THE EFFECTS OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION
ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

by

Christopher Clayton

A Project Submitted to the Faculty of

The Evergreen State College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the degree

Master in Teaching

2013

This Project for the Master in Teaching Degree

by

Christopher Clayton

has been approved for

The Evergreen State College

by

_____

Terry Ford, Ph.D., Member of the Faculty

June 2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

Public education policy reforms propose that high-stakes testing environments ensure the academic achievement of all students. For the past decade, while various national assessments of student achievement show that the achievement gap, at best, has narrowed only slightly; researchers have detailed the negative effects of high stakes testing environments on students and teachers. Thus, the purpose of this literature review is to examine claims from multicultural educators for improving student achievement. Thirty multicultural education studies related to student achievement are reviewed. Themes include students' backgrounds, teacher-student relationships, high expectations, teacher and school support, and teacher reflection. Findings suggest that these themes offer important considerations for improving the educational experiences and outcomes of America's students, and should be incorporated into teaching practices and future education policy reforms for improving student achievement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

In order to be truly critical a literature review of this sort must proceed from the current state of public education, and factors that contribute to it. By way of introduction, what follows is a very simplified explanation of the first and most influential policy on public education in the twenty-first century, No Child Left Behind (NCLB), and some statistics that reveal a glaring problem still existent a decade after its implementation: the achievement gap.

In 2001, President G. W. Bush introduced NCLB to legislators and the public. He portrayed it as an outgrowth of the standards-based reform movement that began in the early 1980s (Ravitch, 2010). The goal of the standards-based reform movement was to increase the United States international economic competitiveness, and to reach this goal reformers proposed the implementation of higher academic standards, more challenging standardized tests, and accountability measures intended to motivate educators toward meeting standards. For the past three decades, this vision has shaped the educational landscape in the United States, as each state has been hard at work developing their own standards and protocols for implementing them. The Bush administration's policies built upon this vision by adding new accountability measures to past reforms. In a meeting with Diane Ravitch, President Bush described the guiding principles of his plan:

[…] First, that every child should be tested every year in grades three through eight, using state tests, not national tests; second, that decisions about how to reform schools would be made by the states, not by Washington; third, that low-performing schools would get help to improve; and fourth, that students stuck in persistently dangerous or failing schools would be able to transfer to other schools. (Ravitch, 2010, p. 94)

In addition to these principles, NCLB requires underachieving schools to create timelines that detail how their students will make adequate yearly progress (AYP) each year. If schools fail to meet even one of the NCLB requirements for AYP, they are labeled "failing" and face annually increasing punitive measures, including funding cuts, and are ultimately forced to restructure. They essentially have the option to hand control over to the state or private management, in which case they become charter schools (Ravitch, 2010). The ultimate goal of NCLB was to give schools the incentive to raise levels of student achievement. In the eyes of its architects, it was reasonable to expect that 100% of the nation's students would perform at or above his or her grade level on standardized mathematics and reading tests by 2014. However, at the beginning of 2013 that goal still seems far from reach.

Statistics show that the achievement gap – typically between middle and upper class White and Asian American students and their poor Black and Hispanic counterparts – remains as wide as it was before 2002. According to the U.S. Department of Education's 2011 report, *The Condition of Education*,

between 2007 and 2009 reading scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress for Black, Hispanic, and White students improved, but the achievement gap did not narrow significantly. In 2009, twelfth grade White students still scored 27 points higher than Black students, and 22 points higher than Hispanic students (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). According to *The Nation's Report Card: Reading 2007*, 88% of Black and 86% of Hispanic eighth graders read below grade level, compared to 62% of White eighth graders (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). There were, however, marked improvements in fourth and eighth grade mathematics scores (27 and 20 points, respectively). Nonetheless, White students still scored 30 points higher that Black students and 23 points higher than Hispanic students.

In most school districts, if students do not pass standardized tests they will not graduate. Swanson's (2009) study showed that while 78% of suburban students are graduating high school with diplomas, only 53% of students in the United State's 50 largest cities are. Urban students' graduation rate is nearly 20% below the national average (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Eighty percent of students from the top income quartile attend college within 20 months of high school graduation, whereas only 57% of students from the lowest quartiles do (Kane, 2001). There have been some improvements in terms of dropout and graduation rates, though. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, the status dropout rate for Black students dropped from 11.3 in 2002 to 8.0 in 2010, and that of Hispanic students dropped from 25.7 to 15.1. Still, Black students drop out at more than one and a half times the rate of White

students (5.0), and Hispanic students at more than three times the rate (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). Furthermore, while 78.4% of White students graduated at the end of the 2010-11 school year, only 57.6% and 57% of Hispanic and Black students did (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2012). Each subgroup made improvements, especially Black students whose graduation rates increased by almost 10% since the 2001-02 school year, however, the nearly 20% gap between the graduation rate of White students and their Black and Hispanic counterparts indicates that the public education system continue many students of color behind despite 30 years of standards-based and accountability reforms. Within the framework of NCLB the blame for this disparity, and the most immediate repercussions, falls on those teachers working in schools with the greatest need, and ultimately their students.

While the above statistics speak for themselves, they only tell part of the story. There have also been political effects of NCLB. Ravitch (2010) discussed how the current system of public education is based less on the idea of improving the quality of education and more about measuring, punishing, and rewarding. Opinion writers like Joseph Casbarro (2005) have discussed the coercive strategies that politicians use in order to gains support for such policies rather than gain community consensus about what is best for American's children. However, these discussions merely talk around the daily realities teachers face due to high-stakes testing. In 2007, Wayne Au of the University of Washington published a metasynthesis of 49 qualitative studies intended to elucidate the relationship between the high-stakes testing environment created by NCLB and

curriculum. His findings suggested that the high-stakes testing environment lead to the narrowing of content, fragmentation of knowledge, and increases in teacher-centered instruction such as lecturing and the "direct transmission of test-related facts" (Au, 2007, pp. 262-263). While teachers have lost control of their curriculum and pedagogy, they have also been inundated with paperwork and other formalities that hinder their ability to truly care for their students.

Over the past decade, statisticians and critics have analyzed NCLB from a number of perspectives. Very few, if any, conclude that it has been a success. The effects of high-stakes testing, whether viewed through statistics, politics, or the experiences of teachers themselves seems less related to the achievement of all students than anything else. It is from this point, the failure of the standards and accountability movements to promote equitable education, that this literature review proceeds.

Rationale

The rationale for this literature review is simple: 30 years of education reform have not worked, so what will? In spite of the seemingly uphill battle to support the academic achievement of all students, there are still teachers who work hard to teach beyond the tests. These teachers typically identify themselves as multicultural educators, and follow in a long tradition that predates the standards and accountability movements. While there are a number of theoretical approaches to multicultural education, increasing the academic achievement of all students is its overarching goal (Banks, 1993). Multicultural education focuses

on reshaping schools in order to meet students individual needs. Thus, this critical literature review looks to multicultural education to investigate implications it could have for the future of public education.

Historical Background

The Standards and Accountability Movements

The history of standards movement in the United States can be traced back to the Cold War. Between the 1950s and 1970s, there was a "back to the basics" emphasis in public education. The "back to the basics" movement emphasized reading, writing, math, and codes of behavior. Supporters of the movement thought that the education children were receiving at the time was worse than what they had experienced because of, among other things, a lack of standards, objectives, and codes of behavior (Spring, 2011).

The early proponents of the standards movement were explicit in their desire for school curricula to reflect the historic ideologies and political views of the dominant social classes in the United States (Spring, 2011). For instance, Native American boarding schools of the 19th and 20th centuries were the sites of some of the most extreme examples of dominant groups using education as a tool for cultural destruction. Educators in these boarding schools wanted Native students to assimilate into the dominant American culture and would not allow them to practice their own traditions (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). The standards movement reflected these same ideals by emphasizing certain content areas like reading and mathematics while downgrading others. It did not matter

what students' or their home cultures valued in education; the ultimate goal was that every student would exit the public school system with the same set of knowledge and skills.

The Reagan Administration's 1983 report, *A Nation at Risk*, marks the beginning of contemporary standards movement. By urging politicians to reform the public education system to reflect the capitalist/ nationalist ideals of efficiency and international competitiveness, the report echoed previous incarnations of the standards movement. However, it emphasized U.S. competitiveness in the global economic market, marking the beginning of much greater corporate influence on the American school (Spring, 2011). The report portrayed high school curriculum as a cafeteria in which students had the choice of what they wanted to study. Students could make it through high school taking general track classes and never focus on the courses that corporate interests deemed important. In order to produce more internationally competitive laborers it suggested that schools emphasize subject areas such as English, mathematics, science, social studies, and computer science (Ravitch, 2010).McLaren & Farahmandpur (2006) wrote that the *A Nation at Risk* forced American schools to take responsibility for the United States' relatively weak economic performance compared to Europe and Asia. It led to a new economic model of education that currently manifests in No Child Left Behind. However, as Ravitch (2010) noted, NCLB neglects standards for the sake of accountability; therefore, it represents an even greater to attempt to wed the business market to the Unites States public education system.

Multicultural Education

The history of multicultural education has its roots in the encounters and coexistence of different cultural groups. Its formal history, however, begins with the Civil Rights Movement. In 1954, *Brown v. The Board of Education* overturned *Plessy v. Ferguson*, marking the end of school segregation. African American activists then began to push for their histories to be included in public school curriculum. In the 1960s and 1970s, the Women's Rights movement joined this initiative for education reform by challenging curriculum that contributed to the institutionalization of racism and sexism. In the later 1970s and early 1980s, other groups such as gays and lesbians, the elderly, and people with disabilities also made calls for similar curricular changes.

Throughout this history, a theoretical body of knowledge began to grow as scholars took to the task of developing the framework of multicultural education. Banks (1977) defined multicultural education as education that teaches about American cultural groups who have been the victims of prejudice and discrimination because of their distinct cultural characteristics. It was at this point in its history that multicultural education began to transcend curricular changes and analyze the school as a social system. In Bank's later work he outlined the five dimensions of multicultural education: content integration, knowledge construction, prejudice reduction, equity pedagogy, and an empowering school culture (Banks & Banks, 1995).

Content integration describes the way that multicultural educators use a variety of cultures to inform their content and instruction. They use different

cultural perspectives to teach key concepts, principles, generalizations, and theories in their specific content area. *Knowledge construction* refers to the methods teachers use to help students understand the influence that race, ethnicity, and class has on how knowledge is created. *Prejudice reduction* focuses diminishing racism and other forms of oppression in order to foster democratic values and attitudes in students. *Equity pedagogy* is a dynamic process that contextualizes education within existing social structures in ways that empower students. Teachers enable students to take ownership of their education and the skills and knowledge that come from dismantling social stereotypes and power structures. Teachers who employ equity pedagogy modify their content and instruction to meet their students' individual needs while teaching them how to critically analyze the process of schooling.

By the mid-1990s Sleeter (1996) had outlined five approaches to multicultural education. The *Culturally Different* approach uses culturally relevant instruction to raise the academic achievement of students of color. The *Human Relations* approach uses the understanding cultural differences to teach students about the commonalities of all people. The *Single Group Studies* approach teaches about the historical and contemporary issues of oppressed groups. The *Multicultural Education* approach works to transform the educational process to reflect the ideals of democracy in a pluralistic society. The *Social Reconstructionist* approach teaches students to be active members of a more equitable society through teaching them about oppression and discrimination.

From the theoretical foundations laid out by scholars like Banks and Sleeter educators continue to practice and redefine what multicultural educations in.

Definitions

'At-Risk'

The term 'at-risk' does not frequently appear in this paper, however it is often applied to racially/culturally diverse and socioeconomically (SES) disadvantaged students. Much of the research presented in this literature review focuses on 'at-risk' student. There are many critics of the term because it proposes a deficit model that views students as lacking what they need for academic and social success rather than addressing the context that defines that success. The issue of labeling students 'at-risk' concerns how the culture of education that does not align with students' culture (Ladson-Billings, 1995). For instance, African Americans, Hispanic/Latin@s, ELLs, and students with low SES face cultural borders in schools that define success in White middle-class terms. For the purposes of this literature review, 'at-risk' refers to those students whose cultures do not match the culture of public schools (Hixson, 1983). As Hixson noted, 'at-risk' students are in schools that do not accept, accommodate, and respond in the necessary ways that help them achieve their maximum social, emotional, and intellectual growth and development. These students are in situations that create the potential for them to make decisions that will either lead to dropping out of school or incarceration. It is important to note here that although this literature review discusses the relationship between 'at-risk'

students' backgrounds and academic achievement it does not intend to imply that these students are not successful because of their backgrounds. Rather, the implication should be that the responsibility for students' success, within reason, should fall on the school system and how it does or does not meet their needs.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy/Teaching

As outlined above, there are various components and approaches to multicultural education. However, the underlying goal of multicultural education is to foster the achievement of all students, particularly those of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (Banks, 1993). Multicultural education is the overarching theme of this critical review. However, the primary focus will be on equitable classroom practices and management rather than curriculum.

The term culturally responsive pedagogy refers to an adaptive pedagogy that recognizes the cultural diversity of the classroom and, therefore, meets the social and cultural needs of all students (Gay, 2010). In general, responsive teaching means attending to students' needs and allowing them to direct teaching practice (Howard, 2009). Thus, culturally responsive teaching is when teachers use students' culture to direct their curriculum and classroom management. Ladson-Billings (1995) defined culturally relevant pedagogy as a pedagogy of opposition because it is intended to be collectively empowering. It is teaching that challenges the traditional educational ideals of monoculture, assimilation, and sorting (Spring, 2011).

Limitations

One of the major limitations of this literature review is that is somewhat untraditional. Typically, researchers focus their literature reviews in such a way as to allow explicit contradictions between research to unfold – that is, the findings of one study might challenge the findings of another. Focusing on research with similar samples, variables, metrics, etc. permits this dynamic, and allows the literature review to unfold in a way that leads to specific implications with regard to a limited number of variables. This literature review, however, is atypical in that the research it presents addresses a broad range of questions, hypotheses, samples, methodologies, etc. It is a more general literature review that approaches the question: what effects student achievement? Themes within multicultural education were the only means of narrowing this question. Likewise, this literature review is not exhaustive. Rather, it addresses four concerns or themes within multicultural educations – students' backgrounds, teacher-student relationships, caring for students, and teacher reflection – and their relationship to students' academic achievement. Lastly, this literature is generally limited to socioeconomically disadvantaged students – African Americans in particular – because, as noted in the introduction to this chapter, they achieve at the lowest academic levels based on today's standards of achievement.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this literature review is to interrogate the relationship between themes within multicultural education and student achievement, and

determine what those relationships suggest for teacher practice and further research. These themes include students' backgrounds, teacher-student relationships, expectations, support, and teacher reflection.

Summary

This chapter introduced the context from which the rationale and purpose of this critical literature review emerged. The standards and accountability measures of the past 30 years have their history in discriminatory education practices that have primarily served the interests of dominant cultural groups and corporations. Ultimately, they have failed to promote the academic and social success of all students. Therefore, this literature review looks to alternatives to standards and accountability in multicultural education. Multicultural education, on the other hand, has its history in the struggles of marginalized people. Scholars continue to critically analyze the various approaches to multicultural education, and teachers continue to redefine it through their practices. The purpose of this literature review, then, is to examine how multicultural education relates to student achievement and what suggestions it might have for the future of public education in the United States.

Chapter 2 presents 30 research articles that address some of the themes within multicultural education. The first section focuses on the relationship between students' backgrounds and engagement and achievement. The second section examines the relationship between teacher-student relationships and academic achievement. The third section addresses what it means to care for

students in terms of multicultural education. The fourth section posits teacher reflection as an integral aspect of culturally responsive teaching.

Chapter 3 summarizes the findings from this literature review, considers implications for teacher practice, and provides suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER 2: CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Chapter 1 framed this critical literature review within the contemporary context of education reforms. Those reforms are rooted in the standards and accountability movements. They have not produced the results they were supposed to. Therefore, this literature review turns to themes in multicultural education and how they might relate to student achievement.

The first section of this chapter presents literature on the relationship between students' background and academic achievement. The second section presents literature on the relationship between teacher-student relationships and engagement and academic achievement. The third section presents literature on the effects of teachers' expectations and teacher support on academic achievement. The final section presents literature on the relationship between teacher reflection and academic achievement.

Students' Backgrounds Affect Student Achievement

The research articles presented in this section focus on the ways in which factors such as race and socioeconomic status can affect students' educational experiences. While some of these studies in this section address factors beyond student achievement, it will only present those findings associated with student achievement. In the first study, Felner, Brand, DuBois, Adan, Mulhall, and Evans' (1995) examined the relationship between the conditions of socioeconomic

disadvantage and student achievement. In the second study, Blau, Lamb, Stearns, and Pellering (2001) examined how the socioeconomic characteristics of students' communities could affect their academic achievement. In the third study, O'Donnell, Schwab-Stone, and Muyeed (2002) analyzed the relationship between students' level of exposure to community violence and the effects that various social supports could have on students' educational experiences. In the fourth study, Blake, Butler, Lewis, and Darensbourg (2010) investigated the relationship between race/ethnicity and disciplinary actions. In the fifth study, Sheeta (1996) examined the relationship between students' race/ethnicity and their perceptions of discipline. In the sixth study, Farkas, Grobe, Sheenhan, and Shuan (1990) examined how teachers perceive the academic skills, habits, and styles of students from various backgrounds, and how those perceptions influence teachers' dispensation of grades.

Felner, Brand, DuBois, Adan, Mulhall, and Evans (1995) conducted a correlational study of 389 seventh-through ninth-grade students from low-income and rural communities in the southeastern United States in order to quantify the relationship between socioeconomic disadvantage and adolescent student achievement. The conceptual framework for this study posited a model in which the conditions associated with socioeconomic disadvantage (e.g., lower levels of parental education and occupational status, exposure to stressors, economic hardship) are associated with the social and academic development of children and adolescents. The researchers found that the conditions of socioeconomic disadvantage can negatively affect student achievement

The demographics of their sample were approximately balanced – nearly equal numbers of male and female, and African American and White students. Felner, et al. collected data from student self-reports, teacher behavior ratings, and school records of student achievement. They analyzed this data using three categories: (1) conditions of household disadvantage, (2) experiences of proximal environmental conditions, and (3) levels of socioemotional and academic adjustment. The term "proximal environmental experiences" referred to the experiences associated with the different environmental factors: family climate and parent-child relationships; school climate; perceived social support received from friends, family, and school personnel; and stressful events. The scales used to measure these factors had Cronbach's alpha scored ranging from .50 to .95, the majority of which were above .70. First, Felner, et al. conducted analysis of variance (ANOVA) and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to examine associations between household disadvantage and adolescent adjustment. Then they tested the hypothesis that proximal environmental experiences mediate the effects of disadvantage on adolescent adjustment.

Felner, et al. found statistically significant relationships between parental education attainment, occupation status, and academic adjustment. For instance, children from households in which neither parent had graduated from high school reported less sense of belonging at school than children of parents who had at least attended college (did not graduate vs. college: $M = 2.19$, $SD = .70$, and $M = 2.64$, $SD = .59$, $F = 11.75$, $p < .001$). They also found moderate correlations between parental educational attainment and children's classroom behavioral

problems [$F_{(2, 322)}$ = 3.93, $p < .05$], school performance [$F_{(4, 798)}$ = 5.65, $p <$ .01], and academic achievement [$F_{(4, 340)}$ = 4.22, $p < 01$)]. In terms of occupation status, they found that children of parents with semi-skilled and unskilled occupations reported a lower sense of belonging at school (unskilled: M = 2.28, SD = .71; semi-skilled: M = 2.27, SD = .68; skilled: M = 2.61, SD = .57, F = 5.73, $p < .01$). Furthermore, they found relatively strong correlation between household occupational status and school performance [$F_{(4, 798)}$ = 7.20, $p <$ .01], and academic achievement [$F_{(4, 340)}$ = 5.20, $p < .01$]. In sum, less parental education attainment and lower occupational status were associated with less sense of belonging at school, more classroom behavior problems, poor school performance, and less academic achievement.

Felner, et al.'s findings supported their hypothesis that the effects of socioeconomic disadvantage can be understood in terms of how the day-to-day experiences and developmental circumstances of disadvantaged adolescents determine the impact that socioeconomic disadvantage has on their adaptive outcomes. That is, the *experiences* of socioeconomic disadvantage mediate its relationship to the social and academic adjustment. Felner, et al. did not limit their researcher to proving causal relationships between the variables they analyzed. Of the statistics listed above, the strongest and most statistically significant was the correlation between household occupation and school performance. However, this finding's statistical significance was moderate at best, thus not ruling out the influence of other factors on academic achievement. Nonetheless, the statistical significance and strength of the correlations that

Felner et al. found, and the level of rigor with which they conducted their research do not pose serious threats to the study's internal validity. In terms of internal consistency, some of the Cronbach's alpha scores for the scales the researchers used to measure environmental factors were relatively strong ($a >$ .70), however, the findings would have been more reliable if the researchers had used more consistently strong scales. In terms of external validity, the findings would be most generalizable to minority and low-income students.

Blau, Lamb, Stearns, and Pellering's (2001) conducted a correlational study using data from the 1990 U.S. Census and the 1992 metropolitan High School Effectiveness Study (HSES; n = 2,435) to quantify the effects that neighborhood factors had on adolescent students' learning, and found that the conditions in "cosmopolitan" neighborhoods could support academic achievement in terms of social learning. Their sample included 146 schools in 30 metropolitan neighborhoods.

At the start, it is important to understand how Blau et al. defined the neighborhoods they compared. The researchers used the combination of two variables to distinguish between neighborhoods: diversity and resource consolidation. Diversity referred to social differentiation within neighborhoods based on at least one of the following dimensions: race, ethnicity, nativity, language, and socioeconomic status. Resource consolidation referred to the concentration of economic or other resources by categories of group membership. Thus, a "cosmopolitan" neighborhood would be one that very diverse and has little resource consolidation. The opposite of a "cosmopolitan"

neighborhood, then, would be one in which resources are concentrated within one social group, which the researchers referred to as "consolidated inequality". Blau, et al. hypothesized that "cosmopolitan" neighborhoods facilitated socialization across cultural lines, and supported the kind of imaginative thinking integral to social learning.

Blau, et al. conducted one-way ANOVA to compare the mathematics, reading, and social studies gains of students attending schools in neighborhoods with consolidated inequality to those attending schools in cosmopolitan neighborhoods. They found that neighborhood factors mattered little for mathematics, reading, and science, but had significant effects for social studies. The mean school gains follow accordingly: mathematics: 3.698, science: 3.324, reading: 3.136, and social studies 6.965 ($p < .001$). Following these results, Blau, et al. conducted MANOVA to analyze correlations between neighborhood factors and social studies gains. They found a significant and strong negative correlation between consolidated inequality and mean gains for social studies ($r = -0.837$, $p < .01$). However, they only found a moderate correlation between diversity and social studies gains ($r = 0.406$). Blau, et al. interpreted these results to mean that the effects of neighborhood factors on social studies gains was the "contrast between environments for which there is virtually no association between race and economic and other resources, on the one hand, and environments in which racial differences are confounded with economic and other resources, on the other hand" (p. 131).

