basic level, UTRs are resident-centered and K12 student-centered, so that they can train and retain high quality teachers to the specific high-need context.

Retention. Retaining high quality teachers was a main rationale for establishing UTRs. Higher retention rates for UTR graduates is both beneficial to the school district in which they are employed and democratic. In addition, as teachers stay in the school context they have an ability to understand it at a deeper more nuanced level, which can help build the foundation for associated living and collaboration. Furthermore, as the teachers increase their understanding of the students and school context, they may be able to deepen their and their students' critical inquiry. Numerous studies inquired about retention rates of graduates. In general, those that looked at retention rates found fairly high retention of UTR graduates. The major difference was the operational definition of retention. These varied from very specific, like Solomon (2009), who set the standard as alumni still within BPS after three years, to very general, like Rogeman et al. (2017) who measured how many alumni were still in teaching in any district after five years. Berry et al. (2008a, 2008b) stated that initial retention rates for UTR graduates from

AUSL and BTR was upwards of 95% after three years. Silva et al. (2014) found UTR retention to be slightly higher than other novice teachers for the first two years. In his study of the BTR, Solomon (2009) found an 86% retention rate within Boston Public Schools within the first three years of entering teaching. Similarly, Papay et al. (2012) found retention rates to be 20% higher for BTR grads than other teachers after 5 years in BPS. Roegman et al. (2017) found that 86% of their study participants remained in teaching, no matter the context urban or otherwise, after five years. Guha et al. (2016) offered the most comprehensive look at retention data, as they analyzed data from multiple studies around teacher retention and found that after both three and five years of teaching, residency programs had higher retention rates than their non-resident counterparts. Because UTRs appear to raise teacher retention rates, and thus we may expect to see growing numbers of UTR alumni in urban schools, it is particularly important that we research impacts of UTRs on teachers' democratic habits.

Diversifying teacher workforce. Connected to the goal of higher retention is helping to diversify the teaching profession and placing more diverse teachers in hard-to-fill, high-needs schools. Having teachers that represent the population being served has been shown to positively affect test scores, attendance, and suspension rates (Dee 2004, 2007; Lindsay & Hart 2017). These positive effects could grow community, which can help lower barriers to student voice, collaboration, and associated living. In their studies of BTR, Solomon (2009) and Papay et al. (2012) found that the diversity of BTR alumni had increased, with a particularly high increase in teachers of color. Additionally, Solomon (2009) found that at least 51% of the residents were people of color. Papay et al. (2012) found that BTR alumni were more diverse, racially and culturally than other BPS teachers. A more diversified teaching force could mirror the student population and this has the potential to bring diverse perspectives and experiences to

the UTRs. This could help UTRs act more democratically through empowered collaboration and consensus building thus working toward the greater good.

Conclusion

The amount of scholarly work focusing on democratic education in urban school settings is scarce, particularly in connection to UTRs. This is particularly troubling since many urban schools tend to be undemocratic spaces. However, the democratic urban literature offers insight into the possibilities of empowerment and agency among students as well as the constraints on democratic education, such as lack of buy-in and continued support to teachers and schools practicing democratic education. While UTRs tend to espouse social justice education they do not seem to explicitly foreground democratic education. However, it appears that UTRs are well suited to exhibit and support democratic education. This potential is first based on the connections between social justice and democratic education. Additionally, the structure and elements of a UTR seem to naturally allow for democratic habits to be practiced. This study seeks to illuminate some of these possibilities and the potential for UTRs to align with and practice democratic habits explicitly.

Chapter 3: Methods

For this study, a qualitative case study design (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) was utilized. The case consists of two cohorts of teachers from an Urban Teacher Residency (UTR) called the Mid-Atlantic Teacher Residency (MATR). The first section of this chapter I clarify why a qualitative case study was appropriate for this project. For this project, I conducted semi-structured interviews and secondary data analysis. I, the author, had previous experience with the data; I describe my positionality as the researcher, which includes my motivations, role, and limitations. Next, I describe the context in which the participants were located, how they were selected originally for a larger program evaluation, and why I selected the aforementioned cohorts for my study. I then go into detail about how the data was collected, including examples of each of the protocols originally utilized. Following that, I explain my analysis procedures, as they were informed by my research questions and the selected methodology of a qualitative case study. Finally, I lay out the limitations of the study.

Qualitative Case Study

Qualitative research methods were selected for this study as a way to collect data that has depth and richness based on the context of the study. Furthermore, qualitative methods were appropriate as my aim was to make meaning and understand the phenomenon of democratic education as employed or not employed by teachers in one UTR (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). More specifically, a qualitative case study approach was utilized, as one UTR was selected as the focus of the study.

As I was interested in analyzing democratic education within one program, MATR, a case study seemed most appropriate. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) defined qualitative case study as a study based on “in-depth description and analysis of a bounded system” (p. 37). They

continued by noting that qualitative case studies are determined to be case studies not by the focus of the study but the unit of analysis. This study was attempting to understand the phenomenon of democratic education within one urban teacher residency program. In other words, democratic education is a concept that can and is utilized in a variety of settings, thus making it boundless, whereas MATR is a program that takes place in one location in one contextual setting, essentially giving it boundaries (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Smith, 1978). In the end, the teachers within MATR were the unit being analyzed to understand their use of democratic education. Since the teachers were trained through the MATR program, their experiences and perceptions of teaching cannot be separated from the influence of the program. In the end, the influence of the program on the teachers cannot be ignored, as the program was a key component of the contextual reality of the teachers.

Furthermore, the usefulness and appropriateness of a qualitative case study approach was found in the difficulty in separating the phenomenon from the context of the study (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2014). This was based on the idea that the realities that define the context and the variables that define the phenomenon were so closely related that it would be near impossible to delineate the two. In other words, the context was relevant to the phenomenon under study (Yin, 2003) and thus the understanding of phenomenon in its real-life context was essential (Yin, 2014). Since MATR is a program that was and is set in a specific setting, the context was critical to understanding the phenomenon of democratic education as it relates to urban education.

Research Site

This case study was conducted on an urban teacher residency program in a mid-sized Mid-Atlantic city. This program that was the focus of this study was selected for a few reasons. First, I had developed a familiarity with the city and program from my work as a research

assistant on a separate program evaluation of MATR, which will be described in more detail below. Second, as I learned more about the program, I quickly started to see the value and ability of MATR to train successful teachers in the urban setting. Additionally, I had a desire to see urban youth and students, who are often silenced, disenfranchised, and have limited access to political power (Levinson, 2012; Stitzlein, 2014b) as they are commonly from marginalized groups, empowered to become democratic citizens, which in turn, will hopefully allow them to gain political power and voice. MATR has the potential to influence numerous urban teachers and thus students to become empowered agentic citizens.

The school district MATR partners with serves nearly 25,000 students in more than 40 schools. At the time of the study, the racial demographics of the district were 71.2% Black, 13.96% Hispanic, 11.6% White, 1.3% Asian, 1.7% two or more, and less than 1% Hawaiian or Native American. Three-fourths of the student population qualified for Free or Reduced Lunch and one-third of students lived 100% below the federal poverty line. There were roughly 38 different languages spoken by students, with 9% of the population being English Language Learners.

Program. Mid-Atlantic Teacher Residency (MATR) is a teacher residency based on principles outlined by the National Center for Teacher Residencies (See Table 1). MATR partners with an urban school district and a large public university located in the same mid-sized Mid-Atlantic city. From the outset, MATR's goal has been to recruit, prepare, support, and retain highly-effective teachers to be successful and committed to the urban school unit. The 13-month program combines theory and research-based graduate level teacher preparation courses through the partnering university and school-based, real-world classroom experience. MATR has expanded since its inception from merely a secondary track program to include an

Table 1

National Center for Teacher Residency Principles

Principle	Description
1. Targeted recruitment and selection of residents	Through a highly selective recruitment process, residencies attract a diverse group of talented college graduates, career changers, and community members.
2. Rigorous selection and support of teacher mentors	Residencies select a cohort of experienced teachers within the district to be paired with residents for the duration of the school year.
3. Training in cohorts	Residents train as part of a cohort — a peer group that provides ongoing support and collaborative learning throughout the residency year and beyond.
4. A yearlong classroom apprenticeship	Residents spend the full academic year in a district school, developing under the guidance of an experienced mentor teacher.
5. Linking theory to practice	In addition to their hands-on work in the classroom, residents engage in master's-level education coursework designed to inform and enrich the apprenticeship experience.
6. Strategic hiring of graduates	Residency graduates commit to serving their district for at least three years after the completion of their residency.

NCTR (2018, <https://nctresidencies.org/about/residency-model-teacher-mentor-programs/>)

elementary school track and special education track. All residents receive tuition remission, a stipend of more than \$20,000 to cover living expenses, and reimbursement for required licensure testing. Accepted applicants commit to serving for a minimum of four years, with one of those years being a resident year, and the remaining three committed to the school district. The program also gives residents preferred hiring within the school district and has a 100% placement rate.

Each resident is paired with a veteran teacher for a year-long placement, designed to allow residents to observe, co-teach, and learn alongside the mentor teacher. Each resident takes

classes while teaching simultaneously, so they can develop their own teaching praxis as they learn theory and gain practical experience. Throughout their teaching residencies, mentor teachers and residents meet regularly to discuss and reflect upon classroom experiences. This mentorship does not end with the residency year; teachers continue to receive coaching through at least the first two years of teaching. As the year progresses during their residency year, residents are given more teaching responsibilities until they are solo teaching for a number of weeks. In line with UTR recommendations, resident teachers earn their master's degrees and teaching licenses after successfully completing their residency year.

Teachers within this study were placed in their residency-year and year-one placements based on a few different factors. First, the interests and intended license-area of the teacher determined which schools were options for that teacher. Second, during the residency year, a mentor teacher was needed, so the number of willing, trained, and available teachers that fit the level and content-area of the resident determined placement. Then, hiring the resident was dependent on their licensure area and the needs of the district. The participants for this study were members of secondary track cohorts, which includes middle school and high school teachers from a variety of core content areas. Secondary track teachers were the focus of the study, as I have my secondary teaching license and have interest and experience in secondary school settings.

Participants. For this study, first, I selected two cohorts using purposeful convenience sampling (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). There were a few criteria that were used for selecting cohorts. First, the teachers needed to have been enrolled in MATR and have completed both their residency and first year of teaching. This was important as they have completed the program and can offer multiple data points that will be helpful in illuminating any changes in the

teachers' use of democratic habits. Second, the teachers needed to have been part of the secondary track. The secondary track was selected out of my personal interest and understanding of secondary education as I was, and currently am a high school teacher. Finally, the teachers in cohorts A and B were the focus of this study, as they already have data collected for their residency and year-one experiences. While there are other older cohorts that have completed their contracts, cohorts A and B are the two most recent cohorts to complete their residencies and year one experiences. At the time of the study, cohorts A and B were the most recent, temporal proximity to the program provides current and relevant insight into the influence of the most recent iteration of the program. Cohort A included seven secondary teachers (n=7) who were residents during the 2015-2016 school year. Cohort B included nine (n=9) secondary teachers who were residents during the 2016-2017 school year. However, for cohort B only eight of the residents were included in this study as one, Eric, did not complete his first year of teaching. Table 2 provides details about the teachers in both cohorts. Additionally, all resident alumni were given pseudonyms. It was also important to keep the teachers categorized within their cohorts as their particular year and cohort could influence their learning and growth as teachers.

Additionally, I interviewed two MATR program administrators. They were purposefully selected because of their roles within the program and their first-hand knowledge of the program. Dr. Damian (pseudonym) was selected as she is one of the program founders and directors, thus she casts vision for and guides the direction of the program. She had limited interaction with the residents but directs the MATR staff and direction of the program. Dr. Damian was often working with state and local level government officials to garner continued support for the MATR program. At the time of this study, she was also overseeing the expansion

Table 2

Resident Participant Placement and Completed Interviews

Resident	Gender	Placement Level		Interviews			
		Residency	Year 1	Residency		Year 1	
				Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Cohort A							
Keira	F	Middle	Middle	X	X	X	X
Diana	F	High	Middle	X	X	X	X
Lee	M	High	Middle	X	X	X	X
Amanda	F	Middle	Middle	X	X	X	X
Bre	F	High	High	X	X	X	X
Mia	F	High	Middle	X	X	X	X
Billy	M	Middle	Middle	X	X	X	X
Cohort B							
Teddy	F	Middle	Middle	X	X	X	
Anna	F	Middle	Middle	X	X		
Murphy	M	Middle	Middle	X	X	X	X
Martin	M	High	High	X	X		
Chloe	F	Middle	Middle	X	X		
Justin	M	Middle	Middle	X	X	X	
Darla	F	Middle	Middle	X	X	X	
Travis	M	High	Middle	X	X	X	X
Eric	M	Middle		X			

of the program to other school units in the area. In the end, her influence could determine what is emphasized or seen as critical to the program, so her insight was of great value.

Dr. Sams (pseudonym) was selected because of her position within the program and her direct connection with the residents. She was the curriculum coordinator as well as one of the instructors and evaluators for each secondary track student during their residency year. Gaining her insight was important, as she had influence over what was introduced and emphasized with the residents' classroom experiences. As she evaluated their progress she could also foreground,

marginalize, or ignore certain practices or theories, so it was important to understand her views on democratic education.

As an instructor, Dr. Sams taught two courses that all residents took as part of the program. One course she taught the residents took in the summer before they entered the classroom as residents, *Educational Issues, Ethics, and Policy*. The other course she taught was during the fall of the residency year as the residents had just entered the school and classroom. This course was *Issues in Urban Education*. Each of these courses were structured as seminars. Dr. Sams had multiple points of contact and influence in the residents' training and development as teachers.

Finally, I interviewed multiple instructors of the residents' master's level courses. These instructors were ones that had taught courses to one or both of the cohorts. Three instructors were interviewed, so including Dr. Sams a total of four course instructors were interviewed. Instructors were determined based on the course(s) they taught and degree to which the teachers referenced them in their interviews. Further, these instructors were referenced in multiple interviews as having impact on the residents learning, thus they were selected. These instructors played a vital role in the theories and knowledge that were shared with the residents as they went through their residency. In the end, the instructors, their curriculum, and pedagogic methods held a great deal of influence over the teachers so it was of critical importance to understand whether, and if so how, democratic principles are reflected in their courses.

Dr. Ryan (pseudonym) was a professor at the affiliate university and taught two social studies specific methods courses that all secondary social studies residents took. *Teaching Secondary School Social Studies* was taken in the fall of the residency year and *Investigations and Trends in teaching Secondary Social Studies* was taken in the spring. Both courses were

mandatory for the social studies residents as well as students pursuing a teaching license through a traditional student-teaching experience. While Dr. Ryan taught all MATR social studies residents, these courses also included other pre-service social studies teachers. Dr. Ryan has been teaching with MATR since the creation of the program and was part of the team that planned and developed the MATR in the beginning.

Dr. Conrad (pseudonym) was a professor at the partnering university and taught three secondary English methods courses. Similar to Dr. Ryan, all three methods courses were mandatory and taken by all English MATR residents and students pursuing a teaching license in secondary English through a traditional student-teaching experience. In the fall, the students took two methods courses, *Teaching of Secondary School English* and *Young Adult Literature*. In the spring they took *Investigations and Trends in the Teaching of English*. Dr. Conrad has been teaching the English methods courses for MATR since the fall of 2013.

Dr. Adams (pseudonym) was a professor at the partnering university and taught two courses all MATR residents took during their residency experience. She taught a classroom management class and a weekly seminar in which the residents would meet with their cohort and share and discuss relevant classroom experiences. Additionally, she helped to supervise and observe the residents throughout their residency experience. Dr. Adams and the weekly seminar she led were the most common positively mentioned instructor and experience by the residents. While she is no longer affiliated with the MATR program she helped plan and develop the MATR program in the beginning and taught with MATR until her departure in 2017.

Researcher Positionality

For this study, the teacher data that was analyzed was from a larger multi-year evaluation of a Mid-Atlantic Teacher Residency (MATR). The purpose of the evaluation was to understand

teacher preparation and the factors most related to beginning teacher success, particularly within an urban setting. The evaluation utilized a mixed methods approach, but I only used the qualitative data collected during the evaluation. Over the life of the evaluation it has been directed by the same two full-time faculty at a university in the same Mid-Atlantic city. They employed multiple graduate research assistants for data collection and analysis, including me.

I was a part of the qualitative evaluation research team from the fall of 2017 until the fall of 2018. As a result, I became familiar with much of the teacher interview data for two of the cohorts. It was this interaction with the data that sparked my interest and was one reason I desired to work with the data for this study. While on the team, I heard and/or read all of the interviews that were analyzed for this study, but the focus and research questions of the evaluation differed from those of this study. As I examined the use of democratic education by these teachers, I hoped to add understanding to what has already been found through the evaluation as a way to see if democratic education could be foregrounded within the program in order to develop engaged citizen teachers, and thus influence the students they come in contact with to become democratic citizens themselves.

While my familiarity with the data has played a major role in my choices, my own personal experience and reality have also led to my interest in this topic. Since I, the researcher, am the primary research instrument it is important for me to reflect on and disclose personal biases, experiences, passions, and interests, all of which may shape my interpretation of the data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). As I conducted and concluded this study, I am currently teaching high school social studies with American Government as one of my main content areas. I am in my ninth year of teaching in an affluent public-school district outside of Columbus, Ohio. This context is one in which academics and social mobility are highlighted. In

my experience there, it has seemed as though the only engagement with democracy or society was to fulfill volunteer requirements or a line on a resume for college. It is often joked that the students in this district, particularly the high school in which I have spent the large majority of my career, live in a “bubble,” devoid of the realities of the rest of the world. Out of this narrative, my desire to teach and train students to be engaged and knowledgeable citizens has grown, especially in the past few years, as a result of taking a two-year sabbatical from teaching to pursue my doctorate in education. The program I chose was one that focused on how schools influence society and how society influences schools. Through this program and my classes, I grew in my criticality and in my desire to educate students who value their voices and are -- hopefully -- going to become agentic democratic citizens. The combination of my teaching experience and education has placed a deep belief in the value of democratic education for students as well as teachers, which has helped to guide and inspire the focus of this study.

My two five-year-old sons, one black and one mixed, black, white, and Native American, can be identified with marginalized and oppressed populations. At the same time, I have a biological daughter who is white and was born during the #MeToo movement. While being othered cannot be quantified, the realities of the world in which my children live and will be walking into, especially after they leave our home as adults, has hit me to the core. My desire is to work to change the realities around their schooling and to defend and ensure democracy endures, a democracy that allows for diverse citizens who are seen, heard, and empowered. The reality of my children has helped me to work on becoming an ally to groups that have been othered, marginalized, and/or oppressed.

Another important area of influence for me was my mediocre teacher preparation experience. Much of my time within my teacher preparation felt very uneventful, leaving me

feeling as if I was missing valuable lessons and experiences throughout my preparation. I completed a traditional student-teaching experience which, looking back, did very little to prepare me to be a full-time teacher. As a result, I waited a few years to even pursue full-time teaching jobs. Even when I got my first teaching job, I struggled and felt as though I was learning lessons and skills for the first time. Once I was a few years into my career, I was able to reflect and started to believe there had to be a better way to prepare educators. I am not sure exactly how or when, but I started to become an advocate for apprenticeship models; in my opinion, the longer a pre-service teacher can be in a classroom, the better. My desire to see teachers better prepared and equipped to enter the classroom has become a passion and influenced my studies, as well as this project.

Data Collection

I collected and used four sources of data for this study: teacher interviews, interviews with program administrators, course instructor interviews, and program documents. My goal with using multiple data sources was to allow for a variety of perspectives as a way to triangulate the data to test and hopefully confirm interpretations. In other words, validity was increased through an abundance and variety of evidence that was analyzed to either support or refute the research questions (Maxwell, 2013). All of the teachers' interviews were previously collected by evaluation team members, but I interviewed the program administrators and program course instructors and collected the program documents.

Participant Recruitment

All five MATR staff participants were recruited in the same manner. Each participant was emailed individually and invited to participate in the study. Additionally, each participant was given a study description in order to understand the scope and recruitments needed to

participate. The teachers were all recruited as part of the previously explained program evaluation.

Teacher Interviews

Four semi-structured interviews were collected with the teachers, two during their residency years, and two during their year-one experiences. The interviews from both the residency year and year one were completed around the end of their fall and spring semesters for each year. All seven of the teachers in cohort A completed all four interviews. For cohort B, only two teachers completed all four interviews, three additional teachers completed the first three interviews, and eight of the nine completed the first two interviews. It is unknown as to why interview completion varied for cohort B, but it is known that eight of the nine completed their residency year and first year of teaching. Since not all of cohort B completed all four interviews the perspectives from cohort B are not as representative as cohort A. Table 2 summarizes which interviews teachers completed. Interviews ranged from 25 minutes to over an hour, averaging 45 minutes, and were digitally recorded and transcribed. The interviews were transcribed by an outside company. The focus of the residency year interviews was on the MATR model around how the teacher was experiencing the various components of the program and how prepared they felt as teachers being trained through a residency model in an urban setting. Once the teachers were alumni and teachers of record, the focus of the interviews shifted to their development as professionals through having them reflect on the MATR model, their teacher identities, and professional growth. Interviewers asked clarifying and probing questions as they saw necessary during the interviews. The interviews were developed and administered by members of the evaluation team. Each of the four interview protocols can be found in Appendix A.

