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Abstract

A person’s beliefs about the cause of a problem influence the solutions they seek to implement. Inaccurate attributions for the causes of educational issues could lead teachers to an overly narrow understanding of educational outcomes in urban education by focusing on student factors to the exclusion of teacher, school, or contextual factors. A narrow attribution of educational outcomes to student factors can then lead to lower expectations for students in urban educational settings. A consequential result because “[d]ifferences in expectations lead to differences in what is taught, which in turn lead to differences in what is ultimately learned” (Brophy, 1983, p. 639). The purpose of this study was to investigate the attributions that preservice teachers make for educational outcomes and the expectations they hold for students in relation to urban education. Twenty-three preservice teachers participated in an undergraduate level Urban Education course that served as a 15-week intervention. The course material examined historical and contemporary factors related to urban education outcomes to provide a more complete context for making attributions about academic and behavioral outcomes in urban educational settings. Furthermore, participants studied expectancy effects in combination with education practices that demonstrate high teacher expectations. In this mixed-methods study, preservice teacher attributions and expectations were measured in preintervention and postintervention surveys and through bi-weekly entries recorded in reflections journals and a self-reflection project. The findings indicate little change in the overall attributions made and expectations held by the participants, but qualitative data provided evidence for changes in their reflective awareness of making attributions about the educational outcomes in urban schools and holding expectations for those students.
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Executive Summary

Introduction

This study investigated the attributions that preservice teachers make for educational outcomes and the expectations they hold for students in relation to urban education. A person’s beliefs about the cause of a problem influence the solutions they seek to implement. Inaccurate attributions for the causes of educational issues could lead teachers to an overly narrow understanding of educational outcomes in urban education by focusing on student factors to the exclusion of teacher, school, or contextual factors. A narrow attribution of educational outcomes to student factors can then lead to lower expectations for students in urban educational settings. This is a consequential result because “[d]ifferences in expectations lead to differences in what is taught, which in turn lead to differences in what is ultimately learned” (Brophy, 1983, p. 639). The awareness of attributions and regular reflective practice provides a mechanism for educators to interrogate their practice and reflect on the accuracy of their attributions. When observing the actions of other humans, people tend to overestimate the salience of personal qualities while underestimating environmental factors (Weiner, 1992). Therefore, the attributions that teachers make are important because narrow attributions for negative educational outcomes to the student or the student’s culture without an examination of teaching, school policy, or oppressive societal context could lead to low expectations (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Without a careful examination into the causes of disparate educational outcomes, teachers could reach the incorrect conclusions that some people, as defined by racial or cultural groups, are not as academically capable as others or that some cultures do not care about education. This potentially leads to lower academic and behavioral expectations. If educators are not equipped to reflect on their assumptions and biases, and if they are not knowledgeable about the historical and contemporary
factors related to urban education, they are unlikely to make accurate attributions about outcomes for students of color attending urban schools. It then becomes likely for these teachers to hold low expectations based on outcomes related to the opportunity gap and prevalent racial stereotypes.

Accurate attributions allow teachers to see that students of color are as academically capable as any other student in any other setting (Ogbu & Simons, 1998) while acknowledging the strengths and resources students can draw on and the areas in which they might need support. This understanding provides a foundation for high academic and behavioral expectations, a necessary starting point for success in urban schools.

**Problem of Practice**

Patterns of school and housing segregation (Gay, 2010; Li, 2009; Massey & Tannen, 2018) often produce different worlds and experiential realities for White, middle-class preservice teachers, and urban students of color. Absent personal interactions, physical and cultural separation can mean that beliefs about urban students of color form largely from stereotypical media representations, with racist undercurrents creating negative associations with people of color (Brown & Donner, 2011; Eberhardt, Goff, Purdie, & Davies, 2004). Although often unexamined, teacher expectations affect teaching and discipline (Gay, 2010; Knoblauch & Chase, 2015; Ladson Billings, 1995), and teacher beliefs on race, culture, and class are resistant to change (Gay, 2010). Low teacher expectations for urban students of color can manifest as less rigorous teaching methods (Diamond et al., 2004), higher discipline rates (Bryan, 2017), and as attributing lower outcomes to the students’ personal, home, or cultural characteristics rather than to classroom instruction or educational atmosphere (Knoblauch & Chase, 2015; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Rodriguez & Berryman, 2002). In writing assignments, reflections, and discussions,
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White, middle-class PSTs at Midwestern Christian Teachers College (MCTC) demonstrate different, often lower, academic and behavioral expectations for urban students of color than they do for students with a background similar to their own, which may perpetuate academic and social underachievement for culturally and socioeconomically diverse students.

Background and Context

The study is set at a private teacher education college in the Midwest operated by a medium sized religious denomination. MCTC is located in a town of 13,000 people 90 miles from the nearest metropolitan area and whose economy is a mix of agricultural, manufacturing, and service industries. Approximately 750 students are enrolled in the institution, 550 of whom are seeking an Education degree. Of the 750 students on campus, more than 700 identify as white, non-Hispanic. Graduates of the education program receive a Bachelor of Science in education and are qualified for the state teacher licensure. The mission of the college is to produce workers in the form of teachers, ministers, and staff, for the affiliated denominational school district, which contains 387 early childhood centers, 294 elementary schools, and 28 high schools nationwide, as well as 1270 congregations (Institutional Statistical Report (anonymized), 2018).

Needs Assessment

The needs assessment study explored the residential and educational experiences of White preservice teachers at Midwestern Christian Teachers College (MCTC) in relation to their interactions with people of other races, ethnicities, cultures, and classes through PST interviews with 8 participants. A quantitative survey completed by 44 PSTs further investigated PSTs’ professional beliefs about diversity (Pohan & Aguilar, 2001) and culturally responsive outcome expectancy (Siwatu, 2007), as well as their attribution of problematic student behaviors.
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(Kulinna, 2008). The findings demonstrate that the factors hypothesized to contribute to the problem of practice are relevant to the participants and if this sample is representative of the population of PSTs at MCTC, relevant to that population. Experience in segregated residential and educational settings, limited contact with people of color, and perceptions of urban schools and students of color based on a comparison to personal experience, are potentially related to a different, often negative view of urban schools and students of color, which can lead to lower academic and behavioral expectations, findings that demonstrate the utility of further investigation and intervention.

**Intervention Literature**

Attribution theory holds important implications for schools in that teachers make attributions about their students that inform their expectations for those students and subsequently how they teach. Students, in turn, make attributions about themselves based on the type and difficulty of material they are given in school and whether they are successful with that material. Attributions are integral to the purposes of this study because attributions about students inform the selection of educational and classroom management practices. If educators hold inaccurate attributions about students of color in urban settings, they could select inappropriate teaching and management strategies (Kulinna, 2008). Furthermore, if teachers attribute academic and behavioral issues to the student, their family, or their culture without considering the role of the school and societal factors such as racism, they could develop low expectations for those students (Ladson-Billings, 2006). The expectations that teachers hold for their students are linked to the attributions that they make about those students. If, for example, teachers view students attending schools in urban settings as less academically capable based on average test scores, ignoring the historical context that might have led to fewer or lower quality
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educational opportunities, they could hold lower expectations for those students. In such a case, inaccurate attributions could foster low expectations and again “[d]ifferences in expectations lead to differences in what is taught, which in turn lead to differences in what is ultimately learned” (Brophy, 1983, p. 639). Students are often aware of their teachers’ general levels of expectation, especially when evidenced by differential behavior in the classroom (Good & Nichols, 2001). Years of study from Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) to Ding and Rubie-Davies (2019) have demonstrated that expectancy effects are related to how teachers teach and therefore student outcomes. Students whose teachers hold high expectations perform better than students whose teachers hold low expectations.

Research Objectives

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attributions PSTs make for educational outcomes and the expectations they hold for students in relation to urban education. The research questions explored PST attributions and expectations each through a quantitative and qualitative lens.

RQ1: To what extent did PSTs’ educational attributions for students change from the beginning to the end of the intervention?

RQ2: How will PSTs describe any changes or stability over time (duration of the course) to the educational attributions for students?

RQ3: To what extent did PSTs’ educational expectations for students change from the beginning to the end of the intervention?

RQ4: How will PSTs describe any changes or stability over time (duration of the course) about their educational expectations for students?
RQ5: Did PSTs ascribe different attributions and expectations to traditional school settings and urban educational settings?

**Research Design**

The research was conducted as a mixed-methods convergent design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018), employing a preintervention and postintervention quantitative design and qualitative analysis of student self-reflections. Data from both strands were collected simultaneously since the investigation took place within a single school semester. A parallel-databases variant was utilized, where the questions and prompts were determined ahead of time.

**Intervention**

The intervention was a course taught by the author called Introduction to Urban Education. The intervention consisted of a semester-long three-credit course. The basic progression of the course considers Self: reflection on one’s relative standing in society, Others: examining the experiences of groups who have traditionally been underserved in education, and Connection: how to bridge divides for the purpose of education. Participants began by examining themselves in the context of current American society. They reflected on their race, culture, and class to position themselves in relation to people of different races, cultures, or classes in society. Next, they explored diverse voices from authors, speakers, educators, and students to learn from the perspectives of people from different backgrounds and experiences. Concurrently, PSTs investigated historical factors that have influenced urban schools and affected students of color attending those schools. Finally, aware of the potential distance between themselves and their future students, they examined culturally responsive approaches to education to incorporate in their future classrooms. The intervention provided contextual and historical information about urban education so that PSTs could attribute academic and behavioral outcomes for urban
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students of color with greater accuracy, with the goal of shifting PST expectations for urban
students of color. The intervention introduced the role of expectancy effects in education,
highlighting the potential impacts of low and high teacher expectations on students. Finally, the
intervention further developed high teacher expectations for students by exploring teaching and
management practices that demonstrate high expectations in the classroom.

Data and Analysis

The quantitative data included preintervention and postintervention results of three
surveys examining expectations for culturally responsive teaching, expectations for schools, and
attributions. The survey results were analyzed using paired sample $t$-tests and a Wilcoxon signed
ranks test. Qualitative data were collected in the form of participant reflection journal entries and
the transcripts of self-reflection projects, both of which were analyzed using thematic content
analysis.

Findings

The preintervention and postintervention survey results showed significant change in how
participants attributed academic and behavioral issues for students in urban schools, but not for
non-urban schools. Responses from the reflection journals and self-reflection project transcripts
revealed PSTs were initially unaware of their attributions about students in urban settings, which
were often based on unexamined beliefs about American society. However, the readings,
reflections, activities, and discussions presented new information to consider, often moving them
to emotional responses. Therefore, they included historical and societal factors in their
attributions about students of color in urban settings, including a desire to make changes through
continued learning and future teaching. The combination of the quantitative and qualitative
strands of the data indicates that there was a change in awareness of attributions, in conjunction with broadened attributions for students in urban schools.

Participant expectations for culturally responsive teaching increased at a significant level. Their expectations for both non-urban and urban schools increased for almost all listed categories, but not at a significant level. The qualitative results showed that the concept of teacher expectations for students was relatively new to most participants, but they found it important and relevant in connection to teaching. Therefore, they expressed a desire to become better teachers to demonstrate their high expectations for students. Again, in taking the two strands together, PSTs’ shifted from unawareness teacher expectations to awareness, but only at a beginning level of expectational change.

Finally, the preintervention and postintervention survey results revealed non-significant differences in the attributions that PSTs made and the expectations held for non-urban and urban schools. Participant attributions became more external overall, including teachers, schools, and societal context more often in the postintervention. This shift was slightly more pronounced as they considered urban schools but the shift was not statistically significant. Expectations for schools rose overall for both non-urban and urban schools, but PSTs’ expectations for non-urban schools remained higher than their expectations for urban schools even in the postintervention results.
Chapter 1

Overview and Factors Related to the Problem of Practice

The K-12 student enrollments in American public schools have been growing increasingly diverse, but teacher demographics have been slow to shift (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2018). White educators make up 80% of the current teaching force (NCES, 2018), and according to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (2018), of the nearly 100,000 preservice teachers who graduated with an undergraduate degree in education in 2018, only 25% were people of color. As these predominately White educators encounter classrooms with growing diversity, there is a significant possibility for differences along racial, ethnic, cultural, and socio-economic lines. The potential dissonance could cause complications for teachers and students in communication of expectations and the interpretation of behaviors (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2006).

This literature review explores factors related to the expectations that preservice teachers (PSTs) hold for students of color in an urban setting. The vast majority of PSTs included in the extant studies were White. The term students of color signifies K-12 students who identify their race or ethnicity as other than White or Caucasian. In some cases, a particular race or ethnic group such as Black or African American may also be given as specified by the cited research. Further, when urban is used to describe an educational setting, it may carry more meaning than the traditional definition used in census information denoting a geographical area with a given population density (Herbert & Thomas, 2013) but also includes the connotations attached by preservice teachers to include a racial or ethnic component typically Black or Hispanic and a socioeconomic dimension of students from low-income households or living in poverty (Watson, 2012). For the purposes of this study, PSTs are defined as undergraduate college students
enrolled in a teacher education program and seeking to earn a bachelor’s of science in education and teaching licensure. The majority of PSTs are White, that is, they identify their race as Caucasian, can trace their ethnic heritage to Europe, and come from middle-class backgrounds (Ford & Sassi, 2014; Milner, 2010); consequently, this examination of research focuses on White, middle-class PSTs.

Residential patterns established in the decades following World War II and continuing today make it highly probable that White, middle-class PSTs have lived near, attended school with, and interacted with primarily other White, middle-class people (Chapman, 2018; Card, Mas, & Rothstein, 2008; Li, 2009; Massey & Tannen, 2018). Even as PSTs enter college, they bring with them a conception of what school is and what teachers do, based on their personal experiences as students, a phenomenon known as the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975). As PSTs progress through educational training, their beliefs about students and educational settings may further be shaped by methodology courses and clinical experiences such as classroom observation and student teaching (Baumlet et al., 2016; Bryan, 2017; Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016; Siwatu et al., 2017; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006). However, growth in knowledge and understanding regarding students from other races, cultures, ethnicities, and socioeconomic classes tends to be relative to each PST’s prior experience (Han et al., 2015; Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006). Thus, although every state and the District of Columbia require that teacher education programs fulfill multicultural or cultural competency standards, which aim to prepare teacher candidates to work in a culturally responsive manner with diverse student populations, in order to earn teaching licensure (Akiba et al., 2010) PSTs may graduate holding varying expectations for students of other races, cultures, ethnicities, and socioeconomic classes, or for students attending school in
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urban districts. Furthermore, the traditional definition of urban includes population size and
density of a city whose primary economic concern is non-agricultural (Herbert & Thomas,
2013). However, the term urban in an educational context signifies more than metropolitan
metrics. PSTs, many of whom come from a suburban or rural background, base their norms for
education on their personal experience so that urban may be construed as something other than
the norm (Watson, 2012).

From Rosenthal and Jacobson’s (1968) seminal paper on expectations to more recent
work investigating self-efficacy (Dicke et al., 2014; Knoblauch & Chase, 2015; Knoblauch &
Woolfolk Hoy, 2008; Larson et al., 2018; Siwatu, 2011, 2011b; Siwatu et al., 2017), research has
established a connection between the beliefs that educators hold about students and their ability
to teach them, and actual student outcomes. Low expectations for urban students of color can be
borne out in less rigorous academic work (Diamond et al., 2004), more exclusionary disciplinary
actions (Bryan, 2017; Larson et al. 2018), and higher referral rates to special education (Bryan,
2017; Skiba et al., 2005). Concurrently, low expectations for students of color correlate to a
greater attribution by PSTs of disparate academic and behavioral outcomes of students of color
to the personal failings of those students, the lack of parental interest in education, or cultural
deficiency rather than on the quality of education being offered in the classroom or the setting
and atmosphere of the school (Carter-Andrews & Gutwein, 2017; Cook et al., 2018; Glock,
2016).

Problem of Practice

Patterns of school and housing segregation (Gay, 2010; Li, 2009; Massey & Tannen,
2018) often produce different worlds and experiential realities for White, middle-class PSTs, and
urban students of color. Absent personal interactions, physical and cultural separation can mean
that beliefs about urban students of color form largely from stereotypical media representations, with racist undercurrents creating negative associations with people of color (Brown & Donner, 2011; Eberhardt et al., 2004). Although often unexamined, teacher expectations affect teaching and discipline (Gay, 2010; Knoblauch & Chase, 2015; Ladson Billings, 1995), and teacher beliefs on race, culture, and class are resistant to change (Gay, 2010). Low teacher expectations for urban students of color can manifest as less rigorous teaching methods (Diamond et al., 2004) and higher discipline rates (Bryan, 2017) and as attributing lower outcomes to the students’ personal, home, or cultural characteristics rather than to classroom instruction or educational atmosphere (Knoblauch & Chase, 2015; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Rodriguez & Berryman, 2002). In writing assignments, reflections, and discussions, White, middle-class PSTs at Midwestern Christian Teachers College\(^1\) (MCTC) portray different, often lower, academic and behavioral expectations for urban students of color from students with a background similar to their own, which may perpetuate academic and social underachievement for culturally and socioeconomically diverse students.

**Theoretical Framework**

Ecological Systems Theory (EST) (Bronfenbrenner, 1994) is employed to examine the factors related to the problem of practice under consideration in this literature review. Two propositions constitute Bronfenbrenner’s (1994) EST. First, human development is the result of reciprocal interactions between an individual and their environment, including the people, places, objects, and symbols that comprise the environment. Second, the extent and direction of influence between the individual and the environment vary in relation to the person, the environment, and the developmental process affected. The personal characteristics of an

\(^1\) A pseudonym
individual can mitigate or accelerate the influence of the environment, and the environment can influence to reinforce or counteract the characteristics of an individual. Interactions related to development occur at different levels: the macrosystem includes the larger cultural setting in which an individual exists, exosystem exchanges consist of the social setting that influences the individual indirectly through their contact with others such as parents or teachers, and the microsystem focuses on the individual’s interpersonal relations and direct interaction with the immediate environment (Bronfenbrenner, 1994).

In considering the problem of practice, macrosystem factors include patterns of housing and school segregation as well as racial stereotypes. Policy related to education, both the K-12

Figure 1.1 Ecological Systems Theory Model

![Ecological Systems Theory Model](image)

*Figure 1. Factors relating to preservice teacher expectations based on ecological systems theory. Adapted from Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) nested model of ecological systems depicting the dynamic interaction between an individual and various levels of their environment.*
schooling experience of the PST and the teacher education they encounter as they train for a
career in the classroom, constitute the exosystem factors reported in this literature synthesis.
Finally, the microsystem factors related to PST expectations for students include residential and
school demographics, interactions with people of other races, cultures, ethnicities, and
socioeconomic classes, exposure to culturally responsive educational practices, and multicultural
education within a teacher education program (see Figure 1).

**Synthesis of Factors Related to Preservice Teacher Expectations**

The majority of teachers and PSTs in America are White and come from middle-class
backgrounds (Ford & Sassi, 2014; Geiger, 2018; Milner, 2010). A number of factors described
below related to cultural and geographical separation, educational experience, and teacher
training may create the potential for White, middle-class PSTs to enter the teaching workforce
with different expectations for urban students of color than they hold for students with a
background similar to their own.

**Cultural Setting of Segregation and Stereotype**

The cultural setting related to race and class in the United States is complex. From
colonization and conquest, revolution and constitution, to industrialization and technological
innovation, both race and class have played an integral role in defining who we are as a society
(Alexander, 2012). Race and class have influenced our government and the direction of
governmental policy, as well as the American economy and the educational system that
undergirds it (Tatum, 2007). Centuries of changing attitudes bending ever closer to equality for
all Americans have not served to fully ameliorate the past wrongs of slavery, segregation, and
racism (Alexander, 2012). Historical events echo through the ages and beliefs can be slow to
change, at times, leaving White Americans to interpret the lower educational and life outcomes
for people of color through a deficit lens (Alexander, 2012; Delpit, 2006). The topics below provide an examination of some key factors in this process.

**Segregation**

A combination of factors regarding race and class have led to large-scale residential and school segregation in America. This situation separates White Americans, especially those in the middle class or higher (Card et al., 2008; Massey, 1990; Massey & Tannen, 2018), from people who are dissimilar from them in race, ethnicity, culture, or class. Black Americans, for example, were restricted to purchasing and renting in certain areas of major cities during the great migration from the South to the industrial North (Massey, 1990). As their presence grew and became permanent, White residents left those parts of the city, often taking businesses and jobs with them, which devastated neighborhoods and decimated the tax base, reducing the revenue that would have gone, in part, to support public schools (Card et al., 2008; Massey, 1990). White families relocated to neighboring suburbs and transferred their children into suburban school districts or private education in a process known as White flight (Chapman, 2018; Li, 2009). Even in areas where the residential population was still primarily White, parents withdrew their children from public schools at a rate similar to the increasing enrollment of students of color (Chapman, 2018; Li, 2009).

In particular, the influx of low-income African Americans in schools and neighborhoods prompted the strongest and swiftest reaction from White parents as they transferred their children out of the affected schools and sold homes in the changing neighborhoods (Card et al., 2008; Li, 2009). This pattern has persisted over time, leading to large-scale residential segregation, such that the majority of White families who are considered middle class or higher on the socio-economic scale live in predominantly White neighborhoods, even as the number of middle-class
families of color living in the suburbs has increased (Massey & Tannen, 2018). Furthermore, federal legislation addressing the integration of schools only applies at a district level; as Whites relocated to suburban school districts, the percentage of minority students in the urban districts grew, leading to de facto school segregation (Chapman, 2018). Neither state nor federal legislation could compel large-scale student integration across neighboring district lines (Chapman, 2018). The end result is a reduced level of contact between White students and students of color during school-aged years, as well as less interaction between Whites and other groups within neighborhoods and communities (Massey & Tannen, 2018). The general segregation of schools and neighborhoods is relevant in light of neuroscience findings related to empathy. For example, study participants witnessing someone from their own racial ingroup experience pain reacted with a higher level of empathetic brain response than they did when watching the pain of racial outgroups (Avenanti et al., 2010). In a similar experiment, Cao et al. (2015) found that participants’ empathetic brain responses for racial outgroup members experiencing pain increased based on the amount of contact they had with other races in their daily environment. The empathy, or lack thereof, that a teacher possesses for their students is likely to relate to their expectations for those students.

**Stereotype**

Absent personal interactions, physical and cultural separation can mean that the beliefs White Americans hold about people of other races, ethnicities, cultures, or classes form largely through stereotypical media representations (Brown, 2018; Brown & Donnor, 2011). Historical representations of Black Americans, whether the men and women brought from Africa in the slave trade or their descendants, were consistently negative, questioning their humanity. As slavery grew during colonial times and persisted through the formation of the United States, both
religion and science were employed in the process of subjugation (Brown, 2018). During this historical period, the practice of slavery was justified by casting doubt on the humanity of African slaves (Brown, 2018). Blacks were considered neither equal in standing nor deserving of the same rights as Whites, as demonstrated through deliberate misinterpretations of the Bible, which framed Africans as either subhuman creatures, or as a cursed subset of humanity (Brown, 2018). Pseudo-scientific racial classifications hypothesized that Blacks were the least evolved of the human races through hierarchies of superiority and inferiority (Brown, 2018). From post-slavery to the present, representations of Black people have evolved from outright racism and blatant attacks on their intelligence and moral character to contemporary depictions of criminality and an inferiority of culture leading to the image of the Black male as perpetually in crisis and in need of rescue (Brown, 2018; Brown & Donnor, 2011; Burrell, 2013). The prevalence of these messages is so strong and persistent that White Americans were found to hold a bidirectional association between Blackness and criminality; that is, images of Black people evoke thoughts of criminality, with the association to crime growing stronger the closer the image is to the viewer’s stereotypical picture of Blackness, and conversely, images associated with crime induce association with Black people (Eberhardt et al., 2004). Furthermore, socialization at an early age makes these beliefs difficult to identify and leaves many White people reluctant to identify their racial identity (Diangelo, 2018).

Negative stereotypes for people of color are further exacerbated by reports of statistics detailing higher rates of incarceration, joblessness, and lower high school graduation rates than the White population, even if those rates are the results of structural inequality (Alexander, 2012). Incarceration rates by percentage are higher for people of color as a whole than those of Whites; as of 2016, 64% of the population classify themselves as White non-Hispanic, that is,
European Americans who do not claim a Hispanic ethnicity; this same category makes up only 30% of the national prison population (Gramlich, 2018). Minorities, or those who classified themselves as anything other than White non-Hispanic, account for 36% of the general population but represent 70% of the national prison population, and the rate is higher still when disaggregated to examine Black Americans, who comprise 12% of the overall population and 33% of the prison population (Gramlich, 2018). The trend is reversed when considering employment. African American populations fare the worst with the highest unemployment by group from 1973-2017, with Hispanic populations in second place for highest unemployment by group (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018). School outcomes, as measured by high school graduation rates, are similarly lower for minority students, 76% and 79% respectively for African Americans and Hispanics, than for their White counterparts whose graduation rate is 88% (NCES, 2018). Although underperformance of American minorities in the fields of school and employment, as well as the overrepresentation in the penal system, can be largely accounted for by contextual factors rather than innate or cultural failings, this understanding is still widely debated in the public discourse (Alexander, 2012). The lack of consensus allows for the attribution of underperformance or overrepresentation to the failure of individuals or the weakness culture, a designation that has been prevalent in schools (Knoblauch & Chase, 2015; Rodriguez & Berryman, 2002).

The macrosystem factor of racial segregation for residential and educational settings, whether de jure or de facto, has led to the widespread separation of White Americans, especially those in the middle class or higher, from citizens of other races, cultures, ethnicities, and classes effectively limiting interaction. Without personal experience to draw from, the view of White people can be informed by stereotypical representations that have pervaded American media
from the days of slavery and persist today despite having evolved over time. Therefore, when PSTs and novice teachers encounter educational or behavioral outcomes of students of color without considering or understanding how contextual factors such as segregation, discrimination, and unequal education produce worse outcomes for minorities, these results can be interpreted as a deficiency of an individual from a minority group or a deficiency in the group’s culture (Bauml et al., 2016; Kinsler, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Terrill & Mark, 2000). The attitudes and ideologies of the culture can potentially prime educators to hold low expectations for students of color, which is subsequently reinforced within the educational system through the school setting, teacher training, and education policy.

Policy, Legislation, and Funding Factors

Social factors driven by policy, legislation, and funding have led to the creation of local educational landscapes. The distribution of students within the public school system, the types of educators employed, and teacher training combine in a fashion that results in a mismatch between the academic and behavioral expectations of schools and the students they are tasked with educating. Viewed through the lens of EST (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), these exosystem factors comprise the backdrop of what PSTs perceive to be typical in education.

Student Demographics

According to the terms of the 1896 legal decision Plessy v. Ferguson, American public schools were once segregated with an understanding that education could be separate but equal; however, the landmark decision of Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka Kansas of 1954 overturned the previous ruling and opened the door to racially integrated education (Chapman, 2018). The Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka Kansas decision, when paired with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, led to widespread enforcement of the rights of students of color to
attend schools that had been exclusively for White students (Chapman, 2018). In the following decades, schools across the nation were integrated, often through a process of busing students of color from their neighborhoods to schools in White neighborhoods (Chapman, 2018). This large-scale redistribution of students throughout districts led to the closure of many of the schools that had formerly served Black students, and many Black educators lost their jobs as a result of school closures (Tatum, 2007). However, a less well-known case decided in 1974, *Miliken v. Bradley*, paved the way for the eventual resegregation of schools (Chapman, 2018). As the student populations diversified, White families moved out of cities and into neighboring suburbs, transferring their children to the suburban school districts; although integration could be carried out within any given district, *Miliken v. Bradley* prevented urban districts from crossing into neighboring suburban districts to alleviate segregation (Chapman, 2018). This ruling allowed the suburban districts to grow while students of color were concentrated into urban districts, and while some White families remained in urban districts, there was a demonstrable transfer of White students out of public schools and into private schools during this same period (Li, 2009).

In many major metropolitan areas, public schools are nearly as segregated as they were in 1954 when *Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka Kansas* was passed (Chapman, 2018; Tatum 2007) and, to a large extent, White, middle-class students attend schools where they are in the numerical majority (Chapman, 2018; Tatum, 2007).

**Educator demographics**

Before the *Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka Kansas* decision, Black teachers taught in Black schools, but following the move to integrate schools, the large-scale educational rearrangement of students throughout districts led to the closure of many of the schools that had formerly served Black students, as stated above (Tatum, 2007). Many Black teachers left the
profession after being laid off when traditionally Black schools closed, and few were hired into traditionally White schools even after integration; the number of Black educators has only grown slowly since then (Tatum, 2007). Today, the vast majority of teachers are White women from middle-class backgrounds (Ford & Sassi, 2014; Milner, 2010). Although students of color benefit from having at least one teacher of color (Klopfenstein, 2005; Villegas & Irvine, 2010), Epstein (2005) argues that institutional and state policies that do not account for structural inequities affecting minority teaching candidates that exclude a large number of those who wish to enter the profession. Furthermore, Bornstein (2017) presents a case demonstrating how schools can effectively silence the voices of underrepresented teachers and parents of color when they bring up potentially biased or racist practices by justifying decisions as adhering to superficially race-neutral policy. Many teacher education intuitions are seeking to recruit men and women of color, and states are supporting initiatives to encourage the diversification of the teaching workforce (Villegas & Irvine, 2010). However, despite the intentional movement to recruit and retain teachers of color, all 50 states have a teacher diversity gap (Boser, 2011). The teacher diversity gap tends to be largest in the most populous states such as California, Texas, and New York, which also have high racial and ethnic diversity (Boser, 2011).

School Policy

School policy, although written in race-neutral language, in practice allows a workforce consisting largely of White, middle-class teachers to reinforce students exhibiting language and social norms that match their own while sanctioning those who differ through selective tracking of minority and low-income students (Bornstein, 2017; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Skiba et al. 2005). There are systems and policies in place within schools that can allow teachers to act on racial bias, obscured behind a nominally race-neutral system or rule, which allows the action to
continue while remaining unexamined by the perpetrator (Bornstein, 2017). Bornstein relates a case study involving the implementation of an approach called Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports in a school that potentially masked the disproportionately high disciplinary rates for students of color and students with disabilities by appealing to the race-neutral language of the approach. Skiba et al. (2005) found that special education placements, although race-neutral in their intended formulations, allowed for the tracking of African American students into special education at disproportionately high rates. According to Skiba et al., although the overrepresentation of African Americans in special education was highest for low-income students, there was a disparity across all income levels. This may be the result of teachers referring or tracking students who do not match the teachers’ behaviors and expectations for language and behavior patterns, which are likely to be based on White, middle-class norms rather than cognitive disabilities (Ladson-Billings, 1995; McElderry & Cheng 2014; Skiba et al., 2005).

Policies related to school discipline and the discipline gap for students of color have also raised concerns and investigation. In a study of statewide disciplinary information from public schools in the state of North Carolina examining the relation between office referrals and suspensions as well as the length of suspensions given, Kinsler (2011) found discipline disparity by race between schools, but not within schools, prompting the following queries and hypothesis:

The question remains, what drives the cross-school variation in discipline? Do principals utilize strict discipline in order to maintain school safety, promote a healthy learning environment, or simply placate teachers? Alternatively, strict discipline may be used as a substitute for a lack of other inputs, such as experienced teachers (p. 1382).
Kinsler’s hypothesis coincides with data regarding the experience level or teachers that students of color typically encounter. Clotfelter et al. (2005) examined descriptive school data from all 117 districts in the state of North Carolina and found an uneven distribution of novice teachers to schools where a majority of the enrollment consisted of students of color. They hypothesize that as union contracts typically dictate pay scales across entire districts, administrators may enact unofficial policy to reward successful teachers. Clotfelter et al. propose that in lieu of cash incentives to teachers, districts can offer favorable placements in classrooms or buildings preferred by teachers, which appear to include placements with lower concentrations of Black students, who are seen as harder to educate. Therefore, the likelihood of a novice teacher having a class with more Black students or students who are otherwise perceived as more difficult to educate is higher than it is for experienced teachers. The finding by Clotfelter et al. that students of color are more likely to have novice teachers, when considered in conjunction with Kinsler’s assertion that the strict enforcement causing the discipline gap may exist in part, due to the over-exercise of disciplinary policy to compensate for a lack experience, point to the implementation of school policy as a potential factor in educational inequity for students of color.