Blau, et al. concluded that students who lived in areas defined by socioeconomic inequality made less gains in social studies than students who lived in less consolidated and more diverse areas due to the fact that there were more opportunities for them to develop relationships across racial lines. One of the strengths of this study was that the researchers offered tentative explanations for the relationships they examined rather than attempting to explain, in concrete terms, any causal links between them. Another strength is that they did not claim that the lack of resource consolidation was the sole reason for gain in social studies, simply that the cosmopolitan environment, due to its lack of restriction on relationships across racial lines, could promote imagination and curiosity. Such an assertion does not foreclose the possibility that other factors might also affect academic achievement. Blau, et al.'s research was also strong in terms of internal validity. They disregarded any correlations that were weak or statistically insignificant, and based their conclusions solely on those that were strong and statistically significant. Although the statistical significance of the correlation between consolidated inequality and social studies gains was moderate ($p < .01$), the correlation itself was strong ($r > .75$). Their research was also strong in terms of external validity because they used a large number of students and schools from around the United States that differed greatly in terms of race, ethnicity, and socioeconomics. This makes their findings widely generalizable to most public schools and the neighborhoods in which they reside. Overall, though their research did not show direct correlations between neighborhood factors and gains in all school subjects, it is valuable because it suggests that where

students live, and more importantly the conditions within their neighborhoods, can have an impact on their social learning and academic achievement.

O'Donnell, Schwab-Stone, and Muyeed (2002) conducted a correlational study of 1,855 adolescent students to quantify the relationship between students exposure to violence and various social supports. They found dynamic relationships between various types of resilience for students at different levels of exposure to violence and the social supports available to them. This research was part of ongoing study led by one of O'Donnell's research partners that was designed to assess risk and protective factors in adolescents' adjustment(Schwab-Stone, et al., 1995; Schwab-Stone, Chen, Greenberger, Silver, Lichtman, & Voyce, 1999). It tested a four-part hypothesis. First, the researchers hoped that their statistical analysis would substantiate the existence of discrete elements of resilience. Second, they believed that the interaction between family and school support would have a stronger relation to resilience for students severely exposed to community violence. Third, they suspected that peer support would decrease resilience rather than strengthen it. Fourth, they predicted that the extent of the relationship between social support and resilience would increase over time.

O'Donnell, Schwab-Stone, and Muyeed conducted surveys to quantify the effects that risk and protective factors had on mental health and social competence dimensions of resilience. The researchers administered the surveys in 1994 and 1996 to sixth, eighth and tenth graders in the same eastern United States school district. They excluded any subjects with missing data, making the

final sample size from both surveys n = 1,855. Risk factors included victimization by violence and witnessing violence. Protective factors included parental, school, and peer support. The mental health and social competence dimensions of resilience that the researchers measured included anxiety/depression, delinquency and school misconduct, future expectations, interpersonal relations, self-reliance, somatization, and substance abuse. The surveys included true/false (0 = false, 1 = true) and Likert scale items based on Weissberg, Voyce, and Kasprow 's (1991) Social and Health Assessment (SAHA) and other sources. The majority of the scales obtained Cronbach's alpha scores greater than .70, the conventional level for sound scale structure. However, four scales scored below .70. These included the victimization and violence scale (a = .63), the self-reliance scale (a =.56) the school misconduct scale (a = .57), and the somatization scale (a = .61). The researchers used the sum of the true/false answers to create a total score, and averaged the individual Likert item scores to create totals for the groups. For the purposes of this literature review, the summary of O'Donnell, Schwab-Stone, and Muyeed's findings will focus solely on those results explicitly related to student engagement and academic achievement – delinquency, future expectations, and school misconduct.

O'Donnell, et al. divided their participants into three groups based on their level of exposure to community violence (no-exposure, witnesses, and victims) and then analyzed their data cross-sectionally and longitudinally using structural equation modeling. The results of the surveys revealed demographic similarities between the victimized and witness groups. More often than the no-exposure

group, the victim and witness groups tended to be African American (58.6% and 51.9%, respectively), male (56.0% and 41.9%), received free lunch (63.2% and 63.4%), and had previously repeated at least one grade (34.4% and 28.8%). The researchers noted that these findings were consistent with current literature on demographics and community violence which finds that African American children and those living in poverty were more likely to be exposed to community violence than their White middle- and upper-class counterparts.

The witness and no-exposure groups showed greater similarities in terms of baseline adaptive characteristics, but the victimized group was unique in terms of delinquency, future expectations, and school misconduct. On the delinquent behavior scale, the victimized group had a mean score of 7.59, while the witness and no-exposure groups had mean scores of 5.39 ($p \le .01$) and 2.17 ($p \le .01$), respectively. On the future expectations scale, the victimized group had a mean score of 3.32, while the witness and no-exposure groups had mean scores of 4.37 ($p \le .01$) and 4.49 ($p \le .01$), respectively. On the school misconduct scale, the victimized group had a mean score of 5.80, while the witness and no-exposure groups had mean scores of 3.58 ($p \le .01$) and 1.28 ($p \le .01$), respectively.

Social support had different effects for each group, and these differences occurred in different categories of resiliency. However, social support had the most significant overall effects for the victimized group and was least significant for the no-exposure group. For instance, parental support was a statistically strong predictor of resiliency against school misconduct for the victimized group

(*B* = .42, *p* < .001). When comparing the three groups, parental support was a stronger predictor of school misconduct for the victimized group than the witness group (*t* = 2.95, *p* < .01) and the no-exposure group (*t* = 2.4, *p* < .05). However, the victim group seemed to receive the least amount of parental support. On the parent communication scale, the victimized group had a mean score of 3.98, while the witness group had a mean score of 4.24 and the no-exposure group had a mean score of 4.47 (*p* ≤ .01). The researchers found similar results when comparing the groups based on their parental supervision scale scores: the victimized group had a mean score of 12.81, while the witness group had a mean score of 13.10 and the no-exposure group had a mean score of 13.41 (*p* ≤ .01).

School support was an exceptionally strong predictor of resilience against school misconduct (*ß* = .62, *p* < .001), and similar to parental support, it was a stronger predictor for the victimized group than the no-exposure group (*t* = 3.5, *p* < .001, respectively) and the witness group (*t* = 3.29, *p* < .001). On the other hand, higher levels of peer support predicted lower levels of resilience against school misconduct (*ß* = -.17, *p* < .05) for the victimized group.

Overall, there were no overarching similarities between the groups. Similarities and differences depended on the researchers' analytic perspectives. For instance, the two exposure groups had greater similarities in terms of sociodemographics, but the victimized group stood distinguished from the other two groups in terms of resilience and support. Exposure to community was more common for economically disadvantaged African American males, and threatened resiliency against such factors as delinquency, low future

expectations, and school misconduct. The most statistically significant findings suggest correlations between students' level of exposure to community violence and school misconduct ($p < .01$), and that parental and school support could help students build resilience against school misconduct ($p < .001$). There was also a relatively week yet statistically significant correlation between peer support and higher future expectations ($p < .05$). These correlations indicate a moderate level of internal validity. The study's Cronbach's alpha scores indicate some internal consistency. The scores were not always very strong, but the researchers showed ethical integrity by being transparent about the fact that some scales did not reach accepted alpha scores. The stratified sample makes the researchers' finding most generalizable to African American male students exposed, on some level, to community violence.

In a correlational study of 9,364 elementary and secondary female students enrolled in a midwestern urban school district during the 2005-2006 school year, Blake, Butler, Lewis, and Darensbourg (2010) found that Black girls were overrepresented in exclusionary discipline practices for reason that differed significantly from White and Hispanic girls. To qualify for the study, each participant had to have received at least one prior disciplinary sanction. The student population of the district was 21% Black, 26% White, 49% Hispanic, and less than 5% Native and Asian American. The teaching faculty for the district at the time of the study was 78% female, 90% White, and less than 5% identified as Black, Hispanic, Asian, or Native American.

Blake, et al. collected data from school records. The database consisted of each school's disciplinary referrals and sanctions based on the district's disciplinary policy. The researchers narrowed the school districts 38 possible sanctions down to 10 reasons for discipline referrals: (1) disobedience, (2) truancy, (3) defiance, (4) tardiness, (5) improper dress, (6) fights with students, (7) threats to students, (8) being profane to adults, (9) encouraging fighting, and (10) being profane to students.

Blake, et al. analyzed the data using Relative Risk Ration (RRR), and MANOVA. RRR is the risk index of comparison groups divided by the risk index of the target group, and allowed the researchers to assess the disproportionality of discipline. If the RRR was one, the risk of the target group receiving a disciplinary sanction was equal to the comparison group. An RRR greater or less than one was indicative of over- or underrepresentation, respectively. RRR analyses revealed that when compared to Hispanic girls Black girls were overrepresented in in-school suspensions (2.25) and out-of-school suspensions. Compared to White girls, Black girls were more drastically overrepresented in in-school suspensions (4.61), and overrepresented (2.42) in out of school suspensions.

Blake, et al. used MANOVA to compare differences between disciplinary infractions. Overall, 38.97% of sanction were given to Black girls, 38.62% to Hispanic girls, and 18.68% to White girls. In terms of individual infractions, the researchers found a similar spread for in-school suspensions: 41.36% were given to Black girls, 41.93% to Hispanic girls, and 13.66% to White girls. Again,

the researchers found similar percentages for out-of-school suspensions: 41.71% were given to Black girls, 39.21% to Hispanic girls, and 14.24% to White girls. The percentage of expulsions given to Black girls (50.00%) was nearly twice the percentage given to Hispanic girls (28.57%), and more than three time the percentage given to White girls (14.29%).

Blake et al. also used MANOVA to identify the differences between racial/ethnic groups for specific infractions. This analysis revealed that teachers disciplined Black girls for defiance ($M = 0.16$, $N = 532$) more than White girls ($M = 0.07$, $N = 115$). Teachers also disciplined Black girls for improper dress ($M = 0.10$, $N = 326$) more than White girls ($M = 0.05$, $N = 74$). Teachers also disciplined Black girls more for fights with other students ($M = 0.08$, $N = 280$) than White girls ($M = 0.05$, $N = 80$). Only these three measures showed a significant racial difference between Black girls and White girls.

This study suggests that, similar to Black boys (see Skiba, 2002), Black girls are often overrepresented in exclusionary discipline practices. Moreover, the reasons for Black girl's discipline referrals – defiance, fights, and improper dress – differed significantly from White and Hispanic girls. These infractions reflect stereotypical assumptions that Black girls violate traditional White, middle-class standards of femininity by exhibiting more relational and physical aggression, as well as perceived hypersexuality. Ultimately, these findings suggest that, to some extent, students' racial and cultural backgrounds interact with the institution of the public school in positive and negative ways.

Similar to the previous studies in this section, Blake et al. relied on data analysis to explain relationships between variables rather than causal relationships, reducing threats to internal validity. The researchers relied on credible data analysis methods to explore within-gender differences between races/ethnicities. Their large sample group produced a relatively high level of external consistency. In their discussion of the findings, Blake, et al. did not confine themselves to a singular, concrete explanation for their findings. Ultimately, they achieved their goal of expanding the body of literature concerning Black youth to include more information on the experiences of Black females.

Sheeta (1996) conducted an ethnography of 16 high school students and nine of their teachers to examine how different ethnic groups perceive conflict and discipline and found that differences in perception tended to fall along ethnic lines. The conceptual framework of this study came from theories that address the frustrations that often accompany interethnic group interactions in diverse classrooms. Sheeta focused on interpersonal interactions as the location of disciplinary problems by investigating following questions: What are the differences in student' and teachers' perception about discipline? Are conflicts interpersonal, procedural, or substantive? How do ethnicity, achievement, gender, and position influence practice?

Sheeta's study took place at a "Lincoln High School", which was situated in a predominantly White middle-class community and served 1100 students. The student population at the school was 37.1% Asian American, 5.9% Filipino

American, 16.6% African American, 6.9% Latin@ American, 38.2% European America. The school staff was 77% European American. The students in Sheeta's study had GPAs ranging from 1.71-2.08. All of the students came from single parent families, and were native born. Sheeta chose two males and two females from each group to participate in the study. Then she chose two focus students, one male and one female, from each ethnic group who she identified to have the highest number of reported disciplinary actions and two with the least. The students then chose nine teachers they liked best and with whom they felt most successful. Six of the teachers were female (one African American, one Chicana, and four European Americans), and three were European American males.

Sheeta conducted interviews, classroom observations, and examinations of school records. She found that the students generally felt alienated and powerless in the face of their teachers' disciplinary practices. They saw their school as a place meant to serve high-achieving students and their teachers. All other students felt that they had no voice. They saw their teachers give differential treatment to some students, favoring certain students and overlooking their rule-breaking behaviors. These students believed that their teachers had already made up their minds about their students, did not listen, and believed that their words to be the truth. Similarly, the teachers reported believing that the purpose of the school was to serve students who could achieve academically and behave. In their eyes, students who could be successful in school did not

have difficulty meeting behavioral expectations, while those they labeled as "disciplinary problems" did.

Sheeta found that when conflicts arose avoidance was the most common coping mechanism among students and teachers. On the one hand, students might decide not to attend class, while on the other, teachers often removed "difficult" students from class. Effectively, both students and teachers engaged in behaviors that would limit opportunities for students to engage in learning experiences. However, whereas the students typically had one response to conflict, the teachers had other approaches. The majority of them agreed that cooperation was important for minor issues, but when conflicts that were more serious arose, they resorted to assuming positions of power and control. This approach reflects most of the teachers' belief that they were responsible for exerting control in their classrooms. The two teachers of color in the study, however, adhered to a different philosophy. They believed that mutual respect was a more effective means of mitigating conflicts. They taught their students negotiation strategies, such as controlling their tempers and not taking disciplinary actions personally.

Many of the perceptual differences of conflict between groups of students arose from differences in culture and communication styles. Most of the teachers' communication styles, for instance, made the students of color uncomfortable. European American students and teachers, on the other hand, recognized that their teachers' perceptions of personal characteristics as hostile, obnoxious, rude, and unreasonable led to the majority of conflicts. These students and their

European American teachers agreed that there was a common set of rules in the classroom, while students of color did not. Sheeta noted that the shared perspective of European American students and teachers was the result of a common cultural background. Students who did not share their perspective believed that their teachers frequently abused their power by changing rules in order to punish students they did not like. The teachers did acknowledge, however, that some of their rules were unclear and unknown to their students.

Sheeta also found different behavioral patterns between the four ethnic groups of students. European American students tended to be more emotive; they explicitly stated when they were in a bad mood, whereas the students of color more often expressed their moods through non-verbal communication. When there was conflict, tuning out tended to be the preferred coping mechanism for European American students. This was due to their belief that conformity rather than resistance would bring them success in life. The Filipino American students also conformed rather than resisted their teachers. Their main coping strategy was to minimize their presence in the classroom by working hard, or downplaying their accents. On the other hand, African American students' behavior was socially motivated. They stressed the importance of supporting others, and often chose to challenge their teachers when they felt that they had disrespected them or someone in their group. For instance, standing up for what was fair took precedence the penalty for disobedience. The Chicano students were also socially motivated, but in a different way. They did not want their misbehavior to bring them shame in the eyes of their families. Thus, they rarely

challenged their teachers directly, choosing more subtle means of sabotaging their teachers' goals.

In general, the students and their teachers perceived conflicts and discipline differently. On the one hand, teachers saw disciplinary acts as monolithic, singular events, while on the other, the students were more aware of the reflexive nature of disciplinary actions. Students saw conflicts and the resulting disciplinary actions taken by their teachers as the result of the teacher's position of power colliding with the students' resistance. The students were not passive recipients of discipline, though. In the event of a conflict, they chose whether to accept, avoid, or ignore their teachers' positions. The students also recognized the cyclical nature of conflict and discipline. Once they had developed bad reputations, students' and teachers' indirect encouragement of misconduct reinforced their roles as "disciplinary problems". For instance, African American students, who were especially sensitive to being "boxed in" by their teachers, believed that their teachers perceived African American males as intimidating, and therefore they treated them differently, pushing them to "act a fool".

Students and teachers also had different perceptions of disciplinary events. The teachers saw the events as a whole: the student misbehaved and, therefore, deserved punishment. In contrast, the students saw disciplinary events in parts. They saw relevance of identifying who started it, their intentions, and their reasoning for challenging the teacher. They believed that the weight of each piece should influence the severity of their punishment. When their teachers

neglected to consider each piece in this way, the students saw them as exaggerating the events.

Sheeta's findings ultimately point the power of ethnic and cultural differences in communication styles. Each group approached and negotiated conflict in different yet culturally appropriate ways. Many students believed that through the eyes of their teachers their experiences of conflict and discipline were largely invisible because of this cultural disconnect. In the end, without resolving these conflicts, both students and teachers remained critical and angry.

Sheeta's goal was to provide a deeper understanding of the differences in how different groups of students perceive and approach conflicts. One of the strengths of her research is its credibility; she triangulated her findings by using different racial/ethnic groups and a variety of data collection methods. She included the voices of students and teachers, and accurately generalized her findings to relevant theory on interethnic communication. The consistency between her findings and such theories makes her research very dependable. Her findings are most transferable to contexts in which primarily European American teachers are working with a diverse set of students. Sheeta's use of multiple data sources and triangulation in her methods makes her findings more reliable. Finally, Sheeta included sufficient detail in discussing her methodology to indicate that her research is confirmable.

Farkas, Grobe, Sheenhan, and Shuan (1990) conducted a correlational study with data from 128,405 students to quantify the relationship between teachers perceptions of students' backgrounds and student achievement.

Farkas, et al. organized their study on the idea that teachers, as gatekeepers, determine students' access to higher levels of study. They examined the relationship between the cognitive and non-cognitive traits that teacher's reward, and how those rewards influence student performance. The researchers found that teachers' perceptions of students' backgrounds influenced their beliefs about students' skills and behavior, which indirectly affected how the teachers dispensed grades.

The participants for Farkas, et al.'s study were students from a southwestern urban school district. At the time of the study, student enrollment was 20.5% Anglo American, 49.2% African American, 28% Hispanic/Latin@, 0.4% Native American, and 1.9% Asian American. The final student sample (n = 486) came from 22 middle schools. A large percentage of students came from low-income homes and approximately half qualified for free or reduced lunch. The ethnic diversity of the district's teachers (N = 7,315) was 55% Anglo American, 37% African American, and 7% Hispanic. Almost 75% of the teachers had more than six years of experience (M = 11 years).

Farkas, et al. obtained data from the district's 1986-1987 school year records, and supplemented their data with a teacher questionnaire. They focused on students enrolled in seventh- and eighth- grade social studies courses. Longer tests in these courses made them more reliable, and the students took the same basic skills tests [Iowa Basic Skills Test (ITBS)].

Farkas, et al. conducted three regression analyses comparing student and teacher characteristics with work habits and styles, coursework mastery, and

course grades. For each analysis, student characteristics included ethnicity (African American, Asian, and Hispanic students coded separately; Anglo American students omitted), gender (male: 1, female: 0), and poverty (free or reduced lunch: 1). Teacher characteristics included ethnicity, experience, and gender.

In the first regression, Farkas, et al. analyzed relationships between basic academic skills, habits, and styles against student and teacher characteristics and interactions. Poverty and ethnicity were statistically significant in terms of basic skills. Low-income students ($ß$ = -5.13, t = 3.9) scored lower than high-income students. Asian American students ($ß$ = 5.21, t = 2.4) scored the highest, while African American ($ß$ = -8.11, t = 5.0) and Hispanic/Latin@ students ($ß$ = -4.70, t = 2.7) scored the lowest. Similarly, ITBS scores revealed that Asian American students were half a grade above Anglo Americans, while low-income, African American, and Hispanic/Latin@ students were half a grade below. Interactions between student and teacher ethnicity indicated a large, negative, and statistically significant African American teacher/African American student correlation ($ß$ = -2.08, t = 2.2) for absenteeism. That is, African American students were less likely to be absent when they had African American teachers.

Interactions between student characteristics and work habits indicated statistically significant negative effect for males ($ß$ = -7.48, t = 2.8), and an extremely large positive effect for Asian Americans ($ß$ = 24.79, t = 5.2). Farkas, et al. predicted the value for work habits of higher-income Anglo American females at 60.8; being Asian American raised that mean by 25 points. When they

added teacher characteristics to the equation, only African American teachers negative effect on work habits ($ß$ = -10.87, t = 2.0) was statistically significant. All of the participating teachers reported that Asian American students had the best work habits.

Teachers rated females as less disruptive than males ($ß$ = 5.94, t = 5.2), and poor students ($ß$ = -6.39, t = 7.2) as less disruptive than the less poor. Asian Americans ($ß$ = -11.23, t = 2.4) were the least disruptive, and African Americans ($ß$ = 14.06, t = 4.0) were the most disruptive. Interactions between student and teacher ethnicity revealed that African American teachers rate African American students as more disruptive ($ß$ = 19.36, t = 2.8). However, African American teachers rated their African American students work habits higher than other teachers ($ß$ = 9.68, t = 1.4).

When Farkas, et al. compared the above variables with teacher judgments of student appearance and dress, they found that Asian Americans ($ß$ = 13.10, t = 3.0) scored higher than Anglo Americans, and low-income students ($ß$ = -6.80, t = 2.6) scored much lower than higher-income students. When the researchers added interactions for student characteristics, low-income Hispanic/Latin@ students ($ß$ = 16.13, t = 2.0) scored highly.

In their second regression, Farkas, et al. analyzed relationships between student characteristics and coursework mastery as determined by a curriculum-reference test (CRT). Asian Americans ($ß$ = 10.34, t = 5.5) scored the highest, while African Americans ($ß$ = -5.41, t = 3.8) scored the lowest. Males scored higher than females ($ß$ = 2.90, t = 2.7). They also found that basic skills ($ß$ =

0.33, t = 9.4) and teacher judgment of student work habits ($ß$ = 0.14, t = 7.0)

positively affected coursework mastery. Days absent ($ß$ = -.14, t = 1.3) and

teacher judgment of disruptiveness ($ß$ = -.02, t = 1.1) negatively related to

coursework mastery.

Farkas, et al. found that controlling for basic skills and noncognitive

variables increased the magnitude of the male effect: males showed significantly

stronger coursework mastery than females. This effect grew stronger when the

researchers controlled for absenteeism, appearance and dress, basic skills,

disruptiveness, and work habits. Males showed greater coursework mastery in

spite of teachers' negative judgments of their work habits and rating of greater

disruptiveness. Controlling for basic skills and non-cognitive variables also

reduced negative differentials for poor, African American, and Hispanic/Latin@

students, and the positive differentials for Asian American students. These

variables explained approximately half of the ten-point Asian American/Anglo

American differential, and nearly half of the five-point African American/Anglo

American differential.