Program Administrators

Both of the MATR program administrators were recruited for the study through email. Each one was sent an individual email that included a study description and requirements for participation. Both administrators agreed to participate and interview times were selected to accommodate their schedule. I conducted one semi-structured interview with each MATR program administrator. The interviews were conducted over the phone, were digitally recorded by me, and ranged from 45 minutes to an hour. Each interview was transcribed by an outside company and individually checked by me. The focus of the interviews was to gain insight into the administrators' beliefs about and perceptions of democratic education, particularly as they pertain to preparing teachers for urban settings. Additionally, because of the positions of the two administrators, other valuable information about the program was obtained through the interviews. The topics included: past and future of the program; perceptions of program success; areas of needed improvement; how curriculum and program design was decided; why the program was designed the way it was, and their perceptions of the qualities that lead an urban teacher to be successful. During the interviews, I asked clarifying and probing questions as needed. The interview protocol can be found in Appendix B.

Course Instructors

All three of the course instructors were recruited through email. Each one was sent an individual email that included a study description and requirements for participation. I conducted one semi-structured interview with each of the course instructors. The interviews were conducted over the phone and digitally recorded by me and ranged from 45 minutes to an hour. Each interview was transcribed by an outside company and individually checked by me. The instructors were interviewed in order to understand the influence they play on the teachers'

knowledge and skills development. Additionally, it was important to understand the instructor's beliefs and perceptions about democratic education, preparing teachers for the urban school context, and how those are connected. The interview covered details about curriculum and instruction methods, the role the instructors play within MATR, their perceptions and beliefs about preparing successful teachers in an urban setting, and what role, if any, democratic education does or could play in their courses and MATR. As the interviews were semi-structured, I asked clarifying and probing questions as necessary. The instructor interview protocol can be found in Appendix C.

Program Documents

I collected a few key program documents. These were documents that residents received and would be considered a key component of the residency model. There were three main documents that I collected and analyzed. First was the "Secondary Program Handbook". The handbook offered a great deal of critical information for the resident as they begin and progressed through the program, such as vision, purpose, standards, expectations and copies of tools that would later be used with their mentor teacher. Second was the "Gradual Release Calendar". The calendar was the progression of when and how residents should be assuming more teaching responsibility until they are solo teaching. Since the calendar set the expectations for when and how the resident's teaching responsibility should have progressed, it was of interest to understand those expectations, as well as examine the wording of the document. The third program document that I collected was the course syllabi from all instructors that were interviewed. These syllabi gave a detailed understanding about the courses the residents took as part of the program. The syllabi revealed theories, readings, curriculum, and pedagogical practices of the instructors. Combined with the instructors interviews the syllabi allowed for a

more holistic understanding of the knowledge and educational experiences that the residents had as they were being trained. In order to gain access to these documents, I contacted MATR administrators and instructors for their permission and to ensure I had access to the version the residents were given.

Data Analysis

As data was collected, it was placed in a data analysis software, Atlas.ti, to be coded; this includes program documents. I conducted a constant comparison method through the use of multiple rounds of coding as a way to make meaning of the data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Focused and open coding was used during coding (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). Additionally, I conducted focused coding that was both inductive and deductive. I started coding with focused deductive coding that included codes developed from the democratic education literature such as associated living, collaboration, voice, student-centered instruction, and critical inquiry. Additionally, since the school context is a critical component to the residents and MATR experience, context codes were included, such as school context, community context, and student context. As I coded, I also did inductive coding as a way to seek emergent themes. Both types of coding were utilized in order to let the data speak to the research questions as much as possible. This was especially important for this study since much of the data being analyzed originates from a study that did not focus on democratic education. A final round of axial coding (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) was conducted to condense and merge codes into broader themes. In the end, roughly 50 codes were used or developed.

In order to increase the richness of my analysis, I also wrote multiple memos and listened to each interview that I did not conduct (Maxwell, 2013). After each interview I conducted, I wrote a brief memo about the interview experience, the setting, the participant, any ideas or

responses that stood out, and initial interpretations. Before I read and coded the interview transcripts, I listened to interview recordings for the teachers. As I listened, I followed Maxwell's (2013) recommendation of writing notes "on what you see or hear in your data, and develop tentative ideas about categories or relationships" (p. 105). In addition, I wrote memos throughout my analysis (Maxwell, 2013; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). First, I wrote an analytic memo after I finished coding each grouping of data. For example, I coded all resident alumni's first interview (T1) during their residency year and then wrote my analytic memo. I did this for all six groupings I created. The first five groups were based on when and who was interviewed with the sixth being the program documents. These groups were created in an attempt to chunk similar data because of the sheer amount of data and to allow for more meaningful analytic memos. These memos were my first attempts at responding to the research questions using the codes and understanding what was gleaned from that round (Maxwell, 2013; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Second, I wrote two reflective memos, one after completing coding for all 6 groupings round one and the second after the axial coding (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). These were a way for me to get my thinking on paper and reflect not only on what I saw or understood in the data, but on my own positionality and experience with the data and ideas (Maxwell, 2013). In the end, the listening notes and memos were used as reflexive tools in order to check codes and develop themes to ensure ideas were not missed. The memoing process helped me notice similarities and differences across different types of data (i.e. program documents, interviews with teachers, interviews with MATR staff) and ensure the constant comparison approach (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016), and as much as possible, let the data respond to the research questions.

Because it was unknown where teachers would end up or if they would stay within one school during their tenure, MATR is designed to prepare teachers for the overall district context,

not individual schools. As a result, my analysis considered the influence of the district context and MATR on preparing the teachers for a career in the district, not a particular school. At the same times, the similarities and differences between sites was not overlooked but taken into consideration as part of the contextual reality of the district.

Limitations

There are several possible limitations to this study. Since most of the data was previously collected, the biggest limitation was the original interview protocols. The original protocols were not designed to answer questions about democratic education, guiding the possible limits they could present. Because the teachers' interviews did not ask about democratic education directly, I may have tried to find evidence in their responses that did not exist. Since I was looking for demonstration of democratic habits, I could infer or mistakenly place meaning where it may not have been intended. While doing member checking could have helped diminish this possibility, due to the design of the original program evaluation, I was unable to do member checks with the participants. One way I tried to address this limitation was through my coding methods. The use of inductive coding and multiple rounds of coding allowed the data to speak for itself as well as reduce possible preconceived expectations. Similarly, I coded for negative cases (Shenton, 2004) or silence on democratic education, as there was no guarantee that the data would show use of or adherence to democratic education. Another way I addressed this limitation was through checking my own bias and expectations. I did this through my memos and having regular peer debriefing with a supervisor familiar with MATR and the cohort (Shenton, 2004). Finally, interviewing two directors/administrators of the MATR secondary program and analyzing program documents allowed for data checking through triangulation, thus increasing credibility of the overall themes and findings.

At the same time, one benefit of not developing the cohort protocols was that I did not write them with any expectation of how they may or may not answer, which limited to some degree, the potential for researcher bias to shape data collection. Furthermore, I had limited connection to MATR and any connection I do have was mostly external, as I did not participate in any trainings or program development, so I had less at stake in representing the program in a certain light. This separation granted me some freedom from conscious or subconscious preconceived expectations around what findings I found by asking certain questions, which could have been the case when protocols were developed by someone who was intimately connected to a program.

As I mostly used secondary data, the fact that I did not collect the vast majority of the data exhibits my lack of control over data collection -- a limitation of the study. Maxwell (2013) discussed the idea of reactivity, which is the influence that researcher has on the participant. Since I was not the one conducting the interviews with the cohort members, I was unable to control for any influence that may have been exerted on the teachers. At the same time, since I was unable to conduct the interviews, I could not see the expressions or body language as participants answered the questions. Being able to see them respond could have given me a fuller picture of *how* they were responding, not just *what* they were responding, which was the case since I only read the transcripts. As I was aware of this limitation, I listened to the interviews as well as read them. Listening allowed me to hear vocal inflection, tone, pauses etc., all of which allowed for a fuller picture of the participants' responses. Additionally, being removed from the data collection made it less likely that I would attribute overly positive meanings to their statements, because I felt less compelled to interpret statements that reflected well on them, as I did not have a personal connection to the participants.

As I was the primary research instrument as the researcher, I was prone to researcher bias (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Maxwell, 2013). I had expectations, goals, and desires for this study, and those influenced my analysis and conclusions (Maxwell, 2013). This possible limitation is why I conducted multiple rounds of memos and had my work checked by a supervisor and a colleague. The memos, also, allowed me to stay reflexive of my own implicit and explicit biases and address issues that I became aware of through the process. The frequent checks with outsiders allowed for external perspectives that brought to my attention any gaps or assumptions I was making.

The sample of the study was another limitation. While a convenience sample was unavoidable based on the focus and contextual settings of the study, it did limit transferability and generalizability of the study. At the same time, the overall generalizability to other UTRs was limited, as the context of MATR was unique and the sample was not a random sample of teachers from UTRs in general.

I made every attempt to ensure credibility and trustworthiness of this study. Many of those efforts are listed above, but there are a few other ways I worked to increase the credibility of the study. One was through debriefing with my advisor. These sessions allowed for collaboration, alternative perspectives, and recognition of bias (Shenton, 2004). I also included thick descriptions of data (Shenton, 2004) as this allows the reader to understand the use of democratic education and whether the findings presented fit with what was described as democratic education. This required me to present as much of the raw data connected to the themes as possible, so that the connections between the data and findings were as transparent as possible to the readers. Moreover, my goal was to conduct a trustworthy study based on its

methodological approach, planned analysis, explicitly in addressing limitations, including efforts to diminish the identified limitations, and taking steps to ensure credibility throughout the study.

Chapter 4: Findings

After much analysis, it appears that, while democratic education was not foregrounded by the MATR program or residents, it was also not ignored. There were parts of the program in which democratic habits were being strongly emphasized, but at the same time the degree to which residents were expressing democratic principles within their classrooms was limited. Barriers, not only to using democratic education but professional development in general, were real and common for these residents. In the end, the use of democratic education and habits was mixed and varies among the MATR program elements and its residents.

In this chapter I communicate major themes and findings from the qualitative data. The study's research questions guide both the structure and communication of the findings. Each research question is addressed using themes, both major and minor, that aid in answering each question.

First, I address the role that democratic education played in the MATR program. This was where democratic education and habits were the most apparent and exhibited the strongest. There were multiple components of the program in which the residents were exposed to democratic principles, both in their residency year and first year of teaching. The professors interviewed for this study used similar pedagogical approaches that employed democratic principles both explicitly and implicitly. Furthermore, the MATR staff was in agreement in their support of, and desire for, residents to be trained in democratic habits and principles.

The next section focuses on the residents and their expression, if any, of democratic education through their actions as residents and teachers. While residents did exhibit some democratic habits, they were limited and most often occurred outside of the classroom with other

professionals. That is not to say that residents were not exhibiting democratic habits within their classroom, but it was sparse.

The final main section addresses the barriers to democratic education that the residents and professors expressed. Some barriers were common to most of the residents while others were very unique to individual residents. In general, these barriers appear to impede the residents' professional knowledge and skill development, and even more so their use of democratic habits. Finally, to end the chapter I summarize the findings as presented in these sections.

Democratic Education Within the MATR Program

As stated previously, while MATR does not foreground democratic education, it includes several areas in which democratic habits and principles are exhibited. During the residents' residency year, several program pieces reflect democratic habits, including the cohort model, the weekly cohort seminar, pedagogical and curricular decisions by professors, and the mentorship relationship. An additional instance of democratic education is in year one of teaching when the residents, now teachers, are assigned a career coach. It is important to note that all five of the MATR staff, professors and administrators that were interviewed expressed that they valued democratic education and democratic habits. Democratic habits and principles were the most prevalent and explicit within the MATR residency experience.

Value Reflected in MATR Staff Beliefs and Program Documents

All five MATR staff members interviewed stated that they supported democratic education and democratic habits for the residents and the program. Dr. Ryan was the most explicit in his valuing and expression of the need for democratic education. He said he viewed his social studies methods course as "*education for democracy*". Additionally, he called his

students “*guardians of democracy*” and gave them the charge of fulfilling this role. Dr. Conrad was explicit in saying that he “*100 percent*” believed in preparing teachers for urban settings and all settings with democratic education. Furthermore, he explained his intentionality in designing his courses to be student-centered as a matter of democratic education. The other three professors saw the value of democratic education as a way to develop citizens (Dr. Adams), which is needed because citizens do not know how to think critically and that is impacting how people make decisions to vote (Dr. Damian), and as a way to culturally engage and support residents’ current and future students, through culturally relevant pedagogy (Dr. Sams).

Both documents produced by the program illuminated democratic habits. The content of the *Gradual Release Calendar* and the *Program Handbook* were very similar. Collaboration was used numerous times in both the *Gradual Release Calendar* and the *Program Handbook*. Residents were required and encouraged to regularly engage in collaboration, particularly with their mentors. For example, the majority of their planning was to be co-planning with their mentor teacher. The collaboration started out very one-directional but was intended to evolve into more of a sharing and collaborative experience as the residents progressed through their residency experience. Additionally, residents were also required to teach some lessons using cooperative learning, which provided potential opportunities for their students to practice collaboration and associated living.

Both documents also highlighted the need for the residents to learn about their students, their school, and the community context. The residents were expected to learn and grow in their ability to be culturally relevant and aware of their students’ lived experiences; they were also expected to deepen their cultural competency. Furthermore, they were expected to practice differentiated instruction in order for all of their students to have opportunities to learn and

achieve. This standard for learning pushed the residents to embody a student-centered approach in their learning, planning, and teaching. This habit was discussed throughout both documents as they called on residents to put students first and be culturally aware.

Additionally, both documents discussed expectations for the residents to teach in student-centered ways, and include specific instructional practices. Some of these practices required the residents to attempt to engage their students in critical inquiry. This could be seen through the expectation to teach inquiry, critical thinking, and problem solving throughout their residency. Finally, a social justice framing could be seen numerous times in both documents as the documents regularly referenced a program standard of “*Advocating for social justice and equity...*”. These multiple expressions of social justice were the clearest instance of the MATR foregrounding social justice. These documents framed the residents’ expectations, guided the residents through their first year of the MATR program, and were littered with phrases, standards, and expectations that pushed the residents to exhibit and practice multiple democratic habits.

The valuing of democratic habits could also be seen through three of the four professors’ course syllabi. Dr. Adams did not provide syllabi, as she said it would not be helpful in understanding her classes since almost everything they did in class was determined by the residents’ experiences. The other three professors provided a total of seven class syllabi, two of which every resident took, three were English methods courses, and two were social studies methods courses. All seven of the syllabi displayed democratic habits, particularly as each course was structured as a seminar. These courses were heavily focused on the residents’ classroom experiences. Dr. Sams’ course *Educational Issues, Ethics, and Policy* mentioned one of the course objectives as “*to recognize and critically consider the potential purposes of and the*

moral/ethical issues arising from education in a democracy” (n.p.). This was the most explicit mention of democracy in any of the syllabi. The professors all attempted to open their classrooms in order to create space for the residents to share, hold conversations, and critically reflect on their practice as teachers. While the courses varied in content, they were structured in similar ways that allowed for democratic habits to be exhibited and practiced throughout the course.

As mentioned, each course was student-centered and most of the coursework and time was based on the residents’ experiences. This openness to, and foregrounding of, the resident experience also allowed for the residents to exercise their voice and associate with their cohort members. Additionally, each course had the students think and reflect critically about both their experience and the context in which they were teaching. Through this process of sharing they also had the opportunity to share ideas and confront authentic issues within their classroom, which allowed them to collaborate with one another.

The four professors provided rationale for their support of democratic education, but the residents were mixed in their awareness of these goals. Students of Dr. Conrad, Dr. Sams, and Dr. Ryan each made reference to their courses and their democratic goals. Keira shared how she desired to teach using strategies similar to Dr. Conrad but could not. This will be discussed in more detail below. Bre regularly referenced Dr. Ryan and a desire to create lessons that required critical thinking and connected to the students’ realities. Dr. Sams was referenced by a few students as helping them think about and understand the contextual realities that the students were coming from. While Ted and Diana discussed preparing citizens, not just students, it was not in reference to Dr. Adams specifically, but rather their mentors and science methods course. Beyond these examples there were no references by the resident alumni to democratic goals of

their professors. In the end, there was consensus amongst the five staff members that democratic education was of value to them and the residents that they were training.

Cohort and Cohort Seminar

A key component of the MATR program is the cohort model. The residents go through the 13-month program with a peer group. These groups take classes together and go through each stage of the residency together. As part of this cohort model and coursework for the residents, there is a component known as the seminar. The focal cohorts of this study met as a group for a weekly meeting on Fridays with a faculty member from the partner university. Dr. Adams was the instructor for both focal cohorts' seminars. While the cohort and seminar are two distinct pieces of the program experience, it was very difficult to separate them as the seminar was the space that allowed the cohort model to truly become a cohort.

The seminar afforded the cohort members a space to grow, reflect, and bring authentic scenarios to the cohort for feedback. Dr. Adams described the seminar thusly:

Mostly what we did in there was we took turns, they were to present a lesson from the week and we took turns on. Now we couldn't do them all in one sitting. But they were to present a good lesson that they did and then say what went right and wrong with it and then get feedback from the cohort. And generally, just practice reflection on both the instructional and the managerial aspects of that. But that is the main thing...we were doing virtually the same thing as a launch pad every week.

The residents were coming together, sharing their experiences, and engaging in reflective discussions with their peers. There was a consensus amongst the residents in the value of talking and sharing their experiences with their peers. Even through the end of their first year of teaching, the residents held their cohort and the seminar in high regard. Keira and Travis both

stated multiple times that being part of the seminar with their cohort was the best part of their MATR experience. This experience and space allowed the residents opportunities to practice multiple democratic habits, including collaboration, associated living, student voice, student-centered curriculum, and critical inquiry.

Collaboration and associated living appeared to be a purposeful and natural part of both the cohort and seminar. When asked about the seminar Bre stated:

Our seminars are extremely helpful for no other reason than I get to be around my colleagues and I get to bounce ideas off of them and hear their stories about what they're going through and provide suggestions, and they provide feedback for me. That is really nice to be with people whom you've been with the whole summer anyway so you know them. And you can talk through what's going on in your classroom.

The residents could relate to each other and what others were experiencing in their schools and classrooms. Additionally, they could offer insight and feedback to help their fellow cohort members grow and develop. Justin's explanation of the seminar illustrates both the collaboration and associated living habits:

We just get to come together and we get to reflect on how our week's been, it's a good time. We learn a lot about what's going on in different schools. We get the perspectives of every single person in there. We go around the room and we just talk about how our weeks went, how our days went, our highlights, our challenges. It's – it gives us a space to just vent, as well as be constructive. We give each other advice, we – we pat our backs when we're feeling down, or like, when someone's upset, we're there to listen.

The residents exemplified collaboration and working together, when giving advice, being constructive, and building solutions to problems. Additionally, they were able to establish

associated living as they shared in each others' experiences and perspectives. As this occurred week after week, the residents continuously learned from each others' experiences, which developed a deep level of trust, closeness, and collaboration. Another resident, Keira, described the seminar as a place that the residents could be *"honest and really talk about what was going and share"* because the secondary track cohort had developed such close relationships.

While these seminars allowed for associated living and collaboration, they also elevated student voice through a student-centered approach. The entire seminar model was based around what the residents were experiencing in the classroom. Dr. Adams joked about not even having or needing a syllabus, as the starting point for each week was what the residents brought. This time allowed for residents to share from their real-life experiences, which was student-centered and gave space for student voice. Giving the residents the space to talk, share, and vent was a purposeful part of the seminar. This can be seen in Justin's articulation above. As well, Lee saw the ability to talk with his fellow cohort members as an important part of development. He said *"I think it's [seminar] good for a developing student teacher to be able to--we're there all year--so I feel like Friday can be a day when you can talk things out and develop that way"*. This consistent period of meeting and being able to share in extended development was important to developing trust, which supported associated living versus merely temporary associations.

Finally, the seminar offered space for the residents to engage in critical inquiry as real-life scenarios were shared. As the residents heard the experiences of their fellow cohort members they were invited to offer feedback and reflection on the scenario. For example, when Darla was asked about the most valuable component of MATR, she not only discussed the habit of critical inquiry, but the overwhelming value the residents placed on the seminar and cohort.

Darla: Seminar. Our Fridays, we would go -- we would have seminar with Dr. Adams. And it was great. It's like the perfect unwinding time and we could reflect on the whole week. We wouldn't have class on Friday. But I mean not -- school. We wouldn't have school on Friday. But we would have class with Dr. Adams. And I think that that really helped us reflect off of the week that we had. That's one of the things I wouldn't trade is having that time to sit down with my fellow peers and just unwind and sit down and tell -- like have a protocol and telling everyone how our week went, what we did, what are some new things that we tried and listening to other people's weeks and how they did and sitting down and trying to uncover where a problem may have happened or how and helping one another. Being able to help one another. I think that that was out of all, the actual program things, that was the most valuable. Sitting down, like I said, discussing, we would all have to discuss an issue that we had or was good, something good that happened this week. Anything. Just sharing. You know, encounters we had with a parent. Basically, just like a therapy session of how your week went.

Interviewer: Sure. So like sort of a group co-reflection almost.

Darla: Right.

Both Darla and Justin described how the format of the seminar was informal, open to the needs of the residents, and egalitarian as each resident could share about their week and experiences. The seminars were non-hierarchical with Dr. Adams acting as a facilitator of discussions rather than as the keeper of knowledge. Because of the intentionality to foreground the residents' experiences and create a space of sharing, support, and equality, the seminar became a democratic community. In general, the cohort model and seminar were one of the

strongest expressions of democratic principles, as it was viewed by residents as one of the, if not the, most valuable pieces of the MATR experience.

Coursework

Similar to the seminar, many of the program's courses embodied democratic principles. All four of the professors were very purposeful in their pedagogy and curriculum, particularly in regard to their use of democratic principles. Three of the four were explicit with the interviewer about their inclusion of democratic principles and habits. The fourth, Dr. Sams, acknowledged using democratic habits in her classes, but not naming them as such. Two of the professors (Dr. Adams and Dr. Sams) taught multiple courses that all secondary residents took during the program. One of those courses was the seminar described above. The other two (Dr. Ryan and Dr. Conrad) taught multiple core subject methods courses as part of the MATR program. At the very least, a resident would be enrolled in four of these courses, and at the most six courses, with these professors throughout their residency coursework.

