Summer 8-2009

Classroom Management: Teacher Training, Attitudes and Beliefs, and Intervention Practices

Margaret Catherine Davis Ladner
University of Southern Mississippi

The University of Southern Mississippi

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT: TEACHER TRAINING, ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS, AND INTERVENTION PRACTICES

by

Margaret Catherine Davis Ladner

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
of The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Approved:

August 2009

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT: TEACHER TRAINING, ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS, AND INTERVENTION PRACTICES

by

Margaret Catherine Davis Ladner

Abstract of a Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
of The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

August 2009

ABSTRACT

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT: TEACHER TRAINING, ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS, AND INTERVENTION PRACTICES

by Margaret Catherine Davis Ladner

August 2009

This study examined the factors that are associated with teacher classroom management with regard to training, attitudes and beliefs, and intervention practices of general and special education teachers in dealing with classroom control. These factors were examined in general and special education classrooms. The participants for this study were teachers of kindergarten, 1st grade, 2nd grade and 3rd grade students in three public school districts in a southeastern state. Participants were recruited through a convenience or voluntary sample selection.

The school districts chosen for this sample provide a good cross-section of schools; they were representative of buildings with different percentages of free-reduced lunch, enrollments, and ethnicity, yet were similar in student-to-teacher ratio. Information about the school districts selected for this study was obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics website. Demographical information such as gender, class taught, current grades taught, licensure, license class, areas of endorsement, years of teaching experience, and number of years teaching at current school was provided through a participant questionnaire. Additional questions provided a description of teachers' beliefs about behavioral interventions. The Attitudes and Beliefs about Classroom Control-Revised (ABCC-R) Inventory was used to measure various aspects of teachers'

attitudes and beliefs about classroom management.

A multiple regression was conducted and showed an overall model of four predictor subscale scores of people management and instructional management, amount of training reported, and beliefs about behavior management. None were statistically significant in predicting the total number of Response to Interventions (RTIs). A multiple regression was conducted and results indicated that an overall model of four predictor subscale scores of people management and instructional management, amount of teacher training reported, and beliefs about behavioral interventions did not statistically significantly predict the total number behavioral intervention plans. A MANOVA was used to evaluate differences in variables based on teacher type (general education, special education, and inclusion). Results indicated teacher type did not make a statistically significant difference in the combination of four variables, nor in any of the variables (belies about behavioral interventions, subscale scores of people management and instructional management, and training) considered individually. Lastly a regression was conducted to determine if the dependent variable (teacher type) was equal across groups. When conducting tests for between-subjects effects by combining inclusion teachers with special education teachers, the researcher found that the dichotomy between special education teachers and general education teachers did not make a significant difference in the overall outcome. This dissertation further explains the results and presents suggestions for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I must first thank my Lord and Savior who gives me strength daily. I thank God for the blessings in my life. Colossians 3:23 states "Whatever you do, work at it with all you heart, as working for the Lord, not for men." Writing this dissertation has been one of the most challenging academic endeavors I have ever faced. I have learned so much about myself and my ever present need for guidance and a continued personal relationship with Jesus Christ.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my dissertation committee. I would like to thank Dr. Thelma Roberson for agreeing to take on an additional student and serve as committee chairperson in the middle of this process. Her knowledge and commitment to the highest standards inspired and motivated me through the dissertation process. Dr. Kyna Shelley, thank you for your encouraging words and despite my fear of statistics, always offered advice and support through statistics classes. Thank you for initially agreeing to chair my committee and for staying on to serve as statistician after departmental changes were made. You have been an inspiration to me through out my educational career. I would like to thank Dr. Michael Ward for serving as my advisor and for the kind gentle words of advice and encouragement that made me strive to be a better educator. Thank you to Dr. Rose McNeese for serving on my committee and providing continued encouragement and advice. I would also like to thank Dr. Nancy K. Martin with The University of Texas at San Antonio for allowing me to use the ABCC-R for my research.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my respect and thanks to my family. I would like to thank my mom and dad for making me who I am today and always encouraging me to reach for the stars and follow my dreams. To my sweet husband, Larry, thanks for listening to me while I talked out loud, waiting patiently for me after classes, and keeping me sane. I love you. To my two wonderful daughters, Courtney and Claire, you are smart and beautiful and so gifted. I thank God for you everyday and want you to know that you can do anything you set your mind to. You have blessed me in ways I could never have imagined. I love you.

Finally, this dissertation is dedicated to my dad, Jeff Turner Davis, who always supported all of his girls and taught us at an early age that only we can limit ourselves. I wish you were here to share in my accomplishments. You are the reason I was determined to finish what I started. I miss you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

In response to 1997 amendments to the Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), educators began conducting functional behavior assessments and creating behavior management plans to address behavior problems in the classroom. These amendments included requirements for children with behavior problems that negatively influence their education. The reauthorization of IDEA 1997 forced educators to focus on the relationship between instruction and discipline by requiring them to not only assess learning, but also gain greater understanding of behavior problems. Schools are places where teachers and students spend significant amounts of time together and therefore, opportunities for creating behavioral interventions are numerous in both structured and non-structured environments (Gresham, 2004).

This study investigated training, attitudes and beliefs of general education and special education teachers in dealing with classroom control and behavioral interventions for general education students and special needs students in the regular and special education classrooms. The first chapter of this document presents background information concerning changes in the law that required educators to address student behavior in a more comprehensive way, statement of the problem, research questions and hypotheses, definition of terms, assumptions, delimitations, and justification for conducting this research project. Chapter II provides theoretical foundations of behavior management and behavior management systems upon which to base this research, contributions made by leaders in the field of behavior management, functional behavior

assessments, behavioral intervention plans, and other factors that research has shown to be related to behavior management such as teacher training, teacher attitudes and beliefs and parental involvement. Chapter III introduces the research questions and hypotheses, describes the research design, provides background information of participants, identifies variables, describes the instruments and gives specific data collection and statistical analysis utilized within this study. Chapter IV provides the results of the data collected form the questionnaire and the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory-Revised. Chapter V provides a summary, conclusions and recommendations for future research.

Background

Amendments to the Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) became law (P.L. 105-17) in June of 1997. The IDEA was amended and reauthorized by Public Law 108-446 in December of 2004. Final regulations were published and became effective in 2006 and are known as the Individual with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) of 2004. Researchers and school personnel supported by the Office of Special Education Programs found that problem behaviors can interfere with the learning of individual students and their peers (OSEP, 2000). Furthermore, the OSEP suggested that training teachers and staff is essential for the success of interventions to improve problem behaviors (OSEP Discipline Guidance, 1997). The provisions concerning behavior and functional behavior assessments were upheld in the reauthorization and signified a shift in behavioral interventions, theory and practice. The amendments introduced two concepts relating to educating students with problematic behaviors that violate school codes of conduct and exhibit unacceptable social behaviors

(Horner & Sugai, 2000). One concept was to implement positive behavior support with interventions and strategies to address problematic behavior. The second concept was to conduct functional behavior assessments. Positive behavior support is a general term that refers to the application of positive behavioral interventions and systems to attain socially appropriate behavior. A behavioral intervention plan addresses issues specific to an individual student and should contain strategies for dealing with specific problem behavior along with the educator's role in improving student learning and behavior (Killu, 2008). A functional behavior assessment is an approach that incorporates a variety of techniques and strategies to diagnose the causes and to identify likely interventions intended to address problem behaviors (Horner & Sugai, 2000).

Yell and Shriner (1997) stated that a behavioral intervention plan must be part of the Individual Education Plan (IEP) for a special education student that has a history of behavior problems. Yell and Shriner (1998) maintained that the law (IDEA) requires that a functional behavior assessment be conducted for a special education student that has been suspended more than 10 days for disciplinary action or when a manifestation determination is conducted. A manifestation determination is conducted to determine if the behavior causing the suspension is a manifestation of the student's disability. Therefore, a functional behavior assessment of the behavior which resulted in the suspension should be conducted; and the behavioral intervention plan should be developed or revised if a current behavioral intervention plan exists (Yell & Shriner, 1998). In order to provide a behavioral intervention plan teachers and professionals involved in assessing students must receive training in functional behavior assessments as well as applied behavior analysis procedures. Such training should include legal

consequences and appropriate use of disciplinary procedures. The behavioral intervention plan is intended to be a proactive plan designed to teach replacement behaviors based on information gathered from the functional behavior assessment (Yell & Shriner, 1998). The functional behavior assessment focuses on identifying biological, social, affective, and environmental factors that initiate, sustain, or end the behavior in question (Horner & Sugai, 2000).

The IDEIA 2004 mandated that school districts provide trained professionals to conduct functional behavior assessments at each school. Failure to follow these mandates could be considered depriving students of their right to a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) as guaranteed under federal law Individual with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504). Academic standards set by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 and concerns about high stakes testing, functional assessments, access to general education, adequate yearly progress and allowing parents to have more choices in their children's education add to the need for collaboration between special educators and general educators (Neel, 2006).

Each state's department of education works with local school districts to assist with providing professional development, in-service training, and technical assistance for school personnel conducting functional behavior assessments (Conroy, Clark, Gable, & Fox, 1998; Dunlap, White, Vera, Wilson, & Panacek, 1996). Assessing a student's problematic behavior includes: (a) conducting a functional behavior assessment of the student's problem behavior, (b) developing measurable goals to address problem behaviors, and (c) developing a behavioral intervention plan that includes positive

behavior support strategies that are non-aversive rather than relying on coercion or punishment for behavior change (Conroy, Clark, Gable, & Fox, 1998; Dunlap, White, Vera, Wilson, & Panacek, 1996).

Statement of the Problem

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires that all students reach proficient levels of academic performance in core subjects by the year 2014. To measure this growth, schools must administer state-mandated tests to all students, including special education students who were formerly excluded from testing. This has resulted in more students with special needs being placed in general education classrooms that are taught by general education teachers. These teachers may lack training in dealing with the special needs of these inclusion students, especially when dealing with behavior.

As a requirement of Response to Intervention (RTI), general education teachers are now required to implement behavioral interventions for students not yet eligible for special education who present behavior problems that disrupt the learning environment (Yell & Shriner, 1998). The accountability requirements of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in general education magnify the need for teacher training in behavioral intervention techniques that were previously reserved for special education.

Inappropriate student behavior can prevent teachers from providing high quality instruction for students in general education classes. Inappropriate student behavior can have a negative affect on overall student academic performance levels associated with the mandates of NCLB (2001) and the added requirements for participation in statewide assessments as mandated by the reauthorization of IDEIA. Therefore, educators are now focusing on interventions and strategies to address behavior problems and create

environments conducive to learning. Special educators face many challenges in conducting functional behavior assessments and implementing behavioral intervention plans. There is an added challenge for general educators to begin to identify target behaviors, conduct functional behavior assessments and monitor student progress through the implementation of behavioral intervention plans. Although special educators have some additional training in behavior management, there is a lack of teacher training programs in the area of behavior management for special and general educators.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study will address the following questions

1. What is the amount of training teachers receive in conducting functional behavior assessments?
2. What is the amount of training teachers receive in classroom management?
3. What are teachers' attitudes and beliefs about classroom control in the areas of instructional management and people management?

Predictions regarding theses research questions are describes in the following hypotheses:

H1: There is a significant relationship between the amount of training, beliefs about behavioral interventions, beliefs and attitudes about classroom control and the number of interventions at each RTI tier for general educators.

H2: There is a significant relationship between the amount of training, beliefs about behavioral interventions, beliefs and attitudes about classroom

control and the number of students requiring behavioral intervention plans for special educators.

H3: There is a significant difference in the amount of training, beliefs about behavioral interventions, beliefs and attitudes about classroom control among general and special education teachers.

Definitions

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions are provided:

Behavioral intervention plan (BIP). A written description of how the student, school, and family intend to support positive changes in a student's behavior and learning (Killu, 2008).

Challenges. For the purpose of this study, challenges are barriers or obstacles faced by educators such as students continuously disrupting instruction time.

Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA). A systematic process with problem solving strategies that consist of problem identification, information collection and analysis, intervention planning, and monitoring and evaluation (Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, & Hagan-Burke, 2000).

Individual Education Plan (IEP). A written education plan for each student with a disability that is developed, reviewed, and revised in accordance with IDEA.

Positive Behavior Support (PBS). A general term that refers to the application of positive behavioral interventions and systems to achieve socially important behavior changes (Sugai et al., 2000).

Problematic Behaviors. For the purpose of this study, problematic behaviors are inappropriate behaviors that may interfere with a student's learning or the learning of

others. Behaviors may range from mild to severe such as inattentiveness to more aggressive and disruptive behaviors.

Response to Intervention (RTI). A three-phase or three-tiered process that consists of academic and behavioral interventions which become more student-specific and intense as each tier is implemented (Ardoin, Witt, Connell, & Koenig, 2005).

Assumptions

The researcher made the following assumptions:

1. Participants in this study will complete the survey instrument.
2. Participants' responses are truthful.
3. National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) data are accurate.

Delimitations

The following delimitations were imposed upon this study:

1. Subjects in the study will be delimited to a selected group of general education, and special education teachers of in three public school districts in a southeastern state.
2. Subjects in this study will be delimited to teachers of kindergarten through third grade.
3. The district selection will be delimited by specific demographic characteristics as defined by the researcher: student population (kindergarten through third grade), the number of students placed in the tier process at each level, the number of students requiring functional behavior assessments, and number of students requiring behavioral intervention plans in general and special education.

4. Teacher demographic variables will be delimited to gender, type of certification, years of teaching experience, years of teaching experience at the present school, amount of training in behavior management classes, training specific to functional behavior assessments, and training in behavioral interventions.
5. This study will be delimited to variables of select demographics, training, attitudes and beliefs, number of students at each tier, number of students with functional behavior assessments conducted and number of students with behavioral intervention plans in special and general education settings.
6. Responses will be elicited from participants by means of a questionnaire.

Justification

Although past research efforts have focused on the inclusion process and teachers' attitudes toward inclusion, little attention has been given to the needs and attitudes of general educators serving students with and without disabilities who exhibit severe behaviors problems. Therefore, further research is warranted to better understand teacher attitudes and beliefs about student behavior, classroom management, behavioral interventions and the amount of training teachers receive in classroom management, conducting functional behavior assessments and designing behavioral interventions for students who exhibit challenging behaviors.

Summary

In this chapter the researcher introduced the research project, stated the problem, and presented three research questions and three hypotheses that will guide the research.