In their third regression analysis, Farkas, et al. examined the extent to

which student and teacher characteristics combined with coursework mastery

determined the grades teachers assigned. On average, Asian Americans scored

nearly ten points higher than Anglo Americans did. Ethnicity's effect on course

grades only had a negative effect for African American males ($ß$ = -2.83, t = 2.3).

However, the researchers stated that they found no evidence of White teachers

discriminating against students of color when giving course grades. Basic skills,

student behavior, and teacher judgments of students' habits and styles were strong predictors of school success, as evidenced by a .58 increase in R^2 when the researchers added basic skills and non-cognitive variables to the equation. They concluded that the teachers graded on these factors more than their relation to coursework mastery did. Adding coursework mastery to the equation, income and ethnicity effects diminished to no statistical significance. However, gender still had an effect. Teachers graded males 1.35 points lower than females. As the researchers noted, this reflects literature suggesting that teachers grade boys down because they find them hard to manage. Comparing student and teacher background characteristics, the researchers found that Hispanic/Latin@s received higher grades when they demonstrated better basic skill performance.

Frakas, et al. findings do not suggest teacher bias in the allocation of grades. However, they do suggest that teachers' can be biased in their perceptions of student skills and behavior, which ultimately predicts student achievement. For instance, teachers place more value on behaviors that reflect the ideal of citizenship, as measured through attendance and work habits, than cognitive (i.e., test score) performance. As students' coursework mastery increases, rewards function as incentives for behaviors such as school attendance and work habits because they support coursework mastery. However, as this research suggests, there is a relationship between factors such as race, ethnicity, culture, gender, and socioeconomic status and how teachers perceive students behavior and academic performance. Students from different

cultures exhibit different behaviors and study habits, and how teachers perceive their students' academic skills and behavior could lead to self-fulfilling prophecies. This effect may be subtle, but could manifest in teacher attention to certain negative behaviors of some students and positive behaviors of others. Thus, it is not simply teacher bias in the allocation of grades, but how well they pay attention to their students. The result is an indirect relationship between student behavior and grades mediated by teacher perception.

One of the strengths of Farkas, et al.'s research is that they analyzed data rather than tested a treatment, which diminished the possibility of threats to internal validity. The researchers controlled for independent variables, which reduced confounding effects on their findings. In terms of external validity, the large sample size and its diversity make their findings broadly generalizable.

Summary

The six studies in this section each dealt with different aspects of students' backgrounds and their relationship to academic achievement. This research suggests that students' backgrounds can shape their educational experiences when, for instance, teachers and schools are unresponsive to students' cultural and social needs

Felner, Brand, DuBois, Adan, Mulhall, and Evans's (1995) research provided a deep analysis of the relationship between socioeconomic disadvantage and academic achievement. They found that the conditions associated with socioeconomic disadvantage – most importantly, low parental

education attainment and occupational status – negatively affect student achievement. Blau, Lamb, Stearns, and Pellerings's (2001) findings highlighted the relationship between socioeconomic status and academic achievement. They found that students from "cosmopolitan" neighborhoods – those with high diversity coupled with low resource consolidation – make considerable gains in terms of social learning. O'Donnell, Schwab-Stone, and Muyeed (2002) found that school support can diminish the effects of exposure to community violence. In their research, O'Donnell, et al. noted that the majority of students exposed to community violence were socioeconomically disadvantaged African Americans male. Parental and school support, however, are associated with these students resilience against school misconduct. Blake, Butler, Lewis, and Darensbourg (2010) found that Black girls are overrepresented in exclusionary discipline practices, and noted that this trend is similar for Black boys. Sheeta (1996) found that students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds perceive conflict discipline differently. While European American students and teachers tended to have similar perceptions, students of color tended to perceive their teachers (who were most often European American) as favoring certain students, and not taking into account factors they perceived as important to consider in conflicts and the resultant disciplinary actions. Farkas, Grobe, Sheenhan, and Shuan (1990) found teachers allotment of grades was associated with their perceptions of students' behaviors and academic skills. The teachers in their study tended to have better perceptions of the behaviors and skills of female and Asian students, and lower perceptions of male, poor, and African American students.

In the end, the findings from this collection of research suggest that students' backgrounds are associated with academic achievement. Most of these studies tended to focus on the educational experiences of poor African American students. These students tend to live in neighborhoods that are defined by resource consolidation, have parents who achieve lower levels or educational attainment and work in low-status occupations, and are at risk of being exposed to community violence. Each of these factors is associated with lower levels of academic achievement. However, rather than receive the support they need from their schools, which could have a positive effect on their resilience against school misconduct, they are overrepresented in exclusionary discipline practice. Gaps in communication cause them to have conflicts with their teachers, leaving them feeling alienated and powerless. In addition, their teachers' dispensation of grades is often mediated by negative preconceptions of their skills and behaviors.

Teacher-Student Relationships are Associated with Student Achievement

The studies in this section focused on the relationship between teacher-student relationships (TSRs) and academic achievement. In the first study, Jamieson and Thomas (1974) found that teachers' use of coercive power might be linked to students' avoidance of conflict, which can have implications for their future relationships with authority. In the second study, Cotten and Wilson (2006) found that college level students' misunderstanding of the purpose of teacher-student relationships can impede the development of social relationships with

their faculty. In the third and fourth studies, Goodenow (1993) and O'Connor and McCartney (2007), the researchers found a positive relationship between TSR quality and student achievement. In the fifth study, Gehlbach, Brinkworth, and Harris (2011) found students' and teachers' perceptions of TSR quality were associated with academic achievement. In the sixth study, Murray and Malmgen (2005) found that improving the TSR could improve students' academic performance. In the final study, Muller (2001) found that for students at risk of dropping out of high school their perception that their teachers cared for them was associated with their level of achievement.

Jamieson and Thomas (1974) conducted a correlational study of 207 high school, undergraduate, and graduate students in order to quantify the ways in which power and conflict shaped interactions between students and teachers, and found a dynamic relationship between teachers' use of power and students avoidance of conflict. The participants included 105 high school students from Southern California, 61 undergraduate students from UCLA, and 41 masters and doctoral students from UCLA's School of Education and Management.

Jamieson and Thomas collected data by providing each student with a three-part questionnaire. The first part asked the students to report on their satisfaction with their education and their teachers. The students assessed their own learning in relation to the influence their teachers upon their behavior and attitudes. The researchers asked the participants to choose from two pairs of social power that identified why they accepted the influence of their teachers. For example, "The other person has the right to tell me what to do" (legitimate) vs.

"The other person could do something unpleasant to me" (coercive); or "I would like to be his friend" (referent) vs. "I sometime have to go along to avoid trouble" (coercive). The students then identified which one appropriately described their relationships with their teachers. Then the researchers determined the score by noting the number of times students chose a certain power base over another.

The other two sections of the questionnaire assessed the power bases through which teachers influence students, and how the students approached conflict with their teachers. The researchers did this by asking students to identify how they would respond in different situations. Similar to the exercise above, they provided the students with a set of statements that identified whether they are competitive, collaborative, compromising, accommodating, or avoidant in conflicts. Again, the researchers calculated the scores by determining how many times the participants chose one type of statement over another.

Jamieson and Thomas consistently found that high school and undergraduate students' predominantly perceived their teachers' power bases as coercive (m = 5.59 and 5.95) legitimate (m = 5.62 and 5.36), and expert (m = 5.25 and 5.30). These three power bases represented authoritarian positions. The majority of students, across all three groups, identified avoidance as their primary strategy for negotiating conflict with their teachers (m = 7.13). Jamieson and Thomas noted that coercive power and avoidance were not directly associated with each other; student dissatisfaction mediated their relationship. They found a negative correlation between teachers' use of coercive power and student satisfaction (r = -.27, p ≤ .01), which the researchers interpreted to mean

that socialized dependence was at the root of student dissatisfaction. They explained that during developmental stages students learn to take a submissive role in relation to their teachers' authoritarian position. They miss opportunities to challenge authority and engage in educational change. Therefore, their internalized sense of powerlessness turns into alienation, withdrawal (avoidance), or militancy. These three approaches leave students with a recurring lack of opportunities for conflict resolution, thus causing their needs to go unmet. This, Jamieson and Thomas noted, could explain the relationship between coercion and avoidance. This pattern indicates a highly uneven distribution of power in relationship between students and teachers.

The strength of this research comes from its generalizability. Jamieson and Thomas expected that the diversity of participants coupled with the fact that they spent so much time in classrooms with teachers made it reasonable to expect that the pattern of avoidance documented in their findings would generalize to some degree to other relationships of authority, which suggests some external validity. However, though they found the correlation between teachers' use of coercive power to be statistically significant at the $p < .01$ level, which is only moderately significant, the correlation was not very strong. This suggests a low level of internal validity. The researchers also failed to include any measures of reliability (e.g., Cronbach's alphas) for the instruments they used, which makes their findings less reliable. This researchers did, however, use multiple sources of data which makes their findings somewhat more reliable.

Cotten and Wilson (2006) conducted an ethnographic study of 49 undergraduate students at a mid-sized public research university in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States in order to highlight the underlying processes that determined interactions between the students and their teachers. They found that factors such as students' time, awareness, interest, and insecurity, as well as teachers' attitudes, presence, and personality influenced the interactions between students and teachers. The school had a moderately diverse student population: 18% of the students were Asian American, 16% were African American, 3% were Hispanic/Latin@. Approximately 50% of the students were female.

Cotten and Wilson gathered data from nine focus groups (two groups to 10 students) between February and April of 2002 using participant observation, unstructured interviews, documents, and photographs. The researchers attended and moderated each of the focus groups. They posed the following questions to each group: Do you have contact with a faculty member outside the classroom? Can you tell us about the types of interactions that you have? For those of you who do not have contact with faculty members outside of the classroom, why do you think this is? What are your perceptions of your interactions with faculty outside the classroom? Who initiates interactions outside the classroom, and why? Do students have an interest in forging relationships with faculty? What factors would make it more/less likely that you would develop relationships outside the classroom with faculty? The researchers made audio recordings and

transcriptions of the meetings' discussions, and noted group interactions in their field notes.

Cotton and Wilson analyzed their data using an inductive coding system that focused on the group questions, debriefing sessions, and early reviews of the transcripts. Their key analytic constructs included student-faculty interactions and frequency, factors that hindered interaction, reasons for contact, who initiated contact, the benefits and costs of contact, students' perceptions of contact, and key demographic classifications – residency status, class, and sex. The researchers then used two coding processes to analyze their data.

Cotten and Wilson's analysis produced many thought-provoking results, however, the following two results are the most pertinent to this literature review: (1) the students misunderstood of the roles and responsibilities of their teachers, and (2) the teachers' dispositions positively or negatively influenced their relationships with students. First, the students demonstrated a limited, almost purely academic rather than social view of their teachers. This perspective represented their general misunderstanding of the academic environment, as if social development is not part of the academic experience. Rarely did the students report that their interactions with their teachers were interpersonal rather than academic in nature; they were generally brief and centered on homework assistance. The researchers noted that the students seemed to view interactions with their teachers as part of their coursework. Their teachers were merely tools for the students' academic progress rather than actual people with identities beyond academics. However, context played an important role in

characterizing interactions between the students and their teachers. When the students interacted with teachers who they were not currently working with academically, their interactions happened to be more social than academic.

Second, the students perceived their faculty as neutral, uninterested in interacting, making them seem unapproachable. The students reported that they often felt intimidated and belittled in response to the faculty's egotism. The teachers' affect had a clear association with the frequency, nature, and length of their interactions with their students. Cotten and Wilson noted that this implied that the teachers needed to take a more active interest in their students, and encourage interactions with a focus on quality over quantity because interactions between students and teachers can increase students' academic self-confidence, and become the basis for performance-based motivation.

In sum, the students viewed school as an academic rather than social environment. Their motivation was task-specific and grade oriented. Coupled with the teachers' attitudes toward their students, these factors contributed to the obstruction of the students' intellectual curiosity. For them, the college experience was merely a means for receiving credentials, not engaging in social and intellectual development.

Cotten and Wilson's study investigated the frequency and nature of interactions between students and teachers at the college level. Their ethnographic approach and use of focus groups was appropriate for uncovering the experiences of individuals and groups within the institutional context of academia. Though focus groups allowed the researchers to triangulate their data

and conduct member-checks, data from faculty would have enriched their findings by providing another perspective on student-teacher interactions. Cotten and Wilson's methods were credible, as they comprehensibly explained their purposive sampling procedures – using introductory courses, residential assistants, and student listservs in order to obtain a diverse sampling – and data collection processes. The findings are also dependable because Cotten and Wilson frequently referred to research with similar findings, or literature that supported their findings. However, as the researchers noted, their findings are only transferable to similar institutions because of the role that campus culture plays in an academic environment.

Goodenow (1993) conducted a correlational study with 353 early adolescent students in order to quantify relationships between students' perceptions of school support and their sense of belonging and academic achievement. She found correlations between teacher support and students' effort and grades. Goodenow conducted the study at a school in New England in late spring. Her sample included 126 sixth graders, 122 seventh graders, and 105 eighth graders, ranging in age from 11 to 15 years old. Ninety-three percent of the students were White.

Goodenow administered a School Opinion Questionnaire to measure the students' motivation in a particular academic class. She assessed the students' motivation by measuring their expectancy of success in the class, and their perceived value of the content. She measured the students' expectancy on a 1-5 Likert-type scale, which obtained a Cronbach's alpha score of .90. She used the

eight-item Intrinsic Value Scale to measure the students' interest, value, and perceived importance of an academic subject, which obtained a Cronbach's alpha score of .88. She then measured the students' perceptions of the social-emotional quality of the class in terms of their own sense of belonging/alienation and personal support from teachers and peers. To do this, she used a Class Belonging and Support Scale (CBSS), which consists of 28 1-5 Likert-type items (Cronbach's alpha = .93). Goodenow's data set also included the teachers' indications of their students' probable fourth quartile grade in English, and an "effort" rating (3 = high, 1 = low).

Goodenow measured students' motivation by analyzing sample means and underlying factors in students' subjective sense of belonging and support. First, it is important to note that she found correlations within students' motivation, between expectancy and value (R^2 = .633, adjusted R^2 = .399). Correlations between expectancy and value across subgroups ranged from R = .563 to R = .729 (p < .001). Expectancy also had the highest correlations with students' effort (R = .422, p < .001) and grades (R = .625, p < .001). To a certain extent, the valued students attributed to a class depended on how whether or not they expected to be successful in it. Overall, the three belonging/support factors that Goodenow measured (belonging/alienation, peer support, and teacher support) explained over a third of the variation she found in expectancy (adjusted R^2 = .40). Of these three factors, teacher support had the most consistently substantial influence across student subgroups in terms of expectancy [grade six (n = 110): .511; grade seven (n = 116): .506; grade eight (n = 98): .435; girls (n =

156): .566; boys (n = 168): .404 (p < .001)]. Therefore, teacher support was clearly associated with expectancy on some level for all of the students in the study, and the more they expected to be successful the more they valued what they were studying. This suggests that the level of support that students perceive from their teachers can play some part in whether or not they expect to be successful and, ultimately, how much they value what they are learning.

Goodenow's findings provide some support her two hypotheses: belonging/support factors were associated with motivation (expectancy and intrinsic value), and furthermore, belonging and motivation were associated with classroom effort and student achievement. Correlations between students' expectancy and, value, and academic performance were statistically significant at the .1% significance level. R-values greater than 0.5 indicated that correlations between expectancy and intrinsic value, effort, and grades were moderate. Of the factors she measured, teacher support had the greatest influence on expectancy. Correlations between teacher support and expectancy were significant at the .1% significance level, yet they were mostly weak to moderate (R = 0.3-0.5), with stronger correlations for female and younger students than others. In terms of internal validity, these correlations were not strong enough to rule the influence of factors such as peer support, sense belonging versus alienation, or other factors Goodenow did not examine. However, she provided reliable research because all of the scales that she used had high Cronbach's alpha scores. In terms of external validity, Goodenow's use of convenient sampling indicates some sampling bias, which means that her results might not

hold true for all populations. The small sample size and its lack of diversity also put some limitation on the generalizability of her findings.

O'Connor and McCartney (2007) conducted a longitudinal correlational study of 880 children to quantify the relationship between the quality of TSRs and students achievement, and found a positive correlations between TSR quality and student achievement. The researchers worked with the participants from preschool to third grade. The participants were originally part of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development's Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development (1999). The final sample included children who had also participated in a Strange Situation experiment, which is a type of experiment designed to activate children's attachment behavioral system.

O'Connor and McCartney examined third-grade achievement using a hierarchical regression model that included a number ecological variables that ultimately affect development, for instance, mothers and teachers. Their goal was to determine how these variables interact and influence achievement. Their measurements included achievement, authoritarian parenting, child behavior problems, classroom environment, early cognitive abilities, episodes of family poverty, ethnicity, gender, maternal attachment, maternal education, and the quality of TSRs, peer relationships. To achieve the purpose of this literature review, the following summary of findings will focus solely on those findings concerning TSR quality and student achievement.

To evaluate the teachers' feelings about students' actions toward her or him, O'Connor and McCartney developed a 15-item subscale of the Student

Teacher Relationship Scale (STRS), which obtained Cronbach's alpha scores ranging from .88 to .94. They based the items on attachment theory and the Attachment Q-sets. While administering the STRS, the researchers used a five-point Likert scale (1 – definitely does not apply, 5 = definitely applies) that allowed the teachers to rate how applicable each item was to their current relationship with a particular child. Then they identified two features of their relationships to study: conflict and closeness.

O'Connor and McCartney measured teacher and student behaviors in the classroom through observations using the Classroom Observational System (COS; The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1999). They focused on classroom engagement, academic instruction, and teacher attentiveness. They observed each child in two 44-minute cycles, which were structured so that the observers recorded and observed in 30-second intervals during three ten-minute periods.

O'Connor and McCartney used individual growth modeling to measure the quality of teacher-student relationships throughout the study by assessing teacher perceptions of the TSR. They used Ordinary Least Squares regression to determine the true initial status (intercept) and rate of change (slope) in TSRs for each individual and the population. This method revealed a moderate association between the intercept and slope (τ = .50). The mean value for the intercept was 63.38, and the mean value for the slope was -.05.

Due to significant variability in TSR quality between students, O'Connor and McCartney used Nagin cluster analysis to classify students based on

patterns of linear change and level for quality or teacher-child relationships. This led to three classifications of students: stable-moderate (25% of the sample), declining-low (approximately 13%), and inclining-high (approximately 62%). Stable-moderate students exhibited no significant change in TSR quality, and had average relationships at third grade. Declining-low students demonstrated the least optimal pattern (slope = -1.52, intercept = 44.34), and had low quality relationships at third grade. Inclining-high students indicated the most favorable pattern (slope = .82, intercept = 70.00), and had relatively high-quality teacher-student relationships at third grade.

O'Connor and McCartney found that TSR quality ($r =.25$, $p <.01$) and change in TSR quality ($r = .24$, $p < .05$) showed to have substantial, independent effects on achievement when they controlled for child and family variables. When they added classroom environment (engagement, instruction, and teacher attentiveness) to the equation, TSR quality dropped from $r = .25$ to $r = .14$, which they interpreted to mean that student and teacher behaviors mediated the effects of TSR quality on academic achievement.

When O'Connor and McCartney compared stable-moderate students to declining-low students, they found the associations between TSR quality and achievement was more significant for declining-low students ($r = -.07$, $p < .05$). They interpreted this to mean that TSR quality was a risk factor for those students. Compared with declining-low students, stable-moderate students also demonstrated higher levels of classroom engagement. Consequently, higher

levels of engagement were associated with higher levels of achievement ($r = .19$, $p = < .001$).

O'Connor and McCartney's findings concerning the effect of TSR quality on achievement were statistically significant at the 1% and 5% significance levels, and the correlations were relatively weak ($r < .30$). Family environment factors (maternal education, episodes of poverty, and authoritarian parenting had similar correlations at higher levels of significance. In terms of internal validity, these results indicate that although the TSR is a factor other variables are also correlated with student achievement. The research is reliable because the scales the researchers used had Cronbach's alpha scores greater than .80. In terms of external validity, the researchers pulled from studies that used a conditional random sampling reflective of the general demographic diversity of the United States, which ensures the broad generalizability of their findings.

Gehlbach, Brinkworth, and Harris (2011) conducted a correlational study with 922 adolescents and 127 teachers to quantify relationships between their perceptions of TSR quality academic achievement, and found positive correlations between those perceptions and student achievement. The researchers drew samples from six different schools, five urban and one suburban. Three were public schools, two were private, and one was military/vocational. Demographics varied between schools, but about half the students, and most of the teachers were female. The majority of the students were Black, White, and Hispanic, with different schools having a majority of one or another race/ethnicity.

The study consisted of two levels of analysis. First, Gehlbach, Brinkworth, and Harris measured how students and teachers perceived TSR-positivity and TSR-negativity. They assessed differences in perception of TSRs across particular subgroups by running a series of multi-level models, nesting students within teachers, and controlling for school through fixed-effects. Both of the student and teacher TSR-positivity and -negativity subscales had Cronbach's alpha scores of .91 and .74, respectively. In their second analysis, Gehlbach, Brinkworth, and Harris analyzed how the TSR could predict student outcomes. The researchers analyzed this data using Stata's mixed procedure to examine two outcomes for each measure. Stata is a statistical software package that assists researchers in unbiased estimations about the predictive power of TSRs. In each model (school), the researchers controlled for gender (female = 0, male = 1), and race (non-White = 0, White = 1). This analysis only included four of the sample schools due missing data for the other schools.

Gehlbach, Brinkworth, and Harris's first analysis revealed that, in terms of gender, girls rated TSR-positivity higher than boys did (t = 2.87; p = .004); yet, there were no gender differences between students concerning TSR-negativity (t = .74; ns). Although the teachers rating of TSR-positivity did not differ based on students' gender (t = -1.54; ns), they did feel more negatively about their male students (t – 4.12; p < .001). In terms of race, White students felt just as positive about their teachers (t = -.53; ns) when compared to their non-White counterparts. White students felt slightly less negatively about their teachers than their non-White counterparts (t = -1.92; p = .06). The teachers reported that they

felt no more positively towards White students as compared to non-White students (t = -1.14; *ns*), but they did feel less negatively toward their White students than their non-White counterparts (t = - 2.09; p = .04). The researchers found no association between the teachers' gender or race and any of the TSR subscales. In other words, the teachers' gender or race did not predict how students perceived TSRs, and teachers of a particular gender or race did not rate their TSRs higher than other teachers did.