The de facto segregation of schools regardless of intended integration policies (Chapman, 2018), along with the persistent homogeneity of the national corps of teachers (Ford & Sassi, 2014; Milner, 2010), allows for preference to White, middle-class behavioral expectations for students under a seemingly race-neutral policy (Bornstein, 2017; Skiba et al., 2005). Adherence to White, middle-class expectations for behavior can result in the perpetuation of race and class divides, maintaining both an academic achievement gap and a discipline gap between White students and students of color (Kinsler, 2011; NCES, 2018). The subsequent achievement and discipline gaps can allow educators to attribute academic underperformance or increased
disciplinary rates to the students, their home settings, or their culture unless there is a clear institutional directive for teachers to assume personal responsibility for their students’ success (Diamond et al., 2004).

**Teacher Training Programs**

An extensive call has gone out from researchers to include, improve, and increase training for cultural competency in teacher education programs (Bauml et al. 2016; Dicke et al., 2014; Ford & Sassi, 2014; Gay, 2010; Han et al., 2015; Knoblauch & Chase, 2015; Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016; Ladson-Billings, 1995; McElderry & Cheng, 2014; Rodriguez & Berryman, 2002; Siwatu, 2011b; Terrill & Mark, 2000; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006; Watson, 2012; Williams & Conyers, 2016). Teaching standards required by all 50 states and the District of Columbia, whether written and approved at the state level or by the adoption of national standards, include diversity-related content (Akiba et al., 2010). However, there is a wide variance in what type and how much diversity training is required for PSTs (Assaf, Garza, & Battle, 2010). It is common for a teacher education program to include one required foundational course considering multicultural education, but in some cases, this component is deemed sufficient for meeting the diversity standard requirement, and few programs are shown to have integrated multiculturalism throughout their teacher education program (Assaf et al., 2010; Gorski, 2009; Sleeter, 2017).

Instruction in multicultural education is shown to produce attitudinal change, particularly in conjunction with field experiences that expose PSTs to diverse student populations (Han et al., 2015: Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006). Han et al. (2015) compared the reactions of PSTs to the inclusion of multicultural elements to a literacy education course at two institutions, Mountain University, a predominately White institution in the rural
Mountain West, and Inland University, more diverse setting located in a diverse urban region of southern California. The 14 PSTs from Mountain University, all White, resisted the integration of multicultural materials and indicated that they would have preferred a stronger focus on the technicalities of teaching reading. Meanwhile, the 10 participants at Inland University, one Mexican American, two African American, and seven White, embraced the multicultural material and social justice project included in their education Literacy course. The Inland University students cited participation in a family literacy event held in connection with a local elementary school as crucial in their understanding of working with diverse others (Han et al., 2015).

Another investigation explored the notion of color-blindness in 85 PSTs preparing for elementary or early childhood education, 79 of whom were White (Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016). The investigators administered assessments gauging attitude towards race to students taking a required, undergraduate level, diversity course. By the end of the semester, mean scores still revealed that students thought of themselves as color blind but that there was an overall change towards being less color blind. Some students moved from admitted bias to a color-blind stance, which the authors describe as an attempt on the part of the student to minimize the impact of their bias, treating minority students as they would White students, while only a few went from color-blind to celebrating diversity (Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016).

In an examination of the malleability of beliefs, Walker-Dalhouse and Dalhouse (2006) studied 92 White PSTs enrolled in a diversity seminar and practicum. Their quantitative analysis of survey results from the beginning and end of the semester indicated that there was some change in beliefs following coursework and experiences in diverse settings, but change across the entire group was only significant for two of the nine inventory items. The authors conclude
that their testing demonstrates that progress can be made in preparing preservice teachers to work with students of color, but that this task will be challenging and may require a more robust intervention than a single course (Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006).

Investigations into self-efficacy demonstrate a connection between multicultural instruction, PSTs beliefs about their ability to work with diverse students, and positive student outcomes both academically and behaviorally (Dicke et al., 2014; Knoblauch & Chase, 2015; Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy, 2008; Siwatu, 2011). According to the analysis of Dicke et al. (2014), self-efficacy serves as a mediating factor related to stress levels in novice teachers. This study of 1227 teacher candidates working in German schools connected lower levels of stress with reduced emotional exhaustion. The authors theorized that self-efficacy indirectly mediates emotional exhaustion. They further posited that increasing self-efficacy is most beneficial in reducing emotional exhaustion for teachers who begin with low self-efficacy, but the process reaches a point of diminishing returns once educators reach a general level of self-efficacy (Dicke et al., 2014).

Although Dicke et al. did not specifically consider multicultural aspects of self-efficacy, Knoblauch and Woolfolk Hoy (2008) explored self-efficacy in light of educational setting, rural, suburban, or urban, in a study that was later replicated by Knobloch and Chase (2015). Knoblauch and Woolfolk Hoy (2008) tracked the self-efficacy scores of 102 PSTs, of whom 100 were White, before and after student teaching. The PSTs were categorized by placement, 29 in rural schools, 45 in suburban schools, and 28 in urban schools. PSTs who had completed student teaching while attending weekly seminar sessions exhibited increased self-efficacy beliefs at the conclusion of their clinical experience, including those who worked in an urban educational setting. Subsequently, Knobloch and Chase (2015) broke the study of self-efficacy into more
specific subtests, including classroom management self-efficacy. Again, by the end of their student teaching period with weekly seminar sessions included, the group of 368 student teachers experienced an increase in self-efficacy as a whole. However, the classroom management self-efficacy of urban student teachers did not show a significant increase. The authors offer two possible explanations, first that a lack of familiarity with the setting could produce fear and an expectation of more discipline problems, second that the perception of authoritarian discipline in urban schools led to dissonance with the approaches the student teachers had learned for classroom management in their undergraduate coursework (Knobloch & Chase, 2015).

Finally, Siwatu (2011) conducted a mixed-methods study to uncover both the culturally responsive self-efficacy beliefs of 192, primarily White, 183 of the 192, PSTs at a Midwestern institution and the specific strategies associated with that concept. Siwatu’s most pertinent finding was that as PSTs identified strategies associated with culturally responsive teaching, those who had practiced the methods they named indicated a higher level of self-efficacy (Siwatu, 2011).

Although training for diversity is a common expectation of teacher education programs nationwide, a single course in the subject, even when well taught, is only shown to produce small and incremental changes for teacher candidates relative to their beliefs at the beginning of the course (Han et al., 2015: Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006). Furthermore, while clinical practice coupled with supportive instruction is connected to an increase in PSTs’ self-efficacy for teaching and management, those results were limited in an urban educational setting when compared to suburban or rural experiences, which seems to be related to the expectations White PSTs hold for urban schools (Dicke et al., 2014; Knobloch & Chase, 2015; Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy 2008; Siwatu, 2011).
Home town setting of the teacher candidate and the location of a teacher education program can influence the expectations and opportunities of PSTs. Terrill and Mark (2000) state that suburban and rural communities produce the largest volume of PSTs, who attend education programs in suburban and rural areas in part because of the proximity to their homes. Boyd, Lankford, Loeb, and Wyckoff (2005) found that new teachers prefer to teach in close proximity to where they grew up, limiting their initial job search to a small geography centered on their home town. Qualitative research from Han et al. (2015) that examined the attitudes of PSTs from a rural and an urban setting as they studied literacy through a critical pedagogy lens indicated that the location of practice teaching, whether urban or rural, affects the willingness of PSTs to engage in diversity and equity in teaching. In qualitative interviews, Watson (2012) found that the location of a PST’s high school informs the standards PSTs employ when evaluating other contexts, in effect setting suburban as the norm and urban settings as less than the established norm. Teacher institutions are often limited by geography as to the field placements they can arrange or recommend to their PSTs (Terrill & Mark, 2000), which if the institution is located in a demographically homogeneous region, in turn, limits PSTs’ exposure to diversity. The limited number of courses required to meet diversity standards, when considered with the partial effectiveness of those multicultural courses, especially if taught in isolation or as the single component to meet diversity standards, and the high potential for demographically homogeneous clinical practice, mean that teacher education programs offer limited training and experiences to overcome bias and stereotypes or prepare culturally competent teaching candidates.

As demonstrated above, the exosystem factors surrounding the problem of practice in relation to education settings and teacher education tend to reinforce the status quo. It is likely that K-12 school environments will be less responsive to students of color than to White, middle-
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class students who match the norms and expectations of the teaching force (Bornstein, 2017), which itself is comprised disproportionately of White, middle-class women (Ford & Sassi, 2014; Geiger, 2018; Milner, 2010). Next, due to the minimal requirements to fulfill diversity standards and the limited effects of such training, producing candidates who express comfort and self-efficacy working with diverse student populations can occur (Bauml et al., 2016; Dicke et al., 2014; Rodriguez & Berryman, 2002; Shook, 2012; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006) but is not a given. Further, the location, availability of neighboring diverse areas, and minimal diversity of feeder schools can mean that PSTs are likely to encounter demographic homogeneity in their field training (Han et al., 2015; Terrill & Mark, 2000). For example, Han et al. (2015) found that PSTs from a university in the rural Mountain West, who reported minimal exposure to diversity, resisted critical pedagogy, social justice learning, and multicultural literature in their education courses. Researchers Terrill and Mark (2000) state that, “The majority of teacher education students come from rural and suburban communities; one important reason for attending their teacher education institutions in its proximity to their homes.” (p.149) Therefore, unless training to work with diverse students, including field experiences, is integrated into the required education curriculum, teacher education programs offer limited preparation to train culturally competent teaching candidates, resulting in a mismatch between the expectations of schools and the students they are tasked with educating (Bornstein, 2017; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Skiba et al., 2005).

**PSTs Within Teacher Education Programs**

Limited interaction with people of other races, cultures, ethnicities, and socioeconomic classes in the community and school settings can shape the perceptions of PSTs. If PSTs do not understand the context in which other people live and attend school, it is possible that they could
misinterpret disparate outcomes for people of other races, cultures, ethnicities, and socioeconomic classes, which may eventually inform their expectations as they enter the classroom.

*Location and Interaction*

As previously established, most White people live near other White people of similar socioeconomic status (Card et al., 2008; Massey & Tannen, 2018). This factor can limit the interaction that White PSTs have had with people of other races, cultures, ethnicities, and socioeconomic classes in their neighborhoods and communities. A similar trend, as documented by Chapman (2018) and Li (2009), has been found in schools, where White students, including those who will go on to become PSTs, attend schools populated primarily with students who resemble them in race and class, which can lead to limited interactions with students of other races, cultures, ethnicities, and socioeconomic classes in their educational setting. Chapman (2018) records how the postwar growth of suburbs and the enforcement of desegregation in schools led to a massive movement of White residents out of urban areas. Segregation, once enforced by laws and contracts, shifted to less visible practice, manifesting in recent decades as White flight from central city regions to suburban and exurban areas. This pattern has impacted schools to the point that levels of school segregation are approaching or surpassing the levels seen before the landmark Brown vs. the Board of Education decision. The increase of minority populations in cities, when coupled with the overwhelmingly homogeneous White populations of suburbs and exurbs, has led to formal decisions stating that legal attempts to forcibly desegregate urban schools are unrealistic and unachievable (Chapman, 2018). Li’s (2009) econometric analysis of 27,011 individuals from 504 counties across the US was conducted to test the hypothesis that some White parents move their children to private schools in response to rising
enrollment of minority and low-income students in public schools. Li uncovered a correlation between a rising share of minority students in public schools and a concurrent increase in the rate of growth in nearby private schools enrolling mostly White students by comparing the increase of minority students in a given district to the growth of enrollment in geographically similar private schools. An overall lack of exposure for PSTs can lead to a limited understanding of other cultures, causing misinterpretation of the words and actions of people who differ from themselves because the PSTs see through the lens of their own culture without understanding that other cultures may hold different values and practices (Carter-Andrews & Gutwein, 2017).

The Apprenticeship of Observation

PSTs do not enter teacher education programs as clean slates, that is, even on the first day of class at a teacher college, PSTs have had 12 or more years of experience in schools informing their beliefs and expectations of what school is and how people behave within the context of education (Lortie, 1975; Smagorinsky & Barnes, 2014). Lortie (1975) termed this concept the apprenticeship of observation and noted that “participation in school has special occupational effect on those who do move to the other side of the desk” because “students have protracted face-to-face and consequential interactions with established teachers” (p.61).

The educational practices that a PST observes or that are absent from their school experience will inform the PST’s mental model of education (Lortie, 1975). If White PSTs attend diverse schools, it is probable that they will observe regular interactions between the teachers and students of color; however, if PSTs attend schools with homogeneous white populations, there is less opportunity for them to witness exchanges between teachers and students of color (Bryan, 2017; Knoblauch & Chase, 2015). Even if a PST attended a school where the teachers employed culturally responsive pedagogy, if there were few students of color, the PST might not
have discerned a difference between teacher interactions with White students and students of color (Bryan, 2017; Ford & Sassi, 2014). A case study related by Bryan (2017) demonstrates this very scenario. While observing a student teacher in a third-grade classroom, the supervising teacher shared with Bryan that a Black student who had recently transferred to her room from a lower-performing urban school was failing academically and causing behavior problems. Later in the visit, after quietly waving and gesturing to several students to return when they had stepped out of the single-file line, the student teacher loudly reprimanded this same Black student for stepping out of line. To compound the incident, after the boy had returned to the line, a White girl in front of him turned around and repeated the student teacher’s harsh words and tone (Bryan, 2017). In a school with few students of color, teachers might not have felt the need to incorporate culturally responsive pedagogy as indicated in the findings of Han et al. (2015) by the desire that PSTs expressed to focus on the technical aspects of instruction and to remove multicultural elements. In either circumstance, the PST is not likely to witness culturally responsive pedagogy in the classroom, nor might they perceive the need for culturally responsive pedagogy. Indeed, Diamond et al. (2004) found that teachers were likely to hold lower expectations for students of color and take less responsibility for their academic outcomes unless the administration actively promoted teacher accountability for all students. The authors observed and interviewed 51 teachers and administrators from five elementary schools in the greater Chicago area with student demographic populations ranging from mostly White, to racially diverse, to all Black; all of the schools had at least 65% low socio-economic status, but as high as 98%. Interviews, faculty meetings, and professional development sessions were observed or recorded to track language about students’ cognitive or non-cognitive traits, and the results were then aggregated to compare schools and ascertain the influence of the school’s
organizational culture. The findings indicated that the race and class of students in a school are associated with general teacher beliefs about students and that expectations are also tied to school context. Teachers across the schools tended to believe that minority and low-income students came from homes or cultures that limited their ability to teach them and therefore held less of a sense of personal responsibility for student outcomes. However, a school’s organizational habitus, if it included a strong sense of responsibility for student learning, could override stereotypical views of low-income students of color found in comparison schools (Diamond et al., 2004). Not only have PSTs been observing the actions of teachers, but they have also been participating in the culture of the school and with the established rules, which can include systems and policies that present as race-neutral while allowing for biased enforcement (Bornstein, 2017), such as the disproportionate tracking of students of color into special education and remedial courses (Bryan, 2017; Skiba et al., 2005), or disparate discipline practices (Bryan, 2017; Larson et al., 2018).

Lortie (1975) further proposes that although students are observing all aspects of school, they are doing so at a surface level, unaware of the reasoning behind the planning, policy, or enforcement that they witness. Therefore, White PSTs, during their time as students, may witness lower academic achievement and higher rates of disciplinary action for their classmates of color without an explanation of why this is happening, which can become part of their mental model of how education works and what happens to different types of students within a school. A mental model, such as the one PSTs develop of the educational system, is significant because it allows for a large amount of information on a topic to be conceptualized as a unit without the need for regular reexamination (Brown, Roediger & McDaniel, 2014). If the sequence described above transpires, PSTs may enter their teacher education program unaware of the existence of
and need for effective educational strategies for working with cultural differences, even resisting instruction in cultural competency and culturally responsive pedagogy (Han et al., 2015; Ladson-Billings 1995; Watson, 2012). If PSTs hold and maintain this deficit model for students from other races, cultures, ethnicities, or socioeconomic classes, their understanding of school as they enter the ranks of teachers will be that students of color belong in lower academic tracks and that they need or deserve more severe disciplinary measures (Gay, 2010; Glock, 2016; Ladson-Billings, 2006).

Examination of microsystem factors reveals that the community and school interactions that White, middle-class PSTs encounter prior to entering a teacher education program can leave them with minimal experience and understanding of people from other races, cultures, ethnicities, and socioeconomic classes (Card et al., 2008; Massey, 1990; Massey & Tannen, 2018). Without personal experience to inform White, middle-class PSTs’ views on others, stereotypical media representations can lead to racist or biased beliefs (Eberhardt et al., 2016). Bias and lack of experiences can mean that White, middle-class PSTs fail to recognize the need for culturally responsive pedagogy or resist the concept even when it is presented as a required component of their teacher education program (Han et al., 2015; Ladson-Billings 1995). Even for PSTs who embrace multicultural education, course completion does not guarantee consistent outcomes (Gay, 2010). If, however, PSTs refuse the premise that culturally responsive pedagogy or teaching, in general, affects the outcomes of students of color, then it is likely that they will attribute negative academic or disciplinary outcomes to students of color regardless of their social or educational context, typically citing a lack of parental support, a failure to value education, or cultural differences as the reasons behind lower outcomes (Knoblauch & Chase, 2015; Rodriguez & Berryman, 2002). The sum total of these factors is the high probability that
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White, middle-class PSTs will hold low expectations for students of color as they enter the education workforce.

The aforementioned factors that may influence the expectations of PSTs gain greater significance in light of expectation effects, as first documented in the seminal study by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968). In this oft-cited work, researchers informed first grade teachers that they were being assigned classes of students who had tested as high IQ but were late bloomers, expected to flourish that school year. By the end of the year, the students in the test classrooms had increased their IQ scores by an average of 27 points, far above the average gains in control classrooms. What was revealed at the end of the experiment was that these students had been randomly selected from the general population, the variable under examination was the teachers’ expectations for the students (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968). Expectation effects studies continued, and a decade later, Rosenthal and Rubin (1978) conducted a meta-analysis of work on the topic, finding the results supportive of the original research. Teacher expectations are consequential because they are not exclusively the internal and unknowable thoughts of a given person. Whether or not it is intentional on the part of teachers, students perceive a different set of expectations based on race and class, which can negatively affect student academic engagement (Carter-Andrews & Gutwein, 2017). Researchers Carter-Andrews and Gutwein (2017) examined students at an urban characteristic school located in a racially diverse suburban district in the Midwest, convening eight focus groups comprised of 64 high school students in total. Three of the groups were only Latino/a students, two were entirely African American, and three groups had Latino/a, African American, and White students. Students of multiple races and ethnicities, including White students, indicated differential treatment from teachers based on race or socio-economic status. The students further reported that teachers enforced rules differently and held
differing standards regarding the level of work given, as well as the assistance rendered in class, which these students took as a demonstration of lower intellectual, academic, and behavioral expectations for minority students. Students also reported that teachers favored “respectful” and “good” students, but that classification as such was dependent in part on race, for even academically successful Black students were treated as problematic. Carter-Andrews and Gutwein (2017) included comments from one student who mentioned banding together with other Black students for academic support due to a lack of help from the teacher.

Other recent research has focused on the application of expectation effects to teacher professionals to improve student outcomes. Allen et al. (2011) worked with 78 educators to improve student-teacher interactions, aiming specifically at emotional climate and sensitivity to students, two components instrumental in the demonstration of high expectations. Allen et al. (2011) found significant gains in student achievement for teachers who participated in the training. Rubie-Davies et al. (2012) and Ding and Rubie-Davies (2019) explored expectation effects in New Zealand and China, respectively. In New Zealand, researchers measured the expectations that 24 primary school teachers listed for their students in the approaching academic year. Rubie-Davies et al. (2012) then compared the student academic gains to the high or low expectations of their teachers, finding a statistically significant positive relationship between high expectations and student achievement. In China, eighth grade students of varying ability levels demonstrated academic gains following intervention training explicating the behaviors that communicated high expectations to students, such as challenging tasks, detailed feedback, and personal regard (Ding & Rubie-Davies, 2019). The expectations that teachers hold for their students are powerful (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Rosenthal & Rubin, 1978; Rubie-Davies et al., 2012), can be perceived by others, including students (Carter-Andrews & Gutwein, 2017),
and can change with targeted intervention (Allen et al., 2011; Ding & Rubie-Davies, 2019) giving further relevance to the problem of practice.

**Summary**

The factors examined herein interact in a complex manner as represented in Figure 1.2. For example, the diversity of residential areas is influenced by the views that White people hold about people of color, as home buyers factor race and perceptions of crime into purchasing decisions (Card et al., 2008). The resultant residential segregation then limits contact between the two groups (Massey & Tannen, 2018), leaving societal representations of people of color to inform the beliefs of White people. Furthermore, the apprenticeship of observation, the mental model of the education process that PSTs develop as K-12 students (Lortie, 1975), depends in part on the diversity of their district. The amount and types of interactions a PST has previously had with people of other races, however, will inform their interpretation of how students of color are treated in schools (Han et al., 2015). The context and experiences of the PST will establish their beliefs as they enter a teacher education program, which in turn can reinforce or modify their expectations for students of color as they prepare to enter the field of education (Bauml et al., 2016; Han et al., 2015; Kinsler, 2011). Although the teacher education program represents a crucial step in preparing educators, it is limited in its scope for providing cultural competency (Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006) and training for culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 2010; Williams & Conyers, 2016). Figure 1.2 provides a visual representation of the interaction of factors related to the problem of practice.
This synthesis of literature details factors that shape the overall culture in which PSTs live, the systems they encounter, and the direct interactions that can influence their beliefs. At a macrosystem level, contact between White people and people of color has in many areas been reduced due to separation resulting from housing (Card et al., 2008; Massey, 1990; Massey & Tannen, 2018) and school segregation (Chapman, 2018; Li, 2009). Without interaction, middle-class, White Americans are left with media representations or years of racial socialization to inform their views of people from other races, cultures, ethnicities, and classes (Brown, 2018; Brown & Donnor, 2011). In considering exosystem factors, policy related to education shapes the school system, both the schooling experience of the PST and the teacher education program they encounter as they train for a career in the classroom (Bornstein, 2017; Chapman, 2018; Diamond et al., 2004; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Skiba et al., 2005). Finally, the microsystem factors related to PST expectations for students include the manner in which residential and school demographics influence interactions with people of other races, cultures, ethnicities, and socioeconomic classes, as well as their exposure to culturally responsive educational practices.
and cultural competency training within a teacher education program (Lortie, 1975; Smagorinsky & Barnes, 2014).

Based on the information presented above, the subsequent research involved two main categories: PSTs interactions with people of other races, cultures, ethnicities, and socioeconomic classes in residential and school settings, and exposure to culturally responsive educational practices. Because interaction with people of color plays an important role in gaining an understanding of cultural difference (Han et al., 2015; Terrill & Mark, 2000; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006), needs assessment interviews investigated the amount and regularity of contact PSTs have had with people of other races, cultures, ethnicities, and socioeconomic classes prior to entering their teacher education program. Interviews also included inquiry into the exposure that PSTs have had to strategies for working with cross-cultural differences in a school context by examining whether respondents witnessed regular interaction between teachers and students of color and description of the nature and quality of those interactions. These microsystem factors play a role in shaping the way in White, middle-class PSTs perceive students of color and the expectations PSTs hold for them.
Chapter 2

Empirical Examination of Underlying Causes

This needs assessment study specifically explored the residential and educational experiences of White preservice teachers at the institution of examination in relation to their interactions with people of other races, ethnicities, cultures, and classes through a qualitative interview process. A quantitative survey further investigated PSTs’ professional beliefs about diversity (Pohan & Aguilar, 2001) and culturally responsive outcome expectancy (Siwatu, 2007), as well as their attribution of problematic student behaviors (Kulinna, 2008).

Context

The study is set at a private teacher education college in the Midwest operated by a medium sized religious denomination. MCTC is located in a town of 13,000 people 90 miles from the nearest metropolitan area and whose economy is a mix of agricultural, manufacturing, and service industries. Approximately 750 students are enrolled in the institution, 550 of whom are seeking an Education degree. Of the 750 students on campus, more than 700 identify as white, non-Hispanic. Graduates of the education program receive a Bachelor of Science in education and are qualified for the state teacher licensure. The mission of the college is to produce workers in the form of teachers, ministers, and staff, for the affiliated denominational school district, which contains 387 early childhood centers, 294 elementary schools, and 28 high schools nationwide, as well as 1270 congregations (Institutional Statistical Report (anonymized), 2018)

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the needs assessment study was to explore the factors named in the problem of practice, including residential and educational settings, contact with people of color,
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and perception of urban schools and students of color based on a comparison to a person’s educational and lived experience among the PSTs at MCTC.

The research questions for the needs assessment study were based on the constructs that emerged from the literature synthesis.

RQ1: How much interaction have PSTs at this institution had with people of other races, ethnicities, cultures, or classes outside of their teacher education program?

RQ2: How much exposure have PSTs at this institution had to strategies for working with cross-cultural differences in their previous school setting?

RQ3: How would PSTs at this institution describe their comfort working in school settings that are unlike their personal school experience?

RQ4: What is the relationship between PSTs’ at this institution beliefs about diversity and expectancy and the attributions they make for the causes of problematic student behavior?

Method

Research Design

The needs assessment study employed a mixed-methods design to examine the experiences PSTs had with diversity and their beliefs and expectations about diversity in educational settings. The mixed-methods approach allowed for both quantitative and qualitative data to support the conclusion as described by Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, and Turner (2007). I interviewed PSTs using a phenomenological research methodology as described by Lochmiller and Lester (2017) to explore their lived experiences. Specifically, I explored the PSTs’ experiences in relation to racial diversity in their hometown and description of apprenticeship of observation related to high school teachers’ interactions with students of color, specifically addressing research questions one and two. Research question three also fits within a
phenomenological research methodology since participants were asked to contrast a hypothetical situation with their past school experience.

**Participants**

The target participants were PSTs, undergraduate college students enrolled in a teacher education program, and seeking to earn a Bachelor of Science in education and teaching licensure. I selected second-year undergraduate students as the target population because they would already be enrolled in education courses and could therefore be recruited based on this registration and because they are not likely to have taken one of the intercultural elective courses required by the education program. Of 52 students enrolled in the two sections of Teaching Science Concepts, 20 responded, indicating that they would be willing to sit for an interview, an initial response of 38%. From the 20 positive responses, several students were removed from consideration because they were either beyond their second year, they had already completed or were currently enrolled in an intercultural elective course, or they had attended high school in other countries. Nine interviews were scheduled, eight PSTs came and sat for interviews, one of the scheduled interviews was canceled due to a school event. The participants in the preservice teacher interviews were second-year students in the education program. All were White, three of the respondents were male, and five were female. In the following semester of the same education course, 44 PSTs participated in a beliefs and attributions survey. Survey participants were similar in demographic composition, with 30 female and 14 male participants; all but one identified as White. Finally, all participants in both the interviews and surveys were 18 years old or older.

**Measures and Instrumentation**
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The qualitative portion of the investigation consisted of interviews, and the quantitative research took the form of a survey. As a part of a cognitive interview process (Presser et al., 2004), a fellow practitioner-scholar previewed the questions and participated in a trial interview to assess the clarity of the interview questions.

**PST Experiences Interviews.** The qualitative interviews explored PSTs’ descriptions of their hometown, high school setting, and perception of urban schools and the students enrolled in urban schools. The interview questions emerged from the examination of factors in the literature review, which pointed to widespread residential and school segregation. I used three primary questions to discern the participants’ perceptions of their experiences. The interview questions were derived from the literature review and related to key factors identified in the problem of practice, each with several possible follow-up questions depending on the respondents’ answers. The interview questions and the related constructs are listed in Appendix A.

**Beliefs and Attribution Survey.** The Beliefs and Attribution Survey (see Appendix B) contained items from three existing instruments, the Behavior Attribution Survey (BAS; Kulinna, 2008), the Professional Beliefs About Diversity Survey (PBADS; Pohan & Aguilar, 2001), and the Culturally Responsive Teaching Outcome Expectancy (CRTOE; Siwatu, 2007). The survey was constructed in two parts, a section on school behavior attribution, which measured the degree to which PSTs attributed student misbehavior to educational factors (teacher or school) or individual factors (out of school or student), and a series of items related to beliefs about diversity and outcome expectancy. The BAS was developed as part of an investigation into teacher responses to student misbehavior to identify the beliefs that underlie management strategies (Kulinna, 2008). The attribution portion of the survey presented three brief descriptions of behavioral and academic issues and asked participants to identify the most
likely source of the behavior and the second most likely source of the behavior to determine how PSTs attribute responsibility. For example, participants evaluated the following statement in terms of the most likely source of the behavior: This student can’t sit still during lessons. The child doesn’t pay attention and doesn’t follow directions. Sometimes the student acts inappropriately to get attention.

The PBADS was specifically constructed for use in educational settings, including teacher education programs, to provide a baseline assessment of beliefs about diverse others (Pohan & Aguilar, 2001). The CRTOE probes expected educational outcomes in relation to culturally responsive practices (Siwatu, 2007). The survey contained seven questions from each the PBADS and the CRTOE to provide information about PSTs' attitudes regarding diversity and culturally responsive education practices. Participants responded to each item on a scale including five ratings: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neutral, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree, to a selection of items from both the PBADS and the CRTOE on the second part. The following items are examples of those included in the survey:

PBADS

- Only schools serving students of color need a racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse staff and faculty.
- Teachers often expect less from students from the lower socioeconomic class.
- In order to be effective with all students, teachers should have experience working with students from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds.

CRTOE

- Acknowledging the ways that the school culture is different from my students’ home culture will minimize the likelihood of discipline problems.
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- Revising instructional material to include a better representation of the students’ cultural group will foster positive self-images
- Students’ self-esteem can be enhanced when their cultural background is valued by the teacher.

**Procedure**

The needs assessment study was carried out over the course of two semesters. I recruited participants from an education course that students complete early in the curriculum, typically taken by second-year students. During the first semester, participants shared thoughts about where they grew up and whether this context put them into contact with people of color during one-on-one interviews. During the second semester, participants completed a survey about their attributions and expectations for students of color in urban schools.

**Participant Recruitment.** Recruitment for interviews was a multistep process. I selected an undergraduate course, called Teaching Science Concepts, consisting of the target population, and obtained permission from the professor to speak at the end of the class period. This course was chosen because of its placement in the education program sequence and because only education majors are enrolled in it. Furthermore, most education students take their required intercultural elective course after this course, and the PSTs enrolled in a given semester represent approximately half of all the second-year education students. I offered a brief verbal invitation, stating that the interview would focus on the participants’ hometowns and experiences prior to coming to our institution and that the research would be used to learn how I could improve the quality of my instruction by better understanding students and share this information generally with the institution. Students were encouraged to look for a follow-up email to which they could respond if they were interested in participating.
Recruitment for the quantitative survey took place in the same class, Teaching Science Concepts, but with an entirely different set of students because it was during the following semester. On one day in two consecutive class periods, 10 minutes were allocated to voluntary participation in the survey. PSTs were informed of the purpose of the research and asked to volunteer by completing a survey. They were further informed that their voluntary participation would not affect their grades or status at the institution and that they could opt out at any time.

**Data Collection.** The investigator conducted eight interviews during the two weeks following the initial invitation. Consent and confidentiality information were presented and agreed to verbally and in written format. Participant interviews were assigned a random number, which replaced the students’ names in the analysis and reporting. The interviewer took handwritten notes and recorded audio of each interview, which were transcribed. The behavior and attributions survey was conducted in the semester after the interviews were held. On one day in two consecutive class periods, 10 minutes were allocated to voluntary participation in the survey. The participants responded on printed copies of the behavior and attributions surveys and turned them in to the researcher.

**Data Analysis.** Data analyses were conducted in two phases. The interview transcripts were evaluated using thematic analysis. I conducted a chi-square test in SPSS software to analyze the survey results.

**Transcript Analysis.** I conducted and transcribed all interviews. Analysis of the transcripts included elements of thematic analysis (Lochmiller & Lester, 2017) as I parsed the descriptions that participants provided, focusing specifically on interviewees’ connections to urban schools. Following transcription, I read and reread the transcripts coding statements if they referred to a location, referenced exposure to diversity, reported teacher interactions with
students of color, or described beliefs about urban students of color. Then each of the statements was moved to a spreadsheet, sorted according to constructs as represented in Appendix C, and the responses were grouped into larger themes. Hometown setting was characterized as rural/small town, city, suburban, or urban based on population and proximity to metropolitan statistical area as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau (2010). PSTs’ hometown demographics were categorized as homogeneous White, no visible people of color; minimal diversity, very few people of color; or diverse, which was based on the participants’ description of the location. Contact with diverse people was also connected to discussion of hometown, and was coded according to the nature and regularity of contact with people of other races, ethnicities, cultures, and classes in that setting. High school setting was likewise characterized as rural/small town, city, suburban, or urban based on population and proximity to metropolitan statistical area, and high school demographics were similarly categorized as homogeneous White, minimal diversity, or diverse based on the participants’ description. Interaction with students of color was classified according to the nature and regularity of contact during school and school-related activities, such as team sports. Participants were also asked about their observations of teacher interactions with students of color, and the responses were coded as equal, different negative, or different positive (see Appendix C).