All four of the professors included time for students to discuss experiences and scenarios that they had encountered in their classrooms as residents; similar to the seminar. While each professor and course handled these discussions slightly differently, their structure was very similar and exhibits multiple democratic habits. First, the class, and specifically its instructional practices, was student-centered and based on the residents' needs and interests. The class was not top down, although there were instances in the courses that the professors would provide scenarios in order to ensure that certain topics were discussed. For example, Dr. Conrad described how the residents' teaching experiences were central to his course:

I would say that the center of that course is debriefing what's happening in student teaching. What's going well, what are the challenges that can you build on, what might

you want to course-correct. And on the one hand the topics that we talk about are open as far as what comes up in student teaching. You know it's impossible to predict everything that comes up in student teaching so students do, who are taking that class, they do a lot of journaling where they're identifying things that are of interest that they want to talk about.

This explanation of how Dr. Conrad's courses were student-centered exemplifies the student-centered focus of all the professors. Similarly, Dr. Sams said that part of her course structure was to:

Bring with you some critical incident-- something that happened--and then the group can kind of talk about it and share it. I mean they get so much out of that...So lots of real-life scenarios that they bring in themselves and that they solve themselves through discussion.

Dr. Sams explained how the residents started to realize that they could solve their own problems and did not need to look to higher authorities; they were realizing their power. The professors were intentional about their structure and course design to ensure it was student-centered and student-driven.

As the structure of the courses allowed for student-driven discussions, space was created for the practice of other democratic habits, such as student voice, associated living, collaboration, and critical inquiry. Student voice was a natural part-and-parcel to the student-driven discussions. The residents were given the space to bring in scenarios, experiences, and situations that they desired feedback on. Not only did this openness allow for the resident to bring a particular experience, but it also allowed other residents an opportunity to exercise their voice and critical inquiry as they offered insight, reflection, and feedback. These situations varied by

course, but ranged from sharing about individual classroom management rules, such as bathroom policies (Dr. Sams) to school policies (Dr. Ryan), to larger structural issues within the district and community, such as the amount of time, money, and energy devoted to high stakes testing (Dr. Conrad and Dr. Ryan), and understanding the lived contextual experiences of their students economically, racially, and or ethnically (Dr. Conrad and Dr. Sams). As the professors worked to understand and reflect on this variety of topics and issues they were exhibiting critical inquiry.

Additionally, within courses, as the residents used their voice and critically examined realities in theirs and others' schools and classrooms, they started to exhibit associated living and collaboration. Dr. Sams did this through one-on-one meetings where she and her residents shared their stories. She said she did this so her residents could grow and have:

Developed some agency in telling your [their] story and can have that shared experience with somebody else. So, it's something they can do with a parent and especially when they get in a position of authority in a school with a parent that may not have that agency.

For Dr. Ryan, “*there's a lot of workshops in my classes where we take, they take time and work together and I try to model for them what it means to work effectively with their peers.*” Similarly, Dr. Conrad described his model of teaching his methods courses as “*based around dialogue of having different ways for students to talk with each other to learn from each other.*” Dr. Adams put it very succinctly as to why the MATR professors value these types of discussion and intentionally include them in their classes, stating “*how vital it is that students learn to engage in dialogue about an array of things without judgment. With one another and as practice for citizenship.*”

Most of the residents saw some value in the coursework they took during the program. These discussions were very often generalized to how the courses influenced their practice and development as a teacher. Only a few discussed the courses in a way that acknowledged democratic habits used by the professors. This acknowledgment ranged from very general (e.g., Travis enjoying and being glad she had taken the social justice course) to more specific (e.g., Darla loving Dr. Sam's class because it allowed for understanding of the current political climate). Democratic habits were also highlighted by a few residents from their science methods course; however, the professor was unable to be interviewed for this study. For example, Diana described skills and a perspective shift she had in her science methods course. When asked about her coursework she stated, *"One thing I learned is that I am preparing students to be citizens who can think critically and analyze the information so they can actually voice their opinion in society."* Conversely, there were a few instances in which residents described a disconnect between their coursework and their classroom realities. For example, Keira talked about how much she learned in Dr. Conrad's class and the instructional strategies she had learned, but she could not use them. She explains:

Keira: ...And then Dr. Conrad as my professor for methods and young adult literature and he's really, really good. The only thing I would say about those classes is he gives, he has so many ideas for instructional strategies, ways to teach, awesome ways to teach information, but then you get into one of these schools and you can't teach like that at all. You cannot teach the excellent ways of instruction that he teaches us.

Interviewer: Why do you think that is?

Keira: Because well, first of all, my students aren't advanced enough to be able to do most of the stuff that he teaches us, which could be because I'm in middle school, but then

a lot of the instruction here has to be like [state test] prep and you know, direct instruction or the option of doing the hands on and all the kinesthetic stuff is not as available I would say.

Keira expressed a desire to emulate practices she has seen in her course with Dr. Conrad, but described were barriers to that happening: student ability, a focus on testing, and a limited possibility to do more student-centered teaching because of the focus on testing. These and other barriers will be discussed in more detail in the final section of this chapter. In the end, the residents were being exposed to democratic habits such as critical thinking, student-centered curriculum, and student voice. The intentionality of the professors to structure and design their courses around these practical discussions made these courses one of the strongest instances of democratic habits being exhibited in the MATR program.

Mentorship

One fundamental piece of a UTR is mentorship, and this mentorship should take place in both the residency year as well as in the first few years of teaching. The MATR program does meet this requirement by providing mentorship in both the residency year and during the first two years of teaching. While the mentorship during the residency year is more intensive, frequent, and focused, the mentorship experience during both years exhibits multiple democratic habits, such as collaboration, associated living, and critical inquiry.

Most residents believed that both their mentor and mentor relationship were valuable parts of their residency. These feelings are put succinctly by Diana, “*I think personally, I think the role of MENTOR is really, really important.*” Even if the residents did not have the best relationship with their mentor, they learned and grew from this experience. Keira is a good example of this. Although she did not have the best relationship with her mentor, she explained

that she was able to learn some things from him. However, Keira said she learned to be enthusiastic with her teaching, to be overly prepared for class, and to have a “*strict classroom management plan*” as a result of working with her mentor. Much of her learning came from putting into practice what her mentor had told her. Keira indicated that her relationship with her mentor improved after her solo teaching experiences, but she still believed that she learned more through trial-and-error than she did from her mentor, stating, “*I would still say I learned the most from doing, rather than from my mentor.*” She did go on to say that it was difficult to pinpoint exactly what her mentor had taught her. The residents found the co-planning and resources from their mentor to be valuable. Through their relationships, the residents and mentors collaborated through co-planning, being in the classroom together, going through the gradual release calendar, and using the coaching tools. These conversations provided opportunities for collaboration and associated living between the resident and their mentor. Much of the discussions were based around the use of the coaching tools. As Travis put it, “*I think that their [tools] use is overall a good thing because of the conversations that it forces. But most of the time I think those conversations are not nearly as worth just the time that getting to know one another better in a professional sense would be.*” While Travis did not completely dismiss the tools, it appears that he desired and saw natural associating as more valuable. Other residents held similar views, that the natural collaboration and sharing of experiences were what they desired, valued, and gained the most from. This belief indicates that the residents’ value more egalitarian, democratic mentorship relationships. Just the fact that the residents were in a mentorship relationship with expected conversation and used the coaching tools to assess their practice made them collaborate on lessons and activities. Understanding the experiences of other teachers, specifically their mentor, allowed for associated living.

Even though the coaching tools were expected to be used during formal conversations with their mentors, the residents had mixed opinions on the value of them. They saw the tools as valuable, but that changed over time, especially as they took on more responsibility within the classroom. The residents often said the informal, authentic conversations, and reflection were the most valuable components; the tools felt forced or redundant. At the same time, almost all of the residents acknowledged the value and importance of reflection, which the tools promoted, as part of their growth. For example, Keira acknowledged this dichotomy, *“I think it’s definitely always nice to check in and talk about what’s going on. But I feel like most of the tools were sort of redundant because we already had those conversations naturally.”* Likewise, when Billy was asked to reflect on the coaching tools at the end of year one of teaching he said:

I think it [tools] just kind of taught me to be always reflective because it was kind of like forced reflection...So the coaching tools, while I don’t necessarily think about them individually as being particularly influential on their own, as just like a practice of reflection, I think it’s a good idea.

This act of reflecting regularly on their practice caused the residents to think critically about their practice and evaluate their performance. For the residency year, the practice of reflection was done with the mentor, which again illustrates how the mentorship relationship created a space for collaboration and associated living. Murphy conveyed this sentiment during his year one interview when he was asked what parts of the MATR program were the most helpful in his development as a teacher. He said:

So, I definitely think the strongest part of the MATR program was just the amount of reflection you did with your mentor because you can do all the self-reflection you want

but you're gonna tell yourself either bad things or good things but having another person tell you stuff is very helpful in establishing yourself and evolving as a teacher.

Reflection is part of both the residency mentorship experience and year one career coaching experience, and residents indicated its' value in both experiences. As part of her interview at the end of year one of teaching, Mia was asked about her career coach and if they used the coaching tools. She indicated that reflection was the most important piece, not a specific tool. She stated, *"I think the tools themselves are kind of secondary to the value of just reflection. Like whatever tool works for you, I think reflection is the most important piece."* Her response conveyed the importance and value of reflection that the residents held no matter the tool or the mentor. Reflection within their mentorship relationships allowed for associated living as the resident and the mentor shared their experiences and understanding of each other's teaching. They were given an opportunity to see the areas that they were alike, associated, and the areas that they may have differed but can learn from one another. Additionally, as they discussed instructional practices they were collaborating and developing plans, activities, and solutions together. Finally, reflection can, but does not always, allow for critical inquiry and as the residents very often questioned the world they are a part of on a daily basis they practiced the habit of critical inquiry.

The residents' career coach was the one component of the MATR program during their first year of teaching that exhibited democratic habits and the residents overwhelmingly saw their career coach as a positive part of their experience. The residents believed their coaches were a great support, resource, and sounding board for them to continue to reflect and grow. While the residents did not see their career coach nearly as much as they saw their residency mentors, this relationship, again, created space for collaboration and critical inquiry. Bre

described her relationship with her career coach as “*extremely supportive in that regard. She yeah, she’s really good. Anything that I need, she, you know, provides for me and gives me tips on different instructional things and reading material.*” When asked about her relationship with her career coach Darla offered a similar sentiment as Bre, and virtually all the residents.

Darla: It's, it's good...She's awesome. With winter break and snow. And testing. It's been hard to really see her.

Interviewer: What does she do when she comes in?

Darla: She observes and she helps me out a lot. She's helped me with my lesson plans. She's helped me out with that honing in and writing like an SLO and just stuff like that. So, she's awesome. I love her and I like to see her in [my classroom].

The residents saw their two years of mentorship as positive and allowed for the democratic habits of collaboration, associated living, and critical inquiry to be engaged in on a regular basis.

Democratic habits and principles were the most evident through the cohort and weekly seminar elements of the MATR program, the pedagogical design of many of the courses, the mentorship relationships and reflective practice that is an essential part of those relationships, and MATR staff seeing the value of democratic education. These pieces make up a large portion of the development spaces the residents experience in their residency year. As a result, the residents are exposed to the democratic habits of collaboration, associated living, and student-centered learning, which gave space for student voice, and critical inquiry. Next, I move to describe the use of democratic habits or principles by the resident alumni as they lived out the professional role of being a teacher.

Alumni and Residents Exhibiting Democratic Habits

Research question 2 focused on the use of democratic habits or principles by residents and alumni. The findings offer a holistic understanding of how teachers from the MATR program exhibited democratic education. It is worth noting that the interview prompts were open-ended thus giving the resident alumni space to respond using social justice or democratic education frames but, in the end, they were extremely limited in applying both of those frames in their responses. While there were discussions of pedagogical practices and professional experiences that illustrated democratic habits, none of the 15 teachers explicitly mentioned or referenced democratic education. The closest that residents and alumni came to connecting their professional practice to democratic education was through brief discussions of developing citizens or social justice.

Developing Citizens

Two residents talked about how they saw their teaching as an important part of developing citizens. These, albeit brief, discussions of citizenry were the closest that any resident came to referencing democratic education or educating for democracy. In her second interview, Diana explained what she learned from her methods courses and explained how she learned to think of her teaching as preparing students to be citizens. She went on to talk about how students needed certain skills as they were being prepared to be citizens and how science education could play a role in that process. She said:

Because I'm a science teacher, the [university] class really helped me to find out the type of lessons that I can do with students in the classroom. One thing I learned is that I am preparing students to be citizens who can think critically and analyze the information so they can actually voice their opinion in society. So, using that should be the main focus because you know, students are not going to remember the parts of plants and those

things, but I can use the science curriculum to actually teach the students to think critically and collect data and present it and pull it out, so those are some things that became really valuable and then how to incorporate the real-life situation in the class and talk about it with students and them research the information and sometimes to do experiments based on that. And then draw the conclusion and do debate, and how to do those things in the science class.

Even in this short reflection on what she has learned in class and her approach to teaching, Diana illustrated the democratic habits of critical inquiry, student voice, and associated living. She mentioned multiple times having students be critical thinkers and use data to inform their thinking and be able to share their thinking with society, which requires them to find and use their voice. Additionally, as Diana desired to connect the science curriculum to real life situations and talk about it with the students, she and they were associating through their sharing of opinions, beliefs, and experiences with those situations. Finally, she mentioned how preparing citizens should be the focus of teaching and how the curriculum could be used to allow that to happen.

Ted was another resident alumni that talked about developing citizens. He discussed this belief in multiple interviews. In both of his interviews during his residency, he talked about working with his mentor teacher and how they used “*real life applications*” with almost everything they did in their math classes. For example, in his first interview he talked about a lesson that his mentor led about stereotypes as a way to explain factoring. He said:

We did a lesson on stereotypes with factoring and how you break down all these numbers, and variables, but when we look at people, we also break them down about like where they came from and how we think about them.

Ted concluded his explanation of connecting their lessons to real life by saying:

So just relating so many things and putting real, real world -- not like you're on a boat traveling 20 miles per hour, it's more like we are human beings who are trying to develop citizens rather than just students who can spit out the quadratic formula.

In his second interview, Ted was asked about what kind of teacher he wanted to be when he had his own classroom and if he would emulate her mentor teacher. He responded:

Ted: I don't think anybody can be a teacher (laughs) like my mentor. One thing that I love that he does that I definitely want to incorporate myself is just relating things to the real world and not you're going on a car ride and blah blah blah. But like their world. Like the students' world. So, a lot of times we'll do -- and I try to do lessons myself on it. I did some things on social media and the effects on teens and what that looks like with the data and how we can project into the future by regressing a line through the points and stuff like that. But like he -- in the beginning of the year we did some lessons on jail and things like that and how it can impact your life and relating it to math, which is stuff that I definitely -- I don't think about at all. And so going into next year, it's how am I going to do that. And it's not necessarily that the kids remember the math more. But it's that they remember the lessons behind it. So, like they know what social media can do to them. And they know stuff about jail that they didn't know before. And it's just that kind of you're developing them as citizens. You're not developing people who can just memorize a quadratic formula and not know why they need to know it or where it came from or how they can -- how it's used in their cellphone and stuff like that.

Interviewer: What was the jail lesson about?

Ted: We were doing absolute value. And so you're kind of like trapped in a jail cell, quote, unquote. And we talked about -- like we did -- showed -- the [city] jail does a daddy day dance where the fathers in the jail have their daughters come and they do a dance. We showed a video on that. And then some of our students had actually been to that with their dads. And they had talked about their experiences about their dads being in jail and how when you get out of jail you either stay the same and you take the same path that you kind of were down and you'll end up back in there, or you can change and be a different person. And so that's kind of how you solve absolute value, is you either, when you get out of absolute value, either stay the same or you change.

Interviewer: It's like a metaphor.

P: Yeah. So just talking about that with them. And just listening to the students and hearing what's going on in their lives too allows us to teach them better.

Interviewer: That sounds really, really -- and so the conversation becomes like a --

Ted: It's like a real conversation. It's not just math. (laughs).

Similar to Diana, Ted desired to move beyond the content and involve real world examples to aid in teaching the students skills and being citizens. Ted keyed in on critical inquiry by having them examine the why and how and not just to know math more. Additionally, he desired to place an emphasis on the students' real world as a way to teach the content and how it impacted their lives. This emphasis illustrated student-centered pedagogy and student voice. As the students shared and hear each other's realities they related to one another; which is a form of associated living. While these were the only two resident alumni to discuss preparing students to be citizens, a few others discussed beliefs and philosophies of teaching that are associated with democratic education.

Social Justice

One of the key components that the MATR program is based on is social justice. Despite the presence of social justice language in program documents, only a few resident alumni mentioned it. The few who did mention social justice did not draw a clear connection between their teaching practices and social justice. Because social justice and democratic education are closely associated and overlap in many ways, social justice education is often grounded in democratic education or framed using democratic principles (Hyttén & Bettez, 2011; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012; Sibbett, 2016; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004), so it would be natural for democratic habits or principles to be present in social justice spaces. The residents' discussion around social justice was very theoretical, generalized, and limited as the residents expressed the value of, and desire to use, social justice more in their classrooms but did not discuss how they were implementing, or would implement, elements of social justice education.

Early in the residency process a couple residents acknowledged the value of the social justice piece of the MATR program. In his first two interviews, Travis discussed how the social justice framework would inform his teaching. First, he stated a desire to use social justice and that it was one of the reasons for becoming a teacher through the MATR program;

I would say the class that we had on social justice within education is super important, very relevant to all of the issues that I feel you know, have kind of brought me to wanting to want to participate in a teaching residency program.

However, Travis went on to say that he was apprehensive to implement social justice once he was a teacher because he was unsure he would be supported by his administration and the district. As he was ending his residency, Travis was asked again about how social justice might inform his teaching and he responded:

I have enjoyed the social justice component of MATR. I did really enjoy the social justice class that we took over the summer. I'm glad we took it over the summer. I think that social justice, not even just in the context of teaching, but just overall social justice, to me, is allowing people the opportunity that they need to get on a level playing field. To me, within the classroom what that means is being prepared for extenuating circumstances. Like we talked about -- one Friday forum we learned kind of about trauma and the effects of trauma and how to work with students who -- victims of trauma... Yeah, learning about the trauma informed practices, that very much helped me because coming in from just oftentimes a very different background than many of my students, I saw things for what I saw in the classroom. And I think that whether you're working with students of any socioeconomic class you need to keep in mind there are things going on at home... But it was very, very important for me over the context of this year to realize that the reasons for maybe students being kind of silly in class -- that's an understatement -- but sometimes really severely disrupting class or having a really bad attitude sometimes and not others while the background is out of my control as a teacher, I need to be on my game so that I can take what the students are willing to give that day, demand more in the education sense, but then also provide the support.

As Travis describes leveling the playing field, it could create a classroom experience that was more democratic and a more equal distribution of power and access between the teacher and students. Additionally, although Travis's discussion of social justice was vague in description of practices, as it could be done in a number of different ways, the democratic habit of being student-centered was highlighted through knowing the circumstances that might manifest in the classroom.

Similarly, two other resident alumni acknowledged social justice in vague undefined terms. First, at the end of his residency year, Billy listed being knowledgeable about social justice as a key component of being a successful urban teacher. He did not elaborate, but did place value on teachers' knowing social justice. Second, as part of her fourth interview, Diana reflected on the role of education, and she had this brief conversation with the interviewer about transformative education--transforming district systems and systems within the schools:

Interviewer: Do you think teachers have a role in that, in transforming education?

Diana: I think so.

Interviewer: Yeah?

Diana: Yeah. I think so. Yeah. But I think also, at the same time, there's a factor in that teachers are tired. Not just with the school but then with the personal things. Definitely I do believe that things can be changed as long as there -- I do believe that things can change. Yeah. And I'm sure that's what MATR is for. (laughs) Bring changes. (laughs)

Interviewer: I hope.

Diana: Yeah.

Interviewer: Yeah.

Diana: Yeah.

Interviewer: Yeah. Yeah.

Diana: I think that once you get to teaching career, it's just people get really tired. And then not only that --

Interviewer: It's hard. Yeah.

Diana: They just become content with where you are.

Diana did not *name* social justice, but seeing education as a way to effect change is closely aligned with social justice and democratic principles. Furthermore, as she laughs it may mean that she sees effecting change as a noble goal, but potentially difficult to achieve.

The vagueness around social justice was consistent with two other resident alumni who talked about the desire to foreground social justice more in their future classes. At the end of her first year of teaching, Mia spent some time reflecting on how she was reminded of how social justice was a reason for entering teaching in the first place. This reminder was a result of attending an MATR alumni group meeting where social justice was the main topic of discussion. She later reiterates the importance of social justice but discussed it from a systematic view and did not mention using it her classroom or to inform her teaching.

I feel so the social justice piece being like I believe in public education and I believe that all children should have access to a high-quality public education. It seems like that's kind of under attack in this country right now. And I want to be somebody who is standing up and saying "no," this is important and we need to reconsider how these pockets of poverty are all getting funneled into these particular schools and then we back up and wonder, like gee, I wonder why we have all these issues. That piece is really important to me. I lost my train of thought. That -- yeah, that's kind of to sum up why I think it's important.

Murphy discussed social justice with a similar view. He reflected on social justice being a piece that drew him to MATR and had forgotten about it because of all the responsibilities teachers have. He stated:

One thing that is on my mind right now is the advocacy of social justice when it comes to MATR. It's what drove me to apply to MATR in the first place. And it's something I think

as a teacher you can forget about because you get so bogged down in lesson plans and testing and every other responsibility that you have as the teacher.

