Walden University
ScholarWorks

Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies

Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection

2022

How Teachers Learn About Using Teacher-Student Relationships in Urban Schools

Cheryl Krapohl
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations

Part of the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Education and Human Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Cheryl J. Krapohl

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Jennifer Courduff, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty
Dr. Asoka Jayasena, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. Cheryl Burleigh, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2022

Abstract

How Teachers Learn About Using Teacher-Student Relationships in Urban Schools

by

Cheryl J. Krapohl

MA, Marygrove College, 1999

BA, Moravian College, 1991

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Education

Walden University

November 2022

Abstract

The teacher-student relationship (TSR) is an important component of instruction that can lead to improved student outcomes, especially in urban schools. Researchers have suggested that instruction in using TSRs is lacking in teacher preparation programs, but there are limited studies examining this claim. The problem addressed in this study is the perceived lack of instruction in using positive TSRs provided by teacher preparation programs. Using Gay's theory of culturally responsive teaching and Milner's concept of relationship-centered teaching as the conceptual framework, the purpose of this basic qualitative study was to explore teachers' viewpoints about the instruction received in innovative methods for using positive teacher-student relationships in urban schools. The research questions were designed to understand teacher-student relationships. Semistructured interviews and focus groups were conducted with 12 first-, second-, and third-year teachers. Data were coded, categorized, and analyzed for themes using qualitative data analysis strategies. The results of this study indicated that instruction in the use of TSRs is not explicitly included in teacher preparation programs but implicitly in the culturally responsive teaching instruction of urban-focused teacher preparation programs. Professors with urban teaching experience, cooperating teachers, student teaching seminars, and student teaching placements in urban districts were also sources of TSR instruction. Recommendations include adding explicit TSR instruction and an urban focus to all teacher preparation programs. This study could contribute to positive social change by improving teacher preparation programs so that all teachers are better prepared to use positive TSRs to improve educational outcomes for all students.

How Teachers Learn About Using Teacher-Student Relationships in Urban Schools

by

Cheryl J. Krapohl

MA, Marygrove College, 1999

BA, Moravian College, 1991

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Education

Walden University

November 2022

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my son, who is my inspiration, and to my mother, who was my biggest fan. I would also like to dedicate this dissertation to the memory of my dear friend Gretchen Schur Leming, who always cheered me on; and to the memory of my dear friend Cheryl Strutzel Urban, who believed in me completely and always reminded me of the good in my life.

Acknowledgments

I would like to start by thanking everyone who asked how my doctorate was progressing and offered encouragement along the way. Their interest and kind words often helped me to keep going at difficult points in the journey. I would also like to thank my fellow Walden University doctoral students, whom I met in class, online, or at residencies, for the support and comradery they offered along the way.

I must also thank Dr. Kaara Lydner for putting this crazy idea into my head in the first place. Without her, I may not have started this journey at all. I would also like to thank my best friend Rebecca, who gave me the strength to stay on this journey when the going was difficult. Thanks also go to Jennifer and Jonathan Steeber, not only for listening to me drone on about my dissertation topic, but for entertaining my son so often so I could work on my dissertation.

Additional thanks go to Dr. Jayasena, for her excellent advice and direction in creating my qualitative study and aligning my work, and to Dr. Burleigh, my URR. Thank you most of all to my chair, Dr. Courduff, for knowing when to push me and knowing when to encourage me. Onward!

Table of Contents

List of Tables v

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study 1

Introduction 1

Background 2

Problem Statement 3

Purpose Statement 4

Research Questions 4

Conceptual Framework 5

Nature of the Study 6

Definitions 7

Assumptions 8

Scope and Delimitations 9

Limitations 11

Significance 11

Summary 12

Chapter 2: Literature Review 14

Introduction 14

Literature Search Strategy 15

Conceptual Framework 17

Culturally Responsive Teaching 17

Relationship-Centered Teaching 20

Literature Review 24
Teacher-Student Relationship Theories 25
Student Outcomes 26
Teacher Behaviors and Attributes 51
Teacher Impacts 52
Teacher Education 59
Summary and Conclusions 69
Chapter 3: Research Method 71
Introduction 71
Research Design and Rationale 71
Choice of Design 72
Role of the Researcher 75
Methodology 77
Participant Selection Logic 77
Instrumentation 79
Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection 82
Data Analysis Plan 83
Data Codes and Categories 84
Issues of Trustworthiness 85
Credibility 86
Transferability 86
Dependability 86

Confirmability 87

Ethical Procedures 87

Summary 88

Chapter 4: Results 90

Introduction 90

Central Research Question 90

Subquestions 90

Setting 90

Demographics 91

Data Collection 94

Data Analysis 96

Evidence of Trustworthiness 100

Credibility 100

Transferability 100

Dependability 101

Confirmability 101

Results 101

Research Question: 102

SQ1: Courses 102

SQ2: Student Teaching 121

SQ3: Culturally Responsive Teaching 134

SQ4: Relationship-Centered Teaching 142

Participant Findings About the Use of TSRs 147
Summary 152
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations 154
Introduction 154
Interpretation of the Findings 156
Teacher Education Courses 156
Student Teaching 160
TSR Elements of CRT 162
TSR Elements of RCT 164
Learning From Experience 165
Limitations of the Study 166
Recommendations 167
Implications 169
Conclusion 170
References 173
Appendix A: Conceptual Framework Alignment 215
Appendix B: Social Media Invitation 216
Appendix C: Interview Protocol 217
Appendix D: Alignment of Research Subquestions and Interview Questions 219
Appendix E: Focus Group Protocol 220
Appendix F: TSR Information Participants Learned 222

List of Tables

Table 1 Participant Demographics 93

Table 2 Categories and Themes 99

Table 3 TSR Elements in Courses 117

Table F1 Professors 222

Table F2 Courses—Getting to Know Students 223

Table F3 Courses—How to Develop TSRs 224

Table F4 Courses—How to Use TSRs 225

Table F5 TSR Information Used During Student Teaching 226

Table F6 TSR Information Learned During Student Teaching 227

Table F7 Cooperating Teachers' Actions 228

Table F8 Cooperating Teachers' Words 229

Table F9 Seminar 230

Table F10 CRT Elements in Courses 231

Table F11 CRT Elements Used in Student Teaching 232

Table F12 RCT Elements in Courses 233

Table F13 RCT Elements Used in Student Teaching 234

Table F14 Participant Observations About Use of TSRs 235

Table F15 Participants' Personal Life Experiences 236

Table F16 Participant Suggestions 237

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

Teacher-student relationships (TSRs) are a fundamental part of teaching. They are the starting point of instruction, an integral part of classroom management (Kwok, 2017; Milner, 2018), and the basis of student academic success (Cornelius-White, 2007). Teachers who get to know their students and use that information to foster positive relationships with them are more successful at improving their students' educational outcomes (Gay, 2010b; Milner, 2018). TSRs can have an emotional impact on students and teachers and are often the part of education that students recall when discussing their school experiences (Uitto et al., 2018). The effects of positive TSRs can be long-lasting.

However, the results of recent research have suggested that many teachers lack the skills to use TSRs as part of their instructional technique (Guvenc, 2015; Zee et al., 2017), especially in urban schools (Milner, 2018; Roofe, 2015; Smith et al., 2017), which could lead to negative student outcomes (Milner et al., 2019; Skiba et al., 2011). Many researchers have suggested that teacher preparation programs need to add this instruction to their curricula (Cahill et al., 2016; Nairz-Wirth & Feldmann, 2017; Pennings, 2017; Rytivaara & Frelin, 2017), but there are limited studies examining whether instruction in TSRs is lacking in or missing from teacher preparation programs. This study could contribute to improved instruction in TSRs in teacher preparation programs, which could lead to teachers being more skilled in using positive TSRs. The potential social implications of this study could be improved student educational outcomes, especially for urban students.

In this chapter, I describe the background of the study, the problem that is the basis of this study, and the purpose of this study. I present the research question, subquestions, and the conceptual framework for the study. I then describe the nature of the study and provide definitions for the key terms used within this study. I address the assumptions present in this study, as well as its scope and delimitations. I describe the limitations of the study and how I will address them, and I identify the study's significance.

Background

Positive TSRs are an important component of successful instruction. TSRs are related to multiple positive student outcomes, including increased student engagement and achievement (Cornelius-White, 2007; Roorda et al., 2017), lower suspension and dropout rates (Quin, 2017), and better classroom management and instruction (Kwok, 2017). Conversely, poor TSRs could contribute to negative student outcomes (Balwant, 2017; Montuoro & Lewis, 2017), including higher suspension rates, especially in urban schools (Martin et al., 2016). These outcomes are even more pronounced for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds (Bouchard & Berg, 2017; McCormick et al., 2017; Murray et al., 2016). Students in urban schools are more likely to experience these negative outcomes, including academic failure, higher discipline rates, and higher dropout rates (Milner et al., 2019; Skiba et al., 2011), but the use of positive TSRs could be effective in preventing some of these negative outcomes for urban students (Gatti, 2016; Gay, 2010b; Milner et al., 2019; Murray et al., 2016; Reese et al., 2018; Roofe, 2015). Teachers need to be trained to use positive TSRs to improve their students'

educational outcomes and prevent negative outcomes, but there are limited studies that examine whether this instruction is provided by teacher preparation programs. This study was needed to determine whether teacher preparation programs are providing instruction in TSRs so that teacher preparation programs can better prepare teachers to use positive TSRs to improve the educational outcomes of their students.

Problem Statement

The problem addressed in this study was the perceived lack of instruction in using positive TSRs provided by teacher preparation programs. Several studies have indicated that teachers lack knowledge about how to use positive TSRs (Guvenc, 2015; Zee et al., 2017), especially in urban schools (Milner, 2018; Roofe, 2015; Smith et al., 2017). Some researchers have called for teacher educators to add instruction in innovative methods for using TSRs to their curricula (Cahill et al., 2016; Civitillo et al., 2021; Nairz-Wirth & Feldmann, 2017; Pennings, 2017; Rytivaara & Frelin, 2017), while other researchers have called for an examination of how teachers are prepared (Zygmunt et al., 2018). Some researchers have called for teacher preparation programs to include instruction in culturally responsive teaching (CRT; Civitillo et al., 2018; Gay, 2010b; Martin et al., 2016; Milner, 2010; Peña-Sandoval, 2019; Schauer, 2018; Zygmunt et al., 2018), and relationship-centered teaching (RCT; Milner, 2018), which are innovative instructional methods that use TSRs and are recommended for use in urban schools. However, few studies have examined how teachers learn to use TSRs, either in their coursework or in their student teaching, and whether this instruction, intentional or incidental, is absent or insufficient. Under such circumstances, this study could address a need for social change

in how teachers learn about positive TSRs in urban schools to increase positive student outcomes.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this basic qualitative study was to explore teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools, both in their teacher education courses and in their student teaching. There are several innovative methods that include TSRs as a component, such as RCT and CRT (Gay, 2010b; Milner, 2018; Schauer, 2018). As such, instruction in the development of TSRs could be embedded within the coursework and student teaching of teacher preparation programs, as well as within instruction in these innovative methods, instead of being directly addressed in the curricula of these programs. Therefore, the instruction teachers receive in TSRs needs to be looked at within the context of these programs.

Research Questions

Research question (RQ): What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools?

Subquestion (SQ)1: What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools in their teacher education courses?

SQ2: What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools in their student teaching?

SQ3: What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in the TSR elements of CRT?

SQ4: What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in the TSR elements of relationship-centered teaching?

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study consisted of CRT (Gay, 2010b) and RCT (Milner, 2018). Gay's (2010b) theory of CRT addresses how teachers' negative beliefs about their culturally diverse students can interfere with those students receiving quality instruction. Her theory includes the development of TSRs as a key component for improving instruction and has been extensively applied (Civitillo et al., 2018; Martin et al., 2016; Milner, 2010; Schauer, 2018; Zygmunt et al., 2018). Milner (2010) also promoted including instruction on cultural diversity and CRT in teacher preparation programs. Milner (2018) promoted the concept of RCT, which focuses on building relationships with students in order to address their academic and social needs, and using TSRs to address the issues of race and cultural differences. He also promoted the use of TSRs in classroom management strategies and the prevention of discipline issues. The combination of these methods provided a conceptual framework for how I explored my research (see Grant & Osanloo, 2014) because I explored teachers' viewpoints about how they learned to use TSRs in their instruction. Both of these methods involve the use of TSRs to improve instruction, student achievement, and other student outcomes. These methods supported the study because they are exemplar methods of using positive TSRs that are innovative and successful and are the type of methods that are called for in teacher education (see Morrison et al., 2020; Peña-Sandoval, 2019; Ravitch & Riggen, 2017). These are the methods in which teacher preparation programs could provide

instruction, and they provide an argument for asking teachers about instruction in other methods of using positive TSRs (see Ravitch & Riggen, 2017). These methods also provide reasons for including instruction in methods that use TSRs in teacher preparation programs.

Nature of the Study

This was a basic qualitative study because the purpose was to examine teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using TSRs in their teacher preparation programs. A basic qualitative approach allowed me to examine the teachers' viewpoints on their instruction and student teaching (see Patton, 2015). The key concept investigated was how teachers learn about using TSRs to improve their teaching methods and the student outcomes for urban students. I collected the data using semistructured interviews with 12 first-, second-, and third-year teachers. I chose these participants instead of current teacher candidates to ensure that the participant's knowledge of their teacher preparation program was complete and recent in their memories. First-, second-, and third-year teachers have completed their coursework and student teaching, have recently graduated from their teacher preparation programs, and have started to apply their learning to instruction of their own classes. I also conducted two focus group discussions with these participants. I analyzed the data using precoding, structural coding, and subcoding in the first cycle coding, and pattern coding in the second cycle coding (see Saldaña, 2013). This data analysis process allowed for the examination of the themes that emerged from the data gathered about the teachers' instruction in the use of TSRs.

Definitions

Closeness: The quality of TSRs that characterize them as positive and warm, or good relationships, and lead to efforts to promote student success (Hamre & Pianta, 2001).

Conflict: The quality of TSRs that characterize them as negative or problematic and lead to efforts to regulate student behavior (Hamre & Pianta, 2001).

Field experience: Also called a clinical experience; in a field experience, a teacher candidate spends time in an actual classroom or teaching situation, either observing, teaching in some capacity, or a combination of both (Smith et al., 2017). Student teaching is also considered a field experience.

Student teaching: Also known as practice teaching, or a practicum (Wang, 2018), student teaching is the semester or school year during which a teacher candidate assumes all of the responsibilities of a regular classroom teacher under the supervision of a cooperating teacher (Cross et al., 2018).

Teacher candidate: A person who is participating in any part of a teacher preparation program (Smith et al., 2017). The term *preservice teacher* is also used synonymously in the literature (Wang, 2018).

Teacher educator: A person who teaches courses in a teacher preparation program or who oversees teacher candidates participating in field experiences or student teaching (Gay, 2010a; Wilks et al., 2019).

Teacher preparation program: A specific course of study at a college or university that prepares future teachers and that includes a combination of coursework

and field experience; it is also referred to as a *teacher education program* (Schauer, 2018). The term *teacher education* is used synonymously but refers more collectively to teacher preparation programs in general.

Urban school: A school located in a large or major city or that has the characteristics and challenges of one, such as a larger population of English language learners, less access to resources, and lower academic achievement levels (Milner, 2012).

Assumptions

Certain assumptions are necessary in the context of a qualitative study. First, for this study, I assumed that TSRs is a concept that may already be included in teacher preparation programs. This assumption was necessary because the literature does not provide conclusive evidence that TSR instruction is specifically excluded. Secondly, I assumed that participants would have accurate recall of the content of instruction in their teacher preparation courses and in their student teaching. Third, I assumed that participants would be honest in their responses and answer candidly, with trust in my assertion that their responses would be confidential. These second and third assumptions were necessary because accurate qualitative data are based on participant responses (see Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). For this study, the accuracy of my data depended on the reliability of the participant's responses.

Scope and Delimitations

This study addressed the instruction teachers received in the use of TSRs in their teacher preparation programs. I focused on teachers' viewpoints in order to examine their opinions of the instruction they received in their teacher preparation programs. The concept of TSRs may already be included to some extent in teacher preparation programs, so my focus was on what information about TSRs if any, the teachers were getting out of their coursework and student teaching. I was not examining the teacher preparation of the curriculum because teachers may not receive instruction in every topic listed in the curriculum. Also, the inclusion of a topic in a course does not mean that students taking the course will successfully master and recall that material.

The scope of this study was limited to 12 participants: first-, second-, and third-year teachers who were currently teaching in urban schools and who had recently completed a teacher preparation program. There are many concepts and theories related to TSRs, but this study addressed only two concepts that are directly related to instructional technique. This study was also limited to first-year teachers who were currently teaching in urban schools; thus, the study is not transferrable to suburban or rural schools. Lastly, the study was dependent on the content of the teacher preparation programs the participants completed and is therefore not transferrable to all teacher preparation programs.

I chose to narrow the scope of my study to urban schools for several reasons. The theories of CRT and RCT, both of which emphasize the use of positive TSRs, are designed to improve the educational outcomes of culturally diverse students (Gay, 2010b;

Milner, 2018). These diverse populations, as well as students from low socioeconomic backgrounds, are found in urban schools (Milner, 2011, 2012, 2018), and the conflict in TSRs some students in urban schools experience is often the result of the cultural misunderstandings, which can be addressed through the use of CRT and culturally responsive classroom management (Gay, 2010b; Milner, 2018; Weinstein et al., 2004). Students in urban schools are not being educated effectively (Howard & Milner, 2014; Milner & Laughter, 2015), are disproportionately disciplined (Skiba et al., 2011), and experience higher dropout rates and incarceration rates, both of which are linked to academic failure (Milner et al., 2019). The use of effective strategies such as positive TSRs could prevent these negative outcomes (Gatti, 2016; Gay, 2010b; Milner et al., 2019; Reese et al., 2018; Roofe, 2015) and could also improve academic outcomes for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds (Bouchard & Berg, 2017; McCormick et al., 2017). Many researchers have suggested that most teacher candidates are not prepared to teach in urban schools (Brown & Rodriguez, 2017; Cross et al., 2018; Howard & Milner, 2014; Milner & Laughter, 2015; Roofe, 2015; Schauer, 2018), and other studies have shown that programs preparing teachers to work in urban districts are effective (Gatti, 2016; Reese et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2017; Zygmunt et al., 2018). Therefore, even though the use of positive TSRs can benefit all students (Gay, 2013; Milner et al., 2019), in this study, I focused on teachers' viewpoints about their instruction in the use of positive TSRs in urban schools.

Limitations

A limitation of this study is its reliance on the viewpoints of the participants. It is possible that the participants may not recall information that was presented in their coursework or student teaching, so their perceptions may be that TSR instruction was not included when it was, in fact, included. I addressed this limitation by requesting participants to review their course syllabi and notes before the interview for information about TSRs that may have been presented in their courses. I also addressed this limitation through the focus group discussions, during which the participants' discussion about the information they learned may help them remember about TSRs from their teacher preparation programs. Another limitation is that the concept of TSRs may be included in the curriculum but not addressed in the coursework or student teaching. Again, I addressed this limitation by requesting participants to review their course syllabi before the interview for information about TSRs that may have been mentioned but not presented in the courses.

With any interview-based study, researcher bias is a potential limitation. My potential biases lie in my personal experience as an urban high school teacher and my personal beliefs on the importance of TSRs. I protected against these biases by keeping a reflective journal in which I recorded my experiences and thoughts during my data collection and analysis.

Significance

This study is significant in that the results may demonstrate the need for changes or improvements to teacher preparation programs through the addition or inclusion of

innovative instruction in the use of TSRs. Findings could lead to improvements in how teacher preparation programs provide instruction in innovative methods for using TSRs and thereby improve TSR quality, which could, in turn, lead to improved outcomes for urban students (see Bouchard & Berg, 2017; Liu et al., 2018; McCormick et al., 2017; Okonofua et al., 2016). Additionally, findings may lead to social change for students in urban schools who experience negative outcomes that could be avoided through the improved use of positive TSRs (see Gatti, 2016; Martin et al., 2016; Reese et al., 2018; Roofe, 2015; Schauer, 2018; Smart, 2014; Smith et al., 2017). These social changes could include improved academic outcomes and higher graduation rates.

Summary

In this chapter, I discussed the importance of positive TSRs and the need to include TSR instruction in teacher preparation programs. I identified the gap in the literature, which is the lack of studies that examine whether TSR instruction is included in teacher preparation programs. I identified this study as a basic qualitative study that used semistructured interviews to examine teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received using TSRs in their teacher preparation programs. I also addressed the scope of the study, which focused on first-year teachers in urban schools, and the limitations of the study, which included the possibility that participants may not have accurately recalled the information from their teacher preparation programs. Lastly, I addressed the significance of the study, which could include improvements in teacher preparation programs and classroom instruction, and, as a result, improvements in student outcomes.

In Chapter 2, I review the strategies I used for my literature search and describe the two theories that provide the conceptual framework for this study. I also review the recent literature related to the study of TSRs and the literature related to teacher preparation programs that include TSRs, CRT, or preparing teachers to teach in urban schools.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Little is known about how teachers learn to use TSRs successfully in their instruction of students. TSRs are a fundamental part of instruction that have established benefits for students and teachers (Cornelius-White, 2007; Quin, 2017; Roorda et al., 2017; Spilt et al., 2011), especially in urban schools (Bouchard & Berg, 2017; Murray et al., 2016). Students in urban schools are more likely to experience negative outcomes such as academic failure and dropout (Milner et al., 2019), but the use of positive TSRs can be effective in preventing some of these negative outcomes for these students (Gatti, 2016; Gay, 2010b; Milner et al., 2019; Murray et al., 2016; Reese et al., 2018; Roofe, 2015). Several studies have suggested that instruction in the use of TSRs is missing from teacher preparation programs (Cahill et al., 2016; Rytivaara & Frelin, 2017), but there are limited studies examining how instruction in the use of TSRs is included in teacher preparation programs. The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools, both in their teacher education courses and in their student teaching.

After an examination of the literature search strategy and a discussion of the conceptual framework, this literature review focuses on the current literature about TSRs. The literature on TSRs includes the many student and teacher variables affected by TSRs, how TSRs have been examined in studies of the coursework and field experiences of

teacher preparation programs, and how teacher preparation programs have addressed the topic of CRT, a strategy that includes the use of TSRs.

Literature Search Strategy

I began my search for articles by using three of the Walden Library's search engines: Education Source, Academic Search Complete, and ERIC. I first used the search term *rapport* to identify relationships between teachers and students, but I was not finding many articles that were appropriate for my study. I switched to using *teacher-student relationships* as my search term and found many more articles. I searched using this term both with and without the hyphen. I also used the search term *teacher education* as a secondary search term with *teacher-student relationships*. Additionally, I used synonyms of the above terms, such as *teacher-child relationship*, *teacher preparation*, and *preservice teachers*, in searching for more articles. I then used the terms *urban* and *urban education* in conjunction with the aforementioned search terms, and later I used the phrase *urban high school*, although this term did not yield any new articles. As I expanded my search into the subtopics of TSRs, I used a number of other terms with the term *teacher-student relationships*, including *achievement*, *engagement*, *motivation*, *dropout*, *suspension*, *behavior*, *social and emotional*, *teacher well-being*, *teacher stress*, *teacher attrition*, and *teacher emotions*. Other search terms I used were connected to my conceptual framework: *culturally relevant pedagogy*, *culturally responsive pedagogy*, *culturally responsive teaching*, *classroom management*, and *relationship-centered teaching*, both with and without the hyphen.

In my research, I also relied heavily on Google Scholar, searching for all of the previously mentioned terms. I used Google scholar to set up search alerts for the term *teacher-student relationships* and the term *teacher education*. As I received emails containing new articles, I reviewed the article lists for those I might be able to use in my study. I also searched the Walden Library database of dissertations for all of the above search terms. I looked at the reference lists of the most recent dissertations to identify any other recent articles that the previously mentioned search engines did not find.

Once I had found a number of articles, I started looking at the reference lists of the more recent articles for potentially relevant articles that I may have missed in my previous searches. If an article seemed important but was too old, I used Google Scholar to find articles that cited this article. I then narrowed those results by my search terms and by year to check for pertinent articles I may have missed. I also used this method to search for studies that cited the articles in my conceptual framework. When I found an author who had written more than one study, I used Google Scholar and the Walden Library search engines to search for articles by that author.

In order to verify my research gap, I searched for articles using the terms *teacher education*, *preservice teaching*, *preservice teachers*, and *teacher preparation* in conjunction with the term *teacher-student relationships*. I checked each article for mention of the content of teacher preparation programs. I also checked the reference lists of these articles for other articles that may have examined teacher preparation programs. If any study did examine the content of teacher preparation programs, I looked for references to content in TSRs, as well as checking the articles referenced by that study.

Even by doing so, I did not find studies that examined the content of teacher preparation programs for the inclusion of information on TSRs.

Conceptual Framework

There are two innovative methods that incorporate the use of positive TSRs into instructional methods designed to improve the outcomes for students from different cultural backgrounds and those in urban schools. One is CRT (Gay, 2010b), and the other is RCT (Milner, 2018). Both theories emphasize the importance of positive TSRs in improving student academic and behavior outcomes, and both theorists have recommended using these methods as the focus of teacher preparation programs that prepare teachers to work in urban schools.

Culturally Responsive Teaching

The theory of CRT originated with Ladson-Billings (1995) and her theory of culturally relevant pedagogy, the practice of which she called culturally relevant teaching. In her landmark study, she identified some general characteristics of teachers who were successful in instructing African-American students. She used these characteristics to build her theory of culturally relevant pedagogy and to describe a model of culturally relevant teaching that could be used in teacher education. The three main categories she identified were (a) conceptions of self and others: having high beliefs in and strong expectations of themselves and their students; (b) social relations: building positive TSRs and connections with students, and encouraging collaborative learning; and (c) conceptions of knowledge: believing in the constructing, sharing, and scaffolding of knowledge, and doing so critically and passionately.

Gay (2010b) built upon Ladson-Billings's (1995) work to create the theory of CRT. In her early scholarship, Gay (1993), a teacher educator, noted the lack of cultural understanding between teachers, who were predominately White, and their students, especially those in urban areas, who were becoming more ethnically diverse. Gay's work moved beyond Ladson-Billings's theory to include understanding students from all cultures and groups. Gay (2010b) emphasized the need to add culturally responsive training to teacher preparation programs in order to address this divide and provide teachers with the skills they needed to teach children from cultural backgrounds different than their own successfully. She initially identified three areas in which teachers needed to be successful and that should be included in teacher preparation programs: acquiring cultural knowledge, becoming change agents, and translating knowledge into practice. The first area, acquiring cultural knowledge, includes learning how to relate to and communicate with students from diverse cultures and understanding how their cultural characteristics may affect their behavior and interactions in the classroom.

Gay (2010b) further expanded her ideas into a theory of culturally responsive pedagogy, the practice of which is referred to as CRT. She identified the characteristics of CRT as validating, comprehensive, multidimensional, empowering, transformative, and emancipatory. Of these characteristics, multidimensional is related to TSRs. Gay discussed TSRs in more detail as part of what she called culturally responsive caring. She discussed the characteristics of caring as including "patience, persistence, facilitation, validation, and empowerment for the participants" (p. 49). Gay asserted, "Teachers who genuinely care for students generate higher levels of all kinds of success than those who

do not" (p. 49). She also noted that students wanted to be able to connect with their teachers, and that caring was "a necessary feature of effective teaching for students of color" (p. 56). Lastly, she noted that teachers did not need to be the same ethnicity to be successful in demonstrating care for students; but they did need to be respectful, supportive, available, and have high expectations for students.

Gay (2006) also examined how the use of CRT can address issues with classroom management. Most of these issues could be prevented through respectful interactions, creating a classroom climate that provides students with a sense of belonging, opportunities for collaborative learning, and effective and culturally appropriate instructional strategies. She referenced the research on the disparate discipline rates for students of color: "Much of the current high levels of racial disproportionality in school discipline is a reflection of teachers not understanding and incorporating the cultural values, orientations, and experiences of African, Latino, Asian, and Native Americans into curriculum and instruction" (p. 343). The use of CRT could prevent the need for punitive discipline through successful and respectful classroom practices.

Gay and Kirkland (2003) advocated for making CRT a central part of teacher preparation programs in order to improve educational outcomes for students. To address the resistance and obstacles they had noted to implementing CRT in teacher education, Gay and Kirkland suggested that part of the curriculum should include space for discussion and reflection where preservice teachers can examine their beliefs as well as the issues of racism, privilege, and social justice that confront urban education. Initially, Gay and Howard (2000) suggested that because of the initial resistance to CRT, its

implementation in teacher education might have to start with individual courses being brought into the curriculum, rather than starting with a complete redesign of teacher preparation programs. Gay (2010a) later noted that although teacher preparation programs had begun to incorporate these courses into their curricula and these topics into existing courses, not enough was being incorporated to address the beliefs and biases that prevented the preservice teachers from successfully mastering the culturally responsive pedagogy. Gay (2013) also discussed the continued resistance to CRT as resulting from those biases and beliefs and discussed ways to address those beliefs through explanation and critical reflection.

Overall, Gay's theory of CRT is used to improve student outcomes for culturally diverse students, but can also benefit all students (Gay, 2013). Although many teacher preparation programs incorporate this theory into their courses, most do not yet use it as a model for teacher education reform (Gay, 2010a). The use of TSRs is an important part of CRT, but the concept of TSRs tends to be embedded within other topics in the theory rather than being directly mentioned in discussions of CRT. Therefore, the concept of TSRs may be embedded within CRT curriculum in teacher preparation programs as opposed to being directly addressed.

Relationship-Centered Teaching

Milner's (2018) concept of RCT was based on Gay's (2010b) theory of CRT, and Gay's (2006) ideas about the use of CRT to improve classroom management. Milner's concept focuses on establishing caring relationships with students, and then using those

relationships as part of a classroom management strategy though which to handle and prevent behavioral issues in the classroom.

Milner (2003), who is also a teacher educator, used a critical pedagogy lens based on Ladson-Billings's (1995) theory to examine how teacher educators prepared teacher candidates to teach in diverse settings in order to improve the quality of education those students received. Milner suggested that teacher candidates needed to reflect upon and discuss difficult issues of race and privilege in order to increase their awareness of their own biases and beliefs because their mindsets may influence their classroom teaching decisions. He proposed two methods, critically engaged dialogue and race reflective journaling, that teacher educators could use to help teacher candidates explore these issues.

Milner studied several teacher preparation programs that incorporated such courses and tools. One course Milner (2005) examined was successful in changing preservice teachers' beliefs and decisions about diversity. Milner attributed this success to the use of a combination of course-based instruction on diversity and a field experience in a diverse setting and argued that both were necessary for the success of the program. He also found that, in one case, a teacher candidate did not fully grasp the course content despite doing well on the course assignments. Milner concluded that more research was needed to examine this disconnect between theory and practice. In another study, Milner (2006a) examined a course that included classroom experience and was designed to help teacher candidates develop the skills and attitudes necessary to be successful teachers in an urban setting. Milner found that this course was more successful in bridging the gap

between theory and practice, and the participants demonstrated increased awareness and insight that was evident in their classroom practice.

In further work on diversity instruction needed in teacher education, Milner (2010) cited Eisner's (1994) three aspects of teacher education curriculum: (a) the explicit curriculum, or what is stated in the course description or syllabus; (b) the implicit or hidden curriculum, or what is not specifically addressed in the course description but is included or mentioned in the course; and (c) the null curriculum, or what is not covered at all. Milner suggested that the complex issues of diversity need to be explicitly addressed throughout the teacher education curriculum, not just in one or two courses or mentioned implicitly, in order to be fully implemented in teaching practice. Other issues that need to be addressed in teacher education include awareness of how skin tone affects perceptions and bias (McGee et al., 2016), and how to prepare teachers to include discussions of race in their classrooms (Milner, 2017). Milner argued that teacher education was better preparing teachers to teach in urban contexts, but that there was still room for improvement.

Milner conducted several studies that looked at the successful methods teachers used with their diverse students in urban contexts. In one of these studies, Milner (2006b) examined the techniques Black teachers used that were successful with Black students and found that relationships, based on cultural connections and their understanding of their students and their experiences, were a key component of the teachers' success. In an ongoing study of three successful teachers, Milner (2008) found that all three teachers used successful methods that differed from those found in typical classrooms. All three

teachers built relationships with their students as part of their teaching strategies (Milner, 2008). Milner (2014) found that one teacher, in addition to teaching her students through the relationships she developed with them, experienced success with her students through a willingness to discuss race and how it impacted their experiences. Milner and Tenore (2010) also found that two of the three teachers in the ongoing study used culturally responsive classroom management techniques (Weinstein et al., 2004), an important component of which was the relationships they built with their students, and an understanding that students from different cultures react differently to situations involving conflict with teachers. One teacher also demonstrated cultural competence in his interactions with his students, and Milner (2011) noted that as a result, this teacher was able to use his relationships with his students to handle conflicts and misbehavior in class instead of sending students to the office.

Based on this research, Milner (2018) suggested that relationships are central to effective instruction, and that some students have difficulty learning from teachers they perceive as uncaring. Milner asserted that an essential part of building relationships with students includes acknowledging and relating to the students' racial identities and experiences. Through these relationships, teachers can defuse or prevent negative student behaviors that can interfere with instruction and successfully teach culturally diverse students as well as all students. Milner also addressed the need to include in teacher preparation programs instruction in how to develop these TSRs that can help improve teaching and learning, especially for diverse students in urban districts.

In conclusion, both Gay (2010b) and Milner (2018), building upon Gay's theory, advocated for the implementation of CRT, that includes an emphasis on TSRs. Both include the development of TSRs as part of classroom management strategies (Gay, 2006; Milner & Tenore, 2010), while Milner extended the use of culturally responsive classroom management into his concept of RCT. While Gay (2010b) did not explicitly call for the inclusion of instruction in relationship building in her theory of CRT, she emphasized the use of TSRs as an important element of instruction within the theory. Thus, the concept of TSRs is implicitly included in the instruction of CRT. Finally, both Gay (2010a) and Milner (2017) advocated for the inclusion of CRT in the teacher education curriculum, with Milner (2018) emphasizing the importance of including instruction in relationship development and diversity in the teacher education curriculum as well.

Literature Review

TSRs are an essential part of teaching. Many researchers have studied the many aspects of TSRs that contribute to positive and negative student outcomes, as well as those that contribute to issues affecting teachers. Several researchers studying various aspects of TSRs have called for content in TSRs, including CRT, to be added to the teacher education curriculum, while other researchers conducting studies of teacher preparation programs have cited the need for content in CRT as a result of teachers not being properly prepared to teach in urban schools. In neither group of studies, however, have the researchers cited evidence that this instruction is missing or lacking. The following review examines the current literature on these topics.

Teacher-Student Relationship Theories

There are several theories upon which much of the research on TSRs is based. Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969) is often invoked in studies of TSRs formed between elementary school children and their teachers. According to this theory, children need a secure relationship with a parent in order to function optimally in society, and this need is correlated to education: children need a positive relationship with their teachers to function optimally in school. While attachment theory continues to support the idea of TSRs with high school students, the relationship between older children and their teachers is also based on social-motivation theory. Social-motivation theory posits that students will not be motivated and engaged in class unless teachers meet certain psychological needs (Deci et al., 1991; Wentzel, 2002). These theories explain why the teacher-student relationship is important in motivating and engaging students. Academic risk theory (Hamre & Pianta, 2001) focuses on the importance of TSRs for academic achievement, suggesting that for students who are at risk of poor educational outcomes, this risk could be mediated by positive TSRs (Hamre & Pianta, 2001), and that this effect is even more pronounced with children from low socio-economic backgrounds (Hamre & Pianta, 2005). Person-centered education theory emphasizes empathy, trust, and flexibility, and Rogers (1969) suggested that there are specific traits in the TSR that promote learning. These theories provide the framework that supports the use and efficacy of TSRs.

Student Outcomes

There is a large body of literature covering the many benefits of positive TSRs for both students and teachers. Several seminal meta-analyses have documented these benefits for students, including improved academic achievement and engagement, and emotional and behavioral outcomes (Cornelius-White, 2007; Quin, 2017; Roorda et al., 2017). In order to successfully teach all students, teachers must be able to develop caring and positive TSRs with all students (J-F et al., 2018) and incorporate those relationships into classroom instruction (Liu et al., 2018). Hattie (2008), in a seminal meta-analysis of the factors that make education effective, found that one of the most important factors for positive student outcomes was a positive teacher-student relationship. Additionally, several studies identify positive TSRs as a main factor for teacher success in urban schools (Oplatka & Gamerman, 2021; Ransom, 2020; Wronowski, 2018). These studies emphasized the importance of positive TSRs for positive student outcomes.

Academic Achievement

There are many studies documenting the positive effects of quality TSRs on student academic achievement (Cornelius-White, 2007; Morrison et al., 2019; Quin, 2017; Roorda et al., 2017; Vandenbroucke et al., 2018b). Cornelius-White (2007) conducted a seminal meta-analysis that showed a positive correlation between nine teacher attributes associated with positive TSRs and nine cognitive student outcomes: academic achievement; student perceived achievement; grades; verbal, math, social science, and science achievement; IQ; and critical thinking. Quin (2017) also conducted a meta-analysis that found that quality TSRs were positively associated with grades.

Positive TSRs have been correlated with other positive academic effects. Positive TSRs predicted increases in academic achievement and protected against negative school outcomes for students entering high school (Longobardi et al., 2016), a vulnerable population. Furthermore, academically at-risk students who received increased teacher support were considered low-risk by the end of the year; conversely, low-risk students who received lower teacher support were considered at-risk by the end of the year (Pitzer & Skinner, 2017). Additionally, positive TSRs could have a longitudinal impact, directly or indirectly. Hajovsky et al. (2017) conducted a longitudinal study of TSR quality as well as its relation to math and reading achievement in first through fifth grades. They found that TSR quality did not impact later academic achievement in reading and math, once earlier achievement levels were controlled for. They suggested that students with lower achievement levels who have received negative feedback may not attempt to engage in relationships with teachers, and that teachers should use strategies to develop more positive TSRs with lower achieving students early on.

Another meta-analysis examined the relationship between academic achievement, engagement, and positive TSRs. Roorda et al. (2017) found in their meta-analysis that positive TSRs were more strongly related to engagement and achievement in secondary grades than in primary school grades. This meta-analysis also showed that TSRs had an effect on achievement through engagement serving as a partial mediator, and that TSRs directly affected student achievement. This meta-analysis built upon and confirmed the results of earlier meta-analyses, which showed that both positive and negative TSRs were associated with student engagement and achievement (Roorda et al., 2011).

Student behavioral and emotional strengths, contributing to and resulting from better TSRs, have also been related to academic achievement. Both student strengths and positive TSRs were correlated to improved academic achievement. Positive TSRs also led to improved student behavioral and emotional strengths, which in turn contributed to improved academic achievement (Sointu et al., 2017). Quality TSRs have also had a positive influence on executive functioning. A meta-analysis of the association between TSRs and executive functions in children showed that positive TSRs could promote executive functions, such as inhibition, working memory, and general executive functioning, in children (Vandenbroucke et al., 2018b). McKinnon and Blair (2018) found similar results in their quantitative study of the relation of teacher-child conflict, executive functions, and early reading and math achievement. They found that conflict in TSRs in Kindergarten was related to lower executive function development and lower reading achievement in first grade.

Motivation and Engagement

The correlation between motivation and engagement has been studied as a separate construct from strictly academic outcomes. There are several measures related to motivation and engagement that have been correlated to positive TSRs. Cornelius-White (2007) conducted a meta-analysis that showed a positive correlation between nine teacher attributes associated with positive TSRs and student motivation, both positive and negative. TSRs were strongly correlated to student motivation, and there was a strong correlation between student perceptions of school climate, of which TSRs are a part, and reading and math achievement (Fan & Williams, 2018). TSRs were also found to have a

protective influence on engagement when teachers provided critical written feedback to students (Zheng et al., 2020). TSRs also had an impact on school engagement for adolescents (Engels et al., 2021). Guvenc (2015) found that teacher motivational support had a positive influence on student motivation and class participation, and that engagement improved as a result of improved motivation, while Lavy and Naama-Ghanayim (2020) found that students who felt that their teachers cared for them had higher levels of school engagement.

Emotional and behavioral engagement have also been correlated to TSRs: meta-analyses have shown a positive correlation between quality TSRs and student engagement measures (Quin, 2017; Roorda et al., 2017; Roorda et al., 2011). Additionally, positive TSRs were correlated with higher behavioral engagement, while negative TSRs were correlated with lower emotional engagement (Archambault et al., 2017). TSRs could also act as a protective factor for the engagement of students who are hyperactive or inattentive. Positive TSRs had a positive impact on the behavioral engagement of hyperactive or inattentive students, and especially on the cognitive engagement of hyperactive boys (Olivier & Archambault, 2017). Conversely, negative teacher behaviors were correlated to lower student behavioral engagement. Higher levels of teacher aggression towards students lowered not only the behavioral engagement of the targets of the aggression, but also lowered the behavioral engagement of all of the students present and interrupted learning (Montuoro & Lewis, 2017). Thus, positive TSRs were important for student engagement (see Archambault et al., 2017) and could improve the emotional, behavioral, and cognitive engagement of students.

Quality TSRs were also important for the engagement of students with lower self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is defined as a student's belief in their ability to accomplish a task, and positive TSRs were correlated to increased student self-efficacy (Prewett et al., 2019). Students receiving higher levels of emotional support from teachers had similar emotional and social engagement levels in math as compared to students with higher self-efficacy levels (Martin & Rimm-Kaufman, 2015). These results demonstrated the potential for quality TSRs to compensate for lower self-efficacy and have a positive impact on students' social and emotional engagement.

This positive influence of TSRs on engagement has also been shown to have a cumulative effect. Martin and Collie (2018) found that students who experienced a larger number of positive TSRs throughout their school day maintained a higher overall school engagement, and that the positive TSRs acted as a buffer for the negative ones. They found these findings consistent as long as the number of positive TSRs exceeded the number of negative ones; once the number of negative TSRs outweighed the positive, however, overall school engagement started to decline. In order to improve engagement and motivation, teachers can use positive interactions with students and create more positive classroom environments (see Fan & Williams, 2018). Additionally, teachers and teacher educators need instruction in meeting students' psychological needs (see Guvenc, 2015). Overall, the results of these studies indicated that improving student engagement and creating positive experiences for students could lead to overall improved student school engagement.

Social and Emotional Outcomes

Students' social and emotional traits have been related to their success in school, and there are many studies that have shown how TSRs are correlated to and can be a protective factor for a variety of these traits. One social-emotional factor that positive TSRs have been linked to is a student's sense of belonging at school. Students identified caring TSRs as an essential factor in their development of a sense of school belonging and their feelings of belonging at school (Bouchard & Berg, 2017; Chiu et al., 2016). Another social-emotional construct related to TSRs is student adjustment to school, which is defined as how well students adapt to the school environment and to being a student. Positive TSRs contributed to school adjustment, and were correlated with emotional and behavioral adjustment (Murray et al., 2016). Positive TSRs also contributed to students' psychological needs being met and a reduction in maladaptive behaviors as a result (Oostdam et al., 2019). These studies demonstrated the importance of positive TSRs in contributing to the sense of belonging, social adjustment, and emotional well-being of students.

Parental and Peer Relationships. Positive TSR was found to be a protective factor for the social and emotional outcomes of children who have negative parent-child relationships or negative peer relationships. For children who had negative relationships with their parents, a supportive message from the teacher enabled these children to perform as well as or better than children who heard supportive messages from their parents (Vandenbroucke et al., 2017). TSRs also played a role in supporting the working memory performance of students having issues with peer acceptance. Because of their

negative perception of their peer acceptance, these students saw teachers as saying what they had to say and not what they really meant; therefore, these students needed more supportive TSRs throughout their schooling to promote their self-confidence and working memory (Vandenbroucke et al., 2018a). These studies showed that supportive TSRs could have a protective influence for students who have negative peer or parental relationships.

Bullying. Bullying is another area in which TSRs have been found to influence student social and emotional outcomes. For students who were bullied, positive TSRs were beneficial for a number of psychosocial outcomes in addition to bullying victimization, because bullied students who did not have strong TSRs were more likely to experience depressive symptoms (Huang et al., 2018). Furthermore, students who were rejected by their peers and who experienced conflict in their TSRs were more likely to engage in behaviors such as bullying and support for bullying. These negative behaviors could be prevented through the development of more positive TSRs (Longobardi et al., 2018). In both cases, TSRs, positive or problematic, influenced student emotions and behavior in relation to bullying, and positive TSRs were found to be a protective factor for both perpetrators and recipients of bullying behaviors.

Behavioral Outcomes

Positive TSRs have been shown to have a positive impact on student behavior. Cornelius-White's (2007) meta-analysis showed a positive correlation between nine teacher attributes associated with positive TSRs and several behavioral student outcomes: attendance, participation, self-efficacy, social skills, satisfaction, and behavior. The

results of Quin's (2017) meta-analysis also showed that quality TSRs were positively associated with lower levels of negative student behaviors and better attendance. Several studies also found that positive TSRs were important for successful classroom management (Giang & Nga, 2019; Hepburn et al., 2020; Kwok & Svajda-Hardy, 2021). In the following sections, I review the many studies that covered a variety of topics related to student behavioral outcomes, their correlation to TSRs, and the effects TSRs could have on these areas.

Internalizing and Externalizing Behaviors. There are two types of student behaviors that have been studied in relation to TSRs: internalizing behaviors and externalizing behaviors. Internalizing behaviors refers to student behaviors that are related to emotional issues such as depression or anxiety, whereas externalizing behaviors refers to student behaviors that are inappropriate and disruptive (Mejia & Hoglund, 2016). Both internalizing and externalizing behaviors were often correlated with conflict in TSRs, while internalizing behaviors have also been correlated with lack of closeness in TSRs.

Internalizing Behaviors. Students' internalizing behaviors have been associated with lower quality TSRs. One study concluded that negative TSRs were associated with internalizing behaviors and could therefore negatively impact students. Student perceptions of TSRs and interactions with teachers were related to internalizing behaviors. Students who perceived their TSRs as negative also perceived interactions with the teacher as negative, and these negative perceptions were associated with internalizing behaviors (Jellesma et al., 2015). Similarly, different student internalizing

behaviors affected the quality of TSRs. Teachers experienced less closeness in their relationships with shy students, and more conflict in their relationships with students who were anxious (Zee & Roorda, 2018). Teachers also became less involved with students whom they perceived as showing more depressive symptoms (Spilt et al., 2018), which suggested the need for teaching strategies in working with children with depressive symptoms.

Conversely, positive TSRs have been found to have a protective effect for vulnerable students displaying issues with internalizing behaviors. Positive TSRs have been shown to serve as a protective factor for the development of depressive symptoms in children (Spilt et al., 2018). They were also found to be a protective influence for students with internalizing behaviors as a result of not living with their parents. Liu et al. (2015) studied the effect of positive TSRs on the emotional and behavioral adjustment of Chinese left-behind children, children whose parents have left them with other caretakers while they seek employment in the cities. They compared these students to a comparison group of students living with one or both parents. They found that the left-behind children demonstrated higher levels of depression and low self-esteem, and while both groups benefitted from positive TSRs, the left-behind children gained greater benefits from these relationships. The authors concluded that positive TSRs could have a protective influence on left-behind children in addition to being beneficial for all children.

Externalizing Behaviors. Students' externalizing behaviors, or misbehavior, could affect the quality of TSRs. Several studies have examined the correlation between

problem behaviors, or disruptive behaviors, in students, and conflict in TSRs. An increased number of behavioral problems in children correlated with higher levels of conflict in TSRs in general (Mejia & Hoglund, 2016; Pakarinen et al., 2018), for ethnic minority children (de Jong et al, 2018), and for children with ADHD (Zendarski et al., 2020). These higher levels of conflict in TSRs contributed to lower levels of student behavioral and emotional engagement (Archambault et al., 2017). While poor social skills had an impact on conflict in TSRs, externalizing behaviors had a greater impact on conflict in TSRs than did poor social skills. Conversely, early conflict in TSRs predicted both later externalizing behaviors and poor social skills (Skalická et al., 2015). Early conflict in TSRs also predicted behavioral issues that began in early grades and persisted through later grades (Ettekal & Shi, 2020). As a result, student behavioral issues increased the conflict in and affected the quality of TSRs, as did teacher responses to these behaviors.

Conversely, positive TSRs could have a positive impact on student externalizing behaviors and student outcomes. The use of positive teacher behaviors has been shown to reduce student misbehavior (Pennings et. al., 2018). Targeted interventions aimed at increasing the positive TSR strategies used by teachers have also been successful in improving student outcomes. Students' aggressive behavior decreased during a school year when teachers used a social-emotional learning intervention to create a more emotionally supportive classroom (Portnow et al., 2018). Positive TSRs have also provided a protective influence for genetic behavioral issues. De Laet et al. (2016) discovered a correlation between increased negative behaviors and decreased engagement

in students carrying one of two specific genes and concluded that positive TSRs could moderate the effect of this genetic influence.

Many studies have shown a correlation between TSRs and students' externalizing behaviors. Lei et al. (2016) conducted a meta-analysis and found significant correlations between positive TSRs and reduced student misbehaviors, and between negative TSRs and increased student misbehaviors. They also found that these results vary with age: positive TSRs had a greater correlation with reduced student misbehaviors for elementary students, while negative TSRs had a greater correlation with increased student misbehaviors for high school students. Other studies have also shown that positive TSRs were correlated to prosocial behaviors, and that conflict in TSRs was correlated to behavioral problems (De Laet et al., 2016; Longobardi et al., 2016; Longobardi et al., 2021; Roorda et al., 2014b). Positive TSRs, then, were important for encouraging positive student behaviors and reducing negative student behaviors.

Other studies have examined the longitudinal effects of TSRs on students' externalizing behaviors, both positive and negative. Teacher praise and reprimands have affected student relational aggression over time. In one longitudinal study, student relational aggression generally increased from grade two to grade four, but teacher praise slowed this rate of growth, while teacher reprimands increased this rate of growth, showing that student problem behaviors, large and small, were influenced by teacher behavior (Weyns et al., 2017). TSRs also had longitudinal effects on student behavior, and students who felt they had quality relationships with their teachers had more positive and fewer problem behaviors for up to four years later (Obsuth et al., 2017). Conversely,

low levels of and fluctuations in TSR closeness contributed to increased aggressive behaviors over the time period from preschool to fifth grade for students who entered school with low levels of aggression; students who did not display low levels of aggression had higher levels of closeness to their teachers (Lee & Bierman, 2018). Over time, positive TSRs had positive effects on student behavior, while negative or weak TSRs had negative effects on student behavior.

The development and subsequent use of TSRs also helped teachers experience success with students exhibiting challenging externalizing behaviors. Teachers who were successful with difficult students built relationships with them by looking at them holistically, as individuals within the context of their lives outside of as well as in school. This view allowed the teachers to see their students as more than their misbehavior. They found ways to relate to their students because they were concerned with their well-being. As a result, their relationships with the challenging students improved over time and ended up being rewarding ones that resulted in improvements for the students as well (Rytivaara & Frelin, 2017). Building more positive TSRs, then, was beneficial for students with behavioral issues.

Bias

The lack of positive TSRs is a factor in school social justice issues in that negative TSRs could be influenced by racial bias. Many studies highlight the need for educational reform in urban schools, citing evidence of inequality and bias in the treatment of urban students and calling for these reforms to start in teacher education. Minority children and children who teachers perceived to have a low socioeconomic

status (SES) were more likely to have negative TSRs, biases which in turn could affect classroom interactions, teacher expectations, and student academic achievement (Fitzpatrick et al., 2015). Similarly, African American students, aside from SES, were more likely to have negative TSRs than other students, which in turn led to a risk of lower academic achievement (Spilt & Hughes, 2015). In both cases, teacher biases affected the quality of TSRs for low SES and minority status students.

This bias has also been found in teacher expectations, which could negatively affect TSRs. It has been well documented that teacher expectations in general could influence student academic achievement, and these expectations could be affected by biases. For example, Gershenson et al. (2016) found that teachers who were not Black had "significantly lower educational expectations" (p. 222) for Black students, and more so for Black male students. Santiago-Rosario et al. (2021) found that these lower expectations led to increased office discipline referrals, and that Black students had a higher rate of these referrals than White students did. Also, academically successful Black students felt teachers held lower expectations for, preconceived notions of, and negative perceptions of them. These students felt that these judgements, along with a lack of culturally relevant teaching, impeded the teachers' ability to establish positive TSRs with them (Woodward, 2018). Bias and low expectations, then, had a negative effect on TSR quality.

Discipline

Teacher bias has been especially problematic in the area of school discipline. Many studies showed that students in urban districts and students of color are

disproportionately disciplined (Gay, 2006; Martin et al., 2016; Noltemeyer et al., 2015; Skiba et al., 2011). In a comprehensive study of school discipline data across ethnic groups and gender, the discipline rates were much higher for African American and Native American students (Martin et al., 2016). These increased discipline rates, as well as increased retention rates, were higher based on race and ethnicity regardless whether the schools were urban, suburban, or rural schools (Peguero et al., 2021). African American students were also more likely than White students to receive office discipline referrals, especially in classroom settings (Smolkowski et al., 2016). Additionally, African American and Latino students were more likely than White students to be disciplined, suspended, or expelled for the same offenses (Skiba et al., 2011). Similarly, teachers gave harsher penalties to Black students than they did to White students even though both behaved in a similar manner. Black students received harsher penalties for second infractions, were more likely to be seen as demonstrating a pattern of misbehavior, were more likely to be seen as being suspended in the future, and were more likely than White students to receive multiple suspensions (Okonofua & Eberhardt, 2015). In addition to African Americans, boys and students with low parental education levels were suspended or expelled at higher rates than White or Asian American students were (Mizel et al., 2016). Preservice teachers were also more likely to give harsher penalties for misbehavior to boys and minority students (Glock, 2016). These studies highlighted the bias in teacher and school discipline, issues that could be addressed with more positive TSRs.

This disproportionate use of discipline has had further consequences for student outcomes. There was a positive correlation between school suspensions and both lower academic achievement and school dropout (Noltemeyer et al., 2015), and out of school suspensions led to a higher probability of criminal behavior and arrest, especially for African American students (Cuellar & Markowitz, 2015). Students of color and those from low SES backgrounds, among others, are more likely to be more severely disciplined, and more likely to experience school failure, drop out, and arrest (Mallett, 2017), a phenomenon called the school-to-prison pipeline, and one that is of particular concern for urban school districts. Previous research has shown that high poverty urban schools used suspensions more frequently than other schools, and that African American students were suspended at higher rates than other students (Noltemeyer & Mcloughlin, 2010). Urban school districts also have higher rates of student referrals to juvenile justice systems, and African American students constitute a higher proportion of those referrals (Marchbanks et al., 2018). These studies highlight the effect of bias and disproportionate discipline on student outcomes, a problem that is being addressed through the implementation of programs that use positive TSRs as a component. Improving TSRs, as previously demonstrated, could help improve student behavior and prevent this escalation to more serious offences.

TSRs and Improved Discipline Outcomes

There are many current studies documenting the improved discipline outcomes that resulted from the use of positive TSRs and programs that incorporated their use. Positive TSRs have been correlated to decreased suspension rates in general (Quin,

2017), and specifically to improved outcomes for urban students through the reduction of the disparities in and the use of harsher disciplinary action (Anyon et al., 2018). Additionally, Civitillo et al. (2021) found that positive TSRs acted as a protective factor against ethnic discrimination. The implementation of teacher training in the use of a restorative practices program in two urban high schools resulted in improved TSRs, fewer discipline referrals, and an improvement in the racial discipline gap (Gregory et al., 2016a). The implementation of teacher training in another program designed to improve TSRs and instructional quality for middle and high school students resulted in teachers having no racial disparity in the number of their discipline referrals, even two years after the PD took place (Gregory et al., 2016b). Another intervention to improve TSRs and classroom management skills included a component to help teachers recognize their implicit biases. This program, tested at the elementary school level, resulted in a two-thirds reduction in disciplinary referrals for Black male students, as well as improved TSRs. (Cook et al., 2018). These programs were designed to improve how teachers interacted with all students, which suggests that, like CRT, in addition to benefitting marginalized populations, these interventions may benefit all students.

Positive TSRs have contributed to lower suspension rates and discipline referrals through the use of less punitive discipline methods and different classroom management strategies. In one three-part experiment, teachers were willing to use more empathetic discipline methods through developing more positive TSRs in place of using more punitive methods; students were motivated to improve their behavior as a result of these more empathetic methods; and the students of the teachers who used more empathetic

methods had improved student behavior and suspension rates for the year that were fifty percent lower than the rates of the control group (Okonofua et al., 2016). The use of more empathetic discipline methods, through the development of more positive TSRs, contributed to improved behavior and fewer suspensions. TSRs have also been used as part of classroom management strategies, especially in urban environments, to reduce the need for and the rate of disciplinary referrals (Anyon et al., 2018; Milner, 2018). First-year teachers who focused on building relationships with their students and used those relationships in their classroom management were found to have higher quality instruction and to be more successful (Kwok, 2017). These classroom discipline issues were also be addressed in part through the use of CRT, which improved classroom management and build positive TSRs (Gay, 2006), as well as through the use of RCT (Milner, 2018). The use of positive TSRs in classroom management and discipline strategies improved student behavior and prevented the need for escalated punitive measures.

As a result of the issues some teachers have had with bias and discipline due to a lack of positive TSRs, many researchers recommended adding teacher training or professional development for teachers to help them in recognizing and addressing their biases (Fitzpatrick et al., 2015; Gershenson et al., 2016; Smolkowski et al., 2016), or handling student misbehaviors in the classroom and promoting more positive behavior to prevent the escalation of those behaviors to offenses warranting suspension (Noltemeyer et al., 2015). Researchers also recommended revising teacher preparation programs to include the diversity awareness, culturally responsive pedagogy, and instruction in CRT

needed for teachers to be successful in urban environments (Civitillo et al., 2021; Gay, 2006; Martin et al., 2016; Milner, 2008). Other recommendations for teacher preparation programs addressed the need to include practice in classroom management strategies that included the use of TSRs, and interventions that addressed preservice teachers' biases and stereotypical beliefs (Glock, 2016). More generally, researchers suggested teacher preparation programs should include relational training and the use of TSRs in teaching practice (Nairz-Wirth & Feldmann, 2017), and teacher educators should emphasize TSRs in their courses (Kwok, 2017). These suggestions all included the use of positive TSRs to address issue of bias in school discipline in order to improve student outcomes.

Dropout Rates

The positive effects of TSRs on student outcomes, such as academic achievement, motivation, engagement, and behavior, have contributed to students persisting in and succeeding in school. Another effect of positive TSRs was a decrease in student dropout rates (Cornelius-White, 2007; Quin, 2017). Positive TSRs helped prevent drop out in tenth-grade students with mental health issues: students with mental health issues tended to have lower grades in part because of the role of less supportive teachers (Holen et al., 2017). Positive TSRs also contributed to students returning to school after dropping out. Among the students who did dropout at one point for various reasons, those students who claimed they did not get along with teachers and other students were less likely to return to school. However, those students who reported having positive relationships in school were more likely to return to school to earn a diploma versus not returning to school and obtaining a general education diploma (GED) instead (Boylan & Renzulli, 2017).

Furthermore, teachers who focused on building positive relationships with their students, including through building student trust and self-confidence, were better able to help secondary students who had previously failed in school to experience success (Frelin, 2015). Positive TSRs, then, protected against dropout or provided an impetus for later matriculation.

Positive TSRs have also been found to help students who had issues with discipline or dropping out to be successful in school. Slaten et al. (2016) studied a successful alternative school in an urban district to find out what students felt made the school successful. This school was particularly successful in helping students who had been expelled from other schools, been suspended, dropped out, or been in the justice system to return back to traditional schools. The six African American male participants in the study felt that in addition to the use of culturally relevant pedagogy and teaching practices, the most important factor in the success of the school was the positive relationships they had with their teachers. They specifically cited their teachers' emotional support, guidance, and acceptance as important factors in the TSRs that helped this school's success with its students. However, some teachers thought dropping out of school was the result of outside factors and not related to other factors within the school and the relationships therein, a perception that researchers felt demonstrated the need for teacher training to include a focus on relational training and its place in teaching practice (Nairz-Wirth & Feldmann, 2017). Doing so could provide teachers with a context for their own role in using TSRs to prevent students from dropping out of school.

Gender

Several studies have examined how student and teacher gender affect the correlation between TSRs and student outcomes. There is support for previous research on the gender gap in engagement and its relation to teacher support. Boys were less engaged in class than girls, and boys perceived their teachers to be less supportive (Lietaert et al., 2015). Similarly, teachers reported having closer relationships with girls and more conflict in their relationships with boys (Hajovsky et al., 2017). Positive TSRs also benefitted girls' engagement while negative TSRs harmed boys' engagement (Archambault et al., 2017), and positive TSRs did benefit the cognitive engagement of hyperactive or inattentive students, both boys and girls, but especially boys (Olivier & Archambault, 2017). Lastly, and conversely, girls' externalizing behavior had a greater effect on conflict in TSRs than that of boys, possibly because teachers may not expect behavioral issues in girls, and may react more strongly to their externalizing behaviors that they do to boys' externalizing behaviors (Skalická et al., 2015). These studies all demonstrated slight differences in how TSRs affect boys' outcomes versus girls' outcomes.

Other studies showed that student and teacher gender did not affect the correlation between TSRs and student outcomes. TSR quality was more important than gender for students who felt they had quality relationships with their teachers, and these students had more positive behaviors and fewer problem behaviors with lasting effects (Obsuth et al., 2017). Teacher involvement was also important for both boys' and girls' engagement

(Lietaert et al., 2015). In general, then, positive TSRs improved student engagement and behavior, regardless of teacher or student gender.

Socioeconomic Status

Many of the studies on the student outcomes that were correlated to TSRs focused on or included students with a low SES or students in urban school districts. The benefits of positive TSRs were often more pronounced for these students. Quality TSRs improved the academic outcomes for students from a low socioeconomic background. The positive association between TSRs, engagement, and achievement was stronger for students with a low SES (Roorda et al., 2014a). In their study on engagement, Martin and Collie (2018) found that even though students with a low SES tend to have lower school engagement, having more positive TSRs than negative ones throughout their school day made their low SES less of a factor in their overall school engagement.

The association between academic achievement, positive TSRs, and low SES was examined in two studies. McCormick et al. (2017) studied whether TSR quality was a moderating factor between SES and reading and math achievement. They found that increases in TSR closeness correlated with increases in reading achievement, and that lower TSR quality correlated with lower math achievement. Kurdi et al. (2018) also studied students from low SES backgrounds, specifically the effect of teacher structure and involvement on the need fulfillment of students with anxiety and lower academic achievement in literacy. They found that teacher involvement positively affected elementary students from low SES backgrounds, with low achievement and low or high anxiety. Both studies concluded that these students would benefit from teaching practices

that emphasize structure and teacher involvement, and that TSRs could be developed as protective factors for students from low SES backgrounds.

Students from low SES backgrounds have also experienced a variety of social, emotional, and behavioral benefits as a result of positive TSRs. TSRs may be even more important for students with a low SES, who may rely even more on their teachers for that sense of belonging (Bouchard & Berg, 2017). Murray et al. (2016) concluded that TSRs were important for the school adjustment of students of color and those from low SES backgrounds, who were the majority of their participant pool.

Several studies focused on the correlation between TSRs, behavioral issues, and students from low SES backgrounds. Collins et al. (2017) examined the correlation between both internalizing and externalizing behaviors and TSRs. They conducted a longitudinal study of boys from urban and low-income backgrounds, collecting data starting from when the boys were 18 months and continuing through age eleven. They found that TSRs could be a protective factor against the development of behavioral problems in boys from low-income, urban areas. They suggested that these findings had implications for targeting intervention programs at low-income schools, and for helping teacher preparation programs inform teachers about the role of TSRs in preventing behavioral problems. Lee and Bierman (2018) found a correlation between low levels of and fluctuations in TSR closeness and increased aggressive behaviors in participants from Head Start programs and low-income families, and the researchers concluded that quality TSRs may be more important for these students given their greater risk for

aggressive behaviors, which could lead to undesirable school outcomes. Overall, students with low SES and behavioral issues benefitted the most from positive TSRs.

Recommendations From Research for Improving TSRs for Student Outcomes

In light of the body of research highlighting the many benefits of positive TSRs, many researchers have made recommendations for improving TSR quality. In order to provide students with the benefits of quality TSRs, researchers have suggested that teachers need to have the time and space in which to develop these relationships (Claessens et al., 2017; Frelin, 2015). However, researchers have suggested that there are problems with teachers being able to develop TSRs in schools. Teachers need to be able to develop high quality TSRs with their students, especially with those students who may be prone to having negative TSRs (Prewett et al., 2019), but school policies may prevent opportunities for teachers to develop these closer relationships (Bouchard & Berg, 2017; Claessens et al., 2017). Obsuth et al. (2017) suggested that schools should support teachers in fostering TSRs to improve student behavioral outcomes, especially in the upper grades. They did not find any TSR improvement programs for adolescents like the programs that exist in preschools. Furthermore, they suggested that schools may use counterproductive punitive measures to control student behavior rather than using TSRs to help improve student behavior and support students with other issues.

There are also various programs and interventions recommended by researchers that schools and districts could use to improve the overall quality of TSRs for their students (Martin & Rimm-Kaufman, 2015). Researchers have suggested that teacher training could help teachers recognize and avoid negative behaviors that lower TSR

quality in favor of more positive behaviors that help improve TSR quality (Balwant, 2017). Teacher training could also help teachers become more aware of the needs of students with internalizing behaviors (Zee & Roorda, 2018), and behavioral intervention programs could target low-income schools (Collins et al., 2017). Researchers have also suggested that social-emotional learning and intervention programs help decrease negative student behavior (Portnow et al., 2018), increase TSR closeness (Baroody et al., 2014), and help teachers increase the quality of their TSRs (Duong et al., 2019; Spilt et al., 2012). Lastly, Liu et al. (2015) recommended that the interventions to improve TSRs, such as those used in Western countries, could be studied and used in China as well.

There are strategies researchers have suggested teachers could use in their own instructional methods to improve their TSRs, starting with reducing alienation and increasing closeness and trust (Murray et al., 2016). Teachers could also use more proactive strategies to nurture TSRs with students who have behavioral issues, which could prevent future disruptive behaviors (Mejia & Hoglund, 2016). Lastly, Weyns et al. (2017) suggested teachers could improve their skills in using more praise and fewer reprimands to build more positive TSRs.

Recommendations From Research for Teacher Preparation Programs

Several researchers, in light of their study results, have made recommendations for improving student outcomes by improving the quality of TSR instruction in teacher preparation programs. Capern and Hammond (2014) examined what teacher behaviors contributed to positive TSRs, and concluded that these behaviors could be taught and should be included in teacher preparation programs. J-F et al. (2018) also concluded

teachers could be taught behaviors that would contribute to the social and emotional development of young teenagers, and that teacher education including this instruction is needed. Finally, Liu et al. (2018) suggested that teacher education programs should include instruction that integrates the use of TSRs into all classroom instruction and not just classroom management.

Researchers have also recommended that teacher preparation programs increase instruction in and awareness of how TSRs could impact behavioral issues. Lee and Bierman (2018) recommended adding training and information about the correlation between low levels of TSR closeness and increases in aggressive student behavior to elementary teacher preparation programs, as well as adding training in relational skills with an emphasis on relating to students with behavior challenges. Similarly, Pennings (2017) suggested teacher preparation programs could include information on avoiding negative teacher behaviors in order to prevent student misbehavior. Collins et al. (2017) suggested helping teacher preparation programs inform teachers about the role of TSRs in preventing behavioral problems. Pakarinen et al. (2018) recommended that teacher preparation programs should include methods for helping teachers to form more positive relationships with students exhibiting problem behaviors, and Lietaert et al. (2015) suggested that teacher preparation programs train teachers to be aware of possible gender bias in their TSRs and their behavior towards their students. In offering these recommendations, however, the researchers in these studies have assumed that this instruction is missing or lacking. There is no empirical evidence offered in these studies to support this assumption.

Teacher Behaviors and Attributes

Several researchers have explored the teacher behaviors and attributes that students prefer and that contribute to the formation of positive TSRs. Students have shown a preference for teachers who are friendly (Pennings, 2017). Also, students generally preferred teachers who contributed to their social and emotional development (J-F et al., 2018). Students had positive perceptions of their TSRs with teachers who demonstrated prosocial behavior and social-emotional support, and these positive TSRs in turn predicted their math interest and self-efficacy (Prewett et al., 2019). Students also placed slightly more importance on the interpersonal versus the academic aspects of instruction, and three teacher qualities they identified as important were assertiveness, humor, and empathy. These students felt their relationships with their teachers, based on mutual respect, were an important basis for successful instruction (Raufelder et al., 2016). Overall, the teacher traits that students preferred were related to personality traits that improved TSRs.

Different types of students had some differences in their preferences for teacher behaviors and traits which contributed to positive TSRs, but there were also some commonalities. Gifted students preferred teacher behaviors that would help them academically, while students with emotional or behavioral difficulties specifically preferred teachers who demonstrated positive relational attributes: caring, understanding, and patience. Both groups, however, desired teachers who did not discriminate, had a sense of humor, and treated them with respect. (Capern & Hammond, 2014). For both groups, teachers' positive relationship attributes were important.

Conversely, negative teacher attributes could negatively affect TSRs. Student behavioral issues could be affected by teacher behaviors that lower the quality of TSRs as well. Poor TSR quality and negative teacher behaviors such as unfriendliness might be the cause of some student misbehaviors (Pennings, 2017). Teacher antagonism also led to disengagement as well as lower test scores for all students, including academically motivated students (Goodboy et al., 2018). Negative teacher behaviors such as yelling, showing a lack of interest in students, and unfair treatment also led to negative emotions, withdrawal, and retaliation in students (Balwant, 2017). These studies highlighted the importance of teacher behavior in relation to TSR quality.

Teacher Impacts

Teachers were also affected by TSRs. Emotions and relationships are a central part of teaching (Rytivaara & Frelin, 2017; Uitto et al., 2018), but the emotional nature of teaching is often overlooked in research. In his seminal study, Hargreaves (1998) described teaching as “emotional labor” (p. 838) and found that emotions and the relationships they formed with students were a part of almost every facet of a teacher’s job. Teachers saw their relationships with students as essential to successful student outcomes, as the purpose of their jobs, and their source of job satisfaction and meaning. Some teachers felt that their TSRs were the most important part of their work (Lassila & Uitto, 2016). Teachers had a need to relate to their students, and they internalized these interactions, which are an important part of their work (Spilt et al., 2011). The effect of this focus was that when students remembered their former teachers, those memories were emotional in nature and focused on the students’ personal relationships with their

teachers, not on the content of the class or the method of instruction (Uitto et al., 2018). Consequently, TSRs had either a positive or negative effect on teachers and their work.

The emotional nature of TSRs is often connected to teacher perceptions of their interactions with students. Teachers perceived positive relationships as consisting of friendly interactions and negative relationships as consisting of hostile interactions. Teachers who experienced negative interactions with students had difficulty establishing positive interactions with them (Claessens et al., 2017). Teachers also felt their relationships with individuals impacted their relationship and interactions with the entire class (Lassila & Uitto, 2016). The difference between the teachers' expectations about the TSRs they would form and the reality also affected their TSRs by making teachers feel more distant from their students; however, when the TSRs were closer to their expectations, the teachers felt closer to the students (Lassila & Uitto, 2016). TSRs and interactions, then, are connected to teacher emotions.

Teachers also need time and space in which they can interact with students. Teachers have noted that their working conditions often interfered with the way they wanted to interact with their students (Lassila & Uitto, 2016). While negative interactions with students occurred mainly in the classroom, positive interactions extended to outside the classroom and included discussions about topics other than classroom matters (Claessens et al., 2017; Lassila & Uitto, 2016). Teachers often don't have access to those outside opportunities to interact with students; thus, teachers need to ways within the classroom structure to build positive TSRs with students (Claessens et al., 2017).

Providing opportunities for teachers to develop positive TSRs could have a beneficial impact on teacher emotions.

Teacher Well-Being

Another area of research concerns the correlation between positive TSRs and teacher well-being. Spilt et al. (2011) theorized that positive TSRs are important to a teacher's well-being. Teachers wanted to feel connected to their students, and these TSRs had a positive impact on student academic and emotional outcomes. They suggested that teachers internalized their interactions with students, and that student misbehavior could have a negative impact on teacher well-being by causing negative emotions and stress, both personally and professionally. Poor TSRs could contribute to teacher burnout, while teachers with stronger TSRs reported feel less burnout and less emotional exhaustion; thus, positive TSRs could provide a protective factor for teachers' well-being (Milatz et al., 2015). Student misbehavior could have a negative impact on TSRs, causing increased emotional exhaustion and decreased job enjoyment; conversely, positive TSRs could have a positive impact on teacher well-being (Aldrup et al., 2018). Likewise, positive TSRs were correlated to teachers having higher levels of enjoyment and lower levels of anger in their classrooms, thereby preventing emotional exhaustion (Taxer et al., 2018). TSRs, then, impact teacher emotions and teacher well-being.

Consequently, having negative TSRs could negatively impact teacher well-being. For teachers over the age of 45, among relationship types and teaching-related factors, TSRs had the greatest impact on teacher burnout (Van Droogenbroeck et al., 2014). For secondary school teachers, the three aspects of burnout, which were exhaustion,

cynicism, and inefficacy, were all significantly affected by TSRs, and more so for public school teachers than private school teachers (Rodríguez-Mantilla & Fernández-Díaz, 2017). Thus, negative TSRs could lead to teacher burnout.

This impact of TSRs on teacher well-being could in turn affect a teacher's performance in the classroom. Teacher stress and burnout were found to be negatively correlated to student academic achievement, with that correlation being greater for students from a low SES background and minority students (Klusmann et al., 2016). Hagenauer et al. (2015) examined the relationship between teachers' emotions and student engagement, behavior, and TSRs, and found that TSR quality was strongly related to teacher emotions. They found that teachers who reported having positive TSRs experienced more positive emotions, such as happiness, and fewer negative emotions, such as anxiety or anger. Hagenauer et al. (2015) also cited Chang and Davis (2009), who stated that teachers could develop compassion fatigue, and suggested that experiencing negative emotions could contribute to a deterioration of TSRs and lead to teacher burnout. Positive TSRs were also correlated to teachers having higher levels of enjoyment and lower levels of anger in their classrooms, thereby preventing emotional exhaustion (Taxer et al., 2018). Therefore, teacher well-being, through TSRs, could affect student outcomes.

Likewise, teacher well-being could affect how teachers behave and interact with their students. Positive teacher emotions made effective teaching possible, while negative teacher emotions caused teachers to lose control and to alienate students (Makhwathana, et al., 2017b). In a similar study, teacher emotional health impacted the quality of

learning and teaching in that emotionally healthy teachers enjoyed teaching more and had a positive effect on learner motivation, while teachers who were not emotionally healthy exhibited negative behavior, which had a negative effect on learner motivation (Makhwathana et al., 2017b). Other studies specifically examined the correlation between teacher self-efficacy and TSRs. In one study, a teacher's lower self-efficacy beliefs in dealing with student misbehavior behaviors negatively affected that teacher's perception of the TSR with that student (Zee et al., 2017). Teacher well-being and behavior, then, could affect the quality of TSRs.

Teacher Attrition

Several researchers have examined the correlation between teacher attrition and TSRs. Positive TSRs could lower teacher attrition rates (Rytivaara & Frelin, 2017), while teacher attrition was correlated to negative TSRs early in teachers' careers as well as in veteran teachers' careers. For teachers who had been in the profession fewer than five years, there was a correlation between their intentions to leave the profession and their beliefs that their negative TSRs were a result of their own lack of ability in developing those relationships. Teachers who did not intend to leave the profession found strategies to use to improve these relationships, and did not take the negative interactions personally (Heikonen et al., 2017). Conversely, positive TSRs were associated with increased job satisfaction for teachers adjusting to a new position (Jonasson et al., 2017). In a study that focused on urban schools, one factor that contributed to lower attrition rates in those schools was a teacher's ability to develop positive TSRs (Wronowski, 2018). Positive

TSRs, then, are important for promoting teacher job satisfaction and preventing teacher attrition.

In two related studies, researchers examined the correlation between job satisfaction and positive TSRs in order to understand causes for later career teacher attrition and early retirement. Veteran teachers attributed their long-term job satisfaction to the positive TSRs they developed and maintained with their students (Veldman et al., 2013). Similarly, veteran teachers with higher job satisfaction felt they had attained their goals in their TSRs, while teachers who did not attain those goals tended to either experience lower job satisfaction, or chose other positions in the profession that required fewer teacher tasks in order to maintain their job satisfaction (Veldman et al., 2016). In both cases, job satisfaction and longevity were related to the quality of TSRs the teachers experienced.

Recommendations From Research for Teacher Outcomes

There are several recommendations researchers have made that may help teachers experience more positive emotions and improve their well-being. Researchers have suggested that both teacher candidates and in-service teachers need the opportunity to discuss their TSRs and the context of their working conditions (Lassila & Uitto, 2016). Researchers also have suggested that teachers need help in recognizing and dealing with their feelings towards these students and misbehaviors in order to improve both their self-efficacy and their TSRs (Zee et al., 2017). To do so, Rodríguez-Mantilla and Fernández-Díaz (2017) recommended training teachers in strategies to overcome and prevent negative situations that could contribute to burnout.

Recommendations From Research for Teacher Preparation Programs

There are also recommendations that researchers have made for teacher preparation programs as well. Hagenauer et al. (2015) concluded that being able to form positive TSRs is an important teaching skill that has been neglected in teacher education, and should be included as an important part of teacher preparation programs. Similarly, Uitto et al. (2018) emphasized that it is crucial for future teachers to understand role of and importance of emotions in teaching, and crucial to educate future teachers in the role of emotions and relationships in teaching.

Because of the importance of TSRs in improving teacher well-being as well as student outcomes, researchers have recommended that teacher preparation programs should include information on building positive TSRs (Claessens et al., 2017) and strategies and experiences with student interactions to help teachers build the interpersonal skills that they lack (Heikonen et al., 2017). Researchers also recommended including in teacher preparation programs courses on anger management (Makhwathana et al., 2017b) and information on the concept and potential use of emotions (Makhwathana et al., 2017a). In short, as Rytivaara and Frelin (2017) suggested, teacher preparation programs need to focus more on TSRs and providing teacher candidates with the skills they need to build quality TSRs. Again, though, the researchers in these studies offered no evidence that teacher preparation programs are missing or deficient in these areas of recommendation.

Teacher Education

In the past few years, there has been an increase in the number of studies examining teacher preparation programs and calling for changes and improvements to those programs. Many of these studies mention TSRs, relational skills, or areas related to relationships as areas in which teacher preparation programs are lacking or insufficient. Many of these studies also cite the use or omission of CRT, a relational-based teaching strategy, as a factor in the success or lack of success of teacher preparation programs. Culturally responsive practices and curricula contribute to student success (Pena-Sandoval, 2019; Whitaker, 2019), and caring relationships are essential to the success of urban students of color (Gay, 2010b), especially Latino students (Curry, 2016). Therefore, instruction in these practices, as well as in using TSRs, could help teacher candidates be more prepared to work with diverse student populations.

Teacher Candidates' Need for TSR Instruction

Several researchers examined teacher candidates' perceptions about the content of and their experiences in their teacher preparation programs. In these studies, teacher candidates felt they needed more instruction and practice in the development of positive TSRs. Teacher-student interaction was one of the three most reflected-upon topics by teacher candidates when they reflected upon their practicum experiences (Wang, 2018). Teacher candidates also reflected that their greatest area of dilemma was relationship issues (Behizadeh et al., 2017). When asked about their coursework, teacher candidates stated they wanted more instruction in classroom and behavioral management, as well as more practice in actual teaching settings where they could learn about developing

positive relationships (Wilks et al., 2019). Novice teachers also felt they had trouble adjusting to actual teaching. They felt strong in their pedagogical knowledge but weak in their relational skills, and they found that the realities of the classroom issues, such as interacting with students, did not allow them to implement their pedagogical knowledge with fidelity (Eteläpelto et al., 2015). More importantly, novice teachers felt they were not fully prepared for all aspects of teaching by their preparation programs. In reference to relational skills, the novice teachers felt that any ability they had in this area came from their personalities or experiences other than those in their teacher preparation programs (Miles & Knipe, 2018). The results of these studies indicated that teacher candidates did not feel fully equipped by their teacher preparation programs to develop and use positive TSRs in their instruction.

Other researchers have examined the preparedness of teacher candidates and the need to add relational instruction to teacher preparation programs. Teacher candidates did not have confidence in their ability or the skills needed to develop relationships with students, which demonstrated the need for teacher preparation programs to include instruction in the development of relationship skills (Cahill et al., 2016). Discipline style was also a factor in the relationship quality teacher candidates had with their students. Teacher candidates who used more aggressive strategies had less affiliation and influence with their students, and they showed a need for instruction in positive discipline strategies that also maintain and build positive TSRs (de Jong et al., 2013). The results of these studies confirmed the teacher candidates' perceptions that they were not prepared to

develop positive TSRs with their students, but the results did not examine the content of the programs or confirm why these teacher candidates are underprepared.

Lack of Preparation to Teach in Urban Schools

Researchers in two studies specifically examined teachers and teacher candidates, their lack of preparation to teach in urban schools, and their ability to successfully develop relationships with diverse students. Five White, middle class urban teachers, who were considered successful urban teachers with an ability to form strong TSRs with their urban students, all had formative experiences in their early lives that enabled them to be more culturally responsive to their students, but felt they were not prepared by their teacher preparation programs to teach in an urban school. They felt that these programs did not address teaching methods for urban schools even if they did address issues of diversity, nor did these curricula address culturally responsive pedagogy. Researcher recommendations included researching the development of teacher preparation programs. They also recommended including culturally responsive pedagogies in these programs to help improve teacher candidates' abilities to form successful relationships with their students (Schauer, 2018). In another study of preservice teachers in urban environments, the participants also felt their teacher preparation programs did not prepare them to teach in an urban environment. Researcher recommendations included providing teacher candidates with experiences in urban environments. They also recommended specifically addressing these contextual issues in the teacher education curriculum through the inclusion of best practices such as Gay's (2010b) theory of CRT and culturally

responsive pedagogy (Roofe, 2015). Neither of these studies, however, examined the content of those teacher preparation programs.

The results of other studies have shown that some teacher candidates showed potential bias against students from urban high schools and were not prepared to interact with these students. Several teacher candidates in one study were persons of color, yet they demonstrated skepticism of higher-level urban students' abilities, amplified and fabricated minor faults in the students' work, and assumed that these students must be different than their urban peers if they were capable of such high-level work. Their privilege interfered with their ability to understand and connect with the urban students, and their reactions illuminated their negative attitudes toward the urban youth they planned on teaching (Brown & Rodriguez, 2017). The researchers recommended that teacher preparation programs should provide teacher candidates with instruction in cultural awareness, which would help teacher candidates to form understanding connections with urban youth. They suggested this instruction would "prepare teachers committed to social justice and educational equity" (Brown & Rodriguez, 2017, p. 88). In another case study, a White teacher candidate, despite the inclusion in the teacher preparation program of a course on diversity and content in race and social justice issues, was not prepared to teach urban youth. He expressed many biases and deficit beliefs that showed a lack of cultural understanding, and his interactions with and attitudes about his students showed his difficulties connecting with and teaching his students. He was especially challenged by his inability to form relationships with his students, an area he previously noted as being of primary importance to him. The researchers suggested that

teacher preparation programs needed to include reflection on and a discussion of the difficult issues of race, privilege, and systemic racism on more than just a surface level in order to help teacher candidates confront their biases. The inclusion of these issues would help to prepare teachers better to work with diverse students (Cross et al., 2018). In addition to showing that the teacher candidates were not prepared to interact with urban high school students, both of these studies also demonstrated that the teacher candidates were unaware of their own biases and deficiencies related to forming TSRs with urban high school students. While these studies offered evidence that teacher candidates are not fully prepared to teach in urban schools, and that they experienced relational issues in their interactions with urban students, there was no mention of, or examination of the teacher preparation program content for inclusion of, TSR instruction.

Successful Urban Teacher Preparation Programs

Some teacher preparation programs have been successful in preparing teachers to develop relationships with diverse students and work in urban schools. Most of these programs include some instruction in CRT, but do not address the use of TSRs. In one study, teacher candidates given good preparation and experiences were prepared to teach in urban schools as a result of specific preparation using instruction in CRT. For this study, they participated in coursework that included instruction in CRT and participated in field experiences in urban schools. In reflecting on their experiences, one main theme that emerged from the data was the participants' emphasis on the importance of building relationships with students that would improve student learning and reduce behavioral issues, and that students would not learn from a teacher they did not respect. The study

results confirmed the importance of teacher candidates completing field experiences in urban schools, and the researchers recommended increasing in teacher preparation programs the instruction in CRT and building relationships with students (Smith et al., 2017). However, there was no specific examination or mention of how the participants felt their coursework prepared them for their experiences, or whether they learned about the importance of relationships from their coursework, their experiences, or both.

Studies of other programs showed that the curricula of these programs included multiple courses or a focus on CRT. These programs also included an additional focus, such as inclusion classrooms in urban environments (Reese et al., 2018), dispositions (Truscott & Stenhouse, 2018), or teaching English as a second language (Luet & Shealey, 2018). They did not, however, while addressing the content of the methods courses and inclusion strategies, address the content of the program related to TSR aspects of learning to teach in urban environments. Another study examined the experiences of two White novice teachers in an Urban Teacher Residency (UTR) program and how they used the program resources available to them. While the program resources helped one participant and not the other, the resources the participants relied on the most were related to their own discoveries about cultural responsiveness and not part of the program resources. One participant cited from her experiences the importance of building relationships with her students in order to be able to teach them. The researcher concluded that program support for cultural and relational issues needs to be considered (Gatti, 2016). These studies demonstrated the lack of attention paid in teacher preparation programs to building TSRs, even within the instruction of CRT.

Other studies of urban teacher preparation programs directly addressed relationships and Gay’s (2010b) theory of CRT, but only in relation to the field experience portion of the program. In an urban community immersion program that included content in classroom management and social justice, provided field experience, and matched each candidate with a community mentor, the preservice teachers experienced success in increasing their ability to engage in CRT and form relationships with their students as a result of their experiences in the community and their relationships with their mentors. The authors suggested the need for more studies on how teacher candidates are prepared for CRT (Zygmunt et al., 2018). The examination of these programs, however, lacked an examination of the course and program content for the inclusion of instruction related to the development of TSRs. Another program, a successful immersion program in a Professional Development School, was similar to a field experience, but also included culturally responsive instructional strategies and reflection. The researchers found that participants successfully worked through their biases and understood their students' cultural background, which led to improved instruction and TSRs (Peters et al., 2018). Both of the programs in these studies included a combination of field experience and CRT that helped prepare teachers to develop quality TSRs in urban schools with diverse student populations. However, both studies were limited to the field experience portion of the programs. Another study of a successful program designed to prepare teacher candidates to teach in urban schools included relationships as a key focus and included coursework designed to improve teacher candidates’ knowledge about urban students and their communities (Schwartz et

al., 2016). While this program did help participants form relationships with urban students, the coursework did not specifically include instruction in TSRs, and, similar to the previous two studies, the participants felt their ability to develop relationships resulted more from their experiences than from their coursework. All three of these programs did, however, emphasize the importance of preparing teacher candidates to teach in urban schools.

One study did examine two different urban teacher preparation programs for how they prepared teachers to develop TSRs. Theisen-Homer (2021) found that one program focused on the techniques used to form relationships at the expense of emotion, while the other program focused on getting to know students without emphasizing the techniques to do so. Theisen-Homer concluded that as a result of a lack of depth in the relationships, neither program achieved its goal of promoting social justice.

Culturally Responsive Teaching and Teacher Preparation

As previously stated, instruction in TSRs is often embedded within curricula containing instruction in CRT. Despite the research-based evidence for the inclusion of culturally relevant pedagogy and CRT in teacher education, researchers have acknowledged the resistance to these programs (Gay & Kirkland, 2003). First, few studies focused on multicultural teacher educators who would be preparing teachers to work in urban districts. Second, in one study containing this focus, multicultural teacher educators faced many challenges, including resistance from their students, their institutions, their colleagues, and a cultural ideology that is increasingly conservative

(Gorski, 2012). As a result, teacher preparation programs may not include instruction in CRT, and consequently, instruction in TSRs.

Even when teacher preparation programs attempted to include CRT in their curriculum, this inclusion only amounted to a few courses or content embedded within courses (Cross et al., 2018; Gay, 2010a; Luet & Shealey, 2018; Sleeter, 2016; Yuan, 2018), or the inclusion was misapplied, misinterpreted, or superficial (Sleeter, 2012). The content covered in some cases was only superficial (Yuan, 2018), and preservice teachers still had difficulties in forming relationships with and connecting to students (Cross et al., 2018; Yuan, 2018). Milner (2010) suggested that such a curriculum is fragmented and not effective, and that diversity studies need to be fully integrated into the curriculum. A full integration would be more likely to cover the inclusion of instruction in TSRs.

Another factor sometimes addressed in teacher preparation programs that could impact the quality of TSRs is the cultural beliefs of teacher candidates. A synthesis of research of teacher preparation programs designed to address the cultural beliefs of teacher candidates showed that diversity trainings had a positive effect on the participants' beliefs about diversity, and that these beliefs directly impacted how teachers related to students. The researchers also noted that these beliefs were more malleable during teacher education. They recommended that such training be included in all teacher preparation programs. Similar to Milner (2010), they also suggested the importance of this instruction being the focus of the teacher preparation program and not just included in a few courses or a standalone training, as was the case for many of the studies they examined (Civitillo et al., 2018). Several other studies also indicated the need for teacher

education to include difficult content and discussions on issues of racism, bias, and privilege (Cross et al., 2018; Sleeter, 2016, 2018). Howard and Milner (2014) also stated the need for teacher education that has the specific goal of preparing teachers to work in urban districts.

One reason Sleeter (2012) cited for the lack of use of culturally responsive pedagogy, and therefore possible instruction in TSRs, was the perceived lack of research on the positive effects of culturally responsive pedagogy on student achievement. In response to this observation, Aronson and Laughter (2016) conducted a synthesis of the research on culturally responsive pedagogy and CRT practices and their connection to positive student outcomes. They found over 40 studies that demonstrated positive effects of culturally responsive pedagogy or teaching on student outcomes in five different content areas, such as math and science (Yu, 2018). As a result, they called for CRT to be a central focus of teacher preparation programs, stating that doing so would help teacher candidates develop the cultural competence and critical consciousness needed to be successful teachers of urban students. Researchers in several other studies called for the addition or expansion of CRT to teacher preparation programs as well (Luet & Shealey, 2018; Roofe, 2015; Schauer, 2018; Schwartz et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2017; Yu, 2018). This conclusion is supported by Gay (2010a) and her theory of using CRT, which includes the use of TSRs, to improve outcomes for diverse students. However, while the focus of these studies was on CRT, this focus omitted any specific mention and inclusion of instruction in TSRs.

Summary and Conclusions

TSRs are a basic component of successful teaching and a central feature of a teacher's job. TSRs have positive effects on student outcomes such as academic achievement, engagement, behavior, social and emotional adjustment, and lower discipline, suspension, and dropout rates. These positive effects are even more pronounced for students from low SES backgrounds and students in urban schools. TSRs also have benefits for teachers' well-being and could contribute to lower attrition rates. Many researchers suggested that some teachers are lacking in these skills and this knowledge, and called for teacher preparation programs to add instruction in the formation and use of TSRs.

Similarly, some studies of teacher preparation programs showed that teacher candidates feel they are lacking in relational instruction, but there is no examination of the content of the programs to verify that perception. Some teacher preparation programs are not successful in preparing teachers to teach in urban schools; those that are successful do not specifically mention the inclusion of instruction in TSRs, but do include instruction in CRT. However, there is some resistance to the inclusion of CRT in teacher preparation programs, and even if it is included, instruction is limited. TSRs are an important part of CRT (Gay, 2010b), but are more embedded within other topics than they are directly mentioned. Likewise, instruction in TSRs may be included in teacher preparation programs, but may be more of an implicit part of the curriculum rather than explicitly taught. Furthermore, while some teacher preparation programs include instruction in CRT, there are no studies that show the inclusion of RCT, probably because

this is a relatively new construct. In conclusion, instruction in TSRs, such as outlined by the innovative methods of CRT and RCT, should be included in teacher preparation programs. While many studies called for this inclusion, there are limited studies of teacher preparation programs to verify that this instruction is missing and not just embedded within other topics; or whether the instruction is included but is not implemented by teachers. This study contributed to filling this gap by examining teacher's viewpoints about the instruction they received in TSRs in their teacher preparation programs. Their responses could indicate the presence or absence of this instruction in their courses and student teaching. In the following chapter, I outline my method for researching how teacher preparation programs instructed teachers in the use of TSRs, and whether these programs included innovative methods such as CRT and RCT.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools, both in their teacher education courses and in their student teaching. This study examined, through 12 interviews and two focus group discussions, the instruction teachers received in TSRs in their teacher education courses and student teaching. A lack of studies that address how teachers learn to use TSRs was a gap in the literature. This study contributes to the literature what instruction in innovative methods for using positive TSRs teachers receive or do not receive, explicitly or implicitly, in their teacher preparation programs.

This chapter contains the research design and rationale for this basic qualitative study. I describe the role of the researcher and any biases or ethical concerns I may have or the study procedures may contain. This chapter also contains the explanation for the participant recruitment and selection procedures as well as the rationale for those selections. The data collection procedures, instrument, and tools are described, as well as the plan for the data analysis. Lastly, this chapter addresses any issues with trustworthiness, including credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

Research Design and Rationale

My research problem was the perceived lack of instruction in the use of positive TSRs provided by teacher preparation programs, and my research purpose was to explore teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using

positive TSRs in urban schools, both in their teacher education courses and in their student teaching. Therefore, my research questions reflected the TSR aspects of the innovative methods in my conceptual framework (see Appendix A), as well as whether teachers receive this instruction in their teacher preparation programs.

RQ: What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools?

SQ1: What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools in their teacher education courses?

SQ2: What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools in their student teaching?

SQ3: What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in the TSR elements of CRT?

SQ4: What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in the TSR elements of RCT?

Choice of Design

I used a basic qualitative approach as the research design for this study. As part of this approach, my research questions explored and looked for a description of how the instruction of teachers includes elements of TSRs (see Patton, 2015). This study followed the principles of a basic qualitative study in that I sought the meaning and interpretation of the participants' viewpoints about their instruction in using TSRs, and in that there was no other additional focus to the study (see Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The focus of this

study was on the teachers' viewpoints about the instruction in using TSRs they received in their teacher preparation programs, so a basic qualitative approach was the appropriate choice.

I chose a basic qualitative approach over a quantitative or mixed methods approach because neither would have been appropriate for this study. A quantitative approach would not have been appropriate because I was not testing a theory or seeking numerical confirmation or disproof of a phenomenon (see Creswell, 2013). Also, the use of a survey to collect data would not have generated the detailed information I was seeking about what the teachers learned in the content of their teacher preparation programs, which also made a quantitative approach inappropriate. There are many quantitative studies documenting the correlation of TSRs and student outcomes (Cornelius-White, 2007; Quin, 2017; Roorda et al., 2017), but because I was not seeking any evidence of correlation in this study, a quantitative approach would not have suited my purposes. Furthermore, as I was not testing a theory or seeking any comparative data to analyze in conjunction with the interview data, a mixed methods approach would not have been appropriate either (see Creswell, 2013). I was seeking information concerning teachers' viewpoints about what they learned in their teacher preparation programs; therefore, a quantitative or mixed methods approach would not have provided the data I was seeking.

There were other qualitative approaches that I considered using, but they did not fit this study as well as a basic qualitative approach did. Narrative inquiry is an approach that uses observation as well as formal interviews and informal conversation to construct

participants' stories about the study topic from their narratives (Holley & Colyar, 2012; O'Toole, 2018). I first considered using narrative inquiry to collect the teachers' stories about their instruction in TSRs and look for common themes (see Patton, 2015). However, the focus of this study was not the participants' stories about their teacher preparation programs or their experiences with TSRs, but specifically about their viewpoints about the instruction they received in using TSRs in their courses and student teaching. Such stories would have provided information that was not related to my research purpose or problem, and telling these stories could have distracted participants from my focus on their viewpoints about what they learned, so a narrative approach was not a good choice. I next considered using a phenomenological approach for this study, because the focus of this approach is on what the participants learned in their courses (see Patton, 2015). However, the purpose of a phenomenological approach is to seek the essence of the participants' experiences (Moustakas, 1994), while I was interested not in the participants' entire experience with TSRs but specifically in their viewpoints about what they learned about using TSRs. Also, the focus of a phenomenological study is on the phenomenon in question (Patton, 2015); however, I was not studying the phenomenon of TSRs but the teachers' viewpoints about their instruction in TSRs in their courses and student teaching. Therefore, a phenomenological approach was not appropriate either.

I looked at but did not consider using a grounded theory approach. The purpose of a grounded theory study is to find the reasons or causes behind a phenomenon or to develop a theory that explains how or why about that phenomenon (Patton, 2015). Because I was not looking for the reasons behind the instruction or content of teacher

preparation programs as related to TSRs, I did not select this approach. I also did not consider using an ethnographic approach because I did not examine the culture of a group (see Patton, 2015). I was not examining the culture of teachers, teacher candidates, or teacher preparation programs; instead, I was examining the instruction teachers received in their teacher preparation programs.

Instead, the focus of this study was the participants' viewpoints about the instruction in using TSRs they received in their teacher participation programs, which was best explored through the lens of a basic qualitative approach. My focus was not solely on TSRs themselves, but on the instruction the teachers received in learning to use them. I examined what teachers learned about using TSRs in the content of their courses, and how they applied that learning in their student teaching (see Caelli et al., 2003). I was not focusing on the phenomenon of the TSR, or what was in the content of the courses, but more specifically I was looking for a deeper understanding of what information about using TSRs the teachers are getting out of their courses and student teaching (see Patton, 2015). For these reasons, a basic qualitative approach was the most appropriate design for this study, which addressed the perceived lack of instruction in the use of positive TSRs provided by teacher preparation programs.

Role of the Researcher

In qualitative research, the researcher is the data collection or research tool (Patton, 2015). The researcher is responsible for collecting the data from the participants. In order to do so, the researcher has to make the participant feel comfortable sharing what may be personal or sensitive information. As the research tool, I used interview questions

to elicit from participants the information I was looking for. I also used interviewing techniques to put the participants at ease so that they were comfortable providing accurate information. I analyzed that data using hand-coding, looked for themes, and compared the themes that emerged from the various participants. In this sense I was the data collection tool, in that I was collecting, recording, and aggregating the data for my study.

Also, as the data collection tool, the researcher needs to recognize that they may influence the credibility of the study. The researcher's bias could seep into the interview questions, into their tone of voice during the interview, and into their facial expressions. The researcher may not be able to eliminate all bias, but by being transparent about any possible issues affecting the study, the researcher can make the study as dependable as possible (Ortlipp, 2008). As the researcher in this study, I did not have any personal or professional relationships with the participants, so I had no personal or power-based bias to manage. My potential bias in this study may lie within the interview content. As a classroom teacher in an urban high school, I have strong feelings about the importance of TSRs and the practice of CRT.

Because I have such strong feelings about my topic, I needed to adopt several precautions to avoid bias in my study. In interviewing, I needed to be aware of my potential reactions to participants' answers, and I needed to be nonresponsive (see Ortlipp, 2008). I needed to be careful not to anticipate participant responses or to allow my tone of voice or facial expressions to influence those responses. Adopting these precautions also helped my participants feel more comfortable participating in this study.

For this study, I also managed my biases in part by keeping a reflective journal in which I recorded my thoughts and feelings as the study progressed. By openly acknowledging my potential biases, I made my thought processes transparent (see Ortlipp, 2008). I acknowledged my thoughts and feelings as a part of the research process, and in doing so made them accessible and transparent. There were no other ethical issues or conflicts of interest related to this study as the interviews were conducted outside of any work environment.

Methodology

Participant Selection Logic

My target group of interest was first-, second-, and third-year teachers who had recently graduated from a teacher preparation program and who were currently teaching in an urban school. As for my criteria for inclusion, my participants had to have completed their coursework, participated in student teaching, and been hired as teachers in urban schools. I used first-, second-, and third-year teachers because their classwork and student teaching was fresh in their memories, and they also have had the opportunity to use in their teaching practice what they learned in their teacher preparation programs. I interviewed the 12 participants individually, as well as conducted two focus group discussions.

My sampling strategy was in part a purposeful random sample in my selection of the first-, second-, and third-year teachers who completed their student teaching and were currently teaching in urban schools. I also used snowball sampling to help locate first-, second-, and third-year teachers (see Patton, 2015). By nature of being recent teacher

preparation program graduates, I assumed that my participants were all information-rich cases (see Patton, 2015). They all had recent experience in their teacher education courses and in their current experience working as urban teachers. I found participants who fit my criteria for inclusion in the sample first by posting an invitation to participate in the study on social media (see Appendix B). My inclusion criteria were very specific in that I was looking for participants who had recently completed student teaching in and were currently working in urban schools, and the best way to find these participants was through social media because I have many contacts in the teaching field. Through this method, my participant selection was somewhat random. Once I located a few participants through social media, I asked those participants to help me locate additional participants. Snowball sampling in this case provided me with some participants from the same teacher preparation programs.

For my sample size, I interviewed a total of 12 first-, second-, and third-year teacher participants and conducted two focus group discussions with most of those participants. A sample size of 12 interviews, with two focus group discussions, helped me arrive at data saturation; after 12 interviews, research shows that there are few new codes, themes, or definitions that emerge (see Guest et al., 2006). This number of interviews was sufficient based on the amount of information sought for data saturation (see Charmaz, 2017). Data saturation can be determined when data from additional participants begins to be repetitive and new data no longer emerge; at this point, the sample size is considered sufficient (Saunders et al., 2018). I wanted to be sure my themes were fully explored from the data I collected, but my concern was with data saturation and not with

theoretical saturation because I was only seeking information and not looking to develop a theory (see Morse, 2003). Any missing data on certain concepts revealed a gap in the instruction. The data from the focus group discussions complemented the data from the interviews and provided data saturation.

Instrumentation

The Semistructured Interview

My interview method was a topical, semistructured interview because I was looking for data about the courses and student teaching content (see Rubin & Rubin, 2012). I used a standardized open-ended interview format, and I asked each participant the same questions (see Turner, 2010). I then used follow-up questions to fill in any information that was unclear or seemed incomplete (see Rubin & Rubin, 2012). This method was best for my study because I was looking for the participants' viewpoints about the TSR instruction in their course content and student teaching, and whether these experiences aligned. Being able to deviate from the question order was useful, though, because some of my participants pursued topics of discussion from later questions during earlier interview questions; for example, topics from their discussion of their courses reminded them of events from their student teaching (see Rubin & Rubin, 2012). I used in-depth interviews with teachers because I needed to know their viewpoints about the course material and their student teaching. I wanted to take longer in interviewing them, approximately 45 minutes, so I could learn as much as possible about what they know and what their viewpoints are (see Patton, 2015). Interviewing is a good way to get in-depth information on a topic. An interview can reveal what a person knows and what they

think about what they have learned (Patton, 2015). By using in-depth interviews, I was able to obtain detailed, rich data from the participants about the inclusion of information on using positive TSRs in their coursework and student teaching.

I used the same interview protocol with each participant (see Appendix C), with each interview question aligned to one of the four research subquestions (see Appendix D). I began my interview with an introductory statement thanking the participant for their cooperation in the study and reminding them of the confidentiality of the interview. I then asked the interview questions, using any necessary follow-up questions. I structured my questions so that they were open-ended to allow the participants to respond with as much information as possible (see Jacob & Furgerson, 2012). I ended the interview with a closing statement thanking the participant for their answers, reminding them of the confidential and voluntary nature of the interview, and reminding them that I would contact them for member checks and participation in the focus group. Because I was using a basic qualitative approach for my study, in my interview guide, I focused my questions on the content that I was looking for, and used a semistructured, topical interview method (see Rubin & Rubin, 2012).

I chose interviewing over other qualitative data collection techniques because it is an expedient way to find out what people are thinking that cannot be observed, and to discover what their viewpoints are (see Patton, 2015). The course listings for the teacher preparation programs would not be very meaningful because they may not list the content the teachers learned in those courses, such as the content the instructors were supplementing or omitting. The course listings are not verification of what was taught in

class, only what was intended to be presented. The course listings also may not address topics that are part of the implicit curriculum or are embedded within other topics.

Other Data Sources

Another data source I used is focus group discussions, a data source commonly used in qualitative research (Carey & Asbury, 2016; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Focus group discussions can provide additional data that is richer and more detailed than the data from interviews alone, in that the discussion among participants can inspire insights and deeper reflection on the topic (Carey & Asbury, 2016). In their interactions, the participants may also question each other's responses, which can provide data that the interviewer might not otherwise have been able to elicit (Hartas, 2015). The data from focus group discussions can be used with the data previously collected from interviews in the data analysis (Carey & Asbury, 2016). The two focus group discussions for this study were comprised of the same interview participants, so that the first-, second-, and third-year teachers could discuss their viewpoints about what they learned about TSRs in their coursework, and how they applied that learning to their student teaching and the classes they were currently teaching (see Patton, 2015). I conducted two focus group discussions, consisting of three and five participants each. Each focus group discussion consisted of a semistructured interview (see Appendix E), and lasted approximately one hour. The number of participants in each focus group discussion depended on the participants' willingness to participate and availability. These focus group discussions were conducted online using Google Meet.

The use of other data sources is a method that can provide triangulation to ensure the validity of the study results (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). In order to ensure the rigor and credibility of my interview guide, and increase the validity of my study results, I used member checks to verify the accuracy of my transcript and interview analysis (see Anney, 2014). The feedback I received from the participants allowed me to verify the accuracy of my interpretations and categorization of their thoughts and provided me with ways to clarify and more accurately describe their ideas (see Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Thus, in addition to interviews, I also used focus group discussions and member checking.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

There are specific procedures I followed regarding participants and data collection. I provided the participants with the interview questions ahead of time. After each interview and focus group, I debriefed each participant by reminding them of the confidentiality protocol and their ability to withdraw from the study at any time. I also, at that time, asked them if I may send them the interview transcript for verification and triangulation purposes.

For the data collection, before the interviews and focus groups commenced, I secured each participant's informed consent. I collected the data from the participants' answers to interview questions by conducting individual interviews, which were approximately 45 minutes on average, and by conducting the two focus group discussions, which were approximately an hour in length each. I audio recorded the interviews using two laptop programs, one being a backup, with the recordings saved to a

flash drive. These individual interviews were conducted virtually due to the Covid 19 restrictions, and I used a private Google Meet for these interviews. I conducted the focus group discussions virtually as well, using a private Google Meet, and audio recorded the interviews using two laptop programs, with the recordings saved to a flash drive. I used Google Meet because most participants had access to this tool. The use of virtual or online focus group discussions has been gaining popularity and legitimacy as a qualitative data collection tool. Virtual focus group discussions have been found to provide the same data richness as in-person focus group discussions (Flynn et al., 2018). Also, the use of video during the virtual focus group discussions provides additional nonverbal data to supplement the meaning of the participants' words (Flynn et al., 2018; Tuttas, 2015). Lastly, participants may be more relaxed and willing to contribute to the discussion from the comfortable setting of their own homes (Stewart & Shamdasani, 2017). Using Google Meet allowed participants to engage in the focus group while in a familiar setting, thus increasing their comfort with the process.

Data Analysis Plan

The key elements of data analysis for a basic qualitative study are to identify the participants' viewpoints, and to make meaning of or find commonalities in those viewpoints. Each interview question is related to a research subquestion, and the participants' responses fell into categories related to those research questions. For this reason, I chose coding methods that helped identify and classify the participants' viewpoints. I started by precoding my data (see Saldaña, 2013). I highlighted words and phrases that pertained to my research questions. In doing this, I started using structural

coding in that I had a list of a priori codes related to the content of my research questions, and I added to these codes as other codes emerged from the data (see Saldaña, 2013). I used a color-coding system to delineate these categories. This first cycle method was used in combination with subcoding. As I coded my data, I grouped codes into subcodes under the categories of courses, culturally responsive teaching, relationship-centered teaching, and student teaching. For example, under the student teaching code, I grouped codes under the categories of cooperating teacher, student teaching seminar, or participants' own ideas. This content analysis and use of subcodes also relates to the exploratory nature of a basic qualitative study (Saldaña, 2013). For my second cycle coding, I used pattern coding to group the codes into more meaningful units that helped explain or make inferences about the participants' viewpoints. I also looked for patterns within the courses and student teaching codes for what was learned about TSRs. Pattern coding is also consistent with the goals of basic qualitative research (Saldaña, 2013).

Data Codes and Categories

Because my research was on TSRs and how teachers learn about using these relationships, my main initial categories correlated to my research subquestions: TSR elements learned in the course content, TSR elements learned in student teaching, TSR elements that are related to CRT, and TSR elements that are related to RCT for similar techniques participants mentioned.

The participants' responses determined the other categories needed. I made subcodes within the original categories to account for the different facets of the teacher preparation programs. In particular, I created categories that correlated with the

participants' viewpoints about learning to use TSRs in their courses and student teaching. For example, within the student teaching category, I needed to make a subcode for the student teaching seminar, and within that subcode, I needed to create categories for information from participants' classmates. I also thought I might need to make subcodes for specific content areas in student teaching, such as math, English, or special education, depending on the participants' specific student teaching placements and their responses related to their content areas, but no theme emerged requiring these specific codes within the student teaching category. Lastly, I needed to create a category related to the participants' viewpoints about which aspects of instruction they felt were lacking or absent. I also created a category for their suggestions for future teacher preparation programs. These last categories included discrepancies that emerged from the data, which indicated differences between the content of the various teacher preparation programs the participants attended.

Issues of Trustworthiness

Even though the subjective nature of qualitative research does not lend itself to the reliability and validity checks used in quantitative studies, there are methods that researchers can use to provide their qualitative studies with trustworthiness (Shenton, 2004). Researchers can take steps to establish credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability, the qualitative parallels of internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity, respectively (Toma, 2011).

