

THE FEASIBILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY OF CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR
MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES PRESENTED IN A PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP FOR MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

OF

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF APPLIED AND PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

OF

RUTGERS,

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY

BY

ANDREW BILLUPS

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF

DOCTOR OF PSYCHOLOGY

NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY

AUGUST 2020

APPROVED:

Adam Lekwa, Ph.D.

Jeffrey D. Shahidullah, Ph.D.

DEAN:

Francine Conway, Ph.D.

Abstract

This study investigated the feasibility and acceptability of a behavior management training for middle school teachers; examining the barriers present when teachers implemented behavior management strategies in their classroom and their perceived improvements in behavior management implementation. A single session workshop was conducted for 11 teachers, which was followed by a four-week implementation period. Teachers completed three surveys (Pre-training survey, Post-training survey, and Follow-up survey) that gathered information on the current status of teachers' behavior management usage, barriers to implementation, perceived growth, effectiveness of training and changes in behavior management application. In addition, teachers completed weekly logs to monitor strategies used during the implementation period. Six of the 11 teachers participated in an in-depth follow-up phone interview to examine teachers' views on how accessible or applicable the information provided was to their classroom. The research indicated that teachers were interested in more trainings on behavior management with a focus on high levels of participant interaction, with a variety of examples of how to manage different student behaviors. Teachers reported a perceived improvement in ability when implementing behavior management strategies and increased awareness of planning prior to class when dealing with disruptive behaviors after attending the professional training. Data also revealed that teachers were more interested in foundational behavior management skills (e.g., proximity control, praise, behavioral momentum...etc.) than full intervention when implementing strategies in their classroom.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank a number of people who have supported and encouraged me throughout the dissertation process. First and foremost, I would like to thank both of my chairs, Dr. Adam Lekwa and Dr. Jeffrey Shahidullah. Thank you both for your patience and guidance through this long journey. Thank you for challenging me to go further and take the next step at each stop along the way. Dr. Shahidullah, I would like to thank you individually for your guidance from my first days at GSAPP as not only a faculty member but an advisor. Dr. Lekwa, I would like to thank you for working with me through my slew of emails and being so responsive to all of my questions.

To my parents, the two people who have inspired me to live authentically and to follow my dreams, there are no words that can fully express the depth of my gratitude. Without your unconditional love, trust in my abilities and constant support I would not be where I am today. Thank you for keeping me grounded and lifting me up when I needed you the most. To my brother, thank you for always being the role model I have needed in life. Always showing me how to put one foot in front of the other and keep going no matter the obstacle. To my friends, your encouragement, support and impromptu “peer supervision” sessions made this journey possible. Last but not least, I want to thank Layla. Thank you for your unwavering support over the past four years and being the highlight of my day. Thank you all for helping me reach this momentous milestone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT.....	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	III
LIST OF TABLES.....	VIII
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Effects of Poor Classroom Behavior Management.....	2
Poorer Student Engagement and Decreased Instruction Time	2
Risk of school failure and adversity in adult hood	4
Teacher Burnout.....	5
Teacher Preparedness for Classroom Management.....	7
Professional development	9
Classroom Management Principles.....	10
Establishing a Positive Classroom Environment	10
Proximity control	11
Behavioral momentum.....	12
Rewarding Positive Behavior	12
Barriers to Using Classroom Management Principles	14
Study Purpose	16
METHODS	18
Participants	18
Training Intervention	19
Measures	20

Pre- Training Survey.....	20
Post –Training Survey.....	20
Follow-up Survey	21
Phones Survey.....	21
Procedure	21
Data collection	21
Data analysis	22
Qualitative methodology.....	23
Quantitative methodology	23
RESULTS.....	24
Research Question 1 & 2.....	24
Quantitative results	24
Classroom Behaviors and teacher preparedness	24
Current Strategy Usage.....	24
Formality of Training.....	25
Research Question 3	27
Qualitative Results	27
Barriers to Implementation	27
Behavior Management Planning Process.....	27
Research Question 4	28
Quantitative Results	28
Training Efficiency	28
Qualitative Results	29

Helpful Training Components	29
Preferred Workshop Changes.	39
Barriers to Implementation	30
Research Question 5	31
Quantitative Results	31
Impact of workshop.	31
Reported Disruptive Behaviors.....	32
Current Strategy Usage.	32
Classroom Preparation	33
Perceived Ability Increase	34
Follow-up In-depth Phone Survey.....	35
Qualitative Results	35
Most Applicable Strategies	35
Barriers to Implementation	36
Teacher Interest/Changes to Future Workshops	36
Weekly logs	38
DISCUSSION	40
Teacher Preparedness.....	41
Barriers to Implementation.....	43
Perceived Increase Implementation Success	45
Implications for Practice and Future Directions	46
Future workshops.....	46
Implications for School Psychologists and Administration.....	47

Limitations	49
Conclusion	50
REFERENCES	75
APPENDIX A	52
APPENDIX B	54
APPENDIX C	55
APPENDIX D	57
APPENDIX E	58
APPENDIX F	59
APPENDIX G	62
APPENDIX H	63
APPENDIX I	64

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page #
1. Definitions and Examples of Behavior Management Principals/Strategies ..14	
2. Disruptive Behaviors Present in The Classroom / Perceived Level of Preparedness and Formality of Training	26
3. Strategies Currently Being Used in The Classroom.	26
4. Barriers during Implementation / Behavior Management Process	28
5. Helpful Training Components / Changes to Future Trainings / Barriers to Implementation	31
6. Perceived Increase in Level of Preparedness / Perceived Increase in Classroom Environment /Decrease in Specific Student Behaviors	33
7. Strategies Used Post Training	34
8. Teacher Planning Process Post Training / Increase in Teacher Ability.....	35
9. Most Applicable Strategies / Barriers – Phone Interview / Future Participation – Phone interview / Future Changes – Phone Interview	38
10. Disruptive Behaviors Present Each Week / Strategies not Used over Implementation Period.....	39

Chapter 1: Introduction

Managing disruptive classroom behavior is a primary role for teachers given the prevalence of students that display behavioral difficulties (Reddy et al., 2013; Nolan et al., 2001). Disruptive behaviors can include hyperactivity, impulsivity, aggression, and noncompliance. Students that display these behaviors might meet Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, Fifth Edition (DSM-5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013) criteria for conditions such as attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), oppositional defiant disorder (ODD), and/or conduct disorder (CD). These are the most prevalent disruptive behavior disorders in childhood and adolescence, affecting up to 5% of all school age children (APA, 2013).

Nolan et al. (2001) studied elementary and secondary teacher reports of disruptive behavior symptoms associated with ADHD, CD and ODD in their classrooms. Within elementary students, 10.3% were reported as displaying inattentive symptoms, 2.3% displaying hyperactive-impulsive symptoms, 4.5% displaying oppositional and noncompliant symptoms, and 2.5% displaying severe symptoms of disordered conduct. Within the secondary-level students, 11.5% reported displaying symptoms of inattention, 0.8% displaying hyperactive impulsive symptoms, with 3.8% displaying oppositional and noncompliant symptoms, and 3.0% displaying severe symptoms of disordered conduct.

Students diagnosed with ADHD, ODD, and CD often are the focus of teachers due to the behavioral symptoms associated with these disorders. After the No Child Left behind legislation, school systems have stressed maintaining more inclusive and student focused classrooms (Reddy et al., 2013); disruptive behaviors could become increasingly prevalent as students with disabilities, such as emotional disturbance are educated in the

general classroom. Teachers are expected to now differentiate lessons and behavior planning for a wider range of students' learning needs-specifically those demonstrating externalizing behaviors (Conway, 2005). This further underscores the importance of teachers having classroom behavior management skills.

It is important to note that teachers have often reported a lack of training and skills in managing disruptive classroom behaviors (Baker, 2005). A teacher needs assessment was conducted by the American Psychological Association (APA) and the highest ranked professional development request of 2334 teachers were classroom management and instructional skills. Teachers not only reported a need, but a want for more classroom management training to ensure that student behaviors do not impede the learning process, create an unsafe environment and students are able to remain actively engaged in the classroom lesson.

The inability to manage these behaviors may lead to many adverse outcomes, including decreased instruction time and student engagement, increased disciplinary referrals, and increased burden or stress placed on teachers (Salovitta, 2013; Brouwer, 2000). These short-term effects can then lead to more long-term implications such as higher suspension and dropout rates, and lower employment rates. The effects of poor behavior management will be discussed in the follow sections.

Effects of Poor Classroom Behavior Management

Poorer Student Engagement and Decreased Instruction Time. Classroom disruptive behavior is a concern in schools (Bloom, 2009), a concern for teachers (Chong & Low, 2009), and impedes classroom learning (Allen, 2010). Disruptive behaviors that are not managed appropriately can interfere with the classroom learning environment,

academic engagement, and the student's involvement with their school system (Bjorklund et al., 2009; Ford, 2013). Classroom disruptive behaviors and inattention can also hinder student academic and intellectual development (Graziano et al., 2007; Hirschy et al., 2004). Level of participation has also been positively correlated to intellectual skill development, and engaging in disruptive behavior hinders a student's ability to positively participate in classroom activities (Bjorklund et al., 2009; Fin et al., 1993). Students' disruptive behavior requires the teacher to spend time on classroom control and discipline, resulting in a decreased amount of time spent on academic instruction. This has also led to a decrease in student achievement most likely due to a reduction in academic engagement and on-task behaviors (Cobb, 1972; Martini-Scully, 2000).

In response to disruptive classroom behavior, teachers often opt to focus on student behavior instead of subject matter (Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, 2010), which negatively affects student learning and the flow of classroom activities (Gable et al., 2009). Salovita (2013) reported "an estimate of six minutes of instruction time is lost due to behavior related issues, which equates to 150 minutes of weekly instruction when extrapolated across classes and 5,700 minutes during the whole school year or 127 lessons of each 45 minutes. This equal five full weeks of school attendance."

Alternatively, rather than managing students' disruptive behavior, many teachers feel they have no alternative and removing the student from the classroom is the only way to preserve the learning environment (Losen et al., 2012). When students are removed from the classroom or from the school entirely, they miss out on instruction, which can hinder their long-term academic success (Appelbaum, 2009). Additionally,

this may increase the risk for secondary reinforcement to occur by which the student learns that disruptive behaviors can serve an “escape” function from non-preferred academic tasks (Roberts et al., 2001).

Risk of School Failure and Adversity in Adulthood. Schools that rely on exclusionary discipline practices, such as suspension, may be hindering the educational progress of students, and creating a failure cycle. Students that are excluded from school appear to lose valuable opportunities to gain academic and social skills (Christle et al., 2007). Of the 49 million students enrolled in U.S public schools in the 2011-2012 school year, 3.5 million students received in-school suspension, 3.5 million students received out-of-school suspension, and 130,000 were expelled as reported by the U.S Department of Education (Department of Education, 2012). Despite suspension rates tending to decrease, the numbers remain alarming as public schools suspended 2.8 million students, or about 6% of its student population, during the 2013-2014 school year (DOE, 2014).

Students that are suspended or expelled during preschool or elementary school are up to 10 times more likely to face jail time later in life (Lamont et al., 2013). The DOE has stressed the racial disparity that improper behavior management has demonstrated for years within public schools across the country as well—African American students being 2.3 times more likely to be suspended than white students (Hinojosa, 2008). Poor behavior management practice by teachers may be one of the factors impacting this racial disparity because we continue to see students of color receive harsher punishments for less serious behaviors than their white counter-parts (Gregory et al., 2010). If consistent behavior management practices were taught and practiced across environments we would hope to see this gap decrease. Research has also demonstrated that suspension is an

ineffective approach for behavior management and is associated with subsequent academic failure and school dropout (Lee et al., 2011). Schools with high suspension rates often have lower mean scores on state achievement tests compared to schools with lower suspension rates (Rausch & Skiba, 2004).

Teacher Burnout. Regarding teacher roles in the classroom, managing student behavior is considered one of the most important activities for a teacher (Langdon, 1996; Nolan et al., 2001). Without effective classroom management, the classroom environment necessary for teachers to instruct students is lacking. “As teachers exceed their resources and begin to feel emotionally taxed by their environment their perceived self-efficacy in classroom management will likely decrease as performance decreases, leading to emotional exhaustion” (Brouwers, 2000).

The increased occurrence of disruptive behavior and inability to manage these behaviors has been demonstrated to lead to increased rates of teacher burnout (Brouwer, 2000). Burnout has been defined as “a psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with other people in some capacity” (Maslach, 1993). “Emotional exhaustion has been defined as feelings of being emotionally overextended and depleted of one's emotional resources” (Maslach, 1993). When teachers display low self-efficacy in their ability to maintain classroom order, effort to decrease disruptive behaviors are likely to decrease (Brouwer, 2000). The lowered self-efficacy in behavior management might lead to increased rates of suspension as a response to dealing with behavioral difficulties (Brouwer, 2000; Dicke et al., 2014).

A Teacher report from Lloyd and Sullivan (2012) retrieved quotes from a teacher who “burned out”: “I spent all my free time chasing kids, who give me attitude... I’m exhausted at the end of the day.” Reports indicated teachers referring to themselves as failures. “Sarah could not negotiate the tension between how she wanted to teach and how she realistically could teach.” There are many factors that impede teachers from being able to have a successful classroom; Lloyd and Sullivan highlight the impact of behavior management on the classroom and how difficult it is for teachers to conduct their classroom lesson with difficult behaviors occurring, which leads to feelings of exhaustion and eventually burn out.