The researcher has also presented definitions, assumptions, and delimitations related specifically to this research project as well as justification for this research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Literature was gathered for this study using a variety of methods, tools and resources. Research was collected from books, journal articles, and internet media. Reoccurring themes used to collect data for this study were functional behavior assessments, behavioral interventions, teacher training, teacher attitudes and beliefs, and parental involvement. Behavior related journals were exceptionally useful tools for conducting this study. The Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, Education and Treatment of Children, ERIC, and internet websites were all useful sources for gathering literature necessary for this study. In this chapter, the researcher discusses the influence of IDEA, IDEIA, and NCLB. Foundations of behavioral assessments and literature related to behavior management systems, functional behavior assessments, behavioral intervention plans, response to intervention, teacher training, teacher attitudes and beliefs, and parent involvement as they relate to classroom management are also discussed.

Background

In a national survey of middle and high school teachers (Public Agenda, 2004), 97% of teachers stated that a school needs good discipline and good behavior to flourish, and 78% of parents agreed. Furthermore, 77% of teachers stated that if it were not for discipline problems they could teach more effectively, and over a third stated that they had seriously considered quitting the teaching profession due to the severity of discipline problems. Other Public Agenda research shows that at the top of the lists of what causes

behavior problems are parents' failure to teach their children discipline and the fact that only about a third of parents have succeeded in teaching their children to have self-control and discipline. Half say they have succeeded in teaching their children to do their best in school. Many schools have developed school-wide behavior support systems to promote positive, safe, cooperative student behavior and to address problematic behaviors that impede learning for all students.

Teachers recognize that in order to promote appropriate behavior by all students, functional behavior assessments and behavioral intervention plans could be used as a proactive measure in the general education setting (Warren et al., 2006). According to Blood and Neel (2007) positive behavior support programs have improved the school environment with approaches to strengthen social competence while successfully addressing problem behavior.

According to the Center for Disease Control and the United States Department of Education and Justice, the number of school-associated deaths varied between 28 and 34 during the 1980s, dropped during 1999-2000 to between 13 and 11, and steadily increased to 21 deaths during 2004-2005. The primary reasons cited for these incidents were interpersonal events (Logue, 2008). Furthermore, in his commentary, Logue (2008) concludes that others may learn from the Amish School Shootings which occurred October 2, 2006. During this event five females were murdered and the perpetrator committed suicide. The lesson learned is that strategies are needed to address risk factors that occur regularly in school settings such as interpersonal disputes (Logue, 2008).

In response to Columbine, the Amish School shootings and other school tragedies, many schools have committed themselves to safety by adopting zero-tolerance

policies. Some states have integrated social and behavior skills with career options and post-school outcomes, therefore, going beyond student achievement mandates of the NCLB Act (Sailor, Stowe, Turnbull III, & Kleinhammer-Trammill, 2007).

Raywid and Oshiyama (2000) suggested that the events at Columbine (a suburban school) confirmed that violence can occur in any school setting and is not confined to disadvantaged or inner city schools. Raywid and Oshiyama advised that "behavior problems are so much greater in larger schools... that any possible virtue of larger size is canceled out by the difficulties of maintaining an orderly learning environment" (Raywid & Oshiyama, 2000, p. 445).

Furthermore, Sailor, Stowe, Turnbull III, and Kleinhammer-Trammill (2007) suggested that for education reform to have an impact on schools, social-behavior standards must be included when identifying effective strategies for improving behavior. Therefore, schools have initiated behavior management systems that implement strategies teaching social behavior with discipline. Amendments to the Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) became law (P.L. 105-17) in June of 1997. These amendments introduced two concepts related to educating students with problematic behaviors who violate school rules concerning behavior and exhibit unacceptable social behaviors. One concept was to implement positive behavior support with interventions, and strategies to address behavior problems. The second concept was to conduct functional behavior assessments. This reauthorization of IDEA 1997 compelled schools to focus on the relationship between instruction and discipline. Teachers have been required to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of underlying causes of inappropriate student behavior in addition to teaching academics (Yell & Shriner, 1998). Furthermore, teachers

were duty-bound to conduct functional behavior assessments and develop behavioral intervention plans for all students with behavior problems that disrupt the learning environment (Yell & Shriner, 1998). Once completed, the functional behavior assessment was used to identify specific target behaviors, antecedents, settings and reinforcers and from that information, a behavioral intervention plan was designed to decrease inappropriate behaviors while teaching appropriate behaviors (Lewis & Sugai, 1999).

Theoretical Foundations

The earliest empirical research for conducting descriptive behavior assessments and experimental field studies was presented by Bijou, Peterson, and Ault (1968). These researchers developed objective methods for quantification of data obtained during descriptive observations through the following steps:

(1) specification of the situation in which a study is conducted

(2) definitions of behavior and environmental events in observable terms

(3) measurements of observer reliability

(4) procedures for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting the data (p. 177).

Since the beginning of the 1900s early behavioral psychologists such as Watson, Skinner, Pavlov, and Thorndike researched and wrote about the analysis of behavior and the functional relationships of behavior to the environment.

According to Corey (1982) behaviorists such as Watson and Skinner emphasized methods which help individuals in a step-by-step process designed to change behavior. B.F. Skinner experimented with different schedules of reinforcement, placed his emphasis on behavior that was observable and developed theories of operant condition. Skinner proposed that a response to a stimulus and the possibility of a behavior

reoccurring depends on consequences that follow that behavior (Corey, 1982). Although Thorndike is considered the father of educational psychology and is considered to be the originator of reinforcement theory; it is Skinner's theories that gave control to the individual and created a wider range of freedom and it is from his research that reinforcement theory evolved (Corey, 1982). Watson's theories on behavior view the individual as an active participant in the therapeutic process and it is through self-direction that the individual is able to make choices that effect behavior in positive or negative ways, evaluate the outcome and obtains the ability to maintain a behavior. Pavlov's contributions included unconditioned/conditioned stimuli to elicit unconditioned/conditioned responses (Corey, 1982).

An article published by Baer, Wolf, and Risley in 1968 titled "Some Current Dimensions of Applied Behavior Analysis" in the *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, became significant in improving behavior outcomes for individuals with disabilities (Sugai, Palmer, & Hagan-Burke, 2000). Through their research it was revealed that behaviors are directly related to environmental events and are predictable (Dunlap & Lutzker, 2008).

A behavior is functionally related to consequent events that follow the behavior according to Skinner's operant learning theory (Gresham, 2004). Sasson and Austin (2002) offered strong theoretical support for a comprehensive view and systematic approach of behavior assessment and intervention and stated "if behavior is a function of the interaction between an organism and its environment, and environment components have interdependencies amongst them, then logic would state that a complete view of

behavior and its determinants requires an analysis of all variable in the performance system" (p. 37).

IDEA, IDEIA, and No Child Left Behind

In December of 2004 the IDEA was again amended and reauthorized by Public Law 108-446. Final regulations were published and became effective in 2006 and are known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) of 2004. Although IDEIA was finalized in 2006, it has received relatively little attention in the field of education research. While IDEIA was based on the laws of IDEA, there are significant differences. Murphy's Education website (http://www.msdaz.org/espweb/IDEA97_2004.htm) provides a comparison of IDEA and IDEIA. For example, IDEA focused on the process for determining eligibility, whereas IDEIA focuses on the results for determining eligibility. IDEA was a "wait-to-fail" model, i.e., waiting until failure occurred, that focused on compliance, while IDEIA is an early intervention model that focused on student achievement. IDEA was considered a dual system that lacked validity in methods of identification; but IDEIA is a unified single system that has rigorous, scientifically based identification methods. The provisions concerning behavior and functional behavior assessments were upheld in the reauthorization and IDEIA 2004 mandates that school districts provide trained professionals to conduct functional behavior assessments and teacher training for functional behavior assessments. Each state's department of education is to assist school districts with providing professional development, in-service training, and technical assistance for school personnel who conduct functional behavior assessments.

Academic standards set by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 and concerns about high stakes testing, functional assessments, access to general education, adequate yearly progress, and increased parent involvement add to the need for collaboration between special education and general education teachers (Neel, 2006). While meeting the academic needs of students with behavior problems, teachers need to consider the mandates of IDEIA and NCLB and the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports in the development, review, and revision of Individualized Education Plans (IEP) for special education students whose behavior impedes their learning or the learning of others. According to Nelson, Roberts, Rutherford Jr., Mathur, and Aaroe (1999), a functional behavior assessment is required when a student with a disability is subject to school discipline proceedings. Section 615(k) (1) (b) (I) of the IDEIA statute states:

> Either before or not later than 10 days after taking disciplinary action described in subparagraph (A)...if the local education agency did not conduct a functional behavior assessment and implement a behavioral intervention plan for such child before the behavior that resulted in the suspension described in subparagraph (A), the agency shall convene an IEP meeting to develop an assessment plan to address the behavior (IDEIA).

IDEA requirements to implement positive behavior support and to conduct functional behavior assessments to address behavior problems became a starting point for addressing problem behaviors in the general education setting in addition to the special education setting. The need for important developments in special education has been fueled by an overrepresentation of minority students. The process used to determine

students eligible for special services has been scrutinized through litigation (Larry P. v. Riles 1979; Marshall et al. v. Georgia, 1984) resulting in procedural modifications as well as definition changes in disability categories (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1997). The Larry P. v. Riles case established a legal precedent that tests administered to minority children must have been validated for use with a similar population. Furthermore, the court held that IQ tests were culturally biased against African American children and banned schools in the state of California from using them when evaluating black children for special education and required the use of a more appropriate evaluation for determining eligibility for special education services. In the Marshall et al. v. Georgia (1984) case, overrepresentation of African American students in Educable Mental Retardation (EMR) programs and procedures for determining eligibility were the focus of the court's ruling. In this case, overrepresentation of African American students in EMR programs was not found to be sufficient evidence of differential treatment when determining eligibility of African Americans for EMR programs. These cases established legal precedent that tests administered to minority children must have been validated for use with that population (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1997).

In order to produce positive school and life outcomes for all students, early intervention is essential because of the chronic nature of behavior problems (Cheney, Flower & Templeton, 2008). Researchers suggest that learning disabilities and behavior problems coexist and should be addressed in combination rather than in isolation (Stewart, Benner, Martella & Merchand-Martella, 2007).

Inclusion

Carr, Dunlap, Horner, Koegel, Turnbull, Sailor, et al. (2002) assert that the philosophy of Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is based on the principle of normalization and students with disabilities should have access to the same opportunities as others. Carr and his colleagues suggested that the principle of normalization is strongly influenced by social roles and conclude that "the normalization principle leads naturally to the principle of inclusion" (p. 5).

In keeping with NCLB requirements to provide special education students access to general education, a practice known as inclusion provides instruction in general education classes with the support of accommodations. Through inclusion, supplemental supports and accommodations are provided by the general education teacher; this allows students with disabilities to be placed in least restrictive environments (Giangreco, 1993). However, placing students with disabilities in the general education setting brings academic and behavior challenges. Therefore, varied support services are needed for the inclusion process to be beneficial. Crothers and Kolbert (2008) suggest teachers should use cooperative learning to increase acceptance of others in the general education classroom.

Class-Wide Peer Assisted Self-Management (CWPASM) is an intervention strategy used to increase on-task behaviors and appropriate use of social skills for an entire class while targeting students considered at-risk. Researchers indicate CWPASM revealed significant improvements in classroom behavior across all classes (Mitchem, Young, West, & Benyo, 2001).

Another evidences based strategy used for both students with and without disabilities at the elementary and secondary levels is Class-Wide Peer Tutoring (CWPT) (Bowman-Perrott, Greenwood & Tapia, 2007). According to Snell and Janney (2000) recent research has indicated that Class-Wide Peer Tutoring (CWPT) not only increased academic skills, but also built social skills among students with and without disabilities. According to Greenwood and Delquadri (1995) the Class-Wide Peer Tutoring (CWPT) was developed to improve academic performance with culturally diverse students in poor and educationally disadvantaged areas. In a review of strategies found to be effective in an alternative education setting, Tobin and Sprague (2000) found CWPT effective in preventing school failure. One modification of CWPT is Peer Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS). The PALS program has received positive reviews and is considered a best practice by the United States Department of Education Program Effectiveness Panel for Inclusion (Fuchs et al., 2001). The Program Effectiveness Panel (PEP) is the Department of Education's primary source for certifying and validating the effectiveness of educational programs and is most noted for focusing on measured effects of programs (Cook, 1991).

Another program that has had encouraging results in the area of inclusion is cross-age tutoring. According to Bond and Castagnera (2006) cross-age tutoring involves younger aged students being tutored by older students and may eliminate the need for the resource teacher to provide pull-out services. A developmentally disabled student with a first grade reading level was placed with a high school student as part of a cross-aged tutoring program. The results of this program revealed an increase in the students' self esteem as well as significant gains in her ability to decode written material (Bond &

Castagnera, 2006). Additional practices and strategies used to support inclusion include peer tutoring, where a student with higher ability is paired with a student of lower academic ability (Bond & Castagnera, 2006) and curriculum overlapping where students experience different outcomes through the context of shared activities from different curriculum areas (Giangreco, 1993).

Broussard and Northup (1995) and Lewis and Sugai (1996) were among the earliest researchers to examine the use of functional assessments with students with mild disabilities and students with behavior problems in inclusion (Doggett, Edwards, Moore, Tingstrom, & Wilcynski, 2001). Recent research examining the effects of assessment-based interventions for a socially withdrawn student with learning disabilities produced immediate marked improvements in behavior (Christenson, Young, & Merchant, 2007). The general education teacher conducting the intervention indicated the assessment-based intervention procedure was highly acceptable and practical and noted additional behavior improvements, including improved peer interactions and an increase in socially appropriate behaviors (Christensen, Young & Merchant, 2007).

Behavior Management Systems

One behavior management system adopted by schools to address discipline and violence problems is Unified Discipline. According to White (1996), Unified Discipline is an approach through which students are exposed to a plan of action that "unifies" attitudes, expectations, correction procedures and the roles of each team member. Traditionally, behavior management focused on students who engaged in high frequency or high-intensity problem behaviors and resources focused on identification, assessment, diagnosis, and development of individualized behavior supports or intervention attempts

to remediate problematic behaviors (Horner, Todd, Lewis-Palmer, Irvin, Sugai, & Boland, 2004). Schools that implement a Unified Discipline approach with clear roles and responsibilities and certain expectations for discipline should reduce inappropriate behavior over time. However, there have been indications that Unified Discipline has not been completely successful due to increases in office referrals and correction procedures being required at the administrative level (White, Algozzine, Audette, Marr, & Ellis, 2001).

While comparing the differences between schools in Japan and the United States, Bear, Manning and Shiomi (2006) found that students who refrained from exhibiting acts of violence which would have resulted in punitive punishment had the highest number of discipline violations. Furthermore, the authors suggested that emphasizing the rules as well as the consequences of breaking those rules was the best strategy for promoting good responsible behavior in schools.