In terms of student achievement, as measured by students' grades and quality of classroom contributions, Gehlback, Binkworth, and Harris found that teachers' TSR-positivity was a consistent predictor of students' grades (model 1: Estimate = 4.66, *SE* = 1.71, p < .01; model 3: Estimate = 4.55, *SE* = 1.24, p < .001; model 4: Estimate = 4.34, *SE* = 1.52, p < .01). It also consistently predicted the quality of students' classroom participation (model 2: Estimate = .60, *SE* = .17, p < .01; model 3: Estimate = .68, *SE* = .10, p < .001; model 4: Estimate = .41, *SE* = .12, p < .01). There were also strong associations between teachers' - TSR-positivity and the frequency of students' contributions (model 2: Estimate = 1.36, *SE* = .16, p < .001; model 3: Estimate = 1.51, *SE* = .15, p < .001; model 4: Estimate = .86, *SE* = .15, p < .001). It also predicted the amount of homework students turned in (model 1: Estimate = 4.16, *SE* = 1.76, p < .05; model 2: Estimate = 16.39, *SE* = 3.30, p < .001; model 3: Estimate = 4.83, *SE* = 1.62, p < .01; model 4: Estimate = 13.95, *SE* = 4.64, p < .01).

In their final analysis, Gehlbach, Brinkworth, and Harris performed Ordinary Least Squares regression with the data from model 3 to measure the

predictive power of their new measure of the TSR. They found that the TSR accounted for 17% of the variation in the students' grades, and 30% of the variation in the quality of their classroom participation. When the researchers examined student behaviors, the TSR accounted for 45% of the variation in the frequency of students classroom participation, and 18% of the variation in the percentage of homework they completed.

Gehlbach, Brinkworth, and Harris sought to reveal the complexity of the TSR, sharpen researchers' understanding of its association with different student outcomes, and provide a means for assessing interventions intended to improve the TSR. The result was a scale that measured the TSR holistically by distinguishing between students' and teachers' perceptions of TSR-positivity and -negativity. The researchers' scale proved to have moderate to strong Cronbach's alpha scores. Further to this study's credit, the researchers used selective diversity sampling, which makes their findings generalizable to a variety of school settings with diverse student populations.

Murray and Malmgen (2005) conducted a correlational study with 48 students and eight teachers in order to quantify the effects of an intervention intended to improve TSRs, and found that supportive TSRs can positively affect school performance. The study took place in February and June at a midwestern high school that served approximately 1100 African American students. The schools' reported graduation rate was 57%, and only 17% of students graduated with their entering class. Only 11% of the students were meeting or exceeding

state standards in reading, 9% in writing, and 3% in mathematics. The average American College Testing (ACT) score was 15.

Eight teachers within the school volunteered to participate in the study: three English teachers, two math teachers, two science teachers, and one social studies teacher. Murray and Malmgen asked the teachers to nominate between five and ten students who (a) enrolled in any one of their classes throughout the day, and (b) demonstrated significant emotional or behavioral problems. Teachers completed assessments for each of the students they had nominated and provided students' academic grades from the semester directly preceding the study, which led to the nomination of 66 students. The researchers eliminated two extreme outliers, as well as 16 other students with missing data. This process led to the final sample of 48 students. All of the participating students received free or reduced-price lunch, 75% were male (n = 36), and 31% were receiving special education services (n = 15).

Murray and Malmgen worked with the teachers to design an intervention that would hopefully establish and measure the effects of ongoing involvement, communication, and warmth in TSRs. They divided the students into a control and an intervention group, and gathered data at two time points (T1 and T2) for comparison. Each teacher was assigned four or five of the students whom they had nominated. The teachers in the intervention group met with a majority of their students (approximately 70%) once or twice weekly, increased praise, and called the students at home one or two times monthly to discuss their progress in school. They also completed assessments using the Walker-McConnell Scale of

Social Competence and School Adjustment, Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL), and academic adjustment. The researchers also collected data on the students' attendance and GPAs.

The Walker-McConnell Scale is a 53-item teacher rating scale that used to measure the teachers' perceptions of their students self-control, peer relations, school adjustment, and empathy. The items in this scale had high Cronbach's alpha scores, indicating high internal consistency (self control αs: T1 = .92, T2 = .93; peer relations αs: T1 = .92, T2 = .91; school adjustment αs: T1 = .91, T2 = .94; empathy αs: T1 = .87; T2 = .88; overall αs: T1 = .96, T2 = .96). The results of the teachers' assessments showed that 58% of the T1 group and 59% of T2 scores below the 19th percentile on the Walker-McConnell Scale, which indicated that a large proportion of them had significant difficulties in social adjustment.

Murray and Malmgen used the Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) to measure students' internalizing and externalizing symptomology. The internalizing scale contained 35 items, including withdrawn, somatic complaints, and anxious-depressed factors (Cronbach's αs: T1 = .89, T2 = .80). The externalizing scale contained 34 items, including delinquent behavior and aggressive behavior factors (Cronbach's αs: T1 = .93, T2 = .92). Approximately 23% of youth in the intervention group and 15% of youth in the control group had scores above the 95th percentile on the internalizing scale of the CBCL. Sixty-four percent of youth in the intervention group and 65% of youth in the control group had scores above the 95th percentile of the normative sample on the

externalizing scale of the CBCL. These proportions provided reliable support for the teachers' initial nominations and suggested that a very large proportion of the youth were exhibiting emotional and behavioral problems.

Murray and Malmgen administered a teacher rating scale of students' classroom engagement at both time points and included five items concerning the students' classroom engagement (e.g., "In my class this student seems very tuned in."). The teachers provided responses on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "1-Not At All True" to "4-Very True". This scale assessed student engagement versus disaffection in classroom settings. Internal consistency reliabilities were high at both time points (Cronbach's αs: T1 = .81, T2 = .88).

Murray and Malmgen conducted five separate one-way analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) tests. Their examination showed that the intervention only produced moderate statistically significant results for GPAs [$F(1,47) = 4.36$, $p <$ .05]. Students in intervention group had higher post-intervention GPAs (adjusted M = .97) than the control group (adjusted M = .69). The researchers determined the positive effect of the intervention on GPA to be in the medium range as assessed by the partial n^2 of .09. This result is significant because the GPAs were three content area composites, excluding the participating teachers' grades. The total independence of the GPAs strengthens the importance of intervention's effect.

The groups did not differ significantly on the Walker-McConnell Scale analysis at post-test (adjusted intervention group: M = 143.04; adjusted control group: M = 138.12, $F(1,47)$ = .42, ns). Analysis of the CBCL revealed that even

when the researchers adjusted for pretest scores the groups did not differ

significantly with regard to emotional adjustment, the internalizing variable

[adjusted intervention M = 4.81, adjusted control M = 5.78. $F(1,47)$ = .81, ns].

Analysis of externalizing variable indicated virtually identical adjusted means for

both groups (adjusted intervention M = 24.13, adjusted control M = 24.24).

Analysis concerning school adjustment revealed that the groups did not show

significant differences in engagement [$F(1,47)$ = .97, ns].

Murray and Malmgen's goal with this study was to show that an

intervention designed to improve the quality of the participants' relationships with

at least one teacher would improve the social, emotional, and school-related

adjustment of African American youth with emotional and behavioral problems.

However, the final analysis revealed that the only statistically significant result

was the correlation between teacher-student relationship quality and GPAs.

These results were significant at the 5% significance level, and were not strong

enough to rule out the influence of other factors. The scales used in this study,

however, were reliable due to their relative high Cronbach's alpha scores, all of

which were above .80, and many of which were above .90. In terms of external

validity, Murray and Malmgen's use of purposive sampling indicates that their

findings are primarily generalizable to high-poverty African American populations.

Muller (2001) conducted a correlational study using data from the National

Education Longitudinal Study (NELS) of 1988-1992 (n = 24,599) to examine the

effects of students' perceptions of TSR quality and teachers' perceptions of

student effort on academic achievement, and found that students' perception that

their teachers cared for them was associated with student achievement. The NELS included eighth-grade public school students who were determined to be at-risk for dropping out of high school by teacher reports. The researchers followed up with these students in 10th and 12th grades. Muller reduced the sample size used for her analysis to 6,007 by excluding students who did not have data from either a mathematics or science teacher, and students who were missing data on any of the variables she measured: 76% European American, 12% African American, 9% Latin@, 3% Asian American.

Muller surveyed students using a 1-4 Likert scale (Cronbach's alpha = .79), asking them to report their level of agreement with statements concerning how well they got along with their teachers, the quality of teaching, whether teachers showed interest in students or not, praised hard work, put students down, listened, and how they cared about their students. Then she averaged these items for a measure of how much the students perceived their teachers as caring.

Muller surveyed the teachers using a 1-5 Likert scale (Cronbach's alpha = .81) asked the teachers to report on how often the student completed their homework assignments and how well they paid attention in class. Then she averaged the teachers' responses for a measure of the teacher's assessment of the students' efforts.

Muller then took the results from her surveys and the NELS data and conducted regressions to determine the extent to which student and teacher factors interacted with academic achievement. These variables included, but

were not limited to, teachers' assessments of students being at risk for dropping out, students mathematics proficiency and test score growth, and students' perceptions of teacher care. When she included an interaction term for the net effects of students' perceptions that teachers care for them, at-risk students' mathematics proficiency coefficients (b = -1.14, $ß$ = -.24, p < .001), and test score growth coefficients (b = -8.66, p < .001) suggested that they might have had greater academic achievement when they perceived that their teachers care about them. In this case, TSR quality had a much larger effect than, for instance, students' socioeconomic status (b = .70 $ß$ = -.17, p < .001). Muller's findings suggest that there was an association between academic achievement and TSR quality. The students who teachers thought gave less effort had lower quality relationship with their teachers, and achieved less academically. Muller interpreted these findings to mean that the amount of effort that students put forth may depend upon how much they think that their teachers care for them, the extent of their willingness to act in students' best interest.

This study was reliable, as scales in Muller's surveys had acceptable to good Cronbach's alpha scores (.70 < a < .90). In terms of internal validity, the above statistics concerning mathematics proficiency and test score growth were strong enough for Muller to reject the null hypothesis that teacher care did not interact with academic achievement. Furthermore, Muller's use of selective sampling gave her a robust data set to work with, and made her findings broadly generalizable.

Summary

The studies in this section addressed the effects of TSRs on academic achievement. Jamieson and Thomas (1974) examined the politics of TSRs on two levels – first those that exist within the boundaries of the classroom, and then through their discussion of the implications that classroom politics can have for society. They speculated that teachers' use of coercive power in traditional high school settings is one factor in their development toward passive/dependent relationships to authority as adults. While supporting students necessarily entails the development of academic skills, this study suggest that an understanding of the politics of the classroom can help teachers develop better interpersonal relationships that support academic and social success. Cotten and Wilson (2006) found that students' at the college level often have a misunderstanding of the academic environment that impedes supportive relationship with their faculty. Each of the studies that followed found statistically significant correlations between factors within TSRs and academic achievement, though these correlations ranged from weak to relatively strong. However, when taken together, the effect of multiple factors within TSRs could be greater than the mere sum of its parts. Muller (2001) found that the quality of TSRs could be most important for the academic achievement of students at risk of dropping out of high school. However, none of these studies presented findings that exclude other factors that could affect student achievement and TSR quality.

Insisting that Students Meet High Expectations in Associated with

Student Achievement

The previous section reviewed research that suggests that teacher-student relationships are positively associated with student achievement. This section focuses on two aspects of the teacher-student relationships: high expectations and support. The first section reviews literature that focuses on setting and reinforcing high expectations. The second subsection reviews literature that focuses on the relationship between teacher support and academic achievement, and culturally responsive approaches to supporting students.

Setting and Reinforcing High Expectations

In the first study, Wood, Kaplan, and McLoyd (2007) found that parents and teachers tend to hold Black male youth to lower expectations than other students. In the second study, Miller, Heafner, and Massey (2009), found that students prefer and respond well to teachers who challenge them and set high expectations. In the third study, Howard (2001) and found that students' perceived their teachers high expectations to mean that they care for them. In the fourth, fifth, and sixth studies, Adkins-Coleman (2010); Bondy, Ross, Gallingnane and Hambacher (2008); and Brown (2004) found that effective and experienced teachers assertively set high expectations and insist that students meet them. In the final study, Ware (2006) found that in supporting their students culturally responsive teachers play the roles of authority figures, care givers, and pedagogues

Wood, Kaplan, and McLoyd's (2007) conducted a correlational study with 281 students and 301 caregivers to quantify the relationship between race, gender, and academic expectations of adolescent youth and found dynamic relationships between students', teachers' and parents' expectations. The researchers obtained their data from the Child and Family Study (CFS) of the New Hope Project during the mid- to late-1990s. The CFS required participating parents to be 18 years old, willing and able to work at leas 30 hours per week, and earning an income at or below 150% of the federally defined poverty level. The CFS researchers selected 745 families to participate in the study, and randomly assigned them to either a program group, or a control group. In their five-year follow-up to the CFS, Wood, Kaplan, and McLoyd narrowed their sample to 301 caregivers by focusing on African American families with children between the ages of six and 16. These caregivers reported on 466 children. This research also included self-reports from 307 youth, and teacher reports for 281 youth.

Wood, Kaplan, and McLoyd assessed the students' expectations with a two-item questionnaire: (a) did s/he expect to go to college, (b) did s/he expect to finish college. The students responded on a Likert-type scale (1 = Not at all sure; 5 = Very sure; Cronbach's alpha= .82). The researchers assessed the parents' expectations with a single item: "How far do you think [child's name] will actually go in school?" Response options included: 1 = Some high school, 2 = Finish high school, 3 = Technical school after high school or some college, 4 = Finish college, and 5 = Graduate or professional school after college. To obtain teacher

reports, the researchers mailed questionnaires to the teachers of participating children that assessed the teachers' expectations using two items: (a) "How sure are you that this child will go to college?" and (b) "How sure are you that this child will finish college?" Respondents used a 5-point response scale to indicate their degree of certainty (1 = Not at all sure; 5 = Very sure; Cronbach's alpha = .96).

Wood, Kaplan, and McLoyd analyzed the data using Ordinary Least Squares regression and STATA software. They used three separate regression models to determine the significance of the relationship between youths' gender and youths', parents', and teachers' expectations. Then they focused on determining if the magnitude of the difference between expectations of boys and girls increased as a function of age. They also used the Sobel test to determine the mediating the role of parents' expectations in relation to youths' gender and expectations.

In terms of gender (female = 0; male = 1) parents and teachers reported lower expectations for males ($ß$ = -.36, and -.36, $p < .05$, respectively), which were reflected in males' lower expectations of themselves ($ß$ = -22, $p < .05$). The researchers found parents' expectations to be a mediating factor between the youths' gender and their expectations. The Sobel test showed that gender's indirect effect on youths' expectations was significant at the $p < .05$ level.

When the researchers controlled for background characteristics, they found that teachers' expectations did not significantly predict the youths' expectations. However, the interaction between their teachers' and parents' expectations did significantly predict the youths' expectations ($ß$ = -.17, $p < .05$).

Consequently, high teacher expectations predicted higher youth expectations when parent expectations were low. Therefore, teacher expectations buffered the effects of lower parental expectations.

In their discussion of the findings, Wood, Kaplan, and McLoyd noted that most of the research into the effects of teacher expectations on student achievement typically shows small effects. However, over the long term, the effects can be greater, especially for African American males. They also noted that the compounding effects of the lower expectations held by African American males, their parents', and their teachers' can have a greater impact on the academic achievement of African American males than African American females, thereby contributing to the gender achievement gap among African American students.

Wood, Kaplan, and McLoyd set out to examine the variables that affect the academic expectations of African American males. Their most important findings reveal that (a) teacher and parents have lower expectations for African American males starting at a young age, and (b) teacher expectations and a school environment that African American males perceive as positive can shield students from the negative effects of "compromised family processes" (p. 424). One of the strengths of their research is that their measures obtained good to excellent Cronbach's alpha scores (greater than .80), which makes their findings reliable. They did not claim one to one correlations between variables, but rather, worked to delineate the impact that these relationships could have on each other. As noted above, while correlations between variables tended to be weak and

only statistically significant at the *p* < .05 level of significance, they showed to have compounding effects. Considering the findings from this perspective provides some sense of internal validity. In terms of external validity, the researchers use of selective sampling, and the relatively large sample size of the study make their findings most generalizable to low-income African American families and their teachers.

Miller, Heafner, and Massey (2009) conducted a sample survey with 24 students to quantify their responses to an intervention that increased teachers' academic expectations, and found that the students responded positively when their teachers challenged them. They conducted their intervention over the course three years at an urban school in an African American community of the Piedmont area in the Carolinas. Ninety-three percent of the students at the school were African American. Seventy-five percent qualified for free or reduced lunch. All of the teachers were European American. The school ranked below average on the ten courses it tested for each year, African American students performing significantly worse (only 38.4% performing at or above grade level) than other students.

Miller, Heafner, and Massey framed their study within literature concerning the development of students' self-regulatory practices. They noted that high-stakes environments often do not provide students and teachers with enough time and the resources necessary for develop these practices. In the particular case of Miller, Heafner, and Massey's study this meant, pacing guides, teacher-led discussion, rote memorization, and recall. The students resisted engaging in

challenging academic pursuits, and their teachers interpreted this as an inability to learn. Thus, the teachers had lower expectations for students who they thought incapable of learning. The intervention tested in this study was designed to reshape those relationships by exchanging teacher behaviors informed by low expectations with those informed by high expectations.

Miller, Heafner, and Massey wanted to find out if the students' "resistance to learning" would decrease in the face of increased academic expectations with the appropriate support. The intervention that the researchers designed increased academic expectations in terms of reading and writing, collaboration, and the completion of multi-day assignments. The first step in their intervention involved altering the students' assignments by orienting them away from test questions and toward reading and critical thinking skills. Four days a week, the students were assigned 20 minutes of reading, after which they had to respond to open-ended questions meant to check their reading comprehension.

The second step involved providing the students with the appropriate academic supports to help them meet these expectations – primarily, teaching the students homework completion strategies. The students' teachers began modeling reading strategies, using a variety of texts, helping students overcome difficulties through persistence, and gradually releasing responsibility as they became more comfortable with new strategies. They also emphasized a causal relationship between studying, homework completion, and academic success. To this end, the students were required to complete nightly homework logs in which they noted the times they started and stopped studying, and listed any

distractions. The teachers also stopped giving grades based on students'
classroom behavior, and started grading students on their homework completion
and performance on weekly quizzes and exams. The students were asked to
predict their scores for weekly tests or quizzes, and their efficacy for achieving
those predictions. Then the students were expected to graph their ratings and
discuss their performance in class.

For nine weeks during the intervention, Miller, Heafner, and Massey
interviewed 24 students – eight low, eight average, and eight high performers.
They administered a survey asking the students to rate the difficulty of their
homework on a ten-point scale and explain their rating. The survey also asked
the students to rate how much they liked and were interested in the homework.
The survey then asked the students to explain how they prepared for a recent
weekly quiz, what they might do to improve their grade, and what the teacher
could do to help. Then the students predicted how well they might do on the next
week's quiz. Finally, the survey asked the students if they had ever reached a
level of engagement with their studies at which they felt "Wow, this is really
great!" – what the researchers called "flow".

In coding their data from the survey, Miller, Heafner, and Massey focused
on identifying and confirming within-case themes. They categorized the survey
responses iteratively by identifying subcategories based on research literature
and the nature of students' responses. Two coders independently coded one-
third of the interview responses to obtain inter-rater reliability. Agreement was

greater than 95%, and the researchers resolved any inconsistencies through discussion.

Miller, Heafner, and Massey found that the students responded positively to the intervention, and were eager to discuss their academic work. However, the students were more interested in explaining their rationales for certain actions or attitudes than rating the researchers' questions. The researchers responded by focusing more on the students' explanations than their ratings. Their first research question focused on students' responses to higher academic expectations, whether they approached or avoided the increased expectations. The majority of the students (19) offered mixed responses. They reported that in the face of increased expectations they were motivated by learning, performance (grades), or they avoided their studies altogether. The researchers interpreted this to be a matter of context: the students were more engaged in their studies when they were in the class under a teacher's supervision, but lacked the skills necessary to complete tasks at home. The majority of the students (20 of the 24), however, identified learning rather than performance as their primary reason for approaching their studies.

Miller, Heafner, and Massey's second research question concerned the reasons why the students approached or avoided their studies. Nine out of 10 of the lower and average performing students combined reported that their teachers' instructional activities or their ability to generate interest in a topic were the main reasons why they approached their academic studies. Seven of the high performers indicated their teachers' ability to generate interest or their pre-

existing interests in a topic as their primary motivation for approaching a new

topic of interest. Miller, Heafner, and Massey noted that such students tended to

be motivated more by grades and graduation than solely for the sake of learning.

Furthermore, the lower and average performers offered four times as many

reasons for avoiding their studies than the high performers, which the

researchers interpreted this to mean that without the supervision of the teacher,

the students lacked the strategies necessary to complete work at home.

Miller, Heafner, and Massey's third research question concerned the

students' study attitudes and behaviors. They found that the higher achieving

students lacked follow-through when completing homework. They could not

transfer the discipline they had in extracurricular activities – such as sports and

caring for siblings – to the school setting. Nonetheless, they did not blame

themselves for their failures. They believed at some future date they would be

successful, and offered specific suggestions for improvement. Consequently,

they offered far fewer responses (75%) than the average and lower performers.

On the other hand, the low and average performers had good study strategies,

but did not know how to improve. For instance, while 12 students indicated that

they used memorization strategies to prepare for tests or quizzes, 13 reported

that they had no idea how to improve. Six of the average performers were able to

explain what they needed to do, but these students also had difficulty managing

multiple distractions when they studied at home. Half of them blamed themselves

for their inability to engage in good study strategies.

Though the researchers found stark contrasts between the responses, attitudes, and behaviors of the students they studied, there was one common factor. All of the students were unable to maintain their motivation and monitor their studies outside of the classroom. On the one hand, the low and average performing students were able to engage in learning in the classroom, but did not practice the reading and writing strategies their teachers modeled for them when they were studying at home. On the other hand, the high performing students knew what they needed to do to improve, but were unable to follow through unless they were supervised. There were many reasons for the difficulties the students faced when trying to study at home. Many of the students had other responsibilities such as taking care of siblings or working after school. Some students simply could not find a quiet place to study free of distraction. Overall, it was difficult, and sometimes impossible, for the students to engage in the kind of learning that took place inside the classroom when they were studying elsewhere.

Miller, Heafner, and Massey provided a useful framework for approaching their research questions. They were able to gain a deeper understanding of how students responded to higher expectations, and how they approached their studies. They found that in most cases the students responded positively, but that their teachers were often working against their students' prior educational experiences or limitations outside of school. The researchers used quota sampling in order to measure the responses of students across different levels of performance, which helps with generalizing their findings to different groups of

students. However, their relatively small sample size limits this generalizability. The study was reliable because the survey that that the researchers used had greater than 95% inter-rater reliability. This research also benefitted from member-checking in that the interviews that accompanied the surveys allowed the students to provide explanations for their responses. In many cases, these explanations added depth to the students' experiences that would have otherwise been missing. An important point of critique, however, was that the study lacked a general base line of students' approaches to their studies. Whether the students' responses to their studies were any different due to the intervention was unclear from Miller, Heafner, and Massey's report.