When discussing teacher burnout, it is imperative that we discuss the impact of working in certain settings. Due to the seclusion of many special education classes, teachers have reported a feeling of isolation from their colleagues (Gersten et al., 2001). Many special education teachers are also employed as co-teachers, at times being treated as teaching assistants leading to teachers feeling devalued (Bettini et al., 2015). With little support from administration, special education teachers have reported a lack of resources leading to difficulty implementing the necessary strategies (Davis & Palladini, 2011). Similar results were found for teachers working in more urban settings. The lack of social support from colleagues and administration leads to higher levels of teacher stress (Roeser et al. 2013). Exhaustion and burnout can be the outcome for teachers when working with a population that causes teachers to balance several roles without the appropriate support (Robinson et al., 2019).

Teacher Preparedness for Classroom Management

Research supports the importance of several classroom management principles for teachers that include both class wide and individual approaches (Oliver et al., 2010; Simson et al., 2008). While numerous classroom management practices have been supported by research, there remains a disparity between effective classroom management research and uptake of those strategies by teachers (Lavay, Henderson, French, & Guthrie, 2012; Oliver & Reschly, 2010; Stough, 2006). A Survey of teachers indicate that their knowledge, competence, and confidence in classroom management principles are limited (Baker, 2005).

In surveys of teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management skills and readiness to implement behavior management techniques, teachers reported low self-efficacy in managing noncompliant/disruptive student behavior and reported they did not "grasp the essentials of classroom management (Baker, 2005; Chesley & Jordan, 2012). More specifically, these teachers reported low ability and low willingness to use varied reinforcement schedules, and individualized reinforcement approaches. Teachers emphasized a lack of time as well as reduced self-efficacy which led to their reports of low willingness.

In addition, teacher mentors reported new teachers lacked fundamental and evidence-based strategies to manage their classrooms (Chesley et al., 2012). Teacher mentors also reported training opportunities to observe the "bigger planning picture," such as pre-planning and teacher preparedness to implement behavioral management was lacking in their teacher preparation programs.

Course materials in teacher training programs infrequently included evidence-based classroom management practices as the use of evidence-based practices are not mandatory across all states (Freeman et al., 2014; Garland et al., 2013). Only 28 states require teacher preparation programs are required to include what were deemed evidence-based classroom management instruction for elementary or secondary general education teachers. The other 23 states, which include 1083 programs do not require the topic of classroom management to be addressed (Freeman, 2014). Moreover, a review by Oliver et al. (2010) of 135 course syllabi from 26 programs found that only 27% of the university-based teacher preparation programs had a full course devoted to classroom management. Further, Oliver and Colleagues found that 42% of university programs had no courses in which the topic of establishing classroom rules was mentioned in any syllabus.

The lack of consistency in teacher preparation programs has also been addressed in the literature (e.g., Banks, 2003; Landau, 2001). Teacher intern interviews indicate that pre-service teachers are exposed to little or no application training leading to confusion and poor implementation, which has led to the use of behavior management practices that are not empirically supported. (Garland et al., 2013). When 292 teachers were asked whether they had heard of the term “evidence-based practices,” 55.5% of teachers indicated they had, while 44.5% indicated they had not or were unsure (Reinke et al., 2011). When these same teachers were asked to provide the top three areas in which they felt they needed additional knowledge or skills training; they reported needing improvements in the areas of working with children with externalizing behavior

problems, recognizing and understanding mental health issues in children, and training in classroom management and behavioral interventions.

Professional Development. Single session professional developments workshops have been used to address some of the issues that were mentioned above in teacher prep programs and more. Professional development has been defined as activities presented to improve teachers' knowledge, implementation of skills in the classroom, and the educational outcomes of students. (Wei et al., 2009). Professional development has been one of the main resources used by schools to address problems and improve schools in the US (Desimone, 2011).

Unfortunately, a truth of many teacher professional development workshops is that participants store the obtained knowledge and never use or refer back to it. (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). It is also important to note the necessary collaborative learning that has proven most effective for teacher learning is not commonly practiced in most schools (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Also pointing to the downfall of some professional developments is that activities presented during workshops are not strongly job embedded to a teacher's classroom (Hawley & Valli, 1999).

Research has already pointed at five core components that impact the effectiveness professional development workshop: active learning, content workshop duration, participation, and coherence of the information presented (Blank, de las Alas, & Smith, 2007; Corcoran, 2007). For professional development to be successful, presenters need to model the approach teachers are going to use in their classroom. Successful professional development can impact teacher knowledge, confidence and their ability to teach (Steffy et al., 2000). Sadly, many professional development programs are perceived

as ineffective and disconnected (Joyner, 2000), which is why the present study aims to examine the single session format of professional developments. Through qualitative research, the present study examined the single session format of professional developments and how presenters can make information/strategies more accessible and applicable to their classrooms.

Classroom Management Principles

Gaps in teachers' education on effective behavior management do not necessarily stem from gaps in theory or empirical research. Expansive research has revealed numerous classroom management techniques for disruptive behaviors (McCleary & Ridley, 1999; Patterson et al., 1993; Reiff & Stein, 2011). The following sections introduce and describe broad classroom management principles and the evidence-based associated with each. While not exhaustive, the four described approaches do reflect general behavioral strategies that are amenable to classroom implementation in a wide range of classroom contexts and target disruptive behavioral concerns.

Establishing a Positive Classroom Environment. Establishing a classroom environment that supports appropriate behavior can be achieved by teachers through preventive strategies (Lewis et al., 2004). Pairing verbal praise (discussed below) for appropriate behavior (e.g., remaining on task, staying seated, following directions) and incorporating increased opportunities for students to respond correctly to directives and tasks is a precursor for establishing a positive learning environment (Lewis et al., 2004). Using praise (i.e., verbally expressing approval to students) with intentional ignoring (i.e., not responding to unwanted student behaviors) has also demonstrated decreases in

talking out of turn, arguing with teacher requests, as well as other disruptive behaviors (Cossairt et al., 1973).

When developing a positive classroom environment, teachers must also increase opportunities for students to respond (OTR) (Partin et al., 2009). Correctly responding to academic questions, tasks, and demands positively affects student's appropriate academic participation, social behaviors, increases correct academic responses and leads to increased task engagement and decreased disruptive behavior for students (Sutherland, Adler, & Gunter, 2003). Due to the effectiveness of OTR on students' academic behavior and reduction in inappropriate behaviors, teachers at all levels should increase the chances students have to provide correct academic responses (Partin et al., 2009).

Proximity Control. The benefits of proximity control have been studied to determine the impact it may have on the behavior/ learning environment of students. Proximity control is defined as the relational distance (physical space) between students and teachers (Gunter et al., 1995). A teacher's movement in the classroom during instruction may be used to control student disruption by bringing the teacher into closer physical proximity to all students, increasing the effectiveness of their interactions with students (Gunter et al., 1995; Shores et al., 1993). Proximity control can decrease negative peer interaction/bullying and increase prosocial behavior. Proximity control displayed increased effects when paired with verbal commands when it comes to student compliance (Van Houten et al., 1982). For example, research displayed verbal commands were more effective when teachers were 3 feet from the student rather than 22 feet (Van Houten et al., 1982).

Pre-service teachers have reported proximity control being one of the strategies most utilized within their classrooms. Teachers reported that proximity control is a strategy they felt most confident using and perceived as one of their most effective behavior management tools (Reupert et al., 2010). Allen (2010) reported a significant decrease in aggressive behaviors, such as bullying, when using proximity control.

Behavioral Momentum. Rhodes et al. (2010) introduced the classroom strategy behavioral momentum. Behavioral momentum is characterized by initiating directives with a student that begins with requests that are likely to yield a high likelihood of compliance before providing other directives. Establishing behavioral momentum for many students that demonstrate low levels of compliance is a strategy to increase behaviors and responses. Teachers will be encouraged to begin the day with several positive requests earlier in the day followed with praise to increase the likelihood that students will comply to more difficult requests later.

Behavioral momentum posits that all positive reinforcements presented in the presence of a non-desired responses increase the possibility for a desired response (Nevin et al., 2011). High probability responses can reduce latency to initiate tasks and increase the rate of task completion (Belifore, 2008). Interventions based on utilizing a high probability command sequence can be effective for problems involving noncompliant behavior. Fifth grade students demonstrated increased compliance when compared to controls after being exposed to behavioral momentum as well as increased maintenance of compliance after the intervention compared to baselines (Axelrod et al., 2012)

Rewarding Positive Behavior. The use of reinforcements has demonstrated to have a positive impact on students demonstrating prosocial behaviors (Maag, 2001).

Techniques that have been shown to be effective for positive reinforcement include: token economies, behavioral contracts, and group-oriented contingencies (See Table 1; Maag & Kotlash, 1994). However, it is noteworthy that adult attention, even in the form of disapproval, is a powerful reinforcement to a child, especially for students with the most challenging behaviors that typically receive little positive attention (Maag, 2001). As research indicates, responses are powerful and reinforcing, so it is imperative that teachers focus on reinforcing the behaviors they want to see instead of the typical use of punishment (e.g., detention, yelling, singling a student out, or suspension).

Reinforcement can be defined as the action taken to *increase* the probability that the behavior it follows will occur again in the future, while punishment *decreases* the probability that the behavior it follows recurs in the future (Maag, 2001; Reppe, 2013). The use of punishment acts as a negative reinforcement for teachers. The removal (suspension) of the student displaying inappropriate classroom behavior immediately alleviates the disruptive behavior but will not prove to be a long-term solution. By catching students engaging in classroom appropriate behaviors a teacher can avoid providing attention for negative behaviors and use praise to increase a long-term behavior change.

Table 1: Definitions and Examples of Behavior Management Principals/Strategies		
Procedure	Definition	Example
Praise	Procedure of providing verbal affirmation after students engage in appropriate classroom behavior.	Teacher enthusiastically tells Billy “I like the way you raised your hand before sharing your answer!”
Selectively Ignoring	Averting all forms of attention (verbal and nonverbal) in response to behaviors that are incompatible with pro-social classroom behavior	Ignoring Billy when he pretends to make animal sounds in the back of the classroom
Reinforcement	The delivery of consequences that increase the chances of the behavior recurring.	After every minute when Billy has kept his hands at his sides, the teacher stands near him, talks pleasantly to him, and gives him a token that he may use to buy special treats
Punishment	The delivery of consequences that decreases the chances of the behavior recurring	When Billy gets out of seat during silent reading time, teacher makes Billy sit in the back of the classroom
Token Economy	System where students earn points for engaging in appropriate classroom behavior (hand raising, remaining seated during class, etc). Points can then be exchanged for a pre-selected reward.	When Billy earns 10 points he can trade those in for extra IPAD time during lunch.
Group-oriented Contingencies	Reward systems in which all children earn token reinforcers for engaging in target behaviors, and work together toward a group goal.	When the class earns a total of 25 more points, each student will gain an extra 5 points on their next homework assignment.
Behavioral Momentum	Beginning with requests that are likely to yield a high likelihood of compliance before providing other directives.	The teacher first requests that Billy help her hand out papers before asking him to sit down.
Proximity Control	The physical distance between a teacher and their students.	The teacher moved closer to Billy as she requested for him to stop talking to his classmates.

Barriers to Using Classroom Management Principles

In a study of 97 teachers, educators reported they were “Likely” to use proactive strategies (e.g., provide praise, review rules, implement strategies) when working with difficult student behaviors. Teachers were observed using more proactive than reactive strategies during the duration of the study (Clunies-Ross et al., 2008). It is important to state the sections above are not looking to imply that *all* teachers are poorly trained.

There are multiple factors that impede teacher success in implementing successful

behavior. As previously stated teacher's perceptions of self-efficacy for managing students displaying difficult behaviors has shown an inverse relationship with ability, willingness and readiness to implement evidence based classroom management strategies. (Baker, 2005). A lack of exposure to evidence-based strategies has presented to be a barrier for implementation as well (Chesley et al., 2012). In regard to reinforcements, many teachers feel maladaptive student behavior should be followed with a punishment instead of rewarding more positive behaviors later (Maag, 2001; McDaniel, 1987) (e.g., "why should I reward a student for doing what they are expected to do?"). Maag et al. (2001) reported, strategies "based on positive reinforcement are perceived to threaten individuals' freedom as autonomous human beings, stating that types of positive reinforcement are sometimes perceived as coercion by external factors and students should have in internal motivator to behave appropriately." Teachers have also reported a lack of time to make the appropriate modifications in regard to behavior management (Baker, 2005; Heflin et al., 1999).

Many teachers have stated these practices fall within the expertise of another professional, such as school psychologists (Marzano, 2006; Reinke et al., 2011). For the practices of behavior management to be effective in the classroom, teachers must accept this role and be trained appropriately (Reinke et al., 2011). Lack of confidence in evidence based interventions leads to reduced implementation and poor follow through. Specifically looking at ADHD and the behaviors that coincide with it, teachers report low confidence in the success of such interventions. This has negatively impacted teachers' self-efficacy and decreased the desire to implement evidence based interventions within their classrooms (Graczyk et al., 2005). Research has also pointed to teachers perceived

institutional pressure which inhibits their ability to implement best practice (Lewis, 1999).