Teachers are given the task of teaching academics in addition to accommodating students with learning and behavior disabilities (Lewis & Sugai, 1999). The ever-evolving system of education continues to search for policies and practices that promote a safe learning environment for all students and teachers. The increased number of incidents of students exhibiting serious behavior problems in the United States demands the efforts of national and state departments of education and local school districts to develop systems to address behavior problems and to prepare personnel to better manage those behavior problems (White, Algozzine, Audette, Marr, & Ellis, 2001).

Positive Behavior Support

Positive behavior support is a general term that refers to the application of positive behavioral interventions and systems to attain socially appropriate behavior (Horner & Sugai, 2000). Positive behavior support is defined as a "systematic approach to enhancing the ability of schools to adopt and sustain the use of effective practices for all students" (Lewis & Sugai, 1999. p. 4).

According to Lewis and Sugai (1999) the six necessary elements for effective school-wide behavior support systems are (1) a purpose statement, (2) set expectations, (3) a system of encouraging expected behaviors, (4) a system for discouraging inappropriate or problematic behaviors, (5) a system for monitoring the implementation and (6) a system for documenting progress of those procedures. Other researchers such as McCurdy, Mannella and Eldridge (2003) have updated Lewis and Sugai's 1999 definition of positive behavior support and describe it as "a general term that refers to the application of positive behavioral interventions and strategies, including the use of functional behavior assessment and antecedent manipulation, to effectively address the individuals with serious and chronic problem behavior" (p. 166). In an overview of positive behavior supports, Trussell (2008) suggests positive behavior support systems are designed to create environments that support social outcomes and reduce problematic behavior. In order to help teachers establish and maintain safe school environments, school districts have established school-wide positive behavior support (SWPBS) systems. George Sugai and Terrence Scott are considered leading experts in the field of behavior management and for the most part the area of positive behavior support. The positive behavior support model has made significant contributions in understanding and

managing problematic behaviors within the classroom as well as creating a positive school environment to promote student learning (Blood & Neel, 2007). Sugai suggests that school-wide positive behavior support systems are necessary if schools are going to be academically, socially, and physically safe for students and teachers.

In a research synthesis, Carr, Horner, Turnbull and colleagues (1999) found characteristics that define positive behavior support refer to two types of interventions, stimulus-based interventions (e.g., prompting procedures and choice options) and reinforcement–based interventions which utilize strategies that increase the probability of a behavior occurring (e.g., social skills, independent living skills and self-management of behavior skills) (Carr et al., 1999). Carr et al. (1999) stated that positive behavior support involves not only changing the individual who exhibits inappropriate or problematic behavior, but also changing the system used to manage behaviors. Furthermore, stimulus-based and reinforcement-based interventions cause changes in how people with disabilities are responded to by others.

In their Handbook of School Violence and School Safety, Sprague and Horner (in press) suggested that the data-based decision making focus of SWPBS will produce extremely effective interventions and provide accurate information about student behavior. Furthermore, they suggest a multi-tiered level of support can provide interventions for students with at-risk and antisocial behavior.

Researchers at the University of Oregon (Sprague, Sugai & Walker, 1998; Sugai, Lewis-Palmer & Hagan-Burke, 1999-2000), along with others, tested the effectiveness of SWPBS techniques in promoting a positive school climate, reducing problematic behaviors and placing emphasis on positive proactive strategies for identifying and

teaching appropriate student behavior. The focus is on creating school-wide, classroom, and individual behavior plans to improve the overall learning environment.

SWPBS has been found to be a systematic and effective approach to improving student behavior for both general education and special education students. Freeman et al. (2006) defined the SWPBS as including "data-based strategies for supporting all students along a continuum of need and intensity based on a three-tiered model of prevention" (p. 4) with the basic idea of the model being effective preventive interventions at primary, secondary and tertiary levels.

As early as 1993, Colvin and Kame'enui stated that one assumption of managing and changing problematic behavior in general education was through punishment and that school discipline programs utilize penalties such as loss of privileges, suspensions, corporal punishment, and expulsion. In setting school-wide behavior rules and expectations through positive behavior supports, schools should identify target behaviors and develop replacement behaviors to indicate what the expected behavior should be. The replacement behavior can then be integrated into the social skills curriculum (Lewis & Sugai, 1999). Instructing students in appropriate behavior must be combined with procedures for reinforcing appropriate behaviors (Warren et al., 2006). Furthermore, praise and acknowledgement of good behavior may be combined with token economy systems or prizes to provide incentives for positive behavior (Lewis & Sugai, 1999). Warren et al. (2006) asserted that an essential part of school-wide positive behavior support is the collection of data which determines the effectiveness of or the need to modify the current intervention. Positive behavior support has been successfully adapted by schools with reports of substantial decreases in antisocial behavior, decreases in

disciplinary referrals and after-school detentions as well as significant increases in prosocial behavior (Warren et al., 2006). Additionally, a higher degree of teacher satisfaction with a rise in family attendance to school events (because of more positive communications between teachers and family members) was reported within two to three years of school-wide positive behavior support being implemented (George, White & Schlaffer, 2007).

While measuring the impact of positive behavior support as it relates to social validity, Kincaid, Knoster, Harrower, Shannon, and Bustamante (2002) formed a consortium to study positive behavior support systems. Originally funded through the Office of Special Education Programs, the Tri-State Consortium for Positive Behavior Support (TSCPBS) provided well established positive behavior support training and technical assistance and functioned as an outreach program for school districts in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Virginia. Members of this consortium provided evaluations of behavior outcomes for students with challenging behaviors to several hundred school districts located throughout the three states. The Behavior Outcomes Survey examined the team members' perceptions of the efficacy of positive behavior support which revealed that the strategies worked well in decreasing problem behaviors and increasing socially acceptable skills (Kincaid et al., 2002).

Williams and Reisberg (2003) discussed the process of combining the two approaches of teaching the academic curriculum and teaching social skills to better meet the needs of students in general education. For example, teaching social skills would be included in daily instruction with academic subjects as an add-on.

A study by Coie and Krehbiel (1984) was one of the first to examine hypothetical models concerning the relationship between academic and social behavior problems. Their research suggested it is possible to deal with social problems by having students focus on successful performances, by reducing opportunities for disruptive behavior. Furthermore, students receiving interventions combining treatments for reading difficulties and behavior problems may need longer treatment periods to be determined truly effective (Lane, 1999).

In a case study of the school-wide positive behavior support model McCurdy, Mannella, and Eldridge (2003) sought to determine if an escalation of antisocial behavior can be prevented. In their Key-to-Success project, the leadership team was comprised of behavioral consultants from a local behavioral health care group and school–based professionals serving approximately 500 culturally diverse students in grades K through 5. Behavioral consultants provided training on the positive behavior support model and classroom management skills. The team established rules, implemented behavioral interventions with motivational rewards and correction procedures teaching replacement behaviors, and developed a parental support component. Two years after the project started, overall office referrals substantially decreased, and more importantly, there was a significant reduction in student fighting.

In researching school-wide behavior, Horner et al. (2004) suggested that the foundation of school-wide positive behavior support is based on two assumptions. The first assumption is that appropriate behavior can be developed and encouraged when students are given a clear set of expectations and teachers enthusiastically teach, as well as consistently acknowledge and reward, appropriate behaviors. The second assumption

is that peer interactions influence behavior as much as or more than adult-student interactions. Through these procedures, research has indicated that schools participating in the positive behavior support system report up to a sixty percent reduction in office referrals as well as improvements in the social climate and students' academic performance.

Sugai and fellow researchers developed the School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET; Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner, 2001), a 28-item researched-based observation and interview instrument that measures the implementation of school-wide positive behavior support procedures. Preliminary research gathered from schools that implemented the school-wide positive behavior support system have encouraged further research efforts focusing on school climate, defining relationships between student behavior and student achievement, and reducing violent and disruptive behaviors (Horner, Todd, Lewis-Palmer, Irvin, Sugai, & Boland, 2004). School-wide positive behavior support makes social expectations applicable to all students often with tangible rewards for appropriate behavior exhibited by all students (Sailor, Stowe, Turnbull III & Kleinhammer-Trammill, 2007).

Researchers of the School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) indicate that there are some negative aspects such as the fact that evaluators require six to eight hours of training, administration and scoring can take an additional four to six hours per school and evaluators must have access to students, staff and administrators. Furthermore, schools can score eighty percent on the SET without having many of the critical features of the school-wide PBS. Finally, the information gathered through the SET contains more information about products and participant knowledge rather than information that could

help schools improve their programs (Horner, Todd, Lewis-Palmer, Irvin, Sugai, & Boland, 2004). School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) has gained national attention in the United States as a means for responding to mandates to make schools violence-free environments (Horner & Sugai, 2000).

Carr et al. (1999) concluded that one-half to two-thirds of positive behavior support systems produce successful outcomes. But, Durand and Rost (2005) caution that it is important to consider the participants in positive behavior support studies and researchers should include descriptions of how participants were selected and indicate if participants dropped out of their research. The SWPBS system provides a promising approach for standards-based education reform by including social-behavior standards and by implementing behavior intervention strategies for securing a positive outcome (Sailor, Stowe, Turnbull III, & Kleinhammer-Trammill, 2007).

Schools respond differently to providing school-wide positive behavior support and additional research is needed to establish outcomes of a varied number of intervention techniques. Interventions can provide support for a student with at-risk and antisocial behavior. SWPBS techniques have been effective in promoting a positive school climate and reducing problem behaviors with positive results (Sprague, Sugai & Walker, 1998; Sugai & Horner, 1999).

Alternative Schools

In other attempts to address the challenging behaviors of some students, many school districts have established alternative schools. For instance, in Mississippi Senate Bill No. 2003 amended Section 37-151-83, Mississippi Code of 1972 on July 1, 2003 and provided funds for alternative school programs established under Section 37-13-92. The

Mississippi Code provides policies and guidelines for the state of Mississippi's alternative programs, which serve all students who are expelled or in danger of being expelled.

Alternative school is defined by Raywid (1994) as an educational setting for students with discipline problems, students behind grade level, students who have not found academic success or students who have truancy or attendance problems. Alternative programs normally serve students from sixth to twelfth grade, however lower grades may benefit (Raywid, 1994).

Tobin and Sprague (2000) refer to alternative education as "nontraditional educational services, ranging from separate schools for students who have been expelled to unique classes offered in a general education school building" (p.178). Tobin and Sprague's research suggests that the lower ratio of students-to-teachers and reduced class size create positive settings for addressing challenging behaviors of the alternative school students. Alternative education has gained increased acceptability and respectability for addressing the issues of NCLB and the IDEIA (2004) allowing students exhibiting challenging behaviors to be expelled and still educated (Gable, Bullock, & Evans, 2006).

Raywid (1994) described alternative education as having three categories. Type I or popular innovations which resemble magnet schools and offer some form of a choice system. Type II or last-chance programs are designed for the disruptive students and focus on behavior modification. Type III or remedial focus programs are designed to academically and socially rehabilitate or remediate students and prepare them to return to the traditional school environment. Just as effective teachers develop additional skills when working with alternative students in addition to developing the knowledge of the

curriculum to include effective behavior intervention strategies, general and special education teachers must also continue to develop skills such as positive behavior supports (Foley & Pang, 2006).

Research examining the school climate in effective alternative programs suggests students were unsuccessful in the traditional realm because of academic and behavior problems which led to negative peer interaction as well as counterproductive interactions with teachers (Quinn, Poirer, Faller, Gable, & Tonelson, 2006). Tobin and Sprague's study (as cited in Quinn et al., 2006) established research-based strategies for alternative education programs with an emphasis on positive rather than punitive interventions for managing behaviors. A more important shift in behavior management has been an emphasis toward prevention of behavior problems and advancements school-wide in the use of the functional behavior assessments and the behavioral intervention plans designed for individual students (Horner, Todd, Lewis-Palmer, Irvin, Sugai, & Boland, 2004).

Functional Behavior Assessments

According to Sugai (2000) the functional behavior assessment is a process for identifying problem target behaviors and possible triggers that contribute to its occurrence and maintenance. Information gathered from the functional behavior assessment provides the needed components for developing the behavioral intervention plan. The functional behavior assessment may be used to identify target behaviors in observable terms that are measurable and easily understood. Furthermore, the critical dimensions such as topography (identifying features), frequency (number of times behaviors occur), duration (how long behaviors occur) and intensity (how strong or extreme behaviors are) must be determined in addition to a definition of the undesired

behaviors as well as possible replacement behaviors (Bullock & Gable, 1999). Steps in the functional behavior assessment process may include a summary statement (identifying problem behaviors, triggers, antecedents, maintaining consequences, and setting events); a collection of data (interviews or questionnaires) to confirm the accuracy of the summary statement; a competing pathways summary; a behavior support or intervention plan; implementation plans that specify who, what, when, and how the behavioral intervention plan is to be implemented; and a monitoring plan to assess the effectiveness and implementation of the behavioral intervention plan (Sugai, Lewis-Palmer & Hagan-Burke, 2000).

When properly implemented, the functional behavior assessment includes the IDEA 1997 requirements such as focusing on the needs rather than a diagnosis, implementing behavioral interventions, the use of assessments conducted over time rather than a single moment in time or pre-post measurement strategies and the use of various measures to assure procedural safeguards of assessment be addressed (Nelson, Roberts, Rutherford Jr., Mathur, & Aaroe, 1999). Furthermore, IDEIA (2004) requires general education teachers to assume some responsibilities in the decision making process by participating in the Individual Education Plan (IEP) meeting and by linking annual goals and objectives to the general education curriculum (Gable & Hendrickson, 1999). The functional behavior assessment process is applicable to any student who displays behavior problems, not just those with special education rulings. IDEIA amendments did not stipulate what should be included in the functional behavior assessment: in fact, as Bullock and Gable (1999) noted it would be considered inappropriate and difficult to mandate specific strategies since the functional behavior assessment is considered a

process that includes any number of strategies and techniques to gain an understanding of the functions of student behavior (Bullock & Gable, 1999).

Researchers at the University of Oregon have developed a way to evaluate the technical adequacy of the functional behavior assessment interview measure by utilizing the Functional Assessment Checklist: Teachers and Staff (FACTS; March, Horner, Lewis-Palmer, Brown, Crone, Todd, et al., 2000). The FACTS consists of two segments, Part A and B, and takes approximately ten to twenty-five minutes to complete. Determining factors of the FACTS are the informant's knowledge and complexity of the behavior. In Part A, problem behaviors are identified by the respondent as well as determining events that were associated with the target behavior(s) while Part B focuses on specific target behavior routinely identified in Part A. Providing some indication of the social validity of the FACTS, school personnel recommended the FACTS interview, because it was easy and required little effort (McIntosh, Borgmeier, Anderson, Horner, Rodriguez, & Tobin, 2008).