The interviews considered PSTs’ comfort levels at the thought of teaching in settings different from their educational experience in terms of size, location, and diversity. The response choices were very uncomfortable, uncomfortable, comfortable, or very comfortable. The final question of the interview asked participants to characterize the difference between their schooling experience and a different educational setting based on size, location, and diversity. They described the difference in terms that were comparative, deficit, or positive. Although
several of the participants identified urban schools specifically when asked this question, I followed up with a question about diversity if a participant focused on the size of the hypothetical student population, leading to a discussion of urban or intercultural settings.

**Survey Analysis.** Behavior and attribution survey results were analyzed using a chi-square test in SPSS. First I categorized responses into three groups based on the primary and secondary attributions: makes attributions only to factors outside of school; makes attributions to school, but only as a secondary cause; and makes attributions to school as a primary cause. Next, I calculated a mean score for responses to the PBADS and CRTOE items. I separated participants by the composite score into thirds to create a high (4.32-5.00), middle (3.63-4.31), and low range (2.93-3.62), with the relatively high scores representing stronger beliefs supporting cultural diversity and responsiveness in an educational setting. In the second stage, I conducted a chi-squared test to examine the data for a relationship between the attribution and the composite score for beliefs about diversity.

**Findings**

To respond to the first research question regarding cross-cultural interaction prior to their teacher education program, I analyzed participant responses about the diversity of their hometowns and schools. Participants who lived in hometowns featuring minimal diversity or homogeneity also attended high schools with minimal diversity. Overall, the findings from the qualitative interviews demonstrate that the PSTs at MCTC experienced segregated residential and educational settings, had limited contact with people of color, and perceived urban schools and students of color based on a comparison to personal experience. Most of the PSTs attended high schools with minimal student diversity, which limited the potential for contact with students of color and the number of interactions they were able to witness between their high school
teachers and students of color. For example, one interviewee commented on the number of students of color at her high school of over 400 students by saying, “there wasn’t (sic) any in my class was really, but there was one ahead of me and one below me” (Participant 2). Three of the PSTs attended a boarding school with minimal diversity in a city different from their hometown. Considering the minimal diversity of the boarding school he attended, Participant 3 recounted,

We’re also pretty white. Lot of kids from around the country, which is interesting. Though a lot of those kids do have background … in the Midwest. Quite a few Foreign Exchange students in each class and say we'll have 3, 4, 5 Asian students in each class from China, Korea, all sorts of places. In terms of my class, we had about a hundred kids, we had a couple of black kids, a couple Hispanic, nothing crazy though. Not to say that diversity is crazy. Yeah, you get what I mean.

Considering the second research question related to the PSTs’ exposure to educational strategies for working with cross-cultural differences, I examined participant responses about their experiences in school settings. It is possible that due to the small number of students of color who attended the students’ high schools, their teachers did not engage in strategies for working with cross-cultural differences in a school context. However, it is also possible that the limited number of interactions between the high school teachers and students of color prevented the PSTs from recognizing strategies for working with cross-cultural differences in a school context. When asked if she saw regular interaction between her high school teachers and students of color, Participant 7 responded, “to my knowledge, it didn't seem like there was a wall, but also that's not my student experience, so I can't say so. But from the outside, it seems like, it looked normal.” In either case, the PSTs who attend high schools with minimal diversity characterized
their teachers’ interactions with students of color as equal and indicated that this was fair from their perspective.

Only two of the participants reported having attended diverse high schools, and these two participants also reported different but positive interactions between their high school teachers and students of color, including accommodations for high school students who spoke English as a second language. One case dealt with a Latinx population whose first language was Spanish, and the other considered international students from Asian countries whose first language was either Chinese or Korean. Both of these participants characterized this difference positively.

Participant 5 explained the experience as follows:

They were very open and they really… interacted with them. Like maybe if they knew a little bit of Spanish they would like go over and you know speak a few words or something like that, and you could really tell that the students who had English as a second language, they really appreciated the teachers, like going over making sure they understood, making sure their translator understood so they would understand the class better. (Participant 5)

Similarly, Participant 6 stated, “When it came to the Asian communities, you know sometimes they have trouble understanding English, and you know is not their first language, so we … accommodate for that.” Conversely, participants who attended high schools with minimal diversity reported seeing limited interactions between their high school teachers and students of color, but they uniformly characterized those exchanges as equal. “It was very equal. I don't think from my point of view, I don't (sic) see any difference” (Participant 1). “I didn't see anything different from compared with any of the other students” (Participant 3).
Culturally responsive practices seemed to have been more visible in high schools with greater diversity, which could be the result of several different circumstances. One possibility is that with a larger number of students of color, the PSTs were able to observe such interactions with more regularity, allowing them to recognize the difference in treatment and discern the positive teacher intent behind them. Another possibility is that because the differences in interactions between teachers and students of color were related to language differences, they were more visible than other forms of culturally responsive practice. In contrast, other culturally responsive practices such as relationship building could just as easily be construed as good teaching or attributed as a personal characteristic of an individual teacher, as opposed to cultural responsiveness.

Although only one PST reported living in a diverse hometown, all reported at least minimal contact with people of color through work or school. When asked about cultural or ethnic diversity in the workplace, Participant 1 referred to a summer job in food service at the state fairgrounds “everybody of all ages, all groups work there, and it was really interesting to work there. That's actually probably where most of my exposure comes from.” For most PSTs who lived in minimally diverse towns, exposure to people of color and cultural diversity occurred primarily as the participants left their hometowns for work in a city or to attend school.

Several of the respondents singled out urban schools in response to the possibility of teaching in a school setting unlike those they had experienced. I asked follow-up questions to guide general responses to consider an urban educational context. All respondents indicated that teaching in an urban setting would take some adaptation and growth in understanding due to the difference from their experience. As they characterized the differences between their educational experience and a diverse or urban setting, three of the PSTs described the deficits or problems
they might encounter, including physical violence, “the reason why I actually left [a school in an urban setting] was cause I got physically attacked” (Participant 1), “broken homes, less safe areas” (Participant 3). Responses also indicated a perception of lower socioeconomic class and students who “need more love, and more patience because they sometimes don't get that from their families” (Participant 7). The other four PSTs also noted differences but described them in comparative terms mentioning how the rules and procedures of urban schools differed from their experience or indicating the need to learn about the cultures and backgrounds of diverse students to become an effective teacher. In one case, when reflecting on the procedures she observed at an urban school, Participant 2 offered that “my school did not have that, we had way less strict of like rules, like lining up and stuff like that than they had, they had that… way more structured than my grade school ever did.”

Only one comment indicated a positive appraisal of urban students of color. Recalling an observation visit to a high-performing urban school, one of the participants contrasted his grade school experience of persistent interpersonal conflict with classmates to the sense of community he witnessed during his visit. “We fought a lot, but it wasn't like, it wasn't physical, only attacking each other verbally” whereas, “They all seem like they were connected. None of them seemed to hate each other. Like honestly, they seemed like they all love each other… like they were close family and my school like that wasn't at all” (Participant 1). However, his overall comments painted this as an anomaly with urban schools in general requiring more strictness to keep students in line.

“I would say [urban school where his mother taught] was little more strict than the schools I attended. That would probably be the main difference. The way the students interact
with each other is a little bit different too… my class especially when I was growing up
we, we fought a lot but it wasn't like, it wasn't physical. (Participant 1)

The responses demonstrated that the PSTs viewed teaching in a diverse or urban setting
as a task notably different from teaching in a setting similar to their own educational experience.
Some viewed diverse or urban settings negatively, but there was no clear association between
where a PST lived or attended school and the manner in which they characterized this difference
in setting.

The results of the quantitative survey indicate some relationship between behavior
attribution and beliefs about diversity and expectancy. The range of scores from the Beliefs
about Diversity and Expectancy section was divided into thirds to delineate upper, middle, and
lower scores. Most respondents scored in the medium range, 28 of the 44 total, 11 were in the
high range, and five scored in the low range (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Behavior Attribution v. Beliefs about Diversity and Expectancy</th>
<th>Beliefs about Diversity and Expectancy Composite Score</th>
<th>Beliefs about Diversity and Expectancy Composite Score</th>
<th>Beliefs about Diversity and Expectancy Composite Score</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attributes behaviors to educational factors as a primary cause</td>
<td>Beliefs about Diversity and Expectancy Composite Score (2.93-3.62)</td>
<td>Beliefs about Diversity and Expectancy Composite Score (3.63-4.31)</td>
<td>Beliefs about Diversity and Expectancy Composite Score (4.32-5.00)</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes behaviors to educational factors as a secondary cause</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes only to factors outside of school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only participants with high or medium composite scores attributed classroom academic and behavioral issues primarily to educational factors such as the teacher or school. Respondents from all three levels of composite scores, attributed classroom academic and behavioral issues to educational factors as a secondary cause, but not as a primary cause. This group accounted for more than half the total. Finally, participants who attributed classroom academic and behavioral issues only to factors outside of school, such as the student, family, or community, came from all three score groupings. The chi-square test did not indicate a statistically significant relationship between the composite scores and attributions $x^2 (1, N = 44) = 5.785, p = .216$.

**Figure 2.1 Behavior Attribution v. Beliefs about Diversity and Expectancy**

*Figure 2.1* Number of students who scored in the upper, middle, or lower third on the composite score who attributed educational issues to educational factors as a primary cause, a secondary cause, or only to factors outside of school.

**Discussion**

According to the diverse-experiences interviews, hometown and school settings featuring minimal diversity or homogeneity have limited PSTs’ contact with people of color. These
participants seemed to have conceptualized urban schools and urban students of color through a deficit lens in comparison with their schooling experience. This would fit with patterns of bias towards African Americans (Eberhardt et al., 2004) and urban educational settings (Watson, 2012) reported in other studies of college undergraduates. The relationship between the Beliefs about Diversity and Expectancy Composite Scores and attribution from the survey further supports this view. A larger number of participants who scored high or medium on Beliefs about Diversity and Expectancy Composite Scores attributed classroom academic and behavioral issues to educational factors such as the school setting or the teacher as well as to the student or their family or community. Conversely, none of those who scored low on the Beliefs about Diversity and Expectancy Composite attributed the problems primarily to educational issues, and three of the five in the low category attributed only to factors outside of school. This pattern corresponds with the deficit view expressed in the interviews. Urban schools are seen as difficult places to teach, and the problems educators experience there are the fault of the students and their families. If PSTs enter the field of teaching holding a deficit view and attribute classroom problems to students and their families rather than examining school policy and their own practice, it is likely to show in their teaching and management. They might interpret student language and behavior patterns that differ from the White, middle-class norm and interpret them as problematic, resulting in unwarranted tracking or referral (Ladson-Billings, 1995; McElderry & Cheng 2014; Skiba et al., 2005). There is a need, therefore, to expose PSTs to diverse voices and examine the historical context of urban schools to see factors beyond the student or their family. Even when noting student resistance, or the incremental pace of change, numerous studies document the ability of multicultural education to prepare PSTs for diverse classrooms (Han et al., 2015; Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006). Only when
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PSTs see urban students of color as capable can they hold high expectations. Furthermore, because many of the PSTs come from educational settings with little cultural diversity, they are likely to need exposure to culturally responsive practices and high expectations behaviors to be able to demonstrate those expectations in the classroom.

Limitations

The size of the study is a limitation, as is the relatively short duration of the diverse-experiences interviews. There also may have been some bias on the part of students given my titles as Dean of Education and Professor of Urban Education. I took several steps to mitigate these circumstances. I presented the invitation to participate in a class taught by another professor so students would not connect participation to potential grade outcomes. Students with an interest or experience in urban education could have been more likely to respond to my personal invitation than if it had been sent anonymously; however, the nominal focus of the interviews was the opportunity to share information about their hometown rather than the relation between location and racial diversity. Also, the diverse-experiences interview did not explicitly specify urban schools when discussing a PST’s comfort level at the prospect of teaching in an educational setting different from their experience, although focusing questions led to descriptions of urban settings in most cases. I was concerned that if the interview had been framed in terms of PST beliefs and expectations about urban students of color, tying it directly to the POP, fewer people would have been willing to participate for fear of giving an answer that could have been perceived as wrong or racist. Once PSTs had responded to an email inviting their participation, my administrative assistant contacted them to schedule times to sit for interviews, potentially reducing the power distance between organizer and participant. Finally, during the verbal consent prior to the start of the interview, participants were explicitly told that
they were free to leave at any time and that if they did so, there would not be any negative repercussions.

Conclusion

The findings demonstrate that the factors hypothesized to contribute to the problem of practice are relevant to the participants and if this sample is representative of the population of PSTs at MCTC, relevant to that population. Experience in segregated residential and educational settings, limited contact with people of color, and perceptions of urban schools and students of color based on a comparison to personal experience, are potentially related to a different, often negative view of urban schools and students of color, which can lead to lower academic and behavioral expectations. I believe that these findings demonstrate the utility of further investigation and intervention. Because all PSTs are required to take a class from the offerings of courses categorized as intercultural electives, this seems a likely place for a future intervention, which might address intercultural competency and exposure to student diversity in educational settings.
Chapter 3

Strategies for Building High Expectations

Chapter one established several factors that lead to low expectations that White, middle-class, PSTs hold for urban students of color. Viewed within the theoretical framework of EST, macrosystem factors include pervasive negative racial stereotypes as well as residential and educational segregation, which prevent regular cross-cultural contact. On an exosystem level, school policy and practice tend to reinforce macrosystem factors by perpetuating school segregation, moving successful educators out of schools with large minority populations, and supporting disciplinary structures that facilitate the school-to-prison pipeline. Finally, the microsystem factors that influence PST expectations for urban students of color can best be framed through the concept of the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975; Smagorinski, 2014). This theory posits that, unlike most vocational fields, PSTs enter their undergraduate training programs with a preconceived, although limited, mental model of education and teaching based on their K-12 experience. Therefore, segregated schools, policy that disproportionately affects students of color, and lower educational outcomes for students of color are viewed as normal and expected aspects of school and teaching. Additionally, PSTs often must grapple with negative and unconscious attitudes towards urban neighborhoods, schools, and students.

The PSTs at MCTC overwhelmingly come from rural, small town, or suburban settings. Their typical K-12 experience included little student diversity and almost no teacher diversity. During interviews, PSTs described a sense that teaching urban students of color would require additional training or skills because of the students in urban districts’ difficult home or community settings. An additional survey addressing attribution and expected outcomes for
culturally responsive teaching was administered to a similar sample group, revealing a range in PSTs’ professional beliefs about diversity and their culturally responsive teaching outcome expectancy. There was a relationship between the beliefs about diversity and expectancy composite score and the attribution that PSTs made for academic and behavioral student issues. PSTs who scored lower on the beliefs about diversity and expectancy composite score tended to ascribe problems in the classroom to the student or parents. In contrast, those with higher scores were more likely to include teacher or school factors as a possible cause of academic and behavioral issues. This correlation supports the deficit view expressed in the qualitative interviews.

The goal of this chapter is to review potential interventions related to this POP. The first section describing the theoretical framework addresses cultural competency training at the undergraduate level, examining the strengths and weaknesses as well as feasibility of approaches in the current case. The second section considers how expectancy effects relate to student outcomes and ways of teaching PSTs to engage in high-expectation behaviors. Finally, a brief description of the intervention is provided.

**Theoretical Framework**

Attribution theory holds important implications for schools in that teachers make attributions about their students that inform their expectations for those students and subsequently how they teach. Students, in turn, make attributions about themselves based on the type and difficulty of material they are given in school and whether they are successful with that material. Attributions are integral to the purposes of this study because attributions about students inform the selection of educational and classroom management practices. If educators hold inaccurate attributions about students of color in urban settings, they could select
inappropriate teaching and management strategies (Kulinna, 2008). Furthermore, if teachers attribute academic and behavioral issues to the student, their family, or their culture without considering the role of the school and societal factors such as racism, they could develop low expectations for those students (Ladson-Billings, 2006).

Fritz Heider (2020) and Bernard Weiner (1992) are two foundational thinkers in attribution theory. Both have engaged in experimentation and theory development to describe the human tendency to seek a causal understanding of the world. People tend to use even partial evidence to draw conclusions about the world around them, including the actions of other people (Weiner, 1992). Much of human understanding and reaction to surroundings is based on the attribution of causes (Heider, 2020). Covariation is thought to be a necessary condition for attribution, that is, a “condition will be held responsible for an effect which is present when the effect is present and which is absent when the effect is absent” (Weiner, 1992, p. 232). Although some reasonable conclusions can be reached with one-time exposure or fragmentary evidence, attributions based on repeated exposure or robust data are more likely to be accurate (Heider, 2020). Attribution theorists have classified causes into three dimensions, locus of causality, either internal or external to the actor, stability, conditions that are stable or changeable over time and between situations, and controllability, whether factors are controllable, uncontrollable, or can be changed at will (Weiner, 1992). People most commonly relate success and failure to ability and effort when considering internal causal ascriptions (Graham & Taylor, 2016). Some internal behaviors, such as aptitude, are seen as constant, while others, such as mood, are variable (Weiner, 1992). Results may also depend on factors that are external to the person, known as environmental factors (Weiner, 1992). When conditions, internal and external, remain
similar from occasion to occasion, then previous outcomes can be expected to recur, whereas variation in causes opens the possibility for different outcomes (Weiner, 1992).

**Outcome and Expectancy**

The ways in which people classify outcomes and their expectancy for various outcomes are related to the attributions that they make. In general, people tend to take credit for their successes by attributing them to stable internal factors such as ability or variable internal factors such as effort; failures, in contrast, are more often attributed to external factors (Weiner, 1992). According to Weiner (1992), actors make attributions to success and failure in relation to social norms so that if a person fails at a task at which most others fail, the result is ascribed externally to the difficulty of the task, but if they fail where most others have succeeded then the result is internalized as a lack of ability or effort. Similarly, when a person succeeds where success is common, the task is deemed easy, but if they succeed where few others have, the result is related to ability, effort, or both with a tendency to include multiple factors (ability and effort) as the difficulty of the task increases. Weiner further posited that aspiration levels for a task are related to experiences, such that a higher expectancy of success based on past experiences leads to higher aspirations moving forward. Here, he explained a task can be assessed against effort and ability levels a person attributes to themselves. When an actor understands failure as resulting from low effort, they may plan to work harder in future attempts, and if failure is instead connected to low ability, they may work to improve their ability through practice. However, Weiner pointed out that there are limits to returning to a failed task and, citing Seligman (1975), explained that when an individual feels that they cannot influence an outcome through an increase in either effort or ability, they will desist out of either helplessness or hopelessness. Weiner offered the following principle and corollaries on expectancy:
Expectancy Principle: Changes in expectancy of success following an outcome are influenced by the perceived stability of the cause of the event.

Corollary 1: If the outcome of an event is ascribed to a stable cause, then that outcome will be anticipated with increased certainty, or with and increased expectancy, in the future.

Corollary 2: If the outcome of an event is ascribed to an unstable cause, then the certainty or expectancy of that outcome may be unchanged or the future may be anticipated to be different from the past.

Corollary 3: Outcomes ascribed to stable causes will be anticipated to be repeated in the future with a greater degree of certainty that are outcomes ascribed to unstable causes. (p. 259)

Weiner’s expectancy principle and its corollaries relate to school settings as teachers assess the performance and behaviors of students.

**Actor and Observer**

Individuals attribute causes for their experiences but also to others with whom they interact. This ascription of causal behavior was demonstrated by Heider and Simmel (1944), who conducted experiments showing participants moving geometric shapes. Observers interpreted the shapes as actors and attributed motives to them to describe the patterns of movements. People also attribute motives to the actions of other people. When observing the actions of other humans, people tend to overestimate the salience of personal qualities while underestimating environmental factors (Weiner, 1992). Conversely, actors tend to relate their actions to situational factors external to themselves, and observers of these same actions ascribe them to the personal qualities of the actor (Weiner, 1992). This tendency can lead to a discrepancy between
the causal understandings of actors and observers, which can make the evaluation of responsibility challenging. Attributions made by observers are also influenced by situations of power, where if the observer is in a position of power over an actor, the observer typically attributes successful outcomes to their power (Weiner, 1992). This may be the case when teachers attribute students’ academic improvements to the quality of instruction and lack of growth to students’ low effort or ability. In such power situations, confidence and trust in the actor tend to be made only after the actor is seen to be successful under conditions where the observer is not in power, suggesting that accurate evaluation for responsibility is only possible by observing both situations (Heider, 2020). This has implications in schools for the attributions that teachers make about their students, where both teacher and student are making attributions about the effectiveness of instruction and student outcomes.

**Protection of Self-Image**

Students make attributions about themselves and their academic abilities based on the results of their work and on the actions of the teacher. Attributions made about success and failure relate to self-image and can be employed to protect an individual’s positive self-image. Weiner (1992) theorized that when actors assign responsibility for success to internal factors, self-image is enhanced, but rather than decrease self-image by making the same internal attributions for failure, people protect self-image by ascribing failure to external causes. In some cases, people will even arrange self-sabotage situations that allow for the deflection of internal attributions to a potential failure. Weiner provided the example of a college student partying the night before a big exam so that a failing grade could be blamed on a lack of sleep or insufficient studying rather than their ability. Again, social norms can influence these attributions, with the greatest pride or boost to self-image following success at a difficult task and the largest detriment
to self-image after failing at a simple task. Even in failure, Weiner postulated, a range of emotions such as shame or guilt is related to differences in attribution. Shame follows a failure that is ascribed to internal and uncontrollable factors such as mental aptitude or physical attractiveness, whereas guilt results from responsibility for failures such as insufficient effort or preparation.

Theorists have noted a difference in the attributions that stigmatized groups make in relation to failure and success. Crocker, Voelkl, Testa, and Major (1991) contend that stigmatized groups experience attributional ambiguity in that others may either unfairly give harsh feedback out of prejudice or overly kind feedback out of pity. When Crocker et al. (1991) engaged college students in research, including feedback on a persuasive essay, they found that Black participants were likely to utilize external attributions, such as prejudiced evaluators, to buffer their self-image against negative evaluations of their writing. The other side of this investigation considered attributions about positive feedback, finding that positive evaluations were sometimes discounted when Black participants assumed that they were made out of either a pity or a desire of the White evaluator not to be seen as racist (Crocker et al., 1991). The authors concluded that resulting attributional ambiguity caused difficulty in making use of feedback to predict future outcomes of their work. This, too, has implications for teaching as educators seek to interpret the actions of their students who may be acting to protect or buffer their self-image. In a negative example, a teacher with low expectations for his students might consistently assign low-level work and offer unsolicited help. Both behaviors signal low expectations to students who may, in turn, assume that this treatment is the result of their low ability. From here, the students may drop their level of effort to protect their self-image but inadvertently confirm the
teacher’s low expectations. Further applications of attribution theory to education are made in the following sections.

**Synthesis of Intervention Literature**

In many ways, a teacher education program can pull back the curtain on the mental model of education and teaching that PSTs have built during their apprenticeship of observation. As K-12 students, PSTs rarely see the preparation that goes into lesson planning, assessment of learning, and decisions related to classroom management and discipline (Smagorinsky & Barnes, 2014). Cultural competency training and the explanation of expectancy effects can change the way PSTs approach the classroom, requiring them to consider race, culture, ethnicity, and class as factors in student outcomes (Milner et al., 2015). As PSTs learn about the influence of immediate and historical contexts on urban students of color, school policy, funding, and parental involvement in schools, their attribution for school outcomes may shift from individual responsibility to include external influence as well (Milner et al., 2015). Furthermore, the expectations that teachers have for their students affect educational results (Rubie-Davies, 2010). Explicitly teaching skills to demonstrate high expectations in the classroom can change teacher behaviors (Ding & Rubie-Davies, 2019).

Cultural competency training can expand the view of White, middle-class PSTs to include the possibility that lower educational outcomes for urban students of color are related to contextual factors and that these students are just as academically capable as their White peers (Han et al., 2015; Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006). Furthermore, PSTs can be trained in specific methods to demonstrate their expectations of competency in the classroom (Saphier, 2016), and a targeted cultural competency course can
potentially change the expectations that PSTs hold for urban students of color (Han et al., 2015: Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006).

This literature synthesis examines the potential for an undergraduate education course in intercultural competency to serve as an intervention to address needs revealed in the literature review and needs assessment. The review begins by examining the potential impact and limitations of cultural competency training courses, followed by a look at how the experiences of PSTs frame the attributions they make regarding outcomes for urban students of color. Next, literature speaking to teacher candidates as learners explores the growth process of PSTs. Finally, I discuss experiences and critical self-reflection in relation to the acquisition of cultural competency.

There are four key areas in which beliefs about diversity can be changed “(a) multicultural courses in education, (b) living and working in cross-cultural contexts, (c) cross cultural relationships, and (d) engaging in critical self-reflection” according to Kahn, Lindstrom, and Murray (2014, p. 56). Both the multicultural course and critical self-reflection fall within the scope of the current investigation. The review will demonstrate that within the context of an intercultural competency course for educators, historical and educational contexts can provide a framework for understanding various factors related to educational outcomes for urban students of color. An understanding of outcomes in relation to context is a vital component of an intervention because it allows PSTs to make more accurate attributions for outcomes for urban students of color, such as the factors that influence educational outcomes, whether those factors can change, and what might be required from teachers and students to produce change. PSTs are more likely to express high expectations for urban students of color when they possess a clear understanding that disparate outcomes are not necessarily a sign that urban students of color are
less able or willing to learn. Therefore, research on attribution and on how to train educators in the behaviors that demonstrate high teacher expectations are included as well.

**Cultural Competency Training**

All 50 states and the District of Columbia require coursework in multicultural education and diversity, including strategies for working with cross-cultural differences in a school context as a requirement of teaching licensure (Akiba et al., 2010). However, the effectiveness of those courses, especially if not integrated throughout the curriculum, is widely variable (Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006). The outcomes of students in the same multicultural education course may vary according to student background and beliefs, and courses themselves may differ in goals and content from school to school and even within institutions, as demonstrated by Gorski’s (2009) typology of classes offered in multicultural teacher education. Gorski first listed five defining principles of multicultural education:

1. multicultural education is a political movement and process that attempts to secure social justice to underserved and disenfranchised students;
2. multicultural education recognizes that, while some individual classroom practices are philosophically consistent with multicultural education, social justice is an institutional matter, and as such can be secured only through comprehensive school reform;
3. multicultural education insists that comprehensive school reform can be achieved only through a critical analysis of systems of power and privilege;
4. multicultural education’s underlying goal … is the elimination of educational inequities; and
5. multicultural education is good education for all students. (p. 310)
Based on the definitions above, Gorski examined 45 college-level syllabi for multicultural education courses deriving a typology describing five distinct approaches to the topic:

Type 1 - Teaching the “Other,”
Type 2 - Teaching with Tolerance and Cultural Sensitivity,
Type 3 - Teaching with Multicultural Competence,
Type 4 - Teaching in Sociopolitical Context, and
Type 5 - Teaching as Resistance and Counter-Hegemonic Practice (p. 312)

Gorski proposed that courses fitting into types one through three are designed to produce multicultural competence but not to produce the systemic changes that would lead to more equitable educational environments. Only about a quarter of the syllabi that he examined matched type four or five in framing education as a political act concerned with furthering social justice by overturning inequitable systems. He further contended that the courses that do not rise to type four or five are not consistent with the principles of multicultural education as he has defined it. Gorski concluded by asserting that teaching with tolerance and cultural sensitivity and teaching with multicultural competence, as embodied in types two and three, should be recognized as important steps towards approaches that promote the active pursuit of educational equity.

Whiteness in the American context often limits opportunities for White, middle-class PSTs to interact with poor or working-class communities of color organically (Brown, 2018; Brown & Donnor, 2011). Media representations of people of color can present negative stereotypes, particularly images and narratives regarding Black males (Brown, 2018; Brown & Donnor, 2011; Burrell, 2013). So strong is the pervasive negative messaging about Black people in America that when Eberhardt et al. (2016) conducted research investigating the beliefs of
hundreds of college students and police officers, they found a bidirectional association between blackness and crime; that is, images of Black people evoke thoughts of criminality, and images associated with crime induce association with Black people. Furthermore, racial socialization ingrains a negative view of cities and urban areas in relation to residents of color (DiAngelo, 2018). White children are trained to label residential areas with noticeable minority populations as the bad part of town. This connection is reinforced by crime reporting without the contextual framework of how these segregated neighborhoods were created or the differences in policing practices enforced there as opposed to tactics employed in White or more affluent neighborhoods (Alexander, 2012; DiAngelo, 2018). Additionally, distance imposed by residential and educational segregation may lead PSTs to attribute lower rates of achievement for students of color to the students rather than to the quality of teaching or school context (Knoblauch & Chase, 2015). Combined, the factors above could mean that by the time White PSTs enter a teacher education program, they begin with a bias against students of color and resistance to culturally responsive pedagogy (Han et al., 2015; Rodriguez & Berryman, 2002; William & Conyers, 2016).

College-level courses that include content on multicultural education or cultural competency have some effect on the beliefs of PSTs about people from a culture or class different from their own, but the results vary widely and can depend on what the PSTs believe as they enter the course (Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006). For example, in the examination of the notion of color-blindness, Kreamelmeyer et al. (2016) found that students moved along a continuum from openly biased at one end, to color-blind as a spectrum mid-point, to appreciation of racial difference at the other end of the spectrum. Almost all students demonstrated progress along this continuum over a semester relative to their beliefs.
as they began the class. To measure this growth, researchers conducted a precourse and postcourse survey in which participants used a Likert scale rating to evaluate prompts related to a colorblind approach to education. Written explanations to the Likert scale responses revealed the movement from bias and intentional color-blindness to some stated appreciation of racial difference. Nearly all participants moved along the spectrum, but at the end of a full semester, most had not progressed beyond the continuum center point of color-blindness, although the goal of the instructors had been the appreciation of racial difference. This result helps to illustrate the limitations of a single course, even when it produces noticeable change. The findings of Bauml et al. (2016) described a common starting point for aspiring educators, as interviews with mostly White PSTs revealed that most respondents expressed negative attitudes towards the idea of teaching in urban schools due to concerns about racial and cultural barriers and the fear of being unable to manage student behaviors. These concerns held for PSTs who were anxious or not interested in teaching in urban schools as well as for those who were willing to teach in urban schools. Viewed together, the findings of Bauml (2016) and Kreamelmeyer et al. (2016) illustrate the challenge in producing culturally competent teachers since many PSTs, even those interested in urban education, begin their training with negative attitudes, a limiting factor since growth over a semester is relative to starting attitudes.

Cultural competency training in teacher education programs appears to have a greater effect when coupled with field experience in diverse school settings (Han et al., 2015; Siwatu, 2011; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006). Walker-Dalhouse and Dalhouse (2006) utilized precourse and postcourse survey responses to a cultural diversity awareness inventory to examine the malleability of beliefs in PSTs. Their examination took place within the context of a reading and Language Arts course coupled with a diversity practicum consisting of 30 hours of
observation and teaching in the local urban school district. The experience also included ten seminar sessions presented by school personnel from the practicum schools. The results of the experience, which was the third in a series of multicultural courses, indicated some change in beliefs following coursework and experiences in diverse settings. However, change across the entire group was only significant for some of the questions posed. By the end of the experience, for example, participants were less likely to refer students for issues related to cultural or language differences and more likely to acknowledge minority parents' ability to assess their children’s abilities.