He went on to talk about the status MATR alumni had and how that could be leveraged to create change at a district or system level. He ended his discussion of social justice by saying:

So, I think having that background of MATR and what MATR stands for is something that initially drew me into MATR and something I want to continue to keep fresh on my mind an in addition to focusing on being a classroom teacher. I also would like to use my MATR status I guess to do more than just be an effective classroom teacher.

However, Murphy was quick to distinguish social justice work and MATR status as different from being an effective teacher. While there were discussions and references to social justice, they were limited and tended to be focused outside of the classroom. Both social justice education and democratic education frameworks were not apparent through the residents' responses. In general, the residents were limited in their connecting one of the key elements of the program, social justice education, to their own practice.

Professional Relationships

One of the strongest expressions of democratic habits by the alumni was through their professional relationships. Many of the alumni discussed the importance of professional relationships they had developed with other teachers and how those relationships offered support, resources, and materials that helped them through their first year. Through these relationships they exhibited collaboration, associated living, and voice.

The professional relationships that were developed were done so independently of the MATR program and varied from multiple teachers within their department to one other teacher to other MATR alumni to non-MATR teachers. Most saw these relationships as instrumental in

their first year of teaching. As Bre was asked about the development of professional relationships during her first year she stated:

The other teacher who teaches the same subject, we're so close and we collaborate on everything. The lesson planning, activities, creating materials, all that. And I think that really helped with our success this year with our kids with that collaboration. It was amazing. My year would have been very different had she not been there to collaborate with so that was really important.

She clearly articulated the democratic habit of collaboration. This was common amongst most of the alumni. The collaboration often came in the form of lesson planning, pacing, materials, and development of overall resources.

Similar to Bre, Justin discussed how much support he felt from other teachers within his school. He described how:

The support is I feel like bountiful here and there is never a lack of it. Whether it be from a math teacher down stairs. Whether it be my mentors and MATR people upstairs to the people next door, I, it's like when I need to let something out they're here to listen. When I need help with a certain activity or I need supplies, they're there to help me and give that to me. When I just need someone to talk to they're always there.

Justin mentioned how the teachers were there to listen and described how there was always someone to talk to if needed. This shows that he used his voice and was given space to use his voice with other teachers to ask and share. As he shared, sought advice, was given advice, and talked with his fellow teachers they were living out associated living. This experience was not unique to Justin. While Ted and Lee were more simplistic in their description of their professional relationships they conveyed the habits of collaboration, voice, and associated living.

For example, describing those whom he had developed professional relationships with, Lee said, *“Yeah. The math teacher, he’s basically an unofficial mentor. He comes in here all the time and talks with me. I just tell him stuff and he’s just always been helpful.”*

Probably the clearest expression of voice and associated living was by Diana in her final interview. She went into depth about how she had been supported by her professional relationships, with her closest ones being within her department. She said:

Just sharing our days and just emotionally supporting each other and being a place of listening and being understood. That was just emotionally helpful. And even any questions in terms of like how to prepare for [state test] or how to deal with the students who are giving problems. And because they already have those students. They already know them. So, it gives me some ideas how to handle them. And also supporting each other in terms of, well, you can send your students to me if you need some break. And then if she needs to get some work done, then she can come to me because I have the relationship with her. So those sorts of things really help. We really -- it’s really helpful. And then sharing resources. Those things. I mean, we share all our files and documents with one another. So that has been very, very helpful.

These key relationships were developed independently of any MATR program requirements and went beyond the nuts and bolts of teaching like lesson planning, to providing emotional support. The teachers in her community were sharing their experiences with students, school and district policy, and were open to listening to her as she needed. In the end, her experience illustrates her use of voice and associated living.

The MATR resident alumni also exhibited associated living through their interactions with other MATR residents and alumni that were not a part of their cohort. The common history

and shared experience of going through the MATR program allowed for an easier possibility of associated living to occur. Travis discussed finding out that another teacher was a MATR alumni and how they could relate because of their shared experience:

I feel like we had this instant bond of just what we'd went through, which turned out at first is kind of a funny thing you kind of have this shared suffering in a joking way. Just because of how rigorous the year was. But then its kind of got to a point where I had a lot of points of comparison.

While the depth of connection between the resident alumni and other MATR alumni varied, most acknowledged the power of the shared experience of being a MATR alumni, which established a foundation for associated living.

Pedagogy

Based on their interview data, the residents and alumni were somewhat limited in their expression of democratic habits within their own classrooms. Being student-centered was the most common democratic habit exhibited by the resident alumni. Student-centered classrooms allow for a shift in power dynamics, which can create more equitable classrooms environments and can allow for other democratic habits to take place as the classroom becomes more student-centered. However, a few of the resident alumni mentioned that they saw themselves as teaching with more direct instruction, teacher-centered approaches, and teaching with PowerPoints and notes. Also, many of them discussed using activities as a main pedagogical practice and the activities were often referenced as in opposition to using direct instruction. However, they rarely gave an explanation or example as to what they meant by activity. Much of their discussion about their teaching was in comparison to their mentor teacher and the resident alumni were mixed about emulating what they saw in their residency classroom. These discussions around

being student-centered, using less direct instruction, and using more activities could afford the opportunities for critical inquiry, collaboration, and even associated living amongst the students.

Student-centered and culturally relevant instruction. The most common democratic habit exhibited by the resident alumni in their classrooms was student-centered instruction. The focus on student-centered instruction took place in a variety of ways but did include understanding the student's context and lived experiences, differentiating, giving choice and voice to the students, and the use of activities. Even as the resident alumni regularly discussed being student-centered they still saw places that this habit needed to be limited, particularly in their classroom management. In general, the residents and alumni were in agreement that they had a desire to make their classrooms student-centered at some level.

Having the residents and eventual alumni of the MATR program understand the contextual realities of the city, district, and students that they will be teaching is a key component of the program. The resident alumni often made reference to their coursework and professors being vital to their understanding of the lived experiences of their students. Almost all of the resident alumni discussed their perceptions of the contextual realities of their students and their community. In many cases these perceptions influenced their classroom practice.

Almost all of the resident alumni understood the demographic realities of their students, and many of them tried to use that understanding to inform their pedagogy. A few mentioned that they wanted to present their lessons in such a way that students' lived experiences were related to the content as a way to support learning the content. During her second interview, Diana was asked what it meant to teach in an urban school versus schools in general. Her response was one that illustrated the use of instructional strategies to bridge students'

demographic and cultural realities. Her explanation was fairly typical among the resident alumni but her depth and connecting the two areas was rare. She said:

Urban school requires a lot of patience and you cannot expect the students to know what you think they should know already because sometimes they weren't, I guess, sometimes they didn't grow with the proper, they didn't have the people around them to teach them what's proper and what's not proper, what is appropriate and what is inappropriate. So, teach everything, don't expect that students should know that already. Sometimes they do, sometimes they don't so make it very clear. Do a lot of hands on, something that I really, really would like to do next year because it helps them to stay focused and just because they don't seem like they're not doing anything, don't think that they don't know or don't think that they don't care because they do care. They do care about their learning, they do care when teachers are ready or when they're not ready, they have a voice, they have opinions but they're not just used to verbalizing them or speaking up. So, give them a lot of chances to discuss, share, and talk. And be nice when you talk to the parents because I think the parents don't have very good experiences with schools, so you have to gain their respect if you want their support. They just need a lot of attention, proper attention.

Similarly, Murphy and Travis both discussed how they wanted their lessons to be based on their students' lived experiences. For example, Murphy acknowledged that he was a white man teaching at a school of mostly black and brown students and did not want his teaching to be based on a white savior complex. He went on to say that he wanted to build his lessons around the students' culture. Likewise, Travis stated that he wanted to meet his students where they were. In his fourth interview, he briefly mentioned his awareness of a cultural disconnect between teachers and administrators, on the one hand, and students and parents, on the

other. Both Travis and Murphy were shifting their focus away from themselves and their cultures and putting the focus on their students' context and cultures.

When Amanda was asked about her strengths as a teacher, she discussed her ability to attend to her students' different learning styles. She explained it this way:

I feel like my primary strengths are being able to tap into different learning styles so I'm not doing things all one way. So, I try to do a variety of things to do that. I feel like that's my primary strength. And I'm still getting better with learning the way that my students learn because I want to make sure that I'm serving them and making sure their best interests are always what's at the forefront.

Amanda went on to say in her fourth interview that as she continues in teaching she wants to keep her lessons relevant, interactive, and more real world. Bre was similar in this regard, as she stated that she tried to make her opening activity relevant to the students' experiences. Both were trying to increase student understanding by foregrounding their students' experiences, and by making lessons that were relevant and real world.

Most of the resident alumni that discussed being student-centered gave examples of how that played out in their teaching. Ted shared how he ended up changing his homework policy during his residency because of her students' contextual reality. Due to the students' responsibilities at home and outside of school, he saw the difficulty his students were having in following his policy and completing their homework, so he shifted his classroom practice to meet his students where they were in order for them to be successful.

Justin discussed how he made attempts to differentiate his lessons in order to meet the needs of his students based on their learning styles and lived experiences. He described his classroom as one where he tried to focus on the students as much as possible. For example, he

talked about how important it was to learn and know students' names, as it helps with building rapport. Additionally, he described how he used differentiated activities to meet the variety of his students' needs. Justin would differentiate his instruction, almost daily. Additionally, he used activities so that students could engage with each other and learn from each other. For example, he said:

I try to differentiate my learning where one day I might want to use visuals when I'm trying to teach and the other day I'm gonna make like an outline because I know some students learn best with looking at pictures, some students learn best with looking just at a huge list of things and why that's the case.

Justin also explained how he created lessons that had students engaging with and learning from one another instead of him. These lessons were framed around guiding questions that Justin developed. As the students' needs, experiences, and abilities were centered in the classroom, democratic habits could be practiced. The use of student experiences and abilities combined with activities that had students working together to learn from each other cultivated the habits of collaboration and associated living. Furthermore, the use of activities that had students engaging with, and learning from, each other provided space for students to use their voices in the learning process.

In her inclusion class with English Language Learners (ELL), Amanda was intentional in trying to create a safe space for her students. She shared how she worked to have all her students exhibit respect for other cultures, and worked to develop new visuals and models to support her ELL students. She shifted her instruction to ensure all her students had the opportunity to learn based on their contextual lived experiences.

As Mia tried to shift to more student-centered teaching, she described how she used a gallery walk as a first step in shifting her practice. Additionally, she was very forthcoming with her desire to be more student-centered in the future, but knew it would take time and intentionality. She explained it in her fourth interview.

Interviewer: How do you think that works? I mean, do you feel -- are your students prepared for your more student-centered instruction, your activities?

Mia: No. (laughs) Yeah, I think it can't be switched like all at once. But we did a gallery walk today, which worked out pretty well. Where they were just circulating around the room and basically the way this one was, it was like printed PowerPoint slides so it was content that was just on a poster. You got to stand up and write it down. So, they were taking notes but they were just walking around the room and doing it. And they were in groups so it was kind of required that they communicate with one another to figure out what they needed to kind of fill in each space on their worksheets. So, things like -- that's a pretty good way I think to start scaling it up because it is --

Interviewer: It's different.

Mia: It is different, yeah. And it's more enjoyable. Like for me too because to try to get people to listen to you when they don't care about what you're saying is the worst thing.

Additionally, when Billy was asked about his teaching style and what he was doing in the classroom as a first-year teacher he talked about doing hands-on activities and making his classroom about active learning. He was very upfront about trying to make his class about his students. He said:

As far as implementing lessons, I think just having a variety of activities, doing hands-on stuff, some direct instruction, limiting your direct instruction, trying to do as many things

with the kids that is putting them in kind of the driver's seat to learn something is better than just kind of barking at them in front of the room.

This was even after he had acknowledged and continued to acknowledge his need to grow in his ability to differentiate. Billy was trying to have a classroom that was student-centered, and was not alone in specifically referencing and discussing activities as part of the resident alumni's instructional strategies.

Activities. Throughout all four interviews, the resident alumni referenced using activities as part of their instructional strategy. Often there was little to no explanation as to what was meant by activity or activities. It was regularly used as a way to distinguish themselves from their mentor teachers or from using direct instruction, through PowerPoint or guided notes. The consensus among the resident alumni was to use activities, no matter what kind, more often in their teaching.

As the residents were co-teaching and eventually solo teaching, they were trying to figure out their teaching style and would often compare it to their mentor teacher. For example, when Darla was asked about her mentor's approach she mentioned how they used activities less than she thought they would. She went on to discuss what she planned to do when she had her own classroom, which included doing more partner work, jigsaws, and using technology to be more interactive. Once she was in her own classroom, she mentioned that she did a lot of hands-on activities, used manipulatives, and used games in her instruction. Similarly, when asked, Murphy said he would emulate her mentor teacher in many ways but qualified what he meant by this. He stated, *"I would like to do less PowerPoint note lectures and more stations or experiments, labs, manipulatives, stuff that's not pencil."* Chloe shared a similar sentiment about her future strategy as she planned to emulate the structure of her mentor teacher although she

went on to say, *“I think I’ll do more with interactive notebooks next year because we didn’t do as much with interactive notebooks. But definitely... her structure...I’m stealing.”* While it is unknown what practices the resident alumni will utilize in the future their descriptions here indicate a possibility of creating classrooms that might be open to democratic habits such as collaboration, associated living, or critical inquiry through stations, hands-on activities, or interactive notebooks. Additionally, it is possible that creating more structure could allow for a more democratic environment, as democracy does not mean that there is complete freedom to do whatever someone wants, but rather that there is opportunity to operate within boundaries and structure (Horton & Freire, 1990).

There were a few instances where residents acknowledged their influence on their mentors’ classroom practices. For example, Amanda mentioned how she helped her mentor teacher reflect on, and make some changes to their instruction. She shared how she helped him see the value of exploratory activities. Amanda said, *“So I think that’s where he’s more traditional like, he’ll tell them this is what it is, as I want for them to explore.”* Even as the residents talked about desiring more activities, they did not completely dismiss direction instruction. Bre planned to follow a similar routine as her mentor teacher, which included a mix of direct instruction and hands-on activities. Even though the residents were unsure of how much and what specific aspects of their mentor teachers’ style they were going to emulate, many shared the desire to have their classes more active and student-centered. In the end, as the alumni distinguished themselves from their mentors, they exhibited their own voice and agency.

The resident alumni did talk in some detail about what using the various activities looked like for them. They often described them as hands-on, active, or interactive. Even in a few instances the resident alumni talked about the activities as a way to get the students physically

moving and their bodies active, as a way to engage the students. Keira acknowledged that she likes activities that involve movement and are hands-on. While she was aware of how those classes can get out-of-control, she expressed that the students often appreciate those classes. Bre offered another example of a resident alumni trying to make their class more active and hands-on. Reflecting on her successes in her first few months as a first-year teacher, Bre described her use of activities as a way to engage her students. She said:

I would say doing activities that the kids are engaged in. So, we do a lot of different things where they're just not sitting the whole time, but they're up and moving around the classroom. And the kids are actually interested in the material. They're just not like sitting there taking notes. But they're actively participating and things like that.

Again, Bre referenced physical movement as part of the activities. She also described her use of activities as a way to get her students talking and engaging with one another. She went on to explain her activities and how she uses questioning as a way to make her classes more active:

So, I'm really big on participation and asking a whole lot of questions just because I need my kids to talk because I don't like silence. So typically, a class for me is we'll do our snapshot. I like to do direct instruction. I like to have the kids take notes because I like it when they write down the stuff that they think or research suggests that they memorize it better. But I never do over 10 minutes of direct instruction. After that, we'll do a lot of activities and throughout that instruction, I'm asking a whole lot of questions. Just making sure that the kids are engaged in all points. So yeah. It's a lot of discussion based verbally in my class.

This focus on activities and questioning opened her class to critical inquiry, supporting student voice, and associated living. This was similar to Justin and his instructional approaches

described above that focused on being student-centered, allowing for collaboration, and promoting associated living as the students learned from one another.

Billy mentioned in both interviews during his first year of teaching that he used hands-on activities and active learning. As part of his strategy, he implemented interactive notebooks, spiral or bound notebooks that the students glue or tape class handouts into. The students create a cover page, table of contents and number all the pages so there is uniformity among the class, but outside of these elements the students have creative freedom over their notebooks. Often one side of a page, the right, is for objective material and the other, the left, is where the students are given a variety of ways to be creative and engage the material in ways that they choose. These notebooks were used almost daily as a way to have students engage with the lesson content in a way that makes the most sense to them. Additionally, the notebooks allowed the students to be in control of what was included and how the notes or information was organized and presented in their notebook. This use of the notebooks and active learning was what Billy described as a pedagogical change that he made throughout his first year of teaching to find what worked for him and his students. During his last interview, as Billy reflected on his year, he acknowledged he did more direct instruction and worksheets than he had wanted. He attributed this to struggles with pacing and trying to prepare the students for standardized tests. He explained:

I think when we came to, like I was saying earlier, to the point where pacing and testing was coming into focus a little, I think that it became a little more direct instruction/worksheet heavy than I would like it to be. Just because that moves faster sometimes. Like the activities. You spend an entire day on this one little thing and, you know, when you look at the blueprint [standards] and all the stuff they're supposed to

know, you get a little worried. So, I think that towards the end of the year I might have been less likely to take a day to do something I thought would be fun.

Even as Billy desired to use more activities, it was difficult due to the constraints within the school and district. This movement away from practicing democratic habits was not uncommon for the resident alumni as there were places within the classroom that exhibited habits that could be considered to be in opposition to democratic education or possibly lead to the use of undemocratic practices, thus creating an undemocratic environment.

Non-Democratic Habits

Not all habits that were discussed by the resident alumni can be described as democratic or having the possibility of being democratic. Some could be seen as non-democratic or having the possibility of being non-democratic based on their usage. It should also be noted that because these habits have been highlighted here does not mean these habits or practices are non-democratic in and of themselves, but rather that they have the possibility of being used in ways that could create undemocratic spaces within the resident alumni's classrooms. The resident alumni had two common areas that have the possibility of being non-democratic. First were their classroom management strategies. Many of the resident alumni discussed how they wanted to change their classroom management approach. Additionally, it was one of the most common areas of needed growth and development as assessed by the resident alumni themselves. Second was their use of teacher-centered classrooms. There was regular acknowledgment of teacher-centered instruction, particularly direct instruction, but it was often discussed alongside student-centered desires and strategies.

Classroom management. Whether it was during their residency year or in their first year of teaching the resident alumni were overwhelmingly concerned with classroom

management. As residents, many of them referenced a classroom management style known as warm demander. The idea behind the term “warm demander” was to be welcoming and build rapport with the students, but still ask a lot of them and maintain high expectations. This was a concept they had learned as part of their coursework and were evaluated on during their residency experience. They often would use it to describe their mentor teacher’s classroom management. Its usage also insinuated that being a warm demander was a way to assert control over the classroom and make sure the students did everything the teacher asked of them. When Murphy was asked during his residency what it meant to be successful as an urban educator he brought up his mentor teacher and being a warm demander. His explanation illustrated the dichotomy he saw between understanding the students and building relationships with them while making sure the teacher is control of the classroom. He said:

I think it goes back to what I was saying about what I’ll take from [my mentor] is being a warm demander --Is that not -- or seeing your kids and understanding where they come from and building your lessons through the lens of their culture. But at the same time, expecting the same from them as you would expect from an eighth grader at ... any of the schools out I the west end that the living situation [is] a lot different out there than it is in the city. So being successful is not feeling bad about your students or having a savior complexity. But expecting to see from them and laying down the law that this is what is expected from you. This is how you can be successful. I’m here for you and I’m here to help you. But I expect your best every day. I think that just would be one of the ways to be a successful urban educator.

While he was talking about being aware of and building lessons around the student’s culture, the phrase “laying down the law” seemed a bit odd. While the phrase could hold a more positive

meaning, such as holding the student to certain expectations, it could possibly be meant as a way to control or hold power over the students. This instance illustrates how the contextual reality around classroom management was nuanced and cannot be fully understood through this study because the environment was neither explained in extensive detail by the resident alumni, nor observed by me, the researcher. As the residents prepared to be teachers of record, there seemed to be some uncertainty about what management strategy and style they would use in their future classrooms. However, most of them were certain they would focus on building rapport with their students and developing their own style, often differing from their mentors.

The resident alumni consistently stated that they wanted to change their classroom management strategy or procedures for the next school year. It was rare, if at all, that any of the resident alumni said they were satisfied with their current classroom management, but almost all stated they wanted to be more strict or have more structure than they did during their residency experience.

This idea of being more in control of the classroom and the teacher as the authority was shared in a variety of ways by the resident alumni. Some of them used the word “strict” to describe how they needed to change their classroom management. Another way the residents framed this was by saying they needed to be more authoritative. Billy talked about this in multiple interviews and stated he needed to have more “*authoritative pressure*” in his classes and he needed to do this at the beginning of the year. At one point during the end of his residency year he described his mentor teacher as being better than him because he had an “*authoritarian presence in the room.*” Billy might have meant authoritative, not authoritarian, but if not, then he may have trouble enacting democratic education given his classroom management aims. Similarly, Darla described her mentor teacher as “*authoritative*” and stated

that she needed to be more “*rigid*” with her classes. Martin explained how he felt the students needed to learn that he, the teacher, was in charge. Ted described his desire to be a positive enforcer, meaning he would enforce the rules, expectations, and structure on his class, similar to the warm demander. I acknowledge that the need to be strict or maintain control over a classroom does not guarantee or make a class undemocratic. Additionally, according to Horton and Freire (1990), for freedom to be understood by students there needs to be limits and a respect for authority. At the same time, as many of the resident alumni discussed a desire or need to be strict or authoritative, this could lead to an environment in which the teacher holds all the power, thus silencing the students. Also, since there is already a lot of control over students, including student behavior, within urban schools, what may start out with the best of intentions could quickly turn negative or even harmful to students as the larger school culture of control influences the classroom environment. In the end, structure, rules, and classroom procedures might be necessary for creating democratic spaces, but it is important for teachers to be reflective of their practices so they do not end up creating undemocratic spaces through their management strategies.

Direct instruction. Along the same lines, multiple resident alumni talked about using direct instruction as part of their instructional strategy. Often the resident alumni were explicit about their use of direct instruction and regularly connected it to the use of PowerPoint and guided notes. The use of direct instruction was one instructional practice that was commonly and explicitly acknowledged by the resident alumni. Murphy talked about how as he started his solo teaching he had been using direct instruction with guided notes and PowerPoint. Justin talked about how he regularly utilized direct instruction during his residency. Both Murphy and Justin used direct instruction because they were using materials and lessons provided by their

mentor teachers. During her fourth interview, Mia went into detail about how she was trying to minimize her direct instruction but it was still a key component of her daily instruction. She said:

Lately what I've been doing is trying to really minimize the amount of direct instruction that I'm doing as much as possible. Even though I know that a lot of the resources that are available are guided notes, we have PowerPoint, fill in the blanks. And that does work well for some students but I think it really doesn't work that well for most of them. So what I'm trying to do is to move to a place where we do maybe at most 10 or 15 minutes of direct instruction in a class period and I have a student timekeeper keeping on task...And I think if I start that from the beginning of the year next year and I stick to only using like 10 minutes pretty much every day, then I feel pretty good about that. Just because what the research says, it's how ... How useless direct instruction really is something they're only getting like 10 percent of the information or something from direct instruction. Then I do want to kind of wean myself off of it as much as possible and do more student-centered instruction next year.

Mia explained her desire to limit direct instruction in favor of more student-centered instruction, but acknowledged the difficulty in moving away from fill-in the blank notes, which seem to be in opposition to student-centered instruction. Arguably, direct instruction has its place in the classroom, even democratic ones, but it can become problematic when that is the primary instructional method, particularly when coupled with guided notes or fill-in-the-blank heavy lessons. This can lead to a teacher-centered class, which removes most space for democratic habits. Billy was similar to Mia as he desired to do more activities and student-centered

instruction, but ended the year going in the opposite direction and doing more worksheets and direct instruction due to struggles with pacing and preparing his students for state testing.

MATR staff also commented on how they observed that direct instruction is used regularly by resident alumni. Dr. Damian, program administrator, recalled a time when she went to observe a highly regarded resident and how she was disappointed with what she saw because it was purely direct instruction with guided notes. She stated:

And unfortunately, what I see happening far too much and I think we've even got one of our residents but you know I mean he gets rave reviews from his administrators and you know he's doing a lot of great stuff and he's in a very tough school. But when I went to observe here I was just devastated because it was you know fill in the blank PowerPoints, No thinking whatsoever. If it was just a lecture with you know you fill up the blank and the kids weren't even listening to what he was lecturing. They were just filling in the blank and I just thought oh my gosh you know again it's the path that too often is made in our high needs urban schools where you know if you are quiet and behave yourself I'm not going to push you too hard and you're not going to make this pretty easy on you. And that's the you know the bargain he has made and I just was devastated by that.

Dr. Ryan discussed similar observations with his former students-an adherence to fill-in the blank notes and lecturing on a regular basis. This method of teaching is not what the students had experienced or were taught when they had Dr. Ryan. Direct instruction, particularly lecture and guided notes, positions the teacher at the center of the classroom thereby limiting the possibility of democratic habits being practiced because the power lies with the teacher and the students are rendered bystanders or observers.

In sum, resident alumni exhibited some democratic habits both inside and outside of the classroom. Outside of the classroom, the most common habits they exhibited were collaboration and associated living with other professionals. Inside the classroom, student-centered approaches, particularly through understanding students' contexts and the use of activities, were the most common ways that democratic principles were being displayed. At the same time, the resident alumni were exhibiting non-democratic habits of control and teacher-centered practices. In the end, the resident alumni were mixed in their use of democratic habits and principles.

Possible Barriers to Democratic Habits

This final section presents the findings that help answer the third research question: What barriers, if any, impede residents and alumni from practicing democratic habits? While the residents did not explicitly discuss barriers to democratic education, they regularly talked about barriers to success in the classroom, or within their schools, but never about impeding their use of democratic habits. Understanding the possible barriers to democratic education will take more reasoning and possible speculation based on overall barriers residents and alumni are facing as they teach. At the same time, due to the nature of the interview questions, some of the MATR staff shared what they saw as possible barriers to democratic education.

Barrier Seen by Program Instructors

All five of the MATR staff interviewed offered what they saw as the barriers to democratic education in some schools and the district. Three of them discussed how the district was set up as a hierarchy and policies were top-down. They each went on to say that this system eventually made its way into the classroom and limited the possibility for teachers to try and use democratic principles. Dr. Ryan explained how these top-down hierarchical policies, combined with being a new teacher, made it difficult for resident alumni to push against them and try to

enact change within their schools and district; it was risky and required a delicate balance so they would not get themselves in trouble with their administration. For the 2016-17 school year, zero of the seven middle schools and only three of the seven high schools, two of which had selective enrollment, were accredited. One combined middle and high school was accredited. Only a few of the resident alumni worked within any of these accredited schools. Dr. Sams, as well as a few residents, talked about the influence that school accreditation had on policies the district and school leadership put into place; since there was such an emphasis on making sure students passed the standardized tests, the policies and practices the district implemented almost solely focused on testing.

Dr. Conrad made a similar statement- that he saw high stakes testing as a major influence on how urban schools were run and the policies put in place. He also saw underfunding as a barrier to democratic education because this limited schools' resources and narrowed the schools' focus, impacting what eventually happened in classrooms. This underfunding limited instructional and curricular options and made it so there was only enough funds and resources to focus on what the district deemed essential, which was often limited to meeting state requirements through testing. He explained:

It takes a lot of time and energy and resources and infrastructure to keep all of that [standardized testing] running and all of that time, all of those resources, if not all, then let's say 95% are going towards testing and that's where all of the focus is. It is very difficult in my understanding to teach in a richly democratic way. Teachers are very resourceful and will always find ways in the margins in the cracks to get some Democratic education going on but we certainly don't make it easy for them. The more we put there are schools under the gun of high stakes standardized tests and that our

MATR student-teachers say time and time again that time is one of the big factors. See I just don't have enough time to do this in a way that I think could be really effective and substantive. They'll still find ways to do it, have a list of questions from your students and work with that link it to their own experiences but that's often happening you know in the dead time after the test when students are exhausted and demoralized, teachers are exhausted demoralized. That's just one of if not the major obstacle, at least within schools that we're talking about institutions, that standing in the way of a more robust democratic education.

Dr. Ryan and Dr. Damian each discussed the bargaining or contracts that the resident alumni made with their students. This contract was an unspoken one that said if the students behaved then the teacher would not push them or ask too much of the students. Both said they saw this in classrooms and is one reason they saw almost the exclusive use of direct instruction and the use of guided or closed notes as opposed to activities that asked more of their students. Dr. Damian shared one experience she had where she went to observe one highly regarded resident alumni but observed him doing 90 minutes of direct instruction. She went on to explain why she thought he was so highly regarded and her issue with what she had observed. She said, “*he's getting good test scores so you know everybody's happy and like the kids are just not learning to think at all.*” These were both single incidents, but Dr. Ryan talked about how this was more typical than he would like to admit. Furthermore, they both attributed these instances and others like them to testing and maintaining order in classrooms.

In the end, all five of the MATR faculty saw multiple barriers to teachers using democratic habits in their classroom. Furthermore, all of them saw larger systemic barriers that pervaded the classroom environment and teachers' instructional approaches. Very often, these

were barriers that the teachers had little control over or influence on. Often, it appeared that educational leaders', and by proxy school leaders', choices were creating some of the largest barriers to democratic education and habits.

Barriers Seen by the Resident Alumni

As it has been previously stated, the resident alumni did not explicitly discuss democratic education, let alone what barriers might be preventing them from practicing such habits in their classrooms. While Ted and Diana were the closest to discussing democratic education, those conversations were focused on their instruction and views of students, not on what was preventing them from using democratic education. Throughout the four interviews, the resident alumni were regularly asked about areas of challenge or that they felt the least confident about as teachers. For the most part, the resident alumni were open and willing to share their struggles and what they saw as impeding their ability to be most successful teacher.

There was a great deal of commonality among the 15 resident alumni about what was keeping them from being the teacher they hoped they could be. Since practicing democratic education is part of a teacher's instructional and professional practice, it can be inferred that the barriers to practicing democratic education mirror the barriers to successful teaching described by the resident alumni. While there are a few other possible barriers to the resident alumni practicing democratic education that will be discussed, the majority of the factors that were seen as challenges or areas of needed development fit into two categories: professional practice and system-wide challenges. But before I discuss the professional and system-wide barriers that the resident alumni raised as limiting their success as a teacher, I will discuss some larger, more glaring possible barriers to teachers practicing democratic education.

Other potential barriers. There seemed to be a gap between some of the experiences the resident alumni had in their courses and what they enacted in their classrooms. According to the four professors who taught multiple courses the resident alumni could end up taking as part of the program, they all taught democratic habits and principles to some extent. This was one of the places democratic education and habits were the most evident within the MATR program. Nevertheless, these habits were exhibited sparingly through the resident alumni's instructional practices. There was a disconnect between what the instructors said they did in their courses and what the residents then exhibited in their classrooms.

The most glaring barrier to the residents not practicing democratic education was that it was not foregrounded in their program. One might expect to see some democratic habits exhibited by the resident alumni as a result of the program's social justice language and the standard teaching practices learned through the MATR program. It should not be expected that the resident alumni practice democratic education in their classrooms as they have not been explicitly trained in democratic education through their coursework. For instance, collaboration is a habit that was regularly discussed in the program and program documents, and could be expected from teachers as a part of being a teacher. Additionally, since social justice is based in democratic principles and MATR foregrounds social justice, there is the possibility for some overlapping habits to be exhibited by the resident alumni. Although some of the professors were intentional about including and teaching with democratic values, the overall MATR program neither highlights nor centers democratic education, and this may create a significant barrier to the resident alumni practicing democratic education.

Another possibility for the dissonance between the courses and other places that the MATR program exhibits democratic principles could simply be the resident alumni's

inexperience. Student teaching and the first year of teaching are hard enough as it is, let alone implementing a pedagogy that is uncommon, and even arguably contradictory to the policies within the schools they were placed. Even though the residency experience offers the residents an experiential advantage over most teachers, being a first-year teacher in your own classroom is hard, especially in classrooms within hard-to-staff schools. In most cases, new teachers are simply trying to survive not only their student teaching, but their first few years of teaching (Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998).

Implementing democratic education is not a simple step-by-step process, and it can be a demanding. I am in my 10th year of teaching and am writing a dissertation on democratic education, and it is difficult for me to implement democratic education in my own classroom because of changing school policies, curriculum changes, and most of my classes being tied to a standardized test. It could be that these resident alumni have a desire to implement more democratic habits but they have other needs or areas they see as more critical to their success or survival that makes them put their desires on hold until they can figure out what it takes to be a teacher. About halfway through his first year of teaching, Ted was asked about finding and establishing his teaching style and his response conveys a sentiment of inexperience and figuring it out. He said (referring to getting a feel for her teaching style):

I feel like I am trying to. But again, it is still so hard because I'm trying to learn what [the students] need to know in the curriculum. I'm trying to learn the best way to teach things so I feel like I am trying a lot of different strategies as far as teaching to try and get everything into place so I don't think I am there yet but I'm trying to get there.

One other possible barrier to practicing democratic education is the mentor teacher. This is not to say that the mentor teachers prevented the residents from practicing democratic

education or exhibiting democratic habits, as some did encourage it (e.g., Ted's mentor), but rather that the mentor emerged as a significant representation of what teaching looked like, and the resident alumni regularly referenced them as such. Since the mentor teacher was the primary example that the residents learned from, on some level their habits informed the resident alumni's teaching practices and professional development. Since most of the mentors did not practice democratic education and exhibited limited amounts of democratic habits, it would be unlikely for the resident alumni to then go and practice democratic education. Many of the residents said they would emulate some or most of what they saw and experienced in their mentor's classroom. Even when residents said that they wanted to move away from their mentor's style and add democratic habits, such as being more student-centered, they would regularly fall back into what they knew, and, in particular how they observed their mentors teaching. Billy was a good example of this as he discussed desires to change and add more student-centered, collaborative activities, but by the end of the year he was back to using worksheets and teacher-centered practices in order to make it to the end of the year. If the residents did not see or experience democratic habits with their mentor teacher, it seems logical that they would not do it on their own, especially when things get difficult in their first year.

Professional barriers. Professional barriers was one of the two categories that resident alumni discussed as impediments to their success as a teacher, both while they were preservice and in-service teachers. These were challenges within the resident alumni's classroom. Again, none of the resident alumni discussed barriers to practicing democratic education, but they did discuss challenges to their teaching in general. It is possible that those same barriers could impede the practice of democratic education, especially as they did seem to constrain their abilities to do some practices that are democratic, like student-centered instruction.

The most common challenge expressed by the resident alumni was classroom management. They found it difficult to figure what worked for them and for their students. Additionally, they would regularly express current frustration with their own classroom management plans and desired to change or improve in the year to come. This was one of the areas in which the resident alumni talked about gaining more control and becoming stricter with their classroom management plans and this could be in opposition to democratic habits. This desire for control and prioritizing discipline is not uncommon and has been found to be a constraint on developing democratic classrooms (Carlson, 2005; Seher, 2013), particularly in urban schools (Lipman, 2009; Monahan & Torres, 2009). Furthermore, if their classroom management was lacking, as many of the resident alumni indicated, it could become difficult to employ any pedagogy effectively, democratic education included. As the resident alumni were focused on trying to manage their students and regain their focus and attention, it made it very difficult to implement new and innovative instruction. In the end, classroom management and effective instruction are connected, so as the resident alumni were struggling with classroom management, it took a great deal of their attention and energy, meaning that there was less, if any, left to put into their instructional practices, including democratic education.

A second area that some resident alumni felt impeded their success as a teacher was their lesson implementation. They explained that they had ideas that they tried to turn into lessons but the lesson would end up being a flop or not going as they hoped. Additionally, many of them found or had lessons from other places but struggled with implementing the lesson so that their students were engaged. For example, Martin acknowledged one of his biggest struggles with lesson planning was the *“logistical pitfalls that don't necessarily occur to someone who hasn't run through the lesson before.”* Additionally, when Justin was asked what he saw as possible

challenges to solo teaching, he talked about classroom management but also discussed his lessons. He said:

And finding – creating a lesson that I feel comfortable with teaching. I need more practice with that. I know I said that I love the way that my mentor creates his lessons, but I know I can't just like, copy and paste. In my years to come, I want to be able to create my own flow of things and make sure that I feel good about teaching it, and it's not just a carbon copy of what – [his mentor's lessons].

Murphy expressed a similar sentiment about his instruction during his first year. He said:

So, I would say just a success when it comes to lesson planning would be being open minded and trying new things. Because a lot of the stuff that I would use from my mentor last year didn't really go well with classes this year. So just being flexible and trying out different things--not sticking to my guns and forcing kids to do something that's not going well and they're not taking it well. So, I'd say its success is just being flexible...Or to admit to failure that one lesson didn't go too well. So, you shouldn't do the same structure of a lesson, tomorrow or a week from now.

In both cases, the residents struggled to implement the plans or lessons that they had seen or were provided by their mentors. At the same time, they acknowledged the need to grow, try new things, and create their own lessons. Also, some of them struggled to create and implement age- and skill-appropriate lessons, as the context of their residency differed from their first year of teaching. Simply put, many of the residents did not always feel as though students were learning or engaged to the extent they would have hoped. This could be a result of inexperience and in many cases teaching new content and grades. Lee was the best example of this as he went from teaching high school science during his residency experience to becoming a 6th grade science

teacher. He said the change created “*a lot of harsh learning curves*” and that he questioned how to teach the 6th graders and where to start with the curriculum. Mia had similar struggles moving schools and content. Ultimately, if the resident alumni struggled to implement their lessons, they were likely to fall back onto what they perceived as working and may have been less willing to try a new lesson or instructional practice, including democratic education.

One other area that presented challenges to the resident alumni and their success as teachers was planning. Multiple alumni stated that they struggled with lesson planning, often because of a lack of adequate planning time. Very often the planning time the resident alumni were supposed to receive as part of their daily schedule was taken away by the administration or a need of the school, such as having lunch duty or hallway duty. As a result, some of these resident alumni had virtually no designated planning time during their contractual day. Even if the resident alumni did have planning time, they would occasionally discuss how they struggled to find resources and materials. Billy even stated that he wished there had been a bank of resources for alumni to access so they did not have to spend so much time searching for them. Once they were teaching they would have been able to use their planning to adapt the resources and lessons to their classes instead of using the time to plan the lesson and or find the resources. If the resident alumni did not have protected planning time or they felt as though the time was lacking, they were unlikely to have the space to create the lessons that they desired or saw as effective; there would be little room for innovation or much beyond basic instruction.

Many of the professional barriers that the resident alumni identified directly impacted their instruction. Further, all these barriers could be a result of being new and inexperienced teachers. While it was virtually unanimous that the resident alumni were thankful for and acknowledged the value of the whole year residency experience, they were still new to being in

complete control and accountable for their classroom. It is likely as they become more experienced, many of these barriers will diminish, if not disappear altogether. But nonetheless, these were barriers that they perceived as impeding their success, thus likely impediments to practicing democratic education. Now, I turn to the barriers outside of the residents' immediate control.

System barriers. The other main category of challenges to resident alumni success as a teacher that they acknowledged were system barriers. These barriers were generally school- and district-wide that the residents had little to no say or control over. The most common barrier outside of residents' classrooms was school administration. There were a variety of issues that the resident alumni discussed with regard to their administration. The frequent change in building administrators often created a lack of stability and direction for the school and the teachers. Additionally, some of the resident alumni explained how they did not feel supported by--or in a few cases even seen by--the administration. When Travis was asked how much support he received from his administration he said "zero." In other cases, resident alumni described their administration both in the school and at the district level as having a top-down, hierarchical mentality. For example, Ana described her residency school as one that was a "shit show." She went on to connect the chaos to a "top-down," new principal. She explained:

I think that this program gave me an awesome opportunity to be at a school that has many problems, but also has many great aspects about it. Like this year is our principal's first year, and it's just a lot of things – when I came in from the beginning, I didn't understand all the teachers' frustrations, because they were like, this is not normal, and they're overly stressed out. And a lot of it was top down, but this – I feel like this school

has a lot of problems that are probably in [name of city] and [name of school district] in general.

While Murphy mentioned that he did feel supported by his administration, he did talk about how accreditation played a major role in how the administration interacted with the teachers. He stated:

And so, until the school's accredited they're going to continue to not, I mean they support teachers but it's just not the feeling that you want to get from your boss. When you go into a meeting you get--not yelled at--but talked to you like you're a student or you're a child. And I'm not a child. This is my job and I take it seriously. But I think that's just across the board when it comes to urban education because [of] a lot of stress from other third parties.

Similarly, Darla described how her administration did what they wanted and there were no clear expectations from the administration. She explained:

I hate the fact that you know you're told one thing. So, it's like there's never any clear expectations of what your job actually entails and those expectations are changed at the will of administration as they see fit. So, oh you get this planning period and then next thing you know I get an email. Well you're not actually you know required a planning period every day and then you know and then lunch duty twice a week and you're supposed to stand up the whole time. Well you're not actually required a 30-minute lunch break. It's just like they do what they want.

She went on to connect her experience to what it is like to teach in an urban school. She stated that urban schools have “no resources, no support. Administration cares about how they look to the state because the states are on their butts.” This meant that the teachers had little to no say

in the policies of the school or direction the school would heading in that year. If the school is one with undemocratic values and a controlling administration it would likely be more difficult to establish democratic principles in a teacher's classroom (Carlson, 2009; Silverman, 2012).

One other issue that the resident alumni discussed was their administration's lack of, or late communication, of schedule changes, expectations, policies, and or school rules. Some of the resident alumni described their schools as chaotic and difficult as a result of their administrators and policies. These experiences with administration can impact what teachers can--or feel like they can--do in their classroom. Diana spoke to this during her residency as she described how even in a chaotic school all she could do is close her door and try to control her room. At the same time, she did acknowledge that even with control of her classroom, school-wide chaos still trickled into her instruction and classes. She explained:

I think that school itself has a lot of issues, a lot of problems, but all this, I don't know how it can be fixed, because it's just a bunch of problems all happening at once. I think even with the fact that I brought a referral and it doesn't go through and then the students get away without any consequences, those things I get upset about...So, I just feel like it's, there are a lot of problems and then I think there are many things I feel they should do better like I think the consequences, I think the teachers, even teachers get away without getting any consequences so therefore students also get away without consequences. And I think when there are no consequences, that shows that there's no structure, there's no organization within the school. It just feels like everything is out of structure from the beginning to the end in everything that is happening in school, it's so not structured. So, I think even the students, I also noticed that some of the students that come here and do what they're supposed to do, but then they, somehow, they change and

they get influenced by the school atmosphere and then the friends around them, and then somehow, they turn into students that I wish they weren't. And then like I said, I don't think it's not so much of their background, yes, but also school influence too...So, those things will definitely influence the atmosphere even within the classroom.

A few of the resident alumni also discussed how there was a lack of consistent discipline or expectations for student behavior from administrators. These negative experiences were not the case for all of the resident alumni, but issues with administration was common. While administration may not always have a direct influence over a classroom, their decisions and leadership can indirectly influence the success of a teacher.