The functional behavior assessment process also comes with some obstacles that should be addressed: for example, the assessment can be complicated and time-consuming. As Gable and Hendrickson (1999) state, the use of the functional behavior assessment should have more positive results with regard to strategies in dealing with problematic behaviors, while on the other hand through school policies and procedures, the school district has placed the responsibility of problematic behaviors on to the student and his or her family, which conflicts with the disciplinary provisions of IDEIA. Other obstacles noted by Gable and Hendrickson (1999) include the lack of studies conducted on the use of the functional behavior assessment in general education, limited knowledge

in the use of the functional behavior assessment in school settings, lack of proper training, insufficient resources, and conflicting educational policies and practices. When comparing the use of functional assessments in school settings, the majority were conducted in the special education setting while 83% reported functional assessments were conducted for students without disabilities in the general education setting (Ervin, Radford, Bertsch, Piper, Ehrhardt, & Poling, 2001).

When considering functional behavior assessments, it is the administrator's role to develop building level practices and a flexibility of structure in order to provide leadership that supports the development of functional behavior assessments and support behavioral intervention plans. Furthermore, administrators should be willing to develop proactive discipline procedures rather than reactive strategies to address behavior problems (Conroy & Clark, 1999).

Although the process is still evolving, literature supports the use of functional behavior assessment as the basis for designing and implementing behavioral interventions, and suggests that an assessment-based intervention would be more effective (Ervin, Radford, Bertsch, Piper, Ehrhardt, & Poling, 2001). Because the focus is on the individual factors linking assessment to intervention, the functional assessment has the ability to impact research in the areas of successful behavioral interventions and the implementation of strategies that positively effect behavior outcomes in real settings (DuPaul, 2003). One study examining the relationship between problem behavior using self-management techniques and frequency of teacher praise revealed that teachers need to develop effective strategies for self-management programs (Mitchem, Young, West, & Benyo, 2001). The use of the functional behavior assessment in general education was

used to design an effective behavioral intervention plan (Todd, Horner & Sugai, 1999). Furthermore, Ervin et al. (2001) conclude that the use of a functional assessment may be the simplest procedure for gathering useful information for behavioral intervention planning.

Behavioral Intervention Plans

Behavioral intervention plans are developed for individual students from functional behavior assessment information in both general and special education settings. When considering behavioral interventions, the best time to intervene with problematic behavior is while the behavior is not occurring so inappropriate behavior is prevented from reoccurring (Carr, Dunlap, Horner, Koegel, Turnbull, Sailor, et al., 2002).

A study conducted by Ellingson et al. (2000) researched the effectiveness of behavioral intervention plans when they were developed based on functional behavior assessment findings and behavior plans not based on information collected from a functional behavior assessment. The results indicated that the non-function-based behavioral intervention plans were not as successful as the function-based behavioral intervention plans (Ellingson, Miltenberger, Stricker, Galensky, & Garlinghouse, 2000). Ellingson's study was replicated by Ingram, Lewis-Palmer and Sugai (2005) and their results strongly support the value of conducting a functional behavior assessment and using the data gathered to design the behavioral intervention plan. Furthermore, their research indicates that descriptive functional behavior data are essential in enhancing positive outcomes and reducing behavior problems in general and special education. For example, function-based interventions have produced positive outcomes in increasing on-

task behavior in a student with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (Stahr, Cushing, Lane & Fox, 2006).

Killu, Weber, Derby and Barretto (2006) conducted an investigation of resources developed and distributed by state education agencies (SEAs) and compared the information concerning standard practice for developing a behavioral intervention plan. Results revealed that seventy-three percent of the states indicated a functional behavior assessment should have been conducted prior to developing a behavioral intervention plan and replacement behaviors or teaching alternative skills should be addressed by that plan. Features of a behavioral intervention plan include the student's perception of communication with peers and adults, how the student transitions from one place to another, if the student is capable of predicting the schedule of events throughout the school day, how the student views his or her choice options, how the student interacts socially, if the student participates in activities and if the student receives positive attention (Horner, Sugai, Todd, & Lewis-Palmer, 1999).

The administrators' role is essential when developing behavior support teams because they are able to make decisions concerning funding, resources, time management, and support (Scott, Anderson & Spaulding, 2008). Additional research conducted by Benazzi, Horner and Good (2006) comparing the efficacy of behavior plan developers revealed behavioral interventions developed by behavior specialists without the assistance of a team were not as positive as when the team and the behavior specialist worked together. Metzler, Biglan, Rusby and Sprague (2001) propose five key elements in designing and maintaining an effective intervention program, teaching replacement behaviors, reinforcing positive behaviors, communicating limited rules clearly, providing

consistent consequences, and providing ongoing monitoring to asses and change procedures if warranted. Other strategies suggested for an effective behavioral intervention plan include teaching replacement behaviors, manipulating antecedent events, manipulating consequences, eliminating setting events, and having procedures for responding to emergency or crises situations (Sugai, Lewis-Palmer & Hagan-Burke, 2000).

Schneider, Kerridge and Katz (1992) asserted that teachers may be resistant to interventions because they perceive them as requiring changes routine and instruction time. The purpose of their study was to examine teacher acceptability of psychological interventions with children with severe behavior difficulties in special hospital schools. Social learning theories such as coaching, modeling, and problem solving were compared with behavior modification techniques of time-out and token reinforcement, and traditional clinical treatments such as family therapy, pharmacotherapy and play therapy. Their findings suggested that special education teachers may advocate behavioral interventions more than general education teachers because they encounter more behavior problems on a daily basis. Furthermore, teacher acceptability of interventions indicated teachers may be more willing to implement interventions for aggressive students because they interrupt the learning environment whereas socially withdrawn students are unnoticed (Schneider, Kerridge & Katz, 1992).

One systematic process for finding and eliminating problems with behavioral interventions is the Behavior Intervention Troubleshooter (BIT) which is designed to ensure interventions are implemented utilizing solid classroom fundamentals. In accordance with Witt, VanDerHeyden and Gilbertson (2004) the BIT provides

troubleshooting to improve the effectiveness of interventions and classroom behavior management procedures. The BIT is a checklist that focuses on defining the problem, classroom instruction and behavior management, integrity of the intervention and intervention design. Once the checklist is completed, recommendations are provided to eliminate or resolve the problem which will increase the effectiveness of the intervention based on outcomes (Witt, VanDerHeyden & Gilbertson, 2004). Furthermore, in attempts to maintain treatment integrity an intervention plan should indicate a beginning date, review date, clearly stated intervention steps, persons providing the intervention steps, where and how often interventions will occur, and who will monitor progress (Cochrane & Laux, 2007).

In attempts to better target problem behaviors, many elementary schools have implemented the Check In – Check Out (CICO) system which consists of strategies for increasing structure and providing feedback utilizing a daily behavior report card. Targeted behaviors, reinforcers, and consequences are identified through a functional behavior assessment. Several studies found that teachers and staff reported that CICO interventions decreased behavior problems, increased appropriate behaviors, were easily implemented, and that they would highly recommend CICO to other schools (Filter et al., 2007; Todd, Campbell, Meyer & Horner, 2008).

Curriculum-Based Measurement

According to Deno and his colleagues, the Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM) method utilizes concepts of the behavior assessment for assessing academic competence and growth (Deno, Fuchs, Marston & Shin, 2001). CBM was originally developed to assess the effectiveness of an intervention model used in special education.

This model was called data-based program modification (DBPM) (Deno, 2003). In a later study comparing teacher referral models with CBM, Marston, Mirkin and Deno (1984) found that student behavior had an influence on the teachers' decision to refer a student for discipline problems and that referrals using the CBM method produced fewer referrals from female students with behavior problems than did the teacher referral model.

The curriculum-based measurement method consists of a set of standardized procedures in which the reliability and validity have been achieved through standardized observational procedures, what and how skills are measured, instruction materials are obtained through local schools, samples are repeated across time and it is considered time efficient as well as easy to teach (Deno, 2003). The CBM literature established the needed link between assessment and instruction and provides additional support for the relationship between behavior problems that may impede student learning (Deno, 2003). However, there is little research supporting the use of CBM from the perspective of behavior assessment and one can not effectively evaluate the effects of behavioral interventions in the classroom by evaluating generalization effects (Ardoin, Roof, Klubnick & Carfolite, 2008).

Few studies have been conducted evaluating curriculum-based measurements in reading from a behavior assessment perspective. In their research conducted on evaluating curriculum-based measurement in reading (CBM-R) Ardoin et al. (2008) suggest that because behavior is more situation-specific, the same psychometric theories used in curriculum-based measurement can not be applied. According to Ardoin et al. (2008) the effects of interventions targeting classroom behavior should not be evaluated

only by evaluating generalization effects. "Generalizations do not occur naturally and it is likely that generalization effects will require longer to appear than schools allot for evaluating intervention effects" (p. 44). However, the curriculum-based measure is considered an alternative to traditional referral models for psychoeducational assessments for academic skills, using teacher complaints and disregarding assessment data is inadequate for a comprehensive assessment of a possible behavior disorder (Marston, Mirkin, & Deno, 1984). Although according to Vaughn and Fuchs (2006), there are volumes of research on CBM, progress monitoring, and interventions, little research is available providing guidance for implementing the Response to Intervention (RTI) model and broadening the RTI process to other areas from research to practice. Therefore, using CBM as an instrument to identify students at-risk for academic problems is more credible than to use CBM to evaluate students' response to instruction from a behavior assessment perspective within the Response to Intervention (RTI) model (Ardoin et al., 2008).

Response to Intervention

According to the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities (NRCLD) Responsiveness to Intervention (RTI) is typically a model for identifying students with disabilities (Fuchs, 2007). Also according to Fuchs (2007) RTI has also been utilized as a screening instrument to help educators prevent overrepresentation and inappropriate placements of students in special education. RTI is comprised of three tiers of instruction. Tier one is considered standard classroom instruction, tier two consist of small-group intensive instruction, and tire three includes more intense individual instruction (Samuels, 2006). Benefits of the RTI model include early identification of possible learning problems, related intervention, and a systematic screening process which reduces possible

teacher bias as well as variability in learning disability identification practices. Another benefit of RTI is connecting identification assessment with instructional planning (Fuchs, 2007). Response to intervention provides valuable data for school personnel to use when making decisions about teaching methods.

According to Ardoin, Witt, Connell and Koenig (2005) the Response to Intervention (RTI) model is a three-phase or three tier process consisting of academic or behavioral interventions which become more student-specific and more intense as each phase or tier is implemented. It is during this tiered process that schools conduct functional behavior assessments and begin to develop behavioral intervention plans for students in the general education setting. In the RTI model one element of positive behavior support is to provide classroom universal practices (tier one interventions) to reduce behavior problems and increase academic outcomes as well. Universal practices may include general classroom environment and setup (traffic patterns and access to classroom materials and equipment), procedures (filing work, student requests, and re-entering the classroom), and instructional interventions (giving directions/instruction, positive prompts, wait time, and feedback) (Trussell, 2008). The use of a multi-tiered response to intervention that depends on treatment validity evaluation procedures to determine positive or negative responses to intervention such as RTI is considered an improvement over current eligibility practices (Gresham, 2007).

According to Blood and Neel (2007) when addressing students with severe behavior challenges, the functional behavior assessment is the most common response recommended. However, the functional behavior assessment may also play a vital role in the Response to Intervention (RTI) Model by assessing students with behavior problems

in the general education setting that do not currently have an eligibility ruling. The functional behavior assessment provides important information that may be used in the tier process to provide successful behavioral interventions (Blood & Neel, 2007).

The previously used IQ-achievement discrepancy (IAD) model for identifying students with learning disabilities has been replaced by the Response to Intervention (RTI) model. This allows personnel responsible for evaluating students with suspected disabilities to use RTI interventions in making decisions to determine students eligible for possible placement within special education (Ardoin, Witt, Connell & Koenig, 2005).

More recently, according to Vaughn (2006), the response to intervention (RTI) model has been considered as a tool for identifying students who are underachievers and providing valuable data for diagnosing learning disabilities. Vaughn continues by stating that there is little compelling evidence to support the continued use of the discrepancy model utilizing intelligence testing with achievement testing to determine eligibility because it has both measurement and conceptual problems. A much more successful method for identifying possible behavior or learning problems consists of conducting assessment that utilizes on-going measurement of students' progress to the progress of the class as a whole and the modification practices used when students do not respond.

According to Fuchs and Fuchs (2006) RTI is used for implementing interventions early to address academic deficits rather than behavior difficulties. However, RTI has had positive outcomes with interventions increasing with intensity in addressing behavior issues (Samuels, 2006). The strategies utilized in the RTI model may be applied to the positive behavior support system in that it consists of a three tier process to address

behavior problems which includes conducting a functional behavior assessment and implementing behavioral intervention plans.

Stewart, Benner, Martella and Merchant-Martella (2007) imply that a practical method for addressing reading difficulties and behavior challenges at the same time may be an integrated systems approach. RTI could be considered effective not only for determining eligibility for learning disabilities but may be just as effective in identifying students that respond positively to all types of interventions and therefore may not require further intervention through special services (Cheney, Flower, & Templeton, 2008). One such example occurred at Cheyenne Mountain Middle School where the RTI model was implemented. Interventions at the tier-three level integrating behavior modification therapy with academic interventions report significant improvements in behavior and academics (Johnson & Smith, 2008). RTI appears to be effective in providing opportunities for students to do well rather than experience difficulties in general education classes.

A challenge presented by the RTI model when addressing behavior problems is that targeted behavior usually does not involve measurements for growth and therefore normative information used to define benchmark levels typically does not exist (Gresham, 2004). Gresham suggests that future researchers consider developing guidelines for determining responses to intervention techniques to meet such a challenge. The research base on RTI is expanding but there has been limited empirical work directed at studying RTI as it is implemented by school-based practitioners (Ardoin et al., 2005). One study conducted by Todd, Campbell, Meyer and Horner (2008) utilized the Check In-Check Out Program (CICO) with four elementary school-aged boys with behavior

problems. The results indicated that the use of CICO as a response to intervention was successful with an average of 17.5% reduction in problem behavior. This study contributes to the field by providing a formal demonstration of the effectiveness of CICO when used with some students as a Response to Intervention tool (Todd, Campbell, Meyer, & Horner, 2008).

Training

Koehler (1985) began investigating the existing research on preservice teacher education. Koehler's' research utilizing the ERIC search database categorized his studies into six categories. One of these areas was competencies and attitudes of practicing classroom teachers that reflect on their preservice teacher education. Other categories such as studies of the skills and competencies, evaluations of teacher education courses, methods within courses, or complete programs are also discussed. One area Koehler reports as lacking is the ability of the beginning teacher to assess the culture of the classroom and manage student behavior. Furthermore, Koehler states that regardless of preservice training it is questionable if beginning teachers would feel comfortable with their behavior management skills (Koehler, 1985). Koehler (1985) concludes his article by suggesting that "more work on conceptualizing the relationship between teacher preparation and teaching practice in order to provide goals and objectives which are possible to attain and have the potential to improve teaching" (p. 28).