Additionally, even though all states require teacher candidates to be familiar with multiculturalism or culturally responsive practices (Akiba et al., 2010), these topics have traditionally existed as additional but independent classes within the curricular framework of a teacher education program. This structure persists despite indications that cultural competency training is less effective when taught in isolation than if it is integrated throughout the teacher education curriculum (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1995). The comfort level that the members of an education faculty have teaching issues of race and class can facilitate or impede the integration of these topics throughout the curriculum (Williams & Conyers, 2016). In some cases, an isolated course in cultural competency can serve as a promising first step for PSTs as they gain awareness of the complexities that race, ethnicity, culture, and class bring to education. Still, the single course approach may remain problematic because “awareness often becomes a proxy for action rather than the stimulant and barometer it rightfully should be; frequently it signals the end rather than the beginning of the change process” (Gay, 2010, p. 150). In all, multicultural teacher education holds the potential for change, but student outcomes vary widely.
Bias and limited cross-cultural experiences can mean that White, middle-class PSTs fail to recognize the need for culturally responsive pedagogy or resist the concept even when it is presented as a required component of their teacher education program (Han et al., 2015; Ladson-Billings 1995). Although some PSTs embrace multicultural education, others refuse the premise that culturally responsive pedagogy affects the outcomes of students of color. In such cases, they will likely attribute negative academic or disciplinary outcomes to students of color regardless of their social or educational context, typically citing a lack of parental support, a failure to value education, or cultural differences as the reasons behind lower outcomes (Knoblauch & Chase, 2015; Rodriguez & Berryman, 2002). Although the acquisition of cultural competency is not mutually exclusive to the development of attributions and expectations for educational outcomes, this study focused on the latter. I believe that the attributions that PSTs make about other cultural groups underlies their ability to develop cultural competency. However, the scope of this research was already wide due to the dual focus on attributions in connection with expectations. Therefore, even though cultural competency was one of the stated objectives of the intervention course it was neither included in the research questions nor measured in data collection.

The following sections explore three components of effective cultural competency training. The first discusses changes in understanding through education, acknowledging the fact that learning is a process. The second addresses the role that experiences have in furthering cultural understanding, and the third considers personal reflection as a tool for cognitive growth.

**Teacher Candidates as Learners**

Whether they realize and acknowledge it, teachers ascribe educational outcomes such as academic achievement and classroom behaviors to specific causes. Cultural competency training can address these often unexamined and unacknowledged attributions. Teachers generally
attribute student misbehavior to external factors such as home or student before considering the influence of school or teacher (Kulinna, 2008). Ladson-Billings (2006) noted that when PSTs and novice teachers do not understand how context, school expectations, and teacher beliefs combine with student behavior to produce results, they tend to blame negative academic or behavioral outcomes on the culture of the student, with culture being broadly defined as most influences outside of the teachers’ direct control. Thus, the definitions Milner et al. (2015) provided for urban education can assist PSTs to reframe deficit views through an understanding of the different experiences and opportunities available to urban students of color based on contextual factors. Milner et al. recommend four areas of focus in teacher education programs to inform PSTs about urban environments: (a) Student and family homelessness, (b) Geography and social contexts, (c) Policy and school funding, and (d) Parental and family involvement. Furthermore, their work emphasizes the conceptual difference between the idea of an achievement gap between White students and students of color and an opportunity gap, which focuses on differing levels of education offered to each group. Attribution of student success or failure can change through the exposition of students’ context. Rojas and Liou (2017) found that as educators explored and reflected on the concept of sympathetic touch, “teachers were dispositionally rewriting the scripts by shifting their analysis of educational inequities away from their students’ presumed innate deficits, and toward a society that had historically failed to honor their intellectual promise with the learning opportunities they deserved” (p. 35). Without specific instruction in cultural competency, PSTs are likely to accept the prevailing narrative that academic and educational issues stem primarily from factors outside of school rather than reflecting on teaching or school policy.
It is necessary to hold a dual view of PSTs; on the one hand, they are teachers on the verge of entering the classroom as leaders. On the other hand, they are still students engaged in learning and growth to prepare them for the rigors of their chosen vocation, especially concerning cultural competency. Teacher educators counsel their PSTs against viewing future students through a deficit lens. In multicultural teacher education courses, professors must take care to heed their own advice. There is potential for danger in treating PSTs as a homogeneous group, even among predominately White populations. If the professor views their role as saving the undergraduate students from themselves and their lack of diversity, this deficit practice can be passed on to PSTs and carried into classrooms as they graduate and enter the field (Lowenstein, 2009). Education professors can most effectively teach asset-based approaches to teaching by modeling in their classroom and holding high expectations for the PSTs under their supervision. It is also necessary to consider the starting point of each student as they engage in the sometimes-painful process of growth. As Seidl and Hancock (2011) note,

In some cases where White privilege is being challenged or racism is being explored, a question or response that would be considered developmentally appropriate in a White student who is just moving out of naiveté can be read as resistant by those who do not understand these naive attempts, or by those who are looking for and expecting resistance. (p. 692)

Although education courses offered in a teacher education program can change the beliefs of PSTs, this shift is not a singular event but a process and usually not a linear one. In a study considering inquiry-based instruction in a science methods course, Pilitsis and Duncan (2012) tracked reflection journal responses to examine the attitudes of PSTs in conjunction with a series of course activities. The researchers saw that initial lessons secured student buy-in to
constructivist methods for teaching science, a primary focus of the course since it supports scientific inquiry practices, but also found regression of beliefs in several cases. PSTs struggled with later activities and expressed doubt that the approaches would work in actual classrooms, indicating an overall unstable orientation prone to change. In their concluding remarks, Pilitsis and Duncan suggest that although some activities may frustrate PSTs and turn them to less-effective approaches, the difficult activities should not be removed. Instead, professors could address resistance to student-centered approaches to science instruction through responsive instruction following a careful review of PST reflections on each activity. Within the context of cultural competency training, an analogous reaction to material that challenges long-held beliefs and regression can be expected, and a similar practice of reflection and discussion can be implemented to address concerns and retain valuable learning experiences.

Experiences

Experiences can also play a crucial role in the development of cultural competency. Kahn et al. (2014) noted that the diversification of the teaching force is a desirable but slow process and that, therefore, cultural competency must be a priority for teacher education. The researchers surveyed a group of 56 PSTs in an education program in the Pacific Northwest using the Personal and Professional Beliefs about Diversity Scale. Those future educators rated significant cross-cultural relationships as the most influential factor in gaining cultural competence. Kahn et al. concluded with a recommendation for teacher education programs to include and support cross-cultural experiences to inform the culturally competent beliefs of PSTs. Similarly, Milner et al. (2015) recommend both immersion experiences in urban schools and engagement with community organizations in urban settings. Walker-Dalhouse and Dalhouse (2006) concluded their research on the attitudes White PSTs hold about people from other cultures by asserting that
PRESERVICE TEACHERS’ ATTRIBUTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

Field experiences that place PSTs in urban settings and in contact with diverse student populations appear to be a crucial component in producing culturally responsive teachers. However, teacher education programs in rural areas may not have access to schools where PSTs can experience diverse student populations in their observation or practice teaching (Han et al., 2015). Geographical limitations that reduce opportunities for intercultural experiences necessitate a focus on other practices that have been shown to support PSTs’ growth in cultural competency, such as regular guided reflection and the clear exposition of theory related to responsive teaching.

**Reflection**

In addition to the recommendation for regular reflections and discussion of challenging topics mentioned above (Pilitsis & Duncan, 2012), consideration should also be given to how reflective practice is situated in the curriculum. For example, Kahn et al. (2014) explored PST beliefs about diversity and found that PST beliefs about the significance of self-reflection and the degree to which the reflective activities were completed had the strongest connections to positive beliefs about diversity. The teacher education program can be framed as a system for delivering content and skills or as a vehicle for critical inquiry and reflection on beliefs about self, students, and education (Lowenstein, 2009). Reflection becomes a useful practice when it is intentionally connected to critical experiences and challenging concepts rather than as a repeated exercise separate from the coursework (Kahn et al., 2014). Highlighting reflection by integrating it into the curriculum rather than simply allowing or referencing it might further support students in this practice (Kahn et al., 2014). Others have gone beyond standard reflection and discussion by teaching ethnographic research methods to PSTs. Over the course of a year, Lenski, Crumpler, Stallworth, and Crawford (2005) had PSTs conduct ethnographic observations in the community.
where they were student teaching. As the PSTs observed in local businesses, libraries, and public spaces, they developed new skills for learning about and understanding others. Recording their experiences over an extended period and sharing them with other PSTs allowed them to situate themselves and their work within the context of the interactional patterns and hidden structures in the community (Lenski et al., 2005). Since reflection is built into the ethnographic approach, participants learned to look back at their earlier observations and question the assumptions that had driven their initial observations. Over time, the PSTs engaged in ethnographic study developed observational and reflective skills that were valuable for learning about their students and their families so that they could build positive relationships.

The topics considered above demonstrate that an undergraduate course in intercultural competency is a viable place for an intervention. College-level courses can play a role in the development of cultural competency for teaching. Additionally, course content, experiences, and reflections are vital components for PSTs’ growth and understanding without which ethnocentrism, bias, and stereotypes will serve as barriers to equity in education. The quality of education offered in urban settings is unlikely to improve unless teacher training addresses issues of diversity in such a way that PSTs enter the field with high expectations for all of their future students.

**Expectancy Effects**

Expectancy effects, the impact that a teacher’s expectations have on their teaching, and by extension student learning, have been studied for decades. Researchers have investigated teaching practices that demonstrate high and low expectations for students (Brophy, 1983; Rosenthal & Rubin 1978). They have further studied the student outcomes of teachers with high and low expectations (Goldenberg, 1992; Good & Nichols, 2001; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968).
Finally, researchers have developed programs to teach high expectation behaviors to educators and found improved classroom outcomes (Allen et al., 2011; Ding & Rubie-Davies, 2019). For the purposes of the intervention, high expectations for urban students of color are built on the understanding that history and context are influential factors in educational outcomes.

Expectancy effects are perhaps best known from the seminal work of Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968). In their study, teachers who were told they had been given high IQ students taught in such a way that their classes showed significant academic gain when compared to control classrooms. In reality, they had been assigned students at random, and their only difference was their expectations for their students. Although no research has been able to fully duplicate these results, perhaps due to the widespread publicity this research received, there has been no shortage of studies in this field. In 1978, a decade after his landmark publication, Rosenthal, along with Rubin, analyzed 345 follow-up studies finding that expectancy effects are likely to occur in both real-life and laboratory situations and that the effects were as likely in either setting.

Continuing analysis in this field has been conducted by other researchers adding depth and nuance to the topic. Brophy (1983), for example, stated that although expectancy effects are nontrivial, it is difficult to predict the effect size of expectations due to the number of variables involved. Brophy also detailed key findings on the topic in his meta-analysis, including that observed expectancy effects were more often negative in nature as students lived down to low expectations. A troubling conclusion considering another finding that race and social class can cause teacher bias leading to lower expectations for students of color and students from low-income households. Although some of the cases considered in Brophy’s work described a small number of teachers who were unwilling to change their expectations even when presented with
new information, most studies pointed to teachers adjusting expectations based on information from past teachers, class performance, and classroom dynamics. A clear finding of the literature Brophy reviewed was that “[d]ifferences in expectations lead to differences in what is taught, which in turn lead to differences in what is ultimately learned” (p. 639). The teacher behaviors most reflective of expectations were praise and criticism, specific feedback, and seeking an improved response. Students for whom teachers held high expectations received more praise when successful and less criticism when they failed. High expectation students were also more likely to receive feedback about the correctness of their answers than low expectation students. When an incorrect answer was given, teachers were more likely to repeat the question, provide prompts, or rephrase to elicit a correct answer from high expectation students than from low expectation students. These results match Rosenthal’s early hypothesis, as cited by Brophy (1983), of how teachers can maximize student outcomes “(1) Create particularly warm social emotional relationships with their students (climate). (2) Give them more feedback about their performance (feedback). (3) Teach them more (and more difficult) material (input). (4) Give them more opportunities to respond and to ask questions (output)” (p. 640). Finally, Brophy concluded that teaching teachers about expectancy effects is likely to make them feel a greater responsibility for student outcomes.

Other authors have taken more cautious views of expectancy effects. Goldenberg (1992) documented paradoxical expectancy results in a series of case studies. Studying at-risk, low-income, Hispanic children in southern California, Goldenberg found cases where student outcomes were the opposite of teachers' expectations. Cases detailed both a student who was successful despite the teacher’s low expectations and another who struggled for an entire year.
and was moved to successively lower reading groups even though the teacher held initially high expectations.

Continuing research in this field has explored the dynamic interplay between teacher and students to uncover the underlying mechanics of expectancy effects. Students are often aware of their teachers’ general levels of expectation, especially when evidenced by differential behavior (Good & Nichols, 2001). Students also form expectations for each other based on both teacher behavior and classroom outcomes. In classrooms where status differentiation based on high or low teacher expectations is pronounced, low expectation students participate less, potentially confirming the teacher’s beliefs. Conversely, in classrooms with generally high teacher expectations or little status differentiation, low achieving students participate more often, particularly when mixed ability groups are utilized (Good & Nichols, 2001). The same analysis by Good and Nichols explored the implications of race and class, finding that cultural similarity and familiar social cues can lead White teachers to interact more often and more positively with White students. Good and Nichols concluded their study with a call to action that “teachers should be provided with a solid background in expectancy theory so that they realize that expectancies can be too high or too low and become aware of the many ways that teachers can provide positive or negative feedback” (p. 122).

Building on the body of work exploring expectancy effects, Christine Rubie-Davies (2010) has examined the effects of teacher expectations on student outcomes. Her work confirms findings going back to Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968). Rubie-Davies’ research in New Zealand considered six teachers and their 220 students. Teachers were classified as high expectations (HiEx) or low expectations (LoEx) based on their responses to the Self-Description Questionnaire and confirming responses from their students. Students with HiEx teachers
showed significant gains in reading when compared to students with LoEx teachers. Rubie-Davies attributed the gains to the positive classroom community created by HiEx teachers, noting “[t]his suggests a level of teacher care and respect for students. Increasingly, it appears that the teacher expectation literature may need to focus more carefully on teacher moderators of expectations” (p. 132).

The expectations that teachers hold for their students are linked to the attributions that they make about those students. If, for example, teachers view students attending schools in urban settings as less academically capable based on average test scores, ignoring the historical context that might have led to fewer or lower quality educational opportunities, they could hold lower expectations for those students. In such a case, inaccurate attributions could foster low expectations and again “[d]ifferences in expectations lead to differences in what is taught, which in turn lead to differences in what is ultimately learned” (Brophy, 1983, p. 639).

**Relationships Between Expectations and Attributions**

Practices that demonstrate both high and low expectations to students are generally supported by attribution theory. The attributions made by teachers can be divided into three categories, locus of causality, controllability, and stability (Weiner, 1992), each of which can impact their expectations for a student (Brady & Woolfson, 2008). Locus of causality involves how a teacher perceives the cause of an issue in the classroom; teachers typically ascribe student misbehavior to external factors such as home or student disposition before they consider school or teacher influences (Kulinna, 2008). Attribution of controllability deals with whether a teacher perceives the student to be able to influence their performance in school (Brady & Woolfson, 2008). When teachers see students fail, they tend to characterize that failure in one of two ways, a lack of student ability or a lack of student effort (Graham & Taylor, 2016). In the case that
failure is attributed to a student’s lack of ability, sympathy is a typical response that can be followed by a lowering of expectation, reduction in academic rigor, and the offering of unsolicited help. On the other hand, if a teacher views academic failure as a lack of effort, a more typical response is anger followed by withholding support until the student demonstrates adequate effort. Students then use these teacher responses to inform their understanding of why they failed, whether due to low ability or low effort (Graham & Taylor, 2016). Finally, attributions of stability are reflected in the contemporary discussion of fixed and growth mindset, in which teachers view intelligence, high or low, as an innate quality of a child that persists over time or as a snapshot of a student’s ability at a given point in time that is capable of changing through education and learning (Dweck, 2008, Saphier, 2016). Teachers with high stability attributions, fixed mindsets, are more likely to hold low expectations for students with records of low performance, whereas teachers with low stability attributions, growth mindsets, may hold high expectations even for students who have struggled previously (Brophy, 1983; Dweck, 2008; Good & Nichols, 2001).

Teacher Practices

Recent examinations have focused on the explicit instruction of teaching methods that convey high expectations to students. Ding and Rubie-Davies (2019) demonstrated student academic gains following intervention training for teachers. The professional development explicated behaviors that communicate high expectations to students, such as offering challenging tasks, providing detailed feedback, and demonstrating personal regard. Rojas and Liou (2017) connected a social justice orientation to the concept of sympathetic touch, which they defined as high expectations and an understanding of the contextual barriers that urban students of color face. Their research participants established sympathy in their classrooms
through learning about their students’ experiences with inequity. Rojas and Liou noted this practice as central to the teachers’ social justice orientation. Their description coincides with the warm demander approach, which Ford and Sassi (2014) characterized as a balance of care and discipline to provide a structured environment for academic achievement, including direct discourse and high expectations for students. Ford and Sassi further asserted in their case study analysis that the warm demander style can be employed effectively in classrooms where a White teacher is teaching students of color, provided the educator can demonstrate respect and concern early in teaching. In this case study, successful White teachers constructed positive relationships with their students of color, allowing an opening to discuss issues of race, which, in turn, strengthened the cross-racial relationship. This is further supported through a mixed-methods study of student perceptions by Liu, Savitz-Romer, Perella, Hill, and Liang (2018), in which students described their interactions with specific teachers in open response survey prompts and rated their overall interactions with teachers through Likert scale survey responses. Liu et al. found that teachers active in both giving help and seeking information about students through empathic listening, being attentive to students, and speaking kindly were perceived as both caring and helpful. Alternately, students associated poor teaching practice with agency suppression. Lui et al. emphasize, therefore, the importance of establishing the conditions for positive relationships to improve learning rather than reliance on novel teaching techniques or materials. The examples above both illustrate and fit within the initial framework for demonstrating high expectations of climate, feedback, input, and output proposed by Rosenthal (Brophy, 1983).

Conversely, other researchers have investigated behaviors that communicate low expectations to students. Khalifa (2011) highlighted deal-making, where teachers allowed
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students to disengage from lessons in exchange for a reduction in classroom disruptions or when students were permitted to leave the classroom, citing personal concerns despite a school structure designed to handle these situations outside of class time. Teacher practice, as examined in this investigation, improved when the principal confronted the teachers about acquiescing to disengagement and linked deal-making to low expectations for students. The examination of teacher behaviors is further supported in students’ accounts. Students connect cognitive and emotional engagement as well as behavior to perceived teacher expectations (Carter Andrews & Gutwein, 2017). These researchers held focus group interviews to learn how students perceived the way teachers treated them and other students. Students of multiple races and ethnicities, including White students, indicated differential treatment from teachers based on race or socio-economic status. They reported that teachers enforced rules differently and held differing standards regarding the level of work given, as well as the assistance rendered in class, which these students took as a demonstration of lower intellectual, academic, and behavioral expectations for minorities. Students also reported that teachers favored “respectful” and “good” students, but that classification as such was dependent in part on race, for even academically successful Black students were treated as problematic. The authors included comments from one student who mentioned banding together with other Black students due to a lack of help from the teacher. This powerful research demonstrates the potency of teacher expectations. Whether or not it was intentional on the part of teachers, students perceived a different set of expectations based on race and class. Low expectations for students of color are not simply an isolated construct within a teacher’s mind dictating the work they assign or the discipline they deploy, they are apprehended and experienced by students in real and at times hurtful ways.
Further demonstrations of low teacher expectations include questioning practices such as asking fewer questions to low expectations students with shorter wait times and fewer prompts or follow-up questions in seeking the correct answer before moving on. The assignment of lower-level academic tasks, the acceptance of low-quality work with the absence of feedback, or praise for low-level achievements also communicate low expectations. Finally, relationship cues such as less eye contact or smiling, fewer attempts to establish interpersonal relationships, and a sympathetic approach to student failure all signal low teacher expectations (Brophy, 1983; Good & Nichols, 2001; Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968). The evidence of the effects of teacher expectations points to the need for teacher education and training on this topic.

**Training Educators**

High or low expectations can affect teaching, but the expectations of teachers can be changed through training. In one example from Allen et al. (2011), seventy-eight secondary teachers participated in the MyTeachingPartner program. They found that training teachers for high-quality student interactions indicative of high expectations correlated to improved student outcomes. This workshop-based regimen aimed to advance student outcomes through improving student-teacher relationships based on principles similar to those initially proposed by Rosenthal (1968) and later reiterated by Brophy (1983) as demonstrating high teacher expectations. Participants attended training sessions followed by ongoing coaching, in which teachers sent video recordings of their lessons to trained consultants. The consultants highlighted areas of strength and opportunities for growth based on the Classroom Assessment Scoring System. The 2,237 students whose teachers received coaching showed significant gains on achievement test scores over an academic year.
In a similar experiment on training educators, Ding and Rubie-Davies (2019) explored expectation effects in Chinese schools by teaching high expectation behaviors to a group of teachers. Ding and Rubie-Davies divided eight teachers into experimental and control groups. In the treatment condition, teachers attended professional development, delivered in a series of workshops, explicated behaviors that communicated high expectations to students, such as offering challenging tasks, providing detailed feedback, and demonstrating personal regard. The control group did not receive the professional development but completed a survey about their expectations for their students. The study included 229 students in Grade 8 English foreign language classrooms in China. The experimental classrooms outperformed the control classrooms in all areas under examination. Participating teachers had provided their expectations for their students at the beginning of the academic session. Students for whom teachers held high expectations performed similarly in both experimental and control settings. Students in experimental classrooms for whom teachers held middle or low expectations outperformed their peers in control classrooms, indicating that the biggest potential gains were among the lowest-performing students who experienced the largest gains, even though all students benefitted.

Years of study from Rosenthal and Jacobson in 1968 to Ding and Rubie-Davies in 2019 have demonstrated that expectancy effects are related to teaching and, therefore, student outcomes. Students whose teachers hold high expectations perform better than students whose teachers hold low expectations. Researchers have generated lists and descriptions of educational practices that demonstrate high and low expectations for students. Finally, recent work in this field has shown that it is possible to teach high-expectation behaviors to educators.

**Proposed Intervention**
The proposed intervention is a course that I teach each semester. The course, Introduction to Urban Education, is one of five on a menu of courses Education major undergraduates can choose to fulfill their Intercultural Elective requirement. Introduction to Urban Education’s location within Gorski’s (2009) typology is difficult to pinpoint but probably fits best into Type 3—Teaching with Multicultural Competence. Although communication, tolerance, and cultural sensitivity, which are foundational elements of Type 2—Teaching with Tolerance and Cultural Sensitivity, are vital components of the course, they are building blocks to culturally responsive pedagogy, the focus of Type 3 courses. However, it should be noted that elements of Type 4 courses run throughout the class in the introduction of critical analysis and the examination of systemic influences of power, which are then used to evaluate educational practice in the private religious district connected to the institution. A strand of Type 5 - Teaching as Resistance and Counter-Hegemonic Practice is considered in the portion of the class examining culturally responsive pedagogy but is not the central focus.

The role of the course within the larger mission of the institution should be noted as well. As future teachers in the associated private religious district, the work of teaching is framed as ministry carried out through education. This view places even teaching as a secondary, albeit highly important, goal. All other aspects of the classroom, academic achievement, school culture, and equitable practice are expected results of pursuing the primary work of gospel ministry. This is pertinent in relation to other educational settings where academic outcomes or social justice and educational equity may be the primary focus. In my course at MCTC, the secondary goals are seen as flowing from the primary work of ministry in the classroom.

The primary mission of MCTC is to train teachers for the private religious district connected to the denominational group that operates the college. The past decade has seen the
closure or consolidation of district schools in small towns and the rapid growth in both the size and number of schools in metropolitan areas resulting in a growing number of teaching positions in urban settings. However, the current enrollment of MCTC is approximately 93% White, and the city in which it is located is 95.9% White (United States Census Bureau, 2017). The counties housing schools that are available for clinical placements, including the county in which MCTC is located, are also overwhelmingly White (United States Census Bureau, 2017), affording PSTs little opportunity to experience diverse educational settings or work with students of color. Therefore, the institutional context of the current investigation precludes long-term immersion experiences. However, single-day excursions and simulation activities are available and included in the cultural competency course in which the intervention will take place. The revised version of the Introduction to Urban Education course is the intervention. The revision of the course in response to the intervention literature review consisted of two targeted modules, the first focusing on the examination of the influence of contextual factors on educational outcomes for urban students of color, and the second explicitly training high expectation teaching practices.

**Conclusion**

Given the PSTs demographics at MCTC, a likely placement for an intervention is a course on intercultural competency. I teach the Introduction to Urban Education, which is an ideal setting to address historical contextual factors that affect urban students of color. This knowledge will potentially enable PSTs to make more accurate attributions for student outcomes and the opportunities to overcome challenges. Background contextual knowledge and diverse accounts can demonstrate the capacity of urban students of color as capable learners and influence PSTs’ expectations. The examination of specific practices that communicate high teacher expectations can further bolster the expectations PSTs hold and their ability to
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communicate high expectations in a culturally appropriate manner. This process will be assessed in a mixed-methods approach, looking at both quantitative survey results that contrast student responses prior to and following the intervention in inventories measuring diversity and outcome beliefs as well as attributions for student descriptions. This information will provide a framework for the examination of qualitative data in the form of student reflections and interviews to assess the changes related by students to specific elements of the intervention. The end goal is that participation in the course will result in PSTs expressing high expectations for urban students of color, with the ability to elaborate on why they hold such beliefs and how they will translate those beliefs into action in the classroom.
Chapter 4

Intervention Design Method and Procedure

Needs assessment interviews revealed residential and school segregation or homogeneity as a limiting factor for experience and communication with people of color and deficit descriptions of urban schools and students. Survey results further indicated that PSTs tended to attribute educational and behavioral outcomes to student or parent decisions over school or teacher factors. Therefore, the proposed intervention provided contextual and historical information about urban education so that PSTs could attribute academic and behavioral outcomes for urban students of color with greater accuracy, with the goal of shifting PST expectations for urban students of color. The intervention introduced the role of expectancy effects in education, highlighting the potential impacts of low and high teacher expectations on students. Finally, the intervention further developed high teacher expectations for students by exploring teaching and management practices that demonstrate high expectations in the classroom. Longer-range goals are improved quality of teaching and improved student outcomes in urban schools.

Research Design

The research was conducted as a mixed-methods convergent design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018), employing a pretest-posttest quantitative design and qualitative analysis of student self-reflections. The convergent design can provide a more thorough or well-rounded understanding of the intervention. Data from both strands were collected simultaneously since the investigation took place within a single school semester. A parallel-databases variant was utilized, where the questions and prompts were determined ahead of time. This approach stands in contrast to alternate variations in which the data collected in one strand are utilized to
formulate the research questions or measures for the other strand (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). The parallel-databases setup fits the timeline of the research, where the quantitative strand occurs at the beginning and end of the research in the form of preintervention and postintervention surveys, and the qualitative data are collected throughout the semester. A mixed-methods approach provides the ability to examine aggregate results with the quantitative preintervention and postintervention survey results and focus on individual respondents through qualitative reflection journal data.

A theory of treatment explicates the inputs, outputs, and predicted outcomes of the research (Leviton, 2007). It identifies the POP as well as the treatable condition, the critical inputs, and linkages for expected outputs. The theory of treatment for this project (see Appendix D) outlines the potential impact that PST attributions could have on their expectations for students of color attending urban schools. A summary matrix includes the research questions and measurements related to the constructs identified in the theory of treatment (see Appendix E).

**Process Evaluation**

Working from a constructivist paradigm, simply delivering an educational intervention does not guarantee that all participants will receive it as if it was a carefully measured dose of medication. Rather, students are constructing knowledge and understanding as they interact with the material, with the instructor, and with each other (von Glasersfeld, 2005). Therefore, active engagement as measured by the process evaluation is crucial to effectiveness. Thus, the purpose of the process evaluation is to examine fidelity of implementation, participants’ reactions to the intervention material, and participants’ voices relative to their experience during the intervention.

Process RQ1: What was the participation rate for synchronous discussions/activities?

Process RQ2: What was the completion rate for written assignments?
Process RQ3: How did participants react to the materials, activities, and discussions?

Process RQ4: Do participants feel that their voices are heard during group and class discussions?

**Outcome Evaluation**

The outcome evaluation focuses on two questions related to the content of the intervention modules. The objective of the intervention is to present PSTs historical and contextual factors that have led to the current state of urban education so that they understand that student outcomes are influenced by more than the choices and attitudes of the students. The course material points to external factors as also being related to student outcomes, necessitating evaluation of attribution of locus of causality when considering urban contexts. Equipped with a deeper understanding, PSTs will be able to view urban students of color as capable of learning and can, therefore, hold high expectations for them. Thus, the following research questions structured this evaluation.

Outcome RQ1: To what extent did PSTs’ attributions for students’ educational and behavioral outcomes change from the beginning to the end of the intervention?

Outcome RQ2: How do PSTs describe changes or stability over time (duration of the course) to their attributions for students’ educational and behavioral outcomes?

Outcome RQ3: To what extent did PSTs’ expectations for students’ educational and behavioral outcomes change from the beginning to the end of the intervention?

RQ3a: To what extent did PSTs’ expectations for the efficacy of culturally responsive teaching methods change from the beginning to the end of the intervention?

Outcome RQ4: How do PSTs describe changes or stability over time (duration of the course) about their expectations for students’ educational and behavioral outcomes and expectations for the efficacy of culturally responsive teaching methods?
Outcome RQ5: Did PSTs ascribe different attributions and expectations to traditional school settings and urban educational settings?

**Method**

This study was conducted during the second semester of the 2020-21 school year. The intervention was delivered to education students in an undergraduate course. The course is written as an online hybrid with a weekly face-to-face class session and regular online activities. Given the potential restrictions of the global pandemic, all methods of data collection were conducted online. Participant reflection journals and preintervention and postintervention surveys represent the primary outcomes.

**Context**

The study is set at a private teacher education college in the Midwest operated by a medium-sized religious denomination. MCTC is located in a town of 13,000 people 90 miles from the nearest metropolitan area. The economy of the town is a mix of agricultural, manufacturing, and service industries. Approximately 750 students are enrolled in the institution, 550 of whom are seeking an Education degree. Of the 750 students on campus, more than 700 (93.33%) identify as white, non-Hispanic. Graduates of the education program receive a Bachelor of Science in education and are qualified for state teacher licensure. The mission of the college is to produce workers in the form of teachers, ministers, and staff, for the affiliated denominational school district, which contains 387 early childhood centers, 294 elementary schools, and 28 high schools nationwide, as well as 1270 congregations (Institutional Statistical Report (anonymized), 2018)

**Participants**
The intervention took place within a course taught by the author called Introduction to Urban Education. All PSTs enrolled in the course completed the preintervention and postintervention surveys and the reflection journal activities. However, data were only included from PSTs who consented to participate in the study. Out of a class of 29 students, 23 PSTs consented to participate in the study. Seventeen of the participants were female, and six were male. One participant identified as African American, and one participant identified as Asian American; all other participants identified as White. This constitutes a convenience sample since it is based primarily on accessibility and proximity (Lochmiller & Lester 2015).

**Measures or Instrumentation**

This study evaluated the influence of the intervention on PSTs attributions and expectations. Additionally, participation rates, participant reactions to the material, and perception of voice are included as the process evaluation. This section describes the measures and constructs employed in the study.

**Assignment Completion Database**

The Assignment Completion Database recorded how many students completed each assignment for the course. This addressed both synchronous discussion groups and written assignments (see Appendix G).

**Reflection Journals**

The purpose of the reflection journals is to capture the PSTs’ first-hand accounts of their experiences within the intervention. PSTs responded to specific prompts in the reflection journals (see Appendix F). The journal prompts asked respondents to consider if specific readings, discussions, or activities have changed their views or understandings of urban schools and urban students of color and their expectations for these students. Four written reflections with a general prompt were interspersed throughout the semester to create approximately two-
week intervals between entries when the placement of self-reflection project videos, described below, are considered.

Multiple constructs were addressed using data gathered from the reflection journals. These include process evaluation constructs such as descriptions of how the materials, activities, and discussions made participants feel or how they reacted to them as well as a description of how the ideas, opinions, and questions were acknowledged and incorporated into discussions. The reflection journals also address two important constructs from the outcome evaluation, the attribution of factors that impact academic and behavioral outcomes in urban education and the description of academic and behavioral expectations for urban students of color.

*Preintervention and Postintervention Surveys*

The quantitative preintervention and postintervention surveys addressed three key constructs, attribution of responsibility for academic and behavioral outcomes, culturally responsive teaching outcome expectancy, and expectations of urban students. The three surveys (see Appendices H, I, and J) included an adapted CRTOE survey (Siwatu, 2007), which was introduced in the needs assessment, Teacher Expectations and Perceptions of Students (TES) survey (Rubie-Davies, 2010), and the Behavior Attributions Survey (BAS) (Kulinna, 2008). The three surveys were delivered together using an online form from Qualtrics, and participants completed them as a single unit.

**Culturally Responsive Teacher Outcome Expectancy.** The purpose of the CRTOE was to measure participants’ expectations for the efficacy of culturally responsive teaching methods (See Appendix H). Siwatu (2007) developed the CRTOE to address questions of teacher efficacy in a rapidly diversifying educational environment. As such, the concepts measured in the CRTOE reflect skills and knowledge that are perceptible in culturally responsive educators.
Siwatu concluded that the CRTOE was a reliable measure based on the .95 Chronbach’s alpha for the full 26 item scale. Although no changes were made to the content of the questions in the CRTOE survey (Siwatu, 2007), six questions were omitted to reduce the overall length of the survey. Participants responded to statements based on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Items in the CRTOE survey addressed culturally responsive teaching practices, for example:

- Developing a community of learners when my class consists of students from diverse cultural backgrounds will promote positive interactions between students.
- Revising instructional material to include a better representation of the students’ cultural group will foster positive self-images.

In summary the CRTOE measured the expectations for the efficacy of culturally responsive teaching methods in PSTs at the beginning and end of the intervention.

**Teacher Expectancy Survey.** The purpose of the TES was to measure PSTs’ expectations for student characteristics (see Appendix I). Rubie-Davies (2010) described development of the measure, which began with teachers’ describing the actions and characteristics of children they had previously taught. Their responses were used to compile a list of 15 items, which were subsequently used to measure overall teacher expectations. For the present study, that list was reduced to eight items to reduce the overall length of the survey. I added descriptions of two schools to the TES devised by Rubie-Davies (2010) to create two parallel conditions. This allowed for the comparison of participants’ expectations for the two conditions. Both descriptions are written to portray schools in which participants could anticipate serving because of their relationship to the private religious district connected with the college.
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One description depicted a school of average size and typical location for the private religious district with which MCTC is affiliated, referred to as the non-urban condition (NON):

School 1: Peace Lutheran is located in a small city in the Midwest with a population of about 20,000. Peace is considered traditional and has an enrollment of 125 students served by a faculty of 11. The student enrollment is 95% Caucasian, 2% African American and 3% Latino.

The second paragraph described a school of average size and location for the subset of urban schools within the district, referred to as the urban condition (URB):

School 2: Grace Lutheran is located in a large city in the Midwest, the population of the metro area is about 1 million. Grace is considered urban and has an enrollment of 250 students served by a faculty of 20. The student enrollment is 5% Caucasian, 90% African American and 5% Latino. Most families are considered low-income or in poverty and 90% of students receive free or reduced lunch.

Given those two descriptions, participants rated their expectations for students from each school on eight educational categories using a five-point Likert ranging from 1 (well below average) to 5 (well above average). The educational categories were student achievement, cognitive engagement, motivation, classroom behavior, peer relationships, teacher relationships, parent attitudes to school, and homework completion. In summary, the TES measured the expectations that PSTs held for students in a non-urban and an urban educational setting before and after the delivery of the intervention.

Behavior Attribution Survey. The BAS is a three-item survey used to measure attribution of causes for student behaviors. Kulinna (2008) developed the BAS based on work derived from the Physical Education Classroom Management Instrument. Kulinna analyzed the
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most common behaviors and attributions given by educators from the 59 items of the Physical Education Classroom Management Instrument and used the three most common behaviors to create the scenarios for the BAS and the four most frequent attributions as choices for respondents to explain their perception of the behavior. Kulinna’s analysis or the items included in the BAS yielded an internally consistent result using Chronbach’s alpha. For the current study, I provided participants three scenarios of student behavior, such as a student who can’t sit still during lessons, and asked participants to indicate if the source of the behavior is likely related to the student’s family or community, the student, the teacher, the school, or societal context. For each of the three scenarios, participants listed the factor that they thought to be the most likely or primary cause of the behavior and the second most likely or secondary cause of the behavior. They could choose from Family/Community, Student, Teacher, School, or Context.

A category was added to the BAS used by Kulinna (2008) to clarify results. In the original listing of choices (out of school, student, teacher, and school), it was unclear if out of school included societal context. Therefore, out of school was changed to family/community, and Kulinna’s (2008) original definition of family (e.g., parenting skills, one parent family) and community (e.g., drugs, gangs) issues was retained. A fifth choice called context was added, defined as related to contextual factors in society such as segregation, poverty, oppression, or racism.

As each set of student behaviors is matched to one of the school description paragraphs that were introduced in the TES survey, names typically identified as White and Black (Levitt & Dubner, 2014) were included based on the school description (see Appendix J). In the NON condition, the vignettes were connected to a non-urban school, which resembled a majority of schools in MCTC’s associated school district in enrollment and demographics. In the URB
condition, the vignettes were connected to a school description similar to the schools in urban settings in MCTC’s associated district. A single school description was used to establish the NON condition for both the TES and the BAS. That is, participants read the NON description, responded to the NON TES prompts, and then responded to the NON BAS scenarios. The same pattern was then followed with the URB condition, the school description was presented first, then the TES items were followed by the BAS items. Participants read three scenarios in the NON condition and three scenarios in the URB condition and indicated what they believed to be the primary and secondary causes of the behavior, family/community, student, teacher, school, or context. The scenarios in both conditions were identical except for the name of the student and the description of the school. For example: Amy (NON)/Aaliyah (URB) frequently talks during lessons. Sometimes that talking leads to arguing. She regularly interrupts conversations of others.

Participants made a total of six attributions for the NON condition, the most likely cause of the behavior and the second most likely cause of the behavior for each of three scenarios. Participants also made a total of six attributions for the URB condition, which was structured identically. This allowed for a count of how many of the six attributions for each condition were student-related or external to the student. The externality score was derived directly from this count as the total number of external attributions a participant made out of the six possible attributions in each condition with a range of 0-6.

Self-Reflection Project

Participants recorded three videos over the semester, one during the first week of class, another at midterm, and a final at the end of the course (see Appendix K). In the videos, participants considered their views on their own cultural and class identity as well as their interactions with people who share similar characteristics and those from other cultures or levels.
of socio-economic status. Participants commented on their initial remarks during the second and third recordings. Similar to the reflection journals, the self-reflection project addressed constructs from the outcome evaluation, the attribution of factors that impact academic and behavioral outcomes in urban education, and the description of academic and behavioral expectations for urban students of color.

**Procedure**

The intervention was delivered to participants over the span of a semester in an undergraduate college course. Data collection took place throughout the intervention beginning with the preintervention surveys during the first week of the semester, continuing with reflection journal entries or self-reflection videos approximately every two weeks, and ending with the postintervention surveys at the conclusion of the semester with analysis following. All data were collected electronically in compliance with COVID 19 safety protocols.

**Participant Recruitment**

All students enrolled in the intervention course, Introduction to Urban Education, were asked to participate in the research process by a professor other than myself. They were informed that neither participation nor non-participation would affect their grade in the course. Furthermore, any information collected during the semester would be anonymized, and their names would not appear in any research results. All students in the class completed the preintervention and postintervention surveys as well as the reflection journal activities, but information from those activities would only be included in research if participants have given their consent. The participants saw consent text at the beginning of the preintervention and postintervention surveys in addition to their full Informed Consent Form. The Informed Consent Form was delivered via a secure link in an electronic form. The professor delivering the
recruitment script (not myself) instructed students to type their name and the date if they agreed to participate. The electronic form was administered by my administrative assistant. According to institutional records, all possible participants were English proficient.

**Intervention**

The intervention was a semester-long course, Introduction to Urban Education, which was revised based on the research synthesis. The basic progression of the course is Self, Others, and Connect. Participants begin by examining themselves in the context of current American society. They reflect on their race, culture, and class to position themselves in relation to people of different races, cultures, or classes in society. Next, they explore diverse voices from authors, speakers, educators, and students to learn from the perspectives of people from different backgrounds and experiences. Concurrently, PSTs investigate historical factors that have influenced urban schools and affected students of color attending those schools. Finally, aware of the potential distance between themselves and the students they will soon teach, they examine culturally responsive approaches to education to incorporate in their future classrooms. A detailed outline of the course is provided in Appendices L and M, and a sample lesson plan can be found in Appendix N.

Revisions reflecting the intervention literature review are reflected in updates to two modules. The revised modules represent a significant rewrite of the course material based on the literature and intervention review, as represented in Table 4.1 by Sessions 4, 5, and 6. The modules focus on key concepts related to teacher expectations. The modules will take three and four weeks, respectively, with one 75-minute classroom session and 75 minutes of dedicated online interaction each week.
### Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Unit Theme</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Session 1 | Context                                   | Week 1 – What is urban?  
                                      | Week 2 – Demographic Trends                                             |
| Session 2 | Evaluating Locations                      | Week 3 – My Position in Society                                          |
|           |                                           | Week 4 – Attitudes and Stereotypes                                      |
| Session 3 | Race, Ethnicity, Culture, and Class       | Week 5 – Race, Ethnicity, and Culture                                   |
|           |                                           | Week 6 – Cross-Cultural Communication                                   |
| Session 4 | Societal Structures                       | Week 7 – Framing Poverty                                                |
|           |                                           | Week 8 – Historical Settings – Residential and Educational Segregation   |
|           |                                           | Week 9 – Systemic Oppression and Institutional Racism                   |
| Session 5 | Expectations for Urban Education          | Week 10 – Achievement Gap vs. Opportunity Gap                           |
|           |                                           | Week 11 – Attribution Theory and Expectancy Effects                     |
| Session 6 | Attributions and Expectations             | Week 12 – High Expectations Practices                                   |
|           |                                           | Week 13 – Culturally Responsive Pedagogy 1                               |
|           |                                           | Week 14 – Culturally Responsive Pedagogy 2                               |
| Session 7 | Reflection and Wrap-Up                   | Week 15 – Final Reflection                                              |

**Note.** Highlighted Sessions (4-6) represent new material added or adjusted for the intervention modules. Session 4 corresponds to Module 1, Sessions 5 and 6 correspond to Module 2.

### Revised Modules

Module 1 focused on the historical events that have shaped cities and education for urban students of color, with the purpose of underscoring the contextual factors that influence their academic and behavioral outcomes (Milner et al., 2015). Module 1 consisted of three lessons addressing societal structures presented in consecutive weeks: Framing Poverty, Historical Settings—Residential and Educational Segregation, and Systemic Oppression and Institutional Racism.

The first revised module reformatted some existing course material and added new supporting documentation and activities to emphasize the impact of contextual factors on the educational outcomes for urban students of color, as was supported by the research (Han et al., 2015: Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016; Milner et al., 2015; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006).
Because many White, middle-class PSTs have approached academic and behavioral outcomes from a view of individual choices, it was necessary to highlight the impact of context in the dynamic interplay with student agency (Nogura, 2003). This was important specifically to address the relative unfamiliarity with urban settings and limited cross-cultural contact that most PSTs in this setting have experienced. When PSTs have a clear understanding of the historical and political contexts that have shaped the social and educational landscapes of urban settings, they will be able to make better attributions for the outcomes of urban students of color (Milner et al., 2015). Accurate attributions then affect expectations as PSTs learn to reflect to assess how their teaching or classroom conditions impact student outcomes before automatically attributing failure to sources outside of their control, such as student or home (Brady & Woolfson, 2008; Kulinna, 2008). Approaching the classroom with a growth mindset and empowering students with a sense of agency requires high expectations for students’ ability and desire to learn and grow (Dweck, 2008; Saphier, 2016).

It is vital for teachers serving in urban areas to understand the effects of poverty (Milner, 2010). To that end, the revisions included an examination of historical practices that contributed to residential segregation in urban areas, such as Douglas Massey’s (1990) seminal article America Apartheid. PSTs also engaged in an animated activity called the Parable of the Polygons to illustrate how segregation is maintained even through the choices of relatively open-minded individuals. Lessons detailed court cases such as Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka Kansas (1954) and Miliken v. Bradley (1974) that led to the desegregation and eventual resegregation of public schools, respectively. Further readings from Gorski (2008) and Rogalsky (2009) critique prevalent deficit views of low-income families.
The dynamic interaction between people, behaviors, and environment were included through a range of diverse voices. PSTs read and discussed *Between the World and Me* (Coates, 2015) in small groups over the first few weeks of class to expand their views of education and society. Further readings from Kendi’s (2019) *How to be an Antiracist* and Singleton’s (2014) *Courageous Conversations about Race* allowed students to define and describe prejudice and racism in a variety of forms, including personal, structural, and institutional. Finally, PSTs examined cultural interactions with society and education in the writings of Ogbu and Simmons (1998) and Wilson (2010) by focusing on beliefs and attitudes about education in the African American community.

The revision of this module required more than selecting and introducing new content and activities; it also necessitated careful self-reflection on the instructor's part. Teacher Educators need to hold high expectations, looking for the assets that PSTs can bring to the field of education and avoiding a deficit lens that paints all PSTs as biased and unaware because of their background (Lowenstein, 2009). The integration of this module of the intervention also required patience and perception built from relationships with PSTs, taking into account the various background experiences of PSTs. Seidl and Hancock (2011) caution that

[b]ecause they are ignorant of or naïve about the historical and contemporary state of race relations, when negative images of Whites are mirrored back to them through their interactions with people, texts, or theories, they are taken aback. This surprise can be experienced in different degrees of confusion, shame, indignation, fear, and defensiveness. (p.689)
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Guiding PSTs through the development of a mature double image means they must understand how historical contexts frame interactions, requiring White teachers to earn trust and respect from students of color and their families considering the past (Seidl & Hancock, 2011).

It was, therefore, necessary to select content and activities for processing this information with care. Regular reflection and discussion followed key elements to explore changes in beliefs and attitudes. The inclusion of readings, videos, audio, and conversations may have compelled White PSTs to see themselves through the eyes of people of color. This new vision can allow them to anticipate the reactions of the students and parents they might serve in an urban educational setting and to formulate appropriate responses that will foster communication, cooperation, and education (Seidl & Hancock, 2011).

Module 2 began by examining the role of expectancy effects in education and then moved into detailing high expectations teaching and management practices in education in two units over five weeks. The first unit explored expectations for urban education under the topics: Achievement Gap vs. Opportunity Gap, Attribution Theory and Expectancy Effects, and High Expectations Practices. The second unit investigated Culturally Responsive pedagogy over two weeks. Teacher behaviors that demonstrate high and low expectations were examined through case studies and demonstrated in role play.

This portion of the curriculum began with an examination of the racial achievement gap in educational performance. Students participated in collaborative reading and research of such articles as Hart and Risley (2003), Boykin and Noguera (2011), Darling-Hammond, Friedlaender, and Snyder (2014), Cowan Pitre (2014), and Milner (2013) to consider how much of the achievement gap is really an opportunity gap. They demonstrated their understanding of
these concepts through the co-creation of a graphic organizer on the achievement/opportunity gap.

Attribution theorists such as Heider and Weiner were introduced alongside proponents of Expectancy Theory based on the work of Rosenthal (1978), Brophy (1983), and Good and Nichols (2001). Participants worked to apply the principles of attribution theory to the dynamic relationship between teachers and students. As PSTs reflected on the attributions that they made about students and committed to high expectations for all students, they had the opportunity to watch concrete classroom examples. Students watched videos about successful educators from Marva Collins to KIPP school founders Feinberg and Levin and examined footage of teachers to illustrate specific techniques.

The specific application of high expectation behaviors that PSTs at MCTC have experienced may not transfer to other contexts because most of these PSTs come from traditional educational settings in suburban or small towns with homogeneous student populations. For example, Ford and Sassi (2014) posited that the Warm Demander approach, a direct discourse style that exemplifies high expectations, may be perceived as appropriate and no-nonsense in a classroom with primarily African American students but may appear incongruent in other settings. It was also vital that lists of high and low expectation teacher behaviors were presented within the context of the dynamic interplay of attributions made by both teacher and student, noting that some students are especially susceptible to perceived teacher expectations while others demonstrate strong resistance to expectations, high or low (Brophy, 1983; Good & Nichols, 2001).

Finally, participants engaged in an examination of materials about culturally responsive pedagogy. Over the course of several weeks, they synthesized definitions, elaborated practices,
and described structures from a variety of professional articles on culturally responsive pedagogy. Then they collaborated to evaluate the usefulness and appropriateness of culturally responsive practices in the context of the private religious district affiliated with MCTC. Both revised modules featured regular personal reflections, debrief sessions in base groups, as well as class discussions.

Module 1 demonstrated that similar efforts by students could produce different results depending on their context, a concept vital to understanding the equal academic capacity of urban students of color in comparison to their white suburban and rural peers (Noguera, 2003; Skiba, et al., 2005). In other words, understanding that lower academic or behavioral outcomes for urban students of color are not necessarily the result of intellectual or cultural deficits is fundamental to holding high expectations for these students (Milner et al., 2015). As Module 1 demonstrated that high expectations for urban students of color were appropriate, Module 2 supported those expectations by explaining the effects that high and low teacher expectations can have in the classroom and then equipping PSTs with specific skills to demonstrate high expectations in their teaching and management.

Data Collection

The data collected in this study included both quantitative and qualitative sources. The data collection procedures are detailed below.

Assignment Completion Database. At the end of the semester, I exported grade book information to a separate spreadsheet, removing student identifiers. All grades were replaced with an indicator of 1 if the assignment was completed and 0 if the assignment was incomplete.

Reflection Journal. All participants completed multiple reflective journal entries over the course of the semester. Reflection journal entries were exported from Moodle into Word.
documents. I created a folder for each student and placed the document named Written Reflection into the corresponding folder. As described below, a second file titled Video Transcript was also added to the folder before anonymization. My administrative assistant then deleted folders of students who had not agreed to participate and renamed the remaining folders with a tracking number to deidentify the information.

Preintervention and Postintervention Surveys. All participants completed the preintervention surveys during the first week of the class and the postintervention surveys during the final week of the semester. The preintervention and postintervention surveys were conducted via an online survey accessible through a link available only to students enrolled in the course. My administrative assistant deleted responses from students who had not agreed to participate and renamed participants using the same tracking numbers initially employed to deidentify the qualitative data.

Self-Reflection Project. Participants recorded three videos for the self-reflection project. I downloaded the videos and converted them into transcripts using the platform Otter.AI. I then downloaded each transcript, giving it the name Video Transcript and placed it in a folder for the corresponding student. In the same process described above, my administrative assistant then deleted folders for students who had not agreed to participate and renamed the remaining folders with a tracking number to deidentify the information.

Data Analysis

Data analysis included the examination of quantitative and qualitative elements from a database tracking overall assignment completion, participant reflection journals, surveys administered at the beginning and again at the end of the intervention, and a self-reflection project completed by PSTs.
Assignment Completion Database. I exported grade book information to a separate spreadsheet, removing student identifiers. All grades were replaced with an indicator of 1 if the assignment was completed and 0 if the assignment was incomplete. I calculated participation and completion percentage rates for discussion activities and written assignments using Assignment Completion Database information.

Thematic Content Analysis. I used thematic content analysis to code the participant reflection journals and the transcripts from the self-reflection projects. Qualitative analysis is a multistep process of engaging with the data to code for concepts related to the research questions and to identify emergent themes (Miles et al., 2014). The first step in the analysis process was to classify each entry by type and number, such as “First Written Entry” or “Transcript 2”. I used a-priori codes based on the research questions during both the first and second full reads of the data. In the first full read of the written reflection journals and self-reflection project transcripts, I coded the text for sections clearly referencing student voice and responses to the material reflecting two of the process research questions. During a second read, I coded for language that indicated or directly referenced attributions and expectations, the central topics of the outcome research questions. Following the initial full read-throughs, I extracted the coded text for an individual construct, such as participant voice. I then reread all of the extracted text and conducted a round of secondary coding to reflect codes that emerged from the data. I used the secondary codes to develop themes and used the themes to develop a narrative statement. For example, the narrative statement for the research question related to participant voice was:

a) Participants began the course nervous about saying the wrong thing,

b) but the sense of comfort that developed in their small discussion groups made them feel confident discussing the course material.
c) Therefore, they contributed to and learned from discussions with each other.

With a narrative statement in place, I reread the extracted text, sorting the transcript segments according to the narrative statements to develop a response to the research question. This process was repeated to address the process research questions considering student reactions to the course material, activities, and discussions and perceptions of the relevance of student voice in discussions. Additionally, I utilized this analysis process to investigate the PSTs’ attributions of factors that impact academic and behavioral outcomes in urban education beyond the choices or attitudes of students and parents as well as language connected to academic and behavioral expectations for urban students of color addressing outcome research questions 2 and 4, respectively. A coding chart listing the primary and secondary codes and the themes can be found in Appendix O.

**Preintervention and Postintervention Surveys.** I calculated preintervention and postintervention mean scores for the CRTOE and TES surveys and conducted a paired t-test to analyze the change from the preintervention to postintervention. For the BAS survey, I categorized participants’ attributions into student-related factors and broader factors external to the student. Student-related factors included a set of causes that were associated with the student, including the student themselves and the student’s families and culture. Teacher, school, and context were the broader set of factors external to the student. This classification system is supported by literature. Ladson-Billings (2006), for example, makes a similar distinction as she noted that when PSTs and novice teachers do not understand how context, school expectations, and teacher beliefs combine with student behavior to produce results, they tend to blame negative academic or behavioral outcomes on the culture of the student, with culture being broadly defined as influences outside of the teachers’ direct control. I then counted the number of
attribution for each condition that were student-related and the number that were external to the student. The externality score was the total number of external attributions a participant made out of the six possible attributions in each condition with a range of 0-6. The preintervention and postintervention externality scores for the NON and URB conditions were then compared using a Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test to compare the participants’ responses from preintervention to postintervention as well as between the NON and URB contexts.

Statement of Positionality

I am a White male with both a Bachelor’s and a Master’s degree in education. I grew up in a two-parent household to parents who held college degrees. My mother’s degree was in education, and my father’s degree was in both law and divinity. Due to my father’s work as a minister, my family moved every five years on average. This meant that I grew up in central city Milwaukee, suburban New Jersey, and rural areas of Michigan and Wisconsin. During these years, I was sometimes in the minority and other times in the majority, sometimes in relation to race and culture, other times in relation to class and socio-economic status. I spent ten years serving as a teacher and as a principal in urban schools in the city of Milwaukee, and during most of those years, I live in neighborhoods where my students lived. My wife and I also spent a year living in Hangzhou, China, where we taught English at Hangzhou Normal University.

Banks (2016) proposed a matrix in which a cross-cultural researcher is labeled as either indigenous or external and as an insider or outsider. A researcher can be said to be a combination of their status from the two categories. Throughout my life, I have moved back and forth between being indigenous and external and insider or outsider. In my current setting, I classify myself as an indigenous-insider. I match the vast majority of my colleagues and students in race, culture, class, and values. Banks further notes that the indigenous-insider is someone who can
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speak with authority and legitimacy about a community because they are view as an authentic community member. By virtue of my training and my experiences, I can speak with some authority and legitimacy in my setting.

My position brings weaknesses and strengths. As a White, middle-class male, I cannot speak from the perspective of a person of color in this country or in the realm of education. My students read a wide diversity of authors in my course, and I take care in offering interpretations as we explore these texts. Milner (2007) cautions educators against pitfalls when considering issues of race, including color and culture-blind educational research. Rather than avoiding racialized issues, I seek to have my students confront and understand their meaning for education by reading and researching a broad selection of viewpoints from diverse authors and synthesizing that information through discussion. However, I can share my experiences as an educator and administrator in urban schools and as a person who has lived in rural, suburban, urban, and international settings. Furthermore, as an indigenous-insider I may be able to address some specific fears or concerns that my PSTs have. Ford and Sassi (2014) examined the interactions between students and teachers in cross-cultural and same culture settings to describe the qualities of the warm demander approach to education. One of their observations was that teachers from the same cultural background can build on a shared cultural frame of reference with those students. I possess a shared cultural frame with the majority of my students allowing me to build on common understandings and experiences. I explain to students that, in a sense, my course is a semester-long confession of the mistakes I made as a young teacher, and that part of my purpose is to provide the information and training so that they don’t repeat my missteps as beginning teachers. I believe that openness to my past experiences in urban education strengthens my credibility among my students. Examples from my career become vicarious
learning opportunities as students see what to avoid doing and why or successful progress after failure.

There are also strengths and weaknesses inherent in my official roles at MCTC. As an indigenous-insider on the school faculty, I am accepted and command attention. I serve as the Academic Dean of Education and as the Professor of Urban Education. As the Dean, I oversee all academic advising for education students, and I manage the academic progress, which gives me general authority over education students. It is possible that participants agreed to take part in my study, fearing negative effects if they did not or hoping to gain favor if they did. On the other hand, my role as the Dean may lend credibility to my experience and expertise in the field of education. Furthermore, I have input into curricular decisions at an administrative level. I don’t choose specific materials for instruction, but I am able to influence the overall direction specifically as we examine standards related to cultural understanding. Likewise, it is possible that my relation to urban education or perceived attitudes about my beliefs induced PSTs to provide answers that they thought I would want to hear rather than what they actually thought. However, my title as the Professor of Urban Education might also lend credence to the information and lessons I present to students.

I believe that overall, I am in a position to positively influence students without the use of coercion based on my roles or identity. I employ the power inherent in my role as a professor to highlight the importance of culturally responsive teaching so that the PSTs in my class are better prepared to serve diverse student populations. Furthermore, I use methods designed to meet my learners where they are so that they can build on their strengths. My course is structured around regular discussion, both synchronous and asynchronous within discussion forums so that students can wrestle with difficult topics and come to their own understandings and the evaluation of their
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descriptions and analysis is done holistically. I do this while leaving room for honest discussions
and the freedom to disagree. I can speak to many of the experiences that my students have
shared, and I can build on my teaching experiences to train them for service in urban education.
Chapter 5

The purpose of this study was to determine if a course in cultural competency focused on urban education would change the attributions that PSTs make and expectations that they hold educational and behavioral outcomes. It was hypothesized that an in-depth examination of the historical and contextual factors related to urban education would lead to a broader attribution of outcomes in relation to urban settings, including educational and societal factors. It was further hypothesized that participants would develop higher educational expectations as their attributions expanded beyond the narrow focus of the student. In this chapter, I lay out the findings of the research study. This consists of an explication of the process evaluation as well as detailed results of the outcome research questions. Conclusions and discussion follow the results sections, including strengths, limitations, and implications for research and practice.

Process of Implementation

The class convened weekly every Thursday for 15 scheduled sessions; however, week 13 was moved entirely online with no synchronous meeting due to campus Arbor Day activities. Class sessions consisted of a 75 minute block period of synchronous activity and an additional 75 minutes of asynchronous activity in online discussions, readings and activities. In preparation for teaching the course Introduction to Urban Education course, I divided enrolled students into small discussion groups. I intentionally created heterogeneous groups using directory information to distribute students by major, year, and gender. Every class session, following a brief introduction to objectives and agenda, the first five minutes was dedicated to a small group check-in. The check-in allowed participants to discuss their progress on coursework and to connect and learn about each other on a personal level. Each check-in session followed a similar pattern, in which group members assessed themselves on four predetermined topics: how they
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did on their assignments for the course from the previous week; how school was going for them overall in terms of sleep, health, exercises and activities; and finally a brief personal question such as their favorite food or least favorite job. Class sessions typically began with a review of the previous weeks’ assignments so that we could clarify any remaining questions and connect the work to previous learning. Next, we took time to discuss chapters from the assigned texts and again to make connections to previous lessons. Most of the class time, approximately 45 minutes, was devoted to a major activity such as reading a variety of articles from opposing positions and talking through the viewpoints first in small groups and then as a class. Finally, to close the class session, students used about five minutes to reflect on their learning in a written summary in their notes.

All regular assignments were available through and submitted to the course page on Moodle. Participants wrote or recorded reflections approximately every two weeks. Self-Reflection project videos were due at the end of weeks 1, 8, and 14, and written Reflection Journal entries were interspersed, due at the end of weeks 2, 4, 6, and 10. Students completed the preintervention surveys at the beginning of the second class session and took the postintervention surveys at the beginning of the final class session of the semester.

Findings

This section details the research findings, first responding to process research questions to examine implementation and student reaction, and next addressing the outcome research questions to look at the outcomes of the intervention. The analysis of qualitative data from participant reflection journals and transcripts of self-reflection project entries includes extensive quotations. Since these entries were turned in according to the course calendar, I have listed the
submission dates here rather than including the dates in each of the individual citations (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.1
Chronological Listing of Reflection Journal and Self-Reflection Project Entry Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Citation Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2021</td>
<td>Self-Reflection Project Entry 1</td>
<td>(Transcript 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/11/2021</td>
<td>Reflection Journal Entry 1</td>
<td>(First Written Entry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/2021</td>
<td>Reflection Journal Entry 2</td>
<td>(Second Written Entry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11/2021</td>
<td>Reflection Journal Entry 3</td>
<td>(Third Written Entry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/2021</td>
<td>Self-Reflection Project Entry 2</td>
<td>(Transcript 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/2021</td>
<td>Reflection Journal Entry 4</td>
<td>(Fourth Written Entry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4/2021</td>
<td>Self-Reflection Project Entry 3</td>
<td>(Transcript 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process Evaluation

The process evaluation is a systematic evaluation of the design and delivery of an intervention (Rossi et al., 2019). The process evaluation for this study focused broadly on participant engagement. Specifically, the process research questions examined the rates of participation in activities and discussion, and the rates of completion of assignments; the participants' response to the materials, activities, and discussions; and participants’ perception of whether their voice was heard within the course.

Participation and Completion Rates

Information collected in the Assignment Completion Database provided answers to the first and second process research questions regarding participation and completion rates, respectively. Participation in discussions and activities and completion rates for assignments were extremely high throughout the semester. Out of 32 total entries comprising all recorded activities and assignments in the Assignment Completion Database (see Appendix G), 22 had rates of 100% participation or completion, and another nine had rates of less than 100% but more than 85%. Only one activity was below 85% participation.
Each of the 15 class sessions featured at least one synchronous discussion or activity. I gauged active participation by monitoring the discussions and observing the notes produced in shared documents that served as group workspaces (See Appendix P). Effectively, the only indicator of non-participation for class discussions and activities was absence from class. A total of 13 discussions and activities were recorded in the Assignment Completion Database. Nine of these discussions or activities took place while all students were in attendance for the class session, and Group Workspace notes support full participation. A further three discussions or activities show full participation of all students who were in attendance, but on days with less than full attendance, but greater than 85% attendance. During one class session, class attendance was only 83%, dropping the effective participation rate in the activity below the 85% threshold.

All written assignments and student submissions were turned in electronically on Moodle, the college’s online course management software. I included online discussion forums in this category. Completion of written assignments, including online discussion forums, was similarly high. Nineteen written assignments were considered in the Assignment Completion Database. Thirteen were completed by 100% of the participants, and another six were completed by 97% of the participants.

**Participant Response to Materials, Activities, and Discussions**

Responses from reflection journals and self-reflection project entries were used to answer the third process research question, which asked how participants reacted to the materials, activities, and discussions in the intervention course. Discussions on the topics of race and class in education can challenge PSTs’ assumptions. Since the material, activities, and discussions involved challenging topics, an important part of the process evaluation was to gauge participant responses. The course material evoked a strong reaction in numerous participants. Many of them
commented on how much of the information was new to them. However, exposure to new material promoted growth in understanding of previously known but little understood concepts, leading to a greater depth of knowledge and, in some cases, a shift in perception. The following sections detail participant responses that illustrate the process of growing awareness and perception.

**New Information.** In Reflection Journal entries and Self-Reflection Project transcripts, participants regularly commented on how much of the course material was new to them, sometimes even questioning why they hadn’t been taught this information in earlier levels of education. For example, as the class explored voluntary and involuntary minorities in America, 04M commented, “I hadn’t encountered material like this before, and this continued the theme of these three weeks as we began and continued our look on poverty and how that affects how we are one day going to teach in urban settings” (04M, Fourth Written Entry). The new material presented in class was not automatically accepted, and students were encouraged to read critically and carefully question what they read. A reflection from 02F demonstrated initial wariness that grew into a willingness to consider new ideas over time. “Going into this class, I was not sure how I would respond to the materials. But after just a few weeks of Intro to Urban Education, I am invested. I want to learn more about what urban education is and how I can reach out to others in that setting” (02F, Second Written Entry).

Several students connected their limited exposure to their personal geography. For instance, 05F stated, “Coming from rural areas of small towns I was never exposed to this history and viewpoint” (05F, First Written Entry). A comment from 07F also touched on separation of place, saying:

---

2 Participant identification codes were inserted during the anonymization process of data analysis. Each participant was randomly assigned a number and the letter indicates gender.
I was unsure. I had no idea what I was really talking about. I didn't have the background understanding. I didn't have the history, understanding of race and culture and diversity in our country and how that all plays into our daily lives. I was unaware. I really had no idea what was going on in our cities. (07F, Transcript Three)

19F ventured the supposition that what she learned in the course would not have been available elsewhere. “So I think this course is good for me just in the fact that it's exposed me to a lot of things that I would never be exposed to” (19F, Transcript Two). These results relate to one of the key findings of the needs assessment study that PSTs’ places of origin gave them limited exposure to racial or cultural diversity.

Finally, there was an emotional reaction to the fact that the course material was new to many of the participants. One of the strongest responses for a number of participants is summed up well by a quote from 10F, “My initial reaction to it all is: ‘Why haven't I learned all of this before?? Everyone needs to know this all’” (10F, First Written Entry). Participants quickly realized that the course material was new but important for their future role as teachers, as evidenced by the following supposition from 14F, “Personally, I think this class should be a requirement for all teachers (and pastors)” (14F, Fourth Written Entry). In many cases, what they termed as new was actually new detail filling in a preexisting but vague mental outline of race and culture in America. In most instances, the new course material gave them a deeper understanding of the factors that differentiate urban education from their more traditional school experiences.

**Growth in Understanding.** Participants quickly related this new information to their background knowledge, promoting growth in understanding. They frequently referred to the materials as “eye-opening” indicating their surprise at encountering historical information they
had not previously known. Despite being unfamiliar with many of the concepts presented in the intervention, participants neither accepted material unquestioningly nor did they reject it out of hand. Instead, they wrestled with the new ideas and connected them to their background knowledge. To support the process of metacognition, I provided the example of a large puzzle. I encouraged students to picture their knowledge as a puzzle. If they believed that the puzzle was complete, there would be no place to add new pieces. However, if they acknowledged that their previous years of schooling had only given them enough information to put together the border of the puzzle and maybe a few key features, they would always be looking for where to fit new pieces of information into their existing mental structures. In reflecting on the puzzle example, 18F made a connection to her understanding of culture:

The puzzle analogy that was shown in class really made this mindset stand out to me. Without a doubt, I would characterize myself as someone who has a wide-open door waiting to learn more about what is meant by urban. Through discussion and article readings, I see it as a positive to have a growth mindset in regards to something that is unknown to me. Filling the puzzle with new pieces of understanding is how we can begin to see a new perspective of life in regards to culture. (18F, Second Written Entry)

As the class read articles and engaged in discussions of White privilege, students came to understand this idea through their own experiences. Referring to the article *Unpacking the Backpack of White Privilege* (McIntosh, 1995), 10F explained mental reconciliation this way:

After reading about it, I now understand that having white privilege doesn't mean that everything is handed to me on a silver plate. It means that I have had advantages because of my race and haven't had to face unpleasant/horrible experiences that people of color have. It means I have the privilege of my skin tone and heritage being the norm. I have
the privilege of having fewer obstacles in the path to success. It's really difficult to see that unless you are able to hear/read about other people's experiences and give yourself time to think about it. It's not an easy thing to come to a conclusion to either. We like to think that all our success in life is because of the work of our own hands. But it's not. And realizing it doesn't help us recognize our privilege as white people. (10F, Second Written Entry)

The discussion of race and racism was central to the course, and again, although students knew of the topic, many and not previously reflected on their understandings of the issue. Several students explained that they had been taught about racism as a historical concept and were surprised at its contemporary pervasiveness. In response to a podcast detailing the closing of a school and the subsequent relocation of the mostly Black student body to a mostly white district, 04M said:

[W]hat just took me off guard was the parents talking at that board meeting about what would happen to their white students if integration occurred and black students were allowed in their school district, and just the evil assumptions that were jumped to right away. It really opened my eyes too, that these feelings are still around in this country and are still present. (04M, Transcript 2)

An observation from 09F typified the dawning understanding of racial issues and summarized her overall development, “I believe that awareness of racial justice in me has grown. I didn't realize how injustice worked in America, I had no idea and so I'm more aware of the problems our country faces” (Transcript 2).

Although some commented that the course content forced their attention outside their comfort zone, 07F’s remarks reflect the prevailing attitude towards that discomfort:
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So, reflecting back on my initial self-reflection, I can see the growth that I've made. In my thinking and thought process, I stressed before that I really wanted to get uncomfortable and to learn more about race in urban settings and all the factors that make these topics so touchy. I can probably say I have learned and grown and been uncomfortable in these, like in the best way.” (07F, Transcript 3)

Whether or not the process was comfortable, participants grew in their understanding of key concepts such as White privilege, factors that contribute to poverty, and racism. The growth was explicitly connected to the materials provided in the course and, in some cases, also prompted shifts in perception.

Shift in Perception. Participants grew in their understanding of ideas central to the course, and for a majority of the students, this included not only adding to what they already knew but also a shift in what they believed. Already in the second week of class, students were reconsidering their long-held views of the world. 05F and 08F provide two examples of this thinking that are representative of remarks made by many of the participants. 05F made the following comments in reference to the assigned course material, “I really enjoy the readings we have for this class. They are hard for me to read because they lead me to question much of my childhood education” (05F, First Written Entry). 08F indicated that the materials had led her to question her egocentric point of view, “This class has already showed [sic] me how important it is to take a step back and view the world from another's perspective” (08F, First Written Entry). These remarks, denoting active reflection on beliefs leading to a shift in perception, are typical of the reflections made by many of the PSTs.

Participants reported perceptual changes in relation to White privilege, race, and urban education. For instance, 10F remarked that “the discussion of white privilege has contained a
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LOT of new information and allowed me to look at it from a different perspective.” (10F, Second Written Entry). 05F related that she had grown up in a low-income household and had therefore not believed that she had experienced any sort of privilege in her life. Following readings and discussions on the topic, she commented, “Reading these articles made me realize that although I have had some rough issues in my life I was still able to unintentionally reap the benefits of white privilege” (05F, Second Written Entry). One student, 10F, felt that her new perspectives were so important to her future career that after only two weeks, she opined:

   Personally, I think this class should be a requirement for all teachers (and pastors). Even though it has only been 2 class periods, I have learned so much and gained new perspective on how to look at the city, census data, and social issues regarding race. It's so insightful to have another lens to look at life and people through.” (10F, First Written Entry)

A shift in perspective allowed participants to reframe their views on education and urban schools. 19F made a personal application to her upcoming graduation and setting in which she might soon serve:

   I think going forward, my biggest thing is, I was terrified to be put into an urban school before this course. And now, I mean, it would be a big change for me, because I've never lived in a big city, but I'm not terrified of it, I would actually embrace the challenge, it would be a big curve for me to learn. But I know how to handle it. Now, I feel so much more confident. I know so much more about, you know, the backgrounds of other types of people from different nationalities and cultures. (19F, Fourth Written Entry)

The PSTs who participated in the intervention course were exposed to new concepts and perspectives through the materials, activities, and discussions. Most of them embraced the
process of learning and grew in their understandings of complex issues related to urban education, even when it caused cognitive dissonance. Many of the participants described change beyond just learning more about what they already knew and pronounced a shift in perception in key areas related to this study. This demonstrates a response of active engagement with the materials, activities, and discussions. Williams and Conyers (2016) warn of the need for faculty preparation to discuss race with undergraduate students, because of the tendency for important issues to be ignored, or for students to disengage from study. Considering the charged nature of current discussions of race and culture in education, it was possible that students could have accepted or rejected the course materials without much comment or discussion. However, participants engaged in a meaningful way to consider the concepts presented in the course, as shown in the findings above.

**Participant Voice**

Responses from reflection journals and self-reflection project entries were used to answer the fourth process research question, which asked whether participants felt that their voices were heard during group and class discussions. Reflection journal prompts specifically asked participants, “Did you feel that your voice or point of view was heard during group and class discussions (synchronous or discussion forum)?” The direct mention of this construct led to regular comments from almost all participants throughout the intervention. Participants began the course nervous about saying the wrong thing and experienced initial hesitancy interacting about the course topics, but the sense of comfort that developed in their small discussion groups made them feel confident discussing the course material. Therefore, they contributed to and learned from discussions with each other.
From Initial Hesitancy to Comfort. Given the charged nature of political discourse in the United States of America, it is no surprise that many participants expressed hesitancy to discuss issues of race and class in small groups of people they were mostly meeting for the first time. 14F shared an optimistic concern about the good intentions of her groupmates, explaining, “I felt like I made the points I wanted to and also had good responses to others' replies. I just hope everyone went into it with an open mind and listened to everyone's opinions” (14F, First Written Entry). Participants also recognized the potentially volatile nature of discussing politicized issues. 06M phrased his acknowledgment of this dynamic in stark terms:

In many respects, this class feels like walking through a minefield. The amount of time I have put into assignments for this class, including this journal entry, is more than I expected. I’ve read and reread my lines multiple times to ensure I don’t craft something that can be readily taken out of context. (06M, First Written Entry)

On the other hand, 01F considered the charged nature of the topics with optimism towards her group “I am not afraid to voice my opinion in whole-class discussions, and my group is phenomenal. I can ask "touchy" questions, and they can give their insight without any judgment” (01F, First Written Entry). In a course designed around student discussion, a refusal to talk or fear of participation would be disastrous. Even though many students began with some trepidation, they warmed to their groups as they got to know one another.

Despite some hesitancy to discuss challenging topics, most participants quickly expressed comfort in sharing with and listening to their groups. 02F commented that she “enjoyed being able to express this thought and have the opportunity to hear my other classmates express their similar thoughts and ideas” (02F, First Written Entry), a thought echoed by 08F, who said, “I have appreciated hearing viewpoints that are different than my own in a space that is safe. Many
of the discussions we've had need to be talked about” (08F First Written Entry). Furthermore, the extension of interest on the part of group members encouraged 02F in intellectual growth, “My classmates seemed interested in what I had to say and helped me to extend my thinking about the topic” (02F, Second Written Entry). The group cohesion that developed throughout the course led to thoughtful and open discussions allowing participants to grow in their understanding of the material beyond just completing the readings or writing assignments.

From Comfort to Contributions and Learning. Following initial hesitancy and a growing sense of comfort, participants consistently remarked how productive group discussions were, especially in later entries, as they contributed to and learned from discussions with each other. They moved from a reluctance to voice opinions to regularly listening to others and expressing their thoughts as their voices were heard. Discussions took place synchronously in small groups of three or four and in online discussion forums in groups of seven or eight. Students characterized discussions in both formats as useful for learning and growth. The inclusion of two discussion formats allowed for students to participate at their own level of comfort, both those who were ready with verbal comments and those who preferred to think through a response and type it out, such as 02F, who shared:

Forum discussions helped me to feel heard and allowed me to express my thoughts on the subject. In class, we moved through lots of different materials at an upbeat pace, so I felt it a bit harder to be learning all this new information, process it, and then express my thoughts and hear ideas from others of different backgrounds in the class. (02F, Fourth Written Entry)
Ultimately, participants reflected that the discussions, either synchronous or as discussion forums, were powerful and enjoyable avenues for learning and growth. Perhaps the most emotional reflection on voice came from one of the self-reflection transcripts as 07F shared:

We had lots of discussions, all of the written forum discussions have really made me think, some of them I definitely got a little heated … but there were some aspects of the questions that I felt very passionately about, and I was able to express myself and not feel stunted, or unable to share my thoughts and feelings with the people in those groups. And I was able to ask other people questions, and see how they were thinking and consider how different people from different backgrounds share, or differ in their thoughts and feelings. (07F Transcript 3)

Participants engaged in regular discussions during the course, synchronously in small groups and in online discussion forums. This allowed them to feel that their voices were consistently heard. Although a number of the students approached initial discussions cautiously, trust and comfort soon developed among group members. Not only did participants feel that their voices were heard, the sense of security, especially among the small synchronous discussion groups, led to open discussion and debate, which the students cited as a key to their growth in understanding over the course of the semester.

Although the research questions about participant response to materials, activities, and discussions and student voice are process questions, they overlap with and support the outcome research question findings. It was important to establish that the participants were engaging with the material, the equivalent of taking their medications regularly in a medical trial. But their responses go beyond demonstrating that they read and participated and also show changing perceptions in their views on race and racism, privilege, and urban education. Similarly, it was
essential to demonstrate that PSTs felt that their voices were heard in synchronous and online discussions, and reflections from this theme show that frequent and open discussions led to growth and understanding. Strictly speaking, these results are supplemental to the process research questions, but they serve to detail PTSs’ level of participation and support themes developed in the sections on attribution and expectation.

Summary of Process Evaluation

The process evaluation was designed to systematically evaluate the design and delivery of the intervention. Specifically, the process research questions examined the rates of participation in activities and discussion, and the rates of completion of assignments; the participants' response to the materials, activities, and discussions; whether participants felt that their voice was heard. Participant engagement was high with respect to all research questions. Participants completed the vast majority of assignments and participated in activities when they were present for class sessions. Furthermore, they reported that their perceptions on factors central to the course shifted through their active engagement with the reading, activities, and discussions. Finally, participants declared that not only were their voices heard, but their contributions to active discussion were instrumental to their growth in learning. In summary, participants actively engaged in the intervention throughout its delivery.

Preservice Teacher Attributions for Educational and Behavioral Outcomes

To address the first and second outcome research questions regarding participant attributions, I examined the results of the preintervention and postintervention surveys and the comments that participants made in their reflection journal and self-reflection projects. A significant result in the quantitative data indicates that PSTs’ attributions regarding educational and behavioral outcomes in urban settings changed from the beginning to the end of the
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intervention. Qualitative data support the quantitative findings and provide evidence to support an understanding of these changes.

Attributional Change in the Behavioral Attribution Survey

Much of human understanding and reaction to surroundings is based on the attribution of causes, the conclusions the people draw about the world around them (Heider, 2020). The behavioral attributions that teachers make about their students can influence the actions they take to address student behavior (Kulinna, 2008). I used the BAS to address the first outcome research question, which asked if PSTs’ attribution of educational results changed from the beginning to the end of the intervention. The BAS presented statements describing behavioral issues in an educational setting. Participants indicated which factors they thought were the most and second most likely causes of the behavior from the following list: Family/Community, Student, Teacher, School, or Context. The responses Family/Community and Student were considered student-related, and the responses Teacher, School, and Context were considered external to the student. Participants made a total of six attributions for the NON condition, indicating the most likely and second most likely causes of the behavior for each of three scenarios. Participants also made a total of six attributions for the URB condition, which was structured identically. This allowed for a count of how many of the six attributions for each condition were considered student-related and how many were external to the student. The results of preintervention and postintervention attributions are displayed in Figure 5.1. In all three scenarios for both the NON and URB conditions, the percentage of external attributions is greater in the postintervention responses than in the preintervention surveys.
The externality score was derived directly from the count as the total number of external attributions a participant made out of the six possible attributions in each condition with a range of 0-6.

Figure 5.1. The percentage of responses by scenario that were considered student-related (Family/Community, Student) and external to the student (Teacher, School, Context) in the preintervention and postintervention surveys. The top panel displays results from the scenarios connected to the description of a non-urban school. The bottom panel displays the results of scenarios identical except for student names, and connected to the description of an urban school.
To examine changes in participants’ attributions, I conducted a Wilcoxon signed ranks test. This test is appropriate for the non-parametric comparison of two related samples. In the URB condition, participants made more external attributions in the post intervention surveys. In the NON condition, participants postintervention externality scores were higher ($M = 2.42, SD = 1.31$) than at preintervention ($M = 2.00, SD = 0.75$), but not at a statistically significant level ($Z = -1.038, p = .229$). In the URB condition, participants also reported higher postintervention externality scores ($M = 2.68, SD = 1.16$) than at the preintervention, and this difference was statistically significant ($M = 2.11, SD = 0.74$); $Z = -2.35, p = .025$. In summary, participants made more external attributions in the postintervention surveys for both the NON and URB conditions; however, the increase in externality was only significant for the URB condition. These findings will be explored further within the participants' reflections during the semester.

Statistics for the externality score are presented in Table 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preintervention Survey</th>
<th>Postintervention Survey</th>
<th>z(19)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS NON</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS URB</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Three participants did not provide replies for the preintervention Behavioral Attribution Survey leaving to only 19 usable responses. Only entries with a complete response, in the preintervention and postintervention survey were included in the comparison analysis.

Attributional Change in the Participant Reflections

Participant reflections provided further detail on the topic of attributions, adding weight to and helping us understand the quantitative results. Analysis of the qualitative results also served to address the second outcome research question related to the quality of the change to the attributions PSTs make for educational results for students of color attending urban schools. In written reflection journals and the transcripts of self-reflection project videos, participants
described that they were unaware of their attributions, which were often based on unexamined beliefs about American society. However, even in early entries, they also explained that the course material presented new information for them to consider, often moving them to emotional responses as they reflected. Therefore, they included historical and societal factors in their attributions about students of color in urban settings, and in some cases, expressed a desire to make changes in society through education. The qualitative findings described changes over time to the attributions participants make for educational results for students of color attending urban schools and support the quantitative findings above.

**New Awareness.** Most of the PSTs were unaware of the attributions that they made about students of color in urban settings. They explained that they had rarely, if ever, considered their beliefs or questioned their origins. The following reflection responses are representative of sentiments expressed by a majority of participants. Commenting on urban communities, 14F said, “I haven't had the opportunity before this to learn much about it in school or in my life” (14F, First Written Entry). Similarly, 07F explained, “I really had no idea [redlining] was even a thing, and it just boggles my mind that that's not common knowledge, and we haven't really changed it even though we've seen the damage it has done” (07F, Transcript 3). Building on the theme of new awareness, several participants explained that their understanding was challenged by the course material as it revealed misconceptions and shallow understanding. Only in reflecting over time did they realize that they were not as well informed as they had previously assumed. For example, 01F shared that, “For race and culture, I thought, I knew a lot more than I actually do” (01F, Transcript 2). 09F expressed this awareness, explaining, “What I believed before is nothing like what I believe now, and the things that I thought I knew are nothing like what they actually are” (09F, Transcript 3). One participant, 19F, put it bluntly, saying, “I was
actually thinking about this last night, as I remembered my first video, I watched it, I had no idea about anything” (19F, Transcript 3). The quotes above align with the findings from the third process research question, which indicated that participants experienced a shift in perception in response to the course materials, activities, and discussions.

The PSTs’ new awareness often started with self-reflection and for many students, understanding their own relative position in society was a prerequisite to understanding the impacts of race and class on other people. 17M’s new self-awareness led him to connect concepts that he had previously reserved for others to his own life. He commented on the differences in immigration policy over time, reflecting, “Those articles opened my eyes to things I hadn't thought of before such as how my ancestors never had to prove that they were white and had the right to be citizens” (17M, Second Written Entry). Considering new awareness of intercultural communication, 06M mused, “When you’re immersed and raised in a single culture it can be difficult to examine it from the point of view of someone outside the culture” (06M, Third Written Entry). Group discussions also revealed a self-proclaimed ignorance on key topics, such as 09F’s realization that some people’s perceptions of the police were different than hers, explaining, “I remember being SHOCKED when [an African American classmate] told his story about his fear of the police. I have never been afraid of getting pulled over in that way, and I cannot imagine what it must be like” (09F, Second Written Entry). Discussion spurred new awareness of attributions, leading 12F to comment, “The idea that black students don't get to see people of their own race and culture in charge has really stayed with me … I've known the fact before but discussing it with classmates really made it stick with me” (12F, Third Written Entry). Understanding their position in society relative to marginalized groups supported PSTs as they considered factors related to those differences.
When they reflected on where their beliefs and assumptions had come from, PSTs cited family, media, and location. After reviewing her initial self-reflection video, 22F said, “I really began to think about where my views came from, and I realized that a lot of them came from my parents, as I mentioned before. But now the way I see things is much differently” (22F, Transcript 2). Following a class discussion on crime, 19F examined the origins and impact of stereotypes:

So, I don't think that crime is necessarily associated with African Americans or Mexicans. I think that's definitely a stereotype that the media and those kind of things place on them. You know, we see so many more things because of the social media and TV. And sometimes people only show what they want to show. (19F, Transcript 1)

Others included their hometown geography as a factor in their previously limited understanding, such as 04M, who explained, “where I live, worked as a teen, and went to school was predominantly white, … this has shaped my beliefs or modeled them in a way where I haven't been immersed really in culture or a big city” (04M, Transcript 1). Participants had been unaware of the attributions they made about urban settings and people of color, and their assumptions and their origins had been unexamined until reflecting on this theme during the intervention.

New Information. The course material and discussions presented PSTs with new information to consider, often moving them to emotional responses as they reflected on what they had learned. Much of this information allowed participants to gain a deeper perspective on the challenges faced by people of color, specifically leading to issues in urban education. The book *Between the World and Me* made a deep impression on many students, such as 02F, who contrasted the author’s experience with her own, “I saw how differently they were raised. The
narrator is telling his son all the precautions he had to take in order to stay safe… It opened my eyes to see how different his background was than mine” (02F, First Written Entry). 21F described gaining empathy from reading the book, explaining:

I tried to step into the author's shoes, and he made it very easy to see where he was coming from. I have never experienced discrimination because of my skin color, and I never want to. I never want anyone to feel the way the author is describing his feelings.

(21F, Second Written Entry)

Numerous other readings elicited an emotional response from participants as they learned more about American history and the diversity of experiences in society. This included expressions of sadness, such as those from 09F who stated, “Learning about this creates a deep sadness for what people went through and I only hope that I can be a part of the change” (09F, First Written Entry). However, the expression of emotion alone does not denote a change in attribution but seems to have been another important component leading towards attributional change. As PSTs moved from unawareness to a realistic sense of their relative place in American society, the unease related to racial disparity prompted a self-questioning.

Discomfort caused by new information led PSTs to question their beliefs and actions. 08F examined her interactions with people, explaining that an article challenged her “to check my thoughts and attitude in regards to people different than me. Subconsciously am I treating others differently than white people? I think it is difficult to admit, but I must be honest with myself” (08F, Second Written Entry). Likewise, 10F reflected on the value of diverse perspectives, commenting, “It's really difficult to see that unless you are able to hear/read about other people's experiences and give yourself time to think about it. It's not an easy thing to come to a conclusion to either” (10F, Third Written Entry). Furthermore, participants were able to begin
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framing this new information in terms of education. 16F’s comments consider a society in which the standards and norms reflect the White majority, “I also still am unsettled by the idea that some kids already expect that they will one day get into trouble because of their appearance/being” (16F, First Written Entry). As readings called into question the nature of the achievement gap, 04M responded, “These readings changed my view and opened my eyes to the idea of the achievement gap and opportunity gap… and how that affects how we are one day going to teach in urban settings” (04M, Fourth Written Entry). 18F expressed a comparable understanding of the relationship between educational experiences and opportunities, saying, “Through discussion and reading regarding the topic of the achievement gap, I have thought more about how experiences influence opportunities” (18F, Fourth Written Entry). The new and diverse information provided by course readings and discussions prompted participants to questions their beliefs and actions, opening them to new perspectives.

Although many participants were unaware of the attributions they made about people of color and urban education, exposure to new material often coincided with an emotional response and self-assessment on how they see the world. This then prompted PSTs to change their perspectives to include historical and societal factors in their attributions about students of color in urban settings, including a stated desire to make changes through education. Exposure to new information and reflection led participants to include historical and societal factors in their attributions to urban education outcomes. Furthermore, the change in attributions is concurrent with expressed desire to further equity through education. The relevancy of this point will be explored in a later section on expectations.

**Broadening Attributions.** The PSTs had previously attributed racial disparity in societal and educational outcomes to work ethic or culture. Over time they began to include other factors
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such as segregation, discrimination, and government policy. 02F, for example, described her
dawning realization that “these stereotypes do not define the people or where they come
from…they are not lazy …[t]hey are invested, but also have a life that they are trying to survive
and support their families” (02F, Fourth Written Entry). Participants incorporated what they had
learned about the history and structure of racism in America into their viewpoints. For 12F, it
was revelatory that racial issues of the past still reverberate in modern society, as she describes
here, “It was really interesting to see how much the past ideas of segregation and race have stuck
around without us really even being conscious of it” (12F, Third Written Entry). 11F likewise
recognized contemporary racism, citing an essay that “shows how hidden racism is still thriving,
which is heartbreaking to learn” followed by the introspection “and I wonder, have I done similar
things to black people?” (11F, Second Written Entry). Growing recognition that racism still
exists and produces effects changed the way that many participants viewed society. Over
multiple entries, 04M demonstrated a broadening attribution explaining his belief that “White
cultural norms and whiteness are so involved in our society that most times we turn a blind eye,
especially if we are not a person of color” (04M, Second Written Entry). He later expanded this
notion stating that he “finally saw the other side of the coin, and how people of color have really
been mistreated in this world and the implications that came from this housing segregation that
still are alive in some of our cities in America” following with the thought “I believe that white
people do have a responsibility to the change that is going to happen in America to the
mistreatment that has happened [sic]” (04M, Transcript 2). New awareness and information
allowed participants to broaden their attributions to include historical and contemporary racism
as a factor in urban educational outcomes.
As PSTs grew to recognize that segregation and racism weren’t only historical issues but also current maladies, they included these factors in their attributions for societal and educational disparities for students of color. 18F described her change in understanding and attribution, declaring, “my thoughts have begun to stem more from my awareness of diversity and its presence in the life of many individuals” (18F, Transcript 2). Most students related their broadening attributions to the realm of education. In a statement typical to participant reflections, 07F connected residential and school segregation to disparate educational opportunities, explaining, “I was shocked to read about redlining and school segregation and desegregation programs. And the history is startling, yet ultimately makes our present age makes so much more sense…because I can understand the background from which they’re coming” (07F, Transcript 2). Participant responses also indicated that their attributions included institutions. Referring to redlining and other state-endorsed segregation, 09F implicated the government as a responsible party as she posed the following question, “I wonder what steps the government could take to fix the economy and living situations of those affected by the past?” (09F, First Written Entry). 07F included unfair housing practices in her attributions of why certain areas of the city are underserved and under-resourced. “I now know about the history [of] redlining and civil rights movements, and how our government has shaped the way our cities look” (07F, Transcript 3). Finally, 09F linked historical acts to present injustice, explaining that she now understood the “history behind all of these cultural differences and these racial injustices that are now today and where they came from in our history and how they can be traced back to the decisions that were made by the government” adding that “the growth that I have seen, I believe is tremendous. I am very passionate about this topic now” (09F, Transcript 3). Participants saw how historical acts
frame contemporary society and that racism still exists and included these ideas in their attributions for educational outcomes, a fact that led many to declare a desire to act.

Desire for Action. PSTs developed broader and more accurate attributions for educational outcomes in urban settings. Moved by this deeper understanding of racial injustice, that disparities in urban education are not simply personal or cultural failings; they expressed an aspiration to take action through continued learning and in their future roles as educators. I believe this is a connection point between a change in attributions, what participants believed about the causes of disparity in urban education, and the expectations they held for students in urban settings. As I will discuss in a later section on expectations, high teacher expectations are connected to action, specifically, the methods teachers use to communicate their high expectations for students (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968, Rubie-Davies, 2019). For example, regarding his future role as a teacher, 04M declared, “We cannot have a level of ignorance when it comes to other people's cultures” (04M, Third Written Entry). He then considered the possibility of teaching in an urban setting, positing, “Overall, it is a collective effort to respond to how students and communities have been left behind” (04M, Fourth Written Entry). His attributions had moved beyond narrow views of personal or cultural factors to include societal factors as he considered the change he could make as a teacher. Acknowledging the importance of History in making attributions, 10F considered how to become an effective agent of change, stating:

I hope to obtain a minor in social studies, and I would like to have as much information as possible to pass onto my students. I don't want my students to recognize black history solely as slavery and freedom from slavery. I would like my students to be well-rounded
in world knowledge and grow to appreciate all sorts of people and their history.” (10F, First Written Entry)

Not only were PSTs willing to accept the course readings as they considered factors related to societal issues, but they expressed an interest in seeking out more information from diverse sources. As we discussed protests for racial justice, 16F explained that it “makes me want to listen more intently on what people who are greatly into the BLM movement have to say. Their opinions and what they face matter just as much as anyone else's” (16F, First Written Entry).

19F’s comments indicate that she had broadened her attributions to include herself as a factor as she described how she was already reorienting herself towards action. “I think what is most important is recognizing we all are a part of the problem, but knowing that is the first step and wanting to be better is what matters and what will bring change” (19F, Second Written Entry).

Finally, as participants discussed how their broadening attributions fueled a desire to learn, they focused in on education. As our study shifted to focus on culturally responsive pedagogy, 14F considered teaching a diverse class, declaring, “it is going to be important to understand those [cultural] differences and find a way to accommodate both cultures within the classroom” (14F, Third Written Entry). Similarly, 01F recognized cultural understanding as crucial to educating all students. “I want to know how to help these students, what they're going through that I haven't gone through. So, if I can even see a glimpse into what their life is actually like, and that helps me support them” (01F, Transcript 2). 07F explained how changes in attribution had prompted a drive for action, saying:

I think my passive, neutral ground attitude has become more of an active attitude, that I don't just sit back and listen because I know I'm still learning, but I contribute the things
that I do know. And I engage in these conversations with my parents and my friends now.

(07F, Transcript 2)

In broadening their attributions for disparate societal and educational outcomes beyond individual choices to include segregation and racism, participants gained a desire to affect change as educators.

Reflections revealed that participants began the course largely unaware of their attributions, which were often based on unexamined beliefs about American society. However, they also explained that the course material presented new information for them to consider, often moving them to emotional responses as they reflected. Therefore, they included historical and societal factors in their attributions about students of color in urban settings, and in some cases, expressed a desire to make changes in society through education. This supports the quantitative findings that participants’ attributions about the URB condition changed from the preintervention surveys to the postintervention surveys. It also provides an understanding of what this change meant to participants as their perceptions shifted and they broadened their attributions.

**Summary of Attributional Findings.** The quantitative data demonstrated a broadening of attributions for urban educational outcomes complementing the results of the journal analysis. As anticipated, participants in this study attributed educational outcomes to external factors for students’ in urban educational settings, moving beyond the student, or their family and culture to more frequently include teacher, school, and context as possible causes. The quantitative results indicate movement from student-related to broader external attributions, and the participant reflections illuminate the process of growth. PSTs appear to have begun the course with a more narrow attribution of educational outcomes in urban settings focusing on the individual or their
culture, and over time they grew to include other factors, including structures and institutions. With this broader set of attributions, PSTs may recognize that disparate educational outcomes for urban students are not caused by the students. In fact, students in urban contexts are as academically capable as students in other settings, but are affected by external factors such as racism. As they applied this understanding to their future as educators, they also recognized schools and teachers as factors in educational outcomes. Although students have agency to make choices about and participate in their education, teachers also affect that dynamic interaction in school settings through their actions making them accountable for student outcomes as well. The statistically significant result on the BAS as well as rich descriptions of PSTs’ understanding of the historical context of urban education point to a change in attributions.

Preservice Teacher Expectations of Educational and Behavioral Outcomes

To address the third and fourth outcome research questions regarding participant expectations for students’ educational and behavioral outcomes, I examined the results of the preintervention and postintervention surveys and the comments that participants made in their reflection journals and self-reflection projects. Participant expectations were measured in two of the preintervention and postintervention surveys, the TES survey, which measured participants’ expectations on eight different categories related to the functioning and outcomes of a school based on the NON and URB conditions, and the CRTOE survey, which measured the expected effectiveness of culturally responsive teaching methods addressing research question 3a. Both surveys served to address the third outcome research question looking at the extent to which PSTs’ expectations for students of color attending urban schools changed from the beginning to the end of the course. Responses from reflections journals and self-reflection project transcripts
revealed participants descriptions of their growth in understanding adding context and depth to the survey results.

**Teacher Expectations Survey**

The TES measured the expectations that PSTs held for eight elements of an educational setting ranked on a five-point Likert ranging from 1 (*well below average*) to 5 (*well above average*). I conducted a paired samples *t*-test to compare preintervention TES scores to postintervention TES scores for both NON and URB conditions (see Table 5.3).

Table 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Expectation Survey Results</th>
<th>Preintervention Survey</th>
<th>Postintervention Survey</th>
<th><em>t</em>(18)</th>
<th><em>p</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>M</em></td>
<td><em>SD</em></td>
<td><em>M</em></td>
<td><em>SD</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TES NON</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TES URB</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was not a significant difference in the NON condition between the preintervention (*M* = 3.54, *SD* = .507) and postintervention scores (*M* = 3.62, *SD* = .501); *t*(18) = -.43, *p* = .672. There was also not a significant difference in the URB condition between the preintervention (*M* = 3.01, *SD* = .524) and postintervention scores (*M* = 3.18, *SD* = .493); *t*(18) = -.89, *p* = .387.

Although neither the mean score for the NON nor the URB condition was significant, expectations were higher in seven of the eight categories of the NON condition and all areas of the URB condition (see Figure 5.2).

**Expectations in the Participant Reflections**

Although the concept of high teacher expectations for students was new to most participants, they found it important and relevant in connection to their future careers. Therefore, they expressed a desire to become better teachers in order to demonstrate their high expectations...
for students. As PSTs described the kinds of teachers they would like to become, they often cited cultural responsiveness in connection with high expectations for all students. They posed questions about this topic and related it to their own experiences, connected expectations to building relationships with students for the purpose of understanding their cultures, and finally, as an act of love that all of their future students deserve.

**Figure 5.2 Participant ratings of expectations on eight aspects of the educational environment.** The top image depicts preintervention and postintervention expectancy ratings for the non-urban condition and the bottom panel displays the same for the urban condition.
Culturally Responsive Teaching Outcome Expectancy Survey

The CRTOE presented statements to which participants responded on a 5-point Likert scale. I conducted a paired samples $t$-test to compare preintervention CRTOE scores to postintervention CRTOE scores (see Table 5.4).

| Table 5.4 Culturally Responsive Teaching Outcome Expectancy Survey Results |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Preintervention Survey                          | Postintervention Survey | $t(19)$ | $p$   |
| **M** |
| CRTOE  | 4.24   | 4.56   | -3.72 | .001  |
| **SD** |
| CRTOE  | .444   | .376   |

There was a significant increase from preintervention expectancy scores ($M = 4.24, SD = 0.444$) to postintervention expectancy scores ($M = 4.56, SD = 0.376$); $t(19) = -3.72, p = .001$. This result indicates a statistically significant positive change in the participants’ expectations for culturally responsive teaching. The participants’ beliefs in the effectiveness of culturally responsive teaching methods grew from the beginning of the intervention to its completion. This result is also related to qualitative data, in which PSTs described demonstrating high expectations for student through the use of culturally responsive teaching methods. This connection will be explored at length in the section considering expectations in the participant reflections.

Relevance of Teacher Expectations. Explicit references to teacher expectations were a clear indicator of the awareness participants gained and the importance they placed on it. For instance, in his final reflection project entry, 04M reflected that “Over the course of the semester, I was exposed to new things I knew nothing about like redlining and cities, [and] expectations of students that teachers have in different cultural settings” (04M, Transcript 3). 06M expressed appreciation of learning about expectancy effects, explaining that the material was not all new, “but it was good to read about how your expectations toward students shift both your behavior and their overall learning experience” (06M, Second Written Entry). Perhaps because the
importance of teacher expectations was novel to many participants, the topic generated questions and introspection. In her first written reflection, for example, 14F wondered:

I know that it is still a school and as teachers, we should expect students to do their best, listen in class, participate in activities or discussions and overall be great students. But what, if any, modifications need to be made with classroom management, teaching techniques, etc., when teaching in an urban school? (14F, First Written Entry)

Discussions on expectations resonated deeply with 16F, who related the new awareness of the topic to her own painful school experiences:

After being bullied for most of my childhood, I definitely know that the information you receive growing up makes such a great impression of how you view yourself. That is why I want to integrate positive outlooks on who [students] are at such a young age. (16F, Third Written Entry)

PSTs connected deeply with the topic of teacher expectations, and their comments demonstrate their perceived relevance of the concept. This is further supported by the applications participants made to their reflections on school and their future as educators.

Many of the participants described high expectations in connection to strong student relationships and cultural understanding. 14F declared the importance of understanding her future students in connection to expectations, “I can't ignore the need for me to put in the effort to understand all my students and their cultures” while acknowledging that this is a process, “but I just need to recognize that it takes time to learn about other people and get used to new environments and eventually we will be able to work something out together” (14F, Third Written Entry). 17M also cited the relevance of expectations in relation to learning about diverse students, saying, “It shows how we need to be ready to learn about other cultures than ours so we
can understand them…[and] the traditions and practices of other cultures” (17M, Third Written Entry). Finally, 09F summarized her understanding of good teaching in terms of high expectations borne of responsive practices:

I also now understand the differences between good and bad teaching. This was not something that I had ever heard of. I'm referring to culturally responsive teaching and addressing the opportunity gap, and education gap that is sometimes seen in urban schools. I now know that there are ways that we can address culture in the classroom that are good and that are bad, and that I will hopefully use the good teaching styles in my future ministry. (09F, Transcript 3)

As participants gained an awareness of teacher expectations, many reported their belief in the importance of high expectations and the relevance to their future careers. Furthermore, they began to view cultural understanding as a practice that communicates high teacher expectations to students.

**Desire to Demonstrate High Expectations.** The participants’ perceptions of the importance of high teacher expectations grew over time. Their final transcripts and written entries demonstrate their understanding of high teacher expectations as an act of love that all students deserve. After watching a video in which superintendent Dr. Tiffany Anderson revitalized her district in part by addressing teacher expectations, 08F commented that she was “absolutely inspiring” and that “the way she shows love to her students and their families is something greatly needed in America’s schools” (08F, Fourth Written Entry). 01F responded to a lesson presentation about high teacher expectations by saying:

Another thing I found very useful, and it was kind of a “duh Professor” [sic] moment, but it's still just so impactful, is to love your students. And what I specifically liked about
this, it's not “I like you, when you start putting in hard work or when you start understanding the concepts that I'm teaching,” it's, “I like you, I love you already.” (01F, Transcript 3)

Responses such as the two above illustrate how PSTs were conceptualizing high teacher expectations as a manifestation of a loving educational environment. Finally, 23M wove several threads of thought together as he contemplated the institution’s religious mission and high expectations in terms of cultural responsiveness:

It helped, in my mind, to associate what Paul says [in the Bible], that he became all things for all people, with what Jesus says about doing on to others as you would have them do to you. Also interpreting Jesus' statement as a more general statement. We should interpret it like we want to be loved and thus we should love our neighbor. Loving our neighbors will not force them into our cultural norms and nor will we be forced into theirs. (23M, Third Written Entry)

Here, 23M expressed his understanding of cultural responsiveness as a demonstration of love flowing from a spiritual motivation.

Participants recognized the importance of high teacher expectations for student learning, and they connected this concept to building relationships with students for the purpose of cultural understanding. They then expressed a desire to become better teachers by demonstrating their high expectations for students through culturally responsive practices. 09F was explicit and emphatic in her thoughts related to high expectations in terms of cultural responsiveness:

I will use the culturally responsive pedagogy that we've talked about throughout the class. I'm very excited because I always have believed that putting children in a classroom that has high expectations will be the best for them. And I'm excited to create those high
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expectations and [support] them so that they can actually grow and mature in the classroom, through their own learning, as well as the teaching that I'm giving them. (09F, Transcript 3)

18F expressed similar thoughts on cultural responsiveness as she considered her future classroom:

But I want to gain those exposures to cultures so that I can gain new perspectives. I want to work on fostering an environment of understanding in my classroom that allows for exposure for students to share what their experiences are, that bring new insights at times that are more beyond anything I could ever do anything beyond a personal level of me sharing what who I am, rather who they are and what they bring to the world. (18F, Transcript 3)

Similarly, 01F shared an openness to including diverse members of the community to support her students as role models, a practice which would demonstrate her high expectations for them to succeed in a culturally responsive manner:

And then ultimately, I don't know what success looks like in every other culture. I'm not African American. I'm not Chinese. So, finding them role models to look up to that can sympathize with them, if they're going through something that I just don't understand, because I've never done it, that's okay. I don't need to have the solution, and they can have other role models besides me. So, pointing them towards people who they can look up to and that can help them is very, very beneficial for my students. (01F, Transcript 3)

PSTs described their future teaching practices through a growing understanding of the importance of teacher expectations and specific actions to demonstrate high expectations. This included expressions of loving concern for students and relationships built in cultural acceptance
and responsiveness connected to the religious mission of MCTC and the schools in its affiliated district.

Participants also discussed comfort, connection, and inclusion as expressions of high teacher expectations. In describing how she would like to demonstrate high expectations to diverse students, 18F wrote that she looks to “create a classroom environment where people of all colors feel comfortable, even if it takes time” (18F, Second Written Entry). This idea is echoed in 20M's comment, “I need to ensure my school is inclusive of all cultures and that we are learning about all different kinds of cultures” (20M, Third Written Entry). 04M extended the same idea of signifying high expectations through connection to include families as well, “In our future [teaching position], it will be important to do our research and never stop learning how to teach in a better way or interact in a better way with parents, faculty, or staff” (04M, Third Written Entry). 22M also mentioned the role of research in developing culturally appropriate high expectations:

I can apply this by researching the cultures of those in my classroom or sitting down with the family and talking about their culture and what they value in life. This way I can know what is important to them and can adjust the expectations of my classroom to allow them to live their culture and not just adhere to mine. (22F, Third Written Entry)

Throughout their written and recorded reflections, PSTs acknowledged the importance of high teacher expectations for students. Although this concept was relatively new to most participants, they found it important and relevant to the field of education. They shared their aspirations to demonstrate their high expectations for future students, most commonly citing cultural responsiveness in connection with high expectations for all students.
Summary of Teacher Expectations Findings. The third and fourth research questions investigated whether participants’ expectations changed during the intervention, and if so, how participants described that change. The results from two surveys and reflection entries provided information on PSTs’ expectations. The TES did show some change in the expectations participants held for schools but not at a significant level for either the non-urban description or the urban description. The results of the CRTOE indicated that participants' expectations about the effects of culturally responsive teaching increased significantly during the intervention.

Participant reflections on teacher expectations support the findings of the CRTOE and add depth by exploring the behaviors that participants viewed as exemplifying high teacher expectations. Specifically, PSTs connected high teacher expectations to culturally responsive practices such as building relationships with students for the purpose of understanding their cultures and creating inclusive classroom environments. Through the course of the interventions, participants became aware of the importance of high teacher expectations for students, described them as relevant to their future teaching careers, and conceptualized the demonstration of high expectations in terms of cultural responsiveness.

Participant Attributions and Expectations for Students in Urban and Non-urban Schools

The primary focus of this study has been to examine whether the attributions PSTs made for educational outcomes and the expectations they held for students changed from the start of the intervention, and if so, why. However, those questions were based on the supposition that PSTs viewed non-urban and urban educational settings differently. Although this starting assumption was predicated on both the needs assessment findings and the research literature (Gay, 2010; Glock, 2016; Han et al., 2015; Ladson-Billings 1995, 2006; Watson, 2012), a
A research question was included to validate this assumption. The following sections respond to the fifth research question regarding the difference in how PSTs view non-urban and urban schools.

**Figure 5.3 Preintervention and Postintervention Change in Externality Scores**

![Behavior Attribution Survey Change in Externality Score](image)

*Note.* Externality scores represent the total number of external attributions made by participants in a specific scenario. The preintervention externality score for each scenario was compared to the postintervention externality scores for the corresponding scenarios to develop a frequency count of how many participants showed less external, no change, or more external attributions.

**Attributions**

Participants differed in their preintervention and postintervention survey attributions (see Figure 5.3). For the non-urban description, the attributions of six participants became less external, five exhibited no change, and eight made attributions that were more external. Whereas in the urban description, the attributions of three participants became less external, five exhibited no change, and 11 made attributions that were more external.

When the data were disaggregated into the three scenarios, there was some difference between the attributions that PSTs made between NON and URB conditions (see Appendix Q). The scenarios described identical behavior, but one was described as happening in a non-urban
school, and the other was described as happening in an urban school. Also, the names of the students were changed for the non-urban and urban scenarios. The largest difference occurred in the preintervention survey of Scenario 1. In this instance, participants attributed the primary cause of the behavior of the non-urban student to student-related causes, mostly to students or family/community, while attributing the primary cause of the behavior of the urban student more to external factors such as teacher or school. In the two other preintervention survey scenarios and three postintervention scenarios, the number of attributions to each cause is similar for both the non-urban and urban students (see Appendix Q). This would indicate a minimal difference in attributions for behavioral scenarios in the non-urban and urban contexts. This result is similar to the findings of a statistical analysis (see Table 5.5). The preintervention comparison between non-urban \((M = 2.00, SD = .745)\) and urban mean expectancy scores \((M = 2.11, SD = .737)\); \(t(18) = -0.622, p = .542\), and the postintervention comparison between non-urban \((M = 2.41, SD = 1.260)\) and urban mean expectancy scores \((M = 2.68, SD = 1.71)\); \(t(18) = -1.547, p = .137\), indicated a non-statistically significant difference in these externality scores.

**Table 5.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-urban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>(t(19))</th>
<th>(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preintervention Survey</strong></td>
<td>2.00 .745</td>
<td>2.11 .737</td>
<td>-0.622(18)</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postintervention Survey</strong></td>
<td>2.41 1.260</td>
<td>2.68 1.71</td>
<td>-1.547(22)</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expectations**

The differences between the non-urban and urban were most pronounced on the TES (see table 5.6). The preintervention comparison between non-urban \((M = 3.53, SD = .507)\) and urban mean scores \((M = 3.01, SD = .524)\); \(t(18) = 3.152, p = .006\), and the postintervention comparison between non-urban \((M = 3.63, SD = .501)\) and urban mean scores \((M = 3.18, SD = .494)\); \(t(21) = 3.171, p = .005\), indicated a statistically significant difference in PSTs’ expectations for non-
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urban and urban settings. Although expectations rose for all but one category in the non-urban description and in all categories in the urban description (see Figure 5.2), the expectations for the non-urban setting were higher than the expectations for the urban setting in all categories in both the preintervention and postintervention survey results (see Figure 5.4).

Table 5.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-urban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>( t(n) )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preintervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3.152</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postintervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3.181</td>
<td>3.494</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4 NON v. URB conditions in the Teacher Expectation Survey

Figure 5.3. Participant ratings of expectations on eight aspects of the educational environment. The top image depicts preintervention ratings for the non-urban and urban conditions and the bottom panel displays the same for the postintervention results.
Conclusions

The overall findings point to a successful implementation of the intervention, including active participant engagement with materials, activities, and discussions, and a strong sense of voice, especially in small group discussions. High levels of participation in synchronous discussions activities and a high completion rate for assignments also support this conclusion. There is evidence that attributions changed from the beginning to the end of the course with stronger support from the participant reflections than from the preintervention and postintervention survey results. The results also point to a change in participants’ expectations from the beginning to the end of the course, again with strong support from the participant reflections which fit well with the results of the CRTOE survey and are not contradicted by the results of the TES survey. Finally, it is notable that PSTs held different expectations when comparing the non-urban and urban conditions.

Process Implementation

The rate of participation and completion was high throughout the intervention. High levels of attendance and participation in class sessions were evidenced in my observations and in the content generated in the shared group workspaces. According to the Assignment Completion Database, completion of written assignments, including online discussion forums, was similarly high. This high level of participation in the intervention supports the findings of the other two process research questions which examined the participants’ response to materials and the perception of student voice.

PSTs who participated in the intervention course were exposed to new concepts and perspectives through the materials, activities, and discussions. Most of them embraced the process of learning and grew in their understandings of complex issues related to urban
education, even when it caused cognitive dissonance. Many of the participants described change beyond just learning more about what they already knew and pronounced a shifting perception in key areas related to this study.

Participants expressed that their voices were heard and respected as they engaged in regular discussions during the course, synchronously in small groups and in online discussion forums. Although several students approached initial discussions cautiously, trust and comfort soon developed among group members. The sense of security, especially among the small synchronous discussion groups, led to open discussion and debate, which the students cited as a key to their growth in understanding over the course of the semester. Active engagement with the material, a strong sense of participant voice, and high levels of participation and completion all indicated a successful implementation of the intervention.

Attributions

The evidence related to PST attributions was mixed. The quantitative results of the BAS did indicate some change in attributions to include more external factors such as school, teacher, or context, but not at a statistically significant level. However, the qualitative data indicated that participants moved from a state of unexamined attributions, particularly concerning urban education, to broader attributions. This included attributing some differences in educational disparities to longstanding patterns of segregation and persistent racism among individuals, institutions, and other societal structures.

Expectations

The TES revealed a growth in PSTs’ expectations for all categories of the urban school description, but not at a statistically significant level. There was a significant change in the expectations participants held for culturally responsive teaching practices to support student
learning. Here again, the qualitative results provided greater insight into the process that took place. Although PSTs described that the concept of expectancy effects was new to them, they acknowledged the importance of high teacher expectations for students. Participant reflections described teacher expectations as important and relevant to the field of education. They shared their aspirations to demonstrate their high expectations for future students, most commonly often citing cultural responsiveness in connection with high expectations for all students.

**Discussion**

The transition as ice melts to become water is called a phase change. This process requires a great deal of thermal energy (commonly known as heat), but as water changes from solid to liquid, its temperature stays the same (32°F/0°C). If the equivalent amount of thermal energy were added to the same volume of water already in its liquid state, it would raise the temperature from freezing (32°F/0°C) to more than halfway to boiling (176°F/80°C). It may be that this intervention represented a phase change for the participants wherein a substantial change in thinking and perspective occurred but produced only a small measurable result in terms of their attributions and expectations. That is, instead of a drastic change in their stated attributions and expectations for students’ educational and behavioral outcomes from the beginning to the end of the intervention, the shift might be that they did not previously consider their attributions and expectations, and now as a part of their reflective practice, they do. The difference between being unaware of key factors involved in urban education and awareness could represent a change equal in scope to a future transition from awareness to being able to address those factors effectively.

I believe this to be the case in my research study, given the qualitative evidence that few participants had previously reflected on their attributions and that the concept of expectancy
effects was new to many. Here the strengths of the mixed-methods approach become evident. In their reflections, participants wrote at length of the eye-opening effect of the course material, the relevance of what they were learning, and how they planned to incorporate their newly acquired knowledge to their future classrooms. However, in the preintervention and postintervention surveys, their attributions shifted only slightly, and while their expectations for students in urban schools rose, they never matched their expectations of traditional settings. It is evident from the participants’ reflections that change occurred. It may be that the change was in what they were thinking rather than the strength of those thoughts. This would reflect the findings of Walker-Dalhouse and Dalhouse (2006), who found changes in PSTs’ beliefs related to cultural diversity while accounting for the slow and incremental nature of learning as demonstrated by Pilistis and Duncan (2012), who noted the often non-linear and sometimes regressive progress of their students’ beliefs regarding inquiry-based learning.

This intervention addressed the attributions that PSTs at my institution make and the expectations that they hold about students of color attending urban schools. EST provided a foundational model for the intervention design. As the participants reflected on their attributions and expectations and the origins of these beliefs, they confronted microsystem factors such as their immediate relationships, direct interactions in home and school experiences, and the beliefs instilled in them by their parents. In addressing exosystem factors, the participants investigated their social setting, including the apprenticeship of observation, which Lortie (1975) and Smagorinsky and Barnes (2014) described as the mental model of the education process that PSTs develop as K-12 students by pulling back the curtain on educational practice and policy. Participants recognized macrosystem factors by examining education policy, broadly in the realm of public education and more narrowly in the associated private religious school district.
They also confronted issues of segregation and racism by studying how historical practices relate to current conditions. This aspect of the intervention matches suggestions for multicultural education from many leading thinkers in the field. From Gay (2010) and Ladson-Billings (1995) calls for cultural relevancy in teacher education to later refinements proposed by Gorski (2009) and Milner et al. (2015). Participants investigated media bias to recognize the ways in which racism has manifested in American culture both historically and in contemporary examples. Finally, throughout the intervention, PSTs read, watched, or listened to diverse authors to gain a more thorough and well-rounded understanding of the experiences and attitudes of students of color.

Much of human understanding and reaction to surroundings is based on the attribution of causes (Heider, 2020). Attributions influence the choices teachers make about educational strategies and management (Kulinna, 2008). The awareness of attributions and regular reflective practice (as in this intervention) provide a mechanism for educators to interrogate their practice and reflect on the accuracy of their attributions. When observing the actions of other humans, people tend to overestimate the salience of personal qualities while underestimating environmental factors (Weiner, 1992). Consequently, teachers may attribute students’ academic improvements to the quality of instruction and lack of growth to students’ low effort or ability (Weiner, 1992). Therefore, the attributions that teachers make are important because narrow attributions for negative educational outcomes to the student or the student’s culture without an examination of teaching, school policy, or oppressive societal context could lead to low expectations (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Without a careful examination into the causes of disparate educational outcomes, teachers could reach the incorrect conclusions that some people, as defined by racial or cultural groups, aren’t as smart as others or that some cultures don’t care
about education. This potentially leads to lower academic and behavioral expectations. If educators are not equipped to reflect on their assumptions and biases, and if they are not knowledgeable about the historical and contemporary factors related to current conditions in urban education such as an achievement gap, they are unlikely to make accurate attributions about outcomes for students of color attending urban schools. It then becomes likely for these teachers to hold low expectations based on the achievement gap resulting from the opportunity gap (Milner, 2013) and prevalent racial stereotypes in a society in which the White majority is held as the standard and norm (Eberhardt et al., 2016).

Accurate attributions allow teachers to see that students of color are just as academically capable as any other student in any other setting (Ogbu & Simons, 1998) while acknowledging the strengths and resources students can draw on and the areas in which they might need support. This understanding provides a foundation for high academic and behavioral expectations, a necessary starting point for success in urban schools. Again, the phase change from being unaware of the expectations one holds to regular reflection on those expectations is an important step for any educator. This is especially true for those who endeavor to serve in urban settings in which students have traditionally been underserved, under-resourced, and have, in some cases, lived down to the low expectations of their teachers.

The development of high teacher expectations is a crucial step that must be built on accurate attributions. Expectations matter, as has been demonstrated repeatedly and over time in educational settings (Brophy, 1983; Ding & Rubie-Davies, 2019; Goldenberg, 1992; Good & Nichols, 2001; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Rubie-Davies, 2010). However, it is not enough to hold high expectations; they must also be clearly communicated in word and deed, that is, teachers need to be able to act on those expectations. Teachers need to be equipped with teaching
and management methods that allow them to demonstrate the high expectations they hold from Rosenthal and Jacobson’s (1968) recommendation to attend to climate, feedback, input, and output, to more recent calls for cultural responsiveness (Rojas & Liou, 2017), and caring accountability (Ford & Sassi, 2014). Starting with an attitude of assets-based approaches, intentional relationship building, and cultural responsiveness, educators can continue to specific teaching practices and techniques such as persistent questioning, specific feedback, no-penalty retakes, and restorative practice (Saphier, 2016).

**Strengths and Limitations**

As in any study, this research had strengths and limitations. Strengths included a robust mixed-methods approach and strong implementation. A low number of participants, historical effects, questions regarding measurement, and confounding constructs served as limitations.

A mixed-methods approach lent strength to this research study. The quantitative elements embodied in the preintervention and postintervention surveys demonstrated that some change, although not statistically significant, took place in the directions hypothesized. Attributions did change to some degree to include educational and societal factors over and above the student or the student’s culture. Expectations about the positive effects of culturally responsive teaching grew, and expectations for students attending urban schools improved, but again in a limited fashion. As represented by the participant reflection journals and the transcripts of their self-reflection projects, the qualitative strand allowed for exploration of what that movement meant to the participants. This triangulation of data revealed that the nature of the change centered on novel awareness of key topics of the intervention.

A high fidelity of implementation also lent strength to the study. Participants were highly engaged, regular in their participation, and faithful in completing their work. They reported
thoughtful interaction with the course material and growth through their synchronous group discussions and online discussion forums.

The sample size was lower than anticipated, which is potentially the greatest limitation of the study. However, I believe the results, especially in the combination of the quantitative and qualitative data, make the research useful as an exploratory study. Another limitation was the lack of a control group for the comparison of quantitative measures. Therefore, this study has only limited generalizability.

There were also questions of validity to consider, including historical effects, a questionable instrument, and confounding constructs. Historical effects are the most likely threat to the internal validity of this intervention. The intervention contained a strong focus on issues such as race and equity, topics much in the news and social media feeds during the research process. It is possible that the ongoing coverage of protests for social justice and police reform influenced the attributions and expectations of the participants. Although not quite local, since the MCTC is a two-hour drive from Minneapolis, several participants lived in that metropolitan area and witnessed protests related to the killing of George Floyd. Others saw frequent news coverage at the national and local levels of reporting. Participants also referenced ongoing conversations about key topics from the course with peers and family members, indicating the intervention was not their only source of information.

In the process of reviewing the literature, I located only one instrument to measure the attributions that teachers make for student behaviors, the BAS (Kulinna, 2008). The BAS was not fully validated, nor was there a psychometric evaluation of the adjustments that I made by including it as a part of two different scenarios attaching each condition to either a description of an urban or a non-urban school setting. Furthermore, the results of the BAS were problematic.
Only after several rounds of consultation with advisors was I able to settle on the externality score that led to the most useful application of the data produced.

Finally, although the constructs of attributions and expectations are explicated at length in this dissertation, it is possible that they were confounded or confused by participants. During the intervention, both concepts were presented via direct instruction but as part of a single lesson. As PSTs reflected in a variety of discussions on what they believe about students (expectations) and why they believe it (attributions), the two concepts, being closely related, may have become entwined in their thinking. Furthermore, there may have been an unrealized relationship between these constructs that affected this research's outcomes.

It is also necessary to consider researcher positionality and potential effects on this intervention. At my institution, I serve as an academic dean and teach at least one course a semester, which places me in a role of specific authority over my students and general authority over education students. It is possible that participants agreed to take part in my study, fearing negative effects if they did not or hoping to gain favor if they did. I took steps to mitigate this circumstance through careful recruitment, disclosure statements, and a clear promise of anonymity. All students enrolled in the class, participants and non-participants, were aware that I would not begin processing the data until after the conclusion of the semester and the posting of grades, and that even then, the data would be anonymized so that I did not know the names of the participants. I initially came to MCTC to serve as the Professor of Urban Education, a title I still hold. It is possible that my title or perceived attitudes about my beliefs induced PSTs to provide answers that they thought I would want to hear rather than what they actually thought. In order to address this concern, I set openness, respect, and confidentiality as essential norms for the class, explaining that we (teacher and students, students and students) probably would not always agree.
with each other, but that this was not only acceptable but was a desirable element of our discussions.

I am a White, middle-class, college-educated male. Thus, I match the majority of my students in race and class, but not gender, since females are overrepresented in the education program at my institution compared to the general population. Since my intervention was situated in a course in which the students examine race and class in America, including Whiteness, I could speak to this experience through the lens of someone who has lived in a variety of communities, rural, suburban, and urban; in neighborhoods where I was in the majority and in the minority; and my experience living abroad. However, I could not speak from the perspective of a person of color in this country or in the realm of education. I, therefore, relied on written or recorded accounts to present diverse perspectives. In discussions about these materials, I offered some analysis and interpretations in the form of reading guides, analysis questions, and even responses about what an author meant in a specific statement. It is possible that my interpretations and analyses were not entirely reflective of the authors we studied and, therefore, may have skewed participants’ attributions or expectations. In consideration of this possibility, I provided supplemental resource lists, including additional books, articles, videos, and podcasts of the authors, journalists, presenters, and other voices that we studied. I also encouraged independent interaction in urban schools through research and by promoting an opportunity to train and teach in summer schools in Milwaukee, operated by a high-quality partner organization.

Implications for Research

Given the limitations of this research, the results are not widely generalizable to teacher education programs. However, I believe it is useful to the field of education and urban education,
specifically in examining the relationship of the attributions educators make about academic and behavioral outcomes and the expectations they hold for students in urban educational settings.

Implications for further research include a continuing study of attribution theory in education, specifically teacher attributions for academic and behavioral outcomes, and the investigation of associations between attributions and expectations in education.

Much research has been conducted on attribution theory, but only a small fraction of the literature I uncovered connected this theory directly to teacher attributions for academic and behavioral outcomes. The present study could serve as a starting point for future researchers who would like to study the role that attribution theory plays in education. A useful next step would be developing and validating instruments to measure the attributions that PSTs and educators in the field make for student outcomes. Researchers could more effectively identify the attitudes that teachers hold and where those beliefs come from with such a tool.

Another possible line of inquiry stemming from this study is an investigation of the relationship between teacher attributions and expectations. It would be useful to know if these concepts are related, and if so, how. Is there a correlation between them, or could causality be demonstrated? If, for example, it could be shown that attributions cause expectations in relation to education, teacher educators would have a clearer path to effectively training teachers who could enter the field with high expectations for diverse classrooms.

**Implications for Practice**

The findings of this study hold limited implications for practice, including process elements such as regular group discussions and student reflections as well as outcome elements such as identifying differential expectations, teaching practices that demonstrate high teacher expectations, and acknowledging the incremental nature of the learning process.
Participants described a sense of security, especially among the small synchronous discussion groups, that led to open discussion and debate, which they cited as vital to their growth in understanding over the semester. This key finding of the process evaluation indicates that it mattered how the intervention was delivered. Fostering room for the civil discussion of challenging topics appeared to be important to processing the course content. The implication is that as PSTs consider ideas that might challenge long-held or core beliefs, they need time and space to incorporate these concepts into their understanding of the world. Although not a focus of this research, the small group synchronous and online discussion forum format seems to allow for mental processing as described in constructivist theory (von Glasersfeld, 2005), where students construct meaning by building on their own background knowledge and experiences. This contrasts with some traditional teaching methods of delivering content to a class and then testing for memory and comprehension.

In reflection journal and self-reflection project entries, numerous participants commented that they had not previously considered where their beliefs came from. The repeated act of self-examination, and in the case of the self-reflection project, reviewing past reflections to assess if attitudes or beliefs had changed resulted in new awareness. Although, again, not the focus of this research, this finding of the data holds possible implications for teacher education, cultural responsiveness, and informing attributions and expectations (Kahn et al., 2014; Lowenstein, 2009). PSTs and full-time educators trained in the habit of reflection and metacognition are likely to be more aware of the attitudes and assumptions they bring to the classroom and, therefore, more effective in their interactions with students.

This investigation found some differences in expectations that participants had for students in urban and non-urban schools. This result is consequential because “[d]ifferences in
expectations lead to differences in what is taught, which in turn lead to differences in what is ultimately learned” (Brophy, 1983, p. 639). An implication for practice is that if this difference in expectations for students in urban and non-urban schools exists, it should be identified in teacher education programs so that PSTs can acknowledge and address their beliefs.

Participants in this research indicated that they intended to hold high expectations for all of their future students. Still, it was not until we studied culturally responsive teaching methods that they could clearly express how they might do this. This points to the explicit teaching of expectancy theory and practices that demonstrate high expectations in education courses and practical experiences. This combination has the potential to instill in PSTs the importance of high teacher expectations and provide them the skills to act.

The final implication to practice relates to the phase change analogy made at the beginning of this section. The measurable but non-statistically significant growth evidenced in my research aligns with the findings of other researchers. Gay (2010), Kreamelmeyer et al. (2016), Walker-Dalhouse and Dalhouse (2006), and Williams and Conyers (2016) all found some progress towards cultural competency or multicultural understanding resulting from a one-semester undergraduate course but found that growth to be incremental and slow. I will therefore echo their recommendations that cultural competency training be included as an ongoing thread in education curricula rather than as a single course requirement. Ideally, I would like to see curriculum work on my campus to accomplish vertical alignment of the Intercultural Elective course. This would be a review process to discuss how each course MCTC offers on its Intercultural Elective menu meets institutional goals and state standards. Following vertical alignment, I would like to explore the horizontal curriculum to embed key standards and goals into at least one other general education course and at least one other education course to create a
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spiraling of cultural competency goals. A spiral curriculum would then preview key standards and goals within a content course, highlight the same standards and goals in the Intercultural Elective, and review them with specific application to education. Finally, with both vertical and horizontal elements in place I would like to see an intentional connection of cultural understanding to the institution’s service-learning program. If my intervention moved participants from a state of unawareness to one of awareness, it would take more instruction and experience to move them from awareness to effectiveness. Cultural competency training holds the most promise when integrated as an ongoing element of educator instruction, allowing future educators to first melt from unexamined unawareness to awareness and reflection. Ongoing coursework and practical experiences could then allow them to heat up to the point of generating the steam of effective practice in diverse urban classrooms.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Construct(s)</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Answer classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Tell me about your home town in terms of size, location, and diversity.</td>
<td>Home town setting; Demographics of home setting</td>
<td>General description of city of residence</td>
<td>Rural/Small town, City, Suburban, Urban; Homogeneous White, Minimal diversity, Diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I A. Did the composition of your neighborhood match the town?</td>
<td>Home town setting; Demographics of home setting</td>
<td>Clarification that immediate neighborhood matched general population of home town</td>
<td>Match, Did not match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I B. Did you work in your hometown?</td>
<td>Demographics of home setting</td>
<td>Establish regularity and quality of intercultural contact</td>
<td>Increased intercultural contact, Did not increase intercultural contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I C. Did you have access to a vehicle? Travel outside your home town?</td>
<td>Demographics of home setting</td>
<td>Establish regularity and quality of intercultural contact</td>
<td>Increased intercultural contact, Did not increase intercultural contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Tell me about your high school in terms of size, location, and diversity.</td>
<td>School setting, Demographics of school setting</td>
<td>General description of high school</td>
<td>Homogeneous White, Minimal diversity, Diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II A. What kind of interaction did you have with students of other races, cultures, ethnicities, or socioeconomic status?</td>
<td>Contact with students of color</td>
<td>Establish regularity and quality of intercultural contact</td>
<td>Minimal contact, Regular contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B. Did you see regular teacher interaction with students of other races, cultures, ethnicities, or socioeconomic status?</td>
<td>Observation of teacher interaction with students of color</td>
<td>Determine level of familiarity with CRP from observation</td>
<td>Unfair treatment of students of color, Equal treatment of students of color, Responsive treatment of students of color</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. How comfortable would you be working in school settings unlike the schools you attended in terms of size, location, and diversity?

