2018

Investigating the Third Space: A New Agenda for Teacher Education Research

Jori S. Beck
Old Dominion University, jbeck@odu.edu

Investigating the Third Space: A new agenda for teacher education research

Jori S. Beck

Old Dominion University

Author Biography

Jori S. Beck is an assistant professor of secondary education in the Department of Teaching & Learning at Old Dominion University. Her research interests focus on clinical teacher preparation broadly with emphases in third space ideology, teacher residencies, and equity.

Correspondence concerning this manuscript should be addressed to Jori S. Beck, Department of Teaching & Learning, Old Dominion University, 3113 Education Building, Norfolk, VA 23529 or to jbeck@odu.edu.

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to advocate for an expansion of third-space ideology to the research conducted in clinical teacher preparation programs including research designs and methods of data collection. Clinical teacher preparation has been advocated since the 1980s and is now being systematically realized in the early 21st century. Thus, it is time to revisit research designs and data collection related to this model. The author illustrates first-, second-, and third-space programs, including an overview of teacher residency programs, before advocating a mixed methods research paradigm that aims to create democratic spaces for teacher education research. Research and practice implications are discussed.

Keywords: Third Space, mixed methods research, school-university partnerships

Investigating the Third Space: A new agenda for teacher education research

In the United States, education researchers, deans of colleges of education, and accrediting bodies have called for closer relationships between school districts and institutions of higher education (IHEs) since the 1980s (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation [CAEP], 2015; Darling-Hammond, 2006; National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE] Blue Ribbon Panel, 2010; Sykes, Bird, & Kennedy, 2010; The Holmes Group, 1986; Zeichner, 2010; Zimpher & Howey, 2005). Today, relationships between IHEs and school districts are mandated by the major accrediting body (CAEP, 2015) and IHEs and school districts must work together to prepare teachers for diverse, American schools. Not only must responsibility for teacher preparation be shared, but the CAEP (2015) standards delineate that P-12 schools and colleges of education, "share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation" (p. 1). Thus, these relationships should be accompanied by robust data collection and evaluation plans in order to ensure that these partnerships work effectively and efficiently to academically grow diverse P-12 students. Similar patterns of new school-university relationships are being spurred around the world in countries such as Australia (Williams, 2014) and England (Jackson & Burch, 2016) as governments are beginning to prioritize the assets of both practitioners and scholars.

Recent developments in federal accountability in the United States echo and build upon CAEP's (2015) mandates. The standards and accountability movement has played a major role in efforts to collect data on teacher education programs. The original intent of this movement was to improve the quality of education for students from impoverished and marginalized backgrounds and that objective remains the same today. This movement has resulted in the complex accountability systems currently in place for students and teachers that are troubled by

validity issues such as curricular misalignment (Popham, 2005) and disproportionate fallout on children of color (Shahjahan, 2011). The recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act ([ESEA], 1965) as the Every Student Succeeds Act ([ESSA], 2015) now provides the opportunity for local control and accountability (Klein, 2015) and states, school districts, and IHEs must work together to design reliable and valid accountability systems to serve diverse student populations. The rise of high-stakes standardized assessments is also being seen in other Orgnisation for Economic Co-operation (OECD) countries such as New Zealand (Cowie & Cooper, 2014) where educators and teacher educators have begun to implement data literacy for teaching practices to serve diverse students in this accountability climate. Thus, reconciling accountability with the needs of communities is a cross-national issue.

The current paper advocates for a new research agenda for investigations into clinical teacher preparation programs that will value and integrate practitioner, scholarly, and community knowledge, which I will refer to as third-space research designs. I begin by comparing first-space, second-space, and third-space teacher education programs internationally before explaining the continuum of clinical teacher preparation in depth. I then delineate and advocate for a revamped, mixed methods research agenda in which education researchers work with school districts and communities not only to prepare teachers, but also to develop and implement this research agenda in reclaiming local control over accountability.

Theoretical Framework

I frame the arguments for this paper in postcolonial theory (e.g., Said, 1993) and, specifically, the notion of Third Space (Bhabha, 1994; Rutherford, 1990). I chose these frameworks for several reasons. First of all, postcolonial theory speaks to the oppression of

various groups (e.g., Native inhabitants and women) in a colonial campaign—for the purpose of

this article, this translates to colonizing attempts on behalf of federal and state accountability

systems, IHEs, and school districts. These are discussed in greater detail below. Third Space is

one response to colonization, and the democratizing of spaces speaks eloquently to the

possibilities of collapsing hierarchies in clinical teacher preparation programs that are

increasingly pervasive around the world. These frameworks are therefore robust enough to

address the complicated nature of developing a democratic research paradigm. First, I delineate

how postcolonial theory has been applied to education broadly before examining the application

of Third Space to teacher preparation specifically.

One strand of work on postcolonial theory in education focuses on comparative and

international education. Crossley and Tikly (2004) noted that common postcolonial topics

include slavery; migration and the formation of diasporas; the effects of race, culture, class, and

gender in postcolonial settings; histories of struggle and resistance against colonial and neo-

colonial dominance; identity formation and hybridity; language and language rights; and the

struggles of indigenous peoples. In the U.S., these themes have been taken up by scholars in

discussions of power, resistance, and attempted democratization which are relevant in

considering how to create third spaces. For example, Apple (2011) has compared the effects of

globalization—specifically, black market labor—to slavery. As a result, he advocated for critical

analyses of schools within urban and rural economic markets.

Authors such as Dei (2000) and Shahjahan (2005, 2011) have taken up an anti-colonial

sentiment that overtly resists dominant power structures and epistemologies. Most relevant to my

argument is Shahjahan's (2011) comparison of the evidence-based education movement to

colonial discourse. The author noted striking similarities including "(1) the discourse of

civilizing the profession of education, (2) the promotion of hierarchies of knowledge and monocultures of the mind, and (3) the interconnection between neoliberal educational policies and global colonialism" (p. 182). This colonial discourse includes a privileging of the colonizers' culture and race over the colonized in the construction of a binary system. Such a system is certainly evident in the standards-based accountability movement in the United States, which privileges test scores and evidence over other measures of student achievement or even engagement. Indeed, Shahjahan noted that statistical knowledge and surveys were a technique preferred by the government during the colonial era. This is in stark contrast to indigenous knowledges that include oral storytelling and spirituality (Shahjahan, 2005). A more in-depth discussion of the nuances of postcolonialism is outside the scope of this paper; however, the notions of control, domination, and oppression are central to the argument I put forward here regarding third-space teacher preparation.