Conducting functional behavior assessments require a certain amount of expertise within school district personnel. Conroy and Clark (1999) propose that district-level administrators require a more global understanding of the FBA while the classroom teacher is required to have more specific skills in order to conduct a FBA. According to

Conroy and Clark (1999) these levels are divided into global knowledge, specific knowledge and in-depth knowledge and skills. Global knowledge is required of district-level administrators who make policy decisions based on regulations while specific knowledge is required of school-based administrators who will be directly involved in the FBA process. Finally in-depth knowledge and skills will be required of teachers and staff responsible for implementing the FBA process (Conroy & Clark, 1999). One critical feature of positive behavior support is training with the emphasis on interprofessional teams, including parents, teachers and support staff also referred to as teacher support teams. Furthermore for training to be successful, it should take place in a typical professional community neighborhood with emphasis on local training rather than university or formal workshop settings (Carr et al., 2002).

Research conducted by Nelson, Roberts, Rutherford, Mathur, and Aaroe (1999) indicates that special education administrators may be supportive of the use of functional behavior assessments, but they also believe that teachers may be unwilling and unaware of how to conduct functional behavior assessments or develop behavioral intervention plans. Conroy and Clark (1999) suggest that teachers need training in order to become confident in implementing FBAs and BIPs. Training should include how to define target behaviors, assessing behaviors, developing hypotheses statements based on those assessments, and designing and implementing behavioral intervention plans with supports identified through the FBA process (Conroy & Clark, 1999).

Some research findings suggest that teachers who have not received formal training in positive behavioral interventions and supports may resort to using traditional discipline strategies for behavior violations and are less likely to teach replacement

behaviors and reward students for meeting positive behavior expectations (Bradshaw, Reinke, Brown, Bevans, & Leaf, 2008). However, Ellingson, Miltenberger, Stricker, Galensky and Garlinghouse (2000) examined the ability of general education teachers to conduct functional behavior assessments and implement behavioral intervention plans. The results of their study revealed general education teachers without specialized training in conducting functional behavior assessments were able to conduct observations, identify antecedents and consequences.

Traditional education programs usually focus upon teaching basic academic curriculum and may not address other students who need to learn additional social skills (Williams & Reisberg, 2003). As Neel (2006) notes, special education teachers receive pre-service training focused on behavior management and social skills training while general education teachers receive pre-service training in teaching content knowledge in the general education curriculum. Killu (2008) states that both general education teachers and special education teachers have specific academic and behavior management skills that can benefit the other as well as all students and collaboration between the two groups is essential in order to meet the increasingly rigorous state and national standards in education. Many teachers find that their attempts to manage behavior does not produce the desired results, and teachers that assess and monitor students in the academic areas are not as prepared to assess student behavior (Killu, 2008).

When alternative schools have been successful in transitioning students back into general education, it is often due to effective use of behavior management training for staff (Henley, Fuston, Peter, & Wall, 2000). It is important for administrators and teachers to stay informed of best practices concerning behavior management, especially

in light of the placement of students with such varied needs placed in the alternative school (Menendez, 2007).

Teacher Attitudes and Beliefs

Researchers continue to examine the relationship between teachers' attitudes and beliefs and how they impact student learning. One of the most important features of teacher attitudes is belief in human value and having respect for others' views (Taddeo, 1977). For example, in the Cochrane and Laux study, teachers responded that they believed treatment integrity was important; however, documentation did not support or evidence those beliefs. Martin and Baldwin (1992) suggest that how teachers manage a classroom could change depending upon their beliefs concerning appropriate and inappropriate behavior.

A much earlier study conducted by Bain (1934) examined the attitudes of teachers toward behavior, the conclusions of that study implied that a student exhibiting inappropriate behavior receives teacher attention only after the behavior interferes with what the teacher is attempting to accomplish and incites a response that is aimed at the symptom rather than the cause. Bain's study also reports that the beliefs about problem behaviors are dependent upon societal values of behavior. In order to better address education reform, providers of preservice teacher education must investigate attitudes and beliefs of effective teachers and be willing to address those objectives in the curriculum (Koehler, 1985).

Research conducted by Bandura (1993) asserts that teachers will engage more readily in a task when they feel competent that they are able to execute the task successfully. Baker (2005) examined teacher self-efficacy and the beliefs teachers hold

about classroom management skills and their willingness to implement behavior techniques. Furthermore, Baker (2005) suggests that the areas that teacher reported the highest self-efficacy was in establishing rules for students and teachers reported high willingness to consult and collaborate with colleagues and administrators for support. However, one area where teachers reported low self confidence was when they were challenged by students with defiant and difficult behaviors (Baker, 2005). Abidin and Robinson (2002) examined variables that may influence teachers' decisions when referring a student for disciplinary action. Results indicated that teachers base their judgments on observed behavior rather than prejudiced ideas based on their personal attitudes or perception (Abidin & Robinson, 2002). While researching teachers' abilities to manage student behavior, Baker (2005) found "as a teacher's perceived self-efficacy increases, so does that teacher's ability, willingness, and readiness for managing challenging student behaviors"(p. 59).

Morin and Battalio (2004) suggest that a teacher's attitude about his or her profession and skill play a vital role in understanding and managing incidents of misbehavior. Students as well as teachers respond to reinforcement. When a teacher discovers a strategy that is successful it is likely to be used much more frequently. It is also evident that a strategy that is not successful will not be repeated (Morin & Battalio, 2004).

Glickman and Tamashiro utilized the Beliefs on Discipline Inventory to better identify teachers' thoughts concerning classroom management strategies. The Beliefs on Discipline Inventory is a self-administered, self-scored assessment instrument which assesses teachers' beliefs on discipline. Responses fall within the categories of Non-

Interventionists, Interactionists, and Interventionists. Non-interventionists are defined as believing that bad behavior is a result of unresolved inner conflict where as Interactionists believe that students learn good behavior as a result of encountering the outside world. Lastly, Interventionists believe that behavior is learned through a series of reinforcements and punishments (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980).

The Inventory on Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control (ABCC) was used in 1999 to assess differences between traditional and alternative certification teachers and classroom management styles. Analysis determined there was a significant difference in that teachers participating in the alternative certification plan scored more as interventionists in Instruction Management on the ABCC rather than as non-non-interventionists or interactionists (Martin & Soho, 1999).

Current investigations attempting to better develop and further validate the ABCC now titled ABCC-R, which measures teachers' beliefs toward classroom management styles. There are three components of the ABCC-R, instructional management, people management and behavior management. These components work together in guiding teachers' efforts in attaining appropriate classroom management practices in addition to instructional objectives (Martin, Yin, & Mayall, 2006).

While researching burnout among teachers Evers, Tomic and Brouwers (2004) measured teachers' competence in dealing with classroom behaviors as an element that may impact teachers' attitudes toward students that have behavior problems. The Coping with Disruptions Behavior Scale (CDBS) was utilized to address symptoms of teacher burnout. The results of this study indicated that the variable teachers' competence to cope with disruptive behavior was "a significant predictor" of the burnout dimensions of

emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishments (p. 141). Furthermore this study shows there are striking differences in perception between students and teachers with respect to dealing with disruptive behavior (Evers et al., 2004).

In research investigating classroom management and differences between pre-service and experienced teachers, Martin and Baldwin (1992) revised Tamashiro's Beliefs on Discipline Inventory and titled it the Inventory of Classroom Management Styles (ICMS). The ICMS consists of ten forced-choice items with the same categories of Non-Interventionists, Interactionists, and Interventionists. Results indicate that pre-service teachers are more likely to be categorized as non-interventionists while experienced teachers are more likely to be categorized as interventionists in classroom management styles (Martin & Baldwin, 1992).

Martin and Baldwin (1994) continued research studying beliefs about classroom management between novice and experienced teachers. Results revealed that novice teachers scored significantly higher as interventionists that experienced teachers. Martin and Yin (1997) conducted additional research exploring differences between male and female teachers' attitudes about classroom management using the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control (ABCC) formerly titled the Inventory of Classroom Management Styles. The ABCC Inventory consists of three subscales: instructional management, people management, and behavior management. Results found that males scored significantly higher on both the instructional management and behavior management subscales of ABCC (Martin & Yin, 1997).

In efforts to further improve the ABCC Inventory, Martin, Yin, and Baldwin (1998) researched possible variables impacting teachers' beliefs regarding classroom

management style. One variable in this research project was to investigate effects of classroom management training on teachers' attitudes and beliefs. Results indicated teachers who reported they received training in Assertive Discipline scored significantly more interventionists than those trained in Cooperative Discipline or teachers with no formal training in discipline (Martin et al., 1998).

Parent Involvement

In an attempt to identify factors that lead to successful relationships between the school and parents, Mapp (2002) interviewed eighteen parents about why and how they engage in their child's learning. Mapp's results indicate the most successful collaboration between school and parents occurs when school personnel welcome parents to school, respect and honor their contributions which cultivates sustained respect and meaningful relationships for parents, students, and school personnel. Other factors that influence parent involvement cited by Mapp include parents' own school experiences, work schedules, responsibilities for caring for other family members as well as transportation problems.

Richard Van Acker (2007) examines empirically validated intervention practices for addressing challenging behavior within the alternative setting and suggests individual interventions such as applied behavior analysis, cognitive-behavior methods and social development have produced positive outcomes. Van Acker suggests that emphases on interventions at the family level are particularly effective. One key factor in the alternative education student's success in achieving their General Education Development (GED) test was parent involvement (May & Copeland, 1998). Further research in May and Copeland's study suggest approximately one-third of the alternative

programs have opportunities for parent involvement and recommend school sites incorporate programs that foster positive relationships with peer groups, teachers, and families.

Parental involvement is included in all stages of the functional assessment and in the development behavior plans with the 1997 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) and in NCLB (2001). Parents have always been included as participants or team members in the development of their special education students' individualized education plan (IEP). Parents now have the added opportunity to participate in and provide vital information during pre-referral and eligibility meetings for students that are eligible for special services and those parents may also assist with planning positive behavioral interventions. Parents of students in the general education setting have the same opportunities to participate in their student's assessment and planning for behavioral interventions. Valuable information about a student's development, medical and educational history can be provided by the parent as well as any additional data required by the functional behavior assessment such as, rating behavior for attention levels or student's specific interest and reinforcers.

Lane (1999) suggests that interventions that involve parents are more effective than interventions that do not involve parent participation. Families are considered vital contributors in the application of functional behavior assessments and assessment-based intervention plans especially since they have observed, interacted with the student, and gained insights about behavior issues over a long period of time (Dunlap, Newton, Fox, Benito, & Vaughn, 2001).

Researching collaborations between home and school, Cox (2005) advises home-school collaborations help achieve positive and desired outcomes for student school related behavior problems. Furthermore, Cox's research provides strong support for effective behavioral interventions occurring in schools where parents and schools work together.

School leaders and policy makers should strongly consider parent involvement as an important variable because of its positive influence on student success (Feuerstein, 2000). Teacher satisfaction, parent-child communication as well as successful, effective school programs report improvements because of increase parent involvement (Skiba & Strassell, 2000).

According to Gable and Hendrickson (1999), teachers face many challenges and opportunities as schools struggle to address student discipline, revise current practices and attempt to create a learning environment with positive academic and behavioral supports. Raywid and Oshiyama (2000) suggested that teachers need to cultivate characteristics of acceptance when addressing student behavior and stated "it is reasonable to ask them (students) to accept that even behaviors we might abhor are motivated by the same needs that motivate our own behavior and that the needs, if not the manner in which we fulfill them, define the commonality among human beings" (p. 446).

Summary

Chapter II provided a theoretical framework on which to base the research and support the purpose of this study. Influences of changes in IDEA, IDEIA, and NCLB on assessing behavior were presented. Foundations of behavioral assessments and literature related to behavior management systems, functional behavior assessments, behavioral

intervention plans, response to intervention, teacher training, teacher attitudes and beliefs, and parent involvement as they relate to classroom management were discussed.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Chapter III provides information about the research design related to this study. The research questions and hypotheses associated with this study are outlined. Information about participants is provided as well as specific data collection, and statistical evaluation methods for analyzing data within this study. This study will investigate the training, attitudes and beliefs of general and special education teachers in dealing with behavioral interventions for general education students and special needs students in the general and special education classroom.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study will address the following questions

1. What is the amount of training teachers receive in conducting functional behavior assessments?
2. What is the amount of training teachers receive in classroom management?
3. What are teachers' attitudes and beliefs about classroom control in the areas of instruction management and people management?

Predictions regarding these research questions are described in the following hypotheses:

H1: There is a significant relationship between the amount of training, beliefs about behavioral interventions, beliefs and attitudes about classroom

control and the number of interventions at each RTI tier for general educators.

H2: There is a significant relationship between the amount of training, beliefs about behavioral interventions, beliefs and attitudes about classroom control and the number of students requiring behavioral intervention plans for special educators.

H3: There is a significant difference in the amount of training, beliefs about behavioral interventions, beliefs and attitudes about classroom control among general and special education teachers.

Sample

Participants of this study included special education (N = 30) and general education teachers (N =186) who teach kindergarten, 1st grade, 2nd grade and 3rd grade students in three public school districts. Participants in this study were chosen because they teach in self-contained classrooms and were with the same group of students throughout the school day. Participants were recruited through a convenience or voluntary sample selection. The school districts chosen for this sample provided a good cross-section representative of schools with different percentages of free-reduced lunch, enrollments, and ethnicity, yet were similar in student-to-teacher ratio. Information about the school districts selected for this study was obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics website. Statistical information from each of the school districts regarding number of schools in each district, overall population, student-to-teacher ratio, number of black/white/Hispanic/American Indian/Alaskan Native/other students, and the

number of students receiving free or reduced lunch can be found in Table 1. All three school districts were geographically located in the central portion of a southeastern state.

Table 1

Demographics of School Districts

District	Schools	Student	S/T	Ethnicity					F/R
	K-12	Enrollment	Ratio	B	W	H	AI/AN	O	Lunch
District A	14	11,622	15.5	2,179	9,171	161	79	83	45.9%
District B	13	9,540	16.1	1,144	8,185	141	14	41	28.7%
District C	8	5,138	13.5	3,721	1,262	120	8	74	81.0%

Data Collection Procedures

Approval to conduct this study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Southern Mississippi (Appendix A). Request for permission to conduct this study was obtained from the superintendents of the public school districts (Appendix B). The researcher contacted the principal of each school and arranged a time to meet with the teachers. The researcher traveled to each individual school to administer and collect questionnaires. The researcher introduced herself and gave a brief description of the research project. The Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory-Revised (Appendix C), a demographic questionnaire (Appendix D) and consent document (Appendix E) were distributed by the researcher to certified special education and general education teachers teaching kindergarten through third grade within their respective schools. Informed consent was implied by teachers placing the completed

questionnaires in an envelope that was provided by the researcher. No teachers' names were associated with any survey completed.