Credibility

Credibility is established when the researcher accurately represents the participants' viewpoints (Toma, 2011). For this criterion, I used established research methods and described my methods in detail (see Shenton, 2004). Using a purposeful random sample also adds credibility by reducing bias in participant selection (Patton, 2015). Other steps I took included conducting member checking of interview transcripts for accuracy and including in my study a discussion of any cases that did not match other data or findings (see Shenton, 2004). I also maintained participant confidentiality, and I ensured that I had no personal or professional relationship with any of the participants.

Transferability

Transferability is established when the study could be applied to another context (Toma, 2011). For this criterion, I provided a detailed description of my participant selection and data collection procedures (see Toma, 2011). My participants were all first-, second-, and third-year teachers in urban schools; therefore, the study could be replicated with similar participants from specific teacher preparation programs or those from other geographic locations. Findings from similar or replication studies could provide further information on how teachers learn about using TSRs or on whether or not other teacher preparation programs are providing this instruction.

Dependability

Dependability is established when the study is detailed enough that it could be replicated (Shenton, 2004). For this criterion, I provided a detailed description of the research design and methods (see Shenton, 2004), including a transcript of my interview

and focus group protocols and questions. I used the same interview protocol for each participant, and I asked each participant identical questions in the same order. I used the same protocol and question order for both focus group discussions as well. Other steps I took included articulating any biases I thought might be present, and looking for alternate explanations or contrary findings (see Toma, 2011).

Confirmability

Confirmability is established when the results are derived from the study procedures and not the researcher's biases or presuppositions (Shenton, 2004). For this criterion, I provided detailed descriptions of how I arrived at the categories and codes in my data analysis, which will be part of an audit trail (see Toma, 2011). Other steps I took included extending that audit trail to include a detailed account of all of my data collection and analysis procedures, as well as keeping a reflexive journal (see Anney, 2014). These steps made the qualitative research process transparent and increased the trustworthiness of the study.

Ethical Procedures

I followed several procedures to ensure that my study was completed in an ethical manner. I submitted all study procedures to the Walden University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for review and approval, including any documents pertaining to gaining access to participants. In contacting participants, I downloaded any email interactions that needed to be saved, including permissions and agreements to participate, to a password protected flash drive. Once this information was saved, I deleted the participants' emails from my account. Participation in the study was voluntary, and participants were free to

withdraw from the study at any time. I informed participants that their responses to interview and focus group questions would be kept confidential, and that their colleges, former faculty members, and current employers would have no knowledge of their participation in the study. Participants were given numbered alphanumeric codes, as pseudonyms, starting with the letter P. For example, the first participant was known only as P1. This numbering system ensured the participants' confidentiality.

I kept all interview data on a password protected flash drive stored safely in my home. I used alphanumeric codes for the participants to ensure their privacy. I did not use any descriptors in my data analysis that would reveal any participant's identity. Once I completed my data transcription, I destroyed any part of the data that was online and/or could be linked to the participants. Password protected data stored on the flash drive will be destroyed after 5 years. I am not a member of any college faculty, and I do not work with any potential participants, so there are no potential conflicts of interest.

Summary

This chapter presented the research design for this qualitative study. I described my rationale for choosing a basic qualitative design, my role as the researcher, and any biases or ethical issues that could arise in the process of conducting this study. I provided my reasoning for selecting 12 first-, second-, and third-year teachers as my participants, and I provided my reasoning for using a purposeful random sample and snowball sampling as my sampling strategy. I also described my reasons for choosing to use semistructured interviews as my instrumentation, and for using two focus group discussions as an additional data source. I provided my interview guide for both the

interviews and the focus group discussions. I reviewed my research design for possible issues of trustworthiness, and I described my reasons for using member checks to provide triangulation. I also reviewed the ethical procedures I used in conducting this study. The results of the data collection and analysis based on the methods explained in Chapter 3 are presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this basic qualitative study was to explore teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools, both in their teacher education courses and in their student teaching. The following central research question and subquestions were used in the study.

Central Research Question

What are teacher's viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools?

Subquestions

SQ1: What are teacher's viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools in their teacher education courses?

SQ2: What are teacher's viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools in their student teaching?

SQ3: What are teacher's viewpoints about the instruction they received in the TSR elements of CRT?

SQ4: What are teacher's viewpoints about the instruction they received in the TSR elements of RCT?

This chapter presents the parameters of the study, including the setting, the demographics of the participants, the data collection procedures, the data analysis process used, the evidence of trustworthiness, and the results.

Setting

All participants were recruited via social media and separately from their colleges or employers. At the time of the interviews, the participants worked remotely due to the COVID-19 crisis. Participants had different schedules and levels of online interaction with their current students, but none were in the actual classroom interacting with their students face-to-face. Participants had been teaching the same students face-to-face prior to the pandemic and subsequent closure of schools, so participants had established in-person relationships with the students before switching to all online instruction. All participants had completed their teacher preparation programs, including student teaching, in person.

Demographics

All participants were first-, second-, and third-year teachers working in urban schools. P4 and P5 were over 30 years of age and starting their second careers, while the rest of the participants were under 30 and starting their first careers. P1 and P4 attended the same teacher preparation program, which was a 1-year Masters in the Art of Teaching (MAT) program. P5 and P6 attended the same teacher preparation program, as did P8 and P10. P3 attended the same program as P8 and P10, but P8 was also part of an UTR. Even though P5 and P6 attended the same program, P5 did not complete her student teaching in an urban area while P6 did. P1 and P4 also completed their student teaching in the same school, and P3 completed his student teaching with them as well. P1 and P3 taught in the same school. P2 and P3 both taught in the same school during their first two years of teaching (but were not aware of each other's participation in the study).

P6, P7, and P12 all taught in the same city; P5 started teaching in this same city, but she transferred to a different city during her second year of teaching. The participants' demographic information is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Participant Demographics

Participant	Gender	Year of teaching	Ethnicity	Level/Area	Teacher preparation program	Urban focus to program	Focus group interview
P1	M	3rd	Hispanic	HS/Math	Urban Prep/MAT	Yes	Yes
P2	F	3rd	Hispanic	HS/Math	Bachelors	No	No
P3	F	3rd	White	HS/Science	UTR/Bachelors	Yes	Yes
P4	M	3rd	White	HS/English	Urban Prep/MAT	Yes	Yes
P5	F	2nd	White	MS/Math	Bachelors	No	Yes
P6	F	2nd	White	MS/Math	Bachelors	No	No
P7	F	1st	White	MS/English/ESL	Bachelors and Masters	Some	Yes
P8	F	1st	White	HS/English/SE	BA + MAT	Yes	No
P9	F	3rd	White	HS/PE	Bachelors	No	No
P10	M	1st	Asian	MS/English/SE	BA + MAT	Yes	Yes
P11	M	3rd	Black	Elem/English/SE	Bachelors	No	Yes
P12	F	1st	White	Elem/SE	Bachelors	No	Yes

Note. P = participant; M = male; F = female; HS = high school; MS = middle school; ESL = English as a second language; SE = special education; PE = physical education; Elem = elementary school; MAT = Masters in the Art of Teaching; UTR = urban teaching residency; BA = Bachelor of Arts.

Data Collection

Data were gathered using semistructured, individual interviews and through two focus group discussions conducted on Google Meet. The interviews lasted between 30 minutes and 1 hour, depending on participant responses. Each focus group lasted about 1 hour. Twelve participants were interviewed regarding their viewpoints of the instruction they received in the use of TSRs in their teacher preparation programs. These interviews were conducted over the course of 2 months. Of the 12 participants, three participated in the first focus group, and five participated in the second focus group. The first focus group was conducted after the first six interviews, and the second focus group was conducted after the final interviews were completed.

Prior to being interviewed, all participants who consented to participate in the study were sent the study invitation and the consent form. Before the interview, each participant received the interview protocol, which included the interview questions. During the interviews, participants were asked about their perceptions of what they learned about using TSRs in their teacher preparation programs. Participants were also asked clarifying follow-up questions in relation to some of their responses. Participants were encouraged to elaborate upon their responses and were permitted to use as much time as they wanted to respond.

The interviews were completed as described in my data collection plan. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed using website-based computer applications. The recordings and transcripts were then downloaded to a password protected flash drive and deleted from the websites. During the interviews and focus

group discussions, I reminded participants of the confidential nature of the study. During the interviews, I took notes, and after the interviews, I wrote my feelings and impressions in my reflective journal. All of the participants responded to the request for answers to follow-up questions and interview transcript reviews, and none of the participants withdrew from the study.

One variation to the data collection plan was that not all 12 participants took part in the focus group discussions. I had originally planned to have two focus group discussions with six participants in each one, but coordinating participant schedules was difficult. Some participants were not available when the others were available, and some participants who agreed to participate had to cancel the day before or the day of the interview.

Another variation to my original plan was the inclusion of second- and third-year teachers. My original data collection plan was to interview only first-year teachers who were currently teaching in an urban district and who had student taught in an urban district. After initially not finding the required number of participants for the study, I expanded my participant selection criteria to include second- and third-year teachers and to exclude the need for participants to have student taught in an urban area. I decided, and obtained committee and IRB approval, to open the study to second- and third-year teachers because they were still relatively new to teaching and not that far removed from their teacher education programs. A few of these new participants indicated that they had some difficulty recalling some elements of their teacher preparation programs, but some of the first-year teacher participants also reported having difficulty recalling some of

these elements. While I did eventually have two participants who met the original criteria, as a result of the data analysis, I found that limiting the study to only first-year teachers who student taught in urban districts would have led to an incomplete picture of all teacher preparation programs.

COVID-19 was also a factor in data collection as all participants were teaching remotely from home instead of teaching in a classroom at the time of the interviews, but all of the participants had taught their students in-person for 6.5 months before moving to online instruction.

Data Analysis

For each interview and focus group, I listened carefully to the recording, reviewed the transcript, and edited the transcript where needed for accuracy. For any words I was uncertain about, I emailed the participants and asked them to review that line in particular for accuracy in addition to reviewing the transcript as a whole. Participants who also participated in the focus group discussions were asked to review the transcript for their contributions to the focus group discussion as well. All of the participants responded to my requests for accuracy checks, none reported any inaccuracies, and all reported the transcripts to be accurate.

I started hand coding the transcripts with six a priori codes: TSR in courses, CRT in courses, RCT in courses, TSR in student teaching, CRT in student teaching, and RCT in student teaching. I added a code for the teacher preparation program in general. The course codes focused on what the participants learned about TSR in their courses, while

the student teaching codes focused on what the participants learned about TSR while student teaching or what they used from their courses in their student teaching practice.

As I coded, several subcodes emerged, such as professors under courses, cooperating teachers, and seminars under student teaching. These subcodes seemed to be additional, significant areas from which participants learned about using TSRs. An additional code emerged for what the participants thought about their TSR instruction after experiencing their first years of teaching in an urban district – this was not a research question but a topic that many participants naturally strayed to in their responses. Lastly, P2 discussed her experiences with TSRs and switching to online instruction as a result of school closings during the COVID-19 pandemic, which led me to add a follow-up question about TSRs and teaching online during the COVID-19 pandemic; this topic became a subcode as well.

Once I completed the initial hand coding, I organized the data from each interview and focus group into a data analysis chart by themes and subthemes. Second cycle pattern hand coding by theme yielded areas of similarities and differences in the participants' experiences, as well as in the urban versus the nonurban teacher preparation programs. Other themes that emerged included implicit instruction in TSRs, TSR elements brought in by specific professors, professors who previously taught in urban districts, TSR elements embedded in CRT, and TSR elements embedded within RCT and classroom management.

Under courses, three elements of TSR instruction emerged: getting to know students, how to develop TSRs, and how to use TSRs. Under student teaching, themes

emerged about issues that affected forming TSRs during student teaching: the amount of time allotted to student teaching, interactions with parents, and issues with cooperating teachers. Other themes that emerged included TSR strategies that emerged from specific content areas, student teaching in the fall or spring, and learning from experience. Many participants also discussed what they felt was missing from their courses and student teaching, which led me to create a subcode for participant suggestions. Some participants also brought up personal life experiences that helped them build TSRs, which led to an additional code. The categories and themes are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Categories and Themes

Research subquestion	Category	Themes
TSRs in courses	Program in general	Urban versus nonurban programs
	Professors	TSRs brought in by professor TSRs modelled by professors Professors taught in urban schools
	Courses	Implicit versus explicit TSR instruction Getting to know students How to develop TSRs How to use TSRs Content areas related to TSRs TSR instruction missing
TSRs in student teaching	Program in general	Urban versus nonurban programs Fall versus spring student teaching Contact with parents TSR information learned
	Cooperating teacher	Actions related to TSRs Words related to TSRs Experiences with TSRs Modelled TSRs
	Student teaching seminar	Had / did not have Fellow student teachers' anecdotes Discussions
CRT	Courses	In urban focused programs Relation of CRT to TSRs Issues related to TSR instruction In nonurban focused programs
	Student teaching: TSR strategy sources	Courses Cooperating teachers Their own ideas or experiences
RCT	Courses	Related to classroom management Books Special education English language learners
	Student teaching: TSR strategy sources	Courses Cooperating teachers Their own ideas or experiences
Participant findings	Observations	TSR instruction is inadequate, missing, or needed
	Personal life experiences Lack of preparation for teaching in urban schools TSR information learned thorough experience Suggestions for TSR instruction	

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship; CRT = critically responsive teaching; RCT = relationship-centered teaching.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

Credibility

I took steps to ensure I accurately represented the participants' viewpoints in reporting my findings. I started by using a purposeful random sample to reduce bias in participant selection. P1, P3, P5, P8, P9, P10, and P11 were selected on the basis of their responses to invitations posted on social media. The other five participants were found through snowball sampling, and, with the exception of P1, who referred two other participants, each participant was referred by a different person. I also sent each participant their interview script to check for accuracy, and I asked follow-up questions to make sure each participant provided information about the same salient topics. Each participant responded to the follow-up questions and confirmed the accuracy of the interview transcripts. I maintained participant confidentiality throughout and included confidentiality in the protocol for the focus group discussions. I did not include as a participant any person with whom I had a personal or professional relationship. Finally, in reporting my findings, I included a discussion of any findings that did not match the other data and why those differences may have existed, though there were only minor differences between participants' reports.

Transferability

This study could be applied to another context. I provided a detailed description of my participant selection and my data collection procedures, and I also included my interview questions in the appendix. This study could therefore be replicated with any first-, second-, and third-year teachers in urban schools, either from a particular teacher

preparation program or from a certain geographic location. Replication studies could provide information on whether other teacher preparation programs are providing instruction in TSRs.

Dependability

This study is detailed enough to be replicated. I provided a detailed description of the research design and methods, the interview and focus group questions, and the protocols used for both the interviews and the focus group discussions. I used the same protocols and interview questions for each participant and asked the questions in the same order. I also reported any possible biases, and I looked for contrary findings or alternate explanations in the reported data.

Confirmability

The first step I took in ensuring confirmability was to keep a reflexive journal in which I reflected on my thoughts and feelings during the interview process and questioned any possible biases I may have had. I gave a detailed explanation of my coding category selection process and my data collection and analysis procedures. The detailed descriptions I provided of my research methods and the steps I took in providing an audit trail increased the trustworthiness of the study.

Results

The results of this study are reported below and are organized by the research questions. Within the section for each research question, the results are organized first by interview question and then by theme. These results consist of what the participants reported learning about using TSRs in their teacher preparation programs. Chapter 4

contains two areas of focus concerning TSRs: the method by which participants learned about using TSRs, and the TSR content they learned. For the purposes of this research, I am defining the term TSR method as how the participants learned about TSRs, which includes but is not limited to courses, professors, cooperating teachers, and other teacher candidates. I am defining the term TSR content as what they learned about TSRs, which includes but is not limited to information about and techniques for using TSRs. The participants' responses are both paraphrased where generalities are reported and quoted where specific answers provide detail and clarification. The methods by which participants learned about TSRs are presented as narrative, while tables, listed in Appendix F, are used to list the TSR content reported for each theme. I am using tables to present this information because they provide a much more efficient means of presenting the findings related to the TSR content. The differences in the participants' findings that are related to differences in the types of teacher preparation programs, whether urban or nonurban focused, are also reported.

Research Question:

What are teacher's viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools?

SQ1: Courses

Programs in General

The 12 participants attended two different types of teacher preparation programs: five participants attended ones that focused on preparing students to teach in urban areas (P1, P3, P4, P8, and P10), and seven participants attended ones that did not have such a

focus. One participant, P7, attended a program that emphasized the use of restorative practices and provided a field experience in an urban area, but there was no focus on preparation to teach in urban areas in this program. Also, P11 attended a teacher preparation program located in an urban area but with no specific focus on teaching in urban schools. Therefore, I have included these participants' programs in the group without an urban focus. Another participant, P3, took part in an UTR program in conjunction with that teacher preparation program that focused on teaching in urban areas

The participants in teacher preparation programs that focused on preparation for teaching in urban districts reported the inclusion of some elements of TSRs, CRT, and RCT in their programs. For example, P3 summarized the TSR content of her classes as follows:

> It was a lot about teaching to the whole student and not just teaching the subject to the student. I heard that phrase constantly, really understanding where the students are coming from, and understanding their backgrounds, culturally, racially, socioeconomically . . . before you even begin to teach your content to them, and then ways to incorporate those things into your actual instruction.

Oppositely, the participants in teacher preparation programs with no urban focus reported that TSR instruction was not specifically included in the curriculum, and that any TSR elements that came up in the classes were intertwined with the few CRT elements in those programs. P9, in reference to the TSR elements in his program, reported that "the importance of it was the big thing." P9 also reported learning that CRT "helps improve classroom management . . . that the better relationship that you have . . . [the students are]

more willing to work hard and do your work." Both groups reported that using relationships was intertwined with CRT elements.

All of the participants in the urban programs completed their student teaching in urban school districts. Three of the participants in the urban programs also reported that their programs included field experiences in urban districts in addition to student teaching in urban districts. However, according to P1 and P4, their teacher preparation program did not contain any field experiences before student teaching because their student teaching experience was one school year of their 15-month MAT program. Not all participants specifically discussed the field experiences they had with their courses, but P8 did mention her program containing a field experience in a special education classroom that involved interaction with the students. She stated that

> We did have one class . . . where there was a group . . . of special education students from there, who were all generally going to be in high school till they were 21. . . . So every Tuesday that semester for an hour, I got to hang out with this particular group of special [education] students . . . and me and the three or four people who were in my group, we had to come up with things to show them. . . . That was total interaction. You got to really learn on the fly how to handle specific situations.

Of the seven participants not in urban programs, two (P6 and P11) completed their student teaching in urban districts and three (P2, P7, and P11) were in programs with urban field experiences. The other participants in nonurban programs did have field

experiences before their student teaching, but these field experiences were not in urban districts.

Participants in the programs focused on urban schools reported that the TSR elements were mostly contained within the CRT elements of the courses. P3 reported that her courses even focused more on CRT and TSRs than on the content: “I feel like I was trained way more in terms of culturally responsive teaching and relationships more than I was content.” P1 and P3 also felt that TSRs was a main topic of their program because of the focus on urban teaching. P1 felt this focus was because “most teachers . . . aren’t of the same demographics as students in an urban area.” P4 also noted this focus on CRT and TSRs: “All of the courses in the MAT program, they just kind of went over the same material from a different angle.” He reported that one of his classes focused on TSRs “from the student perspective or the cultural perspective of the students.” In general, P4 reported that his courses focused more on CRT and using TSRs than for content: “I would say probably 75 percent of the classes were focused on getting new teachers to adapt to those situations and build those relationships and only 25 percent or so was actually about the content delivery in the instruction.” P4 also reported that “the overall program was very much about building that connection, so that you can understand why they’re doing something and where that behavior is coming from.” P1, P3, and P4 also noted that they received many books with themes of CRT and TSRs from their programs. Books named by these participants as being texts to help prepare them to build TSRs in urban schools included *For White Folks that Want to Teach in the Hood* (Emdin, 2016), *How to Talk so Kids Will Listen & Listen So Kids Will Talk* (Faber & Mazlish, 2012),

Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Freire, 1972), *Star Teachers of Children in Poverty* (Haberman, 2018), *We Want to Do More Than Survive: Abolitionist Teaching and the Pursuit of Educational Freedom* (Love, 2019), and *Race-ing to Class* (Milner, 2015).

Additionally, P1 had started a teacher preparation program at another college that did not have a focus on urban teaching and felt the focus on TSRs was missing from that program. Of his first program he stated, “They didn't really focus as much on teacher student relationships. Just because you weren't required to teach in an urban setting. Like it was, it was completely different.” P3 reported that her UTR provided her with personalized feedback and support, a coach for her first year of teaching, and optional PDs in CRT which she has attended: “We still get classes today that we do culturally responsive teaching and interdepartmental relationship. We had a whole session on that, like teacher to teacher relationships, teacher to student relationships.”

P10 reported that because his life experience was different than that of urban students, the experiences provided by the urban teacher preparation program, such as the coursework, the urban field experiences, and student teaching in an urban district, helped prepare him to teach in an urban school; otherwise, he “would have been clueless coming in,” without “some instruction on it ahead of time.” P7 and P9, however, specifically reported that their classes in nonurban programs did not prepare them for the issues they encountered while teaching in urban schools. P7 reported, “Nothing I feel like I learned in any of my grad or undergrad courses could have prepared me for some of the behaviors I did encounter, especially in that first week.” Specifically she found, “The disrespect and defiance issues I encountered the most are what I was not prepared for.”

P9 did not think “any information in my classes helped [him] deal with these events [fights, drugs, and cutting].” He did feel that his “student teaching experiences helped [him] learn how to deal with these issues,” but he felt that he “would have been able to develop those skills a little earlier on instead of figuring it out [his] first year” if his student teaching experience had been longer.

Three of the participants (P2, P6, P8) in the programs that did not focus on urban teaching reported that their teacher preparation programs consisted of “by the book” instruction and focused on covering content. P6 stated that TSR instruction did not seem “critical or important” because the program focused on teaching strategies and covering the content, and that “maybe like 10 percent of [the] actual classes talked about teacher student relationships.” P2 reported, “It wasn’t really until my very last class, that building a rapport was really emphasized.” The participants in the nonurban programs also reported that TSRs were not explicitly taught or included in the curriculum other than what some professors chose to include, and that even that implicit instruction was only in one or two classes. P8, who attended an urban program, also specifically commented that she had “only one real class that . . . really touched upon that student teacher relationship.” All of the participants reported that their teacher preparation programs contained no class or part of the curriculum devoted specifically to TSR instruction.

Professors

Professors Brought in TSR Information. All participants except one reported having at least one professor who emphasized the importance of forming TSRs, that these professors brought this emphasis to the class, and that it was not contained explicitly

within the curriculum. The majority of these professors taught specific subject methods courses: P1 and P2 – math; P3 – science; P4 – English language arts (ELA); P5 and P6 – English language learners (ELL); P6, P8, and P12 - special education classes. P3 specifically reported that her professor “brought up” the topic of TSRs, and that the instruction “wasn’t explicit in the syllabus or the course description.” P4 reported that his ELA content professor included “very explicit” instruction in TSRs in both her content course and her classroom management course. P10 reported that the TSR information the professors brought in “was important to that specific professor.” P7’s experience supports this idea. P7 reported that the use of TSRs was emphasized by several professors who included it as part of their instruction in the concept of restorative practices. She reported, “[TSRs] was a big topic of discussion that would come up in the [restorative] circle each week.” P7 reported this professor as saying the topic of restorative circles for her was “a big course of study.” P9 did not mention any professors, but he did state that TSR information “came up” in his classes, particularly his physical education methods class, as opposed to being in the curriculum.

Some participants also reported learning about TSRs from the professors who led the student teaching seminar. P7 reported that her professor “would note when she could see [the student teachers] were building those positive relationships,” and that this professor’s feedback helped. Other participants mentioned learning about TSRs from their student teaching supervisors as well. For example, P10 reported his seminar professor saying teachers should “be honest and who [they] are with our students, and to encourage them to do the same.”

All participants in nonurban programs except P9 mentioned having only one or two professors who brought in TSR emphasis, but P11 reported having "a couple of classes" in which "the professors really stressed among everything else . . . you have to build a relationship with your students." Participants in the programs with an urban focus reported that they had several or many professors who brought in TSR content that was not in the curriculum, and that this information was mostly brought in through the classes that included CRT. As P4 stated,

> I think that's probably the biggest part they could key in on for us, at least in the program that I went through, that first step of making the connection with the individual was our kind of our gateway to making the connection with the culture and the community, depending on where we were.

Table F1 in Appendix F contains a list of information about TSRs that the participants reported their professors directly stated.

Professors Previously Taught in Urban Schools. Almost all of the participants reported having at least one professor who had previously taught in an urban school, but all of the participants in urban programs reported having several or many professors who previously taught in urban schools. 10 of the participants reported that the professors who emphasized TSRs were previously teachers in urban school districts and shared these teaching experiences in their teacher preparation courses. P11 reported that a "handful" of his professors had taught in urban schools, and he felt their urban background aided class discussions and "was invaluable for . . . prospective teachers." P5 reported having one professor who "actually touched on teacher student relationships and how you

needed them to work," and that was the only college class in which she "ever had someone tell [her] how important it was to make a connection." Later during the focus group discussion she said she "found out recently that he did teach in an urban school district for part of his career." P6 reported that she was not aware of having a professor who taught in an urban district, but she was in the same program as P5, and discussed the same professor that P5 discussed. P6 did report, however, that this professor was one of her "favorites," and that she found this class "the most useful and still the class that [she looks] back on today the most." Additionally, P12 reported having a professor who previously taught in a large urban school district, and also mentioned having a student teaching supervisor who "had also taught in urban education."

Several participants reported these professors specifically mentioning or sharing their experiences teaching in urban schools. P2 reported her professor, who previously taught in an urban high school, discussed empathy:

> Sometimes you may start with a set of rules and expectations and you have to understand that life circumstances may cause you to deviate from that, that students come with baggage, and sometimes you may say on the first day, I'm not going to accept anything late. Sometimes, you know, kids don't have light. So you're going to have to accept things late.

P1 also discussed a professor of his who shared her experiences, and how "she was able to just always get through to the students, just because of her nature." P3 reported her professor told stories "about when he was teaching and how he got to know his students." P12 also reported that her professor who previously taught in a large urban school district

"did mention her experiences" working with special education students, and "would talk about how she would work with them and what strategies she would use." However, P6 reported that professors sharing real world experiences was missing from her program: "So I wish they had, interwoven within the classes, the real world experiences of the professors that had taught, and kind of weaving in what they know, and not just necessarily what they had to cover." P7 reported that her professor who emphasized restorative practices previously taught in urban schools and shared "strategies she knew worked well for urban districts." Finally, P10 added that his professors who "had a background in urban education often discussed their experiences in class."

Two participants in the same urban program, P1 and P4, each reported disagreeing on one point with some of their professors who had previously taught in urban schools. They felt that these professors assumed none of the students had experience with or understanding of urban students. P1 stated, "Some of the stuff I didn't necessarily always agree with." This participant had attended urban schools and felt the professors did not listen to his suggestions, which were based on his knowledge and experiences. P4 also felt some of these professors "were ignoring [their] backgrounds." He felt these professors "were trying to teach [them] all the same way while telling [them] not to teach the kids the same way." P4 admitted to making this same mistake of making assumptions in his student teaching and learning from the situation, because if this issue had not come up in class, he might not have recognized the mistake.

Professors Modelled Use of TSRs. Nine participants reported that the professors who brought the TSR information into the classes also modelled the use of TSR

strategies. Three participants specifically reported that these professors practiced the use of TSRs through building those relationships with their teacher preparation students. P7 reported that the professor who focused on TSRs through instruction in restorative practices also modelled those practices: “The way one of my professors would run her classes we would all sit in like a circle, like the restorative circles.” P2 reported that the professor who emphasized TSRs also emphasized using empathy, which P2 says this professor practiced in her own teaching:

> She was very different as a professor. And maybe that's why that was a pivotal course for me, because she was very different herself. I think because she emphasized the student teacher relationship. I also think that because she made it a point that she was also a high school teacher before she was a professor. I felt that I could relate to her, as opposed to in all my other classes. [My other professors and I] really didn't have that relationship. She talked a lot about having empathy for students.

P10 reported that his first semester student teaching seminar professor modeled the use of TSRs by sharing who she was and her own experiences about how she became a teacher. P10 said she helped them become comfortable sharing with the kids, and that he “could see other students then reflecting that back” when he did so. He reported that experience as the “most valuable experience that [he] had then.” P10 reported that his second semester seminar professor also used examples from her urban teaching experiences and emphasized “if we’re honest with the students they’ll be honest with us.” Both of P10’s student teaching seminar professors had previously taught in urban schools.

One TSR method that four participants noted their professors modeling was the use of writing specific comments on student papers and journals. For P5, this professor taught her ELL class: “He wanted to know each and every one of us. . . . even on our papers he wrote specific things . . . and then it was our job to pass that down in our fieldwork.” P10, P11, and P12 reported their student teacher seminar professor modeling TSRs through making comments on the journals they were required to keep while they were student teaching. P11 described it in this way: “He would write personalized messages on our papers, you know, really build that relationship with us. So, so we're like ‘oh that's how it's done.’” P10 described this process as intentional: “As they were working on building the relationships with us, they encouraged us to reflect on what we were doing to build relationships in our classroom [which] I think sort of helped transfer that.” P10 felt the seminar “wasn’t even really focused on the content itself, it was more this idea of modelling how to build a student-teacher relationship.” P12 reported that her experience with journals was similar to P10’s experience. She stated the professor’s journal comments were helpful in reflecting on “a lesson and picking the pros out of it, but also picking out how could you do this differently.” Through the journal comments, these professors modelled building TSRs while encouraging the student teachers to reflect on how they were building TSRs in their own classes.

Some professors modelled TSRs through the relationships they built with their teacher preparation students. P3 reported one of her professors doing so: “The way he modeled to us his relationships with us was the number one best way to teach me how to be a good teacher with a good relationship with your students.” P8 reported that her

behavioral management professor used explicit instruction in TSRs and used the techniques that she taught, and that what she did worked because of the TSRs she developed with her college students. P8 also noted that this class was her favorite, and that she still contacts this professor. P1 reported that his professors used what they had learned about him and his urban background through the TSR they had develop with him, and would ask him to help the other teacher candidates: “Anytime they had a question, they would come to me and ask me regarding cultures.” P1 also mentioned how one of his professors modelled using her knowledge of her students: “She knew how each student was going to react,” and would use that knowledge to model teaching her lesson in different ways “so any student can't make a remark, or any students just can’t not be focused.”

P11 noted that one of his professors made a point to get to know his students: “He modeled it for us, the teacher cohorts, and then sort of, it was our job to kind of pass that down in our fieldwork.” P7 also described an English content professor who modeled TSR by building those relationships with her students: “Sometimes I felt like she knew me better than I knew myself as a teacher.” P7 added that this professor modelled building TSRs outside of class, too, by sending emails to “check in with” students she had not heard from in a while, which P7 felt “goes a long way as a student that you want to do for your students as well.”

In contrast, P5, in a nonurban program, noted that most of her professors did not develop TSRs with their students: “I don't know if they really even took the time to get to

know each one of their students." The professor that P5 did report building those relationships was also the only professor who emphasized the importance of doing so.

Courses

All participants reported that instruction in the use of TSRs was not an explicit part of the curriculum in their teacher education courses. Participants in urban programs reported that these elements of TSRs were mentioned in their first courses; oppositely, two participants in the nonurban focused programs, P2 and P5, reported that their last courses before student teaching was the first class that mentioned TSRs. The TSR information that participants reported being mentioned in their courses included getting to know students, how to develop TSRs, and how to use TSRs. Every participant reported having at least one course that included some aspect of the TSR element of the importance of getting to know your students, either implicitly or mentioned by a professor. Most participants also reported having at least one course that included information on how to develop TSRs, how to use TSRs in teaching, or both; however, some participants noted that instruction in how to develop TSRs (P2, P5, P6, P8, P10, P11) and how to maintain relationships (P5, P7) was missing in their courses. General TSR information and information not explicitly attributed to a professor is included in this section.

Within their courses, five participants specifically mentioned learning how to build and use TSRs through the content areas (P1 – math, P4, P8, P10 - ELA, P11, English). Four of those participants were in urban programs, and three reported the TSR instruction was through the English curriculum. All of the participants in urban programs

reported that their courses emphasized the building and use of TSRs before beginning content instruction. Despite this general focus, P8 reported that she felt the “only [course] that really touched upon that interaction with the students was the behavioral management course,” a special education course; she felt in other classes only “briefly touched upon” TSR instruction.

Participants in nonurban focused programs reported that some aspects of TSRs came up in subject methods courses, special education courses, or ESL courses. P11, however, felt that TSRs were not mentioned in his elementary education content methods classes: “Those were really just how to teach the content.” P5 reported that in her special education class, TSRs were never directly mentioned: “There was never an emphasis on the relationship with the child. It was always just, be positive…it kind of inferred to, but he never really said.” P6 also reported TSRs being brought up “a little bit” in the classroom management part of “one of [her] special education classes,” but that some of this TSR information came from an interview with a principal and a teacher that she had to do as a project for the class. The other class in which P6 mentioned the topic of TSRs coming up in was an ESL class, and this was also the class previously mentioned as being taught by P5 and P6’s favorite professor.

All 12 participants reported that the TSR elements that were included in their courses were those focused on getting to know the students. Nine participants reported their courses included information on how to use TSRs, while P5 and P7 felt this aspect was missing from their courses, and P6 did not report any. However, P5 and P6 mentioned elements of how to use TSRs in the CRT portions of their courses, and P7

reported the restorative practices portions of her classes including how to use TSRs. Lastly, seven participants reported their courses including information on how to develop TSRs, while P8, P10, and P11 reported that how to develop TSRs was missing from their courses, and P2, P5, and P6 did not report any mention of how to develop TSRs in their courses. P8 and P10 felt that there was no explicit instruction in how to develop TSRs in their program, but they did report some strategies that came up in the CRT components of their courses. Table 3 contains a summary of which participants reported which of these three aspects of TSR instruction in their courses, and also which content courses contained that instruction.

Table 3

TSR Elements in Courses

Participant	Included getting to know	Included how to develop	Included how to use	Class with TSR information
P1	Y	Y	Y	Math / all
P2	Y	No	Y	Math
P3	Y	Y	Y	Science / all
P4	Y	Y	Y	ELA / all
P5	Y	No	Missing	ELL, SE, Math
P6	Y	No	No	ELL, SE, Math
P7	Y	Y	Missing	Restorative Practices
P8	Y	Missing	Y	ELA, SE, all
P9	Y	Y	Y	PE
P10	Y	Missing	Y	ELA, SE, all
P11	Y	Missing	Y	ELA, SE
P12	Y	Y	Y	SE, ELL, Elem. Children and Math

Note. Y = yes; ELA = English language arts; ELL = English language learner; SE = special education; PE = physical education; Elem = elementary.

Tables F2, F3, and F4 in Appendix F list the TSR strategies participants reported as included in classes for each topic; if a participant mentioned in which course the element came up, I included the course in the description.

Getting to Know Students. Several participants reported that they learned about using student surveys at the beginning of the year to start getting to know students. P10 reported that one of his first classes in the urban program focused on the importance of getting to know students as the "place to start" for "the things we should look for, or take into account, while we're getting to know our students, because they're the things that might help us plan instruction" and "help you build that relationship." Table F2 in Appendix F contains a list of the elements of getting to know students that participants reported being included in their courses.

How to Develop TSRs. Several participants reported they learned to ask students about themselves and their interests as part of developing TSRs. Table F3 in Appendix F contains a list of the elements of how to develop TSRs that participants reported being included in their courses.

How to Use TSRs. One last area in which participants reported receiving information was how to use TSRs in their teaching practice. Table F4 in Appendix F contains a list of the elements of how to use TSRs that participants reported being included in their courses.

Differences in Content Courses. One final theme that emerged was that it is easier to incorporate TSR strategies in certain content areas. Some participants reported that English classes provide more opportunities for teachers to develop and use TSRs

than other subject area classes do. P1 stated that "the teachers really focused on getting to know your students through your lessons which is extremely difficult with math." P4 stated that developing TSRs was easier to do in English classes and was also easier to do without students knowing you were doing so: "I think we have more tools to make it less obvious." He said English teachers can ask those questions as part of assignments, such as write six things that happened to you yesterday, without it seeming "intrusive." For example, he said a student became offended when he asked how she was, but wrote about how she was when doing so was an assignment. P4 reported that using the strategies from his content classes helped him "learn more about the kids without them instantly knowing that's what [he] was doing." P4 further stated that English content is easier to use to get to know students because you are focused on expression and thought, and not on "that they produce the right answer." P1 agreed and suggested one reason might be that math has more tests and requirements to comply with. Both P1 and P3 agreed that using English content to get to know students is easier than using math or science, but both also agreed that with their content they found ways to do so.

Missing TSR Instruction. Several participants reported that information on how to maintain TSRs was missing from their teacher preparation programs. P5 noted that her instruction "did not touch on 'did you maintain a connection with your kids' type thing." P7 also noted that there was no information on what to do when a problem develops in a TSR: "Like, what do you do when the relationship you built starts to go south?" This lack of information on maintaining relationships was not limited to the nonurban programs. P3 commented on some of the elements missing from the urban program she attended. She

said she did not have a class called classroom management, that she learned how to create rules but not what to do if those rules were not followed, and that the elementary education teachers were given more of those strategies. She also noted that there was no instruction in what to do if there was a problem with those TSRs:

> It was more about all student teacher relationships, and then very little about what to do if you can't make those student relationships happen . . . but not about how to fix relationships, because I didn't, I wasn't able to make wonderful student teacher relationships my first year of teaching.

Overall, most participants in the nonurban programs reported that outside of the mention of some strategies, explicit, in-depth instruction in how to develop and use TSRs was missing from their coursework. P11 stated that there was no explicit instruction in TSRs. He reported that concerning TSRs, his professors said, “You want to do this for your students,” but P11 said, “Well, how can I do it for my students if I don’t know what it is?” In general, P11 felt that there was no coursework in how to build relationships with students, and that TSR information wasn’t “overtly stated.” Likewise, P12 reported that other than in her special education course, TSR “was more just like mentioned.” Additionally, P11 and P12 felt that some aspects of getting to know students at the beginning of the school year were emphasized, but after that the instruction was content-based. According to P11, “There was no real emphasis on how to keep that going.” P10 noted that there “wasn’t necessarily instruction on here’s how to get to know your students.” Finally, several participants, P10, P11, and P12, used the word blueprint to

describe the lack of information on how to build TSRs. P11 reported that for TSRs, “I wasn’t really given a blueprint on how to do that from my coursework.”

SQ2: Student Teaching

Program in General

The student teaching placements varied from program to program. The participants in urban focused programs were placed in urban schools for their student teaching, as were P11 and P6. P11’s program was located near several urban districts, and many teacher candidates from his program were placed there; P6’s program was located near a larger city, but according to P6, placement was based on matching the teacher candidates to cooperating teachers. P2, P5, and P9 student taught in schools that were suburban or nonurban characteristic, and P7 and P12 student taught in rural schools. P5 reported that while she was placed in a suburban school, she did have one class of students who were integrating back into the school “from a school where they had to go when they got suspended or expelled.”

The type of student teaching placement also varied. Two of the participants were in an 18-month urban MAT program, for which they student taught for an entire school year. The participant in the UTR observed in the fall semester and student taught the same classes in the spring semester, as did P8 and P10 in the urban dual certificate MAT program. In the programs without an urban focus, P5 and P6 observed in the fall and student taught in the spring, P7 and P9 student taught one semester in the fall, and P2, P11, and P12 student taught one semester in the spring. As a result, most participants had the opportunity to observe the students they taught in the spring from the beginning of the

school year, while P2, P11, and P12 were the only participants who did not have the opportunity to observe their cooperating teachers interact with students at the beginning of the school year. P7 reported that student teaching in the fall allowed her to see how her cooperating teacher built TSRs at the beginning of the year. P9 observed for one semester in the spring before his fall student teaching, but there was no continuity of schools, students, or cooperating teachers between observation and student teaching.

Participants also reported different levels of interaction with parents during their student teaching. P4 reported that he attended the back to school and parent-teacher conference nights. He also learned that the other student teachers in his program did not have much interaction with parents if at all in student teaching, and that he thought it was just him. P7 reported that she listened to her cooperating teacher make phone calls to parents, but she did not make any parent phone calls herself. She also reported that other student teachers did not have opportunity to call parents either but would have liked to.

Participants discussed the TSR strategies they used in their student teaching, which are listed in Table F5 in Appendix F. Some of these strategies came from courses, from observing their cooperating teachers, from other student teachers, or from their own ideas.

Some participants also discussed what they learned about using TSRs during their student teaching, listed in Table F6 in Appendix F. P10 reported that he uses much of what he learned in student teaching in his current teaching: “I don't even know where I could begin to really separate what I did in student teaching from what I'm doing now, because everything I picked up there I've transferred over into my classroom.” P6 felt she

learned more about TSRs from her student teaching than from her courses: "It was real world and I was in there." Overall, participants reported learning about TSRs during their student teaching and using those techniques in their own teaching.

Several participants in nonurban teacher preparation programs also discussed not feeling prepared for their student teaching. P11 reported that his courses did not prepare him for developing TSRs during student teaching because "there's not a lot in a book that can prep you . . . like just being in it." He stated that the courses are supposed to prepare you, but you realize with a "shock" once you start student teaching that "[there] is no manual for this." When P6 discovered she would be student teaching in an urban school, she was scared at first, but she ended up loving it and getting a job in an urban school.

Participants also reported feeling that their student teaching did not fully prepare them to develop TSRs in their first year of teaching. P12 reported that student teaching for one semester in the spring left her feeling unprepared to start developing relationships at the beginning of the school year. She commented,

> And that was probably a downfall of my student teaching too is, I came in mid-year, so routines were already met, I hadn't really seen the beginning of the year. When I started teaching I was like, "Well, what am I supposed to do for the first months?

P9 reported a similar issue with a lack of time to work on developing relationships during his student teaching, for which he had three placements in one semester. He felt that if he had more time with one group of students he "would have been able to develop those [TSR] skills a little earlier on, instead of figuring it out [his] first year." Unlike P12, P9

student taught in the fall, but he felt that because the first few weeks were spent going over basic instructions and rules that he did not learn as much about developing TSRs as he did during the main part of the school year.

Cooperating Teachers

Some of the participants had one cooperating teacher; P9 had three cooperating teachers at different grade levels, and P2, P8, P10, and P12 had two cooperating teachers. P8 and P10 each had one cooperating teacher who was an English teacher, and one cooperating teacher who was a special education teacher, while P2 had two different cooperating teachers who were math teachers. P12 had two different elementary school placements which included one special education class. P9 had three different placements, two at high schools and one at an elementary school, because of gym being a K-12 certification.

Most of the participants reported that they had good relationships with their cooperating teachers, and that their cooperating teachers had good relationships with their students. P11 reported that his cooperating teacher was one of the highest rated teachers in that school district. P7 reported that her professor tried to match cooperating teachers to student teachers "based on how well they knew [the teacher candidates] and how well they knew that teacher," and that doing so was difficult "because not as many teachers are willing to take on a student teaching at the beginning of the year."

Actions and Words. P5, P7, P10, P11, and P12 specifically reported that they learned about using TSRs from watching their cooperating teachers, that their cooperating teachers were good models of TSRs, and that their student teaching was their

first experience seeing the use of TSRs in practice every day. P10 reported, “We didn't have another real model building using student teacher relationships until we were actually in the classroom with a cooperating teacher who's sort of walking us through it.” Both P5 and P12 reported that their cooperating teachers were experienced and that using TSRs, according to P5, “did come natural” to them, because, according to P12, they had “learned over time” how to do so. P7 reported that her cooperating teacher was amazing “to watch and be mentored by.” P11 also called his cooperating teacher “amazing” and that he learned a lot from her. He reported that his cooperating teacher “was very in tune with [the students’] needs” because she lived in the same neighborhood as her students.

In general, 10 participants reported that at least one of their cooperating teachers demonstrated good to excellent TSRs with their students through their actions and or words, and 11 participants gave examples of what TSR strategies they witnessed their cooperating teachers use, either through their words or actions. P9 did not report specific words or actions his cooperating teachers used, and as previously stated, P1 started teaching from Day 1 and did not observe his cooperating teacher teaching. Table F7 in Appendix F contains a list of the actions participants reported their cooperating teachers using that demonstrated TSRs, and Table F8 in Appendix F contains a list of the words participants reported their cooperating teachers using that demonstrated TSRs, or that provided advice about using TSRs.

Experiences. Several participants also reported how their experiences with their cooperating teachers influenced their ability to learn about and use TSRs during their student teaching. P1, P3, P4, P8, and P10 reported that they were able to take over their

cooperating teachers' classes from the first day of their student teaching. P2 reported that she only observed for about a week before she was able to being teaching. P11 commented on being able to take over a class at the beginning of one of his field experiences:

> I walked in the second period on my first day with my cooperating teacher. She sat back, she goes, "You take this one." . . . she knew, like, for me to fully get it, I had to do it. Watching her, you know, it'll help but, in to win it, you know.

P12 reported that she did not teach all of the classes right away, but that she did teach all day if her cooperating teacher was absent. P4 reported being left on his own to teach, as his cooperating teacher was often absent. P3 also reported being able to teach during her observation period when her cooperating teacher was absent. P8, conversely, reported not being able to teach during her observation period which affected her being prepared to student teach:

> Both of my cooperating teachers did not give me any kind of reins at all during the first half. And then January came and my [student teaching supervisor] was like, "You're not ready to teach and I don't understand why that is." And I was like, "Because they didn't give me anything to do."

P1 and P2 reported that although they were able to start teaching right away, some of the other student teachers in their programs were still observing after five to eight weeks into the semester. P1 reported that he knew what he was doing by then, and P2 reported that the other student teachers were upset about this.

P2 also reported that some of her fellow student teachers discussed how they were "upset" because their cooperating teachers had a negative effect on their ability to form TSRs. These cooperating teachers created a "power struggle" by "interjecting" and not letting their student teachers fully take over the classes. The student teachers felt that "the students weren't respecting them" and "didn't know who to pay attention to" as a result. P2 felt that "the cooperating teacher doesn't understand that the student teacher deserves an opportunity." P2 did not have this issue herself and was able to assume control of the classes in her student teaching after a week of observation.

Additionally, P2 reported learning multiple TSR strategies as a result of having two very different cooperating teachers. She reported that one of her two cooperating teachers was stricter and "had the 'we don't talk in her class' relationship with her students." P2 said this cooperating teacher did not get to know the students, even though she did demonstrate that she cared about the students: "She knows your name, she knows if you're sick, she does care, but it's really like you're there to learn." P2 reported changing TSR strategies depending on the students she was teaching. She used more of this stricter cooperating teacher's style in her first teaching position in an urban high school that did not have strong schoolwide discipline, but then she found that approach did not fit with the students she had in her second teaching position. "I needed to have another attitude, . . . a different approach because those are different students." In this second teaching position, she felt she was "coming off too strong" and found herself using more of the other cooperating teacher's style of getting to know students and allowing more conversation. She reported learning different strategies from each

cooperating teacher, and she reported using a combination of their styles in her own student teaching.

One participant reported having a negative experience with one of her cooperating teachers that impacting what she learned about TSRs. P8, who had two cooperating teachers, reported that one of her cooperating teachers demonstrated negative TSRs. P8 reported that this cooperating teacher's negative TSRs impacted her ability to practice using TSRs while student teaching. This experience was in a special education class. P8 reported that in general, the cooperating teacher criticized P8's way of relating to the students as being too casual. In one specific case, P8 reported developing a relationship with a student who had oppositional defiance disorder. She reported that the cooperating teacher did not develop a relationship with this student. She explained,

> She had had this student before, so they should have already had a rapport, but apparently they didn't, because anytime he would do anything, she would, she like, would pick a fight. And they would scream at each other and then he'd leave the room and she'd write him up and mark him cut. Like that was the goal.

P8 reported that she was able to get this student to complete work. When the cooperating teacher intervened with negative comments, the student walked out of the classroom. P8 suggested, "There were a lot of conversations I had with him and other students that I think she was, she was really threatened by because she didn't make those connections." P8 also reported having a negative relationship with this cooperating teacher herself and was eventually taken out of her classroom and placed full time with her other cooperating teacher. She reported having a positive relationship with her other cooperating teacher

and using the TSR techniques she learned from him in her student teaching and her own teaching her first year.

Cooperating Teacher as Model. Almost all of the participants reported learning about using TSRs from observing their cooperating teachers, and using those techniques in their own teaching. Participants discussed the lessons they learned about TSRs from their cooperating teachers. P4 saw the impact a teacher's relationship style could have on students. He reported that students were drawn to his cooperating teacher's energy, but he also saw how when she was absent often "that weighed on the kids" who were looking for her or "sometimes needing to see her," and "it was, it was a bit of a drop for them." As a result, he saw that being available for the students was an important part of that TSR.

Participants also discussed the impact their cooperating teachers had on them and their development of TSR skills. Both P3 and P5 reported going to their cooperating teachers for advice after they started teaching. P5 stated, "I actually contacted my cooperating teacher when I first started working" to ask her for advice on teaching in an urban school. P3 stated, "I still learn things from her." P3 reported that her cooperating teacher was someone whom she "leaned on heavily" and still calls. P3 stated of her cooperating teacher, "They are absolutely a model for you." Lastly, P2, P3, P4, P5, and P12 all specifically noted that the TSR strategies they use in their current teaching are those they learned from their cooperating teachers, while other participants mentioned using the same strategies they described their cooperating teachers using. These strategies are listed in Tables F7 and F8 in Appendix F.

Both P2 and P4 felt that they had to be themselves with the students. P2 reported, “I had to find a way to be myself with those students who were accustomed to being that way with their teacher.” P8 reported that she did not agree with her one cooperating teacher’s style: “The way he wanted things done was not the way I would have done things,” but that she did them his way while in his class. She did report, “I liked that his attitude was positive.” Because of his TSRs, he was able to get students to read aloud, while P8 felt that “maybe in a couple years, I’ll be able to demand like that. But I can’t right now.” One participant, P1, stated that his cooperating teacher let him take over the classes from the start, and he did not report learning any TSR strategies from this cooperating teacher.

Finally, P3 suggested that cooperating teachers model TSRs by forming positive relationships with their student teachers. She also felt that even having a negative experience could “still be a model either way of how to act or how not to act.” Conversely, P1 felt that a cooperating teacher could have too much influence on a student teacher’s style. He commented,

> And I feel like as a student teacher, you're so influenced by your cooperating teacher that you try to take everything they have, everything they do, and try to make it your own, instead of you making something for yourself, and finding what works for you.

He stated that as a result of being able to teach from day one he was able to be himself and not a “cheap imitation” of his cooperating teacher.

Student Teaching Seminar. All but two of the participants had a seminar in which they met with other student teachers in the program on a weekly basis while they were student teaching. P5 and P6, who attended the same program, reported that their program did not include a seminar with their student teaching. Both of these participants reported that they did have a debriefing session at the completion of their student teaching. P6 reported that she did not feel she learned anything new from the debriefing session, but she did report that of the other student teachers, "There were a decent amount that were placed into urban settings, and a lot of them had a similar experience." P5 kept in contact with the other students teachers in the program via text messages, but she reported, "Nothing that stands out" when asked if she remembers discussing TSRs with them.

Fellow Student Teachers. Some participants reported learning about TSRs from the suggestions and anecdotes told by the other student teachers in the seminar. Table F9 in Appendix F contains a list of these suggestions and anecdotes. P1, P4, P7, P8, P10, and P11 reported learning about TSRs from their fellow student teachers' stories and experiences that were discussed in the seminar. P10 reported that the seminar "was maybe where [he] learned the most about" TSRs. P1 and P4 reported that their fellow student teachers had bizarre problems with students. P4 also reported realizing from hearing these stories that the TSRs he had built helped his classroom management as opposed to student teachers who didn't have the opportunity to build those TSRs.

Some participants reported that these discussions with their fellow student teachers helped them learn about using TSRs. P7 reported that the high school student

teachers struggled with different issues that the middle school student teachers, but that she found the discussions “encouraging” because she saw “they're struggling with this” too. P7 also reported, “We would celebrate each other's victories;” for example, when someone was successful in connecting with a “difficult student.” P8 reported a similar experience in her seminar. She also reported that in her seminar there were other student teachers who were in different grade levels and different subjects, but P8 reported that they “got to see how in different subjects, really the same problems occur.” She reported that in her seminar they also discussed difficult situations they were having with students. She described a typical discussion by stating,

> Each of us [would] explain what our issue was, and explain how we’re trying to tackle the problem to create a positive solution. And then there was a talk back where we got to ask questions. Have you tried this, did you consider this . . . have you tried talking to them.

They would discuss their plan for dealing with those situations and report the results in the next meeting. P4 had a similar experience in his seminar and reported that he wasn’t afraid to discuss mistakes he made while teaching with the other student teachers, but that the others “wouldn’t always want to talk about their mistakes” during the discussions.

Other participants also reported that many of the seminar discussions involved TSRs. P10 reported that they would discuss “the relationships [they] were cultivating, and what sort of changes [they] were noticing in the classroom as a result, or changes in [their] students as a result.” He added that there was no discussion on “how to get to know your students.” P1 and P4 reported discussing classroom management issues

related to TSRs that other student teachers in their seminar struggled with. P1 reported discussing student misbehaviors and “how you manage that,” and P4 reported that while listening to the other student teachers, “I just remember realizing Oh, some of the things I’m able to build the connections on . . . that are helping me with classroom management that I’m not even thinking about.” P9 reported discussing strategies such as “making those relationships” and “building rapport with the students.” P11 reported that he found the discussions in his seminar to be more helpful than the classes or “getting things out of a textbook” because he “got a wider scope of what was going on from the discussions.” P2, however, reported that TSRs were not discussed in her seminar because her fellow student teachers spent most of the time discussing issues they had with their cooperating teachers. P3 specifically reported “using what [other student teachers] had said for [her] own teaching [her] first year” and learning from those discussions.

Some of the participants were in a seminar with student teachers who were placed in urban districts. P5 and P12, who did not student teach in urban districts, learned about teaching and using TSRs in urban schools from their fellow student teachers who were placed in urban districts. P5 reported that her friend told her that student teaching in an urban school was “rough,” that “it was hard to get into their mix or to become friendly with them, she said, but after you knock down their hard shell, it was just so great.” P12 reported her fellow student teachers saying “the hardest part in the beginning was gaining the trust from the kids…because they're used to people kind of leaving.” P6 reported that other urban student teachers had similar experiences to hers in learning that the students “have to be someone they can rely on, have fun with but still teach them – kind of friend

and teacher at same time." P3 reported that the other student teachers in urban schools shared some of their experiences:

> They would bring culture and race into their teaching like every single day. They wouldn't like shy away from like the race talk with genetics and skin color, so that's what I learned the most from that, and it made me feel less nervous to me in my own classroom my first year.

Conversely, P1 reported being a source of information and advice for his fellow student teachers: "They would come to me. They'd ask different questions, like 'How does this work in your [culture]?'" because "I grew up in an urban area" and had attended urban schools.

SQ3: Culturally Responsive Teaching

CRT Elements in Courses

Participants were asked about the elements of their courses that were related to or specifically taught as CRT that contained elements of TSR instruction. Participants reported learning about TSR instruction in the CRT elements of their courses, both in the aspects that were included in the curriculum, and from the professors who taught those courses. Any aspect of TSR that was not reported as coming from a professor has been included with the curriculum elements. Participants did not always specify TSRs when discussing the CRT aspects of their courses, but only the CRT aspects that are related to TSRs are included here.

Instruction in CRT was a main focus of the teacher preparation programs that focused on preparing candidates to teach in urban schools. P1, P3, and P4 reported that

teaching culturally relevant lessons was a main focus of instruction in their urban focused programs, and that a large part of that CRT instruction was related to TSRs. P1 reported that the program was focused on creating an awareness of the demographics of the area for those prospective teachers who might not be familiar with urban schools. He said, "They kind of try to show you the other side of the fence," which was not always a good thing because it "created that idea of, oh I need to go help these people over here." P3 agreed that her program was also focused on preparing teachers to teach in urban schools: "The actual teacher education program as a whole was very much invested in urban settings and making sure that . . . preteachers knew about urban settings . . . no matter where you were going to teach afterwards." P4 reported that TSRs were the starting place for CRT in his program: "That first step of making the connection with the individual was our kind of gateway to making the connection with the culture and the community." P1 also agreed that CRT instruction in this program focused on building TSRs: "So everything about culturally responsive teaching that will work . . . is that you have to understand the student, you have to make everything relatable to them."

P10 also emphasized his program's focus on CRT as it related to TSRs. He reported that "the biggest focus" of the program "really had to do with students' socioeconomic status and students' racial backgrounds." Of these elements in the program, P10 reported, "[The CRT elements were] geared toward getting us to understand . . . the kinds of challenges that students from these backgrounds or settings face, so that we are at least more sensitive to them when it comes to things like grading, or . . . assigning homework." P10 discussed these elements within the context of TSRs,

and reported that TSRs were included within the scope of CRT in the first two courses of the program on urban education (courses students had to take before they could apply to the program). He said the courses included not only incorporating "cultural competencies" into instruction, but also "how to be mindful of these things when [planning] instruction even without necessarily knowing [the] students yet." He also reported that TSRs within CRT was a focus of the program in general: "It was pretty built in, I would say, across many of the classes, but we also did have a few that focused on the specifics of it." P3 also reported, "Every single semester, or at least every single year we would have a class where the basis of the class was culturally responsive teaching." P8 indicated, "Before I was even accepted into their teacher [education] program," successful completion of the first two urban education classes was required. P8 reported that CRT was addressed in "multiple classes," but especially in a class on English language learners. Of that class she said, "I thought there should be more of that" because she found that content useful in her teaching.

Despite reporting not having a class that included CRT, P2 reported having a class on urban education at the beginning of her program, and P7 reported having a general education class that included restorative practices as her first class. P3, P8, and P10 also reported having urban education classes at the beginning of their programs, and that these classes included the socio-economic status differences in types of school districts. P2, P3, P7, P8, and P10 all reported that these early urban education classes included a field experience in an urban school. P8 reported that this field experience provided the opportunity to see how CRT methods were implemented: "How to make a lesson that . . .

covers a certain standard while still relating back to the students. . . . All of those are culturally responsive because you're trying to . . . connect with [the students]." P2 reported that the field experience allowed her to see the lack of resources in urban schools compared to the schools she attended: "They were also using still transparencies instead of smartboards." P2 also reported one professor discussing the lack of resources urban students may have, and "about having empathy for students." P4 reported the program's approach to CRT "was to look at it from those cultural perspectives that maybe we wouldn't have considered." This approach included learning about the perspectives of students from different races, students who lack resources, "and how we can adapt and leverage that into a way that helps us be better teachers and helps them be better students." P3 did not specifically mention the idea of resources or empathy in her remarks on TSRs and CRT.

P1 and P4 reported issues other students in the program faced concerning the instruction in TSRs related to CRT. P1 reported that some other students in the program "have never seen the other side of the fence," and had never been in an urban school. P4 said there were three types of students in the program: those who had never been to urban areas, those who had been, and those who were currently there, and that these three groups respond to culturally responsive instruction differently. P4 reported that some of the students were resistant to or skeptical of instruction in CRT: "It took a while where everyone got comfortable with it. There were still people complaining about it at the end of our program" P4 reported that the professors in his urban focused program tried to get the resistant students to "be open to understanding that culturally responsive means a lot

of different things." He also reported that the professors tended to treat all of the students in the program as if they were unfamiliar with urban schools and missed the experiences that those students could bring to the program: "They were trying to teach us all the same way while telling us not to teach the kids all the same way." There were some suggestions for teaching urban students the professors made that P1 and P4 did not agree with based on their experiences, but P4 also noted that "there was a lot of good stuff there, even in the stuff that the graduate students were a little bit resistant to or skeptical of." P4 pointed out that even though he did have experience in an urban setting, he acknowledged that the professors taught CRT strategies that he could use: "I recognize that as being a good way to strengthen that bond or to build that relationship or be responsive." P4 also acknowledged that he made mistakes that could be perceived as culturally insensitive, and that the program helped him learn how to fix and not repeat those mistakes as well: "That was the . . . biggest part of the culturally responsive instruction I felt like, talking about what we screwed up and what we could do better."

Another issue P1 reported was what he called a "sense of heroism" that some of the other teacher candidates had as a result of the program's emphasis on demographics. P1 felt that these teacher candidates thought they were "coming in to save the day . . . " because of the struggles the students faced, while P1 felt "it's just the lack of connection with a teacher" that was holding those students back. P1 reported that the instructors would try to stop this attitude if they saw it in the teacher candidates, but P1 felt that this attitude was difficult to spot. P1 stated that he would join the conversation and provide his perspective as someone who grew up in an urban area and attended urban schools,

such as pointing out that some of the things the program was emphasizing were not things that he would have paid attention to as a student:

> And it’s just like me growing up in that environment what I realize is you don't ever see it that way. No . . . kid ever stops and says, ‘Oh, look at my free or reduced lunch.’ So, I just, I believe developing the student teacher relationships are essential but at the same time it's how you approach that.

He felt that the program’s emphasis on TSRs “was being too forced” and that “the students will pick up on that’s not really you.” P1 reported that he felt the focus on TSRs and getting to know students, and “putting that into lessons and teaching to what they like” was more important than the focus on demographics, because “once you develop that relationship you begin to understand how the student prefers to be taught.” Both P1 and P4 felt the CRT portions of the program emphasized the struggles or issues urban students face.

Most of the participants in nonurban programs, when asked about the TSR instruction included in their CRT coursework, reported that their programs did not include specific instruction in or courses containing CRT. Complaining about this situation P2 stated, “But there’s not, there wasn't really a course provided that would, that would focus on, you know, culturally sensitive teaching, but there should be, there really should be. There should be.” P11 reported having a special education class that brought in information on the SES differences in types of schools districts. He also stated that CRT elements “could have been touched on more. It was really one of those things that came up in conversations in class as opposed to a textbook.” P7 reported that instead the

emphasis in her program was on restorative practices and mentioned that the element of getting to know students through their cultures was embedded within a few of the courses. P5, P6, P8, and P12 reported that their ELL courses brought in some elements of CRT, and P6 reported that her adolescent psychology class included how coming from different situations or backgrounds could affect students, and that teachers need to meet those needs. Those participants who did not specifically state that their programs did not contain CRT did not report any classes that did focus on CRT either. These participants reported the elements of TSRs related to CRT that they did encounter in their coursework or that were mentioned by professors. Table F10 in Appendix F contains a list of the elements of TSRs that participants reported as being included in the CRT elements of their courses or that were mentioned by professors.

CRT Elements in Student Teaching

Participants reported the various elements of TSR related to CRT that they used in their student teaching. Some of these elements came from coursework, some came from their cooperating teachers, and some came from their own experiences or ideas. P1 reported that doing so was easier for him: “I don’t necessarily have to try as hard to implement, for being more culturally responsive, because I’m pretty similar in culture with them.” P5, P7, and P12 reported not teaching any urban characteristic classes in their student teaching, so they did not have the same experience incorporating culturally responsive elements into their classes. P5 reported challenges in being culturally responsive because of having to teach a prescripted curriculum. In her suburban student teaching, she “did learn to ad lib a little, with names and stuff.” She brought in sports or

"world pictures . . . trying to get them to understand or connect with the material in a different way." P12 reported that the only culturally responsive elements she used in her rural student teaching included talking about "things that were going on around the world . . . like other holidays and stuff like that." Additionally, she reported, "I asked the kids what do you celebrate at home, how do you celebrate differently, what are your traditions?" P7 reported, "There wasn't that much diversity at the rural school I taught at" so "[I] tried to plug in little cultural lessons for the kids that have not maybe been exposed to that." Despite not having diverse classes, these participants brought in elements of diversity when possible.

Several participants reported using their cultural knowledge of students to improve their instruction and engage students. P11 reported learning the importance of bringing TSRs into CRT: "You have to know the students that you serve . . . where they come from, what they might be dealing with." P10 reported that before starting student teaching, he was required to observe and report on the demographics of the school and the cultures represented. He stated that doing so allowed him to be culturally responsive in planning for student needs and equity issues, especially "in terms of responding to students' physical needs, and sort of where socioeconomic status might pose a barrier to learning," and how that barrier could be removed. P4 reported that teaching a novel depended on the context of the students' cultures and was "different from one school to the next." To help her students understand a play, P8 reported telling students to put the characters' words into "layman's terms." She asked the students, "Now how would you say that if you were talking?" She said students asked if they could curse in their writing,

and she replied yes, “If that’s the way that you speak with your friends,” as long as they made the final draft school appropriate. She reported that doing so helped students relate to the play better.

Two participants reported improved TSRs when they used culturally responsive elements in their student teaching. P7 reported improving her TSR with one student through her knowledge of his cultural background. She would use this knowledge to “come to his defense” when other students would tease him for not looking Puerto Rican: “And that worked wonders with him, because then he was more willing to do work for me because I was coming to his defense about his, his race, or his ethnicity.” P11 reported using hand gestures to communicate with a student who did not speak English well. P11 also reported asking a student to translate for him when he was ordering lunch from a Spanish-speaking restaurant worker: “They got a kick out of that, you know? And you know that was me saying, ‘Hey look, I'm human, I'm vulnerable, I don't have all the answers.’” Showing this vulnerability helped P11 connect with students. He reported trying to make those connections with all students, because “you have to you have to try and reach everybody, can't leave anybody behind.” Table F11 in Appendix F contains a list of the elements of TSR that participants reported as being included in the CRT elements of their student teaching, either in what they learned or what they used.

SQ4: Relationship-Centered Teaching

RCT Elements in Courses

None of the participants had heard of the concept of RCT, nor was this concept mentioned in any of their courses or by any of their professors. After the concept was

briefly defined in terms of positive classroom management using TSRs, participants commented on what elements related to this concept they remembered from their courses.

Participants commented on what elements of TSRs were included in the information they learned about classroom management, and about what instruction they received in classroom management in general. P1 and P4 reported that their program had a course that focused on the idea of relationships in classroom management. P4 reported that this class included teacher candidates "discussing what things had worked" in their student teaching and what didn't. However, while P1 did report this course including some elements of RCT such as "you have to remember their home life and why they're going to act like that," P4 reported that this course contained "a lot of traditional stuff for what [he] felt otherwise was a very progressive program." P4 reported that the course instruction was more about traditional tools such as using "proximity" and having "a good lesson plan," and that the methods were more "corrective and restorative, not punishment." P4 did report that "the overall program was very much about building that connection, so that [teachers] can understand why [students are] doing something and where that behavior is coming from." P10 also reported having a classroom management class in which "the focus was on positive behavioral management." P3, however, reported that she did not have a course specifically about classroom management. Pointing out this drawback she stated,

> Specifically with relationships, that was our whole classroom management. That's what they taught us for classroom management and my seminars. It was like, once you build a relationship with your students, you will have a lot less management

> to go on. I don't think we even ever had a class about classroom management. It was just kind of interwoven in those [first two] classes.

P3 also reported that these courses did not have any information focused on "understand why they're doing this, and then act upon it." P1, P3, P4, P9, and P10 reported information on using relationships in teaching as being intertwined with classroom management strategies.

Three participants reported being given books related to RCT. P1 and P4 reported that of the many books they were given at the beginning of the program, one was Richard Milner's *Rac(e)ing to Class*. P3 also reported that of the books about teaching in urban schools she received in her program, one book she mentioned specifically as being related to TSRs in classroom management was Bettina Love's *We Want to Do More Than Survive*: *Abolitionist Teaching and the Pursuit of Educational Freedom,* which she reported included the idea of building relationships based on not just knowing your students but on loving them for who they are.

P2, P5, P6, P7, P9, P11, and P12, even after being given a definition of RCT, reported that there were no specific elements of TSRs related to RCT in their courses. P6 stated that there were just "bits and pieces" of using TSRs in the classroom mentioned in her special education and ELL classes. P9 reported in general learning "that if you had an issue with a kid, it would be easier to solve if you had a strong relationship or some kind of relationship with the student." Similarly, P7 reported that elements of RCT were not specifically taught, but that the idea "that those relationships affect your ability to manage your classroom . . . was touched on in a lot of classes." Both P5 and P8 reported that their

special education courses had some instruction related to relationships. P5 stated that her special education course contained included a "behavior management system where it was positive and not negative," but "there was never an emphasis on the relationship with the child." P12 reported that her program "always focus[ed] on Maslow, saying like if their basic needs at home aren't being met, they're not going to be able to achieve." Her professors made the connection between that theory and TSR – that without "at least forming a bond with them," the teacher might not know the reasons for their behavior. P2 reported that her classroom management classes "were more about being consistent. Those classes were more about teacher behavior, and that teacher behavior would lead to the student teacher relationship." She reported the class included the idea that if the teacher was consistent the "students would understand that [the teacher wouldn't] budge," but P2 felt "that's not necessarily true based on experience." P11 reported that any RCT elements were "lumped into this general get to know your student type thing, but specifically was not really discussed." He did report an incident from the field experience he had, in which a student was falling asleep in class. The teacher kept the student after and asked about it, and found out that the student had been kept up late the night before because his parents had been fighting. Table F12 in Appendix F contains a list of the elements of RCT related to TSRs that participants reported learning about in their courses.

RCT Elements in Student Teaching

Participants reported the various elements of TSR related to RCT that they used in their student teaching – some came from coursework, some came from their cooperating

teachers, and some came from their own experiences or their own ideas. P6 reported that the use of TSRs was a technique she used in her student teaching more than she used the strategies she learned in her courses:

> Of like the 75 to 80 strategies that they tell you in school, that all goes away, and building relationships is something that's so simple, but something that you kind of pass over a little bit, just because . . . you're ready to get out there, you want to try everything that you've learned. But really just building those relationships, and that will take care of a lot of your classroom management problems, because that's going to lead to your students giving you more respect, giving you more effort, and just kind of having a good time in the classroom.

Some participants reported using their relationships with students to prevent or positively address student behaviors. Other participants reported building TSRs that resulted in positive classroom environments. P7 reported having a small table at the back of the room she student taught in where she could work with students who were struggling with something. She would talk with them while helping them with their work. “And I think keeping them in that smaller setting and sitting with them and just listening to . . . what they were struggling with, helped me build relationships with them also.” P7 reported that students were more likely to open up to her in that smaller setting.

P8 reported using TSRs in “everything that [she] did. Every single thing.” She also reported finding that she had a different kind of relationship with her students than an older teacher, and using TSRs helped her get students to complete work. She reported that as a result of the connections she formed with students, the students wanted to teach

her their slang, and because they enjoyed that they wanted to do the work. They also were not afraid of her but did not want to disappoint her. “Like all sudden it was like, they weren't afraid because I was mad at them. They were upset because I was upset, and then they did their stuff. So it was just a different kind of command.” She found that what worked for another teacher would not work for her. “But it was really, the way that I . . . relate to them and the rapport that I develop has to be different than the rapport anybody else develops, because it's just the way that I have to do things.” She reported thinking that she would have been more successful in her student teaching if she could have used her own style of relating to students more often.

P5 reported helping a struggling student by using her relationship with that student, but other than that she “really never had issues” with student behavior in her suburban student teaching that required the use of TSRs. She found she did need to use those techniques in her first year of teaching in an urban school. She used techniques like “tell[ing] them a little bit about [herself], and just listening to them, learning how to just connect at some point with them,” which she reported learning from her cooperating teacher. Table F13 in Appendix F contains a list of the elements of RCT related to TSRs that participants reported learning about or using in their student teaching.

Participant Findings About the Use of TSRs

In the course of the interviews and focus group discussions, the participants reported their overall observations about what they had learned about TSRs during their coursework and student teaching. In addition to reporting their overall findings about TSRs, they also reported their observations about their preparation to use TSRs in urban

schools, personal life experiences they had that taught them about TSRs, the importance of experience in learning to use TSRs, and their suggestions for teacher preparation programs concerning instruction in the use of TSRs.

Observations

The participants shared their observations about TSRs that resulted from their student teaching and beginning year or years of practice. One theme that emerged in the focus group discussion was the students' need of a connection with a teacher. According to P5, "Half the time these kids, all they want is some kind of compassion from someone, and more than likely, it is us, and we're the only ones that give that to them." P12 responded, "I agree too [with P5], because in the classroom, once they realize and you gain the trust, and they have that faith in you like, you're their person." Other participants agreed with this observation.

P2 reported learning that in order to form TSRs she had to let students get to know her too: "A lot of times we, we like to get to know our students but they don't get to know us." She also reported learning that "it's very important to just have conversations with students because teenagers love to talk. They'll give up anything for like, just three minutes of talking about absolutely nothing." Table F14 in Appendix F contains a list of the observations participants made about their use of TSRs.

Personal Life Experiences

Nine participants also reported what they learned about using TSRs from their own personal life experiences. None of the participants mentioned their own elementary or high school experiences, or TSRs they had with their own teachers. Table F15 in

Appendix F contains a list of the personal life experiences that participants reported as contributing to their ability to use TSRs in their instruction.

Lack of Preparation to Teach in Urban Schools

Many of the participants who were not in urban focused teacher preparation programs agreed that they did not feel prepared to teach and use TSRs in urban schools. P7 and P12, who completed their student teaching in rural schools, said they felt unprepared by their teacher preparation programs for teaching in an urban school. P5 and P12 both reported learning about teaching in urban schools in their first teaching jobs. Similarly, P6 felt her teacher preparation program "didn't have any [classes] that addressed urban population" and did not prepare her for student teaching in an urban school.

Several participants reported that their student teaching in nonurban schools did not prepare them for the issues they encountered teaching in urban schools. P9 reported that he learned about issues in urban teaching, such as "fighting and drugs, and . . . skipping school" through experience rather than from his teacher preparation program. By comparison, he reported encountering only issues such as "kids talking when they're not supposed to" in his student teaching. P7 also reported that she was not prepared for "the disrespect and defiance issues" she faced in her urban classes because she did not have those issues in her rural student teaching. P7 reported that her co-teacher helped to prepare her for what to expect in her first urban teaching job, and that "nothing . . . I learned in any of my grad or undergrad courses could have prepared me for some of the behaviors I did encounter, especially in that first week." P7 acknowledged that the

instruction in restorative practices helped her, but she also reported that this instruction was not enough: “I kind of wish I had opportunities to learn about other methods that might be practiced, especially in urban education.”

P12 reported using “very well established” classroom management techniques in her urban classroom as opposed to not having “any formal behavior management system” in her rural student teaching. She also found that it took “about two months” for her students to trust her because “they are so used to teachers just walking out and giving up, and the turnover rate’s really high.” She found that she was not prepared for the issues and situations some of her students faced, like “do they have power at home, do they have food” because “I never got to go to an urban school for student teaching.”

Lastly, P5 reported that not student teaching in an urban district affected her perception of the TSR: “So it was a very different type of connection that I saw in the classroom.” She also stated thinking when she starting teaching in an urban school, “What just happened? Because that’s not what I saw last year.” She did, however, adapt to this teaching assignment: “I learned really quick when I first started working that I couldn’t just be a teacher, especially in the environment that I went into.” She said she thought teaching in an urban school would be difficult but she said, “I can't imagine going somewhere else” once she was there.

Learning Through Experience

Nine of the 12 participants reported that they needed to experience forming and using TSRs in order to learn about them. P2 reported that having a base knowledge about TSRs was important, but that she learned most of it over time, through experience. P9

also reported that he learned about using TSRs "on the fly . . . on the job." P11 also found this to be true: "A lot of that teacher student relationship just comes from getting down to it and doing it." P11 found the use of TSRs to be personal and not something there could be a curriculum for: "And like (P10) said there's, 'Oh this, this is a good practice,' and then there's like actually going and practicing it." P11 reported that even though he learned from his classes that he should get to know his students, once he was in the classroom he found that there was no "blueprint for how to deal with that other than just in the situation." Similarly, P10 reported, "I don't think any amount of theory could have prepared me fully for what true culturally responsive teaching looks like" without the "actual real world experience" of student teaching.

P3 reported that even the student teaching experience did not give her a complete understanding of using TSRs, and that she didn't even truly understand using TSRs until she had her own classes. She realized "I really had to work at those relationships," and that "they weren't just built automatically." P3 felt her courses gave her the "tools" to use CRT and build TSRs, but she found that instead of being able to use what she had learned, "it was much more of a relearning process," and she "had to remember everything, and then force [herself] to do it every day." P2 reported a similar finding about teaching in an urban school. She said you "have to find ways to connect with different kinds of people" because "school is not the first thing on their mind." P2 also reported finding that being herself helped her be successful in the urban school. Lastly, in her first urban teaching experience, P2 found that high expectations and TSRs are compatible:

> It is okay to care about students and their situations while holding them accountable and holding them to the same expectations as all your students or even higher if you really want to help guide them out of a rough situation.

Her experience was similar to P1's discovery that the emphasis on urban students' struggles can lead to "a sense of coddling" those students.

Participant Suggestions

During the interviews and discussions, participants reported what they would have liked to have been included in their teacher preparation programs, or what they felt was missing. Seven of the participants reported wanting more emphasis on TSRs or urban teaching in their courses. P1 felt there was too much emphasis in his urban program on students' struggles being the issue, "when in reality it's not that, it's just the lack of connection with a teacher." P5 felt that she could have been better prepared if she had observed an urban classroom before teaching in one: "I still truly believe that every preservice teacher should go and observe an urban setting." P6 wished her program had focused more on the "realistic side of kind of all aspects of teaching" rather than just on things like lesson plan formats. Table F16 in Appendix F contains a list of the suggestions participants made for the instruction in the use of TSRs based on their experiences in their teacher preparation programs.

Summary

This chapter presented the parameters of the study, including the setting, the demographics of the participants, the data collection procedures, the data analysis process used, the evidence of trustworthiness, and the results. Participants reported how they

learned about using TSRs in their teacher preparation courses and their student teaching, they reported what aspects of their TSR instruction were related to CRT and RCT, and they reported their overall findings about their instruction in TSRs that were not directly related to any of the previous categories. In Chapter 5, I present the interpretation of the findings, the limitations of the study, the recommendations for further research, and the implications for positive social change.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this basic qualitative study was to explore teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using TSRs in urban schools, both in their teacher education courses and in their student teaching. In this study, first-, second-, and third-year urban teachers shared their perceptions about how they learned about the use of TSRs in their teacher preparation programs and in their student teaching, and how that instruction was related to the theories of CRT and RCT.

There is a large body of research about the benefits of positive TSRs and their impact on student outcomes, but there are limited studies examining whether instruction in TSRs is lacking in or missing from teacher preparation programs. This study contributes to the body of knowledge about how the use of TSRs is taught in teacher preparation programs to improve student educational outcomes, especially for urban students.

A basic qualitative design was used to collect and analyze data from interviews and focus group discussions in response to my research questions. I used first and second cycle hand coding, a priori coding and pattern coding, to analyze my data. Key findings from this study include the following:

1. Instruction in using TSRs is not explicitly included in teacher preparation programs. It is implicitly included in most teacher preparation programs, but TSR instruction is not reported in the written curriculum.

2. Teacher preparations programs that included a focus on preparing teachers to work in urban schools included more instruction in using TSRs than did the programs without that focus. Teacher candidates in the urban focused programs felt more prepared to teach and use TSRs in urban settings, while teacher candidates who were not in urban focused teacher preparation programs felt unprepared to teach or use TSRs in urban settings.
3. Teacher candidates learned how to use TSRs from professors, most of whom had previously taught in urban schools.
4. Teacher candidates learn how to use TSRs from their cooperating teachers during student teaching.
5. Teacher candidates learned how to use TSRs from other teacher candidates in their student teaching seminars.
6. Instruction in using TSRs is mostly included in and interconnected with CRT instruction, but CRT instruction is only explicitly included in urban focused programs. Teacher candidates student teaching in urban schools had the opportunity to practice CRT related TSR strategies.
7. None of the teacher preparation programs contained specific instruction in relationship centered teaching, but most programs included some RCT strategies related to TSRs and classroom management. Teacher candidates had the opportunity to practice these strategies in their student teaching.

8. Teacher candidates felt that the only way to really learn how to use TSRs was through experience, and that not even student teaching could completely provide that authentic experience.

In this chapter, I present the interpretation of the findings, describe the limitations of the study, make recommendations for further research, and discuss implications for positive social change.

Interpretation of the Findings

In this chapter, I interpret the findings and how they confirm, disconfirm, or extend knowledge in the discipline as it relates to how teachers learn to use TSRs in urban schools by comparing them with the findings in the peer-reviewed literature discussed in Chapter 2. I also analyze and interpret my findings in the context of this study's conceptual framework, Gay's (2010b) theory of CRT and Milner's (2018) concept of RCT.

Teacher Education Courses

Findings 1, 2, and 3 are related to SQ1: What are teacher's viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools in their teacher education courses? For Finding 1, the data that emerged from the interviews indicated that neither the urban nor the nonurban programs included instruction in TSRs in the written curriculum or through direct instruction in the courses. Teacher candidates indicated the need for additional instruction in the use of TSRs. This finding aligns with research studies that indicated the need for TSR instruction to be included in teacher preparation programs (see Cahill et al., 2016; Nairz-Worth &

Feldman, 2017; Pennings, 2017; Rytivaara & Frelin, 2017; Theisen-Homer, 2021). Additionally, several participants indicated the need for additional instruction in the use of TSRs. This indicated lack of explicit TSR instruction is contrary to the large body of research that demonstrated the importance of TSRs in multiple areas, including social-emotional (Murray et al., 2016), behavioral (Cornelius-White, 2007; Quin, 2017), and academic (Cornelius-White, 2007; Roorda et al., 2017), as well as in preventing negative outcomes for students in urban schools (Gatti, 2016; Gay, 2010b; Milner et al., 2019; Reese et al., 2018; Roofe, 2015). This finding is also contrary to research studies that indicated teachers who form positive TSRs are more successful urban school teachers (Oplatka & Gamerman, 2021; Ransom, 2020; Wronowski, 2018). Participants also reported that, in general, their courses did not prepare them to use TSRs in their student teaching. However, the data did show that TSR instruction was included, albeit implicitly, in most teacher preparation programs, especially those that focus on preparing teachers to work in urban settings. This finding aligns with Theisen-Homer (2021), who found that TSR instruction is sometimes implicit within the pedagogy of some teacher preparation programs; however, this finding contradicts the implication in some studies that TSR instruction is missing from teacher preparation programs (Cahill et al., 2016; Hagenauer et al., 2015; Nairz-Worth & Feldman, 2017; Pennings, 2017; Rytivaara & Frelin, 2017). Some TSR instruction implicitly included in the teacher preparation programs was brought in by professors, as indicated in Finding 3, or implicitly included in CRT instruction, as indicated in Finding 6.

For Finding 2, the data that emerged from the interviews indicated that teacher preparations programs with a focus on preparing teachers to work in urban schools included more instruction in TSRs than did the other programs. As a result, the teacher candidates in the urban focused programs felt more prepared to student teach or teach and use TSRs in urban schools than did the teacher candidates in the nonurban focused programs. The first part of this finding does not specifically match current research and fills the gap addressed in this study. However, the second part of this finding aligns with the research on urban preparation programs, which showed that these programs successfully prepare teachers to teach in urban schools (Peters et al., 2018; Zygmunt et al., 2018). This finding also aligns with research that showed the use of TSR strategies and interventions improve student behavior (Weyns et al., 2017), student outcomes (Cornelius-White, 2007; Frelin, 2015; Glock, 2016; Kwok, 2017; Liu et al., 2018; Nairz-Wirth & Feldman, 2017; Quin, 2017; Rytivaara & Frelin, 2017), and discipline outcomes for urban students (Cook et al., 2018; Gregory et al., 2016a; Gregory et al., 2016b; Okonofua et al., 2016). This finding also aligns with research that showed teacher candidates felt unprepared to teach in urban schools, a finding supported by Miles and Knipe (2018), Roofe (2015), and Schauer (2018). Additionally, those teacher candidates who completed their student teaching in urban schools felt more prepared to work and use TSRs in urban schools as a result. This finding aligns with research that showed that teacher candidates who completed their student teaching in urban schools felt prepared to teach in urban schools (French, 2020; Gaikhorst et al., 2020; Williamson et al., 2016), had improved dispositions for teaching in urban schools (Truscott & Obiwo, 2020), were

more likely to remain in urban schools (Whipp & Geronime, 2015), and may have been better prepared to instruct and develop TSRs with urban students (Matsko & Hammerness, 2014; Whitaker, 2020). This finding also aligns with research that cited the importance of student teaching in urban schools (Cavendish, 2020; Jacobs, 2015; Kuriloff et al., 2019; Matsko et al., 2022), and having the experience of building TSRs in urban schools (Butler et al., 2017; Cross, 2016). Lastly, this finding supports Howard and Milner's (2014) conclusion that teacher preparation programs should prepare teachers to work in urban schools.

For Finding 3, the data that emerged from the interviews indicated that professors in the teacher preparation programs brought TSR instruction into their classes even though it was not explicitly indicated in the curriculum. Like Findings 1 and 2, this finding also contradicts the implication in some studies that TSR instruction is missing from teacher preparation programs (see Cahill et al., 2016; Nairz-Worth & Feldman, 2017; Pennings, 2017; Rytivaara & Frelin, 2017), although it does confirm that the instruction is not an explicit part of the curriculum or program in general. The data also indicated that most of these professors who brought TSR instruction into their classes, either through implicit inclusion in the courses or through modelling TSRs by using these techniques to build relationships with the teacher candidates, had previously taught in urban schools. For the programs that did not focus on preparing teachers to teach in urban settings, these professors were often the only source of TSR instruction. This finding represents an additional gap in the literature. There are some studies that examined professors who chose to experience urban teaching in order to better instruct (McDaniel

et al., 2008) or to share their learning (DiCamillo & Bailey, 2016) with their teacher candidates, and one study that featured as participants professors with previous urban teaching experience (Robinson & Lewis, 2017). One study also suggested that teacher candidates could benefit from teacher preparation program faculty who have knowledge of teaching in urban contexts (Matsko et al., 2022). There is even one study of how teacher educators modelled teaching practices, including the use of TSRs (Montenegro, 2020). However, there are no studies that have addressed how teacher candidates learn about using TSRs from their professors who use their previous urban teaching experience to provide TSR instruction in their courses.

Student Teaching

Findings 4 and 5 are related to SQ2: What are teacher's viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools in their student teaching? For Finding 4, the data that emerged from the interviews indicated that teacher candidates learn how to use TSRs from their cooperating teachers during student teaching, mainly through the cooperating teacher's words and actions. The data also showed that the amount of time spent student teaching, the time of year of the student teaching, the quality of the teacher candidate's relationship with the cooperating teacher, and the number of cooperating teachers all affected the teacher candidate's ability to learn about using TSRs during student teaching. While this finding is supported by research on the quality of the student teaching experience (Casale & Nduagbo, 2021; Torrez & Krebs, 2012), on the quality of the cooperating teacher and teacher candidate relationship (Bullock, 2017; Hart, 2020; La Paro et al., 2018; Shandomo & Zalewski,

2008), and on cooperating teacher quality (Berlin et al., 2021; Frantz-Fry & Polachek, 2016; Whipp, 2013) and effectiveness (Ronfeldt et al., 2018), there are no studies that have examined how teacher candidates learn about using TSRs from their cooperating teachers. Additionally, part of how teacher candidates learned to use TSRs from their cooperating teachers was outside of class time, either in the hallways or during their lunch or free periods. This part of the finding is supported by Claessens et al., (2017), who found that positive TSR interactions tended to occur outside of class time, and that teachers needed time and space to develop TSRs (Claessens et al., 2017; Frelin, 2015).

The data that emerged from the interviews in relation to Finding 5 indicated that teacher candidates learned how to use TSRs from other teacher candidates in their student teaching seminars. They learned from listening to the other teacher candidates' stories about their TSRs, from discussing their experiences, giving them advice, and hearing the results of the TSR strategies the other teacher candidates used. While there is literature on the importance of student teaching seminars for collaboration and support (Almazroa, 2020; Baumgartner & Councill, 2019; Bhukhanwala et al., 2017; Franzak, 2002; Jacobs, 2015; Jaffee et al., 2015; Meyer & Sawyer, 2006; Spangler & Fink, 2013), as well as on professional identity development (Gaudelli & Ousley, 2009; Stewart, 2018), I found no literature on the student teaching seminar as a space for learning about using TSRs from other teacher candidates' experiences. Even the participants whose program did not include a student teaching seminar communicated with each other to exchange stories and advice, which aligns with Lassila and Uitto (2016), who found that student teachers need a space to discuss their relationships with students.

TSR Elements of CRT

Finding 6 is related to SQ3: What are teacher's viewpoints about the instruction they received in the TSR elements of CRT? For Finding 6, the data that emerged from the interviews indicated that TSR instruction was implicitly included in CRT instruction, but CRT instruction was only explicitly found in the urban focused programs. Even then, TSR instruction was not explicitly included in the CRT curriculum of the urban focused programs. Several studies have supported the importance of including CRT instruction in teacher education programs (Cavendish, 2020; Olson & Rao, 2016; Truscott & Obiwo, 2021; Whipp, 2013) and across the entire program as opposed to limited to one or two classes (Milner, 2010; Saultz et al., 2021). However, several studies have noted the lack of the inclusion of TSR instruction as a part of the instruction in CRT (Gatti, 2016; Luet & Shealey, 2018; Reese et al., 2018; Truscott & Stenhouse, 2018).

The data also indicated that the use of CRT led to improved TSRs, a finding supported by several studies (Aronson & Laughter, 2016; Blazar, 2021; Yu, 2018). Conversely, positive TSRs allowed teacher candidates to connect to the students and their cultures, making them an integral part of using CRT in student teaching. This finding aligns with Gay (2010b), whose theory of CRT suggests that caring about and connecting with students could help teachers develop the understanding and cultural knowledge needed to successfully teach those students. Gay's theory is also consistent with this finding in that TSRs are an implicit part of CRT, but TSRs are not addressed by that name in either the theory or the curriculum. According to this finding, only teacher candidates student teaching in urban schools had the opportunity to practice CRT related

TSR strategies. This finding aligns with the research that indicated teacher candidates in urban focused teacher preparation programs were better prepared to teach in urban schools (Smith et al., 2017) and that CRT was an important part of preparing teacher candidates for urban schools (Cavendish, 2020; Olson & Rao, 2016; Truscott & Obiwo, 2021; Whipp, 2013).

Another finding showed a possible misconception about CRT. Some of the CRT elements participants discussed, particularly the nonurban participants, were elements that would be considered multicultural and not culturally responsive. This finding is supported by Sleeter (2012), who found that CRT was often misinterpreted as multiculturalism, and by Barrio (2021), who found a discrepancy between teacher candidates' perceived knowledge of culturally responsive practices and their practice of them.

Both Milner (2017) and Gay (2013) suggested that CRT could improve student outcomes not only for culturally diverse students, but for all students, and should be included all teacher preparation programs, which aligns with the findings in this study that the instruction in CRT included TSR elements and was found mainly in the urban focused teacher preparation programs, and not in all teacher preparation programs, as recommended by Gay (2013) and Milner (2017). This finding also aligns with studies that showed that instruction in CRT is needed for teachers to be successful in urban environments (Gay, 2006; Martin et al., 2016, Milner, 2008).

TSR Elements of RCT

Finding 7 is related to SQ4: What are teacher's viewpoints about the instruction they received in the TSR elements of RCT? For Finding 7, the data that emerged from the interviews indicated that while participants were not familiar with the concept of RCT, they discussed elements of RCT that were embedded within their courses and classroom management instruction. Many of the TSR strategies related to RCT were contained in special education classes, specifically how knowing students helps teachers to understand and improve their behavior. This finding aligns with Milner's (2018) concept of RCT in using TSRs to understand and improve student behavior, with research that showed the use of TSRs is effective in managing student misbehavior (Anyon et al., 2018; Egeberg et al., 2021; Tanase, 2021a), and with research that showed the use of TSRs as a classroom management strategy (Giang & Nga, 2019; Hepburn et al., 2020). Additionally, this finding aligns with research on the use of TSRs in culturally responsive classroom management (CRCM) (Kwok & Svajda-Hardy, 2021; Milner, 2019; Tanase, 2021b), a classroom management strategy that incorporates both culturally responsive pedagogy and TSRs (Caldera et al., 2018; Kwok & Svajda-Hardy, 2021). This finding also aligns with research that called for classroom management instruction to include more culturally responsive strategies (Kwok et al., 2021; Tanase, 2021b). Lastly, this finding aligns with Liu et al. (2018) who found that TSRs were often included in the classroom management components of teacher education rather than classroom instruction as a whole.

Learning From Experience

Finding 8 is an extension of the research questions. For Finding 8, the data that emerged from the interviews indicated that having classroom experience is an important factor in learning to use TSRs. The findings related to this question showed that learning about teaching and using TSRs in their courses did not fully prepare teacher candidates for the actual experience of using TSRs in their student teaching, nor did using TSRs in their student teaching fully prepare them for using TSRs in their own classrooms. This finding aligns with research that found teacher candidates wanted to be able to practice more in their teacher preparation programs (Jordan et al., 2018; Wilks et al., 2019), and with Kwok (2018), who found that teacher candidates benefitted from being able to learn from their own classroom management mistakes. Furthermore, teacher candidates in nonurban teacher preparation programs who did not student teach in urban districts did not have the necessary student teaching experiences with TSRs to prepare them for using TSRs in their teaching in urban schools. Completing student teaching in an urban school was important in giving teacher candidates experience using CRT elements related to TSRs. One teacher candidate found that the TSRs she formed while teaching in an urban school were different than those she formed during her student teaching in a suburban school, which aligns with Goldhaber's (2017) recommendation that teacher candidates be prepared to teach in schools similar to those in which they will work. However, this teacher candidate suggested all teachers should experience urban schools, which aligns with research that suggested preparing teachers for urban schools will provide successful outcomes for all students (Blazar, 2021; Butler et al., 2021; Scott et al., 2021).

The final finding is connected to other life experiences that contribute to teacher candidates' knowledge of using TSRs. Teacher candidates who attended urban schools or worked in urban settings had life experiences that helped prepare them to use TSRs in their own teaching. This finding is supported by Schauer (2018), who found that successful teachers in urban schools had previous experiences in urban areas, and is also supported by Miles and Knipe (2018), who found that novice teachers felt their relationship skills came from their personalities or their experiences. This finding is also supported by Oplatka and Gamerman (2021), who found that life experience and background were predictors of compassion in teachers, and by Whipp (2013), who found that prior experiences with diversity were a factor in successful urban teaching. Conversely, another finding was that teacher candidates who did not experience urban schools as children, even those who did not identify as White, did not feel prepared to teach in urban schools. This finding is supported by Brown and Rodriguez (2017) who found that students of color with suburban backgrounds had negative attitudes toward urban students.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of this study could be a discrepancy between what was taught in the teacher preparation programs and what the participants reported learning. Participants reported what they learned in their teacher preparation programs, but there could be elements of the curriculum that they did not report. This omission could be a result of memory, but it could also be a result of not retaining every part of the curriculum presented in their classes. For example, participants who did not have instruction in CRT

answered the interview questions about what was in their courses based on their understanding of what CRT is and not necessarily on the actual definition of it. This is reflected in their responses. Also, some of the participants' responses about CRT were not directly related to TSRs.

Difficulty in finding participants may have led to another limitation in the study. Due to a lack of first-year teaching participants, second- and third-year teachers were included in the study, which may have led to elements of their teacher preparation program being forgotten. However, even some of the first-year teachers said that they had difficulty remembering everything from their programs. Also, not all participants were included in the focus group discussions, due to scheduling issues.

The Covid-19 pandemic is another potential limitation of this study. Participants taught the first six months of the school year in person, but at the time of the interviews they were teaching remotely from home. The transition to online instruction could have impacted their experiences of using TSRs in their teaching, although most participants delineated between in-person instruction and online instruction in their interviews.

Other issues could include recent changes to the teacher preparation programs the participants attended. Their observations about these programs may not reflect their current offerings. Also, none of the participants discussed whether or not their cooperating teachers cultivated or modelled TSRs with them.

Recommendations

Recommendations for future research are based on the findings and limitations of this study, and the literature review from Chapter 2. One area of future research could

include a study of the structure and content of teacher preparation programs for the inclusion of TSR elements, both within the CRT curriculum and on its own. The current study examines only the participants' viewpoints about their teacher preparation programs and does not examine the programs themselves. Studying the teacher preparation programs could be beneficial in identifying how missing elements of TSRs and RCT could be included in teacher preparation programs, and how elements already included could be made a more explicit part of the curriculum, either within CRT instruction or on their own.

Further research of teacher preparation programs could also examine the impact of professors who previously taught in urban schools on TSR and CRT instruction. These professors served as sources of information about and models of using TSRs, and in some cases were the only source of information about TSRs in the teacher preparation program. Finally, urban focused teacher preparation programs could be studied for their impact on the use of TSR instruction to improve student outcomes and social justice outcomes for students in urban schools as well as for students of color in nonurban settings, for White students in urban settings, and for White students in nonurban settings. This research could examine whether the TSR elements of CRT do in fact benefit all students, as suggested by Gay (2013) and Milner (2017).

Another possible area of future research could address the student teaching experience. One area of study could be the structure of the experience and whether full year student teaching would benefit teacher candidates ability to observe and practice the use of TSRs. This research could also examine the TSR benefits of having a teacher

candidate spend more time with one group of students. Additionally, research could be conducted on the use of additional field experiences to expand teacher candidates' exposure to both suburban and urban schools, a recommendation also made by Cavendish (2020). P5 noted that TSRs were different in suburban versus urban settings, and that she felt she would have benefitted from seeing both. Finally, future research could examine the use of discussions in the student teaching seminar to build TSR knowledge through learning from other teacher candidates' experiences with building TSRs.

Another recommendation for studying student teaching that could be adopted is to conduct a study of the impact of the cooperating teacher's ability to use TSRs on the student teacher's ability to learn how to use TSRs. Cooperating teachers were models of and sources of information about TSRs for the participants in this study, so research could help determine the cooperating teacher's impact on the teacher candidate's proficiency with TSRs. This research could help inform the selection of cooperating teachers in the future.

Finally, CRCM is a concept related to both RCT and CRT, but this concept was not mentioned by any of the participants. An area of future research could include how TSR instruction could inform the instruction and use of CRCM.

Implications

The findings of this research study contribute to advancing knowledge in the instruction in teacher preparation programs of use of TSRs to improve student outcomes. This study may help teacher educators and program directors improve existing teacher

preparation programs to include explicit TSR instruction in innovative curriculum, and to inform decisions regarding student teaching placement.

Additionally, implications for positive social change include revising teacher preparation programs to include explicit instruction in the use of TSRs in the CRT portion of the teacher education curriculum, possibly through the inclusion of RCT. While Milner and Howard (2021) warn against a “one size fits all” approach to teacher education, the inclusion of instruction in the use of TSRs in the teacher education curriculum could be the key to ensuring that as a result all students receive quality instruction whether or not they attend urban schools (Whitaker, 2020). Goldhaber (2017) found that teacher candidates should be prepared to teach in schools similar to those in which they will work, but those schools could include diverse students whether they are urban schools or not (Welsh & Swain, 2020). Several studies suggest that preparing teacher candidates to teach in urban schools will also prepare them to meet the needs of all learners (Blazar, 2021; Butler et al., 2021; Scott et al., 2021). Gay (2013) and Milner (2017) suggested that CRT instruction helps all students, not just those in urban schools, and expanding the TSR instruction in that curriculum could insure positive social justice outcomes for all students in any type of school.

Conclusion

In this study, I examined the viewpoints of how teachers learn to use TSRs in urban settings. I interviewed first-, second-, and third-year teachers about their experiences in their teacher preparation programs. The findings show that TSR

instruction was implicitly included in some teacher preparation programs, but not explicitly contained in the curriculum.

There were two types of teacher preparation programs – those that focused on preparing teachers to work in urban settings, and those that did not. Teacher preparation programs that focused on preparing teacher candidates to teach in urban schools included more implicit instruction in TSRs, which was mostly embedded in the CRT instruction. Participants who did not attend these programs felt they were not prepared to use TSRs in urban settings, which means they would not be prepared to teach in urban characteristic settings either. Participants in both programs felt there could have been more instruction in the use of TSRs. Direct, explicit instruction of TSRs is not included in teacher preparation curriculum or coursework, but teacher candidates did learn about using TSRs from their professors who previously taught in urban districts, their cooperating teachers, their fellow student teachers, and from their own experiences with students.

TSR instruction should be expanded in all teacher preparation programs by including or expanding it in CRT curriculum. RCT instruction and CRCM could be the means by which TSR instruction could be included in teacher preparation curriculum. Teacher education programs should prepare all teachers to teach urban students. This understanding of diverse learners could prove a model for all student-teacher interactions. Teachers need to be prepared to teach urban students in any setting because students of any culture could be in any school district; therefore, teachers should be prepared to teach in urban schools whether or not they plan on teaching there. Instruction in TSRs is a key component of CRT and the key to providing social justice for all students in the

educational system. Adding TSR instruction to teacher preparation programs has the potential of promoting social justice in education - one teacher-student relationship at a time.

References

Aldrup, K., Klusmann, U., Lüdtke, O., Göllner, R., & Trautwein, U. (2018). Student misbehavior and teacher well-being: Testing the mediating role of the teacher-student relationship. *Learning and Instruction*, *58*, 126-136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2018.05.006

Almazroa, H. (2020). Insights from Saudi student teachers: Successes and challenges. *International Journal of Instruction*, *13*(3), 445-460. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13331a

Anney, V. N. (2014). Ensuring the quality of the findings of qualitative research: Looking at trustworthiness criteria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, *5*(2), 272–281.

Anyon, Y., Atteberry-Ash, B., Yang, J., Pauline, M., Wiley, K., Cash, D., Downing, B., Greer, E., & Pisciotta, L. (2018). "It's all about the relationships": Educators' rationales and strategies for building connections with students to prevent exclusionary school discipline outcomes. *Children & Schools*, *40*(4), 221-230. https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cdy017

Archambault, I., Vandenbossche-Makombo, J., & Fraser, S. L. (2017). Students' oppositional behaviors and engagement in school: The differential role of the student-teacher relationship. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *26*(6), 1702-1712. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0691-y

Aronson, B., & Laughter, J. (2016). The theory and practice of culturally relevant education: A synthesis of research across content areas. *Review of Educational*

Research, *86*(1), 163–206. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315582066

Balwant, P. T. (2017). The dark side of teaching: Destructive instructor leadership and its association with students' affect, behaviour, and cognition. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *20*(5), 577-604. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2015.1112432

Baroody, A. E., Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Larsen, R. A., & Curby, T. W. (2014). The link between responsive classroom training and student-teacher relationship quality in the fifth grade: A study of fidelity of implementation. *School Psychology Review*, *43*(1), 69-85. https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2014.12087455

Barrio, B. L. (2021). Understanding culturally responsive practices in teacher preparation: An avenue to address disproportionality in special education. *Teaching Education*, *32*(4), 437-456. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2020.1796956

Baumgartner, C. M., & Councill, K. H. (2019). Music student teachers' perceptions of their seminar experience: An exploratory study. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, *29*(1), 11–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083719867340

Behizadeh, N., Thomas, C., & Behm Cross, S. (2017). Reframing for social justice: The influence of critical friendship groups on preservice teachers' reflective practice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *70*(3), 280–296. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117737306

Berlin, R., Youngs, P., & Cohen, J. (2021). How elementary teaching candidates' learning opportunities are associated with their knowledge, self-efficacy, and

beliefs. *Teachers College Record*, *123*(7), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146812112300702

Bhukhanwala, F., Dean, K., & Troyer, M. (2017). Beyond the student teaching seminar: Examining transformative learning through arts-based approaches. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *23*(5), 611–630. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2016.1219712

Blazar, D. (2021). Teachers of color, culturally responsive teaching, and student outcomes: Experimental evidence from the random assignment of teachers to classes. EdWorkingPaper No. 21-501. *Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University*. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED616770

Bouchard, K. L., & Berg, D. H. (2017). Students' school belonging: Juxtaposing the perspectives of teachers and students in the late elementary school years (Grades 4-8). *School Community Journal*, *27*(1), 107-136. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1146469.pdf

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss.* Basic Books.

Boylan, R. L., & Renzulli, L. (2017). Routes and reasons out, paths back: The influence of push and pull reasons for leaving school on students' school reengagement. *Youth & Society*, *49*(1), 46-71. https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X14522078

Brown, T. M., & Rodriguez, L. F. (2017). Collaborating with urban youth to address gaps in teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *44*(3), 75-92. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1149098.pdf

Bullock, S. M. (2017). Understanding candidates' learning relationships with their cooperating teachers: A call to reframe my pedagogy. *Studying Teacher Education: Journal of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices*, *13*(2), 179–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2017.1342355

Butler, J. K., Kane, R. G., & Morshead, C. E. (2017). "It's my safe space": Student voice, teacher education, and the relational space of an urban high school. *Urban Education*, *52*(7), 889-916. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915574530

Butler, B. R., Coffey, H., & Young, J. L. (2021). Justice-oriented teaching dispositions in urban education: A critical interpretive case study. *Urban Education*, *56*(2), 193-227. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918801428

Caelli, K., Ray, L., & Mill, J. (2003). 'Clear as mud': Toward greater clarity in generic qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *2*(2), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690300200201

Cahill, H., Coffey, J., Davies, L. M., Kriewaldt, J., Freeman, E., Acquaro, D., Gowing, A., Duggan, S., & Archdall, V. (2016). Learning with and from: Positioning school students as advisors in pre-service teacher education. *Teacher Development, 20*(3), 295-312. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2016.1155478

Caldera, A., Whitaker, M. C., & Conrad Popova, D. A. (2020). Classroom management in urban schools: Proposing a course framework. *Teaching Education*, *31*(3), 343-361. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2018.1561663

Capern, T., & Hammond, L. (2014). Establishing positive relationships with secondary gifted students and students with emotional/behavioural disorders: Giving these

diverse learners what they need. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *39*(4), 46-67. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n4.5

Carey, M. A., & Asbury, J. E. (2016). *Focus group research*. Routledge.

Casale, C., & Nduagbo, K. (2021). Mentor partnerships. *Educational Research: Theory and Practice*, *32*(1), 13–17. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1288221.pdf

Cavendish, W., Perez, X., & Mahotiere, M. (2021). Pre-service teacher supports in urban schools. *Action in Teacher Education*, *43*(1), 54-66. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2020.1776175

Chang, M. L., & Davis, H. A. (2009). Understanding the role of teacher appraisals in shaping the dynamics of their relationships with students: Deconstructing teachers' judgments of disruptive behavior/students. In P. Schutz & M. Zembylas (Eds.), *Advances in teacher emotion research* (pp. 95-127). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0564-2_6

Charmaz, K. (2017). The power of constructivist grounded theory for critical inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *23*(1), 34-45. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800416657105

Chiu, M. M., Chow, B. W. Y., McBride, C., & Mol, S. T. (2016). Students' sense of belonging at school in 41 countries: Cross-cultural variability. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *47*(2), 175-196. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022115617031

Civitillo, S., Göbel, K., Preusche, Z., & Jugert, P. (2021). Disentangling the effects of perceived personal and group ethnic discrimination among secondary school students: The protective role of teacher–student relationship quality and school

climate. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *2021*(177), 77-99. https://doi.org/10.1002/cad.20415

Civitillo, S., Juang, L. P., & Schachner, M. K. (2018). Challenging beliefs about cultural diversity in education: A synthesis and critical review of trainings with pre-service teachers. *Educational Research Review*, *24,* 67-83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.01.003

Claessens, L. C. A., van Tartwijk, J., van der Want, A. C., Pennings, H. J. M., Verloop, N., den Brok, P. J., & Wubbels, T. (2017). Positive teacher–student relationships go beyond the classroom, problematic ones stay inside. *Journal of Educational Research*, *110*(5), 478-493. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2015.1129595

Collins, B. A., O'Connor, E. E., Supplee, L., & Shaw, D. S. (2017). Behavior problems in elementary school among low-income boys: The role of teacher–child relationships. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *110*(1), 72-84. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2015.1039113

Cook, C. R., Duong, M. T., McIntosh, K., Fiat, A. E., Larson, M., Pullmann, M. D., & McGinnis, J. (2018). Addressing discipline disparities for black male students: Linking malleable root causes to feasible and effective practices. *School Psychology Review*, *47*(2), 135-152. https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR-2017-0026.V47-2

Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 113-143. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298563

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among the five approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Cross, S. B. (2016). Reexamining pitfalls of experience in urban teacher preparation. *Journal of Urban Learning, Teaching, and Research*, *12*, 116-123. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1119135

Cross, S. B., Tosmur-Bayazit, N., & Dunn, A. H. (2018). Whiteness as a dissonant state: Exploring one White male student teacher's experiences in urban contexts. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118774038

Cuellar, A. E., & Markowitz, S. (2015). School suspension and the school-to-prison pipeline. *International Review of Law and Economics*, *43*, 98-106. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.irle.2015.06.001

Curry, M. W. (2016). Will you stand for me? Authentic cariño and transformative rites of passage in an urban high school. *American Educational Research Journal*, *53*(4), 883-918. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216660380

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, *26*(3/4), 325-346. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.1991.9653137

de Jong, E. M., Koomen, H. M., Jellesma, F. C., & Roorda, D. L. (2018). Teacher and child perceptions of relationship quality and ethnic minority children's behavioral adjustment in upper elementary school: A cross-lagged approach. *Journal of School Psychology*, *70*, 27-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2018.06.003

de Jong, R., van Tartwijk, J., Wubbels, T., Veldman, I., & Verloop, N. (2013). Beginning

and end of the internship: Student teachers' interpersonal profiles and the accuracy of their self-beliefs. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *36*(4), 393-412. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2013.835801

De Laet, S., Colpin, H., Van Leeuwen, K., Van den Noortgate, W., Claes, S., Janssens, A., Goossens, L., & Verschueren, K. (2016). Teacher–student relationships and adolescent behavioral engagement and rule-breaking behavior: The moderating role of dopaminergic genes. *Journal of School Psychology, 56*, 13-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2016.02.002

DiCamillo, L. & Bailey, N. M. (2016). Two teacher educators go to the source: Teaching an interdisciplinary class in an urban charter high school. *The Social Studies*, *107*(6), 218–226. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00377996.2016.1214904

Duong, M. T., Pullmann, M. D., Buntain-Ricklefs, J., Lee, K., Benjamin, K. S., Nguyen, L., & Cook, C. R. (2019). Brief teacher training improves student behavior and student–teacher relationships in middle school. *School Psychology Quarterly, 34*(2), 212-221. https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000296

Egeberg, H., McConney, A., & Price, A. (2021). Teachers' views on effective classroom management: A mixed-methods investigation in Western Australian high schools. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, *20*(2), 107-124. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-020-09270-w

Eisner, E. W. (1994). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs*. Macmillan College Publishing Company.

Emdin, C. (2016). *For White folks who teach in the hood... and the rest of y'all too:*

Reality pedagogy and urban education. Beacon Press.

Engels, M. C., Spilt, J., Denies, K., & Verschueren, K. (2021). The role of affective teacher-student relationships in adolescents' school engagement and achievement trajectories. *Learning and Instruction*, *75*, 101485. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2021.101485

Eteläpelto, A., Vähäsantanen, K., & Hökkä, P. (2015). How do novice teachers in Finland perceive their professional agency? *Teachers and Teaching*, *21*(6), 660-680. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2015.1044327

Ettekal, I., & Shi, Q. (2020). Developmental trajectories of teacher-student relationships and longitudinal associations with children's conduct problems from grades 1 to 12. *Journal of School Psychology*, *82*, 17-35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2020.07.004

Faber, A., & Mazlish, E. (2012). *How to talk so kids will listen & listen so kids will talk.* Simon and Schuster.

Fan, W., & Williams, C. (2018). The mediating role of student motivation in the linking of perceived school climate and academic achievement in reading and mathematics. In *Frontiers in Education, 3*, 50. Frontiers. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00050

Fitzpatrick, C., Côté-Lussier, C., Pagani, L. S., & Blair, C. (2015). I don't think you like me very much: Child minority status and disadvantage predict relationship quality with teachers. *Youth & Society*, *47*(5), 727-743. https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X13508962

Flynn, R., Albrecht, L., & Scott, S. D. (2018). Two approaches to focus group data collection for qualitative health research: Maximizing resources and data quality. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *17*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917750781

Frantz-Fry, K., & Polachek, D. (2016). Effective cooperating teacher qualities and practices for candidates preparing for a career in special education. *International Journal of Learner Diversity & Identities*, *23*(2), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-0128/CGP/v23i02/48528

Franzak, J. K. (2002). Developing a teacher identity: The impact of critical friends practice on the student teacher. *English Education*, *34*(4), 258-280. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ650243

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. 1968. Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. Herder.

Frelin, A. (2015). Relational underpinnings and professionality - a case study of a teacher's practices involving students with experiences of school failure. *School Psychology International*, *36*(6), 589-604. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034315607412

French, K. R. (2020). Student teaching and urban educator aptness: The significance of similar sociocultural scenarios. *Education and Urban Society*, *52*(4), 511-533. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124519877162

Gaikhorst, L., Post, J., März, V., & Soeterik, I. (2020). Teacher preparation for urban teaching: A multiple case study of three primary teacher education programmes.

European Journal of Teacher Education, *43*(3), 301–317. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2019.1695772

Gatti, L. (2016). Learning to teach in an urban teacher residency. *Urban Education*, 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916641171

Gaudelli, W., & Ousley, D. (2009). From clothing to skin: Identity work of student teachers in culminating field experiences. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, *25*(6), 931–939. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.02.017

Gay, G. (1993). Building cultural bridges: A bold proposal for teacher education. *Education and Urban Society*, *25*(3), 285-299. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124593025003006

Gay, G. (2006). Connections between classroom management and culturally responsive teaching. *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*, 343-370. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203874783

Gay, G. (2010a). Acting on beliefs in teacher education for cultural diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, (1-2), 143-152. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347320

Gay, G. (2010b). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Gay, G. (2013). Teaching to and through cultural diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *43*(1), 48-70. https://doi.org/10.1111/curi.12002

Gay, G., & Howard, T. C. (2000). Multicultural teacher education for the 21st century. *The Teacher Educator*, *36*(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730009555246

Gay, G., & Kirkland, K. (2003). Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-

reflection in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice*, *42*(3), 181-187. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4203_3

Gershenson, S., Holt, S. B., & Papageorge, N. W. (2016). Who believes in me? The effect of student–teacher demographic match on teacher expectations. *Economics of Education Review*, *52*, 209-224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.03.002

Giang, B. T. K., & Nga, T. T. T. (2019). Classroom management styles and teacher-student relationship congruency: Its influence on student learning outcomes. *TNU Journal of Science and Technology*, *199*(6), 11-16. https://doi.org/10.34238/tnu-jst.2019.06.333

Glock, S. (2016). Stop talking out of turn: The influence of students' gender and ethnicity on preservice teachers' intervention strategies for student misbehavior. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *56,* 106-114. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.02.012

Goldhaber, D., Krieg, J. M., & Theobald, R. (2017). Does the match matter? Exploring whether student teaching experiences affect teacher effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal*, *54*(2), 325-359. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831217690516

Goodboy, A. K., Bolkan, S., & Baker, J. P. (2018). Instructor misbehaviors impede students' cognitive learning: Testing the causal assumption. *Communication Education*, *67*(3), 308-329. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2018.1465192

Gorski, P. C. (2012). Instructional, institutional, and sociopolitical challenges of teaching multicultural teacher education courses. *The Teacher Educator*, *47*(3), 216-235.

https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2012.660246

Grant, C., & Osanloo, A. (2014). Understanding, selecting, and integrating a theoretical framework in dissertation research: Creating the blueprint for your "house." *Administrative Issues Journal: Education, Practice, and Research*, *4*(2), 12–26. https://doi.org/10.5929/2014.4.2.9

Gregory, A., Clawson, K., Davis, A., & Gerewitz, J. (2016a). The promise of restorative practices to transform teacher-student relationships and achieve equity in school discipline. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *26*(4), 325-353. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2014.929950

Gregory, A., Hafen, C. A., Ruzek, E., Mikami, A. Y., Allen, J. P., & Pianta, R. C. (2016b). Closing the racial discipline gap in classrooms by changing teacher practice. *School Psychology Review*, *45*(2), 171-191. https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR45-2.171-191

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, *18*(1), 59–82. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903

Guvenc, H. (2015). The relationship between teachers' motivational support and engagement versus disaffection. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 15*(3), 647-657. https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2015.3.2662

Haberman, M., Gillette, D., & Hill, A. (2018). *Star teachers of children in poverty* (2nd ed.). Routledge Press.

Hagenauer, G., Hascher, T., & Volet, S. E. (2015). Teacher emotions in the classroom:

Associations with students' engagement, classroom discipline and the interpersonal teacher-student relationship. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *30*(4), 385-403. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-015-0250-0

Hajovsky, D. B., Mason, B. A., & McCune, L. A. (2017). Teacher-student relationship quality and academic achievement in elementary school: A longitudinal examination of gender differences. *Journal of School Psychology*, *63,* 119-133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2017.04.001

Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early teacher–child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development*, *72*(2), 625-638. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00301

Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2005). Can instructional and emotional support in the first-grade classroom make a difference for children at risk of school failure? *Child Development*, *76*(5), 949-967. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00889.x

Hargreaves, A. (1998). The emotional practice of teaching. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, *14*(8), 835-854. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(98)00025-0

Hart, A. (2020). Interpersonal dynamics of the supervisory triad of pre-service teacher education: Lessons learned from 15 years of research. *Georgia Educational Researcher*, *17*(2), 3. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1262456

Hartas, D. (Ed.). (2015). *Educational research and inquiry: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Hattie, J. (2008). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to*

achievement. Routledge.

Heikonen, L., Pietarinen, J., Pyhältö, K., Toom, A., & Soini, T. (2017). Early career teachers' sense of professional agency in the classroom: Associations with turnover intentions and perceived inadequacy in teacher–student interaction. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *45*(3), 250-266. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2016.1169505

Hepburn, L., Beamish, W., & Alston-Knox, C. L. (2021). Classroom management practices commonly used by secondary school teachers: Results from a Queensland survey. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, *48*(3), 485-505. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-020-00402-y

Holen, S., Waaktaar, T., & Sagatun, Å. (2017). A chance lost in the prevention of school dropout? Teacher-student relationships mediate the effect of mental health problems on noncompletion of upper-secondary school. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2017.1306801

Holley, K., & Colyar, J. (2012). Under construction: How narrative elements shape qualitative research. *Theory Into Practice*, *51*(2), 114-121. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2012.662866

Howard, T. C., & Milner, H. R. (2014). Teacher preparation for urban schools. *Handbook of urban education* (pp. 199-216). Routledge.

Howard, T. C., & Milner, H. R. (2021). Teacher preparation for urban schools. In *Handbook of urban education* (2nd ed., pp. 195-211). Routledge.

Huang, F. L., Lewis, C., Cohen, D. R., Prewett, S., & Herman, K. (2018). Bullying

involvement, teacher–student relationships, and psychosocial outcomes. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *33*(2), 223-234. https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000249

Jacob, S. A., & Furgerson, S. P. (2012). Writing interview protocols and conducting interviews: Tips for students new to the field of qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 17*(42), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2012.1718

Jacobs, K. B. (2015). " I want to see real urban schools": Teacher learners' discourse and discussion of urban-based field experiences. *Perspectives on Urban Education*, *12*(1), 18-37. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1085187.pdf

Jaffee, A. T., Marri, A. R., Shuttleworth, J., & Hatch, T. (2015). "I did not think it was an effective use of questioning": Collective critical observation and reflection of social studies pedagogy. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, *39*(3), 135-149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2014.11.004

Jellesma, F. C., Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. (2015). Children's perceptions of the relationship with the teacher: Associations with appraisals and internalizing problems in middle childhood. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *36*, 30-38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2014.09.002

J-F., Swabey, K., Pullen, D., Getenet, S., & Dowden, T. (2018). Teenagers' perceptions of teachers: A developmental argument. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *43*(2), 26-38. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n2.2

Jonasson, C., Lauring, J., Selmer, J., & Trembath, J. L. (2017). Job resources and demands for expatriate academics: Linking teacher-student relations, intercultural adjustment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Global Mobility: The Home of*

Expatriate Management Research, *5*(1), 5-21. https://doi.org/10.1108/JGM-05-2016-0015

Jordan, W. J., Kurilof, P., Sutherland, D., Ponnock, A., & Hoffman, B. (2018). Preparing teachers for urban schools. https://williampennfoundation.org/sites/default/files/reports/Teacher%20Preparation%20and%20Quality%20Report.pdf

Klusmann, U., Richter, D., & Lüdtke, O. (2016). Teachers' emotional exhaustion is negatively related to students' achievement: Evidence from a large-scale assessment study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *108*(8), 1193-1203. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000125

Kurdi, V., Archambault, I., Brière, F. N., & Turgeon, L. (2018). Need-supportive teaching practices and student-perceived need fulfillment in low socioeconomic status elementary schools: The moderating effect of anxiety and academic achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *65,* 218-229. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2018.06.002

Kuriloff, P., Jordan, W., Sutherland, D., & Ponnock, A. (2019). Teacher preparation and performance in high-needs urban schools: What matters to teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *83*, 54-63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.04.001

Kwok, A. (2017). Relationships between instructional quality and classroom management for beginning urban teachers. *Educational Researcher*, *46*(7), 355-365. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X17726727

Kwok, A. (2018). Promoting" quality" feedback: First-year teachers' self-reports on their

development as classroom managers. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction*, *53*(1), 22–36. http://www.jstor.org/stable/45373100

Kwok, A., McIntush, K., & Svajda-Hardy, M. (2021). Equitable or equal classroom management? Teacher candidates' contrasting beliefs about the impact of student demographics. *Learning Environments Research*, *24*(3), 409-422. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-020-09334-x

Kwok, A., & Svajda-Hardy, M. (2021). Classroom management coaching for first-year urban teachers: Purpose, design, and implementation. *Urban Education, 0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/00420859211058418

La Paro, K. M., Van Schagen, A., King, E., & Lippard, C. (2018). A systems perspective on practicum experiences in early childhood teacher education: Focus on interprofessional relationships. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *46*(4), 365-375. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-017-0872-8

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *32*(3), 465-491. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1163320?origin=JSTOR-pdf

Lassila, E., & Uitto, M. (2016). The tensions between the ideal and experienced: Teacher–student relationships in stories told by beginning Japanese teachers. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, *24*(2), 205-219. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2016.1149505

Lavy, S., & Naama-Ghanayim, E. (2020). Why care about caring? Linking teachers' caring and sense of meaning at work with students' self-esteem, well-being, and

school engagement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *91*, 103046. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103046

Lee, P., & Bierman, K. L. (2018). Longitudinal trends and year-to-year fluctuations in student–teacher conflict and closeness: Associations with aggressive behavior problems. *Journal of School Psychology*, *70*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2018.06.002

Lei, H., Cui, Y., & Chiu, M. M. (2016). Affective teacher—student relationships and students' externalizing behavior problems: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*, 1311. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01311

Lietaert, S., Roorda, D., Laevers, F., Verschueren, K., & De Fraine, B. (2015). The gender gap in student engagement: The role of teachers' autonomy support, structure, and involvement. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *85*(4), 498-518. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12095

Liu, Y., Li, X., Chen, L., & Qu, Z. (2015). Perceived positive teacher-student relationship as a protective factor for Chinese left-behind children's emotional and behavioural adjustment. *International Journal of Psychology*, *50*(5), 354-362. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12112

Liu, P. P., Savitz-Romer, M., Perella, J., Hill, N. E., & Liang, B. (2018). Student representations of dyadic and global teacher-student relationships: Perceived caring, negativity, affinity, and differences across gender and race/ethnicity. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *54*, 281-296. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2018.07.005

Longobardi, C., Iotti, N. O., Jungert, T., & Settanni, M. (2018). Student-teacher relationships and bullying: The role of student social status. *Journal of Adolescence*, *63*, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.12.001

Longobardi, C., Prino, L. E., Marengo, D., & Settanni, M. (2016). Student-teacher relationships as a protective factor for school adjustment during the transition from middle to high school. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01988

Longobardi, C., Settanni, M., Lin, S., & Fabris, M. A. (2021). Student–teacher relationship quality and prosocial behaviour: The mediating role of academic achievement and a positive attitude towards school. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *91*(2), 547-562. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12378

Love, B. L. (2019). *We want to do more than survive: Abolitionist teaching and the pursuit of educational freedom*. Beacon Press.

Luet, K. M., & Shealey, M. W. (2018). A matter of perspectives: Studying the persistence of fourth-year urban teachers from two preparation programs. *Urban Education*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918802630

Makhwathana, R. M., Mudzielwana, N. P., & Mulovhedzi, S. A. (2017a). The role of emotional health in learning and teaching. *Journal of Psychology*, *8*(1), 21-27. https://doi.org/10.1080/09764224.2017.1305598

Makhwathana, R. M., Mudzielwana, N. P., Mulovhedzi, S. A., & Mudau, T. J. (2017b). Effects of teachers' emotions in teaching and learning in the foundation phase. *Journal of Psychology*, *8*(1), 28-35.

https://doi.org/10.1080/09764224.2017.1335677

Mallett, C. A. (2017). The school-to-prison pipeline: Disproportionate impact on vulnerable children and adolescents. *Education and Urban Society*, *49*(6), 563-592. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124516644053

Marchbanks III, M. P. T., Peguero, A. A., Varela, K. S., Blake, J. J., & Eason, J. M. (2018). School strictness and disproportionate minority contact: Investigating racial and ethnic disparities with the "school-to-prison pipeline." *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *16*(2), 241–259. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204016680403

Martin, A. J., & Collie, R. J. (2018). Teacher–student relationships and students' engagement in high school: Does the number of negative and positive relationships with teachers matter? *Journal of Educational Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000317

Martin, D. P., & Rimm-Kaufman, S. E. (2015). Do student self-efficacy and teacher-student interaction quality contribute to emotional and social engagement in fifth grade math? *Journal of School Psychology*, *53*(5), 359-373. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2015.07.001

Martin, J. L., Sharp-Grier, M., & Smith, J. B. (2016). Alternate realities: Racially disparate discipline in classrooms and schools and its effects on black and brown students. *Leadership and Research in Education*, *3*(1), 16-33. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1125113

Matsko, K. K., & Hammerness, K. (2014). Unpacking the "urban" in urban teacher education: Making a case for context-specific preparation. *Journal of Teacher*

Education, *65*(2), 128–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487113511645

Matsko, K. K., Hammerness, K., & Lee, R. E. (2022). Learning in context and practicing in place: Engaging preservice teachers in urban-focused context specific teacher education. *Urban Education*, *0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/004208592110651

McCormick, M. P., O'Connor, E. E., & Parham Horn, E. (2017). Can teacher-child relationships alter the effects of early socioeconomic status on achievement in middle childhood? *Journal of School Psychology*, *64,* 76-92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2017.05.001

McDaniel, G., Fayne, H., Constable, S., Knoblauch, D., Ryan, P., & Weiss, A. (2008). Do as I say and do as I do: Teacher educators' narratives about urban teaching. *Networks: An Online Journal for Teacher Research*, *10*(2), 170-170. https://doi.org/10.4148/2470-6353.1119

McGee, E. O., Alvarez, A., & Milner, H. R. (2016). Colorism as a salient space for understanding in teacher preparation. *Theory Into Practice*, *55*(1), 69-79. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1116882

McKinnon, R. D., & Blair, C. (2018). Bidirectional relations among executive function, teacher–child relationships, and early reading and math achievement: A cross-lagged panel analysis. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2018.03.011

Mejia, T. M., & Hoglund, W. L. (2016). Do children's adjustment problems contribute to teacher–child relationship quality? Support for a child-driven model. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *34*, 13-26.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2015.08.003

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (5th ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc..

Meyer, T., & Sawyer, M. (2006). Cultivating an inquiry stance in English education: Rethinking the student teaching seminar. *English Education*, *39*(1), 46-71. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40173236

Milatz, A., Lüftenegger, M., & Schober, B. (2015). Teachers' relationship closeness with students as a resource for teacher wellbeing: A response surface analytical approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *6*, 1949. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01949

Miles, R., & Knipe, S. (2018). "I sorta felt like I was out in the middle of the ocean": Novice teachers' transition to the classroom. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(6). http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n6.7

Milner, H. R. (2003). Reflection, racial competence, and critical pedagogy: How do we prepare pre-service teachers to pose tough questions? *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *6*(2), 193-208. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320308200

Milner, H. R. (2005). Stability and change in US prospective teachers' beliefs and decisions about diversity and learning to teach. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*(7), 767-786. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.05.010

Milner, H. R. (2006a). Preservice teachers' learning about cultural and racial diversity: Implications for urban education. *Urban Education*, *41*(4), 343-375. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085906289709

Milner IV, H. R. (2006b). The promise of black teachers' success with black students. *Educational Foundations*, *20*, 89-104. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ794734.pdf

Milner IV, H. R. (2008). Disrupting deficit notions of difference: Counter-narratives of teachers and community in urban education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24*(6), 1573-1598. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.02.011

Milner IV, H. R. (2010). What does teacher education have to do with teaching? Implications for diversity studies. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(1-2), 118-131. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347670

Milner, H. R. (2011). Culturally relevant pedagogy in a diverse urban classroom. *The Urban Review*, *43*(1), 66-89. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-009-0143-0

Milner, H. R. (2012). But what is urban education? *Urban Education*, *47*(3), 556–561. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085912447516

Milner IV, H. R. (2014). Culturally relevant, purpose-driven learning & teaching in a middle school social studies classroom. *Multicultural Education*, *21*(2), 9-17. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1045839.pdf

Milner, H. R. (2015). *Rac (e) ing to class: Confronting poverty and race in schools and classrooms*. Harvard Education Press.

Milner IV, H. R. (2017). Race, talk, opportunity gaps, and curriculum shifts in (teacher) education. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, *66*(1), 73-94. https://doi.org/10.1177/2381336917718804

Milner IV, H. R. (2018). Relationship-centered teaching: Addressing racial tensions in classrooms. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, *54*(2), 60-66. https://doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2018.1443646

Milner IV, H. R. (2019). Culturally responsive classroom management. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.782

Milner IV, H. R., Cunningham, H. B., Delale-O'Connor, L., & Kestenberg, E. G. (2019). *"These kids are out of control": Why we must reimagine" classroom management" for equity*. Corwin Press.

Milner, H. R., & Laughter, J. C. (2015). But good intentions are not enough: Preparing teachers to center race and poverty. *The Urban Review*, *47*(2), 341-363. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-014-0295-4

Milner IV, H. R., & Tenore, F. B. (2010). Classroom management in diverse classrooms. *Urban Education*, *45*(5), 560-603. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085910377290

Mizel, M. L., Miles, J. N., Pedersen, E. R., Tucker, J. S., Ewing, B. A., & D'Amico, E. J. (2016). To educate or to incarcerate: Factors in disproportionality in school discipline. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *70,* 102-111. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.09.009

Montenegro, H. (2020). Teacher educators’ conceptions of modeling: A phenomenographic study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *94*, 103097. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103097

Montuoro, P., & Lewis, R. (2017). Personal responsibility and behavioral disengagement

in innocent bystanders during classroom management events: The moderating effect of teacher aggressive tendencies. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2017.1291486

Morrison, J., Frost, J., Gotch, C., McDuffie, A. R., Austin, B., & French, B. (2021). Teachers' role in students' learning at a project-based STEM high school: Implications for teacher education. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, *19*(6), 1103-1123. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-020-10108-3

Morse, J. M. (2003). Theoretical saturation. In M. Lewis-Beck, A. E. Bryman, & T. F. Liao, *The Sage encyclopedia of social science research methods*. Sage Publications.

Moustakas, C. E. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Murray, C., Kosty, D., & Hauser-McLean, K. (2016). Social support and attachment to teachers: Relative importance and specificity among low-income children and youth of color. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, *34*(2), 119-135. https:doi.org/10.1177/0734282915592537

Nairz-Wirth, E., & Feldmann, K. (2017). Teachers' views on the impact of teacher–student relationships on school dropout: A Bourdieusian analysis of misrecognition. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, *25*(1), 121-136. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2016.1230881

Noltemeyer, A., & Mcloughlin, C. S. (2010). Patterns of exclusionary discipline by

school typology, ethnicity, and their interaction. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education*, *7*(1), 27-40. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ894465.pdf

Noltemeyer, A. L., Ward, R. M., & Mcloughlin, C. (2015). Relationship between school suspension and student outcomes: A meta-analysis. *School Psychology Review*, *44*(2), 224-240. https://doi.org/10.17105/spr-14-0008.1

Obsuth, I., Murray, A. L., Malti, T., Sulger, P., Ribeaud, D., & Eisner, M. (2017). A non-bipartite propensity score analysis of the effects of teacher–student relationships on adolescent problem and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *46*(8), 1661-1687. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016-0534-y

Okonofua, J. A., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2015). Two strikes: Race and the disciplining of young students. *Psychological Science*, *26*(5), 617-624. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615570365

Okonofua, J. A., Paunesku, D., & Walton, G. M. (2016). Brief intervention to encourage empathic discipline cuts suspension rates in half among adolescents. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *113*(19), 5221-5226. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1523698113

Olivier, E., & Archambault, I. (2017). Hyperactivity, inattention, and student engagement: The protective role of relationships with teachers and peers. *Learning & Individual Differences*, *59,* 86-95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2017.09.007

Olson, J. D., & Rao, A. B. (2016). Becoming a culturally responsive teacher: The impact of clinical experiences in urban schools. *Journal of Urban Learning, Teaching,*

and Research, *12*, 133-141. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1119144

Oostdam, R. J., Koerhuis, M. J. C., & Fukkink, R. G. (2019). Maladaptive behavior in relation to the basic psychological needs of students in secondary education. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *34*(3), 601-619. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-018-0397-6

Oplatka, I., & Gamerman, O. (2021). Compassion in urban teaching: Process, arenas, and factors. *Urban Education*, *56*(2), 318-343. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916685765

Ortlipp, M. (2008). Keeping and using reflective journals in the qualitative research process. *The Qualitative Report*, *13*(4), 695–705. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2008.1579

O' Toole, J. (2018). Institutional storytelling and personal narratives: Reflecting on the 'value' of narrative inquiry. *Irish Educational Studies*, *37*(2), 175-189. https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2018.1465839

Pakarinen, E., Silinskas, G., Hamre, B. K., Metsäpelto, R. L., Lerkkanen, M. K., Poikkeus, A. M., & Nurmi, J. E. (2018). Cross-lagged associations between problem behaviors and teacher-student relationships in early adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *38*(8), 1100-1141. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431617714328

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage.

Peguero, A. A., Varela, K. S., Marchbanks III, M. P. T., Blake, J., & Eason, J. M. (2021).

School punishment and education: Racial/ethnic disparities with grade retention and the role of urbanicity. *Urban Education*, *56*(2), 228-260. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918801433

Peña-Sandoval, C. (2019). Advancing culturally relevant pedagogy in teacher education from a Chilean perspective: A multi-case study of secondary preservice teachers. *Multicultural Education Review*, *11*(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2019.1567093

Pennings, H. J., Brekelmans, M., Sadler, P., Claessens, L. C., van der Want, A. C., & van Tartwijk, J. (2018). Interpersonal adaptation in teacher-student interaction. *Learning and Instruction, 55*, 41-57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.09.005

Pennings, H. J. M. (2017). Using a complexity approach to study the interpersonal dynamics in teacher-student interactions: A case study of two teachers. *Complicity: An International Journal of Complexity & Education*, *14*(2), 88-103. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1157228

Peters, J., McMullen, B., & Peters, P. D. (2018). Professional development school experiences and culturally sustaining teaching. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice, 18*(1), 32-48. https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v18i1.533

Pitzer, J., & Skinner, E. (2017). Predictors of changes in students' motivational resilience over the school year: The roles of teacher support, self-appraisals, and emotional reactivity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *41*(1), 15–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025416642051

Portnow, S., Downer, J. T., & Brown, J. (2018). Reductions in aggressive behavior within the context of a universal, social emotional learning program: Classroom- and student-level mechanisms. *Journal of School Psychology*, *68,* 38-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2017.12.004

Prewett, S. L., Bergin, D. A., & Huang, F. L. (2019). Student and teacher perceptions on student-teacher relationship quality: A middle school perspective. *School Psychology International*, *40*(1) 66–87. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034318807743

Quin, D. (2017). Longitudinal and contextual associations between teacher–student relationships and student engagement: A systematic review. *Review of Educational Research*, *87*(2), 345-387. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316669434

Ransom, J. C. (2020). Love, trust, and camaraderie: Teachers' perspectives of care in an urban high school. *Education and Urban Society*, *52*(6), 904-926. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124519894973

Raufelder, D., Nitsche, L., Breitmeyer, S., Keßler, S., Herrmann, E., & Regner, N. (2016). Students' perception of "good" and "bad" teachers—Results of a qualitative thematic analysis with German adolescents. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *75*, 31-44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2015.11.004

Ravitch, S. M., & Riggen, M. (2017). *Reason & rigor: How conceptual frameworks guide research*. Sage.

Reese, L., Richards-Tutor, C., Hansuvadha, N., Pavri, S., & Xu, S. (2018). Teachers for

inclusive, diverse urban settings. *Issues in Teacher Education*, *27*(1), 17-27. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1174905

Robinson, D., & Lewis, C. W. (2017). Typologies for effectiveness: Characteristics of effective teachers in urban learning environments. *Journal of Urban Learning, Teaching, and Research*, *13*, 124–134. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1150198

Rodríguez-Mantilla, J. M., & Fernández-Díaz, M. J. (2017). The effect of interpersonal relationships on burnout syndrome in secondary education teachers. *Psicothema*, *29*(3), 370-377. https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2016.309

Rogers, C. R. (1969). *Freedom to learn.* Charles E. Merrill.

Ronfeldt, M., Brockman, S. L., & Campbell, S. L. (2018). Does cooperating teachers' instructional effectiveness improve preservice teachers' future performance? *Educational Researcher, 47*, 405–418. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X18782906

Roofe, C. (2015). The urban teacher: Towards a context-responsive teacher preparation curriculum. *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM))*, *43*(1), 3-16. https://researchers.cdu.edu.au/en/publications/the-urban-teacher-towards-a-context-responsive-teacher-preparatio

Roorda, D. L., Jak, S., Zee, M., Oort, F. J., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2017). Affective teacher-student relationships and students' engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic update and test of the mediating role of engagement. *School Psychology Review*, *46*(3), 239-261. https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR-2017-0035.V46-3

Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2014a). The influence of affective teacher-student relationships on students' learning behaviors: Differences between primary and secondary schools. *Pedagogische Studien*, *91*(2), 97-112. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287292461_The_influence_of_affective_teacher-student_relationships_on_students%27_learning_behaviors_Differences_between_primary_and_secondary_schools

Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. Y., Oort, F. J., & Spilt, J. L. (2011). The influence of affective teacher-student relationships on students' school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach. *Review of Educational Research*, *81*(4), 493-529. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311421793

Roorda, D. L., Verschueren, K., Vancraeyveldt, C., Van Craeyevelt, S., & Colpin, H. (2014b). Teacher–child relationships and behavioral adjustment: Transactional links for preschool boys at risk. *Journal of School Psychology*, *52*(5), 495-510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2014.06.004

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Rytivaara, A., & Frelin, A. (2017). Committed to trouble. Learning from teachers' stories of challenging yet rewarding teacher-student relationships. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, *68,* 12-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.08.004

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Santiago-Rosario, M. R., Whitcomb, S. A., Pearlman, J., & McIntosh, K. (2021). Associations between teacher expectations and racial disproportionality in discipline referrals. *Journal of School Psychology*, *85*, 80-93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2021.02.004

Saultz, A., Lyons, A. I., Aronson, B., Sander, S. A., & Malin, J. R. (2021). Understanding preservice teacher dispositions: Implications for social justice and educational policy. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *48*(1), 7-32. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1285082

Saunders, B., Sim, J., Kingstone, T., Baker, S., Waterfield, J., Bartlam, B., Burroughs, H., & Jinks, C. (2018). Saturation in qualitative research: Exploring its conceptualization and operationalization. *Quality & Quantity*, *52*(4), 1893-1907. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-017-0574-8

Schauer, M. M. (2018). “Vygotsky for the Hood”: Connecting teacher prior life experiences and university teacher preparation curriculums for service in urban schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *74*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.04.009

Schwartz, T., Dinnen, H., Smith-Millman, M. K., Dixon, M., & Flaspohler, P. D. (2016). The Urban Teaching Cohort: Pre-service training to support mental health in urban schools. *Advances in School Mental Health Promotion*, *10*(1), 26-48. https://doi.org/10.1080/1754730X.2016.1246195

Scott, L. A., Evans, I., & Berry, R. (2021). Recommendations for teacher education programs to prepare practitioners for diverse urban schools. *Intervention in*

School and Clinic, *58*(2), 76-83. https://doi.org/10.1177/10534512211051065

Shandomo, H., & Zalewski, M. (2008). The effects of mismatching teacher candidates with mentoring teachers. *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education*, *1*(2), 1-18. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1134691

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, *22*(2), 63–75. https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-2004-22201

Skalická, V., Stenseng, F., & Wichstrøm, L. (2015). Reciprocal relations between student-teacher conflict, children's social skills and externalizing behavior: A three-wave longitudinal study from preschool to third grade. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *39*(5), 413-425. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025415584187

Skiba, R. J., Horner, R. H., Chung, C. G., Karega Rausch, M., May, S. L., & Tobin, T. (2011). Race is not neutral: A national investigation of African American and Latino disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Review*, *40*(1), 85-107. https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2011.12087730

Slaten, C. D., Zalzala, A., Elison, Z. M., Tate, K. A., & Wachter Morris, C. A. (2016). Person-centered educational practices in an urban alternative high school: The Black male perspective. *Person-Centered & Experiential Psychotherapies*, *15*(1), 19-36. https://doi.org/10.1080/14779757.2016.1139501

Sleeter, C. (2018). Learning to teach through controversy. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, *54*(1), 18-22. https://doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2018.1407171

Sleeter, C. E. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. *Urban Education*, *47*(3), 562-584. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085911431472

Sleeter, C. E. (2016). Critical race theory and the Whiteness of teacher education. *Urban Education*, *52*(2), 155-169. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916668957

Smart, J. B. (2014). A mixed methods study of the relationship between student perceptions of teacher-student interactions and motivation in middle level science. *RMLE Online: Research in Middle Level Education*, *38*(4), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/19404476.2014.11462117

Smith, L. G., Farnan, S., Seeger, V., Wall, T. J., & Kiene, D. (2017). Teacher candidate perceptions of urban field experiences. *Educational Renaissance*, *6*(1). https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1218627

Smolkowski, K., Girvan, E. J., McIntosh, K., Nese, R. T., & Horner, R. H. (2016). Vulnerable decision points for disproportionate office discipline referrals: Comparisons of discipline for African American and White elementary school students. *Behavioral Disorders*, *41*(4), 178-195. http://dx.doi.org/10.17988/bedi-41-04-178-195.1

Sointu, E. T., Savolainen, H., Lappalainen, K., & Lambert, M. C. (2017). Longitudinal associations of student–teacher relationships and behavioural and emotional strengths on academic achievement. *Educational Psychology*, *37*(4), 457-467. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2016.1165796

Spangler, S., & Fink, L. S., R.W.T. (2013). With a little help from their friends: Making the transition from student to teacher. *English Journal, 102*(3), 87-92.

https://www.jstor.org/stable/23365379

Spilt, J. L., & Hughes, J. N. (2015). African American children at risk of increasingly conflicted teacher-student relationships in elementary school. *School Psychology Review*, *44*(3), 306-314. http://dx.doi.org/10.17105/spr-14-0033.1

Spilt, J. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., & Thijs, J. T. (2011). Teacher wellbeing: The importance of teacher–student relationships. *Educational Psychology Review*, *23*(4), 457-477. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-011-9170-y

Spilt, J. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., Thijs, J. T., & van der Leij, A. (2012). Supporting teachers' relationships with disruptive children: The potential of relationship-focused reflection. *Attachment & Human Development*, *14*(3), 305-318. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616734.2012.672286

Spilt, J. L., Leflot, G., & Colpin, H. (2018). Teacher involvement prevents increases in children's depressive symptoms: Bidirectional associations in elementary school. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-018-0441-7

Stewart, D. W., & Shamdasani, P. (2017). Online focus groups. *Journal of Advertising*, *46*(1), 48-60. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2016.1252288

Stewart, T. T. (2018). Dialogue, inquiry, changing roles, and the dialogical self. In F. Meijers & H. Hermans (Eds.), *The dialogical self theory in education* (Vol. 5, pp. 35-47). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62861-5_3

Tanase, M. (2021a). Addressing challenging behaviours in urban high school classrooms through building relationships with students. *Educational Studies*, *47*(3), 312-327.

https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2019.1701992

Tanase, M. F. (2021b). Are urban teachers culturally responsive? *SN Social Sciences*, *1*(1), 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-020-00007-3

Taxer, J. L., Becker-Kurz, B., & Frenzel, A. C. (2018). Do quality teacher–student relationships protect teachers from emotional exhaustion? The mediating role of enjoyment and anger. *Social Psychology of Education*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-018-9468-4

Theisen-Homer, V. (2021). Preparing teachers for relationships with students: Two visions, two approaches. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *72*(3), 271-283. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487120922223

Toma, J. D. (2011). Approaching rigor in applied qualitative research. In C. F. Conrad & R. C. Serlin (Eds.), *The Sage handbook for research in education: Pursuing ideas as the keystone of exemplary inquiry* (2nd ed., pp. 405–423). Sage.

Torrez, C. A. F., & Krebs, M. M. (2012). Expert voices: What cooperating teachers and teacher candidates say about quality student teaching placements and experiences. *Action in Teacher Education*, *34*(5–6), 485–499. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2012.729477

Truscott, D., & Obiwo, S. M. (2020). Context matters: Cultivating dispositions of responsive and equitable teachers for urban schools. *School-University Partnerships*, *13*(3), 22-38. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sarah-Obiwo/publication/349179172_Context_Matters_Cultivating_Dispositions_of_Responsive_and_Equitable_Teachers_for_Urban_Schools/links/602d4b3945851589

39b055e9/Context-Matters-Cultivating-Dispositions-of-Responsive-an

Truscott, D. M., & Obiwo, S. M. (2021). School-based practices and preservice teacher beliefs about urban teaching and learning. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *96*(1), 54-64. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2020.1864246

Truscott, D., & Stenhouse, V. L. (2018). A mixed-methods study of teacher dispositions and culturally relevant teaching. *Urban Education*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918801438

Turner, D. W. (2010). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators. *The Qualitative Report, 15*(3), 754–760. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2010.1178

Tuttas, C. A. (2015). Lessons learned using web conference technology for online focus group interviews. *Qualitative Health Research*, *25*(1), 122-133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732314549602

Uitto, M., Lutovac, S., Jokikokko, K., & Kaasila, R. (2018). Recalling life-changing teachers: Positive memories of teacher-student relationships and the emotions involved. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *87*, 47-56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.11.004

Vandenbroucke, L., Spilt, J., Verschueren, K., & Baeyens, D. (2017). Keeping the spirits up: The effect of teachers' and parents' emotional support on children's working memory performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 512. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00512

Vandenbroucke, L., Spilt, J. L., Verschueren, K., & Baeyens, D. (2018a). The effects of

peer rejection, parent and teacher support on working memory performance: An experimental approach in middle childhood. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *67*, 12-21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2018.06.007

Vandenbroucke, L., Spilt, J., Verschueren, K., Piccinin, C., & Baeyens, D. (2018b). The classroom as a developmental context for cognitive development: A meta-analysis on the importance of teacher-student interactions for children's executive functions. *Review of Educational Research*, *88*(1), 125-164. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654317743200

Van Droogenbroeck, F., Spruyt, B., & Vanroelen, C. (2014). Burnout among senior teachers: Investigating the role of workload and interpersonal relationships at work. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *43*, 99-109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.07.005

Veldman, I., Admiraal, W., van Tartwijk, J., Mainhard, T., & Wubbels, T. (2016). Veteran teachers’ job satisfaction as a function of personal demands and resources in the relationships with their students. *Teachers and Teaching*, *22*(8), 913-926. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2016.1200546

Veldman, I., van Tartwijk, J., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2013). Job satisfaction and teacher–student relationships across the teaching career: Four case studies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *32*, 55-65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.01.005

Wang, L. (2018). On the content of the pre-service teachers’ teaching reflection in the practicum. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, *8*(9), 1195–1199.

http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0809.13

Weinstein, C. S., Tomlinson-Clarke, S., & Curran, M. (2004). Toward a conception of culturally responsive classroom management. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *55*(1), 25-38. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487103259812

Welsh, R. O., & Swain, W. A. (2020). (Re) defining urban education: A conceptual review and empirical exploration of the definition of urban education. *Educational Researcher*, *49*(2), 90-100. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20902822

Wentzel, K. R. (2002). Are effective teachers like good parents? Teaching styles and student adjustment in early adolescence. *Child Development*, *73*(1), 287-301. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00406

Weyns, T., Verschueren, K., Wouters, S., Colpin, H., Leflot, G., & Onghena, P. (2017). The role of teacher behavior in children's relational aggression development: A five-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of School Psychology*, *64,* 17-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2017.04.008

Whipp, J. L. (2013). Developing socially just teachers: The interaction of experiences before, during, and after teacher preparation in beginning urban teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *64*(5), 454-467. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487113494845

Whipp, J. L., & Geronime, L. (2017). Experiences that predict early career teacher commitment to and retention in high-poverty urban schools. *Urban Education*, *52*(7), 799-828. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915574531

Whitaker, M. C. (2020). Us and them: Using social identity theory to explain and re-envision teacher–student relationships in urban schools. *The Urban Review*, *52*(4), 691-707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-019-00539-w

Wilks, J. L., Snow, M., Lasczik, L., & Bowling, A. (2019). Working towards 'doing it better': Seeking the student voice in teacher education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *44*(1), 76-92. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v44n1.5

Williamson, P., Apedoe, X., & Thomas, C. (2016). Context as content in urban teacher education: Learning to teach in and for San Francisco. *Urban Education*, *51*(10), 1170–1197. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1117912

Woodward, B. (2018). Centering the voice of black male urban high school students on effective student-teacher classroom relationships. *Journal of Urban Learning, Teaching, and Research*, *14*, 63-72. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1195958

Wronowski, M. L. (2018). Filling the void: A grounded theory approach to addressing teacher recruitment and retention in urban schools. *Education and Urban Society*, *50*(6), 548-574. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12974-017-0920-8

Yu, E. (2018). The impact of culturally inclusive pedagogy on student achievement in a multicultural urban school setting. *Urban Education*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918804013

Yuan, H. (2018). Educating culturally responsive Han teachers: Case study of a teacher education program in China. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, *20*(2), 42-57. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1184981

Zee, M., de Jong, P. F., & Koomen, H. M. (2017). From externalizing student behavior to

student-specific teacher self-efficacy: The role of teacher-perceived conflict and closeness in the student–teacher relationship. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *51*, 37-50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2017.06.009

Zee, M., & Roorda, D. L. (2018). Student–teacher relationships in elementary school: The unique role of shyness, anxiety, and emotional problems. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *67*, 156-166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2018.08.006

Zendarski, N., Haebich, K., Bhide, S., Quek, J., Nicholson, J. M., Jacobs, K. E., ... & Sciberras, E. (2020). Student–teacher relationship quality in children with and without ADHD: A cross-sectional community based study. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *51*, 275-284. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2019.12.006

Zheng, Y., Yu, S., & Liu, Z. (2020). Understanding individual differences in lower-proficiency students' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1806225

Zygmunt, E., Cipollone, K., Tancock, S., Clausen, J., Clark, P., & Mucherah, W. (2018). Loving out loud: Community mentors, teacher candidates, and transformational learning through a pedagogy of care and connection. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *69*(2), 127-139. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117751640

Appendix A: Conceptual Framework Alignment

Conceptual framework	Research questions	Data needs	Data sources	Data analysis
Culturally responsive teaching	What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in the TSR elements of culturally responsive teaching?	Teachers' viewpoints	Interviews of 12 first-, second-, and third-year teachers in urban districts. Two focus group discussions with original 12 participants	First Cycle: precoding, structural coding, subcoding. Second cycle: pattern coding
Relationship-centered teaching	What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools in their teacher education courses?	Teachers' viewpoints	Interviews of 12 first-, second-, and third-year teachers in urban districts. Two focus group discussions with original 12 participants.	First Cycle: precoding, structural coding, subcoding. Second cycle: pattern coding.
	What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools in their student teaching?	Teachers' viewpoints		
	What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in the TSR elements of relationship-centered teaching?	Teachers' viewpoints		

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship

Appendix B: Social Media Invitation

Request for First, Second, and Third Year Urban School Teachers to be Interviewed for a Research Study

My name is Cheryl Krapohl, and I have been an urban high school English teacher for 29 years. I am a doctoral candidate at Walden University, and I am currently writing my dissertation on how teachers learn about using positive teacher-student relationships. For my study, I am interested in interviewing first, second, and third year teachers who are currently teaching in an urban school.

Involvement in this study would include participating in an approximately 30 to 45 minute interview, and being invited to participate in an approximately 30 minute to one hour focus group discussion with other first, second, and third year urban school teachers. Both will be conducted online using video conferencing, and both would be followed up with an email to check the accuracy of the interview or focus group transcript and to possibly ask follow-up questions to clarify responses. The interviews and focus group discussions will not be video-recorded, but will be audio-recorded. It is possible to participate in the interview but not the focus group discussion.

The questions will cover how you learned about using teacher-student relationships from your teacher education courses and your student teaching, and how you learned about the teacher-student relationship elements of culturally responsive teaching and relationship-centered teaching in your teacher education courses. Participation in all parts of this study is voluntary, and confidential, and you would be able to withdraw from the study at any time.

If you would be interested in participating in my study, please contact me at xxx@waldenu.edu so I can answer any questions you may have.

Thank you, and I hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Krapohl

IRB Approval # 02-21-20-0367694.

Appendix C: Interview Protocol

Introductory Statement:

Hello, and thank you for agreeing to participate in my study. The purpose of this interview is to explore your viewpoints about your teacher education courses and student teaching for what you learned about using teacher-student relationships. Before we begin, I would like to remind you that I am not affiliated with your college, your professors, or your current employer, that your answers to my interview questions will be strictly confidential, and that you may withdraw from this study at any time. In the study I will not refer to your name, the name of the college you attended, or the district or school for which you currently work. I will be asking you about elements of your coursework and student teaching that are related to instruction in TSRs. You may refer to any documents you have with you that are related to the classes you have taken – an unofficial transcript, class syllabi, and any class notes related to TSRs. May I begin recording?

Interview Questions

1. Thinking about the content of your teacher education courses, what information about using TSRs was covered in this instruction?
2. What elements of TSRs were covered in the culturally responsive teaching components of your teacher education courses?
3. What components of Milner's theory of relationship-centered teaching were covered in your teacher education courses?
4. Thinking about your student teaching, what did you learn about using TSRs from your cooperating teacher?

5. Thinking about your student teaching seminar, what did you learn about using TSRs from your instructor or classmates?
6. What information about using TSRs did you apply in your student teaching?
7. What TSR elements of culturally responsive teaching did you apply in your student teaching?
8. What components of relationship-centered teaching did you apply in your student teaching?
9. Is there anything else you would like to add about the instruction you received in your teacher preparation program in using TSRs?

Closing Statement

I have really enjoyed discussing your teacher preparation with you. I truly appreciate the time you have taken to assist me with my research. I would like to remind you that your participation has been voluntary, that your information will be kept confidential, and that you may withdraw from this study at any time. I will contact you to request your review of the transcript of this interview for accuracy, and to request and arrange for your participation in a focus group on the same topic. Thank you again. Your time and cooperation are greatly appreciated.

Appendix D: Alignment of Research Subquestions and Interview Questions

Research subquestions	Interview questions
What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools in their teacher education courses?	1. Thinking about the content of your teacher education courses, what information about using TSRs was covered in this instruction? 2. Thinking about your student teaching seminar, what did you learn about using TSRs from your instructor or classmates? 3. Is there anything else you would like to add about the instruction you received in your teacher preparation program in using TSRs?
What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in innovative methods for using positive TSRs in urban schools in their student teaching?	4. Thinking about your student teaching, what did you learn about using TSRs from your cooperating teacher? 5. What information about using TSRs did you apply in your student teaching?
What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in the TSR elements of culturally responsive teaching?	6. What elements of TSRs were covered in the culturally responsive teaching components of your teacher education courses? 7. What TSR elements of culturally responsive teaching did you apply in your student teaching?
What are teachers' viewpoints about the instruction they received in the TSR elements of relationship-centered teaching?	8. What components of Milner's theory of relationship-centered teaching were covered in your teacher education courses? 9. What components of relationship-centered teaching did you apply in your student teaching?

Appendix E: Focus Group Protocol

Introductory Statement:

Hello, and thank you for agreeing to participate in this focus group for my study. The purpose of this focus group is for you to discuss with other first-year teachers your viewpoints about your teacher education courses and student teaching for what you learned using teacher-student relationships. Before we begin, I would like to remind you that you may withdraw from the study at any time, that I am not affiliated with your college, your professors, or your current employer, that your participation will be strictly confidential. Therefore, do not use your name during the course of the discussion. In the study I will not refer to your names, the names of the colleges you attended, or the districts or schools for which you currently work. May I begin recording?

Focus Group questions:

1. In your college courses, what did you learn about using teacher-student relationships?
2. In your student teaching, what did you learn about using teacher-student relationships?
3. In your college courses or student teaching, what did you learn about culturally responsive teaching?
4. Please discuss what you learned about relationship-centered teaching.

Closing Statement

I have really enjoyed discussing your teacher preparation with you. I truly appreciate the time you have taken to assist me with my research. I would like to remind

you that your participation has been voluntary, that your information will be kept confidential, and that you may withdraw from the study at any time. I will contact you to request your review of the transcript of this focus group for accuracy. Thank you again. Your time and cooperation are greatly appreciated.

Appendix F: TSR Information Participants Learned

Table F1

Professors

Participant	TSR information learned from professor
P1	"[The professor] always made it a point to make sure that you knew your students. Make sure they knew what they were doing just like make, she kind of, she kind of emphasized 'hey, it's okay if you don't get this lesson today.' If you could take that day and just help that student build that relationship with that student. And she basically said it was okay, like, 'Alright, there's gonna be some days where you may not teach, you may just have a meaningful conversation with your class. And your class will walk away a better classroom.'"
P2	Professor emphasized having empathy for students' circumstances. The student teaching seminar professor told the student teachers they should develop rapport with their students.
P3	One professor stated that nothing else works without TSR. One professor focused on differentiating learning based on TSRs.
P4	ELA content professor emphasized building TSRs as part of content instruction.
P5	Professor emphasized importance of making a connection with ELL students to help them learn the language by getting them involved.
P6	ELL professor's statement in participant's words: "The more you know about the kids, the better you are going to be able to teach them and help them and be there for them."
P7	Professor emphasized using restorative circles to build relationships.
P8	Professors used "their real life examples when explaining culturally responsive teaching." According to professor, "TSR helps when something goes wrong, because the students will work with you. If they don't respect you they never let you hear the end of it if you mess up." Being able to recover when something doesn't work is connected to TSRs.
P9	Professor in the student teaching seminar said try to make a connection with every student every day, such as saying hi to every student every day.
P10	According to professor, participant stated, "Create a space that's personal and warm."
P11	Several professors emphasized importance of building TSR "first and foremost"; students shut off without it if they feel like you don't understand them or try to engage with them on a level they can relate to.
P12	Professor stated the need to have a relationship with students to understand what problems they may have that could be interfering with their learning.

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship; ELL = English language learner.

Table F2

Courses—Getting to Know Students

Participant	Information in courses on getting to know students
P1	Math methods: Get to know students through your lessons. Getting to know students is "a segue into everything else." You need context in order to go into classroom culture.
P2	"Building a rapport with students is key!"
P3	Understand students and where they are coming from; get to know their backgrounds before beginning the content. Science methods: Find out what students know about the content or what preconceptions they have before you begin to teach the content. Teach to whole student. Know your students. Getting to know students is the first step of using TSRs, because "you can't really go further in a relationship with your students if you don't know who they are." "You can't really go further in terms of like classroom management or other student teacher relationship things that you might want to discuss."
P4	Understand students and where they are coming from; get to know their backgrounds before beginning the content. Building TSRs isn't "optional." "It's a holistic approach to everything. You need to be involved with your kids, you need to be involved with their lives, you need to be involved with, you know everything about them, to kind of be able to teach them how to do the simple content."
P5	Get to know students' learning styles (but no mention of getting to know students' interests and feelings).
P7	Use student inventories. Learn cultural backgrounds and personal interests. Get to know students so you can use Maslow's hierarchy of needs and Gardner's multiple intelligences.
P8	Learn about your students. Understand students and where they are coming from; get to know their backgrounds before beginning the content. Teach to the whole student. Know your students.
P9	Learn names, sports, activities, hobbies. Learn about their lives outside of school.
P10	Understand students and where they are coming from; get to know their backgrounds before beginning the content. Learn their cultural background, their socioeconomic status. Teach to the whole student. Know your students.
P11	"Try and you know, get to know them, build, build a bond, you know that's how you reach them." Getting to know students is needed for differentiation.
P12	" Make sure you like build a relationship with them or you're not going to get as far."

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship.

Table F3

Courses—How to Develop TSRs

Participant	Information in courses on how to develop TSRs
P1	Find out what students like. Math methods: Incorporate icebreakers into the content – teach but learn about the students while you are teaching. Example: teach graphs by making a graph of student likes and dislikes.
P2	-said missing.
P3	Communicate. Use icebreakers.
P4	Take what students like, their interests, how they want to approach things, and then find out how that applies to that individual student. Be yourself; be genuine. English methods: "But there was also really an emphasis on connecting to the students with the content, that you can then connect the content to the kids, and kind of tailor what you're doing." Talk to the students "as much as you can . . . the more you can talk to the kids, the more you're going to connect to them just because they're people." Students see him in community, such as at a park or a restaurant. He sees them and talks to them: he wouldn't have thought of that as a way to make connections if program hadn't focused on that.
P5	-said missing.
P6	-said missing.
P7	Restorative practices could be applied to building and maintaining TSRs, and being there for students. Contained instruction in building TSRs.
P8	Discussed how to gain the student's respect. Communicate. Watch what they watch, listen to music they listen to, use the social media they use.
P9	Classes contained "strategies to improve relationships with students."
P10	-said missing.
P11	-said missing.
P12	Math methods class had: gain their trust, let them know it's ok to make a mistake, don't show your frustration, don't be judgmental, just find other ways to teach them.

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship.

Table F4

Courses—How to Use TSRs

Participant	Information in courses on how to use TSRs
P1	Use to increase interaction; use to make lessons more interesting. “Get the students to trust you, so that you can teach your class, or you can use that in your lessons.” Use TSRs to prevent student misbehavior.
P2	“Nothing else works” without positive TSRs. TSRs help students to be comfortable with change, including when sometimes things don’t work.
P3	“And it was very specific . . . how to talk to students to prevent even classroom management problems from happening.”
P4	Nothing else works without positive TSRs. Use to increase interaction. Incorporate what you know about students into instruction. Make learning relevant. “They covered a lot about meeting the students where they were and . . . teaching them ‘when you got there.’” Use TSRs to prevent student misbehavior.
P5	Use students’ cultural backgrounds in lessons.
P6	Use students’ cultural backgrounds in lessons. ELL class: know what is relevant to them, meet them where they are at, bring cultural background into instruction. The teacher in the interview said “the more you involve them in decisions, the more you’re going to get from your kids and the more they’re going to give to you.” Allow students to participate in making decisions.
P7	Apply student inventories to the classroom.
P8	TSRs help students to be comfortable with change, including when sometimes things don’t work. Communicate, make things relevant, make things interesting. Special education behavioral modification: Discussed how to keep respect through the year. Incorporate what you know about students into instruction. Plan meaningful instruction related to students’ cultural experiences.
P9	Classes contained importance of TSR. “You know, how vital it is to student success, to behavior management, all that kind of stuff. Kind of everything builds off of the relationships you have with the kids.”
P10	English content class included choosing material “that students would actually find meaningful in their own lives.” English content class included “understanding where students are coming from and using that to maybe help us connect with them a little bit more, but also more mindfully then incorporating that into what we're choosing to teach in the classroom.” Incorporate what you know about students into instruction. Plan meaningful instruction related to students’ cultural experiences.
P11	Special education class included idea that you need to reach student on individual level to find a balance with students with different abilities or disabilities and from different backgrounds.
P12	Special education behavioral modification class: TSR helps bring back in student who is acting out or exhibiting avoidance.

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship; ELL = English language learner.

Table F5

TSR Information Used During Student Teaching

Participant	TSR information used during student teaching
P1	Developed relationships on his own; did not use information from courses.
P2	Got to know each student. Let students get to know her. Able to teach once they got to know each other. Got to know students first.
P3	Used what students liked to “deepen the connection.”
P4	Used his own personality. From cooperating teacher: had conversations with students; asked them about themselves and their cultures. Used meeting them where they are, finding out interests, how they want to approach stuff, how it connects to that individual student.
P5	Used interest in sports and activities in forming TSRs. Sat with a student who cried to help her in math. Used cooperating teacher’s technique of having lunch with students to form TSRs.
P6	From cooperating teacher: she told herself every class, “The more fun you’re going to have with them the better they are going to do for you.”
P7	Got to know students first. Learned all names first week, greeted each student at the door. Used cooperating teacher’s pulling students into hallway and talking to them privately.
P8	Used the relationship she built with a difficult student to get him to do work. Used cooperating teacher’s Shakespeare teaching strategy. She was able to use this because of the rapport she built.
P9	Used interest in sports in forming TSRs. Used getting to know students outside of class and using their names. Related skills to something one of students did, like playing soccer; said how they could use the skill in their game this weekend.
P10	Used a mix of everything he picked up and a little of himself too. Used cooperating teacher’s method of letting students lead class discussion. Used cooperating teacher’s establishing mutual respect foundation. Used seminar professors idea of sharing pieces of himself; found students more responsive when he did. Used cooperating teacher’s personable, cordial, respectful persona – incorporated into his teaching practice.
P11	Used cooperating teacher’s “I’m here” for you.
P12	Used cooperating teacher’s talking to students, using games, using morning meeting, and question of the day.

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship.

Table F6

TSR Information Learned During Student Teaching

Participant	TSR information learned during student teaching
P2	TSRs help when a lesson doesn't work or things go wrong, and you have to make changes.
P3	Building TSRs is easier with motivated learners.
P4	A lack of relationships between students in one class made teaching more difficult, and he had to focus on building relationships between students as well as with students. He also reported learning not to act like "you're too good for that situation," and to be careful the way he approached and talked to the kids.
P5	Building TSRs is easier with motivated learners. Forming TSRs was easier in suburban student teaching. Students did not like the prescripted curriculum she was required to use, and that she had to find out what the students' interests were in order to add that into the lesson.
P6	In addition to covering the curriculum, "They're also kids and you need to have fun with them, you need to build those relationships that are going to last longer than just the school period that they're in your class." Learned "to let my guard down, and really be open to building those relationships with each and every student, . . . and not necessarily worrying about being their teacher and being strict 100% of the time." "And when you build those relationships, you can have more fun, but having that fun with them as well is kind of what builds up on those relationships."
P8	"You gotta be yourself. . . . if you get in front of the room and you demand respect: 'Yeah, I am the boss, you are not the boss. I make the rules you follow the rules,' very strict, staccato-type teaching, you're not really going to get anywhere. I learned that during student teaching, right? I learned that idea of being silly and being myself and sometimes being sarcastic, and being flustered or not knowing something. That means more to them than 'sit down, don't talk, I'm the boss.' It doesn't work, right? Your connection with them is as important as their connection with you, and they won't connect with you if you don't reach out first, because that's, that's part of the job as being the teacher, is you have to make the connections, you have to be the one to reach out."
P12	Forming TSRs was easier in suburban student teaching.

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship.

Table F7

Cooperating Teachers' Actions

Participant	Cooperating teachers' actions related to TSRs
P2	Had conversations with students. Allowed talking in class. Students accepted responsibility for grades as a result of the TSR he built with them. He did not have to be "on top of" the students all the time. He could change instruction and plans if he needed to.
P3	Learned about and understood students. Knew students' culture and used that knowledge to understand what was going on in the classroom.
P4	Had conversations with students. Asked students about themselves and their cultures, and used this information in the big end of year project. Learned about and understood students.
P5	Greeted students at the classroom door and said hi in the hallway. Kept in touch with former students. Took an interest in all of her students. Would pull students and have lunch with them if they weren't doing work. Listened to students.
P7	Greeted students at the classroom door and in the hallway, and by name. – also observed other teachers in hall doing this. Made weekly positive phone calls home. Would pull student into hallway to discuss misbehavior, and did not demean the student in front of class. She was a good relationship builder; nine out of ten times the student would be fine after that. Used same positive feedback for each student so as not to excessively praise one (called it silent cue). Cooperating teacher learned and used student names quickly and often.
P8	Used a lot of humor. "Developed quite a bit of rapport from the beginning." Got reluctant students to read out loud because of rapport – got students to feel comfortable with him. Students would eat lunch in his room on his free period. Would help students with their other homework on his free period. "His positivity and his attitude with his students made them comfortable, and made them feel like it was a safe room for them to go."
P9	Cooperating teacher learned and used student names quickly and often.
P10	Cooperating teacher used discussion: students sat in a circle. She connected reading back to own lives. Cooperating teacher's class climate and discussion format led to a student coming out to peers during book report on choice of book and personal relation to it. She created space for student voice to be heard. The book talk was a project the cooperating teacher helped him to create. Cooperating teacher was very personable: she approached students in a cordial, respectful way, which was part of her behavior management. She was never demanding or punitive.

Participant	Cooperating teachers' actions related to TSRs
P10	Cooperating teacher used student interest questionnaire at beginning, and referred back to them and used them to make connections to lit and relate to students for behavioral issues. She used this information to help understand behavior and connect and relate to students. If students acted out, would ask what was going on, how can I help? Older cooperating teacher was more mom-like in relating to students. She shared stories about her own kids. Older cooperating teacher had high expectations; also gave students reigns in discussion and trusted them to go off on a tangent and then bring it back to topic. Younger cooperating teacher established boundaries because of her age; she thought students might push or take advantage, so she had honest discussions about rules and respect. She was also able to relate more to student interests like social media: "She was able to make those connections . . . in a way that felt much more natural because she was not too far removed from that age group."
P11	Got down on one knee at the student's level. "Very in tune with their needs that showed through how she talked to them, and through the content that she taught."
P12	Had conversations with students. Asked question of the day and let all students share a response. Gave frequent break to special education students during which she asked them questions about themselves or let them share or play a game. Learned about and understood students.

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship.

Table F8

Cooperating Teachers' Words

Participant	Cooperating teachers' words related to TSRs as reported by participants.
P5	Cooperating teacher told students about herself.
P6	Cooperating teacher said have fun, be yourself. Cooperating teacher said when the students see you want to be here and have fun they will give you so much more.
P7	Cooperating teacher said that building relationships is the best thing you can do because that takes care of 80% of problems that could happen. You don't need other classroom management strategies.
P9	Cooperating teacher said building relationships was "the most important thing *first* she wanted me to do." Cooperating teacher said to make personal connection, if they have that relationship with you they don't want to let you down, and don't want to not pass.
P11	Cooperating teacher said that to the students respect is a two way street – I'm here for you if you need me – I'm here to teach first, but if you need me for any type of support I'm here.

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship.

Table F9

Seminar

Participant	TSR information learned in seminar from fellow student teachers
P1	Some students can't be in seats for long. He learned to give the loud student or the one who wants the attention roles to fit their personality, like being the helper. Don't pull "on the leash too much;" let them go and they will come back. "You really have to get to know the student before you can create that culturally responsive lesson" because there are differences even within a culture. Don't make assumptions. "And that's where like developing that relationship is so essential." You have to develop TSR because "the worst thing you can do is assume they don't know or assume that you know what they're talking about without knowing for sure."
P4	Other student teachers with problems were not able to build the same TSRs that their cooperating teachers had, mainly because the cooperating teachers knew the students from previous years.
P6	"You have to be, not necessarily like a second parent, but you have to be someone they can rely on and that they can have fun with, but still be able to teach them, so, not necessarily be their friend, but kind of be a friend and a teacher at the same time."
P8	An art teacher had a difficult student who said he hated art. She let him try different things and adjusted assignments until he discovered he liked charcoal. She used charcoal to get him started and then was able to add in other things. Don't call parents if you can solve the problem by using TSR, but let students know you will if you have to.
P10	A Muslim classmate said some of her students had not seen a Muslim teacher before. "I think there was something powerful about that." Students commented that they were happy to see a teacher that looks like them teaching English.
P11	Students have to see it's not an act. You can't fake it: they will see right through. You have to build TSRs in order for the students to engage and work with you. Having students feel "as though you understand them and you're with them, and you know, you're not gonna do anything to hurt them is a big key." P11 reported that one of his fellow student teachers was one on one with special needs students and would talk about the hard days. About halfway through the semester she had a breakthrough with student and her reports were more positive after that.
P12	Talking to seniors is different than talking to first-graders; the conversations are more adult level. You also have to form TSRs faster with seniors because they are graduating soon. Ask them what they like to do, or what are their favorite sports or movies.

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship.

Table F10

CRT Elements in Courses

Participant	Elements of CRT related to TSRs in courses
P1	Included demographics and tracking. Be aware of situations students live in. Teachers “have to go to” the students; “do what they like.” Show students other cultures in addition to teaching to their own: “And a lot, and especially in urban schools kids tend to, I want to say, segregate on their own. So it's like a great opportunity to just show them all something different, like and kind of come together.” “You have to understand the student, you have to make everything relatable to them.”
P2	“[The professor] talked a lot about having empathy for students. A lot about you know sometimes you may start with a set of rules and expectations and you have to understand that life circumstances may cause you to deviate from that. Um, that students come with baggage. And sometimes you may say on the first day, I'm not going to accept anything late. Sometimes, you know, kids don't have light. So you're going to have to accept things late.”
P3	Teach to the whole student, don’t just teach the subject. Understand and know where your students are coming from. Know students’ backgrounds before covering content. Incorporate what you know about students into instruction. You can’t teach without knowing students and their culture first. “It was more about us learning about their lives to better teach the students, as people rather than students like just teaching science to the kids.” Research the area really well; analyze the school report card.
P4	See TSRs from “the cultural perspective of the students.” Be aware of situations students live in, and their demographics. “We were kind of inundated at the beginning with the adapting to the cultural perspective of different types of schools.” Understand and know where your students are coming from. Know students’ backgrounds before covering content. Focus on understanding of race and socio-economic issues and how to use that in teaching.
P5	Bringing students’ cultural background into lessons was included in the state math standards.
P6	ELL course: Teachers need to know students’ interests, what is relevant to them and to their culture; bring students’ cultural background into lessons. ELL professor: The more you know about them more you can teach them. Psychology class on the development of adolescents had some information on the situations or scenario students come from, “like how their brain might be different than other students who are coming from different backgrounds, and how we kind of need to meet those needs.”
P7	Elements of getting to know students through cultures were embedded in a couple courses. One course in particular, the first course (the one with the urban field experience), included recognizing that certain behaviors are cultural differences, and not disrespectful. It is “important to recognize them (behaviors / cultural differences) so you can further build relationships with those students.”

Participant	Elements of CRT related to TSRs in courses
P8	ELL course included how to "respond to students' cultures based on the languages they speak or, or don't speak." Advice in multiple classes said to watch shows or listen to music you would not normally: 'whatever is popular,' whatever your students are listening to. Professor used the example of handicapped student who did not need help with something. Communicate so you know what the student needs or does not need (help with); don't assume they can or can't do something.
P9	TSRs help improve classroom management: the better the relationship, the more you can get out of the students, the more they're willing to work hard and do your work. TSRs make it easier, so you don't have issues in classroom or behavior problems.
P10	Incorporate cultural competencies into instruction. Be mindful of cultural competencies even without knowing students yet.
P11	Several professors stressed get to know students, neighborhood, community.
P12	ELL class had a study abroad trip in Spanish-speaking country, which included facial expressions, attitude, and body posture important for communication and forming relationships and trust.

Note. CRT = culturally responsive teaching; TSR = teacher-student relationship; ELL = English language learner.

Table F11

CRT Elements Used in Student Teaching

Participant	Elements of CRT related to TSRs used in student teaching
P1	Put relationship knowledge into lessons.
P3	Used research projects based on culture: their culture or where they lived. Brought skin color into genetics lesson. Build racial knowledge.
P4	Used research projects based on culture: their culture or where they lived.
P5	Put relationship knowledge into lessons. Apply knowledge in teaching, word problems, activities.
P6	Ask questions, have conversations during downtime or transitions, find out what they are interested in, from their backgrounds or what they like to do "hot thing that they're playing with or doing or video game."
P9	Be "available for questions and help, . . . reliable," asking about their day, weekend, parents.
P11	Showing you are trying to communicate goes a long way. Created culturally relevant content that matters to students, and used that as a way to engage and encourage students.

Note. CRT = culturally responsive teaching; TSR = teacher-student relationship.

Table F12

RCT Elements in Courses

Participant	RCT elements in courses
P1	Understand the students' home lives and why they are behaving the way they do. Understanding the unwanted behavior can help stop it. A video shown in class showed a teacher yelling at a student for sleeping in class without understanding why.
P2	Classroom management is more about teacher behavior. Teacher behavior leads to TSR.
P3	Understanding the unwanted behavior can help prevent it. Building a relationship lowers need for classroom management.
P4	Understanding the unwanted behavior can help stop it.
P5	Be positive, not negative; be careful of what you say.
P6	Involve students in decisions, and you will get more out of them.
P7	Building a relationship lowers need for classroom management. Positive relationship and rapport follow through to classroom management. Procedures won't be followed until you have positive TSRs. TSRs affect your ability to manage the classroom.
P8	Building a relationship lowers need for classroom management. "Your relationship with your students is completely 100% either the reason for good behavior or bad behavior." "Because that's how . . . the world works right? Your relationship with somebody will . . . help your work ethic between the two of you . . . so that was exemplified and explained to us quite . . . a few times." There are three tiers of behavior: the bottom is good behavior, the middle needs a bit more of a push, and the top level is the kid who needs one to one focus.
P9	Building a relationship lowers need for classroom management. Contained importance of TSR. Everything builds off of that; it is vital to student success, to behavior management. Issues with students are easier to solve with relationships. Relate it to an interest or role model. Make a connection to their lives.
P10	Building a relationship lowers need for classroom management. Focus on positive behavioral management: examine the behavior, find the root cause. Positive TSRs decrease behavior incidents. "It becomes much easier to manage the classroom when there is this respect established between the teacher and the student." Mutual respect is foundation of classroom management.
P11	"Get to know your kids and really figure out what's going on with them."
P12	Focused more on Maslow: students might not have supplies or uniform, or be hungry and not focusing; without a bond or TSR teacher might not know this.

Note. RCT = relationship-centered teaching; TSR = teacher-student relationship.

Table F13

RCT Elements Used in Student Teaching

Participant	RCT elements used in student teaching
P1	Got to know each student individually and used that knowledge to differentiate instruction. His classes noticed and commented that he never yelled as a result of his use of TSRs.
P3	Outwardly expressed love for the different races in her classes. Used positive narration and I-centered language. Students were not defensive and were more cooperative when she used I statements in addressing their classroom behaviors. Did not yell; used proximity control. Used knowing her students and who they are as people. Be genuine and empathetic. Being vulnerable helped with students who were angry or upset.
P4	Used information he learned from his class materials about being vulnerable as a teacher so that students will be vulnerable with you, which helped him in his classroom management. Sat and talked with students, used a gentle tone, and shared his emotions.
P5	Used surveys. Did not teach the first week; she talked to the students to get to know them. Had lunch with students and would pull a student aside before class to see how they were doing. Used Maslow's hierarchy or needs as a frame of reference for understanding issues students were facing.
P7	Used positive narration and I-centered language. Pulled students aside to have discussions.
P8	Gave one student positive feedback to encourage him when he did well with something he had struggled with. She had two students who did not care about the class but took an interest in her biweekly manicure colors, so P8 used that interest to make a connection with those students and used that connection to move the conversations from manicures to literature. After that, these students cared when she was absent one day, and were sad when she had to leave.
P9	TSRs were helpful with the elementary students in his student teaching because they have a harder time controlling themselves.
P10	The TSRs he built with the students also helped make the students feel more comfortable with each other. Reported cultivating relationships with students, sharing personal anecdotes, and "creating a space where students were able to then speak of their own experiences," which "ultimately allowed for a space where students felt totally comfortable."
P11	If a student is having a rough day, ask questions and find out why, or find out what they are going through. Let students know you are on the same team. Let students know you do not judge and that what they share will remain confidential. Covering the material in class depended on how the students came to class that day.
P12	Played games with special education students to gain their trust so she could teach them the content. Asked elementary students who were not able to focus if they were feeling ok or if they needed to go to the nurse. Used Maslow's hierarchy or needs as a frame of reference for understanding issues students were facing.

Note. RCT = relationship-centered teaching; TSR = teacher-student relationship.

Table F14

Participant Observations About Use of TSRs

Participant	Participant observations about use of TSR
P1	He needed to be himself and do what he was comfortable with. “Kids will do the work for the teachers they like. They will. But, it depends on how much effort the work requires.” Tell students information other teachers do not.
P2	Different ways to draw them in – complement then move to next thing. Being aware of different groups and having empathy is important.
P3	Part of TSRs is making sure students know what is going on – repeat information even if they heard it before.
P4	Forming a connection with parents changes the TSRs with students and helps with classroom management. Threats to call a parent work if you have a good relationship with a student, but if you do call a parent, you have to mend the relationship with the student.
P6	Having fun is what builds the relationships: “The more you give them, the more you’re going to get back from them.” “You need to build those relationships that are going to last longer than just the school period that they’re in your class or just the school year you might see them.”
P7	The program focused on restorative practices but this practice is not used where she is teaching now.
P8	Uses a combination of connecting to student interests while being funny and goofy.
P9	Uses TSR to address issues like cutting. The relationship he has with the student affects how he addresses issue. TSRs can be used outside of class to address issues, and makes addressing those issues easier. Used similar TSR techniques for elementary and high school students, and for physical education and health classes.
P11	Part of TSR is meeting students where they are at. Understand the demographic and talk to them at their level. You can’t be the “high and mighty teacher” or “whatever I say goes.”

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship.

Table F15

Participants' Personal Life Experiences

Participant	TSR information participants learned from personal life experiences
P1	Grew up in urban area and attended urban schools. Shared a similar cultural background with urban students.
P2	Grew up and attended schools in an urban area.
P4	Worked in urban area and had friends from different cultural backgrounds.
P5	Attended urban schools as a child and used those experiences to connect to students.
P6	No experience that helped prepare her for teaching in an urban school other than working at a Footlocker full-time during college.
P8	Attended an elementary school that included a special education program. Attended school in a large urban district Worked at an aftercare and built a relationship with a troubled child that helped her work with him.
P9	Grew up in a suburb of a major city.
P11	Grew up in a diverse urban area and have friends of diverse ethnicities. As a student, he would tune out teachers if he felt they did not care about him.
P12	Her mom passed away when she was younger, so she could connect on a personal level with students that happened to. She has her mother's picture on her desk; students would ask questions and they would talk and share memories, which helped her build a relationship with those students.

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship.

Table F16

Participant Suggestions

Participant	Participant suggestions for teacher preparation programs
P1	Instruction in using TSRs needs to be more natural; the process in the instruction felt forced. Students will know if you are not being yourself. Too much emphasis on student struggles instead of on building connections.
P2	There should be a class on culturally sensitive teaching.
P5	"There should be a whole semester class" on TSRs. "I still truly believe that every preservice teacher should go and observe an urban setting."
P6	The "real world experiences of professors that had taught" should be "interwoven within the classes." There should be more focus on the "realistic side . . . of teaching." There should be more in the curriculum about building TSRs.
P7	"I would have liked to see a more diverse curriculum in terms of building student teacher relationships."
P8	TSRs "could use its own course." TSR instruction "could have been stronger."
P11	Would like to see more TSR information in courses. Instruction "should be centered more around experience in the field and less out of a book."

Note. TSR = teacher-student relationship.