Closely connected to school administration was school-wide and district-wide policy, both of which were described as impediments to being a successful teacher by the resident alumni. A number of the schools that the resident alumni were placed as residents and then hired as alumni needed to obtain state accreditation. As a result, achieving accreditation became the primary, if not the singular focus, of the administration and thus the school. This meant that state standardized testing became heavily focused on, which impacted the school schedule and often teacher's pacing. This was articulated by Darla and Murphy in their descriptions above of their administration. As testing becomes the school-wide focus, it is almost inevitable that passing the test will become the classroom focus as well. This focus on testing was another constraint on everyone in the school-- teachers, students, and administrators included. In the end, the need to pass the test pervades the school and classroom, and it is likely that teachers, particularly new teachers, will focus their instruction on preparing the students for the test and minimize effective, engaging, or innovative lessons, including democratic education (Gilliom, 2009; Lipman, 2003, 2009).

Another policy that a few resident alumni referenced as a barrier to their success as a teacher was limited planning time. They also saw this as a professional barrier but often their lack of planning time during the school day was a result of administrative policy. For example, Ted shared that one of his biggest challenges was a lack of time, particularly planning time. He said:

Like I said, the time there is just not enough of it. We also get pulled to cover classes during our planning period because we don't have substitutes and then I have meetings after school twice a week and during my planning my period twice a week so everything just kind of all my time that I should have at school just disappears and it ends up being what can I get done at home. I don't think I have really planned during a planning period since December. The time is really difficult for me.

Similarly, Darla shared how her planning time was lost due to meetings. These meetings were sometimes multiple days a week during her designated planning time or they were meetings about strategies instead of letting her plan for new instructional strategies. Occasionally resident alumni shared that some or all of their planning time was taken away by the administration in an effort to try and reduce the chaos and dysfunction within the school. The teacher would often be given duties, monitoring, or having meetings instead of their planning time. For instance, Murphy alluded to the fact that he lost his planning due to the needs of the administration and would end up losing his lunch break to lunch duty.

Required professional development (PD) also cut into the resident alumni's planning time. Resident alumni repeatedly saw the PD as unhelpful and a waste of time. They did hope for useful PD and saw some PD as helpful if it was about improving their teaching practice. There were even cases where the mentor teacher saw the PD as lacking value and unnecessary for the

residents. For example, Ted explained how the PD was redundant and not helpful as they had four PD sessions on how to write a lesson plan. He went on to explain:

Yeah, so it's just was not, was helpful the first time but not the fourth time. By the fourth time we wanted to be learning how to we could implement things in the arts and not you know how to write, how to properly say that you are doing an assessment on blah, blah, blah.

Again, as stated above, if the resident alumni, or teachers in general, have little to no planning time it will be difficult to create lessons and activities that are effective or exhibit democratic habits.

No resident alumnus pointed to one single challenge or barrier to their success as a teacher, but referenced multiple factors that affected their residency and first year of teaching. There is the possibility that the barriers to the resident alumni practicing democratic education could be any, all, or any combination of these factors. It could also simply be that they are first year teachers and that is steeped in difficulty in and of itself. At the same time, it is very likely that because the MATR program does not highlight, let alone foreground, democratic education that the resident alumni will not practice democratic education as a whole and be limited in their exhibition of democratic habits or principles. Since the resident alumni were not asked directly about the use of democratic education or observed in their teaching, knowing what is impeding their use of democratic education is uncertain. However, this highlights the need for more research in this area to broaden the understanding of resident alumnis' use of democratic education.

Summary

The use of democratic habits in the MATR program and by the resident alumni was mixed. The habits were most prevalent in some of the coursework and design of the program through the cohort and mentorship. The professors commonly designed their courses to be student-centered based on the experiences of the residents which allowed for associated living, collaboration, and student voice. Some of the professors were more explicit in their use of democratic principles as part of their course; thus, as part the residents learning process they were in multiple classroom environments that exposed them to multiple democratic habits on a regular basis. Similarly, the cohort model opened the residents to an environment that afforded them the opportunities to share their teaching experiences and learn from and with other members of their cohort. This model used the democratic habits of associated living, collaboration, student voice, critical inquiry, and student-centered learning.

The final piece of the program that encompassed democratic principles was the mentorship relationship. While the residents were mixed in how they felt about their mentors and the coaching tools, the act of being mentored allowed for collaboration, associated living, and in some instance's critical inquiry or voice. In the end, the MATR staff interviewed held very positive views of using and the possibility of democratic habits and principles within the program.

As teachers, both preservice and in-service, democratic habits were exhibited in a variety of areas. It is important to note that the question prompts that the teachers responded to were open-ended and rarely asked about social justice education and never about democratic education. In the end they were not applying social justice or democratic education frameworks in their responses, even though there was space to do so. The resident alumni exhibited

democratic principles most commonly in their professional relationships and attitude toward making their classroom student-centered. As the resident alumni entered their first year of teaching they commonly discussed the professional relationships that they developed with other teachers in their school and how important they were to their first year. Through these relationships they found support and exhibited the habits of collaboration, associated living, and often voice.

Then within their classroom as teachers, pre-service and in-service, the residents exhibited a great deal of student-centered attitudes and practices. This was seen most commonly through their understanding of their students' contextual realities and the use of student-centered activities. In general, the resident alumni understood the context from which their students were coming, however only some of the alumni attempted to use that information to connect their content to the students' lives. Also, the resident alumni regularly made reference to activities as a way to show they were focusing on their students and moving away from direct instruction or being teacher-centered. In some instances, the effort of being student-centered and the use of activities allowed for the democratic habits of voice, collaboration, associated living, and in specific instances critical inquiry.

A few resident alumni were more closely associated to democratic education through their views of developing citizens and connection to social justice. Some did explicitly discuss developing citizens and saw teaching as more than content acquisition, but helping students become good citizens with the ability to think. These were some of the instances in which the residents came closest to naming democratic education or democratic habits. Additionally, social justice was discussed by some of the residents, but was often vague and framed as a desired addition in the future and work to be done outside of the classroom. Again, as social

justice and democratic education are connected, the distinct discussions around social justice were some of the occurrences that were the most closely connected to democratic education.

Resident alumni also exhibited potentially non-democratic habits. The philosophies the resident alumni had around classroom management could lead to non-democratic practices. Many of the resident alumni discussed the plans to become stricter or more authoritative in how they dealt with their students. Additionally, direct instruction, mostly PowerPoint and guided notes, was a key pedagogical strategy for most of the resident alumni. Even as the resident alumni exhibited student-centered instructional practices they also regularly adhered to direct instruction. As stated earlier, it should be noted that both adherence to a stricter classroom management and direct instruction does not guarantee a classroom is an undemocratic space, and there are most likely highly democratic classrooms that utilize both of these habits. However, continuously utilizing both has the possibility of shifting the focus and power to the teacher, which is in opposition to democratic principles.

There may be many barriers to resident alumni exhibiting democratic habits or principles but the data does not explicitly point to them, from the residents' perspective. At the same time, the resident alumni regularly shared their challenges, impediments, and areas of needed growth. The residents commonly referenced both professional barriers and system barriers to their success as a teacher. Classroom management and planning were frequently shared as major impediments to their success in the classroom. The residents also discussed a lack of support and consistency by administration in their buildings. Additionally, the policies of their administrators, particularly the heavy top-down focus on accreditation through testing, caused challenges in their teaching and classroom.

While the residents laid out numerous possible barriers to their success as teachers, and by extension their exhibition of democratic habits, there were other potential barriers to them practicing democratic education. One could be the lack of promotion of democratic education by the program. There is a foregrounding of social justice and habits that could be perceived as democratic, but there is no explicit promotion of democratic education or principles. The only place that barriers are discussed and explicitly stated is by the MATR staff. They discuss bigger school-wide and system-wide issues that impact what happens in the classroom. A common barrier that the staff saw was the administration and policies of the district. Both of these factors, while they are district and school wide, trickle into the resident alumni's classrooms. The staff also viewed standardized testing as influencing policy and what the resident alumni can and cannot do in their classrooms. Furthermore, the lack of democratic habits could simply be because they are new teachers. There appears to be a disconnect between the residents' experience in the program and their practicing democratic principles in their own classrooms as teachers. I now move to discuss, synthesize, and share possible implications of these findings and this study.

Chapter 5: Discussion

In this dissertation, I examined the role that democratic education did and could play in one urban teacher residency (UTR). These two areas may seem unrelated, but trends within UTRs and democratic education make this study important. Democratic education is being marginalized in schools; this is especially apparent in urban schools. Furthermore, most urban schools are undemocratic spaces. As UTRs often foreground social justice (which is connected to democratic education) and are designed to train teachers to enter and gradually transform these undemocratic spaces, UTRs seem positioned to bolster democratic education in urban settings. On top of these trends, there was no research that could be found that focused on democratic education and UTRs. In this study I sought to start to understand the current role and the future possibilities of democratic education within UTRs.

My previous experience as an evaluator of the UTR that was central to this study is what afforded me the opportunity to complete this study, and that experience was continuously brought back to my mind. As I have previously stated, I have read and/or heard all of the resident alumni interviews prior to starting my dissertation. This knowledge of the data gave me some ideas of what I could expect with the findings and how my research questions would be answered. With all of that said, I was ever conscious of this fact and took every effort to work with the data with as little preconceived notions as possible. As I compiled the findings and analyzed the data in an effort to answer the research questions, I was critical of my own analysis and wanted to be true to the data and let it speak for itself -- rather than me speaking for the data. To start, I spent some time discussing my analysis of the data. This will include my observations about democratic education within MATR, why we might see what we do in the findings, what might be missing, why it is difficult, and an overall synthesis of connecting UTRs

and democratic education. Then I discuss the implications of this study on both the UTR of focus (MATR) and UTRs in general. Along with that, I share what I see as possible places for future research to deepen the understanding of the current and future role democratic education can have within UTRs and urban schools. I conclude with my final thoughts on this study.

Synthesis - What Was Seen, Why Is It Happening, and Why It Is Not

Coming into this study, I thought it possible for democratic education to be practiced within UTRs and thus by the program resident and alumni. This belief stemmed from the understanding of the common elements of the UTR model (NCTR, 2018a) and the fact that most UTRs espouse social justice principles to some extent. Since social justice is foregrounded in these programs, including the one in this study, and social justice definitions often include democratic principles (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012; Sibbett, 2016; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004), it seemed even more possible that UTRs could be intentionally or unintentionally exposing their residents to democratic principles. I wanted to examine the possibility of democratic education and the places that MATR, a UTR under the NCTR model, was already exposing residents to democratic principles or habits. A few observations I made about the MATR program and its espousal of democratic education and democratic habits.

First, it is apparent that the MATR program does not explicitly practice democratic education, as democratic education is not part of the program. The program foregrounds social justice. But just like many of the previous studies on UTRs, the MATR has places and elements that allow for multiple democratic habits to be exhibited. As was laid out in chapter 2, the understanding of democratic education begins with Dewey's (1916) idea of associated living; but over time, it has been expanded to include multiple habits or dispositions that are democratic in nature and that people can learn (Bean & Apple, 2007; Hytten, 2017; Meier, 2003; Stitzlein,

2014a; Stemhagen, 2009, 2016; Wood, 1992). These were the primary habits that I looked for within the MATR program elements and the practices of the resident alumni. All five of the guiding democratic habits were seen in both the MATR program and the coursework of the resident alumni but three of them -- student-centered instruction, collaboration, and associated living -- were much more prevalent than the other two, voice and critical inquiry.

One distinct aim of UTRs is to focus on the context in which the teachers will be teaching. In other words, the context becomes content (Hammerness & Craig, 2016; Hammerness, Williamson, & Kosnick, 2016; Matsko & Hammerness, 2014; Williamson, Apedoe, & Thomas, 2016). As the program continues to focus on helping the residents make meaning of the context they were in and going to be in, there is a natural focus on the students as this is the context in which the teachers will be teaching. This may help explain why the most widely exhibited habit was student-centered curriculum and teaching. This approach was heavily seen through much of the MATR program and the resident alumni's teaching. It appeared to be a key philosophy of the program as student-centered elements were seen in the courses they took, the cohort model, and the mentorship model. Additionally, the resident-alumni discussed efforts to make their teaching more student-centered on a regular basis.

Often, creating space for student voice is a natural result of being student-centered. The amount of the elicitation of student voice exhibited in the resident alumni's classrooms was limited, particularly when compared to how prevalent student-centered curriculum and teaching was found. Student-voice was more evident in the cohort forums and some of the courses that the residents took. It was virtually unseen in the resident alumni's descriptions of their instructional practices. This does not mean that the alumni were not creating space for student voice, but it was rarely highlighted in the interviews. There were even practices that hint at

reducing student voice, such as the desire to be more in control or stricter with classroom management, as well as using guided notes.

The understanding of democratic education and democracy that guided this study was grounded in the Deweyan (1916) idea of associated living or communicated experiences. The habit of associated living is closely connected to collaboration (Beane & Apple, 2007; Gutmann, 1993; McAvoy & Hess, 2013) as they both are based on the idea of people learning from one another's experiences. This happened almost weekly during the residency year, as the residents were in their cohort and weekly seminar. They regularly expressed how they shared their experiences and learned from other cohort members' experiences, not only in the seminar but in their courses. The mentorship relationships seemed to reflect collaboration more than associated living, in that they were working together but not necessarily sharing experiences, and this could be due to the type of relationship. It is very likely that the mentor-mentee relationship was more like a teacher-student power dynamic than two equal parties. This dynamic, whether it was ever spoken or not, could limit the sharing of experiences and connecting and ultimately could have been more transactional than one-directional. Nevertheless, the relationship still involved collaboration even if it was transactional, especially because of the mandatory use of the coaching tools.

As the residents moved into their full-time teaching positions, they still exhibited associated living and collaboration, but it was almost exclusively with other teachers as opposed to through their instructional practices. The resident alumni commonly discussed how they had built relationships with, and relied on, other teachers to make it through the first year. But they were very limited in describing opportunities for their students to work collaboratively or have communicated experiences. It is possible that as the resident alumni adhered to student-centered

lessons and classrooms, that they were creating spaces for their students to collaborate and share their lived experiences with one another and the teacher. The resident alumni did discuss the desire to create activities, build rapport, and--to some extent--create lessons that were based on the student's lived realities which could very well have, again, created space for associating and collaborating.

Democratic classrooms also open up spaces for students to question, reflect, and problem-solve about the world around them and societal realities through critical inquiry (Beane & Apple, 2007; Meier, 1995; Westheimer & Kahn, 2004; Wolk, 2007). The residents were able to experience this through their coursework as the professors regularly had them share and think about the world and classrooms they were in and those they were about to go into. The residents engaged in critical inquiry as they learned about the contexts of their students and community and the system and district which they were now a part of. Additionally, when the residents were in their courses and with their cohort, they often shared experiences and were challenged to think of advice or how to deal with various situations. Thus, there was a lot of problem-solving.

However, once the residents were teachers, they engaged their students in critical inquiry in limited amounts. Only Amanda explicitly mentioned having her students engage in critical thinking. In terms of engaging in their own critical inquiry, the resident alumni shared their frustrations with their schools, administrators, and the district, but the space for them to critically question their reality was limited.

The shift away from critical inquiry could have been for a variety of reasons. Creating space and activities that involve critical inquiry could require more time, planning, and a depth of content knowledge that first year teachers may not possess. For critical inquiry to be possible,

a level of student freedom is needed, which could have been hard for resident alumni to establish, as many of them shared concerns about classroom management.

While I expected that all five of the democratic habits would be exhibited at some point in the resident alumni's first two years, the level to which they were exhibited, and where, was unknown. Democratic habits were much more prevalent during the residency year than they were in the resident alumni's descriptions of their first year of teaching. This is one of the most glaring findings, as democratic habits seem to happen a lot during the program but seem limited-to-non-existent once the resident alumni are on their own. There is some sort of disconnect once they have their own classrooms. The explanation could be as simple as they are first year teachers and they are just trying to survive, and thus do not yet feel equipped to implement a new pedagogy (Wilson & Berne, 1999). At the same time, since MATR does not emphasize democratic education it is less likely that the resident alumni would exhibit democratic habits through their instructional practices. Furthermore, there could be multiple factors at play that are beyond the scope of this study, such as the testing accountability pressures are stronger once they are instructors of record.

Even with social justice education helping to frame the program, there is little discussion about social justice education among residents and alumni. It raises the question of how social justice is being framed throughout the program and why there is so little discussion by the residents in their interviews. One item I had to grapple with in my theoretical grounding was connections and distinctions between democratic education and social justice education and the findings offered little clarity to this ambiguity. Additionally, I wonder if social justice education is becoming a buzzword in urban settings, particularly within UTRs. In the end, it is an interesting reality of the resident alumni's experience that raises more questions than answers.

How Is Democratic Education Happening?

Since MATR program documents and vision do not mention, let alone foreground, democratic education, there must be other factors that are allowing these democratic habits to be found in the residency program and the resident alumni's teaching. MATR is designed to fit the UTR model (NCTR, 2018a) and because of the key UTR elements, it seems inevitable that some of these habits were seen in this study. It is likely that the structure of the program is a major reason why democratic habits were found. In particular the cohort and mentorship elements are ones that could convey democratic habits no matter the context in which they were implemented, as they both are built around sharing experiences in relationship. This should allow for most, if not all, five democratic habits. The other element of the program that promotes democratic habits is how UTRs focus on preparing teachers for a certain context (Hammerness & Craig, 2015; Matsko & Hammerness, 2014). This focus naturally encourages a focus on the students, student-centered pedagogy and associated living, and for the residents to be critically examining the community and system they are now within.

While a UTR does not have to be connected to social justice, most of them are, including MATR. This connection and espousal of social justice could explain why there are so many democratic habits displayed. In reality, since social justice is regularly framed using democratic language, the social justice elements offer the possibility of being democratic. But again, as it has been explained elsewhere in chapter 2, social justice and democratic education are so connected that the findings in this study illuminated how the social justice elements of the MATR program did, in fact, support democratic habits. Regardless of whether these habits are expressed through social justice education or democratic education, they are still democratic and of value for developing democratic citizens.

Professors are another factor that could help explain why democratic habits were being exhibited. The professors have a great deal of influence over the possibilities of their own classroom being democratic (Bickmore & Parker, 2014). All four of the professors embraced democratic education and taught democratic habits, even though it was not being a part of the program. Their individual beliefs and buy-in of democratic education on their own influenced the extent of habits being displayed. If one or more of the professors was not connected to democratic education, it could greatly diminish the amount of democratic habits the residents would have been exposed to. The implication for other UTRs or teacher preparation programs (TPP) is that the degree to which professors support and model democratic education could determine the level to which democratic habits are exhibited. At the same time, as only a few of the alumni noticed democratic elements in their coursework, so more research is needed to explore if there is a correlation.

Even as there were factors that seem to encourage the practice of democratic habits, there were also factors that could be limiting the use of democratic habits by the resident alumni. The schools and district the MATR program is situated in are mostly undemocratic spaces, which aligns with the trend happening within many urban schools (Apple, 2009; Lipman, 2009; Moses & Rogers, 2013). The schools and even many of the resident alumni's classrooms are sites of control. Resident alumni shared desires to create classroom management that is more structured, strict, and authoritative. At the same time, the schools are adding to this control through their policies and focus on testing which impacts the pacing and curriculum of the teachers. Additionally, most of the schools were seen as top-down hierarchical systems with the administration at the top. Through this system, the resident alumni regularly complained about their administrators and how they caused more challenges than they resolved. Since the context

of the study is a high-needs urban district, these findings are not shocking or extreme, as urban schools are becoming more and more controlled and constrained as a result of pressures to improve test scores and accountability (Lipman, 2003, 2009; Gilliom, 2009, Ravitch, 2016; Schinder, 2017). Ultimately, to the extent that democratic habits can be seen and are exhibited by resident alumni in this contextual reality, it is happening because MATR opens up space for democracy in an undemocratic environment.

The power of the teachers (in this case the professors), mentors, and resident alumni to cultivate democratic habits or a democratic classroom is undeniable. Some of the findings from this study affirmed the previous literature on democratic education in high-needs urban settings, particularly studies that focused on the teachers' experiences. Multiple studies found that teachers hold a great deal of influence, both positively and negatively, over the development of democratic classrooms (Basu & Barton, 2010; Bickmore & Parker, 2014; Seher, 2010; Silverman, 2012) and the resident alumni from this study appear to be no different. While the residents experienced multiple democratic habits in a variety of spaces throughout their residency experience once they were in the role as teacher, their exhibition of democratic habits dwindled dramatically, thus influencing the degree to which their classroom was a democratic space. The professors illustrated how, when a teacher is intentional about practices in their class, they can create democratic spaces. At the same time, one cannot expect the teachers to develop classroom environments that they have had little-to-no training for.

Recommendations

Program Recommendations

What can be gleaned from the data could be beneficial to many UTRs beyond MATR. At the same time, the context of each UTR is unique and extremely informative to how

that program is designed and implemented in order to meet the needs of that context. With these perspectives in mind, I will make some recommendations that can apply to the MATR program but may be extended to other UTR programs. These recommendations come under the belief that democratic education needs to be moved from the margins, particularly in high-needs urban schools, as schools play a key role in developing student civic engagement (Torney-Purta, 2010) and UTRs are well-suited to meet this need.

MATR and UTRs should keep much of their structure and systems as this already easily opens them to practicing democratic education and habits. Additionally, they should not shift their structure and model, as it is one that continues to grow in usage (NCTR, 2018b) and is seen as effective in meeting its goal of recruiting, training, and maintaining highly qualified teachers in urban settings (Berry et al., 2008a; Berry et al., 2008b; Guha et al., 2016; Roegman et al., 2017; Solomon, 2009). Since there is a great deal of democratic possibility within UTRs, they should promote democratic education and democratic habits as part of the program content. This could be done alongside the social justice element as a way to highlight the qualities of each. However, being explicit about the democratic pieces could bridge the democratic habits gap between the residency year and the first year of teaching. For this to happen there needs to be a more robust use of language throughout the program in which there is an examination of power, privilege, and systemic oppression through democratic aims of collectivism, equity, and associated living. The program also needs to ensure that program staff and administrators have a shared understanding of social justice education and democratic education. This may require the program to do internal evaluation of how they are using and framing social justice education and how they can implement democratic habits in explicit ways. Evaluators should assess the program's aims and practices to ensure they are aligned and the program is doing what it was

created to do. Additionally, if the program staff worked to ensure common usage and robust language they themselves could be practicing multiple democratic habits and this could then be transferred to the residents throughout the program. Promoting democratic education has value in empowering students (Silverman, 2012), humanizing students (Hantzopolous, 2015), community building (Trujillo et al., 2014), and developing agency in students (Mirra & Morrell, 2011). Finally, these effects align with social justice and thus the aims espoused by UTRs.

The cohort model and, in the MATR's case, the cohort seminar, could be a model for building democratic classrooms. Residents continuously expressed the value of the cohort and seminar to their development as teachers, both because of the professional development, but also the personal connection, support, and comradery. Mirra and Morrell (2011) found that in order for teachers to develop these habits, they need to be in community, and that is what the cohort is: a mini democratic community. If program staff used the residents' experiences within their cohort as a model for a democratic space, the resident alumni may be able to mirror some of those qualities and habits in their own classrooms. The resident alumni in this study saw the value and acknowledged the learning that happened through their cohort, and, by bringing their attention to the possibility within their classroom, it may open some of them to think and teach more democratically. Again, it is about being forthcoming about the possibility of democratic classrooms, community, and habits. Additionally, the cohort needs to be in the community, as democracy allows for all voices, shared experiences, and fosters care for others. This should involve the residents not only being in the community but becoming a part of the community. Cohort members should be required to live within the district and have requirements to be involved in community projects or organizations. This will help the residents to become partners with the community both inside and outside of the school and has the potential to limit the

possibility of working as saviors of the students. This can happen in multiple ways. true democracy allows for all voices and works to create a school and environments that involve the community. In the end, being a part of the community and building democratic community has the potential to focus on the experiences of others which can allow for overcoming inequality, and oppression.

It may also be beneficial to revisit democratic education as the resident alumni gain more teaching experience. As it was found that democratic education may be constrained as a result of the first-year struggles of the alumni, they were potentially limited in what they tried or could do within their classes. With more experience they may be more apt to adopt new instructional strategies. This continued, or even later, introduction to democratic education could happen through continued alumni networks, workshops, or professional development that the UTRs put on for alumni even after they end their contractual arrangement.

Finally, leader buy-in is critical for anything to take hold, especially democratic education. The leaders of the MATR that were a part of this study were open to and shared positive beliefs about democratic education. The mentors, particularly during the residency year, have influence over the professional development of their mentees. The selection of mentors and career coaches needs to be rigorous with part of the selection process understanding the mentors and coaches' perceptions and use of democratic education as part of their teaching philosophy. It is of critical importance that the mentor and coaches' philosophies and praxis align very closely to those of the MATR program. It would even be beneficial to recruit and use MATR alumni as mentors because they already know the program, the expectations, and can relate to the residents as they continue through their experience. This could also help with retaining the teachers and offering continuous professional development around teaching in urban high-needs schools and

democratic education. Since the mentors and career coaches do hold influence, promoting democratic habits should be a part of the mentor training. The tools that are used during the mentorship discussions could encompass discussions of democratic habits and education so the residents can practice these skills just as they would with any instructional practice.

Additionally, the mentor training and tools should utilize the robust language and help train the residents in critical inquiry around power, privilege, and oppression.

Based on barriers as seen by the residents and MATR staff, school administrator buy-in is critical for the possibility of democratic classrooms. As resident alumni described, there seems to be high turnover rates of administrators; it may be extremely beneficial for high-needs urban schools if principal residencies were created that mirrored UTRs. I will reiterate Dr. Sams' recommendation of creating a principal residency program, which could recruit and train school administrators to understand the specific context in which they would be working and then leading accordingly. I have seen throughout this study that administration is a key component to what is possible in a teacher's classroom. Along the same lines, there needs to be shifts within the district practices in order to allow space for teachers and schools to become democratic spaces. Working with the district partners to create an administrator residency and overhauling district and school policy to be much more democratic would create more possibility for system change within the school and thus in the community at large.

In the end the program needs to bring clarity to not only its use of social justice education but its articulation of democratic education. With this all stakeholders need to be on the same page in their purpose and use of democratic language. If there is no cohesion and consistency from the program director to the career coach then the possibility of democratic education reaching the residents, let alone the students, becomes much less likely. All MATR stakeholders

need to know, understand, and buy-in to the vision, mission, and language of the program for it to flourish in democratic education.

Research Recommendations

This study fills a few gaps in democratic education research, particularly within high-needs urban settings. First, this is the only study that I am aware of that examines democratic education within UTRs. Simply, there needs to be more studies done connecting and examining the possibilities for democratic education within UTRs. It would be beneficial for future research to be more explicit in the questions about democratic education asked of teachers. This would provide depth and clarity to their thinking and instructional choices. Additionally, future research would benefit from observing the teachers and collecting classroom artifacts in order to evaluate the practice of democratic education. Second, this study adds to the limited research around democratic education in urban settings. In general, more studies need to be done highlighting democratic education in these settings. But it could be difficult if democratic education continues to be marginalized in the American educational system (Au, 2007; Au & Apple, 2010).

MATR is one UTR so it would be valuable to examine other UTRs for their adherence to and exhibition of democratic education. I would start with Los Angeles Urban Teacher Residency (2018) as it is one of, if not the only, programs to mention democratic education. In a similar vein, conducting studies where UTR trained teachers are compared to non-UTR trained teachers could offer a great deal of insight about better promotion of democratic education, and/or democratic education development.

The goal of democratic education is not merely to develop these habits within the teachers and school personnel, but to create spaces where students can develop these habits in the

hope that they will become engaged, agentic, democratic citizens. Although it may be difficult, it would be helpful to understand the development of democratic habits within students. Do they carry these habits with them once they leave school? How can they learn and/or develop these habits? Do they maintain them, over time, if they do learn or develop them? What prevents or impedes them from developing democratic habits?

One takeaway from this project is the unclear relationship between social justice education and democratic education. Both in literature and in practice the distinction, connection, and relationship of democratic education and social justice education is not well-articulated. This ambiguity reveals a much-needed area of research. There needs to be more work done on understanding and parsing out the similarities, differences, and overlap of social justice education and democratic education.

These are just a few possible directions for future research around UTRs and democratic education. Since this is a new research line there is a great deal of possibility for future research. Meaningful research could truly deepen the understanding and illuminate the possibilities for democratic education in UTRs.

Conclusion

Over the last few decades, democratic education has been marginalized for a number of reasons, all while the United States becomes more divided than it has been in over a century (Pew Research Center, 2017). Furthermore, urban schools have become increasingly undemocratic spaces of control (Lipman, 2009; Monahan & Torres, 2009). As this has been happening, urban teacher residencies have been implemented around the country in response to the need for high quality teachers in settings that have been historically underserved and marginalized. UTRs are gaining traction and popularity as a viable alternative to recruit and

retain teachers in these high-needs urban settings. As a result of these realities, I have sought to understand how UTRs, one in particular, enact democratic education and how they might address the lack of democratic education in urban schools.

While democratic education was not fully practiced through any piece of MATR or the resident alumni experience, there still were a great deal of democratic habits and principles displayed throughout. The strongest display of democratic principles was during the residency program through the MATR program elements. Even with multiple barriers to practicing democratic education, the resident alumni still exhibited a variety of democratic habits. However, the extent that the resident alumni exhibited democratic habits was limited in comparison to those which were displayed through the MATR program elements. If UTRs embrace democratic education, they can play a key role in strengthening our democracy through developing teachers that intentionally work to prepare democratic citizens in some of the most marginalized schools in the U.S. The potential is great.

While it does not appear that UTRs are foregrounding democratic education or democratic principles, UTRs and democratic education align particularly well. This alignment is based on what the UTRs are already doing to recruit, train, and retain high quality teachers in urban high need areas. The alignment could be stronger if UTRs were purposeful about imparting democratic habits to their residents. This is particularly important as this model of teacher preparation has grown in popularity, therefore putting more of these programs and residents in urban school contexts, which tend to be undemocratic spaces of control because of the accountability movement and adherence to harsher discipline through increased surveillance. Foregrounding democratic education in UTRs, as they have access to so many urban school settings, has the potential to be a key element of cultivating democratic

environments and habits in these schools. Democratic education can be done in urban settings with positive and empowering results. Aligning UTR curriculum and framework with democratic education does not have to diminish the already established social justice orientation. Rather, it could enhance the skills and tools that residents have at their disposal as they walk into their classrooms. As the United States becomes more divided and polarized, empowering teachers, residents, and in turn their students, to work toward consensus building and the greater good is not something that should be left to chance, but a main focus. This important goal can be achieved through purposeful alignment with democratic education.

REFERENCES

- Anderson-Levitt, K., van Draanen, J., & Davis, H.M. (2017). Coherence, dissonance, and personal style in learning to teach. *Teaching Education, 28*(4), 377-392.
- Apple, M. W. (2001). *Education the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Apple, M. W. (2009). The measure of success: Education, markets, and audit culture. In T. Monahan & R. D. Torres (Eds.) *School under surveillance: Cultures of control in public education* (pp. 175-193). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Au, W. (2007). High stakes testing and curricular control: A qualitative metasynthesis. *Educational Researcher, 36*(5), 258-267.
- Au, W., & Apple, M. W. (2010). Reviewing Policy: Testing, accountability and the politics of education. *Educational Policy, 24*(2), 421-433.
- Barnes, M. K., Crowe, E., & Schaeffer, B. (2007). *The cost of teacher turnover in five school districts: A pilot study*. Washington, DC: National Commission for Teaching and America's Future.
- Barrett, M., & Brunton-Smith, I. (2014). Political and civic engagement and participation: Towards an integrative perspective. *Journal of Civil Society, 10*(1), 5-28.
- Basu, S. J., & Barton, A. C. (2010). A researcher-student-teacher model for democratic science pedagogy: Connections to community, shared authority, and critical science agency. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 43*(1), 72-87.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 544-559.

- Beane, J. A. (2005). *A reason to teach: Creating classrooms of dignity and hope*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Beane, J. A., & Apple, M. W. (2007). The case for democratic schools. In M. W. Apple & J. A. Beane (Eds.), *Democratic schools: Lessons in powerful education* (2nd ed., pp. 1-29). Portsmouth, NH, Heinemann.
- Beck, J. S. (2016). The complexities of a third-space partnership in an urban teacher residency. *Teacher Education Quarterly, Winter 2016*, 51-70.
- Berry, B. (2005). The future of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(3), 272-278.
- Berry, B., Montgomery, D., Curtis, R., Hernandez, M., Wurtzel, J., & Snyder, J. (2008a). *Creating and sustaining urban teacher residencies: A new way to recruit, prepare, and retain effective teachers in high-needs districts*. Retrieved from The Aspen Institute website: <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/creating-sustaining-urban-teacher-residencies-new-way-recruit-prepare-retain-effective/>
- Berry, B., Montgomery, D., & Snyder, J. (2008b). *Urban Teacher Residency Models and Institutes of Higher Education: Implications for Teacher Preparation*. Carrboro, NC: Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from: https://www.teachingquality.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Urban_teacher_residency_models.pdf
- Bickmore, K., & Parker, C. (2014). Constructive conflict talk in classrooms: Divergent approaches to addressing divergent perspectives. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 42(3), 291-335.
- Bogges, L. B. (2010). Tailoring new urban teachers for character and activism. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(1), 65-95.

- Boyd, D., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wycoff, J. (2005). Explaining the short careers of high-achieving teachers in schools with low-performing students. *The American Economic Review*, 95(2), 166-171.
- Carlson, D. (2005). Hope without illusion: Telling the story of democratic educational renewal. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 18(1), 21-45.
- Carter, P. L. & Welner, K. G. (2013). Building opportunities to achieve. In P. L. Carter & K. G. Welner (Eds.) *Closing the opportunity gap: What America must do to give every child an even chance* (pp. 217-228). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chou, V., & Tozer, S. (2008). What's urban got to do with it?: Meanings of "urban" in urban teacher preparation and development. In F. P. Peterman (Ed.), *Partnering to prepare urban teachers: A call to activism* (pp. 1-20). New York: NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. (2005). Executive summary: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 1-36). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world of education: How American's commitment to equity will determine our future*. University. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dee, T. S. (2004). Teachers, race, and student achievement in a randomized experiment. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1), 195-210.

- Dee, T. S. (2005). A teacher like me: Does race, ethnicity, or gender matter? *American Economic Review*, 95(2), 158-165.
- Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *John Dewey: The middle works, 1899-1924* (Vol. 9), Electronic edition. Carbonale, IL: Southern Illinois
- Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L.L . (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fasching-Varner, K. J., Mitchell, R. W., Martin, L. L., & Bennett-Haron, K. P. (2014). Beyond school-to-prison pipeline and toward and educational and penal realism. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 47(4), 410-429.
- Fineout, G. (2019, October 18). Judge hits Florida law limiting felon vote in limited ruling. *Politico*. Retrieved from <https://www.politico.com/states/florida/story/2019/10/18/judge-hits-florida-law-limiting-felon-vote-in-limited-ruling-1225697>
- Flannery, M. E. (2016). Survey: Number of future teachers reaches all-time low. *neaToday*. March 15, 2016. Retrieved from: <http://neatoday.org/2016/03/15/future-teachers-at-all-time-low/>
- Flynn, N. K. (2009). Toward democratic discourse: Scaffolding student-led discussions in the social studies. *Teacher College Record*, 111(8), 2021-2054.
- Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. *Social Text*, 25/26(1990), 56-80.
- Friedman, A. A., Galligan, H. T., Albano, C. M., & O'Connor, K. (2009). Teacher subcultures of democratic practice amidst the oppression of educational reform. *Journal of Educational Change*, 10, 249-276.

- Gatti, L. (2016). Learning to teach in an urban teacher residency. *Urban Education, 2016*, 1-29.
- Gatti, L., & Catalano, T. (2015). The business of learning to teach: A critical metaphor analysis of one teacher's journey. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 45*(2015), 149-160.
- Gardiner, W. (2012). Coaches' and new urban teachers' perceptions of induction coaching: Time, trust, and accelerated learning curves. *The Teacher Educator, 47*, 197-215.
- Garza, R., Duchaine, E. L., & Reynosa, R. (2013). Preparing secondary STEM teachers for high-need schools: Challenges of an urban residency program. *Teacher Education and Practice, 26*(4), 721-738.
- Gardiner, W., & Lorch, J. (2015). From "outsider" to "bridge": The changing role of university supervision in an urban teacher residency program. *Action in Teacher Education, 37*(2), 172-189.
- Garza, R., & Harter, R. A. (2016). Perspectives from pre-service mathematics and science teachers in an urban residency program: Characteristics of effective mentors. *Education and Urban Society, 48*(4), 403-420.
- Garza, R., & Werner, P. (2014). Preparing mathematics and science teachers through a residency program: Perceptions and reflections. *Teaching Education, 25*(2), 202-216.
- Gilliom, J. (2009). Lying, cheating, and teaching to the test: The politics of surveillance under No Child Left Behind. In T. Monahan & R. D. Torres (Eds.) *School under surveillance: Cultures of control in public education* (pp. 194-209). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (2016). Democratic education under siege in a neoliberal society. In C. Wright-Maley & T. Davis (Eds.) *Teaching for democracy in an age of economic disparity* (pp. 13-24). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Goldhaber, D., & Walch, J. (2014). Gains in teacher quality. *Education Next*, 14(1), 38-45.
- Goodwin, A. L., Roegman, R., & Reagan, E. M. (2016). Is experience the best teacher? Extensive clinical practice and mentor teachers' perspectives on effective teaching. *Urban Education*, 51(10), 1198-1225.
- Guha, R., Hyler, M. E., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). *The Teacher Residency: An Innovative Model for Preparing Teachers*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from: <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/teacher-residency>
- Gutmann, A. (1993). Democracy & democratic education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 12(1), 1-9.
- Gutmann, A. (1999). *Democratic education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hammerness, K., & Craig, E. (2016). "Context-specific" teacher preparation for New York City: An exploration of content of context in Bard College's urban teacher residency program. *Urban Education*, 51(10), 1226-1258.
- Hantzopoulos, M. (2015). Sites of liberation or sites of despair? The challenges and possibilities of democratic education in an urban public school in New York City. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 46(4), 345-363.
- Hollins, E. R. (2012). *Learning to teach in urban schools: The transition from preparation to practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Horton, M. & Freire, P. (1990). *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change*. B. Bell, J. Gaventa, & J. Peter (Eds.). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Hyttén, K. (2017). Democracy and education in the United States. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. March, 2017. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.2

- Hyttén, K., & Bettez, S. C. (2011). Understanding education for social justice. *Educational Foundations, Winter-Spring 2011*, 7-24.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). Is there really a teacher shortage? (Report No. R-03-4). *CPRE Research Reports*. Retrieved from: https://repository.upenn.edu/cpre_researchreports/37
- Ingersoll, R. M., *Renewing Our Schools, Securing Our Future: A National Task Force on Public Education* (2004). *Why do high-poverty schools have difficulty staffing their classrooms with qualified teachers?* Washington DC: Center for American Progress and Institute for America's Future. Retrieved from:
<http://scholar.gse.upenn.edu/sites/default/files/rmi/files/ingersoll-final.pdf>
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Perda, D. (2009). *The mathematics and science of teacher shortages: Facts and myths*. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Johanek, M. C., & Puckett, J. L. (2007). *Leonard Covello and the making of Benjamin Franklin High School: Education as if citizenship mattered*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Journell, W. (2016). Introduction: Teaching social issues in the social studies classroom. In W. Journell (Ed.) *Teaching social studies in an era of divisiveness: The challenge of discussing social issues in a non-partisan way*. (pp. 1-12). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kauffman, J. (2018, November 21). Georgia set to remain a battleground for voting rights ahead of 2020. *NPR*. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/sections/politics/>

- Klein, E. J., Taylor, M., Monterio, A. K., Romney, W., Scipio, M., Diaz, A., Dunn, B., & Poole, S. (2015). Making the leap to teacher: Pre-service residents, faculty, and school mentors taking on action research together in an urban teacher residency program. *Networks: An On-line Journal for Teacher Research*, 17(1), 1-12.
- Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle of educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34(1), 39-81.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2013). Lack of achievement or loss of opportunity? In P. L. Carter & K. G. Welner (Eds.) *Closing the opportunity gap: What America must do to give every child an even chance* (pp. 11-22). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2002). Teacher sorting and the plight of urban schools: A descriptive analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(1), 37-62.
- Levinson, M. (2012). *No citizen left behind*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lindsay, C. A. & Hart, C. M. D. (2017). Exposure to same-race teachers and student disciplinary outcomes for Black students in North Carolina. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 39(3), 485-510.
- Lipman, P. (2004). *High stakes education: Inequality, globalization, and urban school reform*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Lipman, P. (2009). Politics by other means: Education accountability and the surveillance state. In T. Monahan & R. D. Torres (Eds.) *School under surveillance: Cultures of control in public education* (pp. 159-174). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Los Angeles Urban Teacher Residency. (2018). *Residency Aims*. Retrieved from: <http://golautr.com/>

- Marri, A. R. (2010). Using law-related education to engage marginalized urban high school students. *Action in Teacher Education*, 32(3), 40-54.
- Matsko, L. L. & Hammerness, K. (2014). Unpacking the “urban” in urban teacher education: Making a case for context-specific preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(2), 128-144.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McAvoy, P., & Hess, D. (2013). Classroom deliberation in an era of political polarization. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 43(1), 14-47.
- Meier, D. (2003). So what does it take to build a school for democracy? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(1), 15-21.
- Merriam, S. & Tisdell, E. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Michelli, N. M., & Keiser, D. L. (2005). *Teacher education for democracy and social justice*. New York: Routledge.
- Milner, R. H. (2006). Preservice teachers’ learning about cultural and racial diversity: Implications for urban education. *Urban Education*, 41(4), 343-375.
- Milner, R. H. (2012). But what is urban education? *Urban Education*, 47(3), 556-561.
- Mirra, N., & Morrell, E. (2011). Teachers as civic agents: Toward a critical democratic theory of urban teacher development. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(4), 408-420.
- Monahan, T. & Torres, R. D. (2009). Introduction. In T. Monahan & R. D. Torres (Eds.) *School under surveillance: Cultures of control in public education* (pp. 1-18). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

- Moses, M. S. & Rogers, J. (2013). Enhancing a nation's democracy through equitable schools. In P. L. Carter & K. G. Welner (Eds.) *Closing the opportunity gap: What America must do to give every child an even chance* (pp. 207-216). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Mueller, R. S. (2019). *Report on the investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 presidential election*. Washington D.C.: United States Department of Justice.
- Murray, M. (2018). NBC/WSJ Poll: Democrats hold 9-point advantage for midterm elections. *NBC News*. October 21, 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/first-read/nbc-wsj-poll-democrats-hold-nine-point-advantage-midterm-elections-n922266>
- Murrell, P. Jr. (2006). Toward social justice in urban education: A model of collaborative cultural inquiry in urban schools. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 39, 81-90.
- National Center for Teacher Residencies. (2015). *Grant supports scale of evidence-based teacher residencies*. (Press Release, December 16, 2015). Retrieved from: https://nctresidencies.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/PR_2015_Stone-Foundation_12-16-15_final.pdf
- National Center for Teacher Residencies. (2017). *National Center for Teacher Residencies awarded \$850,000 to develop proven teacher training programs in six school districts*. (Press Release, January 10, 2017). Retrieved from: <https://nctresidencies.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Kellogg-NCTR-release-FINAL.pdf>
- National Center for Teacher Residencies. (2018a). *2017 Stakeholder Perception Report* (Research Brief, June 2018). Retrieved from: <https://nctresidencies.org/research-publications/reports/>

National Center for Teacher Residencies. (2018b). *The residency Model*. Retrieved from:

<https://nctresidencies.org/about/residency-model-teacher-mentor-programs/>

National Council on Teacher Quality. (2018). *2018 Teacher prep review*. Retrieved from

https://www.nctq.org/dmsView/2018_Teacher_Prep_Review_733174

Nelson, R. M., Duke, B. L., Hutchens, K., & Machell, J. (2014). Urban teacher preparation academy: Preparing urban teachers through collaborative partnerships. *Metropolitan Universities, 25*(2), 42-55.