Instrument

The instrument used in this researcher consisted of two parts. Part one, questions 1 through 18, included demographic information such as gender, certification areas, grade currently being taught, licensure, teaching experience, training received in classroom management, functional behavior assessments, and behavioral interventions, number of student taught that were classified as general education and special education, number of students in tier process, or who had behavioral intervention plans (Appendix D). Questions 13 through 18 were descriptive of teachers' beliefs about behavioral interventions. Part two was the Attitudes and Beliefs about Classroom Control-Revised (ABCC-R) Inventory developed by Nancy Martin (Appendix C).

The ABCC-R is "a multidimensional instrument designed to measure various aspects of teachers' beliefs and predispositions toward classroom management practices" (Martin, Yin, & Mayall, 2007). This instrument was used to survey the study sample. The instrument, originally a 48-item scale that measured instructional management, people management, and behavior management, was revised by the authors in 2007. The revision being used in this study consisted of 20 horizontal numeric scale format statements and two subscales: instructional management dimension and people management dimension. A four category response scale for each item was retained with responses of "describes me very well" was scored 4, "describes me usually" 3, "describes me somewhat" 2, "describes me not at all" 1. Scoring of several items was reversed. Items 1 through 10 measure the dimension, and items 11 through 20 measure the

instructional management dimension. A score for each sub-scale was determined by summing the responses of all items in that dimension. A broad range of classroom management practices and beliefs were addressed through the ABCC-R. When considering the subscales, the approval of an item indicated the degree of teacher control over students. High subscales scores were indicative of a more controlling, interventionist attitude while lower scores were considered a less controlling belief in the aspect of classroom management.

A study was conducted by Martin et al. (2007) to further refine the ABCC-R, its ability to measure the construct and report the factor structure and concurrent validity of the revised version of the Attitudes and Beliefs of Classroom Control (ABCC-R) instrument.

> Internal consistency coefficients for each sub-scale in the ABCC-R were calculated for the total sample and separately by level of certification gender, and years teaching experience. Cronbach's alphas exceed .70 in the instructional management and people management subscales. The reliability coefficients for different levels of certification, gender and years teaching experience were all above.70 for the instructional management and people management subscales with one exception. At the item level, the corrected item to total coefficients all exceeded .30 in the instructional management and people management subscales. The mean inter-item correlations were .24 and .23 for the instructional management and people management subscales, respectively (Martin, Yin & Mayall, 2007).

Permission to use this instrument was given by author, Nancy Martin, the University of Texas at San Antonio (Appendix F).

Analysis of Data

Descriptive statistical analysis was used to answer the research questions.

1. What is the amount of training teachers receive in conducting functional behavior assessments?
2. What is the amount of training teachers receive in classroom management?
3. What are teachers' attitudes and beliefs about classroom control in the areas of instructional management and people management?

Regression analyses were used to address hypotheses 1, 2 and 3. Independent variables include amount of reported training, and attitudes and beliefs about classroom control (instructional management and people management subscale scores); the dependent variable is the number of RTI interventions (H1); the dependent variable is the number of behavioral intervention plans (H2).

H1: There is a significant relationship between the amount of training, beliefs about behavioral interventions, beliefs and attitudes about classroom control and the number of interventions at each RTI tier for general educators.

H2: There is a significant relationship between the amount of training, beliefs about behavioral interventions, beliefs and attitudes about classroom control and the number of students requiring behavioral intervention plans for special educators.

H3: There is a significant difference in the amount of training, beliefs about behavioral interventions, beliefs and attitudes about classroom control among general and special education teachers.

Summary

In this chapter the researcher described the research design of this study. The research questions and hypotheses were presented. Information about participants was provided with data collection procedures and statistical methods for data analysis used within this study. A review of the instrumentation and various subscales was given. Variables for this study were discussed such as teacher training, attitudes and beliefs of general and special education teachers in dealing with behavioral interventions and classroom management for general education students and special needs students in the general and special education setting.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

Chapter IV describes the results of the study. Factors examined were the amount of teacher training received in behavior management, functional behavioral assessments, and behavioral intervention plans, teachers' attitudes and beliefs about behavioral interventions and classroom control with kindergarten through third grade teachers in general and special education settings. This chapter provides descriptive information for the research questions and statistical results of the statistical tests used for each hypothesis. Participants of this study were 216 special education and general education teachers who teach kindergarten, 1st grade, 2nd grade and 3rd grade students in three public school districts. Participants in this study were chosen because they teach in self-contained classrooms and were with the same group of students throughout the school day. Participants were recruited through a convenience or voluntary sample selection. The school districts chosen for this sample provide a good cross-section representative of schools with different percentages of free-reduced lunch, enrollments, and ethnicity, yet are similar in student-to-teacher ratio. Information about the school districts selected for this study was obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) website. The Statistical Program for Social Sciences (SPSS) 15.0 was used to analyze data.

Data Analyses

Demographic Data

The demographic characteristics of the general and special education teachers participating in the study were obtained from the completed questionnaires. The demographical information was asked in questions 1-8. The data were analyzed according to a) gender, b) class taught, c) current grades taught, d) licensure, e) license class, f) areas of endorsement, g) years of teaching experience, and h) number of years teaching at current school.

The data revealed that 4 (1.9%) of the respondents were male and 212 (98.1%) were female. The number of respondents who taught special education was 21 (4.2%), general education 186 (86.1%), and 9 (4.2%) inclusion. The number of teachers who reported having administrative licensure was 3 (1.4%). The number of teachers reported having obtained licensure through the alternative route was 5 (2.3%). The majority (n = 211; 97.7%) reported having obtained licensure through the teacher certification route. More than half (n =119; 55.1%) of the respondents reported their highest level of education was a Bachelor's degree with 93 (43.1%) reporting a Master's degree and 4 (1.9%) reportedly obtaining a Specialist's degree.

Question 6 asked about specific certification and areas of endorsement. The teachers who responded to this item indicated endorsement certification in the areas of elementary education (n =81; 37.5%), elementary and secondary education (n = 80; 37.0%), and special education certification (n = 21; 9.7%); 34 participants (15.7%) did not list an area of endorsement. Additional areas of endorsement were Reading (n = 59; 27.3%), Language arts and English (n =10; 4.6%), Math (n = 4; 1.9%), Science (n = 15;

6.9%), other academic content (n = 24; 11.1%), other non-academic content (n =10; 4.6%), and National Board Certification (n = 3; 1.4%).

Questions 7 and 8 asked about the total number of years of teaching experience and the total number of years of experience at the current school. The total number of years of teaching experience ranged from 3 months to 36 years with a mean of 13.08 years. Total number of years of teaching experience at the current school ranged from .25 to 33 years with a mean of 5.9 years. There were 35 (16.3%) teachers who reported 3 years or less of teaching experience; 7 (3.2%) reported 28 years of experience. Forty-four (20.4%) teachers reported being at their current school 1 year or less and 23 (10.6%) reported that they had been teaching at their current school for exactly 9 years.

Teacher responses indicated that 125 (57.9%) received training in behavioral intervention plans 76 (35.2%) reported having received no training and 13 (6.0%) indicated that they did not know if they had received training in behavioral intervention plans. Teacher responses also indicated 71 (32.9%) received training in 1-2 workshops through local school district staff development; 16 (7.4%) received training in graduate courses, 41 (19.0%) received training undergraduate courses, 16 (7.4%) received training in undergraduate courses with a behavior component, and 18 (8.30%) receiving training in out-of-school staff development.

Survey questions 12A – F related to number of general education and special education, class size, number of students on Tiers 1, 2, and 3 and behavioral intervention plans. Reportedly there were 202 general education students and 153 special education students. Average class size for general education students was 18.9 and 2.5 for special education students as reported by general and special education teachers. Of the 202

general education students, teachers reported 7 students in Tier 1, 1 student in Tier 2 and .2 students in Tier 3. Total number of students reported with behavioral intervention plans was 39. Of the 186 general education teachers 17 reported behavioral intervention plans for 22 students (1.2 per teacher). Among the 30 special education and inclusion teachers 7 reported a behavioral interventions plan for 17 students (2.4 per teacher). Behavior intervention plans may be implemented for students in both the general and special education setting.

Survey questions 13 through 18 were asked to ascertain teachers' beliefs about behavioral interventions. Teachers were asked to choose from a four-point scale and each item was scored 1-4 with corresponding response choices of *very untrue, untrue, true,* and *very true*. Higher scores represented more agreement with the survey statement.

Survey responses revealed that the majority of the respondents (n = 124; 57.9%) (M = 3.17) reportedly believed they were adequately prepared to manage challenging behaviors in the classroom. Teacher responses (n = 120; 55.6%) (M = 3.19) indicated that a majority believed they received support from their principal with behavior management with regard to time availability and decision making assistance. When asked if the teachers believed their principal supported behavioral interventions, 106 (49.1%) (M = 3.36) responded *true* and 97 (44.9%) responded *very true*. Teacher responses (n = 137; 63.4%) (M = 3.36) indicated a majority believed behavioral interventions were effective in decreasing problematic behaviors in the classroom. When asked about the importance of parent involvement in behavioral interventions, 167 (49.5%) teachers responded *very true*. In response to the follow-up question asking if teachers believed parents were

encouraged to participate in behavior intervention in their school, 107 (49.5%) teachers responded *true* and 92 (42.6%) indicated *very true*. See table 2.

Table 2

Beliefs about Behavioral Interventions

	M	*SD*	*Very Untrue*	*Untrue*	*True*	*Very True*
I believe I am adequately prepared to manage challenging behaviors in my classroom.	3.17	.65	1.4%	10.2%	57.9%	30.6%
I receive support from my principal with behavior management with regard to time availability and decision making assistance.	3.19	.74	5.1%	4.6%	55.6%	34.7%
I believe my principal supports behavior interventions.	3.36	.66	2.3%	3.7%	49.1%	44.9%
I believe behavior interventions are effective in decreasing problematic behaviors in my classroom.	3.36	2.8	.5%	8.8%	63.4%	26.9%
I believe parents are important partners in behavior interventions.	3.74	.51	.9%	.9%	20.8%	77.3%
I believe parents are encouraged to participate in behavior interventions in my school.	3.33	.64	.9%	6.9%	49.5%	42.6%

Findings Related to the Research Questions

This section examines three research questions and three hypotheses tested for the current study. The procedures utilized to test the research questions and hypotheses as well as the results of the statistical procedures are presented in this section. Data collected from the completed questionnaires and the ABCC-R are presented.

Descriptive statistical analysis was used to answer research questions 1, 2, and 3. Research questions 1 and 2 asked respondents to report the amount of training received specific to the area of functional behavior assessments and classroom management. Questions 9, 10, and 11 of the questionnaire were asked to determine the amount of teacher training received in behavior management/classroom control, functional behavior assessment, and developing behavioral intervention plans. Respondents were to respond by marking *yes, no,* or *don't know*. If the respondent answered *yes*, they were to indicate where they had received training from the following four choices: in an undergraduate college course, undergraduate college course with an embedded behavior assessment component, graduate course, staff development provided by the school district, and staff development out of school district. Respondents were then asked to mark how much training they had received ranging from *0, 1-2, 3 or more,* and *not sure.*

Research Question 1

What is the amount of training teachers receive in conducting functional behavior assessments?

Data Analysis for Research Questions 1

The teacher responses indicated 76 (35.3%) had received training in functional behavior assessments and 101 (46.8%) had received no training. Thirty-seven (17.1%) indicated that they did not know if they received training in functional behavior assessments. Teacher responses also indicated 50 (23.1%) received training in 1-2 courses through local school district staff development 37 (17.1%) received training in 1-2 undergraduate courses, 19 (8.8%) in 1-2 undergraduate courses with a behavior

component, 17 (7.9%) in graduate courses, and 13 (6.0%) received training in out-of-school staff development.

Research Question 2

What is the amount of training teachers receive in classroom management?

Data Analysis for Research Questions 2

Teacher responses indicated 207 (95.8%) received training in behavior management, 5 (2.3%) indicated they received no training and 4 (1.9%) indicated that they did not know if they had received training in behavior management. The teacher responses indicated 102 (47.2%) received training in behavior management in 1-2 undergraduate courses, 55 (25.5%) received training in 1-2 undergraduate courses with a behavioral component, 35 (16.2%) received training in a graduate course, 113 (52.3%) received training in 1-2 workshops provided through local school district staff development, and 46 (21.3%) reported receiving training in out-of-school staff development.

Research Question 3

What are teachers' attitudes and beliefs about classroom control in the areas of instructional management and people management?

Data Analysis for Research Questions 3

Responses from the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory – Revised (ABCC-R) were used to answer research question 3. Respondents were asked to choose from a four-point scale of agreement with the statement on the survey where each item was scored 1-4 with response choices of *describes me very well, describes me usually, describes me somewhat,* and *describes me not at all* so that the higher the score

the more agreement with the survey statement. Scoring for items 1 through 10 was reversed and they reflected the opposite of the attribute they measured. A score for each sub-scale was determined by summing the responses of all items for each of the two dimensions: 10 items for the instructional management dimension and 10 items for the people management dimension with the highest possible subscale score being 40 and the lowest possible subscale score being10 if a rating was marked for each item in that dimension. The instructional management dimension is reflective of how a teacher oversees the instructional environment in the classroom and the people management dimension is reflective of how a teacher attempts to develop relationships with students. High sub-scale scores were indicative of a more controlling, interventionist attitude while lower scores point to a less controlling belief in that aspect of classroom management. The results of this study revealed subscale scores in people management ranging from 13 to 39. There were 4 (1.9%) missing items for this subscale. The instructional management dimension revealed subscale scores ranging from 17 to 40. Missing items for this subscale was 6 (2.8%).

Research Hypothesis 1

There is a significant relationship between the amount of training, beliefs about behavioral interventions, beliefs and attitudes about classroom control and the number of interventions at each RTI tier for general educators.

Data Analysis for Research Hypothesis 1

A multiple regression was conducted to determine which independent variable (subscale scores of people management and instructional management, amount of training reported, and beliefs about behavioral interventions) was a predictors of total

Response to Interventions (RTIs). Regression results indicated an overall model of four predictors (subscales scores of people management, instructional management, amount of training reported, and beliefs about behavioral interventions) none were statistically significant in predicting the total number of RTIs, $R^2 = .086$, $R^2_{adj} = .039$, $F(4,77) = 1.81$, $p = .135$. The model accounted for 8.6% of variance in total response to interventions (RTIs). When considering the variables independently, none were statistically significant predictors of response to intervention totals. See table 3.