Howard (2001) conducted a case study with four elementary school teachers and 17 of their African American students to qualify the students' perceptions and interpretations of the teachers' culturally responsive instructional practices, and found that the students often perceived their teachers as being mean yet caring about their success. The study took place in four large urban elementary schools in a large northwestern city during the 1997-98 school year. The student participants included 10 girls and 7 boys. Howard used purposive sampling to choose teacher participants who were considered to use culturally responsive teaching practices. He then chose students based on their academic achievement as assessed by teachers. The teachers identified low-, medium-, and high-achieving students. Howard chose a cross-section of students to reduce the likelihood that students would give glowing testimonials of their teachers.

Howard gathered data by interviewing the students once individually and then again in focus groups. Howard analyzed data from observations and interviews by using patterns and responses that emerged from the interviews to develop codes and thematic categories that highlighted the findings. After careful coding, he used an outside rater to recode the data. Three categories emerged from the data analysis: the importance of caring teachers, the establishment of community/family-type classroom environments, and education as entertainment.

Howard described caring teachers as those who can develop effective relationships with their students by giving them "warm pats on the back to encourage their best effort; verbally expressing high expectations for performance; and direct statements about how [they feel] about the students" (p. 137). One of the students in the study commented that his he could tell his teacher cared because she put more effort into supporting those students who did not want to learn. Another student commented that he knew his teacher cared because of the range of emotions she displayed. Other students noted that this teacher's ability to show her emotions helped build empathy in the classroom. Her students felt more connected with her and saw her more as a human being with emotions like their.

The students noted that toughness was another aspect of caring. In one instance, a teacher got upset with students because she did not complete an assignment. Moments after expressing her disappointment with the students' performance, the teacher went and put her arm around her. The next day, the teacher showed a note to Howard in which the student expressed gratitude for

the teachers' toughness. The students qualified this sense of toughness by commenting that caring teachers found a balance between expressing impatience or dissatisfaction with students' performance and using authentically kind words.

Respect was also an important part of how the teachers' expressed care. The students commented that although some of their teachers yelled a lot, their students learned the most and tended to take up the majority of the honor roll at the school. Howard observed that the students never seemed to take reprimands personally, or thought that their teachers held grudges against them. The students were able to see beyond their teachers' strictness and experience academic success.

Howard found that the teachers he studied created optimal learning environment in which their students felt cared for. They told students they cared about them on a daily basis, displayed emotions in educational and noneducational topics, and most importantly, held them to high expectations. Moreover, the students saw doing their work and behaving appropriately as ways of supporting their teachers. Overall, the relationships shared by these student and teachers were socially and academically effective.

Howard set out to understand how African American students perceived and interpreted their teachers' culturally responsive instructional practices. Including student voices in the literature on culturally responsive teaching was an important motivating factor behind his research. He used purposive sampling in order to have a balance of gender and academic achievement in his sample of

students. Howard's research is credible because he clearly described his data collection and analysis methods. His use of an outside rater to recode the findings means that his findings were confirmable. His findings are also dependable because they reflect other literature on culturally responsive teaching.

Adkins-Coleman (2010) conducted a qualitative case study to investigate the beliefs and practices of two African American teachers who successfully facilitated engagement among African American students and found that both teachers set and insisted that students meet high expectations. She conducted the study in two high schools – both situated in an ethnically and socially diverse community proximal to a major urban center. Forty-five percent of the students at these schools qualified for free or reduced meals, and 40% of the students read at or above proficiency level.

In selecting participants for the study, Adkins-Coleman adopted Ladson-Billing's adaptation of Foster's community nomination process. This process allows researchers to get an "insiders point of view" (p. 42) on effective Black teachers in the school. Adkins-Coleman generated a list of participants from various community resources, parents, and students, then cross-referenced the list with one generated by the schools' principals. She chose the teachers who received the highest percentage of student and principal nominations. The first teacher, Ms. Morrison, had been teaching English for eight years, and had B.S. in criminal justice. The second teacher, Ms. Lomax was in her early 40s who had taught English for 19 years, and had a B.A. in English.

Adkins-Coleman collected data from interviews and observation, and examined student artifacts. The teachers participated in three structured 45-minute interviews before, during, and at the end of the study. The primary goal of these interviews was to document the teachers' past school and professional experiences, and teaching philosophies before the commencement of the study. The second goal of the interviews was to elicit the teachers' classroom observations, which provided preliminary data analysis during and at the conclusion of the study. Adkins-Coleman also conducted three unstructured 15-minute interviews designed to clarify activities and interactions that occurred during classroom observations. She spent six weeks in the teachers' classrooms, observing Lomax 26 times and Morrison 13 times. Her field notes were as close to verbatim as possible, and included detailed descriptions of actions that occurred in each of the classrooms. She focused on classroom configuration, instructional methods, teacher-to-student interactions, student-to-teacher interactions, and student-to-student interactions. Lastly, she collected all of the teachers' instructional materials, indexed them in a research log, and examined them for greater understanding of teachers' practices.

Adkins-Coleman used cross-case analyses to make meaning of the data from both teachers. She divided the data by category and identified emergent themes, and analyzed them using a constant comparative method, an approach that attempts to explain social phenomena by developing theories based on what emerges from reality. After collecting data, Adkins-Coleman read the transcripts and artifacts, recorded emerging impressions, created domains for analysis, and

developed a coding system. She organized the data by emerging themes and provided detailed summaries of her initial interpretations. Finally, she conducted a member-check with the participants, revised the summaries, and identified similarities between their two classes.

Of the five categories that emerged from Adkins-Coleman's analysis, the most salient ones for this literature review were facilitating motivation and the challenges associated with maintaining high expectations. She found that both teachers facilitated motivation by developing environments of mutual respect and trust. Both teachers believed that their responsibility was to love and care for their students. They understood the importance of using words and actions to build empathetic relationships and exhibit their commitment to their students. Most importantly, they genuinely enjoyed their students, and developed "personal" relationships with them. They showed genuine interest in student-to-student relationships by being "hands-on" and participating as socially as they did.

Adkins-Coleman found that both teachers set high expectations for their students. They ensured that the students understood their expectations, and enforced them with realistic consequences. Both teachers demanded effort from the beginning of class. For instance, Ms. Lomax's class started 5-7 minutes before the bell, and she demanded that students always be prepared to work. The combination of empathy and high expectations made both teachers their students' harshest critics and greatest supporters. Some of the teachers' practices facilitated such high levels of engagement that major infractions by the

students were rare. Ms. Morrison explained her reprimands, followed through with consequences, and never lost control or became frustrated.

The teachers, however, did experience some challenges in maintaining high behavioral expectations. Ms. Morrison sometimes relied heavily on worksheets in which the students found little meaning. Consequently, her students would get off task and become conversational than usual. Adkins-Coleman noted, however, that though the students were having conversations, they continued to work on their worksheets.

Overall, Adkins-Coleman found that both teachers created environments that motivated students and helped them learn the value of participating in demanding instructional activities. The students knew the their teachers took special interest in them. They knew that their teachers had high academic expectations for them, and provided unlimited support for them to reach those expectations. They saw their teachers as strict but fair, and realized that their strictness was part of their caring.

Adkins-Coleman's study was credible because she thoroughly described her participant selection, data collection, and analysis procedures. Further to the credit of her work, she conducted member-checks to ensure the accuracy of her findings. This study is also dependable because the findings are consistent with other studies of culturally responsive classroom management. However, as Adkins-Coleman noted, there are limitations to transferring the findings to other classrooms beyond ethnically diverse high schools.

Bondy, Ross, Gallingane, and Hambacher (2008) conducted a qualitative case study with three novice teachers, and found that students are more resilient and successful when teachers establish and hold students accountable to high expectations. Bondy, et al. focused on what teachers did at the beginning of the school year to effectively create a safe and productive classroom for diverse student populations. All of the participating teachers were female, and had fewer than five years of teaching experience. Bondy & Gallingane selected the teachers based on their knowledge of the teachers' practice.

Bondy, et al. gathered data by videotaping the teachers during the first two hours of the first day of school. They also interviewed the teachers after school so that the teachers could reflect on their day's work. The researchers asked the teachers how the day went, followed by more probing questions, such as "How did you get ready?" "What went well?" "What are you concerned about?" "What will you do about it?" "Why this?"

The four researchers analyzed the interview data collaboratively. After analyzing the interview data, the researchers reviewed their ten hours of video with the question, "What is the teacher doing?" Then they developed codes based on categories of meaning that emerged from the data, and identified what each teacher did and how she did it. The following categories emerged from the analysis: the importance of a respectful and caring environment, believing in students and their capacity to succeed, how to establish expectations, and concerns about the first day. The researchers then reviewed the data within each category and organized their findings into the following salient categories within

each domain: establishing a caring inclusive environment, establishing expectations, and using a culturally responsive communication style. The researchers used several strategies to enhance the verisimilitude of the categories, such as prolonged engagement, peer debriefing, data source triangulation, and member-checking. Then they organized their findings into four refined categories: developing relationships, establishing expectations, holding students accountable for meeting expectations, and communicating in culturally responsive ways.

Bondy, et al. found that the teachers established high expectations for students by explicitly and assertively communicating rules and procedures during the first two hours of the first the first class. When the teachers' requests did not initially elicit the correct responses, they held students accountable by insistently repeating their requests. Two of the three teachers delivered warnings and imposed formal consequences within the first hour of school. They reiterated their expectations for up to two weeks until the students demonstrated a clear understanding. The researchers found that each teacher used different strategies for setting expectations. For instance, some provided non-examples, while others used call-and-response, humor, or asked "what if" questions. Futhermore, the teachers used formal and informal communication to express clear expectations for academic success. The teachers utilized their students' cultural ways of being to interact with them more effectively. They also used sincere terms of endearment and humor, as well as expressions familiar to the students.

Bondy, et al. chose their sample in order to better understand the practices of culturally responsive teachers. As such, they chose teachers that best fit the contemporary model of culturally responsive teaching. This study is credible because the researchers provided clear descriptions of their data collection and analysis processes. Using three teachers also facilitated the triangulation of their data, which adds further credibility to the research. Their findings are dependable because the researchers noted consistencies with other literature. Moreover, the findings are transferable to culturally diverse contexts, yet limited by the fact that all of the teachers in the study were novices.

Brown (2004) conducted qualitative case studies of 13 first- through twelfth-grade teachers to investigate their classroom management strategies, and found that experienced teachers clearly and assertively set and hold their students to high expectations. Brown's goal with this research was to identify the teachers' classroom management strategies and compare them to the literature on culturally responsive teaching.

The participants included two middle school teachers from Philadelphia, one primary school teacher from Harlem, one primary and one high school teacher from Chicago, one primary and one high school teacher from Los Angeles, two intermediate teachers from San Francisco, one middle school teacher from Minneapolis, and one high school teacher from Wichita. One was Sri Lankan, one was African American, two were Hispanic American, and nine were White. Brown chose the participating teachers based on his personal knowledge of their teaching effectiveness, and from information that he gained

from colleagues in each city. Their classrooms included African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian American students. Many of the students were recent immigrant and refugees, and the majority of them received free lunch.

Brown audiotaped interviews with five of the teachers, and annotated three telephone interviews with the other eight. The interviews focused on three primary classroom management questions: How do you interact with students? How would you describe your management style? What works well for you in communicating with your students? Brown developed five categories from the interview data: developing personal relationships and mutual respect through individualized attention, creating caring learning communities, establishing business-like learning environments, establishing congruent communication processes, and teaching with assertiveness and clearly stated expectations.

Most of the teachers focused on developing personal relationships with their students through respect and individual communication about academic and nonacademic issues. Each teacher showed personal interest in his or her students, and demonstrated their emphasis on mutual respect through and creating safe, secure learning environments. Several teachers established congruent communication processes in their classrooms. These teachers responded appropriately to their students' social, emotional, cultural, ethnic, and cognitive needs. This ability requires teachers to utilize research based pedagogical processes that promote cooperation in the classroom. To meet student needs for socialization, many of the teachers organized instructional

activities and designed learning experiences in ways that promoted socialization and discussion.

The experienced teachers established business-like environments in their classrooms to promote academic success. They had an astute awareness of the need to establish clear expectations and insist that students meet them. These teachers commented that urban teachers must develop heart and voice. That is, they must have a strong sense of self, while also conducting themselves authoritatively. Moreover, the experienced teachers noted that teachers who are intimidated by their students and reluctant to admit it often adopt the strategy of ignoring misbehavior rather than holding students accountable.

All but one of the novice teachers reflected on how they failed to set expectations during the year. Brown noted that these teachers lacked clarity in their expectations, and assertiveness in classroom management. The teachers seemed to expect that students would respect them solely on the basis that they were teachers.

Brown's research was firmly grounded in the literature on culturally responsive teaching. Citing prominent scholars, Brown supported his findings concerning expectations, democratic classrooms, and creating academic learning environments that promote academic and social success. Brown's findings are dependable because they are consistent with similar studies. Brown's findings are transferable to urban teaching environments with novice and experienced teachers. His findings are also confirmable, as an outside party

would be capable of auditing both the process and product of his data collection and analysis.

Ware (2006) conducted qualitative comparative case studies with two African American teachers in order to identify the multiple aspects of "warm demander" pedagogy. Warm demanders are teachers who insist that their students meet high expectations in caring, culturally responsive ways. These case studies were means of identifying the different roles that culturally responsive teachers assume in the classroom and comparing them with the literature on culturally responsive teaching. Ware found that warm demanders play the roles of authority figures, care givers, and pedagogues.

The two teachers in this study were Ms. Willis and Mrs Carter. Ware selected them from a group of teachers who participated in the Center for Urban Learning/Teaching and Urban Research and Education and Schools (CULTURES) at Emory University. Ms. Willis lived by the principle that all children can learn. She had been teaching for 16 years at Triwood Elementary and was a respected member of the community. She taught third, fourth, and fifth grades because she believed that she could make up for the lack of preparation with which the students began their school years. She taught in an inner-city school district, Triwood being in one of the most socioeconomically disadvantaged communities in the district. Ware described Mrs. Carter as a teacher in the process of developing into teaching as a profession. Mrs. Carter taught at Baker Middle School, which was working toward attracting more middle-income families at the time of the study.

Ware approached her research with three questions: (1) How did the teachers describe their instructional practices and beliefs? (2) What similarities and differences existed between the teachers' practices and beliefs? (3) Was there evidence that the shared cultural/ethnic background of teachers and students influenced instructional practices? She interviewed with both of the teachers during 2000-2001 school year. As part of a pilot study, she conducted three semistructured formal interviews with Ms. Willis. She also spent three one-hour sessions in Ms. Willis's classroom as a participant observer, followed by five additional interviews. She used this pilot study to develop the methodology for the comparative study. She spent 25 sessions in Mrs. Carter's class as a participant observer, and followed up with 25 interviews. She then performed a member check by conducting two additional interviews.

To code and analyze the data, Ware analyzed the transcriptions from the classroom observations and interviews to determine patterns and codes. She coded the interviews separately from the observations. The categories were: (a) ethic of caring; (b) beliefs about students, teachers, parents, and community; and (c) instructional practices. Ware used these categories as a framework for organizing the data collected on Mrs. Carter. As the warm demander categories emerged, she collapsed the initial categories into those that defined the multiple roles played by warm demanders: authority figures, caregivers, and pedagogues. Ultimately, Ware described warm demanders as teachers who are successful with students of color, and provide students with a "tough-minded, no-nonsense,

structured and disciplined classroom environment for kids whom society had psychologically and physically abandoned" (p. 56).

Ms. Willis showed herself to be an authority figure through her voice and expression. She spoke in a loud, clear voice when she expressed her expectations, and her students were absolutely quiet and attentive when she spoke. When she had to reprimand the class, they did not move or express any verbal or nonverbal disagreement or anger. She spoke directly to the whole class, not particular students, so they all shared in any shame or blame. All of the students seemed to respond by listening and showing facial gestures that indicated remorse.

In terms of caregiving, Ms. Willis's caring yet insistent behavior illustrated her dedication to her students' needs. She showed herself to be an "other-mother" (p. 440). In response to Ware's question about the good or "right" ways to educate African American students, Ms. Willis responded, "The right way is to have high expectations and have a positive attitude to them" (p. 440). She advised other teachers not to let the negative influences of low expectations or negative beliefs about their African American students affect their teaching. Ms. Willis kept an open mind toward her students, and did not assume anything about them based on their reputations with other teachers or their official academic records. In an interview, Mrs. Carter described that she cared for her students' personal "hunger", physical health, and success. She demonstrated her caring for students both by listening to them and by disciplining them.

As pedagogues, both teachers demonstrated culturally specific practices. They incorporated elements of the students' culture into their teaching by setting high expectations and adapting instruction to meet their students' learning styles. Ware observed Mrs. Willis using "teacher directed instruction" – teaching directly from a preprinted text, and using call-and-response. Ware noted that this was an authoritarian instructional style consistent with the preaching tradition of call and response in African American churches. When the students conformed to behaviors found in the church, they were engaged in the lesson and responded at the appropriate time. Mrs. Carter, on the other hand, scaffolded new information onto the students' interests in music. With this approach, the students were actively involved in the lesson. She also connected her curriculum to the students' community and provided them with positive role models. In doing so, she illustrated the positive relationship between warm demander pedagogy and cultural/racial identity.

Ware's goal was to identify the roles that culturally responsive teachers play and compare what she found with the literature. She selected urban teachers whose instructional practices could be defined as culturally responsive, which facilitated the process of analyzing and categorizing their warm demander teaching practices. This, however, limits the transferability of her findings to urban contexts. Her research is credible because she used multiple participants to triangulate her findings, and interviews to member-check her interpretations and categories. Moreover, her findings are consistent with literature on cultural responsive/warm demander pedagogy. One weakness of this study, however, is

that both participants were female. Ware's research would have benefitted from comparing the practices of male and female warm demanders.

Effective Teachers Develop Supportive Teacher-Student Relationships

This subsection presents research that focuses on how teachers and schools support students. In the first study, Milner and Tenore (2010) found differences in how teachers' approaches to developing personal relationships with their students. In the second study, McDougal (2009) examined the culturally responsive teaching preferences of African American students and found that they prefer teachers that help them break content down and relate it to their lives. In the third study, Marri (2009) used a case study of a culturally responsive teacher to delineate the relationship between theories of caring for students and supportive teaching practices. In the fourth study, Roberts' (2010), examined the relationship between pedagogy and African American ethics of care that promote cultural ways of communicating political clarity.

The last two studies in this subsection take different perspectives on supportive relationships. In the fifth study, Jacob (1995) found that multicultural education creates a culture of support between students. In the sixth study, Knight-Diop's (2010) analyzed changes in one school's structures that were intended to support students college-going processes and found that they can have positive and negative effects on the relationships that develop within the school.

Milner and Tenore (2010) conducted case studies of two urban middle school teachers to investigate their culturally responsive teaching practices and found that they had different approaches to the same goal of developing personal relationships with their students. The researchers selected both teachers because they worked at "Bridge Middle School", a southeastern urban school in a low-income community that had a reputation for being one of the district's better schools. Bridge had 354 students. The student population was 59.8% African American, 31.3% White, 2.8% Asian American, 0.3% American Indian. Seventy-nine percent of Bridge's students were on free and reduced lunch. Forty-five percent of the teachers were African American, and 55% were White. Mr. Hall, a White science teacher, had taught at Bridge for 3 years; Mr. Jackson, an African American math and science teacher, had taught there for 7 years.

Milner and Tenore used Weinstein, Tomlinson-Clarke, & Curran's (2004) five aspects of culturally responsive classroom management as the conceptual framework for their study. This framework includes: (1) recognition of teacher's own ethnocentrism; (2) knowledge of student' cultures; (3) understanding of broader social, economic, and political system; (4) appropriate management strategies; and (5) development of caring classrooms.

Milner and Tenore interviewed and observed Mr. Hall for two years. They collected data from Mr. Jackson for only one year because he transferred to another school at the beginning of the second year of the study. Milner and Tenore observed and recorded field notes in the teachers' classrooms, at other school-related activities, events, and in spaces such as assemblies, the library,

and the cafeteria. They interviewed each teacher two to three times individually, tape-recording and transcribing each interview. They also conducted numerous informal interviews, the data from which they recorded in their field notebooks. Then they hand-coded the data, analyzed it recursively, and used analytic induction to develop categories for analysis.

Milner and Tenore found that Mr. Hall set and reinforced high expectations for his students, yet had different expectations for each of them. He expressed that he recognized his students' multiple and varied identities. In addition, he provided his students with multiple opportunities for success, and worked to foster agency in them. In other words, he differentiated his teacher practice based on his students' unique needs, demonstrating that he gave priority to equity rather than equality in the classroom. The researchers observed that the students felt like they knew and respected Mr. Hall. Concurrently, Mr. Hall respected his students as learners by providing them with opportunities to make up for past mistakes. Mr. Hall's students saw him as father figure. He granted students access to his world by telling personal stories about his family. While letting his students into his world, he also immersed himself in their worlds, for example, asking them about the sports or other activities in which they participated. He embraced the notion of the school as a community with family members. He saw his students as part of his family and was not willing to let them fail. He saw potential in all of them, and believed that he was fighting for their survival.

Mr. Jackson, on the other hand, believed in treating his students equally. He worked to make sure that his students had a positive image of him. He wanted them to adopt his vision of the world, rather than let them develop their own. He demonstrated his understanding of the power structures that exist between students; his primary strategy for classroom management was using the influence of the popular students to motivate the rest of his students' engagement. Mr. Jackson also immersed himself in his students' lives, and had a deep level of interest and knowledge about their lived experiences. He stayed current with his students were interested in – hip-hop, sports, and movies – and communicated with them in their vernacular.

Both Mr. Hall and Mr. Jackson focused on developing authentic, positive relationships. However, Milner and Tenore found a difference in how the teachers approached equity and equality. Equity refers to fairness, treating students differently based on their individual needs, while equality refers to treating all students the same (Banks, 1995). Mr. Hall was the more equitable of the two teachers. He differentiated his instruction and worked hard to build solid, sustainable relationships in his classroom. On the other hand, Mr. Jackson strove for consistency with all of his students, treating them equally, and putting more work into ensuring that they had positive image of him.

Mr. Hall and Mr. Jackson' approaches to dealing with issues of race in the classroom demonstrated their understanding of themselves in relation to their students. Mr. Jackson recognized that he had a racial advantage with his Black students, while Mr. Hall saw dealing with race as one of the most difficult parts of

his job. When negotiating behavioral issues, he made it a priority to let his students know that his problem was not with them personally, but with their behavior. Most importantly, Mr. Hall developed bonds across the racial divide in his classroom by acknowledging similarities between his and his students' socioeconomic backgrounds. He also emphasized being authentic with his students. He saw situations of struggle as opportunities to help them connect with him and realize that he was not racist. Despite their varied approaches, both teachers reflected on influences like ethnicity and socioeconomic status, knew their students, developed appropriate management strategies, and developed caring environments for learning.

One strength of this study was Milner and Tenore's sampling process. They chose teachers representative of a range of diversity in terms of race and years of teaching experience, which makes their findings transferable to contexts in which novice and experienced teachers from different racial backgrounds work to support diverse students. Milner and Tenore's research is also credible and confirmable because they provided a clear explanation of their data collection and analysis methodology to the extent that it could be auditable by an outside party. The teachers' voices support Milner and Tenore's conclusions, and the researchers' triangulation of their findings makes their work all the more credible. Moreover, their findings reflect the literature on culturally responsive teaching. Overall, this study effectively sheds light on the ethnic, racial, and sociocultural dynamics of developing supportive relationships with students.

McDougal (2009) conducted a qualitative ethnography into the cultural and stylistic instructional preferences of African American males in high school and found that they preferred holistic, culturally responsive teachers who broke down new concepts and related them to their lived experiences. He framed his research within an Afrocentric paradigm that puts the culture, experiences, and perceptions of people of African descent at the center of any human enterprise.

Eighty-nine students from "Young Men's High School" participated in McDougal's study. He used a web-based random selection program to identify 29 of the students to be interviewees. The goal of these interviews was to examine their perceptions of how they learn best, and the instructional strategies that they thought best supported their understanding of academic information.

McDougal found that the students at Young Men's High School preferred teaching that addresses their spiritual, physical, and mental needs. His analysis, showed that 45% of the students preferred to have information broken down for them. They also preferred when teachers helped them understand how what they were learning related to their lives. Without this relevance, the students sensed a clear disconnect between their education and their experiences. Moreover, the students identified effective teachers as the ones who modeled and provided examples rather than simply gave the students answers. In light of these findings, McDougal suggested that teachers take a problem-based approach to teaching, one that speaks to the real world/real life problems these kinds of young men face.

McDougal's research lacks some credibility because he did not provide sufficient details about his data collection methods and analysis. He did, however provide a relatively clear explanation of the conceptual framework within which he was working. His conclusions relied on consistent responses from his interviewees; nonetheless, he did not conduct member checks, or triangulate his findings. His findings are dependable, nonetheless, because they are consistent with the literature on culturally relevant pedagogy. His findings are transferable to contexts in which teachers are working with high-poverty African American males. Finally, the extent to which much of McDougal's methodology is missing from his report calls the confirmability of the study into question. His report is full of students' voices, but it is difficult to tell whether an outside party could audit his data analysis. Overall, McDougal's lack of methodological integrity undermines his findings, though they are logical and consistent with the literature.

Marri (2009) conducted a case study of one teacher to investigate his use of curriculum and pedagogy to support socioeconomically disadvantaged and racially/ethnically diverse secondary students, which resulted in the formulation of a pedagogical approach termed Classroom-based Multicultural Democratic Education (CMDE). Marri found that the teacher, Mr. Sinclair, developed supportive relationships with his students that included (1) teaching content through critical and multiple perspectives to (2) challenge the dominant ideologies of the status quo while (3) making the classroom an open forum for ideas.

Marri conducted the study at the "Seventh Avenue School" (SAS). SAS was an alternative school situated in "Homestead", the second largest district in a midwestern state. The school's mission was to provide a program for academically struggling students that focused on core academic curriculum and the completion of requirements for a high school diploma. While teaching the requisite skills for graduation, the school also wanted to give its students skills for independent adult living, citizenship, and work – that is, democratic living.

Marri used four selection criteria to find his teacher participant. The teacher needed to (1) provided equitable opportunities for all students to learn through integrating multiple sources of information, (2) teach content through multiple perspectives, (3) encourage students to expand learning beyond the classroom, and (4) participate in professional development activities. Marri found that Mr. Will Sinclair, a seventh year social studies teacher, fit these criteria.

Marri's research also included 15 of Mr. Sinclair's students who had been working together for the previous three semesters as participants in the study. There were 10 female students (six White, one African American, one Native American/African American, one Hispanic, and one Asian American), and five male students (four White and one Hispanic). All of the students started going to SAS because they had only 0-5 credits after their first two years at a comprehensive high school. Many of the students' atypical high school experiences also made them ideal candidates for the SAS program.

Marri collected data through observations, interviews, and teacher-generated materials like handouts, quizzes, exams, and projects. He conducted

25 50-minute classroom observations during a four-week unit of study. The interviews took place at the start, mid point, and conclusion of his observations. He analyzed the data using line-by-line inductive coding, which allowed him to make categories out of common meanings inherent in the data.

Marri found that Mr. Sinclair built supportive relationships with and between students through teaching them the values of a democratic society. Mr. Sinclair's teaching emphasized critical thinking and building community by connecting curriculum to current issues and events relevant to his students' lives. He taught multiple perspectives in order to show his students "that there's more than their opinion on something" (pp. 15-16). He helped his students see beyond their own ideas and assumptions, and made his classroom a public sphere of ideas in which every student had a chance to speak and offer opposing viewpoints. Though his students held strong opinions, they were able to respectfully listen to each other, critiquing ideas and not the person expressing them. Mr. Sinclair built a strong community in his classroom by using activities that helped his students see each other as individuals rather than representatives of larger groups.

Marri provided a clear explanation of the multicultural education framework with which he was working, and his methods of data collection and analysis would be auditable by an outside party, making his research confirmable. One of the strengths of Marri's research is the dependability of his findings. As he noted, they are consistent with other multicultural education literature. His research is also credible because he triangulated his data using

various sources to support his conclusions. His findings are transferable to contexts in which educators are working with diverse groups of secondary students who have not been successful in comprehensive high schools.

Roberts' (2010) qualitative phenomenological study investigated how African American Teachers cared for their African American students and found that they challenged their students to have higher expectations of themselves than American society does. This study focused on defining teacher care from the perspective of African American secondary teachers. Roberts' goal was to provide examples of how these teachers cared for their students, and explain their caring behavior. Roberts' participants included eight African American secondary teachers who taught in schools in a metropolitan region of the southeastern United States. The schools these teachers worked in primarily served African American students. To select participants, she had principals and parents identify teachers who successfully supported the academic achievement of African American students.

Roberts conducted three 90-minute interviews with each of the eight teachers. The first interview focused on concrete details of the participant's experiences and understanding regarding their care for Black students. The second interview aimed at eliciting deeper understandings about the meaning and perceptions of themes, issues, stories, or statements from the previous interview. The third interview gave the respondents time to review their personal profiles and narratives. In addition to transcribing the interviews, Roberts also recorded the respondents' non-verbal signs in her field notes as an interpretive

tool. She then used a four-step inductive coding process that involved bracketing thematically pertinent information and emergent themes, formulating meanings of significant teacher statements and constructing teacher profiles, clustering themes, and describing the results.

Roberts' analysis led to two emergent themes of teacher care for African American students: political clarity/color talk and concern for their futures. The teachers described these practices as attempts to address the realities of racism in their students' lives. Political clarity, or sociopolitical critique, is the acknowledgement and critique of the affects of race in everyday experiences. Color talk is the discourse between similarly marginalized teachers and students that pertains to the specific challenges and issues associated with being a member of their culture in the United States. Practicing political clarity/color talk illustrated these teachers' desire to reveal to their students the various and often subtle machinations of racism in today's society. The teachers believed that it was their responsibility to expose their students to the truth about racism and White privilege. Thus, they disclosed the nature of "Blackness" as the performative expectations imposed upon African Americans by a dominant White society. In this way, these teachers empowered their students to push back against racism, to set higher academic expectations than those imposed upon them.

The teachers showed concern for their students' futures by emphasizing a mastery of life beyond mastery of content. They thought that if mastery of content was out of reach their students should still have a chance to succeed in life. On

the one hand, they wanted their students to understand the weight of choosing or not choosing academic achievement, an idea that reflected the teachers' belief that all of their students had the capacity to succeed academically. On the other hand, if their students' chose an alternate route, they wanted them to be successful at making decisions along that trajectory. As such, they introduced their students to the vocational possibilities they could obtain with or without a college degree, and advised them against getting a criminal record. Furthermore, the teachers explicitly taught their students about code switching, for instance, changing names, dress, and behavior to make them more marketable academically and to employers. Although this practice implies that certain aspects of Black culture might be "unacceptable" in mainstream society, the teachers expressed their vision of challenging racism: White people will continue to take care of themselves, and their students will have to do whatever they can in order to be successful. They couched this understanding in the belief that they should also teach their students to critique the dominant White culture – to play into it for their own sakes, but not to buy into it in the end.

Roberts' study has a strong theoretical framework in the ethics of care, critical race theory, and phenomenology. She thoroughly addressed problematic issues that emerge from such a multifaceted approach. For instance, when using a phenomenological approach, the researcher must take into account her own positionality. Roberts addressed this issue by stating that being a Black woman and former secondary teacher of African American students adds validity to her methodology. Furthermore, Roberts thoroughly explained her data collection and

analysis, which adds to the credibility and confirmability of her research. She was meticulous in collecting and organizing her data, and presenting the patterns she found therein. Moreover, she continuously supported her interpretations with relevant literature.

Jacob (1995) conducted an ethnographic study of an inner-city high school to examine how its multicultural program affected student interactions and academic achievement, and found that while it had positive effects on student achievement it also bred intergroup conflict. Jacob's research included 240 hours of participant observation. He conducted 14 individual interviews with teachers, administrators, as well as 10 student focus groups comprised of three or four students. The respondents' interests and insights guided the interviews, but they also included questions concerning their initial involvement in the school program, the goals and practices of the program, relations between staff and students, and student achievement. The student focus groups, which engaged in 40-minute open discussions, enabled the students to discuss their insights and interests regarding the programs goals and practices, their favorite and least favorite aspects of the program, and intergroup relations in the program. The study also included student surveys, and analysis of written materials – grant evaluations and policy statements collected during the 4-month period of the study.

Jacob utilized the school newspaper to deliver the initial informal surveys to a random sample of 200 students in the program. This survey focused on the student attitudes and perceptions regarding the program, their self-perception of

ethnic identity, comfort in the multicultural program, number of friends outside the program, and willingness to date someone outside the program. A second survey came from students in a class called "Global Issues". In this survey, the students reflected on characteristics of "good" high schools, and compared their multicultural program to other aspects of their school, as well as with a suburban high school.

Jacob used grounded theory to analyze his data. This approach generates initial concepts and themes from the data. His analysis revealed that the program fostered a close-knit community that had a positive effect on students' motivation, effort, and the identification with the school. He found that discussing and understanding culture could also have a significant impact on student relations, attitudes, and behaviors. Jacob noted, however, the possibility that multicultural education might create an environment for intergroup conflict, especially among minority groups. He concluded that multicultural educators should shift their focus away from interactions between dominant and subordinate groups and toward the interactions that occur within minority groups.

Jacob's findings, as he frequently noted, were consistent with multicultural education literature. His study is credible because he used a variety of perspectives from within the school to triangulate his findings and check his assumptions. Jacob's research is also confirmable due Jacob's detailed explanation of his theoretical framework, as well as his data collection and analysis methods. It is safe to assume that similar findings would also emerge if

this research and the multicultural program it analyzed were implemented in other urban schools.

Knight-Diop (2010) conducted an ethnographic study of African American students in a collegiately focused high school, and found that school structures can have positive and negative effects on academic and interpersonal relationships. The study took place between 2000-2004 at "Denver High School", located in New York City. Prior to the study, the school had undergone college focused reforms, which included organizing the school into ten houses based on students' particular career goals; dedicating three staff to personal and academic development, guidance counseling, and community outreach; distributing college advertising around the campus; and providing students with co-curricular activities supportive of the college going process. The school's ethnic makeup was 30% Black, 60% Hispanic, 6% Asian, and 4%. The schools student body was 57% female, and 43% male. Eighty-one percent of students were free or reduced lunch eligible. The teaching staff was predominantly White, and 85% had attained master's degrees or higher.

Fifteen African American students – seven boys and eight girls – participated in 51 individual semi-structured interviews and 13 student focus groups. During the students' sophomore and junior years, the researchers administered surveys about their college preparation process. Knight-Diop recorded data from observations of each participating student. She conducted weekly school-wide observations of co-curricular activities, college-related events, counseling procedures, PTA meetings, and talent shows to see first hand

how schools promoted college attendance. She compared her data with documents outlining school's stated goals of school wide college-focused reforms.

Knight-Diop conducted ongoing iterative data collection and analysis. She coded categories based on individual and focus group interviews and observational field notes. She then built these categories into emergent themes around such issues as future aspirations, student relationships, test preparation, co-curricular activities, and institutional and interpersonal structures.

Knight-Diop's data analysis revealed that while the school demonstrated a commitment to a college-going culture, certain mediating factors raise questions about the equitability of its covert tracking program (i.e., the house structure). While the college-going culture was supportive, it was not as supportive for all students as it was for some. On the one hand, the house structure created small learning communities, which many educators commonly accept as beneficial for students because they help students build relationships with each other. However, on the other hand, the school organized the houses around career goals; therefore, teachers in certain houses set lower standards of academic achievement. Different standards for academic achievement reshaped relationships between teachers and students. Teachers would expect more from some students and provide them more support than others. For instance, teachers offered college-bound students more personalized support that the vocationally tracked students did not receive. Although small learning

communities can be beneficial to students, these findings call into question the value of curriculum and interpersonal relationships within those communities.

Knight-Diop also found that the school's learning center helped build supportive interpersonal relationships between students because it focused on peer tutoring. The learning center was always crowded because students saw it as a social environment as well as an academic one. Knight-Diop noted the possibility that the learning center accounted for some of the inequity in interpersonal relationships between students and teachers, and gender differences in co-curricular activities.

Knight-Diop's goal was to examine the relationship between theories of care and the college going culture within the high school. In the end, her study revealed some of inequities and complexities involved in putting those theories into practice. One strength of Knight-Diop's research is its confirmability. She provided sufficient and clear explanations of her data collection and analysis methods. Her research is also credible because she triangulated her data in her initial coding as well as across data sources. Knight-Diop's findings are also dependable because, as she noted, they either correlate with the literature or reflect relevant questions currently raised by researchers. The transferability of the findings, however, is limited to schools serving African American students and implementing a similar kind college-bound program.

Summary

This section included studies that focused on high expectations. The first eight studies in the first subsection centered on setting and reinforcing high expectations. Howard (2001) and Muller (2001) both found that teachers' high expectations communicate how much they care to their students. Miller, Heafner, and Massey (2009) found that students prefer and respond well to teachers who set high expectations and challenge them. However, Wood, Kaplan, and McLoyd's (2007) found that parents and teachers tend to hold lower expectations for African American males. Adkins-Coleman (2010); Bondy, Ross, Gallingnane & Hambacher (2008); and Brown (2004) found that effective and experienced teachers set and reinforce high expectations. Lastly, Ware's (2006) findings added depth to the definition of warm demanders – teachers described as kindly insisting that their students meet high expectations. They play the roles of authority figures, care givers, and pedagogues.

The six studies in the second subsection focus on developing supportive relationships that help students meet high expectations. Milner and Tenore (2010) found that part of culturally responsive teaching is that teachers approach supportive relationships differently. McDougal (2009) found that African American students prefer teachers who break information down for them and relate content to their lives. Through a case study of a culturally responsive teacher, Marri (2009) demonstrated how practices such as teaching multiple perspectives and building community in the classroom reflect theories of care. Roberts (2010) found that culturally responsive African American teachers use cultural forms of

communicating political clarity with their students and show genuine concern for their futures. Jacob (1995) found that multicultural education can create a culture of support between minority students, and suggested that multicultural educators pay attention to the social dynamics within minority groups. Knight-Diop (2010) found inequities in academic and social support in one school's college-going program, thus demonstrating some of the complications inherent in attempting to create school structures that show concern for students' futures.

Teacher Reflection as an Integral Component of Culturally Responsive Teaching Practice

The studies in this section focus on the relationship between teacher reflection and academic achievement. In the first study, Birell (1995) documented the experiences of a teacher as his developing cultural understanding permitted him to see more clearly his relationship to his students. In the second study, Chubbuck and Zembylas (2008) documented one young teachers process of negotiating the ambivalent emotions that so often accompany teaching for social justice. In the third study, Maye and Day (2012) investigated how teachers' understandings of their own cultural identities can influence their pedagogy. In the fourth study, Love and Kruger (2005) examined the relationship between teachers' cultural beliefs and student achievement.

Birell (1995) conducted a case study of a novice White teacher to analyze how he responded to Black youths' "ethnic" behavior and found that he began to value his students' experiences as he developed closer relationships with them.

"Ron", Birell's subject, was a White teacher who grew up in a middle-class community. He received his teaching credentials from a midwestern university, which he called, "One of the best teacher education colleges in the country" (p. 139). He described himself as "colorblind", and had little interaction with diverse youth until he started teaching in a southwestern high school. Unable to find work in his home community, Ron was forced to find work elsewhere, and ended up taking a social studies teaching position at a school in which Whites were the minority.

For two years, Birell documented Ron's experiences as he taught in diverse classrooms. Birell frequently interviewed Ron, and observed his teaching twice a week. He also had Ron keep a daily reflective journal. Birell then analyzed the data he collected using a constant comparative method, which allowed him to theorize about the themes that emerged from Ron's experiences. Birell's data analysis revealed that initially Ron was averse to his students "ethnic attitudes". His credential program did not prepare him for his students' oppositional behavior.

On his first day in the classroom, Ron realized that he was not accustomed to so much diversity. Where he grew up, Black kids "acted White", he said, but he found that the students in his class did not seem as predictable as the African American kids he knew growing up. Ron's bias made it difficult for him to connect with his students. He found that the classroom management strategies he had seen other teachers use with success in less diverse classrooms did not work for him. In fact, he believed that his classroom

management strategies increased his students "ethnic attitudes". His cultural encapsulation caused him to lower his expectations of his students. He concluded that his students and their parents did not care about education, and saw no option but to fail them. Ron's assumptions about his Black students and their families affected the way he taught them.

After his first experiences in a diverse classroom, Ron moved to another high school. There, he was responsible for supervising in-school suspensions, monitoring students who refused to complete their schoolwork or homework. This school had a noticeable gang presence that was absent from Ron's prior teaching assignment. He received some mentoring from an experienced ex-gang member turned school district employee on how to counteract the students' intimidations. Nonetheless, Ron remained frightened; when the pressure got to him, he submitted a request for a transfer to another school.

Ron was very pleased with his transfer to an affluent suburban high school, his ideal school. His background was similar to the students and teachers he worked with. As his comfort level increased, so did his personal and professional self-confidence. In this safe environment, Ron had the space to become more sensitive to the difficult position in which most Black youth find themselves. He had fewer Black students in his classes, and felt less overwhelmed by their "ethnic attitudes". He started to connect more with his students, and began recognizing the inherent racism in his comment about Black kids "acting White".

Through his participation in this study, Ron had to reflect on the cultural interactions that took place in his classroom. Ultimately, while it is undeniable that many factors helped Ron along in his process of development as a teacher, those particular students with whom he worked shaped his experiences. However, one cannot discount the fact that through this process he had to reflect on his and his students' racial and ethnic backgrounds. The process of reflection helped Ron begin to see beyond stereotypes and better understand his students as individuals. In the end, though, Ron continued to see the task of teaching as assimilating Black students into dominant White culture. At the conclusion of his the study, he still considered diversity as something to tolerate rather than appreciate.

One of the strengths of Birell's study is that his use of multiple data sources to better understand Ron's development as a teacher makes his findings more credible. He also provided adequate explanations of those data collection methods and his analysis procedures, which make his findings confirmable. His findings are transferable to contexts in which novice teachers who did not grow up in diverse communities are teaching diverse, especially African American, students.

Chubbuck and Zembylas (2008) conducted a case study of a first-year teacher's experiences as she managed the ambivalent emotions that emerged from the conflict between her social justice ideals and the reality of teaching in the United States today. They inquired further into the implications of Sara's emotional struggles, and how an analysis of the emotions related to teaching for

social justice can contribute to a theory and praxis that is transformative for teachers and learners – in essence, a "critical emotional praxis", as they called it.

Chubbuck and Zembylas chose Sara because of her acknowledged passion for teaching for social justice. Sara also worked closely with Chubbuck in her advanced methods class, which provided for the open lines of communication and trust necessary for the depth of study the researchers wanted to achieve. However, Chubbuck's familiarity with Sara was also a threat to the validity of the study's findings. The researchers minimized this threat with Zembylas function as a critical observer of Sara's teaching practice.

Chubbuck and Zembylas observed Sara throughout the course of a nine-week semester. They interviewed her six times, and reviewed a reflective journal she maintained throughout the study. The researchers intended the interviews to elicit Sara's vision of socially just teaching, and how her practice did or did not meet her goals. Chubbuck and Zembylas triangulated their data from interviews with artifacts from Sara's students. They conducted a final interview and two more observation sessions in the spring of the following school year, as a final opportunity to member-check their findings.

Due to the threat to validity posed by Chubbuck and Sara's relationship, the researchers analyzed the data collaboratively and separately. They read and coded all of the data independently using open coding techniques – a method of analysis that identifies, categorizes, names, and describes phenomena. They focused their analysis on Sara's emotional struggles as she navigated the different events that took place in her classroom. Emergent themes included:

Sara's vision and practice of socially just teaching, the ambivalent emotions related to her socially just teaching and their effects, her navigation of these emotions, and the resulting changes.

Chubbuck and Zembylas found that Sara had never experienced inequality before college, and her experiences led her to seek out "tangible, practical" ways of reducing suffering in other people's lives. She viewed curriculum, pedagogy, and relationships with students as conduits for her commitment to social justice. She designed her curriculum with the goals of teaching her students to analyze their experiences and develop their own agency. She also taught her students to take into account multiple perspectives, reading both with and against the grain. (It is important to note here that Sara also mentioned that teaching for social justice was a way for her to relieve the guilt she felt for the suffering of others.)

Sara's desire to deescalate potential conflicts in the classroom showed that she applied her ideas about social justice to her relationships with students. When students made rude or insulting comments in class, she ignored them or provided sincere answers. Instead of writing referrals for her more disruptive students, Sara would talk to them in the hall about the emotions they were both experiencing and suggest ways that they could change their behavior. Sara would then ask the students to write an apology letter. The students consistently returned to class and began working or writing their apology letters. However, this did not end the students' behaviors; they would get back to work for that day, but the behaviors would return the next day.

During her first year, Sara became anxious about failing to implement socially just teaching, but she realized the ethical nature of her anxiety. She equated losing her anxious feelings with complacency, not caring about her students. She decided to take steps to sublimate her anxiety, to manage it in in ways that were more positive. She engaged in educational and external therapeutic interventions; she worked on her negative cognitions through counseling, and enrolled in a nonviolent communication class. She also began working with her school's forensics team, which was comprised of students who were not in her class. They frequently called her out and helped her realize how she was presenting herself as "that White lady from *Dangerous Minds*…come to save [the] poor kids in the ghetto" (p. 302). They helped her learn to relax, have fun, and not approach everything with such a serious mindset. Eventually Sara realized that her own negative emotional responses were oppressive toward herself. She began to get over herself, and was better able be present and less critical of her students.

One of the strengths of Chubbuck and Zembylas's research was that they were able to use Chubbuck and Sara's relationship to derive some subjective depth while maintaining some objective integrity through Zembylas's analysis. This dual perspective provided an internal and external view of Sara's struggles. Their ability to address and navigate this threat to validity reveals their high level of ethical concern for their research. Another strength is the credibility of their research. The dynamic between researchers and subject unique to this study ensured that they effectively triangulated their data. Moreover, they rechecked

their findings with Sara before publishing. Chubbuck and Zembylas also provided a detailed explanation of their theoretical framework – from feminist to critical theory – as well as their methods. There are confirmable, and transfer to the majority of teachers working in the United States, since they tend to be female and come from middle class backgrounds. It would be safe to assume that many teachers oriented toward social justice would have similar experiences.

Maye and Day (2012) conducted case studies of nine teachers working in high-poverty middle schools and found that their understanding of their own cultural identity influenced their pedagogy. This study took place in one rural and one urban high-poverty middle school located in the same North Carolina school district. The participants included nine middle school language arts teachers, from five rural and four urban schools. The majority of the participating teachers were White, middle-class, and female.

Maye and Day collected data through interviews and observations. The researchers structured their observations on Ladson-Billings conceptual framework of culturally relevant pedagogy. This framework includes teachers' understanding of their own cultural identity, ability to comfortably and respectfully discuss cultural diversity with others, displaying self-efficacy when working with culturally diverse students, and perceiving one's self as part of the community. They based the observations on and Love and Kruger's (2005) adaptation, which obtained a Cronbach's alpha score of .85. The primary researcher observed each teacher interacting with and providing instruction to students during a 45-minute class period. After the observations, the researchers concluded the data

collection process with 30-minute interviews. They used interview questions from Ladson-Billings (1994) *The Dreamkeepers*, and validated their questions by asking five teachers outside the study to determine the extent to which they understood them.

Maye and Day reported their findings for two teachers, "Kelly" and "Mike". Both teachers worked at the same middle school and exhibited awareness of their own cultural identities. As a result they demonstrated culturally relevant teaching practices. Kelly was a first-year teacher who recognized the cultural differences between herself and her students. She attended a homogeneous White middle-class high school, and found it difficult to identify with or understand the experiences of the majority of her students who lived in poverty. As a new teacher, she made a concerted effort to understand her students' culture. Although she had a difficult time with her students' behavior, she understood that socioeconomic differences could affect social interactions, and hinder students' completion of academic tasks. Kelly soon recognized a common interest she shared with her students – pop culture – and began integrating it into her instruction. She also helped her students relate their thoughts and ideas to real-life examples, which helped her to better understand their culture. Ultimately, commonalities and Kelly's genuine interest in her students fostered the type of relationship necessary for culturally relevant pedagogy.

Mike was in his fourth year of teaching, a veteran. He also grew up in a predominantly White middle and upper class community, though he did not identify himself in that way. He was one of four children to a single parent, and

118

had experienced poverty. In school, his teachers helped him discover his own learning style. He said that these experiences made understanding the realities that students face in today's schools relevant and meaningful for him. Mike used his understanding to help students articulate their own goals and expectations. He made learning a personal matter for them, and used that to motivate them toward academic goals. Mike also recognized the effects of his skin privilege in the classroom – the barrier created by being a White teacher of mostly Black students. Understanding his own identity raised Mike's awareness of how his students might perceive him. Similar to Kelly, he used background commonalities (i.e., poverty) to build the relationship with his students necessary to support culturally relevant pedagogy.

Maye and Day found that teachers' awareness of their own cultural identities helped them recognize their students' cultural orientations. Culturally relevant teaching practices are rooted in this kind of self-awareness, they noted. The teachers found that recognizing the way their students perceive them helped them to reduce their institutionalized power.

One of the strengths of Maye and Day's study is its credibility; they triangulated their data from interviews with their data from observations. They also provided a clear outline of their conceptual framework – culturally relevant pedagogy – as well as data collection and analysis procedures, which suggests that their findings are confirmable. They also ensured that their survey questions were relevant and understandable to the teachers they were working with. The high Cronbach's alpha score of Love and Kruger's scale suggests that the

research methods were dependable. Their findings are transferable to the majority of teachers working in culturally diverse classrooms.

Love and Kruger (2005) conducted a correlational study of six schools in the southeastern United States to quantify the relationship between urban teachers' culturally relevant beliefs and student achievement, and found correlations between the types of beliefs that teachers' held and their students' level of achievement. The researchers used convenience sampling to select schools that primarily served African American children. All six schools were located in the southeastern United States, and served free and reduce-price lunches. In four of the schools, 95% of the students received free and reduced-price lunches. The participants included 244 teachers, para-educators, counselors, principals, instructional specialists, and media specialists. The participants' professional educator experience ranged from 0 to 37 years. The participant group was 48% African American, 42% Caucasian, 3% were Latin@/Hispanic, Indian, Asian, or Biracial, and 7% chose not to report. Eighty-five percent of the participants were women.

In this two-part study, the researchers first surveyed teachers to identify their beliefs, and then used regression analysis to examine how their beliefs correlate with student achievement. The survey took place during the 1998-1999 school year. It included 48 four-point Likert-type statements (strongly agree to strongly disagree). Twenty-five of the statements were meant to elicit the teachers' culturally relevant beliefs (Cronbach's alpha = .85). They addressed the teachers' regard for their students, student cooperation and interaction,

community connections, commitment to urban education, and the effects of cultural and ethnic factors on teaching. The remaining 23 statements concerned the teachers' "assimilationist" beliefs – those that disregard students' culture and expect them to conform to society (Cronbach's alpha = .72). Love and Kruger organized all of the statements from the survey into six dimensions of beliefs: (1) knowledge; (2) students' race, ethnicity, and culture; (3) social relations in and beyond the classroom; (4) teaching as a profession; (5) teaching practice; and (6) students' needs and strengths.

From the survey results, Love and Kruger found mixed results concerning teachers beliefs about race and culture. On three of the culturally relevant beliefs statements, an overwhelming majority of teachers (between 79% and 96% endorsed culturally relevant beliefs. In a fourth, 74.2% rejected assimilationist beliefs. Love and Kruger interpreted this to mean that the majority of teachers agreed that students' race, culture, and ethnicity are important in teaching. For instance, 96% of the teachers saw their students as unique composites of racial, cultural, home, and peer experiences. However, the teachers accepted two other assimilationist statements (62% and 73%, respectively), saying that they saw their students as just children, not defined by their race or culture.

The second part of study included two of the participating schools from the first study, and 50 of the previous 244 participating teachers. Love and Kruger chose the two schools because they primarily served children of African descent from the surrounding neighborhoods, and participated in a coalition involved in school change efforts. Both schools also placed in the lower 20% of schools in

the state. Each of the participants was considered a lead classroom teacher. There were four kindergarten, 13 first-grade, 10 second-grade, eight third-grade, nine fourth-grade, and six fifth-grade teachers. The participants' ethnicities were 70% African American, 28% Caucasian, 2% Indian. There was a one to 30-year range of teaching experience, with the mean being 11 years and a median being nine years.

Love and Kruger obtained the ITBS achievement scores for all of the teachers' students from school records. They regressed survey items from the survey with the schools' standardized (norm-referenced) achievement scores, and aggregated the scores by classroom.

Love and Kruger found that nine of the 48 statements in the survey correlated strongly with student achievement. For instance, one of the knowledge statements, "It is my job to disseminate knowledge to my students", correlated with reading and language arts scores ($r = .30$, and $r = .37$, respectively). One teaching practices items, "Sometimes I play the role of student and allow my students teach the class", correlated with mathematics scores ($r = .36$). Communalism in the classroom also correlated positively with student achievement. The item, "Testing is an individual assessment; however, test results of an individual reflect on the groups efforts toward helping the individual learn, as well" correlated with reading scores ($r = .35$).

Love and Kruger noted two important implications based on their findings. First, there are multiple ways to successfully teach African American children, yet those practices function within a framework that accounts for students' individual

needs. The most successful teachers in the study did not adhere to only one belief system about their students or their teaching practices. They determined what did and did not work, and adjusted their teaching according to their students' individual needs. Second, their findings suggest what many teachers already know: supporting students in not merely an academic endeavor. As the first few studies in this literature review demonstrated, students' backgrounds can have considerable effects on their educational experiences. They come into the classroom with personal, social, and cultural needs. Love and Kruger's findings suggest that teachers' beliefs about their students manifest in their teaching practices and have some effect on student achievement. That is, the often negative relationship between diverse students' backgrounds and their educational experiences cannot be divorced from teachers' beliefs. The implication here is that teachers must examine their assumptions about knowledge, race and culture, teaching practices, academic expectations, social relations, and teaching as a profession in order to support the academic achievement of all students. The teachers in this study recognized that their classroom management style and curriculum had to reflect the makeup of their classrooms, not their assumptions about "good" teaching.

Love and Kruger sought to quantify the relationships between factors implicit in teachers beliefs and their students levels of achievement. They found that teachers' beliefs are associated with student achievement. One of the strengths of this study was that it included a diverse range of educators in terms of experience, and roles in the school. Therefore, in terms of external validity, the

findings are more generalizable to the general field of teachers. One of the weaknesses of this study, however, is the lack of statistical significance values and relatively weak correlations, suggesting a lack of internal validity. Love and Kruger's measure, nonetheless, were reliable, especially the culturally relevant beliefs statements that had a Cronbach's alpha score of .85.

Summary

This final section presented research that focused on the role of teacher reflection in connecting culturally responsive teaching theory to practice. Love and Kruger (2005) found that academic achievement is associated with teacher's beliefs. Maye and Day (2012) found that teachers' cultural identities affect their teaching practice. Birell's (1995) research illustrated how teacher reflection can uncover beliefs and biases and potentially leads to better relationships with students. Chubbuck and Zembylas's (2008) research showed how teacher reflection could help teachers recognize and negotiate discrepancies between their beliefs and practices.

Chapter 2 Summary

The literature reviewed in this chapter addressed a number of themes in multicultural education. Much of this research focused primarily on the relationship between race, ethnicity, and class, and students' educational experiences – primarily the experiences of socioeconomically disadvantaged African American students. The intention here was not to imply that other factors

such as gender, sexuality, and disability are any less important to consider. The focus on race, ethnicity, and class permitted this review to highlight those students who are currently achieving at some the lowest levels in terms of graduation rates and standardized test scores.

To start, the first section addressed how students backgrounds factor into their educational experiences and influence engagement and achievement. For instance, the racial/ethnic and socioeconomic composition of students' neighborhoods influences their social learning. However, when economic disparities within communities fall upon racial/ethnic lines, which continues to be a reality in the United States today, they can hinder students' social learning. This is equally true for students from White middle-class communities who do not experience diversity as it is for socioeconomically disadvantaged minorities from diverse communities. However, the latter are more likely to experience community violence. The experiences associated with socioeconomic disadvantage, such as violence and poverty, mediate the relationship between socioeconomic disadvantage and student achievement. For instance, parents' occupation influences students sense of belonging in school, thus implying that teachers can support those student by finding ways to make them feel safer in the school environment. Building a supportive learning community is, in fact, one aspect of culturally responsive teaching.

The second and third sections in this chapter address the role of the teacher-student relationships in students' educational experiences. Together, these two sections move from illustrating how positive TSRs can improve

students' achievement to discussing what it means to care for students. Caring for student, of course, implies concern for them. However, in practice, caring is more complex. Caring for students entails setting high expectations for them, insisting that they meet them, and supporting them along the way. Students respond positively to high expectations, but they may perceive their demanding teachers as mean. However, they also understand that their teachers hold them to high expectations because they want the best for their future. They work harder with those teachers they perceive to care for them, thus illuminating the relationship between high expectations and student achievement. This is why experienced teachers consistently express care for their students by firmly demanding more for them while giving them the support they need in order to achieve socially and academically.

Supporting students can mean many different things. Traditionally, people think of teachers primarily as support for academic development, but this view neglects the social, cultural, and political aspects of education. Effective multicultural educators address each of these aspects through their instruction and their TSRs. Culturally responsive teachers practice building social relationships in the classroom that support academic development. They teach students multiple perspectives on issues, facilitate student discussion of varying viewpoints, and in doing so, foster a culture of support and respect in the classroom. Furthermore, they use their understanding of students' cultures to design instruction, for instance, the holistic preferences of many African American males.

Within the historical context of public education in the United States, these culturally responsive teaching practices are explicitly political. They are not attempts to respond to anything lacking in the student, but to the ways in which school and society have marginalized them. However, in many ways these practices reflect an understanding of how broader national politics manifest in the immediate political structures of the classroom. For instance, culturally responsive teachers speak honestly with their students about historic racial issues in the United States. Furthermore, they understand the dynamics set up by the differences or similarities between teachers' and students' identities.

The final section in this chapter examined research on teacher reflection. Teacher reflection helps teachers identify and reshape their beliefs. For instance, examining inequities in their practice can uncover what they truly believe about their students. Interrogating their own beliefs helps them to better understand how they relate to their students. Analyzing how they relate to their students illuminates the identity politics within their classrooms. Each aspect of reflection helps teachers better understand and align their beliefs and practices. Thus, they can clearly identify whether or not their teaching reflects the idea of supporting the academic achievement of all students.

The two ends of this literature review come together with student and teacher backgrounds. In terms of multicultural education and academic achievement, it is somewhat logical that their relationships are central to this literature review. However, when taken together, the research here illustrates the complexity of teacher-student relationships, and public education. Diverse

identities typify multicultural societies; students and teachers come from different background that shape how they relate to each other. Culturally responsive teaching, it appears, focuses on turning those relationships into tools for students' academic and social success.

The relationship between students' backgrounds and their academic achievement is what makes understanding students' backgrounds so important in multicultural education. Public education's historic marginalization of diverse students compounds the effects of the circumstances they face outside of school rather than meets students' needs. The various ways that public education has marginalized these students is representative of their diversity. The interrelations between each aspect of student's histories and identities have shaped their experiences in different ways, thus making every students' needs different. Multicultural educators benefit from understanding how those differences shape what students need in order to be engaged and achieve academically.

Chapter 3 presents a summary of the findings from Chapter 2, the implications those findings have for teaching, and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 3: CONCLUSION

Introduction

Chapter 1 provided a brief description of No Child Left Behind, and how ten years after its enactment the achievement gap it intended to close remains just as wide as it had been. Chapter 1 also provided the rationale for this literature review: since the standards and accountability movements have been unable to close the achievement gap, it turns toward multicultural education to interrogate its relationship to student achievement. Then it provided brief histories of the standards and accountability movements, and multicultural education. Finally, Chapter 1 explained that the purpose of this literature review is to critique multicultural education research in order to determine what implications it might have for teaching.

Chapter 2 provided summaries and critiques of 30 qualitative and quantitative research articles. Those articles were divided into four themes: students' backgrounds, teacher-student relationships, high expectations, and critical reflection.

This final chapter first presents a brief summary of the findings from Chapter 2. This summary presents the articles in terms of their strengths and weaknesses, as well as their similarities in order to provide some focus for the discussion of implications that follows. Then, based on this research, it presents classroom implications and suggestions for future research.

Summary of Findings

While there are a number of theoretical approaches to multicultural education, its overarching goal is the creation of an equitable education, one indicator of which would be the narrowing of the achievement gap. The components of multicultural education that this literature review focused on were students' backgrounds, teacher-student relationships, caring for students, and critical reflection. This section discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the studies reviewed in each section of Chapter 2 in terms of their relationship to this literature review's questions: How does multicultural education affect student achievement?

Students' Backgrounds Affect Engagement and Academic Achievement

The purpose of this section was to present research that would hopefully provide some insight into factors within students' backgrounds and how they relate to student achievement. The six studies in this section had the greatest implications for students commonly labeled as 'at-risk'. The first four studies (Felner, Brand DuBois, Adan, Mulhall, and Evans, 1995; Blau, Lamb, Stearns, and Pellering, 2001; O'Donnell, Schwab-Stone, and Muyeed, 2002) presented the most compelling findings. In a broad sense, these studies were methodologically similar in that they all focused on quantifying correlations between students' backgrounds and their levels of achievement. Though these studies focused on different variables, they all point to the notion that the conditions of socioeconomic disadvantage affect student engagement and achievement. Blake, Butler, Lewis, and Darensbourg (2010) and Sheeta's (1996)

studies were different from the studies because they focused more on relationships between discipline and factors like race, ethnicity, and gender. Farkas, Grobe, Sheenhan, and Shuan (1990) was also different from the other studies because it focused on teachers' perceptions of students skills and behaviors based on factors like race/ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status.

Felner, Brand, DuBois, Adan, Mulhall, and Evans (1995) found that a number of conditions related to socioeconomic disadvantage correlate with students' educational experiences. The children of parents with less education and lower occupational status had less sense of belonging at school, were more likely to have classroom behavior problems, and ultimately, achieve less academically. Their strongest finding was that household occupation was positively associated with students' performance. Some of the scales these researchers used, however, did not obtain high enough Cronbach's alpha scores to ensure the highest level internal consistency, which might also explain why some of their correlations were moderate at best. Since their sample only included children form low-income communities, which limits the generalizability of their findings.

Blau, Lamb, Stearns, and Pellering's (2001) identified one relationship within the conditions of socioeconomic disadvantage that relates to academic achievement: diversity and resource consolidation. Their most significant finding was a strong negative correlation between consolidated inequality and achievement in social studies. The findings from this study are broadly generalizable because the researchers used a large sample of students from

various racial and socioeconomic boundaries. In terms of its relevance to this literature review, however, is that this study did not find correlations between the cosmopolitan environment and gains in reading and mathematics. Nonetheless, this does not exclude this research from having implications for the classroom.

O'Donnell, Schwab-Stone, and Muyeed's (2002) research found that community violence typically affects socioeconomically disadvantaged African American youth. Their primary finding was that school support could potentially strengthen their resilience against risk factors such as substance abuse and school misconduct. Not all of the correlations that O'Donnell, Schwab-Stone, and Muyeed analyzed were very strong or statistically significant; however, they could have compounding effects that ultimately have serious repercussions for student achievement. Their sample was relatively large and included students from many different backgrounds and levels of exposure to community violence, thus making their findings broadly generalizable.

Blake, Butler, Lewis, and Darensbourg (2010) and other researchers have found, African American students tend to be overrepresented in disciplinary actions, and received discipline for different reasons than their White counterparts. The researchers relied on credible methods of data analysis. Their findings were significant because they suggested that, even though there were nearly the same number of Black and White students in the school district, Black girls received disciplinary action twice and sometimes three times as often as White students, and for reasons that reflect historical Black female stereotypes.

Sheeta (1996) found that the predominant culture of discipline within public schools could leave African American students feeling alienated and disempowered. She provided one of the most credible studies in this section, as she included students and teachers voices in her research, as well as delineated how her findings were consistent with the literature on interethnic communication. Her findings suggest that differences in perception and communication styles within a framework in which teachers hold all the power can leave African American students feeling utterly powerless.

In the final study in this section, Farkas, Grobe, Sheenhan, and Shuan (1990) teachers' perceptions of students' backgrounds affect student achievement. The strongest findings from this study were that teachers' judgments of basic skills, student behavior, and teacher judgments of students' habits and styles were strong predictors of school success. In those three categories, teachers tended to rate Asian American and female students the highest. Teachers rated poor, African American, Hispanic/Latin@, and male students the lowest, by far, in all of these categories. While Farkas, et al. did not find any teacher bias in the teachers' dispensation of grades; they did find that the teachers' judgments of students skills and behaviors were mediating factors in the grades they gave. The large sample size in this study makes the findings more broadly generalizable to diverse classrooms.

Authentic Relationships Increase Engagement and Academic Performance

The studies in this section suggested that teacher-students relationships affect student achievement. Jamieson and Thomas (1974) examined the politics of TSRs on two levels – first those that exist within the boundaries of the classroom, and then through their discussion of the implications that classroom politics can have for society. Their examination of the relationship between teachers' power bases and students perceptions of conflict revealed how important high school TSRs can be in shaping students relationships with college faculty. The researchers speculated that teachers' use of coercive power in traditional high school settings is one factor in their development toward passive/dependent relationships to authority as adults. While supporting students necessarily entails the development of academic skills, this research suggests that an understanding of the politics of the classroom can help teachers develop better interpersonal relationships that support academic and social success. Jamieson and Thomas's findings were significant at the 1% level, which is only moderate. Their findings, though dated, are generalizable to diverse student bodies.

Cotten and Wilson's (2006) findings suggest that developing the interpersonal aspects of academic relationships with students could be an important part of helping them prepare for college where their teachers might not be as outgoing. These findings were supported by the literature, are transferable to diverse settings, and emerged from a sound ethnographic methodology.

Goodenow's (1993) research suggested that the quality of TSRs could affect students' expectancy for success, sense of belonging, and perceptions of

support from their teachers. Furthermore, these relationships could ultimately affect student achievement. While the correlations that Goodenow found were not particularly strong and only moderately statistically significant, her methods had strong levels of internal consistency. However, the lack of diversity in her sample significantly limited the generalizability of her findings to White students.

O'Connor and McCartney (2007) also found that the quality of teacher-student relationships can be a predictor of student achievement. However, they found that teacher-student relationships held different levels of significance for different types of students. For instance, they determined that teacher-student relationship quality was most significant for those students who had declining-low teacher-student relationsip from preschool to third grade. O'Connor and McCartney's findings were also more generalizable than Goodenow's (1993), as their sample intentionally reflected the demographics of the United States. Their findings suggested moderate correlations between teacher-student relationships and student achievement that were, at most, moderately significant. Nonetheless, their methodology was sound in terms of internal consistency because their scales had strong Cronbach's alpha scores.

Gehlbach, Brinkworth, and Harris (2011) suggested that when students hold positive perceptions of their TSRs they are more motivated to participate, have a stronger sense of belonging at school, and behave better in the classroom. The most statistically significant finding in their study was that students' positive perceptions of their relationships with their teachers predicted the quality and frequency of their contributions in class. Positive perceptions of

relationships with teachers also predicted homework completion, but the statistical significance of this finding varied between the different schools that participated in the study. Gehlbach, Brinkworth, and Harris's measures demonstrated moderate to strong levels of internal consistency. Their use of selective sampling for diversity made their findings generalizable to diverse school settings.

Murray and Malmgen (2005) found that interventions intended to improve TSRs could positively improve students' GPAs. On average, the intervention groups' GPAs were four percentage points higher than the control group However, in terms of statistical significance this finding was not very strong. Their measure demonstrated strong levels of internal consistency, and their findings were generalizable to high-poverty African American students.