At local levels, there are also issues of domination and oppression within IHE-school relationships. Miller and Hafner (2008) have demonstrated the difficulties of collapsing power structures in these relationships. Specifically, they conducted a qualitative study of a partnership steeped in Freirean notions of dialogue. Even within this intentionally democratic space, community members still felt disenfranchised in their work with their IHE colleagues. Zeichner and Payne (2013) also framed this in their question about, "*whose knowledge* should count in teacher education" (original emphasis; p. 3). However, school districts can also wield power over stakeholders. Hibbert, Heydon, and Rich (2008) discovered themes of colonization and domination in their study of a literacy training program in Canada. Their approach was to employ a model of turnkey training that utilized literacy "experts" who were chosen from various schools to attend training and then return to their school site to train their peers in the

new knowledge and skills they learned. In this model, teachers were defined as "deficient" (p. 313) and knowledge flowed in a hierarchical pattern. Similarly, MacGillivray and colleagues (2004) found that teachers in their study were disenfranchised by their school district. The authors framed this through neocolonialism, which they connected to the history of European and American dominance over other countries, but with the current implication of relationships of power related to race, gender, and class. However, important issues of race, gender, and class are not explicit in other studies of school-university-community relationships (e.g., Miller & Hafner, 2008) and must be considered.

These issues can be extended to the racial demographics of the education field. Although dominated by women, and thus a deviation from the typically patriarchal nature of colonization, the teaching workforce is overwhelmingly White (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). Since the teacher educator population draws from this pool, this workforce is also predominantly White and female (Oklahoma State University, 2015). In contrast, student populations are increasingly diverse; the U.S. Department of Education (2016) has predicted that White students in public schools will make up only 46% of the population by 2024. Such a dynamic has immediate implications for instruction including assessment; Shahjahan (2011) has called for the employment of materials and resources to serve the needs of a diverse student body. Furthermore, he has raised important questions on this issue about the cultural assumptions and histories undergirding evidence, data, and learning outcomes and who has the most at risk in these systems. Predominantly female and White teacher educator and teacher workforces almost certainly reinforce Western notions of evidence and reasoning. For all of these reasons, the notion of Third Space, which is derived from postcolonial theory, is most relevant to this discussion because it provides a framework for democratizing these colonial spaces.

Third Space

According to Bhabha (1994), the Third Space is an equalizer—it "challenges our sense of the historical identity of culture as a homogenizing, unifying force" (p. 54). In the Third Space, it is possible to collapse traditional hierarchies and break down binaries (Bhabha, 1994; Rutherford, 1990) in order to introduce more dynamic and egalitarian systems. Third Space ideology discourages othering, or the distancing of oneself from another through comparison. Instead, the Third Space provides the opportunity to "elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of our selves [*sic*]" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 56). Many spaces in higher education, including some teacher preparation programs, are overtly hierarchical with an emphasis on top-down implementation and Western epistemologies. The Third Space is a space of revitalization and creativity in which all voices, narratives, and histories can be honored.

Gutiérrez and colleagues (2008; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejeda, 1999) have conducted seminal work on the Third Space. In this research, the authors demonstrated how particular programs have supported emerging bilingual students in managing hybrid identities including the construction of dialogue that utilizes students' home languages and prior knowledge as assets. Their work relied on Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development, rather than any association with Bhabha's work (Bhabha, 1994; Rutherford, 1990), and these authors argued that hybridity and diversity serve as the building blocks of Third Spaces—thus alluding to the valuing of various epistemologies as well as a broad notion of diversity including racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, linguistic and, I add, sexual orientation. They have championed new, hybrid spaces. For example, in one study of an elementary classroom (Gutiérrez et al., 1999), the teacher built an instructional unit inspired by students' shared curiosity about sexual reproduction and utilized their home language in facilitating classroom dialogue.

The literature on third-space teacher preparation programs includes some similarities to that of Gutiérrez and colleagues' work (2008; 1999) but is different. Third-space teacher preparation programs are those in which university personnel and P-12 faculty work together to prepare teacher candidates (TCs) for the classroom. Third-space teacher education is more democratic than previous models in its privileging of P-12 practitioner, university personnel knowledge, and community knowledge; it is a collaborative space in which all stakeholders potentially stand to benefit. Zeichner (2010) led the field in delineating the possibilities that third-space programs present for teacher preparation and advocated the embedding of P-12 personnel into university preparation programs and university faculty into P-12 schools as "hybrid teacher educators" (Zeichner, 2010, p. 94). This is one means of avoiding the traditional "'application of theory model'" (Zeichner, 2010, p. 90) in which TCs learn theory at the university and go to their school placements to apply it which results in disconnected and superficial learning. As Martin, Snow, and Torrez (2011) explained, "[S]chool and university-based educators, working in tandem to scaffold and guide teacher candidates, can lead to a collective third space in which both individuals and the collective develop. New and shared understandings and practices evolve through coordinated activity" (p. 300). Although the implications for TC growth through zones of proximal development are evident here, inquiry into third-space teacher preparation programs over the years has been grounded in Bhabha's (1994) work rather than Vygotsky's (1978).

First-space teacher preparation. Here I briefly lay out my conception of first- and second-space programs to provide contrast to Third Space programs. In first-space programs, either schools or IHEs are emphasized to the neglect of the other which can result in thin TC learning. Some teacher residency programs, like the Boston Teacher Residency, may fall into

this category since it situates teacher preparation in a school district and uses adjuncts to teach

courses (Solomon, 2009). This program seems to be heavily school-site based to the neglect of

theory and research, which can be provided by IHEs—thus sending the message that theory and

research may not be valued in this program. This is also evident in England in the School Direct

program (Jackson & Burch, 2016) in which candidates are mainly prepared at school sites with

university personnel playing only an ancillary role. In these programs, hybrid roles—those in

which teacher educators or school personnel serve as bridges between the P-12 school site and

the university—are absent or used only peripherally since there is an emphasis on school-based

personnel with no mention of IHE faculty. Finally, but significantly, community knowledge is

not included in these programs.

        Second-space teacher preparation. Second-space programs are the majority of

American teacher preparation programs today. These are the programs that loosely couple theory

to practice in the "'application of theory'" (Zeichner, 2010, p. 90) model of teacher preparation.

TCs are provided theory and research at their IHE and left to make connections for themselves in

their field experiences. In these models, doctoral students and adjuncts are hired to staff teacher

education programs and faculty are rewarded for their scholarship rather than their work in

school sites facilitating TC learning (Zeichner, 2010). Of course, the latter might be more

applicable to faculty working in research-intensive universities where the reward structure

privileges these activities; however, cooperating teachers in schools in any program may not be

privy to the goals and values of the teacher preparation program in which they are working and

may not be recognized as teacher educators. Thus, a chronic divide persists between the field and

the IHE partner in second-space programs and multiple ways of knowing are allegedly privileged

but this value is not reflected in action. Hybrid roles may exist, but may be poorly executed in

bridging theory and research to practice or in furthering the goals of the program or its coherence. Community assets, epistemologies, and values are not recognized in second-space programs. The teacher education program in South African studied by Mutemeri and Chetty (2011) illustrated the pitfalls of such a program. The lecturers and TCs in their study recognized that there was a disconnect between universities and school districts including a lack of communication, "at this university we don't liaise with the schools. We don't" (p. 514). Furthermore, TCs were not prepared for their work in schools and mentor teachers weren't prepared to work with TCs. As a result, the authors recommended the development of third space programs that provide closer ties between universities and schools.