Table 3

Coefficients for Model Variables

	B	β	*t*	*p*	Bivariate r	Partial r
People management	-.113	-0.65	-.572	.569	-.046	-.065
Instructional management	.299	.191	1.72	.090	.217	.187
Training total	1.05	.136	1.21	.228	.147	.137
Beliefs behavioral interventions	.501	.125	1.11	.270	.173	.126

Research Hypothesis 2

There is a significant relationship between the amount of training, beliefs about behavioral interventions, beliefs and attitudes about classroom control and the number of students requiring behavioral intervention plans for special educators.

Data Analysis for Research Hypothesis 2

A multiple regression was conducted to determine which independent variable (subscale scores of people management and instructional management, amount of teacher

training reported, and beliefs about behavioral interventions) was a predictor of total number of behavioral intervention plans. Regression results indicated an overall model of four predictors (subscale scores of people management and instructional management, amount of teacher training reported, and beliefs about behavioral interventions) was not statistically significant in predicting the total number behavioral intervention plans, $R^2 = .037$, $R^2_{adj} = -.000$, $F(4,103) = .989$, $p = .417$. The model accounted for 3.7% of variance in behavioral intervention plan totals. See Table 4.

Table 4

Coefficients for Model Variables

	B	*β*	*t*	*p*	Bivariate r	Partial r
People management	.006	.048	.473	.637	.016	-.047
Instructional management	-.007	-.060	-.619	.537	.053	-061
Training total	-.071	-.184	-1.89	.061	-.177	-.183
Beliefs behavioral interventions	.008	.035	.353	.725	.012	.035

Research Hypothesis 3

There is a significant difference in the amount of training, beliefs about behavioral interventions, beliefs and attitudes about classroom control among general and special education teachers.

Data Analysis for Research Hypothesis 3

MANOVA was used to evaluate any differences in variables (subscale scores of people management and instructional management, amount of teacher training reported,

and beliefs about behavioral interventions) based on teacher type (general education, special education, and inclusion). Results indicate teacher type did not make a statistically significant difference in the combination of four variables, Wilks $\Lambda = .956$, $F(8,396) = 1.135$, $p = .338$ nor in any of the variables considered individually, beliefs about behavioral interventions $F(2,201) = 2.23$, $p = .110$, people management $F(2,201) = .023$, $p = .977$, instructional management $F(2,201) = 1.73$ $p = .179$, and training $F(2,201) = 1.08$, $p = .341$. A regression was conducted to determine if the dependent variable (teacher type) was equal across groups. When conducting tests between-subjects effects by combining inclusion teachers with special education teachers, the dichotomy between special education teachers and general education teachers did not make a difference in the overall outcome.

Summary

Chapter IV has provided a description of results of this study of general and special education teachers. Demographic information, factors concerning teacher training, teachers' attitudes and beliefs about behavioral interventions and classroom control of kindergarten through third grade teachers in the general and special education setting were analyzed. Results of the analysis of the data were provided for three research questions and three hypotheses using statistical procedures such as descriptive analyses and multiple regressions using the Statistical Program for Social Sciences (SPSS) 15.0.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Chapter 5 presents a summary of the research study and conclusions drawn from the data analyses. This chapter also presents a discussion that explores and explains the results of the conclusions of this study including limitations of the study. The final section of this chapter focuses on recommendations for policy and practice and future research. This study investigated teacher training, teachers' attitudes and beliefs about classroom control and beliefs about behavioral interventions for general and special education settings.

School administrators, teachers and parents are continually searching for techniques and methods to improve student behavior and reduce the number of office referrals for discipline problems. The reauthorization of IDEA 1997 compelled educators to focus on the relationship between instruction and discipline by requiring them to not only assess learning, but also gain greater understanding of behavior problems. As a requirement of Response to Intervention (RTI), general education teachers are now required to implement behavioral interventions for students not yet eligible for special education who present behavior problems that disrupt the learning environment (Yell & Shriner, 1998). In keeping with NCLB requirements to provide special education students access to general education, a practice known as inclusion provides instruction in general education classes with the support of accommodations. Through inclusion, supplemental supports and accommodations are provided by the general education teacher; this allows students with disabilities to be placed in least restrictive environments (Giangreco, 1993).

However, placing students with disabilities in the general education setting brings academic and behavior challenges.

The basis for this study was that teachers may lack training in dealing with students with challenging behavior problems in both general and special education classrooms. As a requirement of Response to Intervention (RTI), general educators are now required to assist with functional behavior assessments and behavioral interventions for students who present consistent behavior problems that disrupt the learning environment.

Specifically, this study was designed to ascertain the amount of training teachers received in functional assessments and classroom management and teachers' beliefs about behavioral interventions, and teachers' attitudes and beliefs about classroom control. The researcher's intent was that this study would provide support for schools in determining factors and predictors that affect the total number of response to interventions and behavioral interventions plans. The research findings compiled in this study describe factors that are associated with managing students with challenging behaviors. This research study examined the relationship between training, teachers' beliefs about behavioral interventions, attitudes and beliefs about classroom control, as they related to the number of interventions at each of the three tiers as well as the number of behavioral plans implemented. This research also took into account other factors that impact student behavior such as parental involvement, teacher type and administrative support provided.

Conclusions and Discussion

Descriptive statistical analysis was used to determine the amount of training teachers received in functional behavior assessments and classroom management. The findings of this study are consistent with Koehler's (1985) research on areas such as competencies and attitudes of practicing classroom teachers that reflected on their preservice teacher education. Other categories such as studies of the skills and competencies, evaluations of teacher education courses, methods within courses, or completed programs were also discussed. One deficit Koehler reported was the inability of the beginning teacher to assess the classroom and manage student behavior. Results of this study indicated teachers believed they were adequately prepared to manage challenging behaviors in their classroom. Koehler also stated that it is questionable if beginning teachers would feel comfortable with their behavior management skills regardless of preservice training (Koehler, 1985). The results of this study revealed teachers with 3 years or less of experience indicated that they believed they were adequately prepared to manage challenging behaviors in their classroom. A small percentage $n = 3$ indicated they did not feel adequately prepared to manage challenging behaviors in their classrooms. Therefore, results of this study imply that teachers felt adequately prepared to manage challenging behaviors regardless of years of experience or amount of preservice training in behavior management.

As Neel (2006) noted, special education teachers receive pre-service training focused on behavior management and social skills training while general education teachers receive pre-service training in teaching content knowledge. Schneider, Kerridge and Katz (1992) suggested that special education teachers may advocate behavioral

interventions more than general education teachers because they encounter more behavior problems on a daily basis. Although the results of this study did find that special education teachers reported a higher average number of students on behavioral intervention plans than general education teachers, the difference was not statistically significant. These findings may be explained by the fact that special education teachers may have more experience in interventions in general because of the specific needs of the special education student and may be more willing to attempt a behavioral intervention than the general education teacher. Furthermore, teacher acceptability of interventions indicated teachers may be more willing to implement interventions for aggressive students because they interrupt the learning environment whereas socially withdrawn students are unnoticed (Schneider, Kerridge, & Katz, 1992).

The results of this study indicated that most of training received in behavior management was provided by the local school district. Also, teachers received the largest amount of training in functional behavior assessments from the local school district. Carr and his colleagues found that in order for training to be successful, it should take place in a typical professional community neighborhood with emphasis on local training rather than university or formal workshop settings (Carr et al., 2002).

Descriptive statistical analysis was used to determine teacher's beliefs and attitudes about classroom control in the areas of instructional and people management utilizing the Attitudes and Beliefs about Classroom Control-Revised (ABCC-R) Inventory. Results of this study indicated teachers attempted to develop relationships with students and exhibited a more controlling, interventionist attitude in the aspect of classroom management.

On the instructional management dimension, which is reflective of how a teacher oversees the instructional environment in the classroom, this study revealed subscale scores that were indicative of a more controlling, interventionist attitude than a non-interventionist, less controlling belief in classroom instruction management skills. This is reflected by the teachers (74%) that reported subscale scores of 30 or higher and (57%) reporting subscale scores of 32 or higher on the instructional management dimension. On the people management dimension which is reflective of how a teacher attempts to develop relationships with students, this study revealed subscale scores that were indicative of a more controlling, interventionist attitude than a non interventionist, less controlling belief in developing relationships with students. This is reflected by the teachers (53%) that reported subscale scores of 28 or higher and (40.5%) reported subscale scores of 30 or higher on the people management dimension.

Additional results of the ABCC-R Inventory revealed teachers believed that they should require student compliance and respect for law and order and identified themselves as teachers that believed the class rules were important because they shape the student's behavior and development. Finally, teachers stated that they would explain a reason for a rule if a student thought the rule was unfair; however, they would not change the rule. These findings are consistent with Baker (2005) who suggested that the area that teachers reported the highest self-efficacy was in establishing rules for students.

In their research, investigating classroom management and differences between pre-service and experienced teachers, Martin and Baldwin (1992) utilized the revised Beliefs on Discipline Inventory titled the Inventory of Classroom Management Styles (ICMS). Results indicate that pre-service teachers are more likely to be categorized as

non-interventionists while experienced teachers are more likely to be categorized as interventionists in classroom management styles (Martin & Baldwin, 1992). For the purpose of this study pre-service teachers were not included in the sample, however, the results of the ABCC-R revealed no significant difference in categorizing teachers as non-interventionist and interventionist classroom managers between experienced teachers and teachers with 3 years or less experience. Martin and Baldwin (1994) revealed that novice teachers scored significantly higher as interventionists than experienced teachers. The researcher expected that the more experienced teachers would have higher scores in the areas of instructional and people management simply because they had more years of experience. However, the results indicated teachers with 3 years or less of experience actually had higher scores in these areas. The more experienced teacher responses indicated a more interventionist attitude and a more controlling belief in the aspect of classroom management. Therefore, the results of this present study were inconsistent with Martin and Baldwin's research, an inconsistency which may be explained by a small sample size or may be due to changes in teacher preparation programs.

In the study conducted by Martin and Yin (1997) males scored significantly higher on both the Instructional Management and Behavior Management subscales of ABCC. Gender differences in this present study could not be analyzed due to the small number of male (1.6%) participants.

In an effort to further improve the ABCC Inventory, Martin, Yin, and Baldwin (1998) investigated variables impacting teachers' beliefs regarding classroom management style such as the effects of classroom management training on teachers' attitudes and beliefs. They found that teachers who reported receiving training in

Assertive Discipline scored significantly higher as interventionists than those trained in Cooperative Discipline or teachers with no formal training in discipline (Martin et al., 1998). The findings of this present study were similar to those of Martin et al (1998) in that teachers reported receiving training in classroom management or assertive discipline also had high scores in the areas of instructional and people management. Such scores indicated a higher degree of teacher control over students and a more controlling, interventionist attitude in the aspect of classroom management.

Results of this present study indicated teachers believed behavioral interventions were effective in decreasing problematic behaviors in their classrooms. Furthermore, as the research study conducted at the Cheyenne Mountain Middle School where the RTI model was implemented, interventions at the tier-three level integrating behavior modification with academic interventions, Cheyenne teachers report significant improvements in behavior and academics (Johnson & Smith, 2008).

The findings of this study reported the actual number of students on tier interventions, which did not reflect teachers' beliefs about the effectiveness of interventions. Sample size for this analysis was substantially lower ($n = 82$) because a large number of respondents did not report students in RTI tiers. One interpretation of respondents leaving items blank would be that they had no students in tiers for behavior which did not allow for an accurate analysis.

One challenge presented by the RTI model when addressing behavior problems is that targeted behavior usually does not involve growth and therefore normative data used to define benchmark levels typically does not exist (Gresham, 2004). Gresham suggests that future researchers consider establishing guidelines for determining responses to

intervention techniques to meet such a challenge. Consistent with the results of this study, and the research conducted by Ardoin et al. (2005), the research base on RTI as it relates to behavior is in the early stages and there has been limited empirical work directed at studying RTI as it is implemented by school-based practitioners.

Other factors impacting functional behavior assessments and behavioral intervention plans considered in this study include parent involvement and administrative support. Lane (1999) suggested that interventions that involved parents were more effective than interventions that did not involve parent participation. Families were considered vital contributors in the assessment-based intervention plans especially since they had observed and interacted with the student, and had gained insights about behavior issues over a long period of time (Dunlap, Newton, Fox, Benito, & Vaughn, 2001). Results of this present study supported Lane's findings. When asked about the importance of parent involvement in behavioral interventions, teachers indicated they believed parents were important partners. Furthermore, in response to the follow-up question teachers indicated they believed parents were encouraged to participate in interventions.

Baker (2005) examined teacher self-efficacy and the beliefs teachers hold about administrators for support. Findings from this study indicated teachers agreed that the administrators provide support with regard to time availability and decision making. This study revealed over half of the teachers indicated they received support from their principal with behavior management with regard to time availability and decision making assistance. Furthermore, the teachers believed their principal supported behavioral interventions, which is consistent with the findings of Scott, Anderson and Spaulding

(2008) in that the administrators' role is essential when developing behavior support teams because they are able to make decisions concerning funding, resources, time management, and support.

Limitations

The researcher acknowledges the following limitations to this study:

1. The instrument prompted teachers to list their area(s) of endorsement, but did not prompt them to identify specialty area for National Board Certification or ask if they were TESOL (Teachers of English Speakers of Other Languages) Certified.

2. The sample was limited to kindergarten through third grade teachers in elementary schools from three separate school districts in a southeastern state.

3. Participants may not have clearly understood questionnaire items; this may have resulted in a large number of missing items. For instance, the instrument prompted teachers to indicate if they had received training in specific areas and to indicate how much training they had received. Some teachers indicated they had received training but did not indicate how much or indicate where they had received their training. Also, a high number of teachers responded "don't know" when asked if they had received training in functional behavior assessments or behavioral interventions.

4. The sample size was small and limited the researcher's ability to generalize findings beyond this study's sample population. These results could be sample-specific and teachers who responded may be qualitatively different from those of a larger sample.

5. The ABCC-R is a self–report instrument that attempts to measure teacher's attitudes and beliefs.

6. The survey instrument designed for this study did not ask teachers about the number of functional behavior assessments they had conducted or if a FBA had been conducted prior to implementing a BIP.

7. The survey instrument did not ask teachers to identify specific target behaviors of students' currently on behavioral intervention plans but rather asked the teachers to identify only the number of students on behavior plans.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

Recommendations for policy and practice revealed by this study include but are not limited to the following:

1. Staff development should be provided to school administrators and teachers on the effects of behavioral interventions and their association with improving overall classroom control and increasing teacher understanding of behavior management techniques.