Study Purpose

The research above discussed the impact poorly managed disruptive classroom behaviors can have on students and teachers. Through a single session workshop, weekly logs, surveys and teacher interviews, the present study aims to better understand the impact of behavior management trainings on teachers. I examined 5 research questions to take the next step in providing professional development workshops, gain insight into what teachers gain from behavior management training and what will make information provided most applicable to classrooms.

1. How frequently do teachers use evidence-based strategies for managing disruptive classroom behaviors?
2. How prepared do teachers feel to manage disruptive classroom behaviors?
3. What do teachers identify as barriers to evidence-based classroom strategies?
4. What are teachers' perceived feasibility of the single-session workshop format for bringing about change in practice what barriers will teachers report when implementing strategies presented?
5. Will a one-time workshop increase participants perceived effectiveness of evidence based strategies for classroom management?

To address the research questions above, a behavior management training was conducted to examine the feasibility of delivering a single session workshop and the effectiveness of the workshop increasing participants' perceived ability to successfully implement

evidence based strategies in the classroom. As previously stated, teacher reports will be examined through a series of weekly logs, surveys and interviews.

Chapter II: Methods

Participants

Eleven teachers were recruited through a “request to participate” email to their school district email address as well as flyers placed in their faculty mailboxes at IE Middle School. In 2017, IE reported 1,224 students in grades 6-8, with 54% of these students being male. Demographics included 20% African American, 63% Latino, Five percent Asian and 13% white. It was also reported that 70% of the students at IE were economically disadvantaged during the 2017 report, meaning 70% of their students were eligible for free or reduced lunch.

Inclusion criteria for study participation included teachers actively teaching a middle school class (grades 6-8) and working in general or special education context. The present study accepted participants from electives such as art, music, language courses and physical education. *Exclusion criteria* for study participation include administration (e.g., principal, department directors).

The average number of years teaching for those that participated in the present study was 17.7 years, seven years being the minimum years teaching and 31 the maximum. Eleven teachers participated in the 90-minute workshop and completed the Pre-and Post-training survey. Four of the eleven participants dropped out of the study and did not complete the measures for data collection during or after the four weeks of strategy implementation. One of the participants agreed to a brief phone interview and reported why they did not implement any of the strategies provided. Five of the seven participants completed phone interview reporting on their implementation process.

Training Intervention

Teachers participated in a single session training that was roughly 90 minutes. The training was conducted by a doctoral level graduate student in school psychology. The training incorporated a variety of behavioral management techniques to be implemented in the classroom. The first 45 minutes of the session included psychoeducation on behavior management principles including, creating a positive learning environment and behavioral momentum. The principle of creating a positive learning environment included sub components of setting specific rules, increasing opportunities for success, and increasing student-teacher interaction through praise. The principle of behavioral momentum included the use of proximity control and positive reinforcement/contingency reinforcement.

The last 45 minutes of the session included two evidence based strategies from the manual “The Tough Kid Tool Box” manual: (1) Mystery Motivators and (2) the Sure I Will Program (Rhode et al., 2010). Mystery Motivators uses positive reinforcements that are chosen by the students to increase positive behaviors in the classroom. A “mystery” reinforcement is selected and students are rewarded for displaying the predetermined prosocial behaviors. “Sure, I Will” incorporates a call and response to teacher requests (e.g., “Sure, I will” or “You got it”). As students provide the selected response and complete the teacher’s request, points are assigned to the student/team.

All materials required for implementation were provided to participants after the training (markers & charts), strategies were modeled and time was left for participants to ask questions.

Measures

Teachers completed four surveys: 1) A *Pre-Training Survey* that served as a needs assessment, 2) a *Post-Training Survey*, 3) a *Follow-up Survey* administered 1-month after the training, 4) a *follow-up in-depth Phone Survey*. The first three Surveys were in paper-based format.

Pre-Training Survey. The pre-training survey contained nine items, which include open-ended, multiple choice, and Likert-type response options. For example, participants were asked to list the current strategies they use for behavior management, as well as the target behaviors they wish to address in their classrooms. The pre-training survey also inquired about the barriers teachers face when implementing behavior management strategies in their classroom. Examples of Likert-type questions include: “I am effective with my current classroom and behavior management strategies/techniques for disruptive behaviors”, “The university/teacher prep program I attended provided course work/ training in teacher management of disruptive behavior”, and “I plan how I will react to disruptive behaviors in my classroom in advance.” These questions were asked across an increasing scale of disagree or agree, a yes/ no format, and a never to always format.

Post-Training Survey. Upon completion of the training, participants were instructed to complete an eight-item post training survey, which included questions such as “What components of the training did you find useful”, “What barriers do you see impeding the successful implementation of the skills you learned today?”, “What components of the training did you not find useful.” These questions were asked across an increasing scale of disagree or agree, a yes/ no format, and a never to always format.

These questions inquire about the participant's acceptability of the training and how applicable they feel the training will be to their classroom.

Follow-up Survey. After four weeks, participants were asked to complete a seven item follow up survey inquiring about their experience implementing the management strategies they were provided. Participants were asked the strategies they found most applicable to their classroom, what strategies they used and why, to reflect on the barriers present. Questions inquired about the overall relevance and feasibility of the single-session workshop model of training. This included questions such as "What barriers, if any, affected your ability to implement the strategies provided?", "I feel more prepared to manage disruptive classroom behaviors" and "If any which specific behaviors decreased within your classroom after implementing the strategies provided in the training?" These questions were asked in a "disagree" or "agree", a yes/no format, and "never" to "always" formats.

Phone Survey. After four weeks, five participants were selected to answer four questions via telephone. The head researcher asked participants to elaborate on the barriers they encountered during the implementation period. Participants also reported what changes to the training they would make so information would be more accessible to them and the strategies they found most helpful. Lastly, teachers reported whether they would participate in a workshop pertaining to behavior management again.

Procedure

Data collection. Teachers that elected to participate in the study completed the initial survey and signed an accompanying consent form. Participants were entered in a raffle to win a \$75 gift card upon completing the *Follow-up Survey*. To maintain

confidentiality, surveys were coded and stored separately from initial forms in a locked cabinet. Coding consists of pairing each survey with an identification number allowing the researcher to compare participant responses.

After completing the training, teachers were encouraged to implement the strategies learned within their classroom via weekly emails. Each week teachers were also prompted to log the strategies used, which served as an indicator of the strategies used over the four-week implementation period.

Upon completion of the four weeks of implementation, weekly logs were analyzed and six teachers were selected for a follow-up phone interview. The seventh participant did not elect to participate in the phone interview. The phone interview inquired about the strategies teachers felt were the most applicable to their classroom, barriers to implementation, and changes teachers would make to the training, with hope to increase the accessibility of the training.

Data analysis. Mixed methods analysis was used to examine the behavior management strategies teachers felt were the most applicable to their classroom and the barriers they felt were preventing them from being successful. Within a mixed method approach qualitative and quantitative research methods are used conjointly (Leech et al., 2009). Mixed method studies are conducted either concurrently or sequentially. The present study used a partially mixed concurrent dominant design. This design posits that both quantitative and qualitative facets occurred concurrently, so that either facet has the greater emphasis (Leech et al., 2009). The quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed separately before being compared and inferences were made.

Qualitative Methodology. I used an open coding method to analyze my open-ended responses. The open coding process included decontextualization (units labeled with a code, which should be understood in relation to the context), recontextualization (have all aspects of the content been covered in relation to the aim?), categorization (themes and categories are identified), and compilation (comparing and tying all themes together) of data (Bengtsson, 2016). Teacher answers were reviewed and labeled with a key-word/phrases that encompassed the meaning of the statement to create a list of codes for each question. Teacher responses could fall under the co-occurring coding process if the statement reported had multiple distinct themes. Codes were combined and separated as needed, until I was able to narrow each question down to the necessary themes. Higher order categories (themes) were developed and categorical overlap was identified and simplified into code names. A second coder (doctoral level graduate student) was recruited and trained in the coding process. Separate from my coding process; the second coder completed the same steps mentioned above to test for coding reliability. The second coder and myself had an 84% coding reliability. After completing the coding scheme for each question, the second coder and myself calculated the frequency in which teacher responses fell under each theme/category.

Quantitative methodology. While this is a qualitative oriented study, brief quantitative data were collected from each survey. Descriptive statistics were derived from the responses received from teacher on the Likert-type questions from each survey.

Chapter III: Results

RQ 1 & 2: How frequently are teachers using evidence based classroom management strategies and how prepared to teacher feel managing disruptive behaviors?

Quantitative Results

Classroom behaviors and teacher preparedness. Eleven participants completed the pre-training survey. Table 2 is a report of the disruptive behaviors teachers reported as occurring in their classrooms prior to the training. Ninety percent of teachers reported off task and attention seeking behaviors were seen in their classrooms, while oppositionality and noncompliance were reported by 70% and 50% of teachers. Regarding teacher preparedness in dealing with disruptive behaviors, 18% of teachers reported they were slightly prepared, 45% of teachers report they were moderately prepared and 36% of teachers report they were very prepared prior to receiving the behavior management training (Table 2).

Current strategy usage. On the pre-training survey teachers were asked to report the frequency in which they use a variety of behavior management techniques each class period (e.g., predetermined class rules, positive praise, behavioral momentum, punishment, proximity control). Forty five percent of teachers reported using predetermined classroom rules one to two times per period, 36% of teachers reported using predetermined classroom rules three to five times per period, ten percent of teachers reported using predetermined rules six or more times per period and ten percent

of teachers report not using predetermined class rules at all. Sixty three percent of teachers reported using positive praise three to five times per period and 35% of teacher reported using praise six or more times per period. Behavioral momentum was reported as a strategy used by ten percent of teachers one to two times per period. Punishment was reported by 18% of teachers, occurring one to two times per period. Proximity control was reported as occurring one to two times per period by 35% of teachers, three to five times per period by 33% t of teacher and six or more times by 33% of teachers (Table 3).

Formality of Training. Teachers were asked to report the formality of their training in behavior management. Teacher responses indicated that 60% of teachers received no formal training in behavior management, rather introduced to strategies through workshops, independent study and consultation with colleagues. Twenty percent of teachers reported a portion of a class in their formal education focused on behavior management. The final 20% of participants reported they received an entire course on behavior management in their formal training (Table 2). All participants reported that participating in additional professional development opportunities focused on classroom behavior management techniques would be beneficial.

Table 2

Disruptive Behaviors Present in the Classroom / Perceived Level of Preparedness/
Formality of Training

Item	Responses	# of Teachers Reporting	%
Disruptive behaviors present in the classroom (n =10)			
	Off task	9	90
	Attention Seeking	9	90
	Oppositionality	7	70
	Non-Compliant	5	50
Perceived level of preparedness in dealing with disruptive behaviors. (n = 11)			
	Not at all prepared	0	0
	Slightly prepared	2	18
	Moderately prepared	5	45
	Very Prepared	4	36
	Extremely Prepared	0	0
Behavior management training. (n = 10)			
	Portion of class (Formal training)	2	20
	One class (Formal training)	2	20
	Independent study	6	60
	Workshops	6	60
	Colleague consultation	6	60

Table 3

Strategies Currently Being Used in the Classroom

Item	Strategy	Never	Seldom	1-2*	3-5*	6+*
Strategies currently being used in the classroom. (n = 11)						
	Predetermined class rules	10%	0%	45%	36%	10%
	Positive praise	0%	0%	0%	63%	35%
	Behavioral momentum	10%	10%	10%	0%	0%
	Punishment	10%	30%	18%	0%	0%
	Proximity control	0%	0%	35%	33%	33%

RQ 3: What do teachers identify as barriers to evidence based classroom strategies?

Qualitative Results

Barriers to implementation. On the pre-training survey teachers reported barriers present when implementing behavior management strategies in their classrooms. Answers were coded and categorized into four different themes (Class makeup, Administration, Specific student behaviors, Miscellaneous). Teacher responses that fell under the theme of “Class makeup” included teacher statements such as “The make-up of the class and lack of space if a child needs space to chill” and “Large class size, poor mix of students and not enough space to hold constructive class.” Teacher responses that fell under “Administration” included statements such as “Rules not consistently reinforced by higher up levels (admins)” and “unnecessary pressures from administration.” Responses that fell under “Specific Student Behaviors” included statements such as “Some kids are oppositional and noncompliant”, “Poor attention spans” and “Rules not taken seriously by students” Teacher comments that fell under “Miscellaneous” included statements that did not fit match any category completely such as “feel unprepared to handle unmotivated students.” and “Positive language” Twenty six percent of answers fell in the theme of Class Makeup, 11% of answers fell within the theme of Administration, 47% of answers fell within the theme of “Specific Student Behaviors”, and 16% of answers fell into the theme of “Miscellaneous” (Table 4)

Behavior management planning process. Teachers reported on their preparation process when dealing with disruptive behaviors prior to the training. Teacher answers were coded and categorized into four themes, “No- I don’t plan”, “Classroom rules”,

“Responding positively to student behavior”, and “Miscellaneous”. Teacher Responses that fell under the category of “Classroom rules” included statements such as “Rules & consequences clearly established” and “Review class rules and expectations.” Teacher responses that fell under “Responding to student behavior” included comments such as “Positive praise” and “Figure out what students will respond well too.” Teacher comments that fell under “Miscellaneous” included statements that did not fit match any category. Thirty six percent of responses fell into the theme of “No”, 18% of responses fell into the category of “Classroom rules”, 18% of responses fell under the theme of “Responding to student behavior” and 20% of responses fell under the theme of “Miscellaneous” (Table 4).

Table 4

Barriers During Implementation / Behavior Management Planning Process			
Item	Theme	Frequency	%
What would you describe as the barriers you face when implementing classroom management practices? (n = 11)			
Class makeup		5	26
Administration		2	11
Specific student behaviors		9	47
Miscellaneous		3	16
Do you plan how you will respond to disruptive behaviors in class in advance? (n = 11)			
No		4	36
Classroom rules		2	18
Responding to student behaviors		2	18
Miscellaneous		3	27

RQ 4. What are teachers' perceived feasibility of the single-session workshop format for bringing about change in practice what barriers will teachers report when implementing strategies presented?

Quantitative Results

Training efficiency. On a scale of Disagree, Slightly Disagree, Slightly Agree, Agree, 100% of participants agreed that time during the training was used efficiently and addressed all the goals of the training. Ninety percent of participants reported their attendance in the workshop was beneficial to their ability managing classroom behaviors. The other ten percent reported that they slightly agree. All participants reported the content of the workshop was relevant to their work as teachers, and felt confident in their ability to apply the strategies presented in their classroom.

Qualitative Results

Helpful training components. Teachers' responses for the most helpful aspects of the training were coded into 3 themes, "Full interventions", "Student interaction strategies", and "Miscellaneous." Teacher responses that fell under the theme of "Full Interventions" included statements such as "Some new ideas I like - Sure I will program, which gets into the group oriented contingency I already use, we will use Por Favor...Si Senorá" and "Suggestions such as mystery motivation and yes, I will." Teacher responses that fell under "Student Interaction strategies" include statements such as "Behavioral momentum, the idea of giving a student 1 or 2 task that can be accomplished before something that might be a bit more challenging for the student" and "I also like the term

selective ignoring which is also so key day to day.” Teacher comments that did not fit into any category fell under the theme of “Miscellaneous.” Fifty four percent of teacher’s responses for the most helpful components of the training fell under the theme of “Student Interaction strategies”, 27% of responses fell under “Full interventions” and 18% of responses fell under “Miscellaneous” (Table 5).

Preferred workshop changes. Teachers also reported what they felt would make the training more accessible for teachers in the future. Responses were coded into 4 themes “Time”, “Nothing-no changes”, “Participant interaction”, and “Miscellaneous.” Teacher responses that fell under the theme of “Time” included statements such “Need to add more time to the workshop.” Teacher comments that fell under the theme of “Nothing” included comments such as “Nothing, I wouldn’t change anything” Teacher responses that fell under the theme “Participant Interaction” included statements such as “More activities would be helpful” and “Use more role plays.” Responses that did not fit into any category and were placed in Miscellaneous include statements such as “Discuss behaviors of emotionally disturbed students’ vs autistic.” Twenty eight percent of responses fell under the theme of “Time.” Forty two percent of teacher responses fell under “Nothing”, 21% of responses fell under Participant interaction and seven percent of responses fell under “Miscellaneous” (Table 5).

Barriers to implementation. Teachers reported barriers to implementation four weeks after the workshop and responses were coded into three themes, “Classroom environment”, “Nothing”, and “Miscellaneous.” Teacher responses that fell under the theme of “Classroom environment” included statements such as “Number of classes meeting in the gym” and “I borrow three different classrooms, those rooms are usually

science rooms, making class set up difficult.” Teacher responses that fell under the theme of “Nothing” included statements such as “No barriers.” Teacher responses that did not fit into either category were classified as “Miscellaneous” which included statements like “I felt like intervention would be too much in addition to other things I do.” Forty two percent of teacher responses fell under the theme of “Classroom environment”, 29% of responses fell under “Nothing” and 29 % of responses fell under “Miscellaneous” (Table 5).

Table 5

Helpful Training Components / Changes to Future Trainings / Barriers to Implementation			
Item	Themes	Frequency	%
What was the most helpful about the training? (n = 11)			
	Full intervention	3	27
	Specific Interaction strategies	6	54
	Miscellaneous	2	18
What changes would you make for a future training? (n = 11)			
	Time	4	28
	Nothing	6	42
	Participant interaction	3	21
	Miscellaneous	1	7
What barriers, if any affected your ability to implement the strategies provided? (n = 7)			
	Classroom environment	3	42
	Nothing	2	29
	Miscellaneous	2	29

RQ 5. Will a one-time workshop increase participants perceived effectiveness of evidence based strategies for classroom management?

Quantitative Results

Impact of workshop. Participants’ perceived increased level of preparedness in dealing with disruptive behaviors four weeks post training was recorded via a scale of

Disagree, Slightly Disagree, Slightly Agree, Agree. Seventy one percent of teachers reported they Agree and 29% of participants reported they Slightly Agree their level of preparedness in dealing with disruptive behaviors increased (Table 6). Using the same scale teachers reported the perceived improvement of the classroom environment. Forty two percent of participants reported they Agree the classroom environment improved and 57% of participants reported they Slightly Agree their classroom environment improved (Table 6).

Reported disruptive behaviors. Teachers also reported the disruptive behaviors they perceived decreased post behavior implementation. Eighty three percent of teachers reported that off task behaviors decreased in their classroom, 66% of teachers reported attention seeking behaviors, 33% of teachers reported oppositionality decreased and 17% of teachers reported non-compliant behaviors decreased in their classroom as well (Table 6).

Current strategy usage. Teachers were asked to report the frequency in which behavior management strategies were used post workshop. Eighty five percent of participants reported using predetermined class rules one to two times per period and 15% of teachers reported using predetermined class rules three to five times per period. Fifteen percent of participants reported using positive praise one to two times per period, 43% of participants reported using positive praise three to five times per period and 43% reported positive praise six or more times per period. Seventy one percent of participants reported using behavioral momentum one to two times per period, 29% of participants reported using behavioral momentum three to five times per period, and 29% of participants reported using punishment one to two times per period. Seventy one percent

of participants reported using proximity control three to five times per period and 29% of participants reported using proximity control 6 or more times per period (Table 7).

Table 6

Perceived Increase in Level of Preparedness / Perceived Increase in Classroom Environment / Decrease in Specific Student Behaviors

Item	Teacher Responses	# of Teachers Reporting	%
Perceived increase in level of preparedness in dealing with disruptive behaviors 4 weeks after the training. (n = 7)			
Disagree		0	0
Slightly disagree		0	0
Slightly agree		2	29
Agree		5	71
Perceived improvement in classroom environment 4 weeks after training. (n = 7)			
Disagree		0	0
Slightly disagree		0	0
Slightly agree		4	57
Agree		3	42
Behaviors in which teachers reported a decrease 4 weeks after training. (n = 6)			
Off task		5	83
Attention seeking		4	66
Oppositionality		2	33
Non-compliant		1	17

Table 7

Strategies Used Post Training

Item	Strategy	Never	Seldom	1-2*	3-5*	6+*
Strategies currently being used in the classroom. (n = 7)						
	Predetermined class rules	0%	0%	86%	14%	0%
	Positive praise	0%	0%	14%	43%	43%
	Behavioral momentum	0%	0%	71%	2%	0%
	Punishment	71%	0%	29%	0%	0%
	Proximity control	0%	0%	0%	71%	29%

Classroom Preparation. Responses regarding changes in teachers' preparation in managing disruptive behavior prior to the start of class was recorded and coded into three themes, "Strategy implementation", "Increased awareness", and "Miscellaneous".

Teacher responses that fell under the theme of "Strategy implementation" include statement such as "Getting them more involved, behavioral momentum was a great help" and "I go over Mystery motivators with one student." Teacher responses that fell under the category of "increased awareness" included statements such as, "Helped with being mindful of taking proactive steps in anticipation of where students may struggle" Teacher responses that did not fit into either category was placed in "Miscellaneous" and included statements such as "Seating arrangements." Sixty Six percent of responses fell under the theme of "Strategy implementation", 22% of responses fell under "Increased awareness" and 11% of responses fell under "Miscellaneous" (See table 8).

Perceived ability increase. Teachers' responses about their perceived increase in ability to effectively use evidence based strategies were recorded and coded into the three themes, "Increased awareness", "Environmental factors", and "Miscellaneous." Teacher

responses that fell under the category of “Increased awareness” included statements such as, “Being more aware and making a point to plan a little more.” Teacher responses that fell under “Environmental factors” included statements like “I found it difficult to implement or should I say monitor given the structure of a PE class.” Teacher responses that did not fit into either category was placed in “Miscellaneous.” Fifty percent of teacher responses fell under the theme of “Increased awareness”, 28% of respondents reported no increase in their ability and their responses fell under the category of “Environmental factors” and 14% of participants answers fell under “Miscellaneous.” (See Table 8).

Table 8

Teacher Planning Process Post Training / Increase in Teacher Ability

Item	Themes	Frequency	%
“After Participating in the training did your planning around behavior management prior to class session change?” (n = 7)			
	Strategy implementation	6	66
	Increased awareness	2	22
	Miscellaneous	1	11
“Do you feel there has been an increase in your ability to effectively use evidence based strategies to manage disruptive behaviors in your classroom?” (n = 7)			
	Increased awareness	4	57
	Environmental factors	2	28
	Miscellaneous	1	14

Follow-up In-Depth Phone Survey**Qualitative Results**

Most applicable strategies. Six teachers participated in phone surveys to allow for a more in-depth view of the implementation process and accessibility of the

information presented in the workshop. Teachers reported the components of the training they found most applicable to their classrooms and responses were categorized into three themes, “Combination of foundational strategies”, “Implementation of modified interventions”, and “No strategies/interventions used”. Teacher responses that fell under the theme of “Combination of foundational strategies” included statements such as “I used a combination of behavior skills and behavior momentum was very helpful for a particular student.” Teacher responses that fell under the theme of “Implementation of interventions with slight modifications” included statements such as “I used Mystery motivators with one student and I’m still using it” and “I use a call and response... Por Favor, Si Senora.” Teacher responses that fell under “No strategies” included statements such as “I don’t need the interventions as much as inexperienced teachers. Fifty percent of teacher responses fell under the theme of using a “Combination of foundational strategies”, 40% of teacher response fell under the “Implementation of modified interventions” and ten percent of responses fell under “No strategies/interventions used” (Table 9).

Barriers to implementation. Teacher reports of barriers to strategy usage during the four weeks of implementation were categorized into three themes, “Student response to intervention”, “Not applicable to setting”, and “Miscellaneous.” Teacher responses that fell under the theme of Student response to intervention included statements such as “Students began over using the call and response Sure I will to get points” and “Initial

student push back with new rules.” Teacher responses that fell under the theme of “Not applicable to setting” included statements such as “Interventions were difficult because of staffing personal in the gym, not all staff attended the workshop.” Responses that did not fit into either category were placed in “Miscellaneous.” Fifty seven percent of teacher responses fell under “Student response to intervention”, 14% of responses fell under “Not applicable to setting”, and two percent of responses fell under “Miscellaneous” (Table 9).

Teacher Interest/Changes to future workshops. The final question on the phone survey pertained to teacher’s interest in participating in a behavior management training/workshop again. Eighty three percent of teachers reported, “Yes, they would participate in a training covering behavior management again” (Table 9). Teachers also reported on the changes that would make the training material more accessible. Teacher responses were categorized into four themes, “Time”, “Staff engagement”, “Feedback from presenter”, and “No change.” Teacher responses that fell under the theme of “Time” included responses such as “More time would be beneficial, so that we could get through everything and not feel rushed.” Responses that fell under the theme of “Staff engagement” include statements such as “More role plays.” Responses that fell under the theme of “Feedback from presenter” included statements such as “More of a Q&A that focused on specific behaviors we see in the classroom.” Responses that implied no changes necessary fell under the theme of “No.” Twenty two percent of responses fell under “Time”, 44% of responses fell under “Staff engagement”, 22% of responses fell

under “Feedback from presenter” and eleven percent of response fell under “No” changes necessary (see chart 9).

Table 9

Most Applicable Strategies / Barriers – Phone Interview / Future Participation – Phone interview / Future Changes – Phone Interview

Item	Themes	Frequency	%
Were the foundational behavior management skills or full interventions more applicable to your classroom? (n = 6)			
	Combination of foundational strategies	5	50
	Implementation of modified interventions	4	40
	No strategies/intervention uses	1	10
What did you identify as barriers to successful behavior management? (n = 6)			
	Student response to intervention	4	57
	Not applicable to setting	1	14
	Miscellaneous	2	29
Would you participate in a training such as this again? (n = 6)			
	Interested	5	83
	Not interested	1	16
What changes to the training or interventions provided would have made implementation more successful? (n = 6)			
	Time	2	22
	Staff engagement	4	44
	Feedback from presenter	2	22
	No changes	1	11

Weekly Logs

During the four weeks of strategy implementation, teachers reported the behaviors that were present in their classroom and the strategies they did not use. Teachers reported that off task behaviors occurred at the highest rate across the four weeks as well as oppositionality, non-compliance and attention seeking behaviors (Table 10). Over the

four weeks of implementation, Mystery motivators and Sure I Will were reported as the interventions utilized the least, whereas the foundational behavior strategies were utilized by a majority of teachers, with behavioral momentum being as the least used foundational strategy (Table 10).

Table 10

Disruptive Behaviors Present Each Week / Strategies not Used over Implementation Period

Item	Strategy	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4
Disruptive behaviors present over each week. (n = 7)					
	Off task	86%	86%	57%	86%
	Oppositional	57%	57%	57%	43%
	Non-complaint	43%	43%	43%	29%
	Aggressive behaviors	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Attention seeking	86%	71%	43%	17%
Strategies not used during implementation period. (n = 7)					
	Proximity control	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Behavioral momentum	42%	1%	42%	28%
	Selective ignoring	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Catching a student doing well	1%	0%	0%	0%
	Positive reinforcement	0%	1%	1%	0%
	Mystery motivators	85%	85%	71%	57%
	Sure I will	71%	57%	57%	85%

Chapter IV: Discussion

The present study was conducted to gain a better understanding of how teachers might feel about their ability to manage disruptive behaviors in the classroom and their perceived increase in ability post training. I was also looking to examine teacher acceptability of a 90-minute workshop and how accessible teachers found the material presented to them. As an exploratory study, I sought to identify key features of teacher workshops that lead to the highest rates of implementation and accessibility for teachers.

In this study, participants gave their thoughts and opinions through multiple surveys about behavior management implementation after participating in a 90-minute workshop. I developed a pre, post, follow up survey, weekly logs and an in-depth phone interview to gain a better understanding of the teachers' behavior management implementation within their classrooms, perceived barriers, perceived growth, and strategies teachers deemed most applicable to their classroom. I attempted to draw conclusions and make recommendations for future research. There were five research questions that governed this research study:

1. How frequently do teachers use evidence-based strategies for managing disruptive classroom behaviors?
2. How prepared do middle school teachers feel to manage disruptive classroom behaviors?
3. What do teachers identify as barriers to use of evidence based classroom strategies?
4. What are teachers' perceived feasibility of the single-session workshop format for bringing about change in practice what barriers will teachers report when

implementing strategies presented and what barriers will teachers report when implementing strategies presented?

5. Will a one-time workshop increase participants' perceived effectiveness of evidence based strategies for classroom management?

A primarily qualitative methodology governed the findings of the present study, which were that 4 weeks post training, teachers reported a perceived increase in their ability to implement behavior management strategies in the classroom as well as a perceived increase in their classroom environment. Qualitative data was broken down into themes for each question. Four major themes were identified based on teacher responses once data analysis was complete. These themes included: Increased awareness, Foundational behavior management strategies, Time (subcomponent: Participant participation) and Student response to intervention.

Teacher preparedness

The majority of teachers in the present study reported feeling moderately prepared in managing disruptive behaviors present in their classroom prior to the workshop but only a few (20%) received formal training in evidence based strategies to do so. As previously stated in earlier chapters, only 28 states require teacher prep programs to include evidence based classroom management instruction (Freeman, 2014). All teachers in the present study reported that more professional development trainings on behavior management would be beneficial to their practice. When a teacher in the present study was asked if he would participate in a professional development on behavior management again in a post implementation phone survey he stated, "Any type of training that can help you grow in teaching, you would be a fool not to want to go"

Before the workshop, teachers reported using the foundational behavior management strategies to some capacity. Forty five percent of teachers reported using “Predetermined” class rules one to two times per period and only 10% reported using “Behavioral momentum” in their classroom. Upon completion of the study 86% of teachers reported using “Predetermined” class rules and 71% reported using “Behavioral momentum” one to two times per period. More teachers reported planning prior to class time on how they will handle disruptive behaviors, indicating an *Increased Awareness* of behavioral strategies that can be implemented with students prior to class starting. Teachers reported “I focused on the most difficult child and tried to be proactive.” Increased awareness helped those in the study be more proactive when dealing with their disruptive students. Teachers in the present study helped support the hypothesis that a one-time session on behavior management can allow for an increase in awareness about prepping and using a “strategy toolbox” prior to students arriving to class.

Teachers were exposed to a variety of strategies and demonstrated an increase in how frequently they were being used. How prepared a teacher is to handle disruptive behaviors impacts the effectiveness of their classroom. Having an effective classroom requires a teacher to demonstrate forethought, and planning in advance for how they can support a student (Evertson & Poole, 2008). Teachers in the present study reported that one barrier to strategy implementation was student responses to interventions. The forethought to plan and anticipate possible behaviors students may display provide teachers with a better opportunity to maintain an effective classroom and respond appropriately. This allows teachers the opportunity to be more proactive instead of reactive.

Barriers to Implementation

Within teacher reports, themes emerged during the present study pertaining to the barriers present when teachers were implementing evidence based classroom strategies. “Specific student behavior” and “Student responses to intervention” were the most reported barriers. A weakness in many professional development workshops is they are not strongly related/applicable to a teacher’s classroom (Hawley & Valli, 1999). Teachers in the presented study reported engaging participants in roles plays and providing specific responses to student behaviors will make information more accessible/applicable to their classroom. By providing more tailored examples of possible student behaviors within professional developments teachers might feel more prepared when dealing with specific student behaviors.

When discussing students’ responses to interventions, it is pertinent to also discuss extinction bursts that may occur within the classroom. An extinction burst is when a consequence (reinforcement) is removed, which was obtained by an undesirable student behavior which has drastically increased with the goal of obtaining the stimulus that is no longer available (Ehrlich & Kratochwill, 2002; Waters, 2011). To address this barrier, teachers must be aware of not only how to implement a strategy but how students may respond. Students may call out for teacher attention, which can be addressed with planned ignoring, however when that attention is no longer provided the behavior may intensify. If a teacher responds to the student after ignoring they have now reinforced the behavior at a more intense level (Obenchain & Taylor, 2005). By presenting not only the strategy but a more in-depth explanation of student behavior teachers can have a better chance of remaining consistent during an extinction burst.

Time was another theme reported as a barrier to implementation. When providing teachers with interventions/strategies in professional developments, school psychologists must consider the context of the classroom in which they work. Does the teacher have classroom aides, paraprofessionals, or other resources in the classroom? If not then, time and preparation will inherently be a barrier if the intervention presented is very involved. Teacher stress is negatively impacted when school leaders are inattentive to the needs of their staff (Bays & Crockett, 2007).

As previously stated, lack of administrative support was reported as one of the leading causes of teacher stress and attrition (Roeser et al. 2013). If resources and personnel (e.g., no teaching assistants or aids) are limited within the classroom, class wide interventions (e.g., Sure I will, Mystery Motivators) may be too involved for a teacher, so bolstering their knowledge in foundational behavior management skills would be the most useful for that teacher. For teachers with less time and support, simplifying strategies seems to be the most valuable component. Educating teachers about behavior and providing a broad array of strategies to address these behaviors in a variety of settings gives a safety net and flexibility to teachers who are faced with disruptive classroom behaviors on a daily basis. Understanding not only the problem within the classroom but ability to implement is necessary when discussing strategies with teachers.

The final barrier teachers reported was the presence of administrative demands. Whoever is presenting a professional development to teachers need to be aware of administrative expectations because teachers become overwhelmed with administrations who have competing priorities (Cancio et al., 2013). Remembering to ask the question, “Does the current intervention being presented in my workshop match the expectations of

the district or any behavioral intervention that are currently occurring school wide?” This will inherently become a barrier for teachers to overcome, if the intervention provided conflicts with the administrative plans. So, teachers would benefit from the presentation of foundational strategies (increasing awareness) alongside class-wide interventions, allowing teachers to address the concerns of the class while also focusing on district expectations.

Perceived Increase in Implementation Success

The structure in the classroom that supports prosocial student behavior needs planning and forethought. Successful classroom environments decrease the opportunities for inappropriate student behaviors. (Oliver & Reschly, 2007). All teachers in the present study agreed that after the four weeks of implementation they perceived improvements in their classroom environment and their ability to implement evidence based strategies in the classroom. This ties back into one of the major themes of Increased Awareness. Teachers reported knowing many of the behavior strategies that were presented to them however, did not use them consistently prior to the workshop. Teachers reported that many of the foundational strategies were not new but the workshop prompted them to be more aware of how strategies may be implemented in their classrooms prior to the beginning of their lesson.

The design of the present study did not enable conclusions about improvements in teachers' skills, however teachers did report being more proactive (increased awareness) which research has indicated can set a teacher up to be successful (Evertson & Poole, 2008). A more aware/proactive teacher is likely to act in advance to address expected difficult behaviors. A more aware teacher sets up the learning environment to be

successful for both teacher and student (e.g., setting limits, strategically implementing strategies...etc); preparing for the problem instead of reacting to it (Denti, 2012). So, single session workshops could be powerful and used to increase a teachers' "toolbox" to better impact the learning environment, and increase the "skill" of preparation and forethought to address the behaviors before they occur.

The concept of developing a teachers' toolbox by introducing foundational strategies is important. Students respond differently to different interventions and teaching styles depending on that students' motive (De Meyer et al., 2016). Students are motivated by a variety of outcomes, so increasing a teachers' toolbox prepares them to address a broader range of behaviors as well as increases their ability to prepare their teaching environment for a more heterogeneous group of students. While it is important that we do not look at professional developments as perfect or trainings that will ultimately change practice it is important to think about its impact as well as the cost effectiveness.

Implications for Practice and Future Directions

Future workshops

Teachers identified a want and need for classroom behavior management training. Teachers reported a lack of training in this area and the behavior management strategies they currently use are not from formal trainings, however from work with colleagues and independent study. For future trainings, it would be pertinent to take into account the components of the workshop that teachers found strong and the changes they would like to see.

Research states the most successful professional developments emphasizes active

participation from teachers (Darling Hammond & Richardson, 2009). The present study recorded teacher reports so that future workshop can have the benefit of using the components that teachers want/need for professional developments to be successful. The collaboration between teachers in their professional development needs is supported by literature and necessary for successful implementation (DuFour et al., 2010). Teachers in the present study reported that time was a major component. Teachers at IE felt more than 90 minutes needs to be allotted, to address all their concerns. Teachers also emphasized the importance of allowing time for a Q&A with the presenter. As previously stated, teachers stressed the need to discuss student responses to interventions and the addition of varying examples on how to address these behaviors would be beneficial for them.

Teachers also reported the importance of hands-on learning during workshops (e.g., role plays). This ties into one of the previously mentioned components of a successful professional development, teacher engagement (Blank, de las Alas, & Smith, 2007; Corcoran, 2007) It was also beneficial, as reported by teachers, presenters demonstrate how interventions and strategies are to be implemented in the classroom, as well as the presentation of a broad array of examples when discussing implementation. Tying strategies to specific examples and making information attainable can increase teachers' confidence when it is time to implement the skills presented (Steffy et al., 2000).

Implications for school psychologists and Administration

Implications for school psychologists and administration can also be drawn from the present studies' research. As previous sections discussed teachers reported Increased

awareness and pre-planning when it comes to behavior management in their classroom. This provides the opportunity for school administrators and school psychologists to implement strategies to improve the classroom environment. However, when referring to the data it is important for psychologist and administrators to be aware of the type of intervention or strategies that are presented to teachers if implementation is to be successful. Teachers reported and present study data indicate that teachers are open to using interventions in their classroom but with the flexibility to adapt the intervention for their setting. Teacher reports in the present study align with research that was discussed in previous chapters, that pressures of administration to implement interventions a specific way, lead to poor implementation and lack of success. So, for successful implementation administrators need to be aware of the interventions in place at all levels as to avoid conflicting ideals, preventing a teaching from having successful implementation.

Teacher reports in the present study pointed to the preferred use of foundational behavior management strategies. This is powerful for school psychologists and administrators because it can lead to teachers addressing behavioral needs without any conflict with administrative interventions in place. Results suggest that psychologists should not only provide teachers with interventions but also introduce foundational strategies that can be used immediately as teachers prep interventions/see how interventions will be implemented in their classroom; strengthening the toolbox of foundational interventions for teachers can lead to increased confidence in classroom management and the use of more cooperative styles instead of more punitive measures (Hammarberg & Hagekull, 2002; Morris-Rothschild & Brassard, 2006).

Limitations

There were several noted limitations of the present study. The workshop had 11 participants however, only seven teachers completed the implementation process and final surveys. While the present study is rich with qualitative data a larger sample would have strengthened the studies external validity. A larger sample size would have also played as a safe guard against the inevitable attrition that takes place in research as well. Another limitation to the external validity of the study was the recruitment of teachers from a single school. Recruitment from a variety of schools would allowed for a stronger representation of all teachers, allowing for a stronger generalization of results.

For the present study convenience sampling was used from the diverse middle school setting of IE, which resulted in the previously stated 11 teachers to participate in the initial workshop. I had to work with the principal of the middle school to identify a time that would accommodate all that were interested. This involved finding teacher coverage, which lead to multiple teachers reaching out, stating they could not participate due to upcoming tests they needed to prepare their classes for or the need for their prep periods to grade assignments. While this was a limitation, the length of the workshop served as a strong buffer. Teachers were able to attend the entire workshop due to the 90-minute format, allowing teachers to return to their classes without much time missed.

It is also important to note that no reliability and validity tests were administered on the surveys used within the present study. While reliability was established for the coding procedure used with the qualitative data, using a statistically established survey to measure teacher responses could have strengthen the quantitative data in the present study. Teachers reported on their perceived improvement in ability to implement

behavior management strategies as well as their classroom environment. For future research, objectively defining and measuring specific student behaviors would provide valuable data to the researcher. Taking this data, alongside teachers' long term perceived growth would be great indicators of the "success" of the workshop.

Conclusion

Behavior management in the classroom will continue to be an important area of focus for teachers. Teachers have not only expressed a need but a want for continued education and training in the area of behavior management. The aim of the present study was to examine ways that professional development workshops can provide strategies that are not only accessible but applicable to middle school teachers. Teachers in the present study reported an "increased awareness" for using the behavior management strategies in their classroom. It has been reported that experienced teachers are more prone to using strategies they perceive themselves to be more confident with, or hold the belief they have a higher efficacy using, rather than employing new strategies (Reupert & Woodcock, 2010). Teachers in the present study reported being aware of many of the foundational strategies presented to them but the workshop "refreshed" and helped teachers be more "mindful" of how they were addressing the needs of the students. By helping teachers be more aware of the strategies in their "toolbox", psychologists might be able to help teachers planning process when looking to address the most difficult students in their class before behaviors began. While we are not looking to increase skills in a short period of time, expanding teachers' toolboxes with not only full interventions but foundational behavior strategies (e.g., planned ignoring, behavioral momentum, proximity control), through role plays, interactive activities and detailed examples of

application, psychologists might be able to increase teacher awareness prior to lessons.

Psychologists can look to use professional developments as a tool to address the process of behavior management instead of the product of skill development.

Appendix A

Pre- Training Survey

1. How many years have you been a classroom teacher ? *Please list _____*

2. The most common behaviors students engage in that disrupt class include: *Circle all that apply*
 - A. off-task (e.g., talking to peers, using phone, sleeping)*
 - B. Oppositional (e.g., talking back)*
 - C. Non-compliant (e.g., work refusal)*
 - D. Aggressive behavior (e.g., cursing, fighting)*
 - E. Attention seeking (e.g., making noises to distract others in class)*

 - Other: _____*

3. How prepared do you feel to manage disruptive behaviors (hyperactivity, aggression, defiance, noncompliance, positionality) within the classroom. *Circle one*
 - Not at all prepared* *Slightly prepared* *Moderately prepared*

 - Very prepared* *Extremely prepared*

4. What strategies do you currently use to manage disruptive behaviors in your classroom. *Select all that apply, along with the frequency at which strategies are used*
 - A. Predetermined classroom rules*
 - Never ; 1-2 times per class period ; 3-5 times per class period ; 6 + times per class period)*
 - B. Positive Praise (e.g. “ Great job raising your hand Adam”)*
 - Never ; 1-2 times per class period ; 3-5 times per class period ; 6 + times per class period*
 - C. Punishment (Office referrals, detention)*
 - Never ; 1-2 times per class period ; 3-5 times per class period ; 6 + times per class period*
 - D. Punishment (office referrals, detention)*
 - E. Never ; 1-2 times per class period ; 3-5 times per class period ; 6 + times per class period*
 - Other :*

5. The university/teacher prep program I attended provided course work/ training in teacher management of disruptive behavior. Yes/ No **If yes, how much training** (Please circle)

Multiple classes

One class

Portion of a class

If yes, please describe the strategies taught:

6. If you did not receive this training through your formal coursework, where did you receive this type of training?

A. *Did not receive*

B. *Independent study (reading, videos)*
colleagues

C. *Workshops*

D. *Consultation with*

7. What would you describe as the barriers you face when implementing classroom management practices? Please list below

8. Do you plan how you will respond to disruptive behaviors in class in advance?

YES

NO

If yes, Please describe the planning procedure below:

9. Participation in additional professional development opportunities focusing on classroom behavior management techniques would be beneficial. *Circle one*

Disagree

Slightly disagree

Slightly Agree

Agree

Appendix BPost-Training Feedback Survey

1. Time was used efficiently and utilized well to address the goals of the behavior management during the training? *Circle one*

*Disagree**Slightly disagree**Slightly Agree**Agree*

2. My attendance in this workshop was beneficial to my ability to manage classroom disruptive behaviors. *Circle one*

*Disagree**Slightly disagree**Slightly Agree**Agree*

3. The content of the workshop was relevant to my work as a teacher. *Circle one*

*Disagree**Slightly disagree**Slightly Agree**Agree*

4. I intend to apply what I learned in this training to actual students in my classroom. *Circle one*

*Disagree**Slightly disagree**Slightly Agree**Agree*

5. I am confident in my ability to utilize the discussed strategies with students in my classroom. *Circle one*

*Disagree**Slightly disagree**Slightly Agree**Agree*

6. What was most helpful about the training? Please list/describe

7. What was least helpful about the training? Please list/describe

8. What changes would you make for a future training on behavior management? Please list/describe

Appendix CFollow-up Survey

1. What barriers, if any, affected your ability to implement the strategies provided ? Please list/describe

2. After participating in the training, did your planning around behavior management prior to class session change? Circle yes or no

YES NO

If yes, what steps were taken?

3. I feel more prepared to manage disruptive classroom behaviors. *Circle one*

Disagree

Slightly disagree

Slightly Agree

Agree

4. Overall, the environment of the classroom has improved since receiving the training. *Circle one*

Disagree

Slightly disagree

Slightly Agree

Agree

5. If any, which specific behaviors decreased within your classroom after implementing the strategies provided in the training?

- *off-task (e.g., talking to peers, using phone, sleeping)*
- *Oppositional (e.g., talking back)*
- *Non-compliant (e.g., work refusal)*
- *Aggressive behavior (e.g., cursing, fighting)*
- *Attention seeking (e.g., making noises to distract others in class)*
- *other _____*

6. Please indicate the frequency in which you utilized each strategy *Select all that apply, along with the frequency at which strategies are used*

A. Predetermined classroom rules

Never ; 1-2 times per class period ; 3-5 times per class period ; 6 + times per class period)

B. Positive Praise (e.g. “ Great job raising your hand Adam”)

Never ; 1-2 times per class period ; 3-5 times per class period ; 6 + times per class period

C. Punishment (Office referrals, detention)

Never ; 1-2 times per class period ; 3-5 times per class period ; 6 + times per class period

D. Punishment (office referrals, detention)

Never ; 1-2 times per class period ; 3-5 times per class period ; 6 + times per class period

Other : _____

7. Did you feel there has been an increase in your ability to effectively use evidence based strategies to manage disruptive behaviors in your classroom?

YES NO

If yes, please explain what has changed in regard to the way you manage your classroom

If no, please explain what you feel would help increase the effectiveness of behavior management in your classroom.

Appendix D

Follow-Up Phone interview

1. Were the foundational behavior management skills or full interventions more applicable to your classroom.
2. What did you identify as barriers to successful behavior management?
3. What changes to the training or interventions provided would have made implementation more successful?
4. Would you participate in a training such as this again?

Appendix E**Weekly Log**

Week # _____

Circle strategies used	Barriers faced- Only fill in for strategies that were not used this week (e.g., time limitations, lack of knowledge, belief that it would not be effective)
Proximity Control	
Behavioral momentum	
Active Ignoring	
Praise	
Catching a student doing well	
Positive reinforcement	
Mystery motivators	
Sure I Will program	

Disruptive behaviors present this week included (please circle):

1. *Off-task behavior (e.g., talking to peers, using phone, sleeping)*
2. *Oppositional (e.g., talking back)*
3. *Non-compliant (e.g., work refusal)*
4. *Aggressive behavior (e.g., cursing, fighting)*
5. *Attention seeking (e.g., making noises to distract others in class)*

Additional comments:

Appendix F**CONSENT TO TAKE PART IN CONFIDENTIAL RESEARCH**

TITLE OF STUDY: The feasibility and acceptability of a classroom behavior management strategies presented in a professional development workshop for middle school teachers.

Principal Investigator: Andrew Billups

This consent form is part of an informed consent process for a research study and it will provide information that will help you decide whether you want to take part in this study. It is your choice to take part or not. After all of your questions have been answered and you wish to take part in the research study, you will be asked to sign this consent form. You will be given a copy of the signed form to keep. Possible harms of participation include, participants feeling mild anxiety while completing surveys. Alternatives to taking part in the research is not to take part in the training while still having access to the resources that will be provided during the workshop.

You are invited to take part in a research study that is being conducted by Andrew Billups, who is a doctoral student in the Graduate School of Applied and Professional school psychology program at Rutgers University. The purpose of the present study is to better understand the barriers that teachers face when implementing classroom management strategies. The researcher hopes to better understand which strategies will be the most applicable when students begin to engage in difficult classroom behaviors such as noncompliance, work refusal, speaking out of turn, and negative peer interaction.

We anticipate approximately 15-20 subjects will take part in the study. You will be asked to attend a 90-minute training/workshop where you will learn a variety of behavior management strategies. Participants will complete a pre-training survey (3 minutes), a post training survey (3 minute) and will be encouraged to implement the strategies presented in the workshop for 4 weeks after attending the above-mentioned workshop. Each week participants will specify which strategies they used on a weekly log. After the 4 weeks, a follow up survey will be collected (3 minutes) by Andrew Billups. A select few of participants will be selected to participate in a phone interview (5 minutes) at the end of the study.

Participants that participate in the phone interview (5 minutes) will also be audio recorded and de-identified. Phone surveys will not be mandatory and those who wish not to participate may opt out.

The risks and discomforts you might experience by taking part in this research include: A loss of time due to participation in the training/workshop and teachers may not experience significant improvements in their overall classroom practices. If you feel distressed at any point during the project please contact Andrew Billups (914) 513-6652. If you decide you would like to no longer participate in the study, you may do so at any time with no consequence. Refusal to participate or withdrawal from the study will have no impact on your teaching positions within the school.

The benefits of taking part in this study may be learning new effective classroom management techniques and teachers may identify prior barriers that were negatively impacting their classroom environment. However, it is possible that you may receive no direct benefit from taking part in this study.

There are no costs associated with participation in this research study. You will not be reimbursed for expenses related to the study such as transportation, or parking. You will be entered into a raffle to receive a \$75 compensation for your time participating in the study. The training/workshop will also provide refreshments for those that attend.

The researcher plans to collect the following types of information about or from you [names, years teaching, and contact information]. The data collected and identifying information will be stored and secured separately as to maintain participant confidentiality. We have plans in place to secure the data in ways that minimize the risk of a data breach, such as forms will be de-identified and stored separately in a locked space. When data is coded, all information will be stored on a password encrypted computer that only the principal investigator will have access to. Upon completion of the study all data and identifying information will be destroyed.

Study data will be kept for the duration of the study and all data destroyed upon the dissertation defense of the principal researcher.

After the study is over the information collected for this research will not be used or distributed to investigators for other research.

The research team and the Institutional Review Board at Rutgers University are the only parties that may see the data, except as may be required by law. If the findings of this research are professionally presented or published, only group results will be stated.

It is your choice whether you take part in the research. You may choose to take part, not to take part or you may change your mind and withdraw from the study at any time. If you do not want to enter the study or decide to stop taking part, your relationship with the

study staff will not change, and you may do so without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

You may also withdraw your consent for the use of data already collected about you, but you must do this in writing to Andrew Billups.

By signing below participants also agree to the primary researcher contacting them once a week via email for the duration of the implementation period which will take place for one month after the workshop.

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, you can call the IRB Director at:

New Brunswick/Piscataway ArtSci IRB (732)235-2866 or the Rutgers Human Subjects Protection Program at (973) 972-1149.

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE

1. Subject consent:

I have read this entire consent form, or it has been read to me, and I believe that I understand what has been discussed. All of my questions about this form and this study have been answered. I agree to take part in this study.

Subject Name: _____

Subject Signature: _____ Date: _____

2. Signature of Investigator/Individual Obtaining Consent:

To the best of my ability, I have explained and discussed all the important details about the study including all of the information contained in this consent form.

Investigator/Person Obtaining Consent (printed name): _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Appendix G**CONSENT TO AUDIO-/VISUALLY RECORD OR PHOTOGRAPH SUBJECTS**
ADDENDUM

You have already agreed to take part in a research study entitled Feasibility and Acceptability of a Classroom Behavior Management Training for Middle School Teachers conducted by Andrew Billups. We are asking your consent to allow us audio taping of a phone interview as part of the research. You do not have to consent to having a phone interview audio recorded in order to take part in the main research.

The recordings will be used to better understand the barriers teachers are facing in the classroom. The recordings will include your name and the head researchers name, we do not anticipate any other identifiers will be recorded. If you say anything you believe at a later point may be hurtful or damage your reputation, then you may ask the interview to rewind and record over such information.

The audio recording may include the following information that can identify you: name, years teaching, subject and strategies used during implementation period. Not all participants in the study will participate in the audio recording. Only a select few participants will be selected for a phone interview.

The audio recording will be stored on a password encrypted computer in a locked room that only the primary investigator will have access to. Data will be identified and have no link to subjects' identity and will be stored for the duration of the study and all data will be destroyed upon the dissertation defense of the principal researcher

Your signature on this form permits the investigator named above to record you as described above during participation in the above-referenced study. The investigator will not use the recording(s) for any other reason than that/those stated in the consent form without your written consent.

Name _____

Date _____

Appendix H

Middle School Teachers

A doctoral level school psychology graduate student is offering a classroom behavior management training/workshop (90 - minute training) designed to help teachers use evidence based classroom management strategies.



Training/workshop

Identify barriers to behavior management

Exposure to foundational behavior management skill

Teachers will be provided 2 full evidence based interventions

All participants will be entered in a raffle to win \$75 gift card!!

Participation will include completion of three brief survey's and success of the workshop will be monitored for four weeks after the training/workshop with quick and easy weekly logs and a 5-minute phone interview.

Appendix I

Dissertation Coding Scheme

Phone Survey

Were the foundational behavior management skills or full interventions more applicable to your classroom?

- A. **Combination of foundational strategies:** Responses reflect teachers use of foundational strategies in the classrooms

Ex:

“I used a lot of the strategies already but the workshop refocused me...Behavioral momentum was new and helped me make sure students had something to do when class started”

“I used a combination of behavior skills and behavior momentum was very helpful for a particular student.

- B. **Implementation of Interventions with slight modifications:** Responses reflect teachers use of one of the interventions presented

EX:

“I used mystery motivators with 1 student... I’m still using it”

“I used mystery motivators Students looked forward to using the indicator pen to see if it was a reward day”

“I use a call and response. Por favor, Si Senora”

“I used mystery motivators and broke the students up in teams

- C. **No strategies/interventions utilized:** Responses reflect teachers did not implement strategies during the 4 weeks.

Ex:

“I don’t feel like I have the time to implement interventions”

“I don't need the Interventions as much as inexperienced teachers”

What did you identify as barriers to successful behavior management?

- A. **Student response to intervention:** Responses reflect teacher's belief that students positive or negative reaction to the intervention being implemented can be a barrier to successful implementation.

Ex:

"Students began over using the call and response "Sure I will" to get points"

"Initial student push back with the new rules"

"Too many target behaviors"

- B. **Not applicable to setting:** Responses reflected that teachers did not feel interventions were applicable to their setting

Ex:

"Interventions were difficult because of staffing personal in the gym, not having the same kids or teachers."

C. **Miscellaneous**

Response reflects an activity that does not fit into a category and is not linked directly to the behavior management categories

-or-

Response reflects a teacher's attempt to answer the survey question in a manner that does not necessarily provide appropriate content for the question being asked.

Ex:

"Administration"

"I did not want the students to be upset if they did not earn and others did"

What changes to the training or interventions provided would have made implementation more successful?

- A. Time** Responses reflect that participants feel that more time would be beneficial

Ex:

"Time was an issue"

“I wanted more time to go over specific strategies”

B. Staff engagement: Responses reflect teacher’s belief that more activities such as role plays would be more beneficial to a training experience

Ex:

“More role plays”

“More demonstrations”

C. Feedback from presenters: responses reflect the teacher’s belief that more situational examples and time for a Q&A would be beneficial.

Ex:

“More time to pick the presenters brain”

D. No change: Responses reflect that no change to the workshop is necessary

Would you participate in a training such as this again?

A. **Interested in future workshop participation:** Responses reflect participants wish to participate in a behavior management workshop again.

Ex:

“Any training to help you grow as a teacher is beneficial”

B. **Not Interested in future workshop participation:** Responses reflect participants wish to participate in a behavior management workshop again. 1

Pre- training survey

What would you describe as the barriers you face when implementing classroom management practices?

- A. **Class makeup:** Responses reflect teacher's belief the makeup of the class can negatively impact the implementation of interventions.

_____ Ex:

“Large class sizes”

“Poor mix of students”

- B. **Administration:** Responses reflect that teacher's belief that consistency on the side of administration can impact the implementation of behavior management practices.

Ex:

“Rules not consistently reinforced by higher up levels (admins)”

- C. **Specific student behaviors:** Responses reflect teacher's belief that specific behaviors impact their ability to implement:

Ex:

“Some kids are oppositional and non-compliance”

“Poor attention spans”

“Keeping class on track when disruptive student requires management”

- D. **Miscellaneous**

Response reflects an activity that does not fit into a category and is not linked directly to the school 3

-or-

Response reflects a teacher attempt to answer the survey question in a manner that does not necessarily provide appropriate content for the question being asked.

Ex:

“Being consistent”

“Student response to intervention”

“Feeling unprepared to handle disruptive child”

Do you plan how you will respond to disruptive behaviors in class in advance?

A. **No:** Responses reflect that no preparation is taken before class for how they will intervene/respond to disruptive behaviors.

B. **Classroom Rules:** Responses reflect that teachers establish classroom rules and consequences to be followed by students

Ex:

“Rules & consequences clearly established”

C. **Praise:** Responses reflect that teachers will plan to praise the positive behaviors they wish to see.

Ex:

“Positive praise”

D. **Miscellaneous**

Response reflects an activity that does not fit into a category and is not linked directly to the school.

-or-

Response reflects a teacher’s attempt to answer the survey question in a manner that does not necessarily provide appropriate content for the question being asked

Ex:

“Plan to contact home if students misbehave”

“Seating chart”

Post- Training Survey

What was the most helpful about the training?

- A. **Full interventions:** Responses reflected teachers interested in the presentation of the full intervention provided to them.

Ex:

“The specific strategies explained Sure I will and Mystery motivators”

“Suggestions such as mystery motivation and yes, I will”

- B. **Student interaction strategies:** Responses reflect teacher’s belief that foundational strategies on how to interact with students was helpful

Ex:

“The discussion on praise vs planned ignoring”

“The behavioral momentum, the idea of giving a student 1 or 2 task that can be accomplished before something that might be a bit more challenging for the student

“I also like the term selective ignoring which is also so key day to day”

- C. **Miscellaneous**

Response reflects an activity that does not fit into a category and is not linked directly to the school.

-or-

Response reflects a teacher’s attempt to answer the survey question in a manner that does not necessarily provide appropriate content for the question being asked

Ex:

“Creating positive learning environment”

“Refreshing to hear that no one method works”

“Gave ideas and suggestion of examples how it can be used in PE”

What was the least helpful about the training -

- A. **Time:** Responses reflect teacher's belief that more time would have been beneficial for the training.

Ex:

"We need more time to go over entire presentation"

"I wish we had more time to ask specific questions about your reinforcements"

- B. **Nothing:** Response reflects teacher belief that no changes are necessary to the workshop

Ex:

"Nothing"

"It was all very useful"

- C. **Miscellaneous**

Response reflects an activity that does not fit into a category and is not linked directly to the school

-or-

Response reflects a teacher's attempt to answer the survey question in a manner that does not necessarily provide appropriate content for the question being asked

Ex:

"Some strategies seemed more appropriate for younger students or younger students may have more buy in"

"it was all helpful even if don't think my current motivators work for my classes. To time sensitive for learning, which requires more practice time."

- A. **Participant interaction:** Responses reflect teachers believe that more teacher interaction such as role plays would be beneficial.

Ex:

"More active group activities would be useful"

what changes would you make for a future training on behavior management?

- A. **Time:** Responses reflect teacher's belief that more time would have been beneficial for the training.

Ex:

“Need to add more time to workshop”

- B. **Participant interaction:** Responses reflect teachers believe that more teacher interaction such as role plays would be beneficial.

Ex:

“More activities would be helpful”

“Use more role-playing scenarios”

- C. **Nothing:** Response reflects teacher belief that no changes are necessary to the workshop

Ex:

“Nothing”

- D. **Miscellaneous**

Response reflects an activity that does not fit into a category and is not linked directly to the school

-or-

Response reflects a teacher attempt to answer the survey question in a manner that does not necessarily provide appropriate content for the question being asked

Ex:

“Discuss behaviors of emotionally disturbed students Vs Autistic.

Differentiating intentional vs unintentional”

“More examples of specific behaviors”

Follow-up Survey**What barriers, if any affected your ability to implement the strategies provided?**

- A. **Classroom environment:** Responses reflect teacher's belief that the makeup of the class was a barrier.

Ex:

"Number of classes meeting in the gym"

"No barriers when I have my original class. Problem when the teacher is out and I have to combine my classes"

"Borrow three different classrooms ... rooms are usually science rooms and set up in such a way."

- B. **None:** Responses reflect that teachers felt that no barriers were present when trying to implement the strategies presented.

Ex:

"No barriers"

- E. **Miscellaneous**

Response reflects an activity that does not fit into a category and is not linked directly to the school

-or-

Response reflects a teacher's attempt to answer the survey question in a manner that does not necessarily provide appropriate content for the question being asked

Ex:

"Didn't implement mystery motivators because I felt it would be too much in addition to things I have in place already."

"My own sense of unfamiliarity with the strategies"

After Participating in the training did your planning around behavior management prior to class session change.

- A. **Strategy implementation:** Responses reflected that teacher's preparation before class included a form of behavior management

Ex:

"Getting them more involved, "behavioral momentum" was a great help."

"yes- Behavioral momentum"

"I used mystery motivators with one student"

"More positive praise, less punishment and proximity control"

- B. **Increase awareness:** Responses reflect teacher's awareness of the steps they take before classes changed.

Ex:

"Yes- helped with being mindful of taking proactive steps in anticipation of knowing where certain students may struggle"

"Yes- I can say it changed all together but it made me more mindful and made me take a close look at what I was doing and what I can do better."

- C. **Miscellaneous**

Response reflects an activity that does not fit into a category and is not linked directly to the school

-or-

Response reflects a teacher's attempt to answer the survey question in a manner that does not necessarily provide appropriate content for the question being asked

Ex:

"Seating arrangement"

"I discussed with class what behaviors we should include as the target"

Do you feel there has been an increase in your ability to effectively use evidence based strategies to manage disruptive behaviors in your classroom.

- A. **Increased awareness:** Responses reflect teacher's belief that they are more mindful regarding their approach to behavior management.

Ex:

"Believe that it helped to be reminded of strategies that we all know we have as a tool to improve our classroom management of behaviors, but it always helps to have a refresher to reemployment certain strategies while also trying to avoid certain strategies"

"Being more aware and making a point to plan a little more "

"Yes- I am being more mindful and making sure each child gets positive reinforcement"

"Yes- Some of the strategies were taught in the past, but a long time ago - so this was a good refresher on those, and a reminder to use them.

- B. **Environmental factors:** Responses reflect teacher's belief that the environment they work negatively impacted their implementation.

Ex:

"No- a larger classroom"

"No- I found it very difficult to implement or should I say monitor progress"

just given the nature of PE classes and how we shift the kids around so much. "

References

- Allen, K. P. (2010). Classroom management, bullying, and teacher practices. 34, 1-15.
Retrieved from <http://www.theprofessionaleducator.org/>
- Appelbaum, M. (2009). *How to handle the hard-to-handle student, K-5*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. Attention-Deficit / Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). (2018, September 21). Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/adhd/data.html>
- Axelrod, M. I., & Zank, A. J. (2012). Increasing classroom compliance: Using a high-probability command sequence with noncompliant students. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 21*, 119-133.
- Banks, M. K. (2003). Classroom-management preparation in Texas colleges and universities. *International Journal of Reality Therapy, 23*, 48-51.
- Baker, P. H. (2005). Managing student behavior: How ready are teachers to meet the challenge? *American Secondary Education, 51*-64.
- Bays, D., & Crockett, J. (2007). Investigating instructional leadership for special education. *Exceptionality, 15*, 143-161.
- Belfiore, P. J., Basile, S. P., & Lee, D. L. (2008). Using a high probability command sequence to increase classroom compliance: The role of behavioral momentum. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 17*, 160-171.
- Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open, 2*, 8-14.
- Bettini, E. A., Cheyney, K., Wang, J. & Leko, C. (2015) 'Job design: an administrator's guide to supporting and retaining special educators. 'Intervention in School and Clinic, 50, pp. 221–225.

Bjorklund, W. L., & Rehling, D. L. (2009). Student perceptions of classroom incivility.

College Teaching, 58, 15-18.

Bloom, L. A. (2009). *Classroom management: Creating positive outcomes for all*

students. Prentice Hall.

Blank, R. K., de las Alas, N., & Smith, C. (2007). *Analysis of the quality of*

professional development programs for mathematics and science teachers:

Findings from across state study. Washington DC: Council of Chief State School Officers

Bostic, J. Q., Nevarez, M. D., Potter, M. P., Prince, J. B., Benningfield, M. M., &

Aguirre, B. A. (2015). Being present at school: Implementing mindfulness in schools. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics*, 24, 245-259.

Broderick, P. C., & Metz, S. (2009). Learning to BREATHE: A pilot trial of a

mindfulness curriculum for adolescents. *Advances in school mental health promotion*, 2, 35-46.

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and

perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher education*, 16, 239-253.

Cancio, E., Albrecht, S., & Johns, B. (2013). Defining administrative support and its

relationship to the attrition of teachers of students with emotional and

behavioral disorders. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 36, 71-94.

Retrieved February 9, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/42900227

Chesley, G. M., & Jordan, J. (2012). What's missing from teacher prep. *Educational*

Leadership, 69, 41-45.

- Christle, C. A., Jolivette, K., & Nelson, C. M. (2007). School characteristics related to high school dropout rates. *Remedial and Special education, 28*, 325-339.
- Christie, C. A., Nelson, C. M., & Jolivette, K. (2004). School characteristics related to the use of suspension. *Education and Treatment of Children, 27*, 509-526.
- Chong, S., & Low, E.-L. (2009). Why I want to teach and how I feel about teaching: Formation of teacher identity from pre-service to the beginning teacher phase. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 8*, 59-72.
- Clark, C., Dyson, A., & Millward, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Towards inclusive schools?* (Vol. 6). Routledge.
- Clunies-Ross, P., Little, E., & Kienhuis, M. (2008). Self-reported and actual use of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and their relationship with teacher stress and student behavior. *Educational Psychology, 28*, 693-710.
- Coalition for Psychology in Schools and Education. (2006, August). Report on the Teacher Needs Survey. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, Center for Psychology in Schools and Education.
- Cobb, J.A. (1972). Relationship of discrete classroom behaviors to fourth-grade academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 63*, 74 – 80.
- Collinson, V., & Tanya, F. C. (2001). "I don't have enough time": Teachers' interpretations of time as a key to learning and school change. *Journal of Educational Administration, 39*, 266-281.
- Conway, R. (2011). Encouraging positive interactions. *Inclusion in action*, 209-258.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). Basics of qualitative research (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

- Corcoran, T. B. (2007). *Teaching matters: How state and local policy makers can improve the quality of teachers and teaching*. CPRE Research Brief No. RB-48. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education
- Cossairt, A., Hall, R. V., & Hopkins, B. L. (1973). The Effects of Experimenter's Instructions, Feedback, and Praise on Teacher Praise and Student Attending Behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 6, 89-100.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Chung Wei, R., Andree, A., & Richardson, N. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.
- Davis, K. C., & Palladino, J. M. (2011). Compassion fatigue among secondary special education teachers: A case study about job stress and burnout. *Online Submission*.
- De Meyer, J., Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Aelterman, N., Van Petegem, S., & Haerens, L. (2016). Do students with different motives for physical education respond differently to autonomy-supportive and controlling teaching? *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 22, 72-82.
- Denti, L. G. (2012). *Proactive Classroom Management, K-8: A Practical Guide to Empower Students and Teachers*. Corwin Press.
- Desimone, L. M. (2011). A primer on effective professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92, 68-71

- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2010). *Learning by doing: A handbook for professional learning communities at work* (2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Ehrlich, M. E., & Kratochwill, T. R. (2002). Behavioral consultation therapy. *Encyclopedia of Psychotherapy, 1*, 191-205.
- Evertson, C. M., & Poole, I. R. (2008). Proactive classroom management. *21st century education: A reference handbook, 1*, 131-139.
- Freeman, J., Simonsen, B., Briere, D., & MacSuga-Gage, A. (2014). Preservice teacher training in classroom management: A review of state accreditation policy and teacher preparation programs. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 37*, 106–120.
- Finn, J. D., & Voelkl, K. E. (1993). School characteristics related to student engagement. *The Journal of Negro Education, 62*, 249-268.
- Fishman, D. (1999). The case for pragmatic psychology. NYU Press.
- Ford, M. (2013). The impact of disruptive students in Wisconsin public schools. *Wisconsin Policy Research Institute, Report, 26*.
- Fowler Jr, W. J., & Walberg, H. J. (1991). School size, characteristics, and outcomes. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 13*, 189-202.
- Gable, R. A., Hester, P. H., Rock, M. L., & Hughes, K. G. (2009). Back to basics: Rules, praise, ignoring, and reprimands revisited. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 44*, 195–205.

- Garland, D., Garland, K., & Vasquez, E. (2013). Management of classroom behaviors: Perceived readiness of education interns. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 13*, 133-147.
- Gersten, R., Keating, T., Yovanoff, P. & Hariness, M. K. (2001). Working in special education: factors that enhance special educators' intent to stay. *Exceptional Children, 67*, 549-67.
- Ghosh, S., & Sinha, M. (2012). ADHD, ODD, and CD: Do They Belong to a Common Psychopathological Spectrum? A Case Series. *Case Reports in Psychiatry, 2012*, 4.
- Graczyk, P., Atkins, M., Jackson, M., Baumann, B., Kim, J., Letendre, J., ... & Sykes, K. (2005). Urban educators' attitudes about mental health services for students with ADHD. *Behavioral Disorders, 30*, 95-104.
- Graziano, P. A., Reavis, R. D., Keane, S. P., & Calkins, S. D. (2007). The role of emotion regulation in children's early academic success. *Journal of school psychology, 45*, 319.
- Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher, 39*, 59-68.
- Gunter, P. L., Shores, R. E., Jack, S. L., Rasmussen, S. K., & Flowers, J. (1995). On the move using teacher/student proximity to improve students' behavior. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 28*, 12-14.
- Hammarberg, A., & Hagekull, B. (2002). The relation between pre-school teachers' classroom experiences and their perceived control over child behavior. *Early Child Development and Care, 172*, 625-634.

- Hawley, W., & Valli, L. (1999). The essentials of effective professional development: A new consensus. In L. Darling-Hammond, & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 127 -150).
- Hirschy, A. S., & Braxton, J. M. (2004). Effects of student classroom incivilities on students. *New directions for teaching and learning*, 99, 67-76.
- Houten, R. V., Nau, P. A., Mackenzie-Keating, S.E., D., & Colavecchia, B. (1982). An analysis of some variables influencing the effectiveness of reprimands. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 15, 65-83
- Joyner, E. T. (2000). No more “drive-by” staff development. *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education*, 385-394.
- Senge, Cambron, Kokkinos, C. M. (2007). Job stressors, personality and burnout in primary school teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77, 229-243
- Lamont, J. H., Devore, C. D., Allison, M., Ancona, R., Barnett, S. E., Gunther, R., ...& Young, T. (2013). Out-of-school suspension and expulsion. *Pediatrics*, 131(3)
- Landau, B. M. (2001). Teaching classroom management: A stand-alone necessity for preparing new teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Lavay, B., Henderson, H., French, R., & Guthrie, S. (2012). Behavior management instructional practices and content of college/university physical education teacher education (PETE) programs. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 17, 195-210.

- Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2009). A typology of mixed methods research designs. *Quality & quantity*, 43, 265-275.
- Lewis, R. (1999). Teachers coping with the stress of classroom discipline. *Social Psychology of Education*, 3, 155-171.
- Lewis, T. J., Hudson, S., Richter, M., & Johnson, N. (2004). Scientifically supported practices in emotional and behavioral disorders: A proposed approach and brief review of current practices. *Behavioral Disorders*, 29, 247–259.
- Lloyd, M. E. R., & Sullivan, A. (2012). Leaving the profession: The context behind one quality teacher's professional burn out. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 39, 139-162.
- Losen, D. J., & Gillespie, J. (2012). *Opportunities suspended: The disparate impact of disciplinary exclusion from school*. Los Angeles, CA: The Civil Right Project, The Center for Civil Rights Remedies.
- Maag, J. W. (2001). Rewarded by punishment: Reflections on the disuse of positive reinforcement in schools. *Exceptional Children*, 67, 173-186.
- Martini-Scully, D. D., Bray, M. A., & Kehle, T. J. (2000). A packaged intervention to reduce disruptive behaviors in general education students. *Psychology in the Schools*, 37, 149-156.
- Marzano, R. J. (2006). *A tool for selecting the "right work" in your school*. Englewood, CO: Marzano Research Laboratory.
- Maslach, C. (2017). Burnout: A multidimensional perspective. In *Professional burnout* (pp. 19-32). Routledge.

- McCleary, L., & Ridley, T. (1999). Parenting adolescents with ADHD: Evaluation of a psychoeducation group. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 38, 3-10.
- Mittler, P. (2012). *Working towards inclusive education: Social contexts*. Routledge.
- Mendez, L. M. R., & Knoff, H. M. (2003). Who gets suspended from school and why: A demographic analysis of schools and disciplinary infractions in a large school district. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 26, 30-51.
- Morris-Rothschild, B. K., & Brassard, M. R. (2006). Teachers' conflict management styles: The role of attachment styles and classroom management efficacy. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44, 105-121.
- Nevin, J. A., & Shahan, T. A. (2011). Behavioral momentum theory: Equations and applications. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 44, 877-895.
- Nolan, E., Gadow, K., & Sprafkin, J. (2001). Teacher Reports of DSM-IV ADHD, ODD, and CD Symptoms in Schoolchildren. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 40, 241-249.
- Noltemeyer, A. L., Marie, R., Mcloughlin, C., & Vanderwood, M. (2015). Relationship between School Suspension and Student Outcomes: A meta-analysis. *School Psychology Review*, 44, 224-240.
- Obenchain, K. M., & Taylor, S. S. (2005). Behavior management making it work in middle and secondary schools. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 79, 7-11.

- Oliver, R. M., & Reschly, D. J. (2007). Effective classroom management: teacher preparation and professional development. TQ connection issue paper. *National comprehensive center for teacher quality*.
- Oliver, R. M., & Reschly, D. J. (2010). Special education teacher preparation in classroom management: Implications for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*, 35, 188-199.
- Partin, T. C. M., Robertson, R. E., Maggin, D. M., Oliver, R. M., & Wehby, J. H. (2009). Using teacher praise and opportunities to respond to promote appropriate student behavior. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 54, 172-178.
- Patterson, G.R., Dishion, T.J., & chamberlain, P. (1993). Outcomes and methodological issues relating to treatment of antisocial children. In *Handbook of effective psychotherapy* (pp.43-88). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Petras, H., Masyn, K. E., Buckley, J. A., Ialongo, N. S., & Kellam, S. (2011). Who is most at risk for school removal? A multilevel discrete - time survival analysis of Individual and context level influences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103, 223-237.
- Putnam, R. F., Luiselli, J. K., Handler, M. W., & Jefferson, G. L. (2003). Evaluating student discipline practices in a public school through behavioral assessment of office referrals. *Behavior Modification*, 27, 505-523.
- Reddy, L. A., Fabiano, G. A., Dudek, C. M., & Hsu, L. (2013). Instructional and behavior management practices implemented by elementary general education teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 51, 683-700.

- Reiff, M. I., Stein, M.T (2011). Attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. In *Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics*, (pp. 327-348).
- Reinke, W. M., Stormont, M., Herman, K. C., Puri, R., & Goel, N. (2011). Supporting children's mental health in schools: Teacher perceptions of needs, roles, and barriers. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 26, 1-13.
- Reupert, A., & Woodcock, S. (2010). Success and near misses: Pre-service teachers 'use, confidence and success in various classroom management strategies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 1261-1268.
- Rhode, G., Jenson, W. R., & Reavis, H. K. (2010). The tough kid book. Eugene, OR.: Pacific Northwest Publishing.
- Roberts, M. L., Marshall, J., Nelson, J. R., & Albers, C. A. (2001). Curriculum-based assessment procedures embedded within functional behavioral assessments: identifying escape-motivated behaviors in a general education classroom. *School Psychology Review*, 30, 264-277
- Robinson, O. P., Bridges, S. A., Rollins, L. H., & Schumacker, R. E. (2019). A study of the relation between special education burnout and job satisfaction. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 19, 295-303.
- Roeser, R. W., Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Jha, A., Cullen, M., Wallace, L., Wilensky, R., Oberle, E., Thomson, K., Taylor, C., & Harrison, J. (2013). Mindfulness training and reductions in teacher stress and burnout: Results from two randomized, waitlist-control field trials. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105, 787–804.
- Saloviita, T. (2013). Classroom Management and Loss of Time at the Lesson Start: A Preliminary Study. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 2, 167–170.

- Schaufeli, W. B., Maslach, C., & Marek, T. (Eds.). (2017). *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (Vol. 33). Taylor & Francis.
- Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., Myers, D., & Sugai, G. (2008). Evidence-based practices in classroom management: Considerations for research to practice. *Education and Treatment of Children, 31*, 351–380.
- Skiba, R. J., Horner, R. H., Chung, C. G., Rausch, M. K., 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*, 85-107.
- Stage, S. A. (1997). A preliminary investigation of the relationship between in-school suspension and the disruptive classroom behavior of students with behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 23*, 57-76
- Stough, L. M. (2006). The place of classroom management and standards in teacher education. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. School Climate and Discipline: Know the Data. (2016, July 18). Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/data.html>
- Steffy, B., Wolfe, M., Pasch, S., & Enz, B. (2000). *The life Cycle of The Career Teacher*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Sullivan, A. L., Klingbeil, D. A., & Van Norman, E. R. (2013). Beyond behavior: Multilevel analysis of the influence of sociodemographic and school characteristics on students' risk of suspension. *School Psychology Review, 42*, 99-114.

Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009).

Professional learning in the learning profession. *Washington, DC: National Staff Development Council, 12.*

Wu, S. C., Pink, W., Crain, R., & Moles, O. (1982). Student suspension: A critical reappraisal. *The Urban Review, 14*, 245-303.