  Third-space teacher preparation. Third-space teacher preparation, in any instantiation, remains elusive in practice as demonstrated by the examples above. Perhaps Klein, Taylor, Onore, Strom, and Abrams (2013) are correct in noting that third-space teacher education is best described as "improvisational," (p. 52) because those individuals operating in that space must continually adjust their work in order to achieve the often ambiguous and shifting goals of the ideology. These authors view third-space teacher preparation as a "change project" that is also a program for its participants, and further described it as "imaginative and generative" (p. 52). Thus, third-space programs require continuous reflection on evidence and outcomes as well as ongoing adjustment—a process of experimentation, data collection, and reflection in endless iterations. It may also require a change in the value systems of IHEs to reward work in the field with TCs, to value the assets of surrounding communities, and to create hybrid positions for this work that span the boundaries of universities and school districts. Although many programs strive to operate in the third space, this model remains difficult to execute because of the balance of various ways of knowing. For example, in Thailand Phompun, Thongthew, and Zeichner

(2013) created a training program that explicitly incorporated practitioner and scholarly knowledge and discovered how this played out in nuanced ways in TCs' instruction. Stevenson (2015) used video-stimulated recall in order to uncover Inuit teachers' methods for teaching about their native cultures in Canada. In the Philippines, Handa and Tippins (2013) created an immersive service learning experience for math candidates to learn about rural villages and connect historic and modern ways of knowing. All of these studies reveal tensions in these relationships as well as their dynamic nature.

One element that is often omitted from conversations on third-space teacher preparation is the use of data for continuous improvement (Sykes et al., 2010). The silence around this issue is somewhat surprising considering CAEP (2015) requirements for the evaluation of provider quality, continuous improvement, and capacity (Standard 5). In 2009, Cochran-Smith and colleagues delineated four key elements in supporting a "culture of evidence" (p. 459) in teacher preparation programs: (a) mixed methods and dialectic approaches generating a portfolio of studies; (b) the recognition that values questions are as inherent in teacher education as they are in any education program; (c) situated and exploratory approaches to evidence construction; and (d) the use of multiple structures to systematize and institutionalize the use of inquiry and evidence. It is time to revisit this idea and methods for achieving this goal due to the authorization of the ESSA (2015) which will return responsibility for accountability to states and school districts (Klein, 2015; Zeichner, 2016) and incentivizes new teacher preparation structures. I provide suggestions for exploring this agenda below.

As Sykes and colleagues (2010) noted, valid and reliable outcomes of teacher preparation programs generally are contentious and difficult to measure. However, some research has demonstrated how third-space teacher education programs, specifically, are beginning to include

a cycle of continuous improvement into their work (Beck, 2016; Urban Teacher Residency

United, 2015[1]) and additional research is needed on continuous improvement in teacher

education in order to aid the field in the implementation of accreditation standards and

accountability systems in the service of diverse communities. In order to advocate for a new

research agenda in third-space teacher preparation, it is necessary to first review the literature on

the continuum of clinical teacher preparation.

Clinical Teacher Preparation

The above discussion of Third Space ideology centers on notions of power and

oppression around issues of diversity. Diversity writ large (e.g., language, ethnicity, race,

socioeconomic status, ability, gender, and sexuality) is operationalized in this section as

community due to the contextualized and varied nature of these concepts. For example, a

community in the southwestern United States will likely have different needs, values, and assets

than a community in the northeastern United States. Thus, in elaborating on clinical teacher

preparation in the service of particular communities I am highlighting the importance of

contextualized preparation as well as the assets of these communities.

The Holmes Group (1986) was the first collective of education scholars to advocate for

reform in teacher education in the United States—including the differentiating of the teaching

profession and closer ties between school districts and IHEs through the establishment of

Professional Development Schools. Clinical teacher preparation, or teacher preparation closely

tied to schools through extensive practica and student teaching experiences, has been

implemented in a variety of forms since that time, and numerous investigations have been

---

[1] Urban Teacher Residency United changed its name to the National Center for Teacher
Residencies in 2015.

conducted into clinical teacher preparation. What can be distilled from the body of research on clinical teacher preparation are the importance of tightly-linked course work and field work (Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005); a focus on continuous improvement; and mission-specific or contextualized preparation (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Sykes et al., 2010). Other authors have provided nuance in understanding how to implement strong clinical programs. Zimpher and Howey (2005) made recommendations for P-16 partnerships within a reform agenda including (a) recognition of the necessity of complex teaching that is responsive to the political and economic realities of P-12 systems; (b) a new view of preparation as an ongoing learning process that spans preservice to inservice; (c) the development of teacher leaders in tandem with TCs; (d) generating and implementing reforms to foster greater leadership capacity in schools; (e) harnessing the capability of universities to research and develop high-quality teaching and learning; (f) the creation of new roles for veteran teachers; (g) and the systematic evaluation of teacher preparation programs. Large-scale, quantitative studies have demonstrated the importance of clinical experiences that replicate the first year of teaching (Boyd, Grossman, Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2009).

Darling-Hammond (2006) edited a volume of studies of seven exemplary teacher education programs—"exemplary" in the sense that their graduates were well prepared for their first days as teachers of record. Her findings overlapped with the larger findings from this body of research and, specifically, demonstrated the importance of close ties between coursework and clinical work in schools; rigorously supervised clinical work; and closer relationships between IHEs and model schools that serve diverse learners. She further argued that, in order to combat public perception of teaching as an easy job, teacher educators must build stronger models of teacher preparation and develop common curricula for teacher education that incorporate clinical

experiences and promote inquiry dispositions in TCs. She cited other elements of exemplary

teacher education programs including "a common, clear vision of good teaching" (p. 305) that is

embedded in course work and clinical experiences; clearly-defined professional standards to

guide and evaluate course work and field work; a strong, core curriculum embedded in human

development and social and cultural context; application of case methods, teacher research,

performance assessments, and portfolio evaluation; and scaffolded experiences to aid TCs in

confronting their beliefs and assumptions about teaching, learning, and students. These findings

were echoed in Brouwer and Korthagen's (2005) mixed methods study in which they found that

effective reflection fostered in university coursework was implemented in tandem with rich field

experiences.

In a large-scale study of New York City teachers, Ronfeldt (2012) found that teachers

who were prepared in easier-to-staff schools were retained longer in the profession and

experienced greater student learning gains. Importantly, these schools sometimes served large,

diverse populations of students and the school culture was positive. Thus, learning to teach is a

complex, long-term process that is best implemented through contextualized teacher preparation

in which TCs complete yearlong experiences, learn the assets of a community, work with teacher

leaders, aid in the systematic evaluation of the program, and are then hired in the same school

district. The research on what makes clinical teacher preparation programs more effective is

clear.

Sykes and colleagues (2010) critiqued clinical preparation by noting some of the

difficulties in executing the model. The first challenge they cited is the recruitment of large

numbers of veteran teachers each year who are sufficiently qualified to serve as mentor or

cooperating teachers. A second, related issue is integrating teacher education program goals into

the field through mentor or cooperating teachers. However, ultimately the authors concluded,

"Teaching is learned so substantially in the schools that the obvious reform is to locate

preparation there, with the university playing an ancillary rather than primary role" (p. 470). This

solution, they hypothesize, will tighten relationships between teacher education and school

districts including hiring practices and curriculum. This is in line with recommendations of the

NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel (2010) that called for centering clinical experiences in teacher

preparation.

Significantly, since the Holmes Group's seminal *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), teacher

education scholars have hypothesized that improvements in teacher education can be a catalyst

for, or must be implemented in tandem with, innovations in P-12 education (Darling-Hammond,

2010; Goodlad, 1990; Zimpher & Howey, 2005):

> [I]f novices are to see and emulate high-quality practice, especially in schools serving the
>
> neediest students, it is necessary not only to seek out individual cooperating teachers but
>
> also to develop the quality of the schools so that prospective teachers can learn
>
> productively and to create settings where advances in knowledge and practice can
>
> continue to occur. (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 43)

Conversely, as Haberman and Post (1992) found, when TCs are placed in settings that serve

ethnically, linguistically, or economically disadvantaged students without appropriate scaffolding

it can be detrimental to their development as equity-minded educators. An NCATE Blue Ribbon

Panel report (2010) called for greater accountability; stronger candidate selection and placement;

revitalized curricula, incentives, and hiring; supporting partnerships; and additional research on

"what works" (p. iv) in clinical teacher preparation. Teacher residency programs were designed

to fulfill this call.

      Teacher Residency Programs. Teacher residencies were first created in Boston,

Massachusetts and Chicago, Illinois as a means of "'home growing'" (Boggess, 2008, p. 8)

teachers for those urban districts. They have gained attention in the media (Keller, 2006), praise

from education researchers (Keller, 2006; Zeichner, 2010), and federal funding (Berry,

Montgomery, & Snyder, 2008) for innovative teacher preparation that responds to many calls for

reform. For the purpose of this article, teacher residencies are defined as those programs in

partnership with the National Center for Teacher Residencies (n.d.); I made this decision because

of the widespread call for residencies (Duncan, 2009; Thorpe, 2014) that has led to proliferation

of a model that is not always true to the intent. For example, at one IHE I collaborated with

faculty who wanted to create a "residency" in which TCs were placed into classrooms without a

mentor teacher. Such an arrangement would not have provided the scaffolded learning that

residencies require. According to the National Center for Teacher Residencies (n.d.), programs in

this network are regularly audited and must abide by particular criteria including: (a) focused

recruitment and selection of residents; (b) robust selection and support for mentors; (c)

contextualized preservice preparation; (d) carefully designed induction support; and (e) strategic

hiring of residency graduates. These elements answer many of the calls in the literature reviewed

above, and are embedded through coursework as well as mandatory, yearlong apprenticeships in

schools in which theory is closely linked to practice and residents are prepared in cohorts. These

programs utilize a variety of instantiations of this model—some were set up to compete with

higher education (Solomon, 2009) whereas others were designed to be true partnerships between

IHEs and school districts (Author, 2016).

Teacher residencies are thus a particular instantiation of clinical preparation, and some of these programs strive for the utopian third space. They aim to provide front-to-back support from yearlong apprenticeships in schools with veteran teachers to induction support of up to three years (Urban Teacher Residency United, 2015). Additionally, teacher residencies implement highly contextualized teacher preparation (Matsko & Hammerness, 2013) and residents prepared in these programs commit to teaching in specific urban districts for three years or more (e.g., Solomon, 2009). The body of literature on teacher residencies is emerging.

What can be distilled from the teacher residency literature is that these programs recruit diverse candidates for hard-to-staff positions and retain teachers beyond average retention rates (Berry et al., 2008; Papay, West, Fullerton, & Kane, 2012). Research on two teacher residencies—the Academy of Urban School Leadership in Chicago, Illinois and the Boston Teacher Residency in Boston, Massachusetts—has demonstrated the recruitment benefits of these programs. Specifically, in Boston, the Residency was responsible for hiring 62% and 42% of the Boston Public School District's math and science teachers respectively (Papay et al., 2012). Berry and colleagues (2008) confirmed these results when they found that 60% of Boston Teacher Residency cohorts and 32% of Academy of Urban School Leadership candidates were preparing to teach in high-needs subject areas in 2007-2008. Residents were also found to be more diverse with 52% of Boston Teacher Residency candidates less likely to be White than their non-Boston Teacher Residency peers (Papay et al., 2012)—thus disrupting the demographics of the teacher workforce. In the 2007-2008 cohorts in Boston and Chicago, Berry and colleagues (2008) found that 55% of Boston Teacher Residency and 57% of Academy for Urban School Leadership candidates were from ethnically marginalized backgrounds. Both Papay and colleagues (2012) and Berry and colleagues (2008) found that graduates of teacher

residency programs were retained at high rates. In Boston, Residency graduates were staying beyond their three-year commitment to Boston Public Schools demonstrating a dedication to serving the school district and students. To sum, teacher residency programs fulfill recruitment needs in urban districts and may be successful in retaining teachers beyond average rates.

Despite the rising importance of clinical teacher preparation around the world and the parallel growth in third space ideology to make sense of this work, to date, no one has applied this framework to research programs in these settings. This is an important step in fleshing out this agenda. Indeed, Routledge (1996) has conceptualized, "a third space as a site from where we may negotiate the locations of academia and activism" (p. 400). Thus, the proposed research agenda is one more step in this effort to bridge academia and activism in and for schools.

A Third-Space Research Agenda

My argument for these particular research designs is steeped in the notion of Third Space with an emphasis on Bhabha's work (1994; Rutherford, 1990). Thus, I highlight research designs and methods that privilege collapsing hierarchies traditionally dominated by IHE personnel and Westernized, statistical evidence. Additionally, the notion of hybrid roles becomes increasingly important in the proposed research designs. First, I advocate several research designs that fit the ideology of third-space teacher preparation; then, I suggest particular types of data collection within these designs. To date, few truly democratic research designs—those that value researcher, practitioner, and community knowledge and experience and involve all stakeholders—have been used to investigate teacher preparation. I use mixed methods designs broadly as generally embodying many Third Space tenets. I begin by providing a rationale for

the paradigm of mixed methods research and then delineating specific designs and methods of

data collection within this paradigm.

Paradigms and Mental Models

In considering research paradigms, there has long been disagreement between

quantitative and qualitative purists (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). The former embrace

positivism, a stance that distances the observer and the subject(s) and privileges objectivity.

Qualitative purists reject this approach and favor constructivism, idealism, humanism,

hermeneutics, and even postmodernism—approaches that acknowledge that multiple realities

exist and the influence context has on people, processes, and outcomes. Johnson and

Onwuegbuzie advocated methodological pluralism through the use of mixed methods research

which, they argued, would inform researchers of possibilities and lead to more effective research.

They endorsed a needs-based approach to mixed methods research that combines methods from

the total spectrum of possibilities that afford the best opportunities for answering research

questions.

Greene (2007) framed her discussion of mixed methods research in "mental models"

which she defined as, "the complex multifaceted lens through which a social inquirer perceives

and makes sense of the social world" (p. 13). In this sense, mental models serve not only as

lenses for constructing meaning, but also as guides for inquiry including analysis and

interpretation. Thus, in mixed methods research, multiple mental models are invited "into the

same inquiry space for purposes of respectful conversation, dialogue, and learning one from the

other, toward a collective generation of better understanding of the phenomena being studied" (p.

13). According to both Johnson and Onwuegbuzie's (2004) and Greene's (2007) theorizing of

paradigms and mental models, mixed methods research can be viewed as a third-space paradigm for its valuing of diverse perspectives and a plurality of methods of data collection.

Mixed Methods Designs

Participatory designs have an explicit focus on "shared ownership of research projects, community-based analysis of social problems, and an orientation toward community action" (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005, p. 273). These designs are meant to help community members act on a particular problem and are intended to be more democratic and egalitarian than other social science designs that may serve only those with power. The connection to third-space ideology is apparent in participatory action research's valuing of community knowledge. In third-space teacher education research, "community" could include not only P-12 stakeholders, but also local businesses and organizations. A broad definition of community must be considered in using participatory designs. McIntyre (2003) used participatory action research to prepare TCs for work in urban schools. These TCs engaged with urban youth in a variety of settings to learn more about their perspectives as well as their funds of knowledge. This is also one approach to helping White and/or middle class TCs make sense of their experiences in urban schools.

In the same vein, transformative mixed methods research (Mertens, 2010) has the explicit purpose of responding to societal inequities, engaging culturally diverse groups, and advancing social justice. Mertens (2010) noted that this model, "supports the use of a cyclical model in which community members are brought into the research process from the beginning and throughout the process in a variety of roles" (p. 472). Thus, this model privileges a variety of members in the research process—not just IHE personnel. Cultural competence is critical for researchers utilizing transformative mixed methods. This design begins with a qualitative

component to learn about the community being studied and to develop trusting relationships

between stakeholders. The focus in this design is on producing change. Although I was able to

locate several studies of teacher preparation programs that use a transformative framework, I was

not able to locate one that used transformative mixed methods specifically yet this model is also

in line with Darling-Hammond's (2006) suggestion that IHEs and schools work together for

simultaneous improvement.

Another promising design is one focused specifically on developing curriculum:

formative design. This model has been used to implement literacy interventions over the last 18

years (Ivey & Broaddus, 2007; Reinking & Watkins, 2000). It embodies third-space ideology in

that P-12 educators and university personnel work collaboratively to implement and adapt an

intervention in order to foster student learning (e.g., Ivey & Broaddus, 2007). This is evident in

the emphasis on both research and practice in the following framework used in Reinking and

Watkins' (2000) study:

(1) What is the pedagogical goal of the experiment, and what pedagogical theory

establishes its value?

(2) What is an instructional intervention that has potential to achieve the identified

pedagogical goal?

(3) As the intervention is implemented, what factors enhance or inhibit its effectiveness

in achieving the pedagogical goal?

(4) How can the intervention and its implementation be modified to achieve more

effectively the pedagogical goal?

(5) Has the instructional environment changed as a result of the intervention?

(6) What unanticipated positive or negative effects does the intervention produce? (p. 388)

This design could be applied to teacher education with multiple implications for teaching and learning. First of all, the pedagogical goal inherent to formative design could be used at multiple levels within any teacher education program. For example, pedagogical goals could be set for TC curriculum as well as P-12 curriculum—thus extending the notion of third space to include Vygotsky's (1978) notion of zones of proximal development. The evaluation of positive and negative effects is important for reasons of validity; in the current policy context it is invalid to make high-stakes decisions (e.g., teacher evaluation) based on insufficient or inaccurate data (Popham, 2005). This design thus accounts for validity threats as well. After multiple data base searches, I have not located any studies on teacher preparation programs that use formative design specifically—perhaps in part due to the difficulty of gaining access to school sites for this work or the time commitment required of teachers and administrators at the school site.

One new challenge facing state education agencies in the United States is designing their Title II applications for funding teacher preparation. Zeichner (2016) has recommended that colleges of education aid in this effort by establishing and supporting hybrid programs with high standards. Although formative design has an explicit goal of creating curriculum which narrowly defines its use, central tenets of the design could be adapted for teacher preparation evaluation. The pedagogical goal and design could be determined with community input. Iterative cycles of data collection using multiple methods and types of data are essential characteristics of formative design that should be considered in designing any teacher preparation evaluation system as well

as the unanticipated positive and negative effects of that evaluation system. Additionally, the

expertise of hybrid educators from across the continuum of teacher preparation should be

brought to bear in this work. For example, observations and surveys could be collected in

iterative cycles in order to inform ongoing changes to a teacher preparation program while

keeping the pedagogical goal in mind.

The final third-space research design I will advocate is mixed methods case study.

Although this design does not mandate that a broad range of stakeholders work together in order

to conduct an investigation, case study relies upon multiple methods of data collection and

attending to a variety of evidence (Yin, 2009) which speaks to third-space ideology's emphasis

on multiple ways of knowing. Moreover, these elements of the design not only combat some

validity threats through inherent triangulation, but also encourage collaboration among

investigators in order to conduct case studies and maintain appropriate levels of rigor in this type

of research. The contextualized nature of case study yields analytic generalization (Yin, 2009)

which could inform the work of other preparation programs although these findings would not be

directly generalizable. However, a statistically significant p value simply indicates the

probability of chance rather generalizability (Cohen, 1994). Teacher education researchers

should be rightfully interested in contextualized research that will grow a particular program and

surrounding districts.

Data Collection

In line with third-space ideology, a variety of stakeholders and methods of data collection

must be used to investigate these programs. In considering sampling, parents, students, P-12

personnel, community members, and university personnel should all be considered as data

sources in order to garner the broadest possible picture of a particular program. Thus, third space research must pay attention not only to the overall design of investigations, but the sources of data and inherent value systems and epistemologies as well.

In third-space research designs, collecting data from student and parent stakeholders is critical. One means of incorporating student voice into teacher education research and evaluation projects is through surveys (Schulz, Sud, & Crowe, 2014). Sammons' and colleagues' (2007) study incorporated student perspectives in order to better understand the influence of school climate and culture related to other variables. It is important that any instrument created for unearthing student perspectives is designed to elicit valid and reliable information; thus, student surveys in early grades may need to utilize emojis in order to garner feedback through developmentally appropriate methods. Additionally, because youth are social learners, focus groups are another method of eliciting rich information from students (Eder & Fingerson, 2003). This method of data collection can also soften power dynamics that may exist between researchers and students thus eliminating the potential for students to provide researchers with the responses they think that they want to hear which could render the data unreliable. Parent data could also be elicited via focus groups with careful attention to include populations that are traditionally marginalized based on gender, sexuality, language, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Focus groups may need to be conducted in multiple languages based on the demographics of the school community and held at community sites. Parent surveys should be administered in multiple formats (i.e., hard copy and electronic) and languages to ensure accessibility to a wide audience. The quantitative data collection so common in American schools today would be complemented by many affordances of qualitative research including the description that it offers, the demonstration of multiple perspectives, and connections to other settings (Tierney &

Clemens, 2010). The addition of qualitative methods would round out the narrow agenda that has disenfranchised teachers and students at times, and provide them with a voice in evaluating the process of teaching and learning. Arguing the value of quantitative over qualitative methods is a fool's errand. Instead, in the third space, the continuum of research methods should be valued.

Building Infrastructure and Capacity for Research on Third-Space Programs

Accomplishing the ambitious goals delineated above creates opportunities for new, hybrid roles within third-space teacher preparation programs as well as the creation of new centers for research and assessment. Community liaisons who are trained in research methods as well as community organizations could ascertain what community members value as outcomes of teacher preparation accountability systems. These individuals could also work with faculty members to translate these definitions into viable research agendas and projects. Additionally, teacher leaders could be developed at the building level to work with university faculty on research projects thus responding to calls to differentiate the teacher workforce (The Holmes Group, 1986; Zimpher & Howey, 2005). Such hybrid roles are in line with third-space ideology and the literature on clinical teacher preparation and would make explicit the valuing of community and practitioner knowledge. Indeed, where resources are available, centers for teacher education program evaluation could be created to promote these efforts.

Infrastructure could also be built within teacher education and doctoral training programs. For example, the recent movement to incorporate data literacy for teaching into preservice coursework in the United States is promising (Mandinach, Friedman, & Gummer, 2015). Internationally, research-based teacher education has been implemented in Finland for 30 years (Malinen, Väisänen, & Savolainen, 2012) and, in Norway, Smith (2017) recently provided a

continuum for a research-based program that includes observations, interviews, and quantitative methods. Such a continuum could be adapted in a variety of contexts and may be complemented by a statistics course specifically for classroom teachers. TCs would be introduced to the notion of using data at both the classroom and building levels to see the possibilities for leadership within this realm later in their careers—including the importance of collaboration to advance program-level goals. At the doctoral training level, Eisenhart and Dehaan's (2005) advice to reconsider the separate training of Ph.D. and Ed.D. students comes to bear here. Specifically, their recommendation that doctoral training include research experience as well as interdisciplinary collaborations would aid in strengthening third space teacher education research. Indeed, students with a clinical focus would be valuable in studying teacher preparation programs in depth because they bring a practical perspective that could disrupt dominant epistemologies. These suggestions are all aimed at building infrastructure from the bottom up to flip the hierarchical nature of these systems.

Institutional barriers to change. Cochran-Smith and colleagues (2009) made recommendations for a new agenda in teacher education almost a decade ago without widespread adoption. Indeed, the sheer size of the teaching profession may make it difficult to implement sweeping changes (Sykes et al., 2010). The suggestions described above will only be realized through national, state, and local incentives. At the national level, value documents such as teacher preparation standards and faculty bylaws must be amended. This has already happened at the national level with CAEP (2015) standard 2, which emphasizes cooperation between school districts and universities for teacher preparation. However, in the third space this needs to be taken a step further to include community assets. Community engagement efforts could also be added to national or state policies, or to other teacher preparation standards such as the Interstate

New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (2017), by including TCs' understanding of community assets in their principles. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2018) already recognizes universities with a community engaging classification for this work and departments and colleges of education could easily contribute to these efforts. At the local level, individual IHEs could consider what they are valuing in documents such as bylaws and merit applications. As Zeichner (2010) indicated, faculty are not rewarded for their work in schools but, instead, for their scholarship. I propose that these reward systems could be flipped to also privilege work in schools and community engagement. At research-intensive universities, empirical journal articles are favored in tenure and promotion applications. However, practitioner journals are more likely to reach teachers in the field and thus have a greater influence on P-12 students. Flipping bylaws and merit systems would mean recognizing the influence that peer-reviewed practitioner articles have for the field and balancing this alongside expectations for the creation of empirical work. Furthermore, faculty members could consider aligning their research questions with local school districts to maximize the influence of their work (Harrison, Davidson, & Farrell, 2017). Faculty could also begin to indicate publications with P-12 administrators and teachers on their curriculum vitae to acknowledge the importance of such collaboration. In sum, IHEs are set up as hierarchical systems in which empirical knowledge production is privileged; to align with a third-space ideology, the standards and rewards of IHEs must be inverted to focus on serving a local clientele and broadening the scope of scholarly work. This combination of national, state, and local policy changes could be replicated around the world where such a change is desired as well and may help to counteract some of the ill effects of the growth of standardized testing in some OECD countries (Cowie & Cooper, 2017).

Implications and Conclusions

In this current era of cross-national accountability, it is critical for IHEs and P-12 partners to work together to prepare teachers. It is a time for innovation in program design as well as the creation of new roles for teacher education faculty to support TCs in their development. The importance of continuous improvement in these partnerships is well known (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Sykes et al., 2010; Urban Teacher Residency United, 2015) but more research is needed to uncover explicit methods for program evaluation and research within the third space. A necessary prerequisite to conduct research on clinical teacher education programs is access to school sites. Teacher education research is methodologically flawed and incomplete when work in schools cannot be explored. Trust must be built between partners in order to conduct this research, and soft skills will be needed for this work; however, both partners must also be open to the idea of conducting research on their own programs. I worked with a school district that required researchers to pay a $50 application fee, align their work to the district's priority areas, and find a district sponsor for their research. Undertones of colonization are evident in these policies that dictate the research in their schools. Other districts operating in clinical programs have not even entertained my request to conduct research, and I know that my experiences are not unique. Conversely, P-12 partners sometimes feel as though university personnel do not value their work or knowledge (Urban Teacher Residency United, 2015). These power struggles must cease and P-12 and IHE partners must come to the table as equals in the work of teacher education research to improve P-12 student learning. The designs and methods of data collection proposed above are meant to facilitate these discussions. Much like quantitative and qualitative research, the experiences and expertise of P-12 and university faculty provide a continuum of benefits rather than discrete advantages. This continuum is enriched by community knowledge.

Specific designs, sampling, and methods of data collection have been suggested above, but additional methods should be generated not only to address the unique policy and practice problems at hand, but also to carve out a new path for teacher education. The regulations for teacher education in the reauthorized ESEA (1965) are a challenge to the profession (Zeichner, 2015), but also an opportunity to reclaim the narrative around teacher education if researchers can continue to demonstrate the benefits of clinical teacher preparation as well as the ability of scholars to regulate and continuously improve the profession (O'Day, 2002). Specifically, there are provisions in the ESSA (2015) for the expansion of teacher residency programs. It is imperative that researchers explore the added benefits of residency programs since there is little conclusive evidence demonstrating the advantages of these programs (Boggess, 2010). The model could also be tested abroad to understand its adaptability to a variety of contexts. Several research questions relevant to this work based on the literature reviewed above include:

(1) How do new, hybrid roles for veteran teachers contribute to the overall school climate and culture?

(2) How can teacher preparation programs work with diverse schools for simultaneous improvement?

(3) What elements of the clinical model are most effective for improving TC and P-12 student growth?

(4) What elements of the clinical model are teacher residencies using that traditional programs might not to grow TCs and P-12 students? How are they using them?

Empirical data are the coin of the realm in this era of accountability and there must be a systematic focus on collecting these data from a variety of stakeholders with an eye toward improving programs.

These implications for research also have implications for practice. In order to conduct research within a clinical teacher preparation program, numerous steps will need to be taken to lay the groundwork for these partnerships including developing a coherent vision of teacher education among all stakeholders (Darling-Hammond, 2006). This will not be easy to determine but will ensure better alignment between coursework and fieldwork as well as evaluation of programs and should include community voices. In order to conduct research within third-space teacher preparation programs, memoranda of understanding between P-12 and IHE partners will need to be created to delineate data collection, sharing, and management (Urban Teacher Residency United, 2015, p. 31).

The field of teacher education is faced with an unprecedented opportunity to redefine itself. Innovative work has been occurring for decades discretely. However, it is important to put a distinctive mark on the field without appropriating from other professions in order to truly carve a path for teacher education as a profession (Miller et al., 1997). For example, the notion of teacher residencies is derived from the medical profession (National Center for Teacher Residencies, n.d.)—likely because it was assumed that a particular level of rigor or prestige would accompany medical terminology. Teacher education must embrace the opportunity presented by the current accountability climate and the challenges ahead and create its own, coherent vocabulary (Sykes et al., 2010), methods, and research and evaluation agenda in order to bolster the field. It is time to take back the narrative of teacher education.

References

Apple, M. W. (2011). Global crises, social justice, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(2), 222-234. doi: 10.1177/0022487110385428

Beck, J. S. (Winter, 2016). The complexities of a third-space partnership in an urban teacher residency. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, pp. 51-70.

Berry, B., Montgomery, D., & Snyder, J. (2008). *Urban teacher residency models and institutes of higher education: Implications for teacher preparation*. A paper commissioned by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education with funding from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations and the MetLife Foundation.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Boggess, L. B. (2008). *Home growing teacher quality: District partnerships with urban teacher residencies* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).

Boggess, L. B. (2010). Tailoring new urban teachers for character and activism. *American Educational Research Journal, 47*(1), doi: 10.3102/0002831209358116

Boyd, D. J., Grossman, P. L., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2009). Teacher preparation and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 31*(44), 416-440. doi: 10.3102/0162373709353129

Brouwer, N., & Korthagen, F. (2005). Can teacher education make a difference? *American Educational Research Journal, 42*(1), 153-224. doi: 10.3102/00028312042001153

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2018). *Carnegie selects colleges and university for 2015 Community Engagement classification.* Retrieved from https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/newsroom/news-releases/carnegie-selects-colleges-universities-2015-community-engagement-classification/

Cochran-Smith and the Boston College Evidence Team. (2009). "Re-culturing" teacher education: Inquiry, evidence, and action. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(50), 458-468. doi: 10.1177/0022487109347206

Cohen, J. (1994). The Earth is round (*p* < .05). *American Psychologist, 49*(12), 997-1003. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.49.12.997

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (2015). *The CAEP Standards*. Retrieved from http://caepnet.org/standards/introduction.

Cowie, B., & Cooper, B. (2017). Exploring the challenge of developing student teacher data literacy. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 24*(2), 147-163. doi: 10.1080/0969594X.2016.1225668

Crossley, M., & Tikly, L. (2004). Postcolonial perspectives and comparative and international research in education: A critical introduction. *Comparative Education, 40*(2), 147-156. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4134646

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 300-314. doi: 10.1177/0022487105285962

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(1), 35-47. doi: 10.1177/0022487109348024

Dei, G. J. S. (2000). Rethinking the role of indigenous knowledges in the academy. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 4*(2), 111-132. doi: 10.1080/136031100284849

Duncan, A. (2009, October). *Teacher preparation: Reforming the uncertain profession.* Speech presented at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY.

Eder, D., & Fingerson, L. (2003). Interviewing children and adolescents. In J.A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Eisenhart, M., & DeHaan, R. L. (2005). Doctoral preparation of scientifically based education researchers. *Educational Researcher, 34*(4), 3-13. doi: 10.3102/0013189X034004003

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, H. R. 2362, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Public law 89-10 (1965).

Every Student Succeeds Act. Public law 114-95. (2015).

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Greene, J. C. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*(2), 148-164. doi: 10.1598/RRQ.43.2.3

Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 6*(4), 286-303. doi: 10.1080/10749039909524733

Haberman, M., & Post, L. (1992). Does direct experience change education students' perceptions of low-income minority children. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 5*(2), 29-31.

Handa, V. C., & Tippins, D. J. (2013). Tensions in the Third Space: Locating relevancy in preservice science teacher preparation. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11*, 237-265.

Harrison, C., Davidson, K., & Farrell, C. (2017). Building productive relationships: District leaders' advice to researchers. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership, 12*(4), 1-16. Retrieved from http://journals.sfu.ca/ijepl/index.php/ijepl/article/view/770

Hibbert, K. M., Heydon, R. M., & Rich, S. J. (2008). Beacon of light, rays, or sun catchers: A case study of the positioning of literacy teachers and their knowledge in neoliberal times. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 303-315. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2007.01.014

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2017). *Model Core Teaching Standards*. Retrieved from https://www.ccsso.org/resource-library/intasc-model-core-teaching-standards

Ivey, G., & Broaddus, K. (2007). A formative experiment investigating literacy engagement among adolescent Latina/o students just beginning to read, write, and speak English. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42*(4), 512-545. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/20068318

Jackson, A. & Burch, J. (2016). School Direct, a policy for initial teacher training in England: Plotting a principled pedagogical path through a changing landscape. *Professional Development in Education, 42*(4), 511-526. doi: 10.1080/19415257.2015.1052090

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm

whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14-26.

Keller, B. (2006, November 1). 'Residencies' set up to train urban teachers at school sites.

Education Week. Retrieved from

http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2006/11/01/10residencies.h26.html

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2005). Participatory action research: Communicative action and

the public sphere. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of

qualitative research* (pp. 559-603). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Klein, A. (2015, November 30). ESEA reauthorization: The Every Student Succeeds Act

Explained [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/campaign-k-

12/2015/11/esea_reauthorization_the_every.html

Klein, E. J., Taylor, M., Onore, C., Strom, K., & Abrams, L. (2013). Finding a third space in

teacher education: Creating an urban teacher residency. *Teaching Education, 24*(1), 27-

57. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2012.711305

MacGillivray, L., Ardell, A. L., Curwen, M. S., & Palma, J. (2004). Colonized teachers:

Examining the implementation of a scripted reading program. *Teaching Education, 15*(2),

131-144. doi: 10.1080/1047621042000213575

Malinen, O.-P., Väisänen, P., & Savolainen, H. (2012). Teacher education in Finland: A review

of national effort for preparing teachers for the future. *The Curriculum Journal, 23*(4),

567-584. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2012.731011

Mandinach, E. B., Friedman, J. M., & Gummer, E. S. (2015). How can schools of education help to build educators' capacity to use data? A systematic review of the issue. *Teachers College Record, 117*(4), 1-50. Retrieved from http://www.tcrecord.org.

Martin, S. D., Snow, J. L., & Torrez, C. A. F. (2011). Navigating the terrain of third space: Tensions with/in relationships in school-university partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(3), 299-311. doi: 10.1177/0022487110396096

Matsko, K. K., & Hammerness, K. (2013). Unpacking the "urban" in urban teacher preparation: Making a case for context-specific preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*. *65*(2), 128-144. doi: 10.1177/0022487113511645

McIntyre, A. (2003). Participatory action research and urban education: Reshaping the teacher preparation process. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 36*(1), 28-39. doi: 10.1080/10665680390210184

Mertens, D. M. (2010). Transformative mixed methods research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*(6), 469-474. doi: 10.1177/1077800410364612

Miller, K., & Eds. (1997). An interview with John Goodlad on the role of laboratory schools and the state of American Education. *National Association of Laboratory Schools Journal, 21*(1), 1-4.

Miller, P. M., & Hafner, M. M. (2008). Moving toward dialogical collaboration: A critical examination of a university-school-community partnership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(1), 66-110. doi: 10.1177/0013161X07309469

Mutemeri, J., & Chetty, R. (2011). An examination of university-school partnerships in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education, 31*, 505-517.

National Center for Teacher Residencies. (n.d.) *Home page.* Retrieved from http://nctresidencies.org

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Blue Ribbon Panel. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/

O'Day, J. (2002). Complexity, accountability, and school improvement. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(3), 293-329.

Oklahoma State University. (2015). *2014-2015 faculty distribution survey of selected criteria.* Stillwater, OK*:* Author. Retrieved from https://irim.okstate.edu/Distribution

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. doi: 10.3102/0162373712454328

Phompun, C., Thongthew, S., & Zeichner, K. (2013). Pre-service teacher education in Thailand in the Third Space. *International Forum of Teaching and Studies, 9*(1), 11-20.

Popham, W. J. (2005). *America's failing schools: How parents and teachers can cope with No Child Left Behind.* New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Reinking, D., & Watkins, J. (2000). A formative experiment investigating the use of multimedia book reviews to increase elementary students' independent reading. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35*(3), 384-419. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/748224

Ronfeldt, M. (2012). Where should student teachers learn to teach? Effects of field placement

school characteristics on teacher retention and effectiveness. *Educational Evaluation and

Policy Analysis, 34*(1), 3-26. doi: 10.3102/0162373711420865

Routledge, P. (1996). The Third Space as critical engagement. *Antipode, 28*(4), 399-419.

doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8330.1996.tb00533.x

Rutherford, J. (1990). Interview with Homi Bhabha. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community

culture, difference* (pp. 207-221). London, EN; Lawrence & Wishart Limited.

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism.* New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Sammons, P., Day, C., Kington, A., Gu, Q., Stobart, G., & Smees, R. (2007). Exploring

variations in teachers' work, lives and their effects on pupils: Key findings and

implications from a longitudinal mixed-method study. *British Educational Research

Journal, 33*(5), 681-701. doi: 10.1080/01411920701582264

Schulz, J., Sud, G., & Crowe, B. (2014). *Lessons from the field: The role of student surveys in

teacher evaluation and development.* Chicago, IL: Bellwether Education Partners.

Retrieved from

http://bellwethereducation.org/sites/default/files/Bellwether_StudentSurvey.pdf

Shahjahan, R. A. (2005). Mapping the field of anti-colonial discourse to understand issues of

indigenous knowledges: Decolonizing praxis. *McGill Journal of Education, 40*(2), 213-

240.

Shahjahan, R. A. (2011). Decolonizing the evidence-based education and policy movement: Revealing the colonial vestiges in educational policy, research, and neoliberal reform. *Journal of Education Policy, 26*(2), 181-206. doi: 10.1080/02680939.2010.508176

Smith, K. (2017, September). *Moving beyond rhetoric: Building a culture to substantiate research based teacher education.* Keynote presented at the 17th biennial European Association of Research on Learning and Instruction Conference Tampere, Finland.

Solomon, J. (2009). The Boston Teacher Residency: District-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 478-488. doi: 10.1177/0022487109349915

Stevenson, B. (2015). Third spaces and video-stimulated recall: An exploration of teachers' cultural role in an Indigenous education context. *Educational Action Research, 23*(2), 290-305. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2014.990986

Sykes, G., Bird, T., & Kennedy, M. (2010). Teacher education: Its problems and some prospects. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(5), 464-476. doi: 10.1177/002487110375804

The Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of The Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Thorpe, R. (2014). Residency: Can it transform teaching the way it did medicine? *Phi Delta Kappan, 96*(1), 36-40. doi: 10.1177/0031721714547860

Tierney, W. G., & Clemens, R. F. (2010). Qualitative research and public policy: The challenges of relevance and trustworthiness. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 57-84). New York, NY: Springer.

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *The state of racial diversity in the educator workforce.*

Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from

https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/highered/racial-diversity/state-racial-diversity-

workforce.pdf

Urban Teacher Residency United. (2015). *Clinically oriented teacher preparation.* Chicago, IL:

National Center for Teacher Residencies.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Williams, J. (2014). Teacher educator professional learning in the Third Space: Implications for

identity and practice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(4), 315-326.

doi: 10.1177/0022487114533128

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

SAGE Publications, Inc.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences

in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-

2), 89-99. doi: 10.1177/0022487109347671

Zeichner, K. (2015, December 5). The disturbing provisions about teacher preparation in No

Child Left Behind rewrite. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2015/12/05/the-disturbing-

provisions-about-teacher-preparation-in-no-child-left-behind-rewrite/

Zeichner, K. (2016, January 26). Member voices: Bringing teacher educators to the ESSA

implementation table. *Ed Prep Matters: Key News and Insights on Educator Preparation.*

Retrieved from http://edprepmatters.net/2016/01/member-voices-bringing-teacher-

educators-to-the-essa-implementation-table/

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.

Zimpher, N. L., & Howey, K. R. (2005). The politics of partnerships for teacher education

redesign and school renewal. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(3), 266-271.

doi: 10.1177/0022487105275922