- **Perceived difference between typical and urban schools**
- **Examine personal feeling of settings different from the PST’s experience**
- **Very uncomfortable**, **Uncomfortable**, **Comfortable**, **Very Comfortable**

### III A. What differences would you expect in this type of setting?

- **Perceived difference between typical and urban schools**
- **Explore perceptions of urban schools in comparison of personal experience**
- **Comparative, Deficit, Appreciation**

### III B. What might those differences mean for a teacher?

- **Perceived difference between typical and urban schools**
- **Explore perceptions of urban students of color in comparison of personal experience**
- **Comparative, Deficit, Appreciation**
Appendix B: Beliefs and Attribution Survey

Name: ___________________
Year of Graduation: _________
Have you taken an Intercultural Elective Course? Yes No If yes, please indicate which from the list below.
(American Minority Writers, Immigration and Ethnicity in US History, Intro to Minority Cultures, Intro to Urban Education, Music in World Cultures, Teaching World Languages and Culture)

I understand that completing this survey is completely voluntary and that I may stop at any time. Furthermore, I understand that the survey is not related in any way to my grades or status at this institution. I understand that all reporting of the results of this survey will be anonymous.

Signature: ___________________

For each of the scenarios below, circle the most likely source of the problem. Definitions of sources are given below the scenarios.

Child #1. This student can’t sit still during lessons. The child doesn’t pay attention and doesn’t follow directions. Sometimes the student acts inappropriately to get attention.

The most likely source of this behavior is: Out of School  Student  Teacher  School
The second most likely source of this behavior is: Out of School  Student  Teacher  School

Child #2. This student talks much of the time during lessons. Sometimes that talking turns into arguing and quarrelling. The child often interrupts conversations.
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The most likely source of this behavior is: Out of School  Student  Teacher  School
The second most likely source of this behavior is: Out of School  Student  Teacher  School

Child #3. This student plays too rough in class and risks injury to self and others with unsafe actions. Sometimes this student pushes or punches others and in general bullies other students.

The most likely source of this behavior is: Out of School  Student  Teacher  School
The second most likely source of this behavior is: Out of School  Student  Teacher  School

Definitions

Out of School. This type of behavior is related to out-of-school factors like family (e.g., parenting skills, one parent family) and community (e.g., drugs, gangs) issues.

Student. This type of behavior is related to child factors like personality, motivation, and social or physical skills.

Teacher. This type of behavior is related to teacher factors like curriculum and methods, caring, or class management.

School. This type of behavior is related to school factors like class size, services for students, or overall school management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acknowledging the ways that the school culture is different from my students’ home culture will minimize the likelihood of discipline problems.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Only schools serving students of color need a racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse staff and faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Revising instructional material to include a better representation of the students' cultural group will foster positive self-images.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Students living in racially isolated neighborhoods can benefit socially from participating in racially integrated classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Students will develop an appreciation for their culture when they are taught about the contributions their culture has made over time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The likelihood of student-teacher misunderstandings decreases when my students' cultural background is understood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Historically, education has been monocultural, reflecting only one reality and has been biased toward the dominant (European) group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Encouraging students to use their native language will help to maintain students' cultural identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Teachers often expect less from students from the lower socioeconomic class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Students' self-esteem can be enhanced when their cultural background is valued by the teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>In order to be effective with all students, teachers should have experience working with students from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Using culturally familiar examples will make learning new concepts easier.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds typically have fewer educational opportunities than their middle-class peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>When students see themselves in the pictures that are displayed in the classroom, they develop a positive self-identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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For each of the items below circle the number that indicates your disagreement or agreement with the statement.

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree
### Appendix C: Needs Assessment Construct Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
<th>Citation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home town setting</td>
<td>Rural/Small town – population of 10,000 or less City – population of 10,001 – 50,000 not adjacent to a metropolitan area Suburban – City adjacent to, or included in a metropolitan statistical area Urban – Central city of a metropolitan statistical area</td>
<td>US Census Bureau Massey and Tannen (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics of home setting</td>
<td>Homogeneous White – no visible people of color Minimal diversity – small percentage (&lt;20%) people of other races, ethnicities or cultures Diverse – noticeable percentage or majority people of other races, ethnicities or cultures</td>
<td>Massey and Tannen (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School setting</td>
<td>Rural/Small town – population of 10,000 or less City – population of 10,001 – 50,000 not adjacent to a metropolitan area Suburban – City adjacent to, or included in a metropolitan statistical area Urban – Central city of a metropolitan statistical area</td>
<td>Massey and Tannen (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics of school setting</td>
<td>Homogeneous White – no visible students of color Minimal diversity – small percentage (&lt;20%) students of other races, ethnicities or cultures Diverse – noticeable percentage or majority students of other races, ethnicities or cultures</td>
<td>Chapman, 2018; Li, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of teacher interaction with students of color</td>
<td>Unfair Equal Responsive</td>
<td>Kreamelmeyer et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort working in typical/urban school settings</td>
<td>Very uncomfortable Uncomfortable Comfortable Very Comfortable</td>
<td>Dicke, et al., 2014; Knoblauch &amp; Chase, 2015; Siwatu, 2011b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived difference between</td>
<td>Comparative – described differences without judgement Deficit – described differences as negative</td>
<td>Diamond et al., 2004; Gay, G. 2010; Glock, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typical and urban schools</td>
<td>Appreciation – described differences positively</td>
<td>Kinsler, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Terrill &amp; Mark, 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Theory of Treatment

Target Population

Preservice Teachers [PSTs] (primarily white, middle-class, suburban/rural)

Problem of Practice

PSTs demonstrate different academic and behavioral expectations for urban students of color than for white students in rural and suburban settings. They tend to attribute negative educational and behavioral outcomes of urban students of color to culture or student/parent decisions over school or teacher factors.

Intervention

Module 1 - Teach contextual and historical circumstances leading to current state of urban ed (3-4 weeks)

Module 2 - Teach expectancy effects. Give and practice examples of teaching behaviors that demonstrate high expectations (3-4 weeks)

Short term - measurable

Knowledge of factors influencing educational outcomes. Measured through reflection journals and BAS.

Knowledge of expectancy effects in education and high expectation practices. Measured through reflection journals, CRTOE, and TES.

Change in PST attribution of educational results of urban students of color to include school and teacher variables Measures through Behavioral Attribution Survey

PSTs gain knowledge of behaviors that demonstrate high expectations in education. PSTs practice those behaviors. Measured by written response and performance assessment.

Intermediate

Higher Expectations for Students of Color Measured by Culturally Responsive Teacher Outcome Expectancy and Professional Beliefs About Diversity Survey

Intermediate

Improved teaching in urban schools at PSTs become novice teachers - Regular examination by novice teachers of school/teacher factors for student outcomes, demonstration by novice teachers of teaching and management behaviors that demonstrate high expectations.

Long Term

Improved outcomes for urban students of color in the classrooms of the novice teachers in terms of academic and behavioral performance.
## Appendix E: Summary Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRQ1: What was the participation rate for synchronous discussions/activities?</td>
<td>Participation rate of at least 85% for synchronous discussions/activities</td>
<td>Assignment Completion Database</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRQ2: What was the completion rate for written assignments?</td>
<td>Completion rate of at least 85% of written assignments</td>
<td>Assignment Completion Database</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRQ3: How did participants react to the materials, activities, and discussions?</td>
<td>Descriptions of how the materials, activities, and discussions made them feel or how they reacted to them.</td>
<td>Reflection Journal</td>
<td>Thematic content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRQ4: Do participants feel that their voices are heard during group and class discussions?</td>
<td>Description of how the ideas, opinions, and questions are acknowledged and incorporated into discussions</td>
<td>Reflection Journal</td>
<td>Thematic content analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORQ1: To what extent did PSTs’ educational attributions for students’ educational and behavioral outcomes change from the beginning to the end of the intervention?</td>
<td>Attribution of responsibility for academic and behavioral outcomes</td>
<td>Behavioral Attribution Survey (pre/post intervention survey)</td>
<td>Wilcoxon Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORQ2: How do PSTs describe changes or stability over time (duration of the course) to their attributions for students’ educational and behavioral outcomes?</td>
<td>Description of factors that impact academic and behavioral outcomes in urban education.</td>
<td>Reflection Journal Self-Reflection project</td>
<td>Thematic content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORQ3: To what extent did PSTs’ educational expectations for students’ educational and behavioral outcomes change from the</td>
<td>Culturally responsive teaching outcome expectancy</td>
<td>Culturally Responsive Teaching Outcome Expectancy Scale (pre/post</td>
<td>Paired t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORQ4: How will do PSTs describe changes or stability over time (duration of the course) about their educational expectations for students’ educational and behavioral outcomes?</td>
<td>Description of academic and behavioral expectations for urban students of color</td>
<td>Reflection Journal Self-Reflection Project</td>
<td>Thematic content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORQ5: Did PSTs ascribe different attributions and expectations to traditional school settings and urban educational settings?</td>
<td>Attribution of responsibility for academic and behavioral outcomes</td>
<td>Behavioral Attribution Survey (pre/post intervention surveys)</td>
<td>Wilcoxon Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of urban students</td>
<td>Teacher Expectations Survey (pre/post intervention surveys)</td>
<td>Paired t-test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Reflection Journal Prompts

Written journal prompt: Your entries in this journal are not visible to other students but can be viewed by the instructor. Please take a moment to reflect on the topics and discussions from the past few weeks and write your reactions. The following are some examples of questions you might ask yourself as you reflect:

- What stood out to you as important?
- Were there ideas that were new to you or that changed the way that you viewed a particular issue?
- Which discussions helped to expand your understanding?
- Were there materials or concepts with which you disagreed?
- What new questions do you have?
- How did this make you feel?
### Appendix G: Assignment Completion Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment/Activity</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment:1.5 Self Reflection Project Entry 1 (Real)</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2.1 Demographics</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment:2.2 Response - Bloom's Taxonomy Activity (Real)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.1 White Privilege</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum:3.2 Expectations for &quot;Urban&quot; rating (Real)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4.1 Multiple Views</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment:4.2 Dialogue with the Text Activity (Real)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment:5.2 Race, Ethnicity, and Culture (Real)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.1 X and Y Activity</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum:6.2 A Framework for Understanding Poverty rating (Real)</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7.1 The Church Sees Color</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment:7.2 Response Paper (Real)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 8.1 Residential Segregation</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum:8.2 The Problem We All Live With rating (Real)</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment:8.3 Reflection Project Entry 2 (Real)</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 9.1 Defining Racism</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum:9.2 Structure and Culture rating (Real)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 10.1 Achievement Gap and Opportunity Gap</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum:10.2 Counterpoints to Payne rating (Real)</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 11.1 Attribution and Expectancy Theories</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment:11.2 Achievement/Opportunity Gap - Graphic Organizer (Real)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 12.1 High Expectations in Action</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum:12.2 Culturally Responsive Pedagogy rating (Real)</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment:13.2 Graphic Organizer for Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (Real)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 14.1 Graphic Organizer Gallery Walk</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 15.1 Movie/Video Discussion</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment:14.1 Final Self-Reflection Project (Real)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm (Real)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam - Final (Real)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Culturally Responsive Teaching Outcome Expectancy Outcome Survey

For each of the items below circle the number that indicates your disagreement or agreement with the statement.

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A positive teacher-student relationship can be established by building a sense of trust in my students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students will be successful when instruction is adapted to meet their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Developing a community of learners when my class consists of students from diverse cultural backgrounds will promote positive interactions between students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Acknowledging the ways that the school culture is different from my students’ home culture will minimize the likelihood of discipline problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Understanding the communication preferences of my students will decrease the likelihood of student-teacher communication problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Connecting my students’ prior knowledge with new incoming information will lead to deeper learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Revising instructional material to include a better representation of the students’ cultural group will foster positive self-images.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Students will develop an appreciation for their culture when they are taught about the contributions their culture has made over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Conveying the message that parents are an important part of the classroom will increase parent participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The likelihood of student-teacher misunderstandings decreases when my students’ cultural background is understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Changing the structure of the classroom so that it is compatible with my students’ cultural background will increase their motivation to come to class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Establishing positive home-school relations will increase parental involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Student attendance will increase when a personal relationship between the teacher and students has been developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Assessing student learning using a variety of assessment procedures will provide a better picture of what they have learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Using my students’ interests when designing instruction will increase their motivation to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Encouraging students to use their native language will help to maintain students’ cultural identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Students’ self-esteem can be enhanced when their cultural background is valued by the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Helping students from diverse cultural backgrounds succeed in school will increase their confidence in their academic ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Using culturally familiar examples will make learning new concepts easier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>When students see themselves in the pictures that are displayed in the classroom, they develop a positive self-identity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Teacher Expectations Survey

School and Student Expectations

School 1: Peace Lutheran is located in a small city in the Midwest with a population of about 20,000. Peace is considered traditional and has an enrollment of 125 students served by a faculty of 11. The student enrollment is 95% Caucasian, 2% African American and 3% Latino.

For each of the categories below rate your expectations for an average class at Peace Lutheran
1 = well below average; 2 = below average; 3 = average; 4 = above average, 5 = well above average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent attitudes to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School 2: Grace Lutheran is located in a large city in the Midwest, the population of the metro area is about 1 million. Grace is considered urban and has an enrollment of 250 students served by a faculty of 20. The student enrollment is 5% Caucasian, 90% African American and 5% Latino. Most families are considered low-income or in poverty and 90% of students receive free or reduced lunch.

For each of the categories below rate your expectations for an average class at Grace Lutheran
1 = well below average; 2 = below average; 3 = average; 4 = above average, 5 = well above average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent attitudes to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: Behavioral Attribution Survey

School 1: Peace Lutheran is located in a small city in the Midwest with a population of about 20,000. Peace is considered traditional and has an enrollment of 125 students served by a faculty of 11. The student enrollment is 95% Caucasian, 2% African American and 3% Latino.

Three students from Peace described below. For each of the scenarios, circle the most likely source of the problem. Definitions of sources are given below.

Definitions
Family/community. This type of behavior is related to out-of-school factors like family (e.g., parenting skills, one parent family) and community (e.g., drugs, gangs) issues.
Student. This type of behavior is related to child factors like personality, motivation, and social or physical skills.
Teacher. This type of behavior is related to teacher factors like curriculum and methods, caring, or class management.
School. This type of behavior is related to school factors like class size, services for students, or overall school management.
Context. This type of behavior is related to contextual factors in society like segregation, poverty, oppression, or racism.

Child #1. Jake fidgets constantly during lessons. He doesn’t follow directions and struggles pay attention. Sometimes to get attention he acts inappropriately.

The most likely source of this behavior is:
- Family/Community
- Student
- Teacher
- School
- Context

The second most likely source of this behavior is:
- Family/Community
- Student
- Teacher
- School
- Context

Child #2. Amy frequently talks during lessons. Sometimes that talking leads to arguing. She regularly interrupts conversations of others.

The most likely source of this behavior is:
- Family/Community
- Student
- Teacher
- School
- Context

The second most likely source of this behavior is:
- Family/Community
- Student
- Teacher
- School
- Context

Child #3. Dylan plays aggressively in class and his dangerous behaviors risk injury to self and others. In general he bullies others sometimes pushing or punching other students.

The most likely source of this behavior is:
- Family/Community
- Student
- Teacher
- School
- Context

The second most likely source of this behavior is:
- Family/Community
- Student
- Teacher
- School
- Context

School 2: Grace Lutheran is located in a large city in the Midwest, the population of the metro area is about 1 million. Grace is considered urban and has an enrollment of 250 students served by a faculty of 20. The student enrollment is 5% Caucasian, 90% African American and 5% Latino.
Latino. Most families are considered low-income or in poverty and 90% of students receive free or reduced lunch.

Three students from Grace described below. For each of the scenarios, circle the most likely source of the problem. Definitions of sources are given below.

**Definitions**

- **Family/community.** This type of behavior is related to out-of-school factors like family (e.g., parenting skills, one parent family) and community (e.g., drugs, gangs) issues.
- **Student.** This type of behavior is related to child factors like personality, motivation, and social or physical skills.
- **Teacher.** This type of behavior is related to teacher factors like curriculum and methods, caring, or class management.
- **School.** This type of behavior is related to school factors like class size, services for students, or overall school management.
- **Context.** This type of behavior is related to contextual factors in society like segregation, poverty, oppression, or racism.

**Child #1.** Jalen can’t sit still during lessons. He doesn’t pay attention and doesn’t follow directions. Sometimes he acts inappropriately to get attention.

- The most likely source of this behavior is: Student
- The second most likely source of this behavior is: Family/Community

**Child #2.** Aaliyah talks much of the time during lessons. Sometimes that talking turns into quarrelling. She often interrupts conversations.

- The most likely source of this behavior is: Student
- The second most likely source of this behavior is: Family/Community

**Child #3.** DeShawn plays rough in class and risks injury to self and others with unsafe actions. Sometimes he pushes or punches others and in general bullies other students.

- The most likely source of this behavior is: Student
- The second most likely source of this behavior is: Family/Community
Appendix K: Self-Reflection Project

Self-Reflection Project (Video Recording)

Entry 1

Throughout the semester you will be working on a self-reflection project. The project will consist of three entries. As you begin working on entry one please see the Self-Reflection Project guidelines and rubric. In preparation for creating your first entry read Bennett's Stages of Intercultural Sensitivity, you are expected to reference this in your reflection. For your first entry in your self-reflection project, you will be recording a video. Your video should answer the following questions:

- What are my thoughts, beliefs, and attitudes about myself, my culture, my class?
- Where did these ideas come from?
- What are my thoughts, beliefs, and attitudes about people who are not like me?
- Where did these ideas come from?
- How do I interact with other people like me? Give examples of strengths and weaknesses.
- How do I interact with other people who are not like me? Give examples of strengths and weaknesses.
- Are these interactions similar or different? Why?
- Was there any specific event that has greatly changed these beliefs or actions?

Your video is a starting point in this project designed to document your beliefs and attitudes near the beginning of the course. Entries two and three will allow you to record your personal growth and/or changing opinions. Your video or presentation should run no more than 5 minutes, and you can submit it online under the section labeled 1.4 on the main course page, email it, or share it with the professor.

Entry 2

Review your statements from the initial entry. In this entry, address which thoughts, beliefs, or attitudes have changed due to the material or discussions in this class? How and why did they change? Was there a specific reading, lecture, or conversation that you found particularly illuminating? Is there any area where you feel that you have not changed, or your views have been reinforced?

Final Entry

Review your statements from the first two entries. Compile information to create a presentation that explains how your views of yourself and of others have changed over time. What additional changes have happened? How and why? Include pertinent material from your first two entries, for example if your answer to any of the questions has changed over time, you could include clips of how you answered each time in order to demonstrate your growth in understanding. You may use clips from your earlier videos, especially if they demonstrate how your answers or understanding has changed over time, but you should NOT just link all three together, only use material that answer the questions or document growth. You may add features like titles, music,
transitions, or captions. You may include still images, for instance if you are depicting your upbringing or family, add a picture or if a specific teacher influenced you greatly maybe you can include a class photo. The ultimate goal is to document your growth in understanding of the material covered in the course, but more importantly how you will apply these new understandings and attitudes in your future ministry.

Presentation Components

1. Where you began journey of self-reflection and how you got to that starting point
2. What has changed in your thoughts, beliefs, and attitudes and what caused those changes? (Changes, growth, or setbacks)
3. How will the changes affect your life and your teaching or preaching ministry? (Application)

In answering the above questions, students will be able to demonstrate the following traits, knowledge, and competencies:

A. Articulates insights into one’s own cultural rules and biases. Awareness of how her/his experiences have shaped these rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description. (Cultural self-awareness)
B. Demonstrates awareness of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices. (Global/cultural awareness)
C. Gives consideration to the feelings of another cultural group and acts in a manner that recognizes the understandings of that group. (Empathy)
D. Shows interest in learning more about other cultures and is receptive to interacting with other cultural perspectives and persons. (Intercultural curiosity and openness)
# Appendix L: Detailed Block Plan for Introduction to Urban Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Weekly Topic</th>
<th>Weekly Objectives</th>
<th>Primary Readings/Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 4 Structures</td>
<td>Week 6 Cross Cultural Communication</td>
<td>Week 7 Framing Poverty</td>
<td>Week 8 Historical Settings – Residential and Educational Segregation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify specific cultural and social factors that influence development (social, cognitive, and academic)</td>
<td>Compare and contrast how communication differs across cultural and social groups</td>
<td>1] Simulate intercultural interaction</td>
<td>1] Define poverty as an emergent system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2] Debrief and describe interactions of the simulation</td>
<td>2] Investigate place and class as factors that influence behaviors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3] Apply lessons of the simulation to educational setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In class: X and Y Activity</td>
<td>In class: Midterm Examination</td>
<td>Online assignments:</td>
<td>Online assignments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Session 6 Teaching | Week 13 Culturally Responsive Pedagogy 1 | 1] Define and Examine Culturally Responsive Pedagogy  
|---|---|---|---|
| | Week 14 Culturally Responsive Pedagogy 2 | 1] Derive basic principles of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy | In class: Student Produced Graphic Organizers Online assignments:
### PRESERVICE TEACHERS’ ATTRIBUTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

| Week 15 Reflection and Review | 1] Reflect on learning throughout the course and questions still unanswered  
2] Evaluate usefulness of material and direction for personal future inquiry | In class: 
Online assignments: |
Appendix M: Course Calendar of Assignments

**EDU2201 Course Calendar: 2020-2021 Semester II** [ver. 12/16/2020]

Listed below are the completion dates for all of the course work of EDU2201 Introduction to Urban Education

Generally, students can expect a discussion forum, and a response to assigned readings on a weekly basis. Exceptions to this pattern may occur when other larger projects are due or if we have days off of school.

Items are due by 11:55 pm (Central time) or by class time (c/t), 1:30 pm. If you find that a due date is unreasonable or something unexpected comes up in your schedule, please let the course instructor know as soon as possible so adjustments can be made!

**Note:** The "weeks" in this course run from a Thursday through Wednesday. This places the weekend in the middle of the course "week", when most students will have more time to work on the course assignments. It is OK to complete an activity prior to its posted due date. The due date is simply the absolute deadline to get work in. It is important to complete any group work and discussion forum postings on time so as not to delay the progress of members of the group.

**NOTE:** c/t = by class time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1 1/28-2/3</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1/28</td>
<td>1.1 Post Introductory PPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1/28</td>
<td>Class – In class activity 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1/28</td>
<td>1.3 Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>1.4 Initial post due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday c/t</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>1.4 Responses completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday c/t</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>1.5 Self-Reflection Project – Entry 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday c/t</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>Read p. 1-30 of Between the World and Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 2/4-2/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>Class – In class activity 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>2/9</td>
<td>2.2 Submit Bloom’s Taxonomy Exercise for “Case for Reparations”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday c/t</td>
<td>2/11</td>
<td>Read p. 30-60 of Between the World and Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday c/t</td>
<td>2/11</td>
<td>2.3 Personal Journal Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 2/11-2/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>2/11</td>
<td>Class – In class activity 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>3.2 Initial post due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday c/t</td>
<td>2/18</td>
<td>3.2 Responses completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday c/t</td>
<td>2/18</td>
<td>Read p. 60-90 of Between the World and Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4 2/18-2/24</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>2/18</td>
<td>Class – In class activity 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>2/23</td>
<td>4.2 Dialogue with text “Becoming Hispanic/White Privilege White Supremacy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday c/t</td>
<td>2/25</td>
<td>Read p. 90-120 of Between the World and Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday c/t</td>
<td>2/25</td>
<td>4.3 Personal Journal Entry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5      | 2/25-3/3     | **SESSION 3**
| Thursday | 2/25 | 5.1 Take implicit associations test |
| Tuesday  | 3/2  | 5.2 Group Assignment due |
| By next class | 3/4 | Read p. 120-150 of Between the World and Me |
| Thursday  | 3/4  | Class – In class activity 6.1 |
| Tuesday  | 3/9  | 6.2 Initial post due |
| Thursday c/t | 3/11 | 6.2 Responses completed |
| Thursday c/t | 3/11 | Read A Framework for Understanding Poverty Intro and Cpt 1 |
| 6      | 3/4-3/10     | **SESSION 4**
| Thursday  | 3/11  | Class – In class MIDTERM |
| Tuesday  | 3/16 | 7.2 Response paper for “Voluntary and Involuntary Minorities” |
| Thursday c/t | 3/18 | Read A Framework for Understanding Poverty Cpt 2-4 |
| Thursday  | 3/18  | 8.1 In class activity |
| Tuesday  | 3/23 | 8.2 Initial post due |
| Thursday c/t | 3/25 | 8.2 Responses completed |
| Thursday c/t | 3/25 | 8.3 Reflection Project Entry 2 |
| Thursday c/t | 3/25 | Read Framework for Understanding Poverty Cpt 5-7 |
| 7      | 3/11-3/17    | **SESSION 4**
| Thursday  | 3/25  | 9.1 In class activity Jigsaw |
| Tuesday  | 3/30 | 9.2 Initial post due |
| Thursday c/t | 4/1 | 9.2 Responses completed |
| Thursday c/t | 4/1 | Framework for Understanding Poverty Cpt 8 & Conclusion |
| 8      | 3/18-3/24    | **SESSION 5**
| Thursday  | 4/1  | 10.1 In class activity |
| Tuesday  | 4/6  | 10.2 Initial post due |
| Thursday c/t | 4/8 | 10.2 Responses completed |
| Thursday c/t | 4/8 | 10.3 Personal Journal Entry |
| Thursday c/t | 4/8 | Read The Early Catastrophe by Hart & Risely |
| 9      | 3/25-3/31    | **SESSION 5**
| Thursday  | 4/8  | 11.1 In class activity |
| Tuesday  | 4/13 | 11.2 Graphic Organizer – Achievement/Opportunity Gap |
| Thursday c/t | 4/15 | Read Star Teachers of Children in Poverty Intro, Cpts. 1, 3, 5./Reading Guide |
| 10     | 4/1-4/7      | **SESSION 6**
| Thursday  | 4/15 | 12.1 In class activity |
| Tuesday  | 4/20 | 12.2 Initial post due |
| Thursday c/t | 4/22 | 12.2 Responses completed |
| Thursday c/t | 4/22 | Read Star Teachers of Children in Poverty Cpts. 7, 9, Conclusion/ Guide |
| 11     | 4/8-4/14     | **SESSION 6**
| Thursday  | 4/22 | 13.1 In class activity |
| Tuesday  | 4/27 | 13.2 Graphic Organizer – Culturally Responsive Practices |
| 12     | 4/15-4/21    | **SESSION 6**
| Thursday  | 4/22 | 14.1 Submit Final-Self Reflection Project |
| 13     | 4/22-4/28    | **SESSION 6**
| Thursday  | 4/22 | 15.1 Post Test |
| 14     | 4/29-5/5     | **SESSION 6**
| Tuesday  | 5/4 | 14.1 Submit Final-Self Reflection Project |
| 15     | 5/6          | **SESSION 6**
<p>| Thursday  | 5/6  | 15.1 Post Test |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>5/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2 Course Evaluation (On Portal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Week</td>
<td>Thursday, May 13, 10:00am-12:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix N: Sample Lesson Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 2 Week 4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO</strong></td>
<td>Assess personal attitudes toward other cultures and how they influence behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expanding Questions</strong></td>
<td><em>What are my feelings? Do these feelings and attitudes align to scriptural principles, personal, institutional, and professional standards?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson Objectives</strong></td>
<td>1) Examine multiple views on a challenging issue in order to assess our personal attitudes 2) Evaluate our attitudes and actions in personal, institutional, and professional standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agenda</strong></td>
<td>Refresher Quiz  Review  BTWAM  Group Jigsaw  Assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Introduction** | Check In | 5 | 5 | 1:35 |
| **F2F** | Quiz - Explain the concept of White Privilege. How does this relate to you? | 5 | 10 | 1:40 |
| **Review** | 1) are we stuck in a cycle? From small towns and suburbs > negative view of cities > expand into more small towns and suburbs > maintain negative view 2) The way you think and talk about people/places matters, important to ask what you/other think and why 3) Stereotypes - our minds take shortcuts, much of the time this is helpful, stereotypes and overgeneralizations [slide of Pygmalion Effect] 4) Sin is sin, yes, but if we know the particulars we can build curbs and seek out root causes | 10 | 20 | 1:50 |
| **Between the World and Me** | Group Discussion (9/11 an attack on some is an attack on all, is mistreatments of some mistreatment of all, why aren’t we enraged to the point of movement by injustice to minority groups?) | 10 | 30 | 2:00 |
| **Discussion** | Discussion of recent media cases: Black Lives Matter, Why are there such opposing viewpoints? Do you feel conflicting thoughts and emotions? (Small Group/Group) (4.1) MEANING for MINISTRY [slide Both/and] | 35 | 65 | 2:35 |
| **Reflect and Review** | Write a summary of notes and discussion | 5 | 70 | 2:40 |
| **Assignments** |  | 5 | 75 | 2:45 |
**Online**

| Dialogue with the text activity: For your assignment this week, read Images and Words that Wound by Daniel Solorzano and consider how descriptions of students, even if they exist only in our own head can affect the way we treat students. Then, read the two essays "Becoming Hispanic: Mexican Americans and Whiteness" and "White Privilege, White Supremacy" in order to complete the dialogue with the text activity. |   |   |

---
## Appendix O: Coding Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Code</th>
<th>Secondary Code</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaction - response to materials, activities, or discussions</td>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>New to me/Shift in Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban education</td>
<td>Eye-opening/ New to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White privilege</td>
<td>New to me/Shift in Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race and racism</td>
<td>Growth in understanding/Shift in Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Heard – did participants feel that they could safely ask questions, make comments, or disagree</td>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>Initial hesitancy to say the wrong thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>As discussion groups developed a sense of trust, felt safe sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning/Shared learning</td>
<td>Participation in and with groups lead to learning from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributions – perceived causes of educational outcomes in urban settings</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
<td>Unaware of their attributions, often based on unexamined beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unexamined beliefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Realization from reading</td>
<td>Readings and reflections presented new information to consider, often moving to emotional responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Realization from reflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accept/include new factors</td>
<td>Inclusion of historical and societal factors in attributions about students of color in urban settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desire to make a change</td>
<td>Expressed desire to make changes in society and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations – belief that students are academically capable</td>
<td>Expectancy effects</td>
<td>Expectancy effects and practices that demonstrate high expectations as a new educational concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High expectations practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevancy to classroom</td>
<td>Relevancy in connection to teaching practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships and cultural understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally responsive teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to make change through learning</td>
<td>Expressed desire to become better teachers to demonstrate their high expectations for students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to make change through education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix P: Collaborative Document Sample

Week 8 In-Class - Activity Housing Segregation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Member(s)</th>
<th>Insights for you reading/activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Definitions:
Compare/contrast:
Big ideas/Takeaways:

Week 9 In-Class Activity - Structures, Institutions, and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Member</th>
<th>Notes from Reading</th>
<th>Notes from Video</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Definitions:
Compare/contrast:
Big ideas/Takeaways:

Week 10 In-Class Activity - Achievement Gap vs. Opportunity Gap?

Week 11 - Article Jigsaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group member/ Article Author</th>
<th>Summary of key points from your article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Week 12 In-Class Activity - High Expectations in Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group member/ Educational Practice</th>
<th>Describe the high expectations practice from your video clip. What adjustments might you need to make for your anticipated grade level?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix Q: Behavioral Attribution Survey Scenario Comparison

Note: Results comparing the non-urban to urban conditions of three educational scenarios.