Muller (2001) found positive correlations between student achievement and how students at risk of dropping out of high school perceived TSRs. She concluded that students put more effort into their academics when they believed their teachers' cared about them. This study's measures had moderate to strong levels of internal consistency, strong correlations that were moderately statistically significant, and the findings were most generalizable to European American students.

Caring For Students as Setting High Expectations and Providing Support for Student Achievement

This section was divided into two subsections: setting and reinforcing high expectations, and supporting students. The first subsection focused on the relationship between expectations and academic achievement. Wood, Kaplan, and McLoyd (2007) found that parents and teachers have low expectations of African American males. They also found that teacher expectations can act as a mediating factor between parent and student expectations, and that this mediating effect becomes greater with time. Teachers' expectations can buffer students against their parents' low expectations. These correlations were not very strong until the researchers considered them in terms of their compounding effects. The measures that the researchers used in this study obtained moderate to strong Cronbach's alpha scores. Their findings, however, were only significant at the 5% level, and most generalizable to low-income African American families and their teachers.

Miller, Heafner, and Massey (2009) found that high expectations are associated with higher academic achievement. In response to an intervention intended to increase expectations and support, students were more motivated to learn. However, the researchers found without teacher supervision the students struggled with motivation. This study had very strong inter-rater reliability, and the researchers' use of member-checking made their findings more reliable. One weakness of this study was that its small sample size limits the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, the researchers provided little evidence of the students' baseline study habits and skills, making it difficult to trace the difference the intervention made.

Howard (2001) researched what it meant for teachers to care for their students, and concluded that caring was expressed through holding students to high expectations. One of the strengths of Howard's study was the use of purposive sampling, which made the findings transferable to settings in which teachers are working with male and female African American students at various levels of academic achievement.

Adkins-Coleman (2010), Bondy, Ross, Gallingane, and Hambacher (2007), and Brown (2004) all conducted similar studies, and found that experienced teachers of African American students clearly and assertively express high expectations and insist that their students meet them. Similar to Howard (2001) and Muller (2011) these studies found that although students might think their teacher are mean when they insist that they meet high expectations, they also believed that their teachers' meanness shows that they care. When the students believed that their teachers cared for them, they were more motivated to behave better and work harder. The participants in these studies were limited to teachers identified by the researchers as culturally responsive. The findings are most transferable to urban settings with diverse student populations.

Ware (2006) identified culturally responsive teachers as "warm demanders". These kinds of teachers play the roles of authority figures, caregivers, and pedagogues. They strongly insist that their students meet high expectations, but culturally appropriate ways of being to support their students. They also use their understanding of their students' backgrounds to inform their

pedagogy. Ware's research was firmly grounded in literature on culturally responsive teaching. She focused primarily on urban teachers of African American students. She also triangulated her findings using multiple sources of data.

The studies in the second subsection focused on the relationship between teacher and school support and academic achievement, and how culturally responsive approaches to supporting students. The teachers in the qualitative studies provided academic support in a variety of ways. Some examples include scaffolding analytic skills (i.e., "breaking it down"; McDougal, 2009), relating content to students' lived experiences (McDougal, 2009; Marri, 2009; and Milner and Tenore, 2010), and showing concern for students' futures by helping them prepare for life after school (Marri, 2009; Roberts, 2010). Each of these studies had strong conceptual frameworks; the researchers also relied on the voices of students and teacher, and triangulated their findings, which were transferable to diverse classroom settings.

Many of the teachers in these studies supported healthy social relationships in two ways. First, they intentionally perforated the boundaries between students' and teachers' worlds. For instance, Mr. Hall and Mr. Jackson got to know their students, and encouraged their students to get to know them too (Milner & Tenore, 2010). Second, they fostered community in the classroom. For instance, Mr. Sinclair fostered solidarity among his students by frequently reminding them of where they came from (Marri, 2009). These three teachers showed concern for the development of teacher-student and student-student

social relationships. Cotten and Wilson's (2006) findings imply that developing the interpersonal aspects of academic relationships with students could be an important part of helping them prepare for college where their teachers might not be as outgoing and students need to take a more active role in developing relationships with their teachers.

Some of the teachers in these studies used their understanding of students' cultures to develop supportive relationships. For instance, the teachers in Roberts' (2010) study used "color talk" to relate to their students while disseminating knowledge about their shared cultural experiences. Robert's research had a strong conceptual framework, and she frequently related her findings to the literature. In another example from Miller & Tenore's (2010) study, Mr. Jackson expressed how he benefitted from the racial experiences he shared with his students, while Mr. Hall understood that being White created a cultural divide between him and his Black students. Nonetheless, Mr. Hall used their common experiences with poverty to bridge that divide. These teachers demonstrated their understanding that culture is not only a tool for classroom management or relating to students, but also a gateway through which they could help their students access content.

Jacob (1995) and Knight-Diop's (2010) studies illustrated the role that school structure plays shaping academic and interpersonal relationships. On the one hand, school structures that reflect the tenets of multicultural education and those geared toward supporting students in college preparation can foster effective academic and interpersonal relationships between and among students

and teachers. They can lead to close-knit communities, supportive relationships, and more challenging curriculum. On the other hand, the possibility exists that problems could surface if schools and teachers do attend to those relationships. Jacob's study highlighted the possibility of inter-group conflict. Educators should not assume that tight-knit communities composed of students with similar backgrounds would not have their problems, but, as Knight-Diop's (2010) research suggested, structures like covert tracking can lead to inequalities in teacher-student relationships, and access to challenging curriculum. Both of these studies relied heavily on student voices, and presented findings consistent with the literature. Their findings are transferable to diverse school settings.

Teacher reflection as an integral component of culturally responsive teaching practice

The studies in this section addressed how reflection can help teachers better understand their own identities, and how, that understanding can improve their teaching. They suggest that critical reflection facilitates the broadening of teachers' beliefs, and builds a strong foundation for culturally relevant pedagogy. The first three studies were case studies of teachers who were asked to reflect upon their own identities and how their backgrounds were related to their pedagogy. Each of the teachers in these studies worked with students whose backgrounds were different from their in many ways, but they sensed that their teaching improved as they began to consider the way differences and similarities with their students influenced their classrooms.

The studies in this section illustrate two of the roles that reflection plays in bridging the gap between theory and practice. Reflection is an important part of culturally responsive teaching because it allows teachers to recognize the relationship between theirs and their students' histories and identities. When used to reshape their teaching practice, this recognition influences the way they teach and how students receive instruction. Reflecting on their instructional practices helps teachers evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching (Birell, 1995; Chubbuck & Zembylas, 2008; Love & Kruger, 2005; Maye & Day, 2012). It helps teachers identify what does and does not work based on individual students' responses to different aspects of their lessons, and then adjust their instruction accordingly.

Furthermore, these studies suggest that critical reflection is necessary for connecting theory to practice by helping teachers see how their ideal play out in reality. For instance, in Chubbuck and Zemblayas' (2010) study, reflecting on her practice helped Sara understand how her anxieties about whether her teaching reflected her social justice affected her positively and negatively. On the one hand, her anxieties were her motivating force, but on the other, they negatively affected her relationships with her students. Reflection enabled her to identify internal and external issues she was facing, and she was able to take the appropriate actions to address them.

These studies also suggest that critical reflection helps teachers identify commonalities they share with their students. It changes how they relate to their students, and effectively reshapes their teaching (Birell, 1995). In one example,

Ron from Birell's study, felt more comfortable working with students with backgrounds similar to his. He was unsuccessful at teaching in classrooms full of students that he could not figure out how to identify with. Similar to Mr. Jackson in Milner & Tenore's (2010) research the fact that he could identify with some students allowed him to teach them better. Working with students who had similar backgrounds to his gave him the room he needed to develop better relationships with students from backgrounds different from his own. In the end, Ron's beliefs and teaching abilities began to improve as his empathy for his African American students developed. Birell's research was strong in the sense that he relied on the voices of Ron and his students. His findings are transferable to contexts in which novice teachers are working with African American students. In contrast to Ron, Kelly and Mike from Maye and Day's (2012) study used the commonalities to connect with students who had different backgrounds from them. These commonalities helped them show their students where they were coming from – that they were not so different after all. They also integrated these commonalities into their instruction also helped them relate content to their students' interests. One strength of Maye and Day's research was their use of multiple data sources to triangulate their findings. Their measures obtained strong levels of internal consistency, and their findings are most transferable to settings with White middle-class teachers and diverse students.

Classroom Implications

Most of the research presented in this literature review pertains to working with 'at-risk' students. Teachers working with these students should learn about how their students' backgrounds affects their education. For instance, the findings from Blau, Lamb, Stearns, and Pellering (2001), Felner, Brand, DuBous, Mulhall, and Evans (1995), and O'Donnell, Schwab-Stone, and Muyeed (2002) that socioeconomic disadvantage affects student achievement. However, as Felner, et al. noted, it is not socioeconomic disadvantage itself, but the conditions created by socioeconomic disadvantage that negatively affect students. Factor such as socioeconomically segregated communities, exposure to community violence, and alienation from school often emerge from these conditions. They can impact student performance and their overall relationship with the school in different ways. For instance, students' social learning suffers when they live in communities with high diversity and high resource consolidation. Students who have been exposed to community violence report less familial support, and poor supervision and communication with parents. This lays the groundwork for issues like substance abuse, behavioral problems in the classroom, and a lower sense of belonging at school. Therefore, teachers should challenge the biases they might hold toward these students. Rather than, for instance, avoiding conflicts, they should try to understand their students' experiences.

In addition to learning more about their students and how their backgrounds could affect their educational experiences, teachers should provide 'at-risk student with appropriate academic support. One way that teachers can

support their students is by working to create positive, supportive relationships with them. Positive teacher-student relationships can improve students' sense of belonging, give them more motivation to participate in class, and ultimately support their academic achievement (Goodenow, 1993; Gehlbach, Brinkworth, and Harris, 2011; Muller, 2001; Murray and Malmgen, 2005; O'Connor and McCartney, 2007). Murray and Malmgen's research suggests that supporting students should include scheduling regular meetings to discuss their progress and increasing praise.

Another way to support 'at-risk' students is to hold them to high expectations. Milner and Tenore's (2010) research found that this can sometimes imply holding different students to different standards. Teachers should also be authoritative but caring. Muller (2001), Howard (2001), Ware (2006), and Milner and Tenore (2010) all support this implication. These studies suggest that caring for 'at-risk' students entails balancing toughness with affection. To support students in meeting high expectations, teachers should also break down content and relate to their students lives (McDougal, 2009). Being able to relate content to students' lived experiences shows a certain level of interest and ability to connect with students. Being able to connect with students is very important because, as the research on teacher-student relationships suggests, it can motivate students to engage in learning and, ultimately, affect their achievement. However, connecting with students requires that teachers are aware of their own ethnocentrism and understand the implications of the broader social, political, and economic landscape of the United States. Therefore, as Roberts (2010)

suggested, it is important that teachers communicate with political clarity. Teachers should work to expand and use their understanding of the broader social, political, and economic landscape of the United States to teach students to think critically. This includes not only using this understanding to inform the way they interact with students, but also teaching content from multiple perspectives, challenging dominant ideologies, and making the classroom an open forum for ideas (Marri, 2009).

It is also important that schools and teachers create safe environments that support socialization across racial and socioeconomic lines. As Felner, Brand, DuBois, Adan, Mulhall, and Evans'(1995) research suggested, these sorts of interactions can promote social learning. However, as Jacob's (1995) suggests, teachers and schools need to attend to the conflicts that can emerge from multicultural programs, and support positive in- and between-group interactions. Knight-Diop's (2010) research suggests that multicultural programs should also support the college going process, but be careful not to use covert tracking.

Teachers should also reflect on their own backgrounds and how they relate to their students. Love and Kruger's (2005) study suggested that teachers' beliefs about their students manifest in their teaching practices, and ultimately affect student achievement. As Birell's (1995) research suggested, the assumptions that teachers can also make it difficult for them to work across racial barriers and build supportive relationships with students. Farkas, Grobe, Sheenhan, and Shuan's (1990) study suggests that, ultimately, these

assumptions can affect how teachers' grade their students. Maye and Day's (2012) study also suggests that there is a relationship between teachers' understanding of their own identities and their pedagogy.   Reflection is also important for teachers who are determined to work toward social justice. As Chubbuck and Zembylas' (2008) research suggests, it can be difficult to manage the expectations that that these teachers hold for themselves. There is no doubt that working to support 'at-risk' students can be unforgiving work. As the teacher in this study, Sara, found, reflection helped her learn to be more forgiving with herself and build better relationships with her students.

Suggestions for Further Research

Students' Backgrounds Affect Engagement and Academic Achievement

Future research should focus on analyzing the positive structures that emerge within multicultural classrooms. While much of the research presented in the students' backgrounds section of Chapter 2 focused on the negative effects that factors in the lives of socioeconomically disadvantaged or culturally diverse students can have when they interact with the school, research like Felner, Brand, DuBois, and Evans (1995) points to the benefits that living in a multicultural society can have. Therefore, research should aim at uncovering the positive effects of factors such as within and between group solidarity, or the ways in which overcoming cultural conflicts might produce positive outcomes for students. Essentially, an important question that researchers should consider is, what aspects of diverse students' backgrounds promote learning?

Future research should also continue to analyze teacher-student relationships, the factors that affect them, and how those factors might relate to academic achievement. One theme that might be important to investigate is how teachers and students from different backgrounds build effective relationships. Much of the research into expectations reviewed here focused on African American teachers and how they support their students. This research is contrasted by the studies on reflection, which typically focused on the experiences of White teachers working with students whose backgrounds were much different from their own. Considering these two perspectives, future research could examine which aspects of how African American teachers supported their African American students end in success or failure for White teachers of African American students. This research should include the experiences of a large and diverse sample of students and data related to their academic outcomes.

Conclusion

This literature review was framed by current education policy. The standards and accountability movements imply that simply by raising standards and implementing accountability measures will ensure the academic success of all students. However, ten years later there is still an achievement gap. It seems that 'at-risk' students need more than just state standards and high-stakes tests. Therefore, this literature review looked toward multicultural education to see what it might suggest for teaching and schooling.

The research presented in this literature review suggests that there are a number of other factors that are also associated with student achievement, Some of those factors – for instance, the conditions of socioeconomic disadvantage – cannot be addressed by public education alone. However, support from schools and teachers can buffer their effects. For instance, schools and teachers can work to promote relationships across differences; they can build positive relationships with their students and show that they care for their student by holding them students to the highest of expectations, and they can improve their teaching by reflecting on the sociocultural landscape of their classrooms. All of these factors are associated with academic achievement in some way or another. Therefore, if policy makers truly intend to close the achievement gap, they need to add these factors to their considerations of future policy changes. Most importantly, they need to address the detrimental effects of the high-stakes testing environment discussed in Chapter 1 of this literature review because they stand in the way of multicultural education practices that are associated with academic achievement.

REFERENCES

Adkins-Coleman, T. A. (2010). "I'm not afraid to come into your world": Case

studies for teachers facilitating engagement in urban high school English

classrooms. The Journal of Negro Education, 79(1), 41-53.

Alliance for Excellent Education (2012). Inseperable imperatives: Equity in

education and the future of the American Economy. Washington, DC.

Au, W. (2007). High-stakes testing and curricular control: a qualitative

metasynthesis. Educational Researcher, 36(5), 258-267.

Banks, C. A., & Banks, J. B. (1995). Equity pedagogy: An essential component of

multicultural education. Theory Into Practice, 34(3), 152-158.

Banks, J. A. (1977). Issues in American Education. Peabody Journal of

Education, 54(2), 73-78.

Banks, J. A. (1993). Multicultural Education: Historical development, dimensions,

and practice. Review of Research in Education, 19, 3-49.

Birrell, J. R. (1995) "Learning how the game is played": An ethnically

encapsulated beginning teacher's struggle to prepare black youth for a

White world. Teaching & Teacher Education 11(2)

Blake, J. J., Butler, B. R., Lewis, C. W., & Darensbourg, A. (2010). Unmasking
the inequitable discipline experiences of urban Black girls: Implications for
urban education stakeholders. The Urban Review, 43 (1), 90-106.

Blau, J. R., Lamb, V. L., Stearns, E., Pellering, L. (2001) Cosmopolitan
environments and adolescents' gains in social studies. Sociology of
Education, 74(2), 121-138

Bondy, E., Ross, D., Gallingane, C., & Hambacher, E. (2007). Creating
environments of success and resilience: Culturally responsive classroom
management. Urban Education, 42(4), 326-348.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1970). Teachers' communication of differential
expectations for children's classroom performance: Some behavioral data.
Journal of Educational Psychology, 61(5), 365-374.

Brown, D. (2004). Urban teachers' professed classroom management strategies:
Reflections of culturally responsive teaching. Urban Education, 39(3), 266-
289.

Casbarro, J. (2005). The politics of high-stakes testing. Education Digest, 70(6),
20-23.

Center on Education Policy. (2011, Dec. 15). AYP Results for 2010-11. Retrieved

    2012, from Center on Education Policy:

    http://www.cepdc.org/displayDocument.cfm?DocumentID=386

Chubbuck, S. M., Zembylas, M. (2008). The emotional ambivalence of socially

    just teaching: A case study of a novice urban schoolteacher. American

    Educational Research Journal 45(2)

Cotten, S. R., Wilson, B. (2006). Student-faculty interaction: Dynamics and

    determinants. Higher Education, 51(4), pp. 487-519

Felner, R., Brand, S., DuBois, D., A., A., Mulhall, P., & Evans, E. (1995).

    Socioeconomic disadvantage, proximal environmental experiences, and

    socioemotional and academic adjustment in early adolescence:

    Investigation of a mediated effects model. Child Development, 66, 774-

    792.

Gay, G. (2010). Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice.

    New York, New York: Teachers College Press.

Gehlback, H., Brinkworth, M. E., & Harris, A. (2011). Social motivation in the

    secondary classroom: Assessing teacher-student relationships from both

perspectives. Paper presented at the American Educational Research

Association, New Orleans.

Goodenow, K. (1993). Classroom belonging among early adolexcent students:

Relationships to motivation and achievement. Journal of Early

Adolescence, 13(1), 21-43.

Hixson, J. (1983). Redefining the issues: Who's at risk and why. Midwest

Regional Center for Drug-Free Schools and Communities.

Howard, M. (2009). RTI from all sides: What every teacher needs to know.

Portsmouth, NH: Heinmann.

Howard, T. C. (2001). Telling their side of the story: African-American students'

perceptions of culturally relevant teaching. The Urban Review, 31 (2), 131-

149.

Jacob, B. (1995). Defining culture in a multicultural environment: An ethnography

of Heritage High School. American Journal of Education, 103(4), 339-373.

Jamieson, D. W., Thomas, W. K. (1974) Power and conflict in the student-

teacher relationship. In The Journal of applied behavioral science (10)3,

321-336

Johnson, B., & Johnson, D. (2006). HIgh stakes: Poverty, Testing, and Failure in American Schools (2 ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Knight-Diop, M. G. (2010). Closing the gap: Enacting care and facilitating Black students' educational access in the creating of a high school college-going culture. Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk (JESPAR), 15(1-2), 158-172.

Ladd, H. F. (2002). Market-based reforms in urban education. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lomawaima, K. T., & McCarty, T. L. (2006). To remain an Indian: Lessons in democracy from a century of Native American education. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Loves, A., & Kruger, C. (2005). Teacher beliefs and studen acheivement in urban schools serving African American students. The Journal of Educational Research, 99(2), 87-98.

Marri, A. R. (2009). Creating citizens: Lessons in relationships, personal growth, and community in one secondary social studies classroom. Multicultural Perspectives, 11(1), 12-18.

Marzano, M. J. (2003). Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Maye, D., Day, B. (2012) Teacher identities: The fingerprint of culturally relevant pedagogy for students at risk. Diverse Learners, 78 (2)

McDougal, S. (2009). "Break it down": One of the cultural and stylist instructional practices of Black males. The Journal of Negro Education, 78(4), 432-440.

McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2006, July-August). The pedagogy of oppression: A brief look at No Child Left Behind. Retrieved Spring 2012, from Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine: http://monthlyreview.org/2006/07/01/the-pedagogy-of-oppression-a-brieflook-at-no-child-left-behind

Miller, S., Heafner, H., Massey, D. (2009) High-school teachers attempts to promote self-regulated learning: "I may learn from you, yet how do I do it?" Urban Review, 41, 121-140

Milner, R. H., & Tenore, F. B. (2010). Classroom management in diverse

    classrooms. Urban Education, 45(5), 560-603.

Muller, C. (2001). The role of caring in the teacher-student reltaionships of at-risk

    students. Sociological Inquiry, 71(2), 241-255.

Murray, C., & Malmgren, K. (1992). Implementing a teacher–student relationship

    program in a high-poverty urban school: Effects on social, emotional, and

    academic adjustment and lessons learned. Journal of School Psychology,

    43, 137-152.

O'Connor, E., & McCartney. (2007). Examining teacher-child relationships and

    achievement as pert of an ecological model of development. American

    Educational Research Journal, 44(2), 340-369.

O'Donnell, D. A., Schwab-Stone, M., & Muyeed, A. Z. (2002). Multidimensional

    resilience in urban children exposed to community violence. Child

    Development, 73(4), 1265-1282.

Ravitch, D. (2010). The death and life of the great American school system.

    Philadelphia, PA: Basic Books.

Roberts, M. A. (2010). Toward a theory of culturally relevant critical teacher care:

    African American teachers' definitions and perceptions of care for African

    American students. Journal of Moral Education, 39(4), 449-467.

Sheeta, R. H. (1996). Urban classroom conflict: Student-teacher perception:

    Ethnic integrity, solidarity, and resistance. Research/Technical, American

    Educational Research Association.

Sleeter, C. E. Multicultural education as social activism. Albany: State University

    of New York Press.

Spring, J. (2011). The American school: A global context from the Puritans to the

    Obama era. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Swanson, C. B. (2009). Cities in crisis 2009: Closing the graduation gap. Editorial

    Projects in Education Research Center. Bethesda: Editorial Projects in

    Education Research Center.

U.S. Department of Education . (2011). The condition of education 2011.

    National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S.

    Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education. (2012). The condition of education 2012.

     Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

U.S. Department of Education. (2007). The nation's report card: Reading 2007.

     Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Ware, F. (2006). Warm demander pedagogy: Culturally responsive teaching that

     supports a culrute of acievement for African American students. Urban

     Education, 41(4), 427-456.

Weinstein, C. S., Tomilson-Clarke, S., & Curran, M. (2004). Toward a conception

     of culturally responsive classroom management. Journal of Teacher

     Education, 55(1), 25-38.

Wood, D, Kaplan, R., McLoyd, V. C. (2007) Gender differences in the

     educational expectations of urban, low-income African American Youth:

     The role of parents at the school. Journal of Youth and Adolescents, 36,

     417-427.