Neumann, R. (2008). American democracy at risk. *Phi Delta Kappan, 89*(5), 328–339.

Noguera, P. (2003). *City schools and the American dream: Reclaiming the promise of public education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Page, S. & Theobald, B. (2018). Poll: Americans can agree that the nation is divided. Beyond that, they don't agree on much. *USA Today*. December 20, 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2018/12/20/poll-democrats-republicans-agree-us-divided-worry-trump-health-border-issues/2349589002/>

Papay, J. P., West, M. R., Fullerton, J. B., & Kane, T. J. (2012). Does an urban teacher residency increase student achievement? Early evidence from Boston. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 34*(4), 413-434.

Peck, C. (2017). Urban school reform in the United States. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. March, 2017. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.27

Pew Research Center (2017, October). *The Partisan Divide on Political Values Grows Even Wider*. Retrieved from <http://www.people-press.org/2017/10/05/the-partisan-divide-on-political-values-grows-even-wider/>

Pew Research Center. (2018, April). The Public, the Political System and American Democracy.

Retrieved from <http://www.people-press.org/2018/04/26/the-public-the-political-system-and-american-democracy/>

Putnam, R. D. (2015). *Our kids: The American dream in crisis*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Ramirez, P. (2017). Preparing pre-service secondary teachers in Arizona: Using culturally sustaining approaches to learn from diverse secondary english learners. In C. Coulter & M. Jimenez-Silva (Eds.), *Culturally sustaining and revitalizing pedagogies: Language, culture, and power* (pp. 106-115) [EBSCO Publishing: eBook Collection].

Ravitch, D. (2016). *The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education* (3rd ed.). New York: Basic Books.

Reagan, E.M., Chen, C., & Vernikoff, L. (2016). "Teachers are works in progress: A mixed methods study of teaching residents' beliefs and articulations of teaching for social justice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59(2016), 213-227.

Reich, G., Stemhagen, K., & Siegel-Hawley, G. (2014). Educational research and the metropolitan mindset: Re-framing the urban-suburban dichotomy. *Journal of Thought*, 48(3/4), 57-73.

Roegman, R., Pratt, S., Goodwin, A. L., & Akin, S. (2017). Curriculum, social justice, and inquiry in the field: Investigating retention in an urban teacher residency. *Action in Teacher Education*, 39(4), 432-452.

Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). Teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(1), 4-36.

- Rothstein, R., Jacobsen, R., & Wilder, T. (2008). *Grading education: Getting accountability right*. New York, NY: Economic Policy Institute.
- Sawchuck, S. (2009). Teacher 'residencies' get federal funding to augment training. *Education Week*. October 9, 2009. Retrieved from:
<https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2009/10/14/07residency.h29.html>
- Sawchuck, S. (2011). Teacher residencies make strides, encounter obstacles: Federal funding subsidizes on-the-job training. *Education Week*. July 8, 2011. Retrieved from:
https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2011/07/08/36residency_ep.h30.html
- Schneider, J. (2017). *Beyond test scores: A better way to measure school quality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Scott, J. & Stuart Wells, A. (2013). A more perfect union: Reconciling school choice policy with equality of opportunity goals. In P. L. Carter & K. G. Welner (Eds.) *Closing the opportunity gap: What America must do to give every child an even chance* (pp. 123-140). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Seher, R. (2011). Forging democratic spaces: Teachers and students transforming urban public schools from the inside. *Schools: Studies in Education*, 8(1), 166-189.
- Seher, R. (2013). Leading for democracy in urban schools toward a culturally relevant progressivism. *Schools: Studies in Education*, 10(2), 242-273.
- Sensoy, O., & DiAngelo, R. (2012). *Is everyone really equal? An introduction to key concepts in social justice education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research project. *Education for Information*, 22(2004), 63-75.

- Sibbett, L. A. (2016). Toward a transformative criticality for democratic citizenship education. *Democracy & Education, 24*(2), 1-11.
- Silva, T., Mckie, A., Knechtel, V., Gleason, P., & Makowsky, L. (2014). *Teaching residency programs: A multisite look at a new model to prepare teacher for high-needs schools* (NCEE 2015-4002). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Silverman, M. (2013). A critical ethnography of democratic music listening. *British Journal of Music Education, 30*(1), 7-25.
- Smith, L. M. (1978). An Evolving Logic of Participant Observation, Educational Ethnography, and Other Case Studies. *Review of Research in Education, 6*(1978), 316-377.
- Solomon, J. (2009). The Boston teacher residency: District-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 478-488.
- Stemhagen, K. (2009). Social justice and mathematics: Rethinking the nature and purposes of school mathematics. In P. Ernest, B. Greer, & B. Sriraman (Eds.), *Critical Issues in Mathematics Education* (pp. 337- 350). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Stemhagen, K. (2016). Deweyan democratic agency and school math: Beyond Constructivism and critique. *Educational Theory, 66* (1-2), 95-109.
- Stitzlein, S. M. (2014a). Habit of democracy. A Deweyan approach to citizenship education in America today. *Education and Culture, 30*(2), 61-86.
- Stitzlein, S. M. (2014b). *Teaching for Dissent: Citizenship Education and Political Activism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

- Sullivan, M. (2019, September 3). Trump's attack on the news media are accelerating. You can expect three results. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/>
- Tienken, C., & Zhao, Y. (2013). How common standards and standardized testing widen the opportunity gap. In P. L. Carter & K. G. Welner (Eds.) *Closing the opportunity gap: What America must do to give every child an even chance* (pp. 111-122). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Torney-Purta, J. (2002). The school's role in developing civic engagement: A study of adolescents in twenty-eight countries. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*(4), 203-212.
- Trujillo, T. M., Hernández, L. E., Jarrell, T., & Kissell, R. (2014). Community schools as urban district reform: Analyzing Oakland's policy landscape through oral histories. *Urban Education, 49*(8), 895-929.
- Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Westheimer, J. (2015). What kind of citizen? Educating our children for the common good. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 237-269.
- Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1998). A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 130-178.

- Williams, J. S. (1967). *Thomas Jefferson: His permanent influence on American institutions*. New York, NY: AMS Press, Inc.
- Williamson, P., Apedoe, X., & Thomas, C. (2016). Context as content in urban teacher education: Learning to teach in and for San Francisco. *Urban Education, 51*(10), 1170-1197.
- Williamson, P. & Hodder, L. (2015). Unpacking practice with clinical instructional rounds in the San Francisco teacher residency program. *International Journal of Educational Research, 73*(2015), 53-64.
- Wilson, S. M. & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education, 24*(1999), 173-209.
- Wolk, S. (2007). Why go to school? *Phi Delta Kappan, 88*(9), 648–658.
- Wood, G. H. (1992). *Schools that work: America's most innovative public education programs*. New York, NY: Plume.
- Wood, G. H. (1998). *A time to learn*. New York, NY: Penguin Putnam.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zeichner, K. (2002). Beyond traditional structures of student teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 29*(2), 59-64.

- Zeichner, K. (2003). The adequacies and inadequacies of three current strategies to recruit, prepare, and retain the best teachers for all students. *Teachers College Record*, 105(3), 490-519.
- Zeichner, K. (2013). Two visions of teaching and teacher education for the twenty-first century. In X. Zhu & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for the 21st century* (pp. 3-19). Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Zeichner, K. (2018). *The struggle for the soul of teacher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K., & Bier, M. (2018). Opportunities and pitfalls in the turn toward clinical experience in US teacher education. In K. Zeichner, *The struggle for the soul of teacher education* (pp. 197-223). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K., & Payne, K. (2013). Democratizing knowledge in urban teacher education. In J. Noel (Ed.), *Moving teacher education into urban schools and communities: Prioritizing community strengths* (pp. 3-19). New York, NY: Routledge.

Appendix A

MATR Resident Interview Protocol

Time 1

Quick overview of project

Review important components of consent

MATR Model Components: Recruitment Process

1. How did you first learn about MATR?
2. Can you describe your experience of the application and selection process?
 - a. Communication with MATR during application process
 - b. Experience on selection day

MATR Model Components: School Match and MENTOR Teacher Match

3. How would you describe your school?
 - a. You probably had certain expectations about the school. What has surprised you the most?
4. Describe your experience as you have entered the classroom with your MENTOR?
 - b. What have you learned?
 - i. Through observation of your MENTOR?
 - ii. Through first hand teaching experiences?
5. How would you describe the teaching style of your MENTOR?
 - a. Can you see yourself being this type of teacher?
6. How would you describe your relationship with your MENTOR?
 - a. How has he or she supported your transition into teaching?

MATR Model Components: Coaching Model

A critical component of the residency year experience is the coaching model. This includes structured activities such as Collaborative Assessment Logs, Observation planning conversations, and selective scripting.

7. Tell me about your experience within the coaching model using these tools.
8. What topics do you discuss during the coaching sessions?
9. What are some examples of conversations you have had during these sessions?
10. Do you see these sessions as helpful?
11. Do you have suggestions for improving the coaching model?

MATR Model Components: Program of Study

An important part of the MATR model is the program of study that goes along with the resident experience. This includes the intensive summer course work, the August retreat, fall course work, and the school-year Friday seminars and forums.

12. What have you learned through your participation in the UNIVERSITY classes? What ideas and concepts gained from the course work and class projects have been the most useful to you as you have entered the school as a resident?
13. What have you learned through your participation in the August Retreat and the MATR fall seminars and forums? What ideas and concepts gained from the course work and

class projects have been the most useful to you as a resident and working in the classroom

14. Do you have suggestions for improving this program of study?

MATR Model Components: Cohort

15. You are part of the MATR cohort. What has been your experience of engaging in this cohort model?

16. How would you describe your relationships to the other members of the cohort?

17. Has your participation in the cohort been helpful to you?

MATR Model Components: MATR Program Staff / Faculty Support

As part of the MATR program, you are also in regular contact with MATR staff and UNIVERSITY faculty. This includes your curriculum track leader, and the site director.

18. How would you describe your relationship with these individuals?

19. Do you see these relationships as beneficial to your residency experience?

Non-MATR Support Structures

20. Outside of MATR based activities, in what other types of organized professional development have you been engaged?

21. Are there any other organizations in which you participate that you see as offering support for your teaching?

Level of Preparation

22. In the spring you will begin taking on more of the teaching responsibilities. This includes taking a lead role in planning and instruction, establishing a classroom environment, reaching out to parents etc.

- Do you feel prepared for this?
- In which areas are you most confident?
- In which areas are you least confident?

MATR Resident Interview Protocol**Time 2**

1. Through the course of the year, you have taken on increased teaching responsibilities. How has this experience been for you?
2. If you were to speak with a resident being placed in your school next year, what you tell them about the school? What advice would you give them about negotiating the school context and building relationships?
3. At the last interview, we discussed your experiences and impressions of the MATR Coaching Model.
 - a. Since you have stepped into the lead teacher role has your use of the coaching tools changed? If so how?
 - i. Are there any ways that you have adapted the tools to better meet your specific professional learning needs?
 - b. Overall, do you think the coaching tools have supported your development as a teacher? If so, in what ways?
 - c. Do you have suggestions for improving the coaching model?
4. How has your relationship with your MENTOR developed over the course of the year?
 - a. What are the most important things that you have learned from working with your MENTOR?
 - b. What will you emulate from your MENTOR as a teacher of record next year? What will you do different from your MENTOR as a teacher of record next year?
 - c. Are there any other teachers at your school with whom you have developed strong professional relationships?
5. In addition to your residency experience, MATR supports you with classes, Friday forums and seminars.
 - a. Now that you have had a year of practical teaching experience, what would you say is the most valuable knowledge you have gained through these other MATR components?
 - b. Can you give examples of instances where knowledge you have gained through your classes, seminars and forums has been useful for guiding your practice?
6. The focus of teacher work is classroom practice (e.g., instruction, building relationships with students). However, there are also roles and responsibilities that teachers take on outside of the classroom in their school or school district.
 - a. What are the most important things you have learned about a teacher's professional role and responsibilities within a school/school system?
7. Now that you have almost a year's worth of experience as a resident, what do you think it means to be successful as a resident?
 - a. To what extent is this different from being a successful teacher of record?
 - b. What advice would you give next year's residents to help them be successful?

8. For this study we are particularly interested in understanding successful teaching in an urban school context.
 - a. What do you think it means to be a successful teacher in an urban school? For example, how is it different than teaching in a suburban or rural school setting?
9. Do you know your placement for next year? If so, what are your feelings about the school placement? If you do not know, what are your hopes?
10. Do you feel prepared to take on full teaching responsibilities?
 - a. In which areas are you most confident?
 - b. In which areas are you least confident?
11. At this point what are your overall impressions of the MATR program?
 - a. Now that you have been through the residency year, is there anything that you would do differently?
 - b. What recommendations do you have for improving the program?
12. Are there any other comments that you have or topics that we missed during our discussion? Thank you for your time and participation.

MATR First Year of Teaching Time 3

Current Context

1. How has your year started?
2. What classes are you teaching?
 - What is your comfort level with content/curriculum?
 - Strategies for successful planning and delivery of instruction?
 - What types of support and resources do you have related to the course content?
3. How are your classes going?
 - What have been the biggest successes?
 - What have been the biggest challenges?
 - Successes/challenges planning and delivering instruction?
4. (*If this is a new school placement*) How would you describe your new school? In what ways is it different than your school from last year?
5. (*If this is the same school*) How would you describe your school?
6. For this study we are particularly interested in understanding successful teaching in an urban school context. How would you describe your current school context as urban? Explain.

Reflection on MATR model

7. Now that you are the teacher of record, what components of the MATR program were the most effective in preparing you to be successful as a teacher?
 - Residency model
 - Tools
 - Seminars and Forums
 - Class work / Community Project
8. Are you still in contact with any of the members of your MATR cohort? If so, what is the nature of these relationships? Are they more personal or professional?
9. Do you feel like you were ready to take on your own classroom? What parts of MATR were most helpful? Is there anything that MATR could have done to better prepare you for your first year of teaching?

Professional Relationships

10. Have you maintained your relationship with your MENTOR from last year? How has this relationship changed? Are they more personal or professional?
11. Beyond your MENTOR, have you developed additional collegial relationships? How would you describe these relationships? Are they more personal or professional?

12. How is your relationship with your school's administration?
13. *(If there are other MATR graduates placed at the current school)* What is your relationship with the other MATR graduates? Do you feel like you have a different relationship with them?

Teacher Identity and Professional Growth

In this study, we are interested in the professional growth of teachers in the urban school context. Gaining expertise in teaching in urban school contexts requires time and experience.

14. Last year we asked you about your teaching style in relation to your MENTOR. Do you feel like having your own classroom this year has made you think differently about your approach to teaching? If so how?
15. As a teacher, what do you see as your strengths?
16. In what area do you see the need for professional growth?
17. How is your relationship with your career coach going?
18. What other supports have you received this year for your professional growth?
 - From MATR
 - From District
 - From colleagues
19. What additional supports could you use?
20. What do you think it means to be a successful teacher in an urban school? How is it different than teaching in non-urban setting?
21. Anything you would like to add that we haven't addressed?

MATR First Year of Teaching: Time 4

Current Context

1. Since we last spoke, how has your school year been?
2. How are your classes going?
 - What have been the biggest successes?
 - What have been the biggest challenges?
 - Successes/challenges planning and delivering instruction?
3. Have there been any changes in the school that have influenced your teaching or professional growth?

Reflection on MATR model

4. Now that you have most of your first year of teaching completed, what components of the MATR program were the most effective in preparing you to be successful as a teacher?
 - Residency model
 - Tools
 - Seminars and Forums
5. How have members of your MATR cohort provided support?
6. Thinking back to the beginning of the school year, what would you have told yourself about your readiness and preparation for having your own classroom?
7. Is there anything that MATR could have done to better prepare you for your first year of teaching?

Professional Relationships

8. Have you maintained your relationship with your MENTOR over the school year? How has this relationship changed?
9. Beyond your MENTOR, how have your relationships with colleagues developed? How would you describe these relationships? Are they more personal or professional?
10. How is your relationship with your school's administration?
11. *(If there are other MATR graduates placed at the current school)* What is your relationship with the other MATR graduates? Do you feel like you have a different relationship with them?

Teacher Identity and Professional Growth

In this study, we are interested in the professional growth of teachers in the urban school context. Gaining expertise in teaching in urban school contexts requires time and experience.

12. When we last met, you described your approach to teaching as Has your approach changed over the course of the school year? If so how? Why?
13. As a teacher, what do you see as your strengths?
14. In what area do you see the need for professional growth?
15. How is your relationship with your career coach going?
16. What other supports have you received this year for your professional growth?
 - From MATR
 - From DISTRICT
 - From colleagues
17. What additional supports could you use?
18. What do you think it means to be a successful teacher in an urban school? How do you think is it different than teaching in non-urban setting?

Final Thoughts

19. What are you looking forward to next school year?
20. Anything you would like to add that we haven't addressed?

Appendix B

MATR Program Administrators Interview Protocol

About you:

1. How would describe your role within MATR?

About MATR:

1. How would you describe the vision and purpose of MATR?
 - a. Do you believe MATR is currently meeting the stated purpose & vision?
2. How has MATR changed since you have been involved?
3. The MATR residency model has some key components, which parts of MATR's residency model are the strongest in terms of training teachers? Retaining teachers?
4. What are the biggest challenges for MATR?
5. Thinking about the future of MATR, what ways or areas do you see that need to adapted, changed, improved upon?

Urban Education:

1. How does the urban context in which MATR operates shape the program?
2. What does it mean for a teacher to be successful in the urban school context?
 - a. How would you say MATR is doing at preparing successful teachers in the urban context?
3. Are there are areas that MATR could improve upon to better prepare teachers for success in the Urban school context?

Social Justice & Dem Education

1. Social justice is talked about as being an essential part of MATR and it is recommended that teachers have A passion for transforming lives and achieving social justice through education. How would you explain social justice and the role that it plays in MATR?
2. What is your understanding of democratic education?
 - a. Do you think it has any value or place with MATR?
3. As part of my study I am interested in how MATR, if at all, and the MATR teachers display democratic habits. As I share some democratic habits, please share examples of places in the MATR experience that fit with that habit. If you don't think it does feel free to say that you do not see how it relates. (Offer definition if they need one)

- a. **Critical Inquiry** - to question, examine, and reflect on beliefs of those they are now sharing experiences with, and question the realities and structures of society
 - b. **Associated Living/Collaboration** - living together, interacting and understanding shared experiences
 - c. **Voice & Agency** - Have a say in to learning and class environment, being heard, and valued
 - d. **Student-Centered Learning/Curriculum** - Based on their reality and what they need, sharing of power
4. Are there democratic habits that you wish your teachers would walk away from MATR with?
 5. What do you see as the role of democratic education in urban schools?
 - a. How important is it? Why?
 6. Where do you see MATR in 5 years? 10 years?
 7. Any final thoughts on MATR?

Appendix C

MATR Instructors/Professors Interview Protocol

The Course and MATR Model

1. How long have you been teaching courses associated with the MATR program?
2. What course(s) do or did you currently teach within the MATR model?
3. Can you give an overview of the course, objectives, desired takeaways, etc.
 - a. What are the main theories presented to teachers? Scholars? Practical skills?
4. How often do/did you see the teachers?
 - a. Do all the cohort members take the course at the same time?
 - b. Do they take it with students outside of the MATR program?
5. Where in the MATR model and sequence is your course currently situated?

Urban School Context

6. How does the urban context in which MATR operates shape your teaching?
7. What does it mean for a teacher to be successful in the urban school context?
 - a. What role does your course play into their success?
8. Are there are areas that MATR could improve upon to better prepare teachers for success in the urban school context?

Social Justice & Democratic Education

9. Social justice is talked about as being an essential part of MATR and it is recommended that teachers have a passion for transforming lives and achieving social justice through education. How would you explain social justice and the role that it plays in MATR?
 - a. How does social justice play a role in your class?
 - b. Other classes?
10. What is your understanding of democratic education?
 - a. Do you think it MATR places any value on it? How so?
 - b. Do you emphasize democratic education democratic habits in your course? Can you give examples? (Offer below if needed)
 - i. **Critical Inquiry** - to question, examine, and reflect on beliefs of those they are now sharing experiences with, and question the realities and structures of society

- ii. **Associated Living/Collaboration** - living together, interacting and understanding shared experiences
- iii. **Voice & Agency** - Have a say in their learning and class environment, being heard, and valued
- iv. **Student-Centered Learning/Curriculum** - Based on their reality and what they need, sharing of power in the classroom and decisions

11. What do you see as the role of democratic education in urban schools?

- a. How important is it? Why?
- b. How well urban schools currently reflect a democratic education framework?

12. Any final thoughts on MATR or democratic education?