

2025

## (Re)Writing the Script: Social Heteroglossia in an Urban Teacher Education Program

Mathew Baker, Ph.D.

*Georgia Southern University, bakermathewb@gmail.com*

Dr. Michael Lee Joseph

*Texas Tech University, michael.joseph@ttu.edu*

William Bae

*University of Texas at Austin, bae.will@utexas.edu*

Jazmin Claxton

*University of Texas at Austin, jazmin.owens@utexas.edu*

Lia Ferrante

*Austin Independent School District, lia.maria.ferrante@gmail.com*

Augustino Fisher

*Pflugerville Independent School District, fisher.strickland25@gmail.com*

Jackson Fisher

*University of Texas at Austin, jacksondfisher@gmail.com*

---

### **Recommended Citation:**

Baker, M., Joseph, M.L., Bae, W., Claxton, J., Ferrante, L., Fisher, A., & Fisher, J. (2025). (Re)writing the script: Social heteroglossia in an urban teacher education program. *Midwest Journal of Education*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.69670/mje.2.1.2>

*Connecting Theory to Practice*

---

**(Re)Writing the Script: Social  
Heteroglossia in an Urban  
Teacher Education Program**

Midwest Journal of Education

22-42

Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69670/mje.2.1.2><https://www.williamwoods.edu/academics/mje>**Dr. Mathew Baker****Dr. Michael Lee Joseph****William Bae****Jazmin Claxton****Lia Ferrante****Augustino Fisher****Jackson Fisher****Abstract**

This study examines social studies teacher education through the lens of social heteroglossia, investigating the "script" of a critical teacher education program and the "counterscript" generated by preservice teachers (PSTs). Through interviews with PSTs and professors, course observations, and document analysis conducted in Spring 2024, researchers found significant alignment in program goals but disparities in execution. While both groups embraced criticality, PSTs experienced a theory-practice divide between university learning and school placement experiences. The program prioritized critical theory while PSTs sought more practical preparation for classroom realities. This bifurcation created parallel discourses—an official script emphasizing criticality and theory, and a counterscript revealing PSTs' pragmatic concerns. The study suggests bridging these scripts through increased communication, horizontal expertise, and professor involvement in placement sites. By acknowledging the counterscript and supporting PSTs' emerging praxis, teacher education programs can better prepare critical educators to navigate today's challenging political climate.

**Keywords**

Critical teacher education, Urban, Social studies

**Corresponding Author:**

Mathew Baker, Clinical Assistant Professor  
College of Education, Georgia Southern University  
275 C O E Dr Statesboro, GA 30460

Email: [bakermathewb@gmail.com](mailto:bakermathewb@gmail.com) ORC ID: 0009-0000-6921-5606

## Introduction

Responding to the perennial and necessary call for an educational renaissance, we examined social studies teacher education and how it prepared preservice teachers (PSTs) for the rugged contemporary political and social climate. University-based teacher preparation programs and social studies have come under siege from neoliberal and reactionary provocateurs, resulting in declining enrollment and retention numbers (Bratanen & Kwok, 2023). University-based teacher education is accused of being overly theoretical (Korthagen, 2009; Schon, 1995; Zeichner et al., 2015), which scholars argue acts as a cynical pretext to open the academy (Souto-Manning, 2019) and education (Apple, 2001; Hursh, 2007) to market forces. Social studies, perennially the site of culture wars (Evans, 2015; Parkes, 2007; Zimmerman, 2002), has once again been dragged into the fray with regressive legislation in states like Florida (i.e. banning Advanced Placement African American History) and Texas (i.e. anti-Critical Race Theory (CRT) bills), further complicating the already challenging task of becoming a teacher.

Past the bald racism, homophobia, and heteronormativity of these statutes, they exacerbate the tension between practice and theory as the opportunity to enact lessons infused with criticality is lessened. A recent example is Trump's edict for a "patriotic curriculum" designed by the conservative 1776 Commission, which delimits the scope of social studies education (American Historical Association, 2025). Nationalistic social studies education tends towards a singular narrative (white, heterosexual, capitalistic). This not only stunts critical thinking (Loewen, 2007) but acts as an ostensible "social cement" (Hawkey & Prior, 2011) through the quashing of diversity in an attempt at unifying nation-building (Koulouri, 2011). Reducing history education to a single narrative becomes dangerous as it deems alternative narratives as "other" (An, 2020). Students then become disengaged from both the learning (Epstein, 2009) and the larger social project (Santiago, 2019) rather than allowing critical education to hone their tools to imagine a better world (Sibbet & Au, 2018).

Restricted curriculum significantly affects PSTs in how education is theorized/conceived (Maarenen et al., 2016) and what the PST deems possible within their praxis (Kavanagh & Danielson, 2020). The practice-theory connection is a recurrent concern in teacher education (Cochran-Smith et al., 2015; Johannesson, 1998), especially regarding social justice (Chubbuck & Zembylas, 2016). A new challenge in our current moment is that the marrying of practice and theory towards justice becomes further complicated through the increased scrutiny and threat of reprisals for including counter-narratives. Both teacher education (Ellis, 2010) and teachers' curricular and pedagogical choices are influenced by the neoliberal and neoconservative mandates (Girard et al., 2021), creating further constriction in PST autonomy. Agency being stripped from PSTs can be subtle, through forms of governmentality, such as rigid standards (Dover et al., 2016; Suskey et al., 2024) and managerial gaze (Brighouse, 2006; Monreal, 2021), or more overt, as the recent conservative overtures indicate.

In order to (re)examine social studies teacher education and better address these challenges, we wanted to extend the research on the two-worlds pitfall (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985). The two-worlds described in the study are the university and the school. The pitfall is the PST being forced to navigate the two sites' different and sometimes competing goals and purposes. Navigating between the two-worlds has been shown to inhibit PST progress as the demands of either world are often incongruent (Lampert & Graziani, 2009). Part of this incongruence comes from the feedback they receive, where schools can focus on practical elements, such as classroom management (Francis, 2017) and the university's theoretical aspects (e.g., learning theory), sometimes to the point of abstraction (Korthagen, 2009). Alignment between the two-worlds can assist in developing PSTs' pedagogical reasoning (Loughran, 2019), especially when

the discourse between the two-worlds overlaps (Stroupe et al., 2022). A strong connection between the university and school works regarding theoretical and practical constructs makes it more likely for critical methods to endure (Fitchett & Moore, 2022), making the PSTs more agentic in developing their praxis (Buitink, 2009).

Moreover, the two-worlds pitfall implies a weak connection between the theory they learn in the university and the practice they see at their school placement sites (Anagnostopoulos et al., 2007; Smagorinsky et al., 2004). More specifically, the thin connection affects how they are applying broader theories (e.g., humanizing pedagogy) to their practice (Dutro & Cartun, 2016), often driving PSTs towards traditional, uncritical methods (Korthagen et al., 2006). Understanding how each respective world is perceived and works with the other can go a long way towards thickening the PSTs' practice-theory connection.

Using Gutierrez et al.'s (1995) notion of social heteroglossia, inspired by Bakhtin (1981), we wanted to (re)examine the script of a teacher education program, or the "official" narrative which is inscribed with power, the counterscript the PSTs generate, and how/if those two communicate at all. We hope this will shed light on how PSTs conceptualize both worlds they operate within and strengthen the marriage between the practice and theory in both sites. The insights gained will hopefully illuminate some potential paths forward, some of which we suggest at the end of this manuscript.

## **Theoretical Framework**

Social heteroglossia, elaborated on by Fairclough (1992), is the discursive nature of social interaction, combined with the multiple "texts" or voices that inform an interaction. For example, a dialogue is not just between two people but also the context, norms, and values that frame the interaction. The interaction is not devoid of power or neutral, but somewhat different locations and positions within the context direct and influence the multidirectional flow of power throughout the interaction. An example of this can be the difference between talking to your boss at your place of work and talking to your boss at an informal barbecue. While power still flows in the boss's favor in both contexts, the latter setting (probably) allows for more latitude as the jobsite, with its rules, expectations, norms, and mores, heavily slants the authoritative terrain in favor of the boss.

A script and counterscript emerge and unfold through this dialogue as the interaction progresses. The script is monologic and therefore maintains hierarchical power relationships. Furthermore, the monologic nature of the script also only allows for one ideological stance, which is often tacit and assumed, and therefore shapes both the conversation and the interaction (Bakhtin, 1981). For teacher education, the preparation program, through its actors and architects, influenced by its history and context, crafts the official narrative of the program. This then constitutes the space the PSTs operate within, both socially and epistemologically. The (ostensibly neutral) script ultimately conveys more than just knowledge; it also conveys cultural values and norms (Smith, 2004), in which the PST is acculturated. This need not always be viewed negatively; at least some teacher education programs are very intentional with the values embedded within and advanced by their program, often aiming the program, and therefore the PSTs, towards social justice (Bartolome, 2004; Chubbuck & Zembylas, 2016; Mueller & O'Connor, 2006).

The counterscript develops and surfaces in response to the script. It is the unofficial narrative of the program and is generated by the subaltern within the context. The counterscript can be voiced but also acts as resistance (Gutierrez et al., 1995). While there can be some harmony and alignment between the two, they typically run parallel, with the interaction typically being correction when the counterscript makes itself visible. The script's attempts to quash or absorb the counterscript through "centripetal forces" (i.e. bringing everything together in the center) (Bakhtin, 1981) is futile as the counterscript persists through different

forms as it is inherently “centrifugal” or pushes out as the different voices of both the agents and the context strive to be heard. Gutierrez et al. (1995) argued that the interaction can constitute a third space in the uncommon moments of convergence between the scripts, where there is common ground. The third space can lead to meaningful communication between the two scripts for productive collaboration, as the power relationship in that space is more leveled. Through this communication and collaboration, students can begin the institution's transformation, rather than its abandonment.

### Methods

This project employed a critical qualitative case study (Denzin, 2015) in Spring 2024. The setting was a teacher education program within a large public university in the southwest United States. The program was “traditional” because it foregrounded theory and mostly left practice to the placement sites (Labaree, 2018). The preservice teachers were in the program for three semesters, with each semester being tied to an increasingly more immersive practicum experience where a field coordinator placed them through the university. The program and participants were purposefully selected (Creswell & Poth, 2018) as we wanted a critical program and people who were indigenous-insiders (Banks, 1998) of that program, so they were familiar with its machinations, branding, and reputation and echoed Banks’ (1998) notion they endorse “the unique values, perspectives, behaviors, beliefs, and knowledge of his or her primordial community and culture” (p. 7). All PST participants and five researchers (two Ph.D. students, three Master's students) were indigenous-insiders of the program. The three university professors were considered indigenous-insiders because they were the architects of the teacher education program. The other two researchers (Ph.D. students) were external-insiders to a certain extent in that they were trained in a traditional university-based teacher education program and, after being in the program, were “adopted” (Banks, 1998, p. 8) into the program’s norms, morays, and expectations.

For this study, we had six participants in total. Three participants were still in the program as PSTs, and the other three were the professors who designed, taught, and worked in the program. All PSTs taught in a large urban district, completing their semester-long, full-time teaching internships. The participants’ names have been scrubbed of identifying data to maintain their confidentiality.

**Table 1**

*Preservice Teacher Participants*

Participant Name	Racial Identity	Gender Identity	Home Region
Elle	White	Woman	Texas, Urban
Vernita	Latine	Woman	California, Urban
Budd	Latine	Woman	Texas, Urban

*Note.* Pseudonyms used for confidentiality

**Table 2***University Professor Participants*

Participant Name	Racial Identity	Gender Identity	Home Region
Beatrice	Latine	Woman	Texas, Rural
Bill	Black	Man	New York, Urban
O-Ren	White	Woman	Virginia, Urban

*Note.* Pseudonyms used for confidentiality

Data collection consisted of two interviews per participant, written reflections by the PSTs, previous coursework taken by the PSTs, five course observations of the PSTs by a research team member, course syllabi used for the teacher preparation program, and the university-approved website describing the program. For the interviews, we used Zoom since we could set the meeting to fit their schedules and felt like a more neutral space than the university or school. The Master's students conducted the PST interviews, as we did not want the PSTs to feel, whether consciously or unconsciously, as though they had to feed us the script about the program. We felt that fellow students might be viewed as peers, and there would be more willingness to share the counterscript with them. The four Ph.D. students did the professor interviews due to a familiarity with the program, a shared comfort with the script, and a stronger relationship with the university professors.

Each interview was semi-structured (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016), lasted about 60 minutes, and was conducted one-on-one between the researcher and the participant. Open-ended interview questions captured an authentic rendition of the program. Two unique sets of participants necessitated two different interview protocols.. The university professor protocol focused on their goals for the program and how they believed the program worked to prepare PSTs, mainly to capture how they viewed and crafted the script. For example, one of the initial questions in the first interview was “What are the program’s goals for teacher preparation?” with a follow-up being: “Are there any obstacles that make it difficult to achieve that goal?”.

The preservice teacher protocol was split, with the first set of questions revolving around how they believed the program viewed itself to determine if there was any consensus on the script. The second set of questions attempted to understand the counterscript, asking how they viewed the program. An example from the first set of questions was a slight variation to the question asked of the university professors: “How do you think the [program name here] would describe itself?”. To angle towards the counter-script, we asked “How would YOU describe the [program] name here?” with a follow-up question of “Are there any tensions in the program and how it prepares you?”

After the conclusion of both interviews, we read the PSTs' written reflections on their student teaching experiences to see if what they mentioned in the one-on-one interviews connected with their personal reflections in the classroom. After both interviews with the university professors, we examined the course syllabi developed for the teacher preparation program to find instances supporting or countering what they believed the program's stated goals were in their interviews.

We used a variety of data points for crystallization (Ellingson, 2009) that helped establish a clearer idea of what occurred. We examined many data points to avoid overinfluence from one source, potentially skewing the results (Maxwell, 2005). We started by coding the data individually to find themes and avoid groupthink (Thomas, 2021). Each researcher independently conducted the initial coding process. Iterative coding cycles were used in the hope that more exposure to the data would better inform the codes for a more holistic view of the dataset (Saldaña, 2015). The initial number of codes depended on each researcher and each worked to collapse some of those codes into meta-codes to streamline the collective coding process (Miles et al., 2019). Afterwards, we coded collaboratively for consistency and found new insights through discourse (Stake, 1995). For example, one of the collaborative codes that emerged was “criticality present in the program,” with subcodes categorizing the type of critical approach (e.g., cultural relevance, counter-narratives, constructivism, etc.).

Lastly, and importantly, as the researchers were serving as the instruments of measure (Yin, 2018), it is important for them to acknowledge how their positionalities may have affected the collection, interpretation, and recording of the data (Merriam et al., 2001). Three of the four Ph.D. student researchers were heterosexual cisgender males in their 30s, one being white, one Arab-American/white, and one Asian-American. One of the Ph.D. researchers was a cisgendered heterosexual Black woman also in her 30s. They were all social studies teachers in urban contexts before working on their Ph.D. The three Master's students conducting interviews with the PSTs were a cisgender white gay woman, a cisgender heterosexual Latino man, and a cisgender heterosexual white man. All three were in their early 30s.

## **Findings**

### **(Official) Script**

The monologic nature of the script was evident in the consistency of how the participants and the researchers defined and described the program. Throughout all of the participants' responses, they identified criticality in one form or another, whether by explicitly labeling the program as critical or other descriptors such as “woke”, “counter-narratives”, and “culturally relevant”. The professors were unabashed in the program being critical, and their rationalizations were similar. For example, Beatrix compared their program to traditional programs. She described the criticality as getting PSTs to “consider other ways of thinking and being in society so traditional programs, therefore, aren't as caught up in critiquing curriculum or in critiquing pedagogies” (Beatrix Interview 1). This was done to get PSTs to “reconceptualize social studies” (Beatrix Interview 1). O-Ren echoed Beatrix's thoughts about developing critical teachers. She said the program works to “really prepare teachers to work in urban settings, particularly thinking about the diversity of experiences in urban settings around race, class, gender and thinking about issues of power that impact education,” (O-Ren Interview 1). She also compared the program to traditional programs: “Some teacher prep programs really, maybe are more disciplinary focused, right? They focus on just the content of the discipline, and maybe what they might consider a more neutral way. But we would probably say that it's just not critical,” (O-Ren Interview 1). What was most notable was the remarkable consistency across their responses. The consistency was not necessarily negative; it indicated that the program was aligned in its goals and purposes. Also, it indicated the entrenched nature of the official script of the program.

### ***Website Communication***

The script was also made evident through the program's website. The teacher education program was critically focused on urban education, especially in diverse settings (racially, linguistically, socioeconomically). The website said the program was "designed to help equity-minded teacher candidates develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions to support teaching and learning in linguistically and culturally diverse urban settings" (Program Urban Teachers Site). It should be noted that the descriptor was strategically muted due to the state's conservative bent, attacking both public education and anything that even had a whiff of DEI. The PSTs were placed in schools that would satisfy the criteria outlined in the program's mission, which was becoming increasingly challenging due to the advanced and still rapid gentrification of the city and its surrounding municipalities. All of the PST participants were placed in schools that were linguistically diverse (predominantly English and Spanish) as well as racially (White, Latine, Black, Asian) and culturally diverse.

### ***Coursework***

The script was also evident in the courses. The three methods courses the PSTs had to take were named Social Studies Methods, Advanced Social Studies Methods, and Student Teaching, but the required coursework was explicitly critical. The readings all revolved around critical pedagogy and foregrounded problem-posing education (Freire, 1968/2018), critical historical inquiry (Salinas & Blevins, 2014) and broadening the notions of citizenship from participatory to critical (Crowley & King, 2018; Taylor Jaffee, 2016; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). In each course, the PST participants were required to do weekly readings, examine their positionality, and explore how oppressive structures evolved and continue to affect students, especially the marginalized.

### ***Program Marketing***

The critical moniker was also constant across the student teachers, which aligned with how the program described and marketed itself. One difference was that the term "critical" was seldom used across the three PSTs' interview responses but rather concepts that would fall under the umbrella of critical. For example, Budd repeatedly emphasized that the program wanted "culturally responsive teaching" in order to "make the classroom safe for anybody" (Budd Interview). Elle's response was similar in that the program wanted PSTs to "teach those courses using a sociocultural lens" that "supports all their different cultural backgrounds" (Elle Interview 1). Vernita's responses were slightly different as she mentioned criticality explicitly but still in the same vein: "getting students to think critically and have a critical perspective on the world. We've been thinking like constructivism" (Vernita Interview). When asked how the program tried to do it, she responded, "I'd say going against narratives that we normally encounter, especially when it comes to race" (Vernita Interview). The PSTs' responses overlapping with those of the professors gestured towards the official script (i.e., the program being critical) as the transcendent script (Luke, 1992), as it was constantly re-invoked by both the powerful (professors) and subaltern (PSTs). The program touted its critical nature. It was certainly present throughout its programming, curriculum, and pedagogy, as evidenced through the syllabi and how the participants depicted the program, which also explained the uniformity of the perception of the program.

### ***Theory-Forward***

Another crucial piece of the official script was who had the practice/theory responsibility of preparation. The program was intentionally theory-forward, with many of the class readings, assignments, and discussions revolving around theory, such as antiracist pedagogy (Santiago, 2019), culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 2021), LGBTQ issues (Schmidt, 2015), linguistic diversity (Taylor Jaffee, 2016), and multicultural citizenship (Dilworth, 2012). In the interviews, the explicit naming was inverted, as the professors generally named concepts and ideas around theory. In contrast, the PSTs pointed out the program's theory-heavy approach straightforwardly. For the professors, Beatrix argued the program should be "an intellectual space, then that intellectual space should be feeding you" (Beatrix Interview 1) and named famous academics such as Vygotsky, Freire, and Bartolome as particular influences on the program. O-Ren implied that the theory was predominantly housed in the university by dividing the labor of learning to teach. She explained: "So learning through experience, learning by being in the field and having that learning mediated by a field supervisor from the university" (O-Ren Interview 1).

The professors consistently emphasized the university space, foregrounding critical theory, although they did it in indirect ways. This could have been because they offered specificity in the interviews, especially given their breadth of knowledge on the subject. It could also be that the theory was taken for granted, and they chose to become more granular and name which theories/theorists are most present in the program's ideological catalog. Either way, the professors emphasized critical theory throughout the program's professional development sequence.

More to the theoretical foregrounding of the program, and perhaps invisible to the PSTs, was the professors' seeing the program serving a secondary purpose of generating spaces for future research and a recruiting program for future academics. Beatrix explained that part of the benefit to graduating from the program was repeated exposure to academia through studies. She stated: "For the next three years we're going to study you and part of the reciprocity of that is that you'll always be in the mix" (Beatrix Interview 1). She elaborated on the process: "I mean the goal continues to be to find good people that want to be just like us, to learn from them throughout their time here, and learn from them when they venture off, and then lure them back" (Beatrix Interview 1). In both quotes, Beatrix was clear in that graduates of the program are more amenable to studies because of their connection, which keeps them connected to the program and potentially opens them up for recruitment to the graduate programs (master's/Ph.D.). O-Ren's postgraduate interaction was mainly confined to graduates who returned as Ph.D. students. She said, "The only times I interact with folks post-program is if they come back" (O-Ren Interview 1). Both professors' responses highlighted the importance of theory. They saw an auxiliary benefit of teacher education: it was a fertile and available ground for research (i.e., build theory) and a place to locate and recruit future academics (i.e., theorists). Nothing was wrong with this; it makes sense for the program to sustain itself, but it reveals how saturated the program was with theory.

The PSTs were more candid in characterizing the location of theory and practice in their student teaching experience. Budd discussed how the PSTs would read the articles for their course and the instructors would model the principles of the article: "It's probably theory and practice combined. It's kind of because we do go through these articles, and then our professors [instructors] will demonstrate through the lesson," (Budd Interview 1). While Budd accurately noted how practice was present, the PST was an observer and had the practice enacted on them rather than being the enactor themselves, which is not uncommon in teacher preparation programs (Matsumoto-Royo & Ramirez-Montoya, 2021). This maintained the university as a predominantly theoretical space for the PST because the practices were intellectual exercises rather than embodied experiences (Francis, 2017; Hurlbut & Krutka, 2020). Elle's perception of the critical theory in

the program, illuminating her practicum experiences, was similar to Budd's. She explained: "So that's something I have seen, and I probably would not have thought that if I maybe didn't have such a critical view from my professors [instructors] having a critical view on the curriculum currently" (Elle Interview 1).

Vernita was more critical as she saw many practical, day-to-day teaching elements missing in her program preparation. She mentioned classroom management and English Language Learner (ELL) strategies as two things that were abundantly necessary but absent in the program. She said that she felt the program did not "set up with good classroom management in preparation" and "I don't know if it really set me up to deal with or to help students that are learning English" (Vernita Interview 2). As standalone comments, they indicated that the program perhaps neglected some omnipresent components of teaching. However, when considered in the context of her previous statements about the program being critical, it alludes to a separation of theory and practice. The implication is that theory (i.e., critical theory and constructivism) was used in the university, and practices (i.e., management and ELL strategies) were used in the schools.

### ***Linking Pedagogy to Practice***

Pedagogy and practices were also present in the program, but not with the same saturation level as theory. Examples such as constructivism (Jadallah, 2000) and problem-posing education (Freire, 1968/2018) were included and sometimes woven with, but were more often separate and subordinated to the previously mentioned theoretical constructs. The participants noted the inclusion of practices in how their course instructors modeled them. Budd mentioned it as "what I'm grasping from all the lectures, kind of like tools, teaching ways they would teach us" (Budd Interview 2). Elle related her practical experience in the program to writing lesson plans and getting feedback: "I do think I've had a lot of practice, writing like lesson plans and stuff like that" (Elle Interview 2). While still valuable and definitely in the realm of the practical, it might be a stretch to say that lesson plan writing was hands-on practical experience.

Much of this can be chalked up to caution as the program wanted to avoid an overly prescriptive curriculum and the methods fetish (Bartolome, 2004) or produce a "neutral" curriculum that recenters and reinscribes whiteness (Daniels & Varghese, 2019). When Beatrix was asked about the program's methodological approach, she responded, "So that's the challenge is that you don't put a teacher on a conveyor belt and treat it with X, Y, and Z" (Beatrix Interview 2). O-Ren was a bit more overt when she described the hesitancy to be too grounded in methodology: "And I think sometimes people can focus so much on "But I just need to learn how to teach" right that sort of toolbox mentality like, give me the tools to do this but it is only part of becoming a teacher because teachers are intellectuals," (O-Ren Interview 2). She recognized that PSTs both crave and equate good teaching to best practices, but she sees that as only part of teacher education, with the intellectual being a central (the main?) component. It is further enlightening when these comments were placed in the context of their consistent insistence that the program maintain a strong critical focus and develop critically-oriented teachers. In light of the frequency of mentions of critical theoretical concepts and the scant mention of practices, and even those mentions are often oblique, there was a clear prioritization of theory within the teacher education program.

Similar to what was discussed earlier, the professors alluded to the bifurcated experience of PSTs as the university was in charge of their theoretical learning, and the schools their practical knowledge. Beatrix shared that after PSTs graduate, they get to apply their university learning, but their student teaching experience can be difficult due to its multivariate nature. She explained: "And then when they leave, that's when they get to see the abstract become material. I mean, the student teaching really is a great experience,

but there are too many unknowns” (Beatrix Interview 2). The biggest problem was finding cooperating teachers (CTs) who were critical and had strong Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK). She elaborated:

You can have a critical disposition but some don’t have PCK. So I put somebody with them, probably trying to think about that, not having the critical disposition but they’re not going to help you on the pedagogical end of things. (Beatrix Interview 2)

Beatrix explained that a logistical challenge of running a critical teacher preparation program was finding CTs who were strong critical pedagogues. In taking what was available, they often had to try to balance personalities, with critical students being placed with teachers with a strong PCK and students with a predisposition towards methods being placed with critical CTs. O-Ren also mentioned some of the challenges of recruiting and retaining CTs. The first was nearly identical to Beatrix’s in that finding alignment between the program’s value and the CTs’ can be tricky: “So I think that’s an obstacle is finding placements and ensuring that those placements that there’s some alignment in between what the program believes and how those teachers are teaching,” (O-Ren Interview 1). A second one she mentioned was more zoomed out, but probably resonates with educators across the US, and that was the right-wing attacks on public education. She explained, “I think that it’s hard to find placements. I think, in this climate for teachers, with the teacher shortage and just the political climate, it’s a lot to ask a teacher to open up their classroom to a novice to learn,” (O-Ren Interview 2). O-Ren posited that teachers may be reluctant to allow PSTs to teach as it could bring consequences for the CT, especially in this age of incessant scrutiny.

### ***Professors and the Official Script***

The official script of the program was dually apparent through the professors’ aims and mandates within the program and how the PSTs had internalized and repeated those. The program was loud and proud about its critical nature and backed it up by designing its courses, syllabi, and overall culture. Drilling down further, even the examples they used to prove the program was critical were remarkably similar. Counter-narratives, challenging the dominant narrative, assessing power, and the importance of cultural competence were present in all participants’ responses, regardless of status as professor or student.

The second part of the official script was where theory and practice resided. The professors tended to be more opaque but still defended the theory-centric nature of the program as preparing teachers as intellectuals (Giroux, 1988). The PSTs, on the other hand, were frank about the somewhat dichotomous setup of the program. What this pointed to was the operation of power within the script. The professors operated with an ideological posture that was assumed and therefore invisible. This was not to say that they were ignorant of the practice-theory schism; they acknowledged it, but they also minimized it in service of what they believed to be the more important aim of the program, which was to create critical theorists. This was made further evident by their belief that the program should be cyclical in using graduates’ classrooms for study and a farm system for future intellectuals. Power did not flow unidirectionally. PST feedback was clearly considered, perhaps creating an ersatz and indirect discourse. But, given the PSTs’ status within the program, both temporally, they were in the program for two years versus the professors’ tenured status, and socially, they were undergraduates in a prestigious university with highly regarded professors, they acted as the program dictated. This brings us to the counterscript, which the PSTs generated in response to the official script, partially in dialogue with it and partially as an act of resistance towards it.

## Counterscript

The counterscript coming from each of the PSTs was quite similar to each other's, although the time, space, and their experiences outside of the program created some distinctions. A commonality between the PSTs' responses was that they lamented the lack of practical education in the program. Budd explained how she felt that she had to bring the practical elements to the university:

I would get my experiences out in the field of my internships, and I would come back into the classroom with my cohort and my professors, and I was like, "Hey, like this is what's going on, what do you think?" (Budd Interview 1).

When asked what parts of her experiences she felt she had to bring, Budd answered, "More like the things my CT is doing, like the different activities and lessons" (Budd Interview 1). Budd's response implied that the onus was on her to bring her experiences and methods to the university; otherwise, they would not have been covered. Similarly, after Vernita's interviewer (a Master's student in the same program) asked Vernita about her experiences and if the program could include more practical elements, namely regarding classroom management, Vernita directly answered "Yes, definitely" (Vernita Interview 1). In both instances, corroborated by the course observations, the PSTs forced the issue when bringing their practical issues into the course discussions. The instructor was not closed off to these but was often focused on the theoretical coursework that revolved around the articles they had read throughout the week before class. Only three of the 12 classes observed had intentional time to unpack their student teaching time. The PSTs often found apertures for their experience in the discussions around the articles, which could have been the instructor's intent. However, it was typically the PSTs who had to take the initiative.

While the participants appreciated the strong theoretical foundation the program provided them, there was a strong desire for ways to apply the program's lofty ideals. The discourse around this was varied. The PSTs' tone was one of hopefulness that practices would be shared in their methods course, but also some sense of confusion that practices were not more prevalent throughout the programming. Budd shared her view: "We're reading all of the scholarly articles, like this is how you become a pedagogue, like a culturally responsive teacher. This is how it looks. But I feel the reality of actually teaching is way completely different to that" (Budd Interview 1). Elle had a similar feeling about the preparation: "They do challenge us to create different types of lessons. They challenge us to take a lot of things into account whenever we work with students. I think I just question: Are they just saying urban means Title One?" (Elle Interview 1). When Vernita was asked about implementing a constructivist approach in her placement, she said: "I'm still working on it because I don't know, it's hard for me to ask meaningful questions or have meaningful discussions [with the cooperating teacher]. It's difficult sometimes, but it's definitely a skill that I'm still working on," (Vernita Interview 1). Each participant mentioned something that the program emphasized, whether that be culturally responsive teaching, being an urban teacher, or constructivism, and how they were falling short due to a gap between the two worlds.

This leads to a second commonality: the university and school being two completely separate sites where learning *about* teaching happens at the university and learning *how* to teach happens in the school (see also Neel, 2017). One way that this was abundantly apparent to us was in the lack of mention of university learning when discussing their experiences at their placements in their reflections. There were indirect references, such as Budd discussing relevancy (Budd Reflection 4), Elle being cognizant of her positionality as a White woman when teaching imperialism (Elle Reflection 6) or pushing students up Bloom's Taxonomy (Vernita Reflection 2). It was telling that the PSTs never explicitly connected the university to these concepts in their reflections, even when the knowledge was transported across the worlds, it was not

consciously recognized. This suggested that the PSTs had a clear distinction between the university and the school sites in their mind, weakening their practice-theory connection as the relationship between the two was not deeply examined. Again, there are discrepancies between how each participant describes the two-worlds. For example, when Budd was asked about the expectations of the school and university, she responded:

I would say the reality of teaching the curriculum that needs to be taught. Of course they want us to teach about the counter perspective, but where do we find the room to teach that in a meaningful way? (Budd Interview 2).

Budd saw a disparity between the standards-aligned curriculum the school demanded and the counter-narratives the university expected. In this same vein, Elle thought the program to be nominally “urban” as she felt the program placed the PSTs in non-urban environments but had expectations that the PSTs would learn to be urban teachers. She explained:

Are they just saying urban means Title One? I just feel like that's what I've got in my experience in teaching, not necessarily teaching a diverse set of student population, but rather just mostly just how to teach students from low income, that's like the only thing I'm used to so far with my student teaching, but that's what it seems like it's more focused on, (Elle Interview 2).

Throughout both interviews, Elle wrestled with what the program meant when it described itself as “urban” and by the second interview, seemed to conclude that what the program meant by urban was Title I (low income). Because of this, she felt that her preparation for urban environments did not align with her student teaching experience in a Title I school that was overwhelmingly Latinx. Vernita saw the same discrepancy between the program’s teaching model and her experiences in her placement. Similarly to Budd, it was finding room for counter-narratives. In describing her CT’s approach, Vernita said: “She's a bit older-fashioned, I guess. Doesn't challenge any of the dominant narratives that I would like to,” (Vernita Interview 2). While Vernita does not explain why her CT omitted counter-narratives, other than that she was “old-fashioned”, it created a gap in what the university recommended and what Vernita was experiencing in her placement.

The reflections bore out much of the same, as the PSTs uncritically accepted the “crazy” (Elle Reflection 4) reality of grading and testing, instead choosing to go with the flow within the school. Vernita expressed frustration with the review being too long and unproductive (Vernita Reflection 3), and Budd took issue with what she deemed to be overly harsh discipline (Budd Reflection 5), but university learning was never mentioned in their critiques. In these scenarios where there is a tension between the school and university, the PSTs generally go with the CTs’ methods (Fitchett & Moore, 2022). This is partially because PSTs are in a relatively powerless position (Francis, 2017) and partially because PSTs place a primacy on the methods they see as practically effective (Valencia et al., 2009). In the course observations, this tension between the two-worlds that the PSTs were experiencing was never brought up, meaning it was running parallel to the official script but only made visible to the PSTs.

Interestingly, what made the program alluring to the PSTs differed from what the professors saw as the most appealing aspects. The professors believed the best selling point of the program was that it challenged dominant notions of social studies to support the critical development of teachers. The PSTs saw the program more instrumentally, viewing it as an efficient path towards becoming a certified teacher. Budd chose it because it was “easier to get into” and would “give us enough space for us to kind of figure out what kind of teacher you want to be” (Budd Interview 2). For Elle, she knew she wanted to be a high school

teacher and talked to her advisor: “I talked to my advisor and said I would like to do middle school or high school, and he said there's this thing called urban teaching, and you get your certification to teach social studies and I was already a history minor,” (Elle Interview 2). Vernita’s experience was different since she transferred from another university teacher preparation program. However, her reasoning was also pragmatic: “But this program you're learning to be a teacher and not just learning your content. And I feel like before I transferred I wasn't,” (Vernita Interview 1). What was telling about all three PSTs’ responses was that criticality did not appear in their reasoning for choosing the program, which ran counter to why professors believed prospective students chose it. Once again, the official script and counterscript had a modicum of congruence; both wanted motivated teaching students, and some dissension as to the reasons for joining the program.

Some PSTs tended to connect theoretical statements to the university and practical ones to their placement. There was rarely an overlap between the two, indicating a weak practice-theory connection. Other PSTs’ practice-theory connection was stronger as they did bring in theoretical concepts such as antiracism and constructivism but often called back to their practicum experience when discussing how they learned to teach.

Noteworthy is that this counterscript was not readily apparent to the professors and Ph.D. students who designed and taught the methods courses. This is consistent with Gutierrez et al.’s (1995) point of the parallel nature of the two scripts. The script, laden with power, determined the route the PSTs took, and in response, the counterscript emerged, often presenting itself as dissatisfaction or a resigned compliance. The PST discontentment was present in their interactions but was not made public, although it was alluded to when they mentioned a text message group chat they created. Thus, they remained invisible to the script. The PSTs believed their scant interactions with the program's professors contributed to the misalignment between their experiences and what the program believed their experiences to be. Budd explained:

I've never met with any of the higher-ups, any of them... I mean it's kind of just a way it goes back to what education is right. They can plan out the whole curriculum. But if you don't make that meaningful connection with the students, it kind of invalidates. (Budd Interview 1)

Elle had a similar sentiment when asked how much interaction she had with the professors: “Man, almost none. I would have loved that because whenever my CT would be like, “So why urban teaching?” And I'm like I think they just kind of named it that honestly,” (Elle Interview 1). When Vernita was asked about her interaction with the professors, she responded: “They're not talking so I talk to my CT, but I lean on my cohort a lot because we're all basically on the same boat. So It's helpful to hear what they use and what works for them,” (Vernita Interview 1). It was telling that Vernita pivoted to her CT and cohort, which indicated that the professors were unavailable and perhaps remote from the PSTs. Since there was a dearth of interaction between the professors and the PSTs, the professors could easily assume the official script as they would have no real contact, even obliquely, with the counterscript, keeping it concealed from their perceptions. Moreover, PST alignment with the script betrayed their allegiance to the counterscript, indicating they had not appropriated the dominant script (Smith, 2004) to form a transcendent script. Here, we can find space to bring the scripts closer together to take steps towards a mutually beneficial teacher preparation experience.

## Discussion

Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann's (1985) two-worlds pitfall has had a profound impact on teacher education scholarship, and one hope of this project was to see if there were any generational changes to their work. Given the historical structure of teacher education (Labree, 2008), this case makes it appear as though theory remains the domain of the academy and practice that of schools. Furthermore, through the social heteroglossia frame, we get an insight into the PST discourse around the two-worlds and practice-theory connection. The official script, inscribed with power, has a centripetal effect working on crafting a unified narrative. However, the centrifugal nature of heteroglossia creates room for resistance (Bakhtin, 1981) and transformation (Gutierrez et al., 1995). In our case, the PSTs' counterscript shed light on the dissonance they experienced between the theory of the university and practice within their placements, which led to a disconnect and stunted their move towards the common goal of critical praxis.

While we understand that total reconciliation of the two scripts is probably impossible given the dynamic, dialectic relationship between them (Fairclough, 1992), bringing them closer together can create an environment where praxis is mutually developed. Optimistically, there was much overlap between the two scripts. The official script was generally accepted, while the counterscript was hidden from the professors. The program's goals aligning with the PSTs created a blind, groping collaboration between the two scripts that could be potentially generative. Using their shared goals of criticality and being prepared to teach as foundational building blocks, the counterscript could be made more apparent through communication to the professors, and the official script could be opened up and subject to more PST input. This would alleviate the blindness and perhaps transform the unilateral actions towards teacher preparation into more collaborative ones. We believe this to be possible because both parties have shared values and goals. In bringing the scripts closer together, horizontal expertise (Gutierrez et al., 2019; Zeichner et al., 2015) can be more fully embraced, allowing PSTs to have one hand on the wheel when steering the development of their critical praxis.

The two scripts and the participants were not the only interlocutors. The context, location, social norms, and overall zeitgeist shape the discourse through dialogic interaction with the scripts (Bakhtin, 1981). Specific to our case, the critical manner of the program more than just colored the responses of both sets of participants but acted as a member through its constant presence and powerful influence. This was most evident in the PSTs expressing their pragmatic motivation of joining the program as a path towards teaching certification, where the program's critical spirit was not expressed as a significant factor. In every other response, the participants' responses were dripping with critical nomenclature, making it clear that the official script had started to become the transcendent script and criticality molding the PSTs' responses similarly to that of another dialogist. We attempted to control for the context by having fellow PSTs conduct the interviews and having the interviews done over Zoom outside of the university setting. This further indicated that criticality was not context-dependent but rather present in the conversation as a third party.

Lastly, by bringing the two scripts closer together, the inversion of the source (familiar) to target (abstract) (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) becomes possible in teacher education. Allowing PST experience to come from the "source", or their teacher preparation experience, can help dictate the "target", or lessons, curriculum, and pedagogy imbued with critical theory (Peercy & Troyan, 2017). This can be done through a third space (Gutierrez et al., 1995) and/or foregrounding PST experience to inform the theory present in the program (Korthagen et al., 2006). Generating time and room for the third space has proven tricky as aligning the two worlds is challenging given their differing goals and pressures (Stroupe et al., 2022). It can also become too dependent on graduate and undergraduate students (Valencia et al., 2009), keeping the ideological core of both worlds, the teachers and professors, insulated from the conversation within the third space,

maintaining the bifurcated scripts. There has been positive work using university coursework and reflection as a third space (Fitchett & Moore, 2022). We agree with the key role of reflection in developing PST praxis. We contend that the reflexive approach should not be laid solely at the feet of the PSTs. Instead, the professors, PSTs, course instructors, and teachers should also reflect on the praxis the PSTs are being apprenticed into as well as how they are challenging or leaning into the ideological zeitgeist of the context and epoch to best co-generate liberatory praxis.

Some work has been done in this direction, and the results are promising. A recommendation is for teacher education programs to embrace horizontal expertise (Anagnostopoulos et al., 2007; Zeichner et al., 2015) for better alignment with the schools. Alignment between the school and the academy has been shown to increase the durability of critical practices (Fitchett & Moore, 2022), foster a stronger sense of community in both worlds (Stroupe et al., 2022), deepen PSTs' ideological commitment to criticality (Francis et al., 2018), and move feedback from the rote and technical to something more conceptual and strategic (Valencia et al., 2009). A strong first step is acknowledging the existence of the counter-script and soliciting feedback to tailor the program to the PSTs' wants and needs. We simultaneously found the counter-script pragmatic and ideological, indicating that the PSTs are already fusing their practical and theoretical understandings. Programs can lean into this reflexive, if nascent, praxis and support it through intentional, guided reflection and flexibly practicing practices that align cleanly with their contexts.

At the risk of suggesting more work, it might behoove professors to observe PSTs in their placement sites. In doing so, they could better gauge how well their instruction makes it into the PSTs' enactments. An additional, longer-term benefit is that a stronger bond can be built between professors and PSTs, strengthening the bridge between the school and the university. This may also help with the CT selection process. Finding CTs that are aligned with the university ideologically has been shown to have substantial benefits for PSTs (see: Fitchett & Moore, 2022; Francis, 2017; Stroupe et al., 2022) to prevent them from being severed from their ideological approach when they step through the school doors. Finding the right match with CTs can be complex and laborious (Magaya & Crawley, 2011). However, it may be beneficial if the professors can glean insights into the CTs' ideological approach by observing them in their classroom.

Positively, the program's critical bent meant dispositions open to feedback and change, which bodes well for bringing the scripts closer together. Particularly, teacher education can build from orienting students towards criticality to applying critical theories for a stronger sense of praxis. Inclusion of practices need not collapse into the methods fetish (Bartolome, 2004) or rote technical preparation (Stroupe et al., 2022) but, rather, can deepen the PSTs' understanding of theory (Fitchett & Moore, 2022). A more profound understanding of theory through practice would help PSTs leave the academy with a fuller sense of their praxis, satisfying the primary goal of both the professors and the PSTs. This can start with a (re)examination of the two-worlds PSTs inhabit through analysis and reconciliation of the official and counterscript and how those contribute towards their praxis for an educational renaissance.

### **Limitations**

We understand that the majority of the researchers' positionalities as indigenous-insiders (Banks, 1998) have the potential to limit the analysis and subsequent findings of this study because of the past experiences working with the professor participants, as well as being past and current members of the teacher preparation program. However, we assert that this positionality also gave us a shared bonding experience with the participants, particularly the PST participants. In addition, the analysis and multistep coding processes conducted during the research strove to mitigate potential biases. We acknowledge that the number of participants for this project is relatively small, with six in total. Nevertheless, we firmly believe that this allowed us to spend quality time interviewing the participants, observing the PSTs, and reading the

PSTs' reflections. By no means do we claim that our findings are generalizable due to the intrinsic nature of qualitative studies and our limited data sets, but we do hope for this research to serve as a reference or starting point for other teacher preparation programs searching for ways to perceive and address their theory and practice disparities.

### References

- American Historical Association (2025, February 5). *AHA-OAH statement on executive order "Ending Radical Indoctrination in K-12 Schooling"*. American Historical Association. <https://www.historians.org/news/aha-oah-statement-on-executive-order-ending-radical-indoctrination-in-k-12-schooling/>
- An, S. (2020). Learning racial literacy while navigating white social studies. *The Social Studies*, 111(4), 174-181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00377996.2020.1718584>
- Anagnostopoulos, D., Smith, E. R., & Basmadjian, K. G. (2007). Bridging the university-school divide: Horizontal expertise and the two-worlds pitfall. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(2), 138-152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487106297841>
- Apple, M. W. (2001). Comparing neo-liberal projects and inequality in education. *Comparative Education*, 37(4), 409-423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060120091229>
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. University of Texas Press.
- Banks, J. A. (1998). The lives and values of researchers: Implications for educating citizens in a multicultural society. *Educational Researcher*, 27(7), 4-17. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X027007004>
- Bartolome, L. I. (2004). Critical pedagogy and teacher education: Radicalizing prospective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1), 97-122.
- Bratanen, B., & Kwok, A. (2023). From interest to entry: The teacher pipeline from college application to initial employment. *American Educational Research Journal*, 60(5), 941-985. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312231185733>
- Brighouse, H. (2006). *On education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203390740>
- Buitink, J. (2009). What and how do student teachers learn during school-based teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(1), 118-127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.07.009>
- Chubbuck, S. M., & Zembylas, M. (2016). Social justice and teacher education: Context, theory, and practice. In J. Loughran & M. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *International handbook of teacher education* (pp. 463-501). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-0369-1\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-0369-1_14)
- Cochran-Smith, M., Villegas, A. M., Abrams, L., Chavez-Moreno, L., Mills, T., Stern, R. (2015). Critiquing teacher preparation research: An overview of the field, part II. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(2), 109-121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114558268>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research & design* (4th ed.). Sage Publishing.

- Crowley, R. M., & King, L. J. (2018). Making inquiry critical: Examining power and inequity in the classroom. *Social Education*, 82(1), 14-17.
- Daniels, J. R., & Varghese, M. (2019). Troubling practice: Exploring the relationship between whiteness and practice-based teacher education in considering a raciolinguicized teacher subjectivity. *Educational Researcher*, 49(1), 56-63.  
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X19879450>
- Denzin, N. K. (2015). What is critical qualitative inquiry? In G. S. Canella, M. S. Perez, & P. S. Pasque (Eds.), *Critical qualitative inquiry: Foundations and futures* (pp. 31-50). Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800416681864>
- Dilworth, P. P. (2012). Multicultural citizenship education: Case studies from social studies classrooms. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 32(2), 153-186.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2004.10473251>
- Dover, A. G., Henning, N., & Agarwal-Rangnath, R. (2016). Reclaiming agency: Justice-oriented social studies teachers respond to changing curricular standards. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59, 457-467. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.07.016>
- Dutro, E., & Cartun, A. (2016). Cut to the core practices: Toward visceral disruptions of binaries in PRACTICE-based teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 58, 119-128.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.05.001>
- Ellingson, L. L. (2009). *Engaging crystallization in qualitative research*. Sage Publishing.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412991476>
- Ellis, V. (2010). Impoverishing experience: The problem of teacher education in England. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(1), 105-120.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02607470903462230>
- Evans, R. W. (2015). The social studies wars: Now and then. In W. Parker (Ed.) *Social studies today: Research and practice* (pp. 25-34). Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. & Buchmann, M. (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher preparation. *Teachers College Record*, 87(1), 53-65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146818508700107>
- Fitchett, P. G., & Moore, S. B. (2022). Democratizing social studies teacher education through mediated field experiences and practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 46(3), 169-193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2021.09.005>
- Francis, A. T. (2017). Reforming only half: A study of practice-based teacher education in traditional field placements. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 29(3), 235-260.
- Francis, A. T., Olson, M., Weinberg, P. J., & Pfeiffer, A. (2018). Not just for novices: The programmatic impact of practice-based teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 40(2), 119-132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2018.1424053>

- Freire, P. (1968/2018). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (50th anniversary ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Hurlbut, A. R., & Krutka, D. G. (2020). Where do we start?: Initiating a practice-based teacher education program around high-leverage practices. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, 9(2), 169-199.
- Girard, B., Harris, L. M., Mayger, L. K., Kessner, T. M., & Reid, S. (2021). "There's no way we can teach all of this": Factors that influence secondary history teachers' content choices. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 49(2), 227-261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2020.1855280>
- Gutierrez, K. D., Higgs, J., Lizarraga, J. R., & Rivero, E. (2019). Learning as movement in social design-based experiments: Play as a leading activity. *Human Development*, 62(1-2), 66-82. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000496239>
- Gutierrez, K. D., Rymes, B., & Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. Board of Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3), 445-472. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.65.3.r16146n25h4mh384>
- Hawkey, K., & Prior, J. (2011). History, memory cultures and meaning in the classroom. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43(2), 231-247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2010.516022>
- Jadallah, E. (2000). Constructivist learning experiences for social studies education. *The Social Studies*, 91(5), 221-225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00377990009602469>
- Johannesson, I. A. (1998). Genealogy and progressive politics: Reflections on the notion of usefulness. In T. S. Popkewitz & M. Brennan (Eds.), *Foucault's challenge: Discourse, knowledge, and power in education* (pp. 297-315). Teachers College Press.
- Kavanagh, S. S., & Danielson, K. A. (2020). Practicing justice, justifying practice: Toward critical practice teacher education. *American Education Research Journal*, 57(1), 69-105. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219848691>
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2009). Situated learning theory and the pedagogy of teacher education: Towards an integrative view of teacher behavior and teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 98-106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.05.001>
- Korthagen, F., Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (2006). Developing fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 1020-1041. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.022>
- Koulouri, C. (2011). Teaching 'victims': History and memory in classrooms. *Der Donauraum*, 51(1), 55-64. <https://doi.org/10.7767/dnrm.2011.51.1.55>
- Labree, D. F. (2008). An uneasy relationship: The history of teacher education in the university. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemster, & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research and teacher education* (3rd ed.). (pp. 290-306). Association of Teacher Educators. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315269566-4>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2021). Crafting a culturally relevant social studies approach. In G.

- Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Culturally relevant pedagogy: Asking a different question* (pp. 201-215). Teachers College Press. [doi.org/10.1515/9780791490600-012](https://doi.org/10.1515/9780791490600-012)
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lampert, M., & Graziani, F. (2009). Instructional activities as a tool for teachers' and teacher educators' learning. *The Elementary School Journal*, 109(5), 491-509. <https://doi.org/10.1086/596998>
- Loewen, J. W. (2007). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. Touchstone. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.26193071>
- Loughran, J. (2019). Pedagogical reasoning: The foundation of the professional knowledge of teaching. *Teachers and Teaching*, 25(5), 523-535. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2019.1633294>
- Luke, A. (1992). The body literate: Discourse and inscription in early childhood. *Linguistics and Education*, 4(1), 107-129. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0898-5898\(92\)90021-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0898-5898(92)90021-N)
- Magaya, A., & Crawley, T. (2011). The perceptions of school administrators on the selection criteria and training of cooperating teachers; Strategies to foster collaboration between universities public schools. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation I*, 1-16.
- Matsumoto-Royo, K., & Ramirez-Montoya, M. S. (2021). Core practices in practice-based teacher education: A systematic literature review of its teaching and assessment process. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 70, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.101047>
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd edition). Sage Publishing.
- Merriam, S. B., Johnson-Bailey, J., Lee, M-Y., Kee, Y., Ntseane, G., & Muhamad, M. (2001). Power and positionality: Negotiating insider/outsider status within and across cultures. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20(3), 405-416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370120490>
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and Implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A.M., & Saldaña, J. (2019). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods source book* (4th ed.). Sage Publishing.
- Monreal, T. (2021). Stitching together more expansive Latinx teacher self/ves: Movidas of Rasquache and spaces of counter-conduct in El Sur Latinx. *Theory, Research, and Action in Urban Education*, 6(1), 37-51.
- Mueller, J., & O'Connor, C. (2006). Telling and retelling about self and "others": How pre-service teachers (re)interpret privilege and disadvantage in one college classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 840-856. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.01.011>

- Neel, M. A. (2017). Making sense and facing tensions: An investigation of core practice complexities. *Teaching Education*, 28(3), 257-278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2017.1296826>
- Parkes, R. J. (2007). Reading history curriculum as a postcolonial text: Towards a curricular response to the History Wars in Australia and beyond. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 37(4), 383-400. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2007.00392.x>
- Peercy, M. M., & Troyan, F.J. (2017). Making transparent the challenges of developing a practice-based pedagogy of teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 61, 26-36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.10.005>
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Salinas, C., & Blevins, B. (2014). Critical historical inquiry: How might pre-service teachers confront master historical narratives? *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 9(3), 35-50. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SSRP-03-2014-B0003>
- Santiago, M. (2019). Historical inquiry to challenge the narrative of racial progress. *Cognition and Instruction*, 37(1), 93-117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2018.1539734>
- Schmidt, S. J. (2015). A queer arrangement of school: using spatiality to understand inequity. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 47(2), 253-273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2014.986764>
- Schon, D. A. (1995). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 27(6), 27-34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.1995.10544673>
- Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L. S., Moore, C., Jackson, A. Y., & Fry, P. G. (2004). Tensions in learning to teach: Accommodation and the development of a teaching identity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(1), 8-24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487103260067>
- Smith, A. L. (2004). Heteroglossia, "common sense", and social memory. *American Ethnologist*, 31(2), 251-269. <https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.2004.31.2.251>
- Souto-Manning, M. (2019). Transforming university-based teacher education: Preparing asset-, equity-, and justice-oriented teachers within the contemporary political context. *Teachers College Record*, 121, 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811912100601>
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Sage Publishing.
- Stroupe, D., Gotwals, A., Christensen, J., & Wray, K. A. (2022). Becoming ambitious: How a practice-based methods course and "macroteaching" shaped beginning teachers' critical pedagogical discourses. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 33(6), 683-702. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2021.1988037>
- Suskey, R., Kaka, S. J., & Colley, L. (2024). Meeting the moment: How micro-inquiry could save us in these divisive times. *Social Education*, 88(6), 356-362.
- Taylor Jaffee, A. (2016). Social studies pedagogy for Latino/a Newcomer Youth: Toward a theory

- of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 44(2), 147-183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2016.1171184>
- Thomas, G. (2021). *How to do your case study* (3rd ed.). Sage Publishing.
- Valencia, S. W., Martin, S. D., Place, N. A., & Grossman, P. (2009). Complex interactions in student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(3), 304-322. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109336543>
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831204100223>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Sage Publishing.
- Zeichner, K., Payne, K. A., & Brayko, K. (2015). Democratizing teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(2), 122-135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114560908>
- Zimmerman, J. (2002). *Whose America?: Culture wars in the public schools*. Harvard University Press.