2. As revealed in this study, teacher education programs should provide behavior assessment and intervention courses and ensure preservice educators are prepared to deal with a range of student behaviors in actual classroom settings.

3. The literature review revealed a trend in school leaders requiring teachers to implement intervention strategies in the area of classroom control, social skills training curricula, and behavior management to reduce discipline referrals to the office and to provide valuable documentation for possible further referrals to special education for evaluation.

4. The literature review revealed a trend in school leaders requiring teachers to intervention strategies in the areas of classroom control, social skills training curricula,

and behavior management to reduce discipline referrals to the office and to provide valuable documentation for possible further referrals to special education for education for evaluation (Lewis & Sugai, 1999).

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should consider the following:

1. Researchers should further evaluate the school climate, defining relationships between student behavior and how behavior may impact student achievement, and reduce violent and disruptive behaviors.

2. Researchers should evaluate how home factors shape behaviors in the classroom.

3. Researchers should continue to study the affects of classroom control and how it may impact overall student achievement.

4. Administrative support should be provided to promote a positive school-wide behavior management climate.

5. Future researchers should establish guidelines for teachers in determining response to intervention techniques for behavior management.

6. It is recommended that the instrument used in his study be further developed with consideration being given to modifying sections regarding amount of training received, identification of tiers for behavior only, sample size, grade level, and areas of endorsements.

Summary

A summary of the research study and conclusions drawn from the data analysis was presented in this chapter. This study investigated teacher training, teachers' attitudes

and beliefs about classroom control and behavioral interventions for general education and special needs students in kindergarten through third grade. This chapter also presented a discussion that explored and explained the results of the conclusions of this study including limitations of the study. The final section of this chapter focuses on recommendations for policy and practice, implications for kindergarten through third grade administrators and recommendations for future research.

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD DOCUMENT

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

Institutional Review Board

118 College Drive #5147
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001
Tel: 601.266.6820
Fax: 601.266.5509
www.usm.edu/irb

HUMAN SUBJECTS PROTECTION REVIEW COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Human Subjects Protection Review Committee in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months. Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: **29020303**
PROJECT TITLE: **Classroom Management: Teacher Training, Attitudes and Beliefs, and Intervention Practices**
PROPOSED PROJECT DATES: **01/12/09 to 01/12/10**
PROJECT TYPE: **Dissertation or Thesis**
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS: **Catherine D. Ladner**
COLLEGE/DIVISION: **College of Education & Psychology**
DEPARTMENT: **Educational Leadership & Research**
FUNDING AGENCY: **N/A**
HSPRC COMMITTEE ACTION: **Expedited Review Approval**
PERIOD OF APPROVAL: **02/03/09 to 02/02/10**

Lawrence A. Hosman — 2-6-09

Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
HSPRC Chair

Date

APPENDIX B

LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION TO CONDUCT STUDY

November 1, 2009

Dear Superintendent:

My name is Catherine D. Ladner, and I am a doctoral student at The University of Southern Mississippi. I am conducting research for my dissertation on the attitudes and beliefs regarding classroom management of general and special education teachers in Kindergarten through third grade. My focus will be on two dimensions of classroom management: instructional management and people management. I am targeting three public school districts in three similar geographic areas of the state for my sample. The districts and teachers will remain anonymous.

In each of the districts, I plan to contact the principal of each elementary school to arrange delivery and collection of the survey instruments. I shall request distribution of the surveys to each general and special education teacher in grades K through third. A cover letter to each teacher will clarify the purpose of the survey, which will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Tentatively, the months of January and February of 2009 are targeted for this purpose.

I am writing to request your permission to conduct my study in your district. Please indicate below your permission for me to do so. I appreciate your support.

Sincerely,

Catherine D. Ladner

_____ Yes, you may conduct research in our school district.

_____ No, you may not conduct research in our school district.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX C

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory - Revised

Please circle the statement that best describes you:	Describes me very well	Describes me usually	Describes me somewhat	Describes me not at all
1. I believe students will be successful in school if allowed the freedom to pursue their own interests.	4	3	2	1
2. I believe teachers should give students freedom so they will develop their own ways of interacting with each other.	4	3	2	1
3. I do not specify a set time for each learning activity because that can only be determined by the students.	4	3	2	1
4. When moving from one learning activity to another, I will allow students to progress at their own rate.	4	3	2	1
5. I believe student's emotions and decision-making processes must always be considered fully legitimate and valid.	4	3	2	1
6. I believe students can manage their own learning behavior during seat work.	4	3	2	1
7. I believe students should choose the learning topics and tasks.	4	3	2	1
8. Students in my classroom are free to use any materials they wish during the learning process.	4	3	2	1
9. I believe friendliness, courtesy, and respect for fellow students is something that students have to learn first-hand through free interaction.	4	3	2	1
10. I believe students should create their own daily routines as this fosters the development of responsibility.	4	3	2	1
11. When a student is repeatedly off-task, I will most likely remove a privilege or require detention.	4	3	2	1
12. The classroom runs more smoothly when the teacher assigns students to specific seats.	4	3	2	1
13. During the first week of class, I will announce the classroom rules and inform students of the penalties for disregarding those rules.	4	3	2	1
14. The teacher knows best how to allocate classroom materials and supplies to optimize learning.	4	3	2	1
15. When a student bothers other students, I will immediately tell the student to be quiet and stop it.	4	3	2	1
16. While teaching a lesson on library skills, a student begins to talk about the research she is doing for her book report. I would remind the student that the class has to finish the lesson before the end of the class period.	4	3	2	1
17. I believe teachers should require student compliance and respect for law and order.	4	3	2	1
18. I believe students will be successful in school if they listen to the adults who know what's best for them.	4	3	2	1
19. I believe class rules are important because they shape the student's behavior and development.	4	3	2	1
20. If students believe that a classroom rule is unfair, I may explain the reason for the rule but would not change it.	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

Please choose one for questions 1 through 3

1. Gender: _____ Male _____Female

2. Which best describes you: Special Ed. Teacher____ General Ed. Teacher_____ Inclusion Teacher____

3. Circle grade you *currently* teach: K 1st 2nd 3rd

4. Please check licensure(s) you currently hold:

_____Administrators License
_____Alternate Teacher Education Route License
_____Teacher Education Route license

5. License Class (please check one)
_____Class A = Bachelor's License _____Class AA = Master's License
_____Class AAA = Specialist's License _____Class AAAA = Doctorate's License

6. Please list area(s) of endorsements:_____
7. Total number of years teaching experience: _____
8. Total number of years at this school: _____

9. Have you received training in behavior management/classroom control? ___Yes ___No ___Don't know
If yes, indicate the type and amount of training (mark all that apply and circle approximately how many of each):

___ Undergraduate college course on behavior assessment	0	1-2	3+	Not sure
___ Undergraduate college course w/embedded behavior assessment component	0	1-2	3+	Not sure
___ Graduate course on functional behavioral assessment	0	1-2	3+	Not sure
___ Staff development provided by school district	0	1-2	3+	Not sure
___ Staff development provided outside of school	0	1-2	3+	Not sure

10. Have you received training specific to functional behavior assessments? ___Yes ___No ___Don't know
If yes, indicate the type and amount of training (mark all that apply and circle approximately how many of each):

___ Undergraduate college course on behavior assessment	0	1-2	3+	Not sure
___ Undergraduate college course w/embedded behavior assessment component	0	1-2	3+	Not sure
___ Graduate course on functional behavioral assessment	0	1-2	3+	Not sure
___ Staff development provided by school district	0	1-2	3+	Not sure
___ Staff development provided outside of school	0	1-2	3+	Not sure

11. Have you received training in developing behavioral intervention plans? ___Yes ___No ___Don't know
If yes, indicate the type and amount of training (mark all that apply and circle approximately how many of each):

___ Undergraduate college course on behavior assessment	0	1-2	3+	Not sure
___ Undergraduate college course w/embedded behavior assessment component	0	1-2	3+	Not sure
___ Graduate course on functional behavioral assessment	0	1-2	3+	Not sure
___ Staff development provided by school district	0	1-2	3+	Not sure
___ Staff development provided outside of school	0	1-2	3+	Not sure

12. Indicate the number of students in your class by general and special education status:
_____General Education
_____Special Education

Of those students, how many are identified as:

General Education: Tier I_____ Tier II_____ Tier III _____ for Behavior.
Special Education: Number of those students on a Behavioral intervention plan: _____

Beliefs about behavioral interventions

Please circle the rating that best describes your beliefs about behavior interventions:	**Very Untrue 1**	**Untrue 2**	**True 3**	**Very True 4**
13. I believe I am adequately prepared to manage challenging behaviors in my classroom.	1	2	3	4
14. I receive support from my principal with behavior management with regard to time availability and decision making assistance.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
15. I believe my principal supports behavior interventions.	1	2	3	4
16. I believe behavior interventions are effective in decreasing problematic behaviors in my classroom.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
17. I believe parents are important partners in behavior interventions.	1	2	3	4
18. I believe parents are encouraged to participate in behavior interventions in my school.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

The University of Southern Mississippi

Consent Document Teacher Questionnaire

Purpose: As teachers of students attending public elementary schools within one of the three school districts selected for this research project, you are being asked to participate in research designed to help us understand teachers' attitudes and beliefs concerning behavioral interventions. This research is being conducted by Catherine D. Ladner, a doctoral student (under the direction of Dr. Thelma Roberson) at the University of Southern Mississippi.
Description of Study: As a participant you are being asked to complete a questionnaire designed specifically to evaluate your attitudes and beliefs about classroom control, beliefs about behavioral interventions as well as several demographic questions. Completing the questionnaire should take no longer than 25 minutes. Overall results of this study will be reported to those interested parties when the study is complete by contacting the researcher using the provided contact information.
Benefits: Although you may receive no direct benefit from your participation in this study, your responses may help us better understand the social and psychological factors related to your decision to participate in the field of education.
Risks: There are no known risks associated with participation in this study. No identifying information will be collected and the results will be reported only in aggregate form so that no individual can be identified. Paper questionnaires will be collected by the researcher upon completion, but they will not be looked at or tallied until all questionnaires from all participants (approximately 400) are completed. At that time, the researcher will shuffle the responses so that there is no possible way that she may identify the respondent.
Confidentiality: Completed questionnaires will be kept secure in the researcher's office. All information gained from individual questionnaires will be kept confidential, seen by no one other than the researcher, the methodologist, Dr. Thelma Roberson, Dr. Michael Ward and Dr. Rose McNeese.
Subject's Assurance: Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate at any time without penalty. Refusing to participate will in no way affect you or your standing as an educator. If you have questions about this study, you may contact the researcher, Catherine D. Ladner, at 601-649-4141or Dr. Thelma Roberson at The University of Southern Mississippi, 601-266-4556. Overall results of this study will be available to you after August, 2009 upon request.

This research project has been reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the chair of the Institutional Review Board, the University of Southern Mississippi, Box 5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001 or call 601-266-6820.

By returning the completed questionnaire, you are indicating your consent to participate. The consent form is yours to keep for future reference. Please place the completed questionnaire in the box provided. The counselor will then place all questionnaires in envelopes provided and seal it.
The researcher will then collect the envelope and secure it with other envelopes from other schools until data are to be analyzed.
Thank you

APPENDIX F

PERMISSION TO USE ABCC-R

From: **Nancy Martin** (nancy.martin@utsa.edu)
Sent: Thu 6/26/08 9:08 AM
To: Catherine Ladner
Cc: Zenong Yin (Zenong.Yin@utsa.edu)

Catherine,
Of course you may use the ABCC in your research. I suggest, however, that you use the ABCC-R. I have attached the article that explains the construct validity of this newly revised version. The full citation is as follows:

Martin, N. K., Yin, Z., & Mayall, H. (2007). The Attitudes & Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory-Revised and Revisited: A continuation of construct validation. Journal of Classroom Interaction (42)2, 11-20.

The newly revised version of the scale is in a table at the end of the article. Let me know if you have any further questions. Good luck with your study!

NM

REFERENCES

Abidin, R. R., & Robinson, L. (2002). Stress, biases, or professionalism: What drives teachers' referral judgment of students with challenging behaviors? *Journal of Emotional and Behavior Disorders, 10*(4), 204-212.

Ardoin, S., Roof, C., Klubnick, C., & Carfolite, J. (2008). Evaluating curriculum-based measurement from a behavioral assessment perspective. *The Behavior Analyst Today, 9*(1), 36-49.

Ardoin, S., Witt, J., Connell J., & Koenig, J. (2005). Application of a three-tiered response to intervention model for instructional planning, decision making, and the identification of children in need of services. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 23*, 362-380. doi:10.1177/073428290502300405

Baer, D. M., Wolf, M., & Risley, T. (1968, Spring). Some current dimensions of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1*, 91-97.

Bain, W. (1934). A study of the attitudes of teachers toward behavior problems. *Child Development, 5*(1), 19-35.

Baker, P. (2005). Managing student behavior: How ready are teachers to meet the challenge? *American Secondary Education, 33*(3), 51-64.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*(2), 117-148.

Bear, G. G., Manning, M. A., & Shiomi, K. (2006). Children's reasoning about aggression: Differences between Japan and the United States and implication for school discipline. *School Psychology Review, 35*(1), 62-77.

Benazzi, L., Horner, R., & Good, R. (2006). Effects of behavior support team composition on the technical adequacy and contextual fit of behavior support plans. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 40*(3), 160-170.

Bijou, S. W., Peterson, R. F., & Ault, M. H. (1968). A method to integrate descriptive and field studies at the level of data and concepts. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1*, 175-191.

Blood E., & Neel, R. S. (2007). From FBA to implementation: A look at what is actually being delivered. *Education and Treatment of Children, 30*(4), 67-80.

Bond, R., & Castagnera, E. (2006). Peer supports and inclusion education: An underutilized resource. *Theory into Practice, 45*(3), 224-229.

Bowman-Perrott, L., Greenwood, C., & Tapia, Y. (2007). The efficacy of CWPT used in secondary alternative school classrooms with small teacher/pupil ratios and students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Education and Treatment of Children, 30*(3), 65-87.

Bradshaw, C., Reinke, W., Brown, L., Bevans, K., & Leaf, P. (2008). Implementation of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) in elementary school: Observations from a randomized trial. *Education and Treatment of Children, 31*(1), 1-26.

Broussard, C. D., & Northup, J. (1995). An approach to functional assessment and analysis of disruptive behavior in regular education classrooms. *School Psychology Quarterly, 10,* 151-164.

Bullock, L., & Gable, R. (1999). Putting functional behavior assessments into practice: A conversation with Dr. Richard Van Acker. *Preventing School Failure, 43*(4), 160. Retrieved April 7, 2008, from Academic Search Premiere database.

Carr, E., Dunlap, G., