

Typologies for Effectiveness: Characteristics of Effective Teachers in Urban Learning Environments

Derrick Robinson

University of South Dakota

Chance W. Lewis

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

ABSTRACT: Despite increasing diversity in U.S. schools, the topic of teacher effectiveness remains to be dominated by a universal narrative. This study applies critical theory, critical race theory, and culturally responsive pedagogy to position teacher effectiveness as contextual to urban schools and relational to the asset-based view of the learner. This study employs a phenomenological design to gather the shared experiences of nine teacher educators with teaching and service experiences in urban schools. The findings produce typologies of effective and ineffective teachers, identifies characteristics of effective urban teachers, and details the style responsiveness of effective teachers in urban schools. This study concludes with recommendations for school leaders and teacher educators to use the findings to impact the effectiveness of in-service and pre-service teachers for urban schools.

Keywords: teacher effectiveness, urban schools, cultural responsiveness

Introduction

The central problem observed in this study is the problem of the long tradition of universality in the approach to effectiveness, in which effectiveness is a one-size fits all model regardless of school setting (Eckert, 2013; Haberman, 1994). The universal approach defines teacher effectiveness as an outcomes-based perspective rooted in the following paradigms: a) the reliance on student test scores, and/or b) teacher credentialing (Rockoff & Speroni, 2011; Silva-Mangiante, 2011). This perspective assumes that if the tests are the same and there are certified teachers in classrooms, effectiveness can be known by the outputs of the school or classroom. This philosophy is problematic in that the assumption of universal effective teaching makes all missteps in the classroom automatically the fault of the learner, which reinforces deficit-based perspectives of learners who do not respond to the universal style of effective teaching. Further, the assumption of universality in effective teaching reinforces a reproductive approach to teaching, affirming of the status quo, that favors the dominant group for which the framework for effectiveness was created (Bennett-deMarrias & LeCompte, 1998). Affirming the status quo absolves society of the need to address teacher effectiveness because the present model is believed to be producing to its expectations. Given increasing projections of school diversity, an assumption of universal effectiveness ignores the reality that classrooms will look different, schools will have different conditions, and the actors within will exercise different means of responding to conditions (Parsons, 1937; U.S. Department of Education, 2015). Finally, holding to a singular, universal claim of effectiveness as a paradigm relieves the education research community of the responsibility of thinking and rethinking about teacher effectiveness. The belief that effective teaching is already known, and universally accepted, implies that there is no

new knowledge to be gained or researched on the topic. Therefore, educational researchers are inclined to explore other critical issues in education.

The purpose of this study is to offer a contextualized view of teacher effectiveness through the agency of current teacher educators who have worked in the urban learning environment to conceive effectiveness for that environment. Three essential research questions guide this study: a) What are the effective, and ineffective, teacher typologies found in urban schools, b) What are the essential characteristics of an effective teacher in an urban school as conceived by teacher educators experienced in urban schools, and c) What techniques, deliveries, or styles are associated with effective teaching in urban schools?

Conceptual Framework

This study adopts the lens of critical theory to examine how structures support a society in which dominant groups exploit and oppress subordinate groups through the exercise of hegemony to socialize morality, conduct, choice, and language systems (Gramsci, 1929; Habermas, 1970). Where critical theory assesses explores the hegemony of dominant groups over subordinate groups through the lens of social class, Critical Race Theory frames race, and thereby racism, as a socially constructed tool to advance white dominance (Delgado & Stefaniec, 2007). Though coined as a legal and social assessment of society, Critical Race Theory is connected to the institution of education through the scholarship of Ladson-Billings (1998) and Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995). Their pioneering work skillfully acknowledges the significant role that white dominance, and the centrality of race, plays in scripting curriculum, othering of marginalized minority students through deficit-based thinking, and the pervasive myth of colorblindness and meritocracy to explain outcomes that ignore both physical and intellectual opportunity imbalances (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1998).

Critical Race Theory in education offers a challenge to the deficit-based meta-narrative of marginalized minority students and can be aligned to culturally responsive pedagogy to affirm the existence of students (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1998). Culturally responsive pedagogy affirms assertions of Ladson-Billings (1998) and Milner (2008) that teaching and teacher training--informed by cultural background, assets of the learner, and relationship-building--must be included in the discussion of effectiveness. Noting the principles of culturally responsive pedagogy, Brown-Jeffy and Cooper (2011) affirm the importance of: a) identity affirmation to academic achievement, b) focus on equity and excellence, c) learning and teaching style variations, d) connection of school to home experiences, and e) relationships.

Methodology

Design

This study employs a qualitative approach informed by a phenomenological design that employs semi-structured, open-ended interview questions to answer the three research questions (Creswell, 2013; Moustakas, 1994). The three research questions seek to determine the effective and ineffective teacher typologies conceived by participants, essential characteristics of an effective teacher in an urban school, and the techniques, deliveries, and styles associated with effective teaching in urban schools.

Population and Sample

This study explores the shared experiences of nine teacher educators with significant experiences in urban schools. Significant experience implies five or more years of direct teaching or administrative experience in urban schools. This study uses five years as a parameter for two

reasons: a) to ensure that the participant has had experiences to contribute to the study, and b) research suggests that nearly 50% of teachers leave the profession within five years (Ingersoll, Merrill, & May, 2014). The sample represents a population of teacher educators that are informed by both research and craft knowledge (Haberman, 2010). Participants, 8 women and 1 man, met three criteria for the study: a) must be a current university-based teacher educator, b) have documented research and scholarship with an emphasis related to teaching in urban schools, and c) must have 5 or more years of direct classroom teaching experience or a combination of instructional and administrative service to urban schools. The duality of experience in teacher education and K-12 urban schools, as shown in Table 1, positions participants to provide insight on teacher preparation and urban schools over a broad range of time. Participant names were de-identified and replaced with pseudonyms.

Table 1: Participant Experience and Research Interests

Pseudonym	K-12 Urban Teaching Experience	Teacher Education Experience	Research Interests
Allison	14	25	Mathematics Education; Effective Math Teaching in Urban Schools.
Carol	14	19	Multicultural Education; Urban Education; Literacy Education.
Gwen	13	4	Educator Efficacy; Critical Race Theory; Urban Education.
Isaiah	19	12	African American Students in Mathematics; Teaching Mathematics for Social Justice.
Karen	5	4	Black Feminist Thought, Black Male Teachers, Critical Race Theory; Culturally Responsive Pedagogy.
Lauryn	10	6	Urban Education; Teacher Preparation and Effectiveness; Social Studies Education; Critical Race Theory.
Michelle	10	10	Urban Education; Elementary Education.
Patrice	12	3	Urban Education; Mathematics Education.
Wendy	6	2	Reading and Literacy Studies; Urban Education.

Note. Information for this chart was gathered from the Curriculum Vitae of the participants as of November 2015.

Instrumentation and Analysis

The interview questions in this study are aligned to a research question and one of three categories: a) *interrelations*, b) *experiences*, and c) *descriptors*. Interrelations, used to uncover the participant's experiences and insight on power relations and dispositions, ask questions such as: *What have been some policies and practices at the school site-level that impact teacher effectiveness?* Experiences, which prompts to recall and share experiences such as success stories

in urban schools, asks questions such as: *Can you provide me with an example, scenario, or story of effective teaching in terms of instructional delivery, interpersonal skills, and classroom management?* Descriptors, words, or ideas associated with an effective teacher ask questions such as: *In terms of attitudes and ideologies, what descriptors that you would use to characterize an effective teacher for urban schools?* The one-hour open-ended, semi-structured interviews involved a baseline of seven questions.

The participants were also provided teacher typologies from established research of Abbate-Vaughn (2004), Haberman (2004) and Ladson-Billings (2009) during the interview, as shown in Table 2. The teacher typologies were prepared as a single document and presented to the participants to stimulate thinking on the prompt and question: *Gloria Ladson-Billings describes six types of teacher behavior patterns: Conductors, Coaches, Tutors, General Contractors, Custodians, and Referral Agents. Martin Haberman describes: Stars and Quitters. Jorgelina Abbate-Vaughn describes three types of teacher ideologies: Quiets, Academics, and Efforts. Who did we miss?* Participants provided their thoughts on the typologies and were asked to offer typologies that they have encountered in their experiences in urban schools.

Table 2: Teacher Typology Prompt

Scholar	Typology	Description
Ladson-Billings ^a	Conductors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Believes students are capable of excellence ● Assumes responsibility for ensuring excellence
	Coaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Believes students are capable of excellence ● Share responsibility with parents, community, and students
	Tutors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Believes students can improve ● It is students' responsibility to improve
	General Contractors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Believes improvement is possible ● Shifts responsibility to other resources
	Custodians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does not believe much can be done to help students ● Does not seek resources for students
	Referral Agents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does not believe much can be done to help students ● Shifts responsibility to other personnel (Special Education)
Haberman ^b	Stars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Believe success is effort, regardless of background ● Commitment to eliciting, fostering, and rewarding effort
	Quitters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Believes that there is a "general intelligence factor" ● See removing students as best solution for ideal teaching situation
Abbate-Vaughn ^c	Quiets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A good classroom is a quiet classroom ● Textbook/worksheet used to resolve discipline
	Academics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Knowing Shakespeare/traditional curriculum is ticket to college ● Addresses behavior by contrasting it to college-

bound behavior

- | | |
|---------|---|
| Efforts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Questioning relevancy of knowledge is acceptable ● Includes student background and strengths in lesson |
|---------|---|

Note. The literature to support the typologies are derived from the following sources:

^aLadson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

^bHaberman, M. (2004). *Star Teachers*. Houston, Texas: The Haberman Foundation

^cAbbate-Vaughn, J. (2004). The things the carry: Ideology in an urban teacher professional community. *The Urban Review*, 36(4), 227-249

A modified phenomenological reduction was used for analysis. Audio-recorded data was transcribed and horizontalized to identify significant statements (Moustakas, 1994). Horizontalization, as noted by Moustakas (1994), involves taking participants statements and adding them as contributions of knowledge. Horizontalized knowledge became elements of data integrated into meaning units. The meaning units became the qualities, characteristics, and approaches of effective teachers. Meaning units were aligned to support the development of the teacher typology, identified by participants.

Findings

Effective and Ineffective Teacher Typologies

The first research question seeks to gain participant reflections on the types of teachers they have seen, encountered, or conceive in urban schools. The participants provided new/elaborated typologies of teachers, six effective and three ineffective. Allison describes the *Anti-Deficit teachers* as teachers who “always look for the best, the shining examples... put the success stories out there.” The continual belief and praise of the shining examples, as described by Allison, comes from the ability to maintain an asset-based view students. Karen adds to Allison’s anti-deficit teacher through contributing the *Cultural Pedagogue*, as an effective teacher in the urban schools. The cultural pedagogue is “that teacher who knows who his or her students are and integrate students’ cultural background.” Karen adds, “I think that’s an important type of teacher who’s willing to go wherever his or her students are and bring that into the classroom.” The anti-deficit and cultural pedagogue represent an extension of *Stars* (Haberman, 2004) and *Efforts* (Abbate-Vaughn, 2004) which display continual willingness to elicit the strengths and contributions of their students. Isaiah adds the element of *love* as an effective teacher type in the assertion of a *Love Pedagogy*. The *Love typology*, as personified by Isaiah, realizes that, “there should be someplace that, even if it’s just for one hour a day...that they know that they are loved and they’re loved for who they are, what they are, what they have to contribute.” Love is positioned as an ideology of *Conductors* (Ladson-Billings, 2009) and *Efforts* (Abbate-Vaughn, 2004) that drives them to create the classroom as supportive spaces that honors student background.

Lauryn, Michelle, and Carol construct effective teacher types in urban learning environments by their commitment to excellence and equity. Lauryn contributed the *Conductor/Coach*, merging two typologies of Ladson-Billings (2009). The conductor/coaches join personal responsibility for student excellence with parent, community, and student responsibility. Lauryn notes,

I don't think it's enough...to just teach....I really think about teaching being so much more than just content, right? It becomes more about also relationships. It becomes more about perspectives. It becomes more about understanding others. It becomes more about community.

Personal and shared responsibility, as noted in Ladson-Billings (2009) *Conductors and Coaches*, is also present with Michelle's assessment of *Warm-Demanders*, teachers who complement high expectations with strong interpersonal relationships. Michelle attributes her present practices to her early alignment to warm-demanders, stating "I have high expectations for my students even now, but I also spend a lot of time building rapport with my students." Carol, in employing the *golden rule*, encompasses the descriptions of Lauryn and Michelle on effective teaching with a commitment to excellence and equity. The *Golden Rulers*, as contributed by Carol, are teachers who are "willing to treat these students and deliver to them what they would want their own loved ones to have." The Golden Ruler is also closely aligned with *Conductors* (Ladson-Billings, 2009). These six effective typologies, as actors in the urban learning environment, help ease the conditions for learning within the classrooms.

The urban learning environment can be made challenging by ineffective teacher types that strain the conditions of the classroom. Participants attribute teacher ineffectiveness to either the presence of deficit-based thinking or lack of preparation. Patrice and Gwen offer an ineffective teacher type that advances deficit-based thinking in seemingly sincere ways. Gwen succinctly frames these teachers as the "*Dangerous Minds*,... 'I'm responsible for everything, and I care about them even more than their families do.'" Through Patrice, we find the *Escaper* teacher. The *escaper*, as offered by Patrice, is "the teacher who believes that succeed means leaving your community." As a teacher educator, Patrice uses this typology to inform her pre-service teaching practices. Patrice shares to pre-service teachers that, "if you [future teachers] force your students to make that choice between their people and this college that they know nothing about, they will choose their people." The advice to future teachers is influenced by Patrice's observation of K-12 teachers who "present education as way for you to get out [of their community]." Patrice advises that "you have to find a way to help kids see college to help their people, support their people. Not something to escape [to]."

Patrice's contribution of the *escaper* teacher is aligned with Gwen's assessment of the *Savior* teacher. The *savior* teacher, as offered by Gwen, advances a deficit-based mindset that is "adversarial, antagonistic to the child's environment." Gwen notes the *savior's* mindset as "a weird thing where they tend to think the students are capable, but only under a specific set of conditions... children have potential, but only if you are in the middle of it." Though seemingly sincere, these ineffective typologies are harmful because, as Gwen concludes, they are often "an improper understanding of [their] role in this child's life." The *escaper* and the *savior*, as conceived by Patrice and Gwen, represent an extension of the *Academic*, provided by Abbate-Vaughn (2004), which does not invest in the cultural capital of students and only respects singular view of success.

Wendy adds another ineffective typology, the *Overwhelmed* teacher. The *overwhelmed* teacher "really had great intentions of becoming a teacher...but they're just so overwhelmed that they don't know where to begin, they don't know where to start, and they don't know who to trust either." The *overwhelmed* typology can be viewed as precursor to *Referral Agents* (Ladson-Billings, 2009), *Quiets* (Abbate-Vaughn, 2004), and *Quitters* (Haberman, 2004). The *overwhelmed* teacher seeks containment, quieting strategies and fear tactics, and shifting responsibility to others, as teaching tools to control classes. When these strategies fail, the

overwhelmed teacher resolves that nothing can be done to teach urban children, symbolically quitting.

Characteristics of an Effective Teacher

The second research question seeks descriptions, experiences, and interrelations of present teacher educators in their reflection on the P-12 teaching experience and their work with current teachers in urban schools. The participants provide an assessment of essential responsive and impactful characteristics of effectiveness. Effectiveness, as conceived by the participants, is characterized by qualities of *kindness, caring, love, knowing, and seeing*.

When asked to describe the effective teacher for urban schools, participants shared significant interpersonal descriptors that characterize responsiveness to learners. Lauryn states that the effective teacher must be “kind and caring...because being kind and caring means that you understand and you accept people for who they are and what they are.” Kindness and caring, as descriptors for participants, directly connects with the characterization of love and Isaiah’s *Loves* typology. As Karen posits that an effective teacher is “kind. That person would be loving. Not afraid to give my child a hug, especially if they’re having a bad day or just to let them know, ‘Hey, it’s good to see you.’” Isaiah adds that “If you don’t love them, you’re never able to go into that space.”

Along with kindness, caring, and love, participants also characterize an effective teacher for urban schools as *knowing*. Knowing, as a characterization of effectiveness, involves the ability to understand and relate to the individual inner workings of children. Aligned with Karen’s *cultural pedagogue* typology, Wendy effectively captures *knowing* in stating “I want them to know about my child as far as their likes, their dislikes, are they morning person, are they not a morning person, what kind of books do they like to read.” Gwen firmly captures this point in stating that an effective teacher is “somebody my child knew every day was looking for him, wanted him to be there, [and] loved him.” It is important to note that Wendy and Gwen, when asked to describe characteristics of effectiveness, positions teacher actions that they would desire for a teacher of their biological children. The quality of knowing is also introspective. Teachers who possess a willingness to know and relate to students, regardless of differing backgrounds, can also be effective teachers. Isaiah asserts that “one thing that is paramount is that you have to admit your racial difference.” In speaking of successful white teachers of black children in mathematics, Isaiah advises his pre-service teachers that, “if you get up there and pretend we’re all the same and that we can throw race out of the window, you’re going to fail.”

Along with the interpersonal skills of loving, caring, kindness, and knowing, participants conceive effective teaching in urban schools as contingent on the ability of *seeing students*. While Allison finds that effective teachers know “that our kids are smart and can do”, she extends this adding that “you’ve got to know that, not just believe it...then, instilling in them...that you know they have it.” From Allison it is gathered that, beyond belief there is knowing, and knowing requires seeing. The notion of seeing students is also aligned with Allison’s *anti-deficit* typology. To truly know a student, effective teachers see intelligence, brilliance, and humanity within their students. Carol, invoking the typology of *golden ruler*, succinctly affirms the notion that effective teachers “see that child as a human being who deserves the best that you can offer.”

Effective Instructional Delivery and Style

The third research question seeks to uncover observable instructional actions associated with effectiveness in urban schools. The effective teacher in urban schools, according to participants, is responsive to students in style and delivery. In assessing style responsiveness,

participants conceive the effective teacher as one who designs an instructional delivery style that works for their children.

Style responsiveness is flexible in delivery, translational in instruction, and reflective in planning. Instructional approaches of effective teachers place heavy emphasis on, as Michelle states, the ability to be “flexible and willing to adapt their instruction” to the needs of student. Patrice, in alignment with Karen’s *cultural pedagogue*, suggests that flexibility in instructional delivery also means that effective teaching is not singular in approach.

The translational approach suggests that the effective teacher constantly works bridge content, what is to be taught and the shared experiences of their children, into meaningful information that makes learning fun and interesting. Bridging content implies knowledge of content, student interests and experiences, and how to connect the two beyond surface level experience. Where Carol posits that effective teachers “makes the curriculum interesting,” Wendy extends this notion through the desire that “a teacher that makes learning fun, and I want a teacher that pushes my student to think critically.” The translational approach, as described by Carol and Wendy, closely aligns with Patrice’s *warm-demander* and Michelle’s *conductor/coach* typology. Isaiah adds that the effective teacher for urban learners also knows that intelligence is measured in “a multiplicity of ways.” Therefore, effective teachers consistently find ways to present material through multiple intelligences and cultural experiences.

Being flexible in style and translation in approach expresses the idea that effective teachers plan and teach with their students in mind. Isaiah, aligning with the *loves* and *cultural pedagogue* typology, frames the effective teacher as “focused on the child, where the child is, [and] what she or he is intellectually [to] constantly be strengthening that intellect.” Focusing on the child requires a level of planning that considers the student and the teacher’s approach to reaching them. Participants express that effective teachers in urban schools are also highly engaged in reflective planning. Gwen, on reflective planning, recounts that the “times when I felt really effective. They always had to do with planning... when I started planning in such a way that it encouraged my students to be more independent.” While there may not be a singular style that identifies effectiveness in urban schools, findings suggest that a learner-focused flexibility in style, a translational instructional approach, and reflective planning are elements to effectiveness.

Implications and Conclusion

Effectiveness in the context of the urban learning environment is a product of dispositional and responsive fit. The six typologies of teachers, while different, each display a dispositional sense of responsibility (Silva-Mangiante, 2011), asset-based perspective of learners (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2009), flexibility in style (Brown-Jeffy & Cooper, 2011; Gay, 2010), and a translational approach to learning (Brown-Jeffy & Cooper, 2011). What generally emerges from the effective typologies is the desire and willingness to go beyond the general expectations of a teacher, the willingness to inconvenience themselves. The willingness to inconvenience themselves is also supported by the observation that participants, particularly Wendy and Gwen, viewed students in urban schools with the same care as their biological children. The identification of effective typologies supported by characteristics and delivery styles in this study also has implications for policy, research, and practice. These characteristics align closely to the work of Rockoff and Speroni (2011) which suggest that subjective evaluations, characteristics, and competencies prior to hire or teaching experience provided more “significant and meaningful information about teacher’s future success in raising achievement” than objective evaluations, value-added measures alone (p. 695).

The Willingness to Inconvenience Themselves

The findings of this study indicate that in urban schools, effective teachers appear to be willing to do the things that are inconvenient. In the findings, Lauryn notes “we have to be willing to inconvenience ourselves...that’s big in urban education.” Effectiveness in this contextual environment involves more than content, test administration, and alignment to curriculum standards. The willingness to inconvenience oneself is align with Gay’s (2010) assertion of the “willingness to improvise...to go beyond established templates and frameworks” (p. 145). Participants note that planning with students in mind, taking the time to know and see student talents and incorporate them into lessons, incorporating multiple intelligences into instruction, and adapting instruction based upon student and class dynamics are not explicit in the job description for teachers. These characteristics, as posited by the participants, align to Brown-Jeffy and Cooper’s (2011) conceptualization of culturally relevant pedagogy.

Effective urban teachers are effective because they are willing to go beyond expectations, even if it means inconveniencing themselves. Effectiveness, then, should be operationalized to include *inputs* and *actions*, as demonstrated by the aforementioned typologies, characteristics, and styles observed in context. It is important to note including inputs and actions, as mentioned in this study, does not replace one universal narrative of effectiveness for another. Rather, it allows effectiveness to move away from a singular, deterministic approach to teaching. Ineffective typologies, through training or disposition, appear to have a diminished appreciation for interpersonal or adaptive qualities that extend beyond content, test administration, and curriculum standards.

Implications for Policy, Practice, and Research

The findings offer opportunities to engage in collaborative partnerships between teacher preparation programs and urban school leaders, at site and district level. This study utilizes the voices of participants who have professional experience in both teacher preparation and K-12 urban schools. Through a collaborative partnerships, their shared knowledge can be utilized to bridge practices between both learning environments. For the teacher preparation program, their continual observation of the K-12 environment keeps teacher educator practices up-to-date with the realities of K-12 teaching and learning. For the K-12 environment, their observation provides insights on evaluation and development of teachers in practice. Focusing on dispositional and technical characteristics of effective and ineffective teachers, collaborative efforts can be made to develop targeted professional development, improved teacher evaluation instruments, and pre-service experiences. As findings suggest the importance of interpersonal skills and relationships, urban school leaders and teacher educators are encouraged to position community-relationships as valuable resources for effectiveness. Further, identification of effective typologies, characteristics, and delivery approaches has important implications for how effective teacher narratives are told and modeled for teachers, leaders, and teacher educators. This study is unique in that it offers an input-based approach to teaching in a contextual learning environments, K-12 urban schools, from a population of teacher educators that have research and craft knowledge of the urban schools (Haberman, 2010). This study uses their shared experiences in urban schools as elements to conceive teacher effectiveness.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, leaders, teachers, and teacher educators can impact the effectiveness discussion in two ways. First, greater promotion, discussion, and identification of effective teacher typologies, characteristics, and approaches among in-service and pre-service

teachers is strongly recommended. This study notes interpersonal skills and instructional styles that are counter narrative to the universal conception of effectiveness. With the findings generated from teacher educators in this study, researchers and practitioners have multiple typologies and characteristics to add to effectiveness discussions.

Second, it is recommended that school leaders and teacher educators utilize the findings to articulate the type of teacher they wish to develop among in-service and pre-service teachers, respectively. As the findings indicate actions that are driven by dispositions, practitioners and researchers can extend the discussion of effectiveness to include dispositional actions of effective and ineffective teachers. Hill-Jackson and Lewis (2010) note that dispositions can be difficult to detect within an abstract environment, this study contributes a specific context for which dispositional effectiveness can be named and actualized. The recommendations suggested in this study provide an opportunity to consider the context schools in the discussion of effectiveness.

References

- Abbate-Vaughn, J. (2004). The things the carry: Ideology in an urban teacher professional community. *The Urban Review*, 36(4), 227-249.
- Bennett deMarrais, K. & LeCompte, M. (1998). *The way schools work: A sociological analysis of education*. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman.
- Brown-Jeffy, S. & Cooper, J. (2011). Toward a conceptual framework of culturally relevant pedagogy: An overview of the conceptual and theoretical literature. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 38(1), 65-84.
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed) [Amazon Kindle version]. Retrieved from www.amazon.com
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2007). Critical race theory and criminal justice. *Humanity and Society*, 31(2), 133-145.
- Eckert, S.A. (2013). What do teaching qualifications mean in urban schools? A mixed methods study of teacher preparation and qualification. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(1), 75-89.
- Gay, G. (2010). Acting on beliefs in teacher education for cultural diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 143-152.
- Gramsci, A. (1929). Intellectuals and hegemony. In C. Lemert (Ed.), *Social theory: The multicultural and classic readings* (4th ed.) (pp. 263-265). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Haberman, M. (1994). Preparing teachers for the real world of urban schools. *The Educational Forum*, 58(2), 162-168.
- Haberman, M. (2004). *Star teachers*. Houston, Texas: The Haberman Foundation.
- Haberman, M. (2010). A modest proposal for making teacher education accountable: How to make university-controlled teacher education accountable for the quality of teachers in schools serving children and youth in poverty. In Hill-Jackson, V. & Lewis, C. (Eds.), *Transforming teacher education: What went wrong with teacher training, and how we can fix it* (pp. 121-152). Sterling, VA.: Stylus Publishing.
- Habermas, J. (1970). Social analysis and communicative competence. In C. Lemert (Ed.), *Social theory: The multicultural and classic readings* (4th ed.) (pp. 387-389). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Hill-Jackson, V. & Lewis, C. (2010). Dispositions matter: Advancing habits of mind for social justice. In Hill-Jackson, V. & Lewis, C. (Eds.), *Transforming teacher education: What*

- went wrong with teacher training, and how we can fix it* (pp. 61-92). Sterling, VA.: Stylus Publishing.
- Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., & May, H. (2014). *What are the effects of teacher education and preparation on beginning teacher attrition?* (Research Report No. 82). Retrieved from the Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7-24.
- Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate, W.F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-68.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Milner, H.R. (2008). Critical race theory and interest convergence as analytic tools in teacher education policies and practices. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 332-345.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. [Amazon Kindle version]. Retrieved from www.amazon.com
- Parsons, T. (1937). The unit act of action systems. In C. Lemert (Ed.), *Social theory: The multicultural and classic readings* (4th ed.) (pp. 213-215). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Rockoff, J.E & Speroni, C. (2011). Subjective and objective evaluations of teacher effectiveness: Evidence from New York City. *Labour Economics*, 18(5), 687-696.
- Silva Mangiante, E.M. (2011). Teachers matter: Measures of teacher effectiveness in low-income minority schools. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 23(1), 41-63.
- U.S. Department of Education (2015). *The condition of education: Racial/Ethnic enrollment in public schools (Indicator 11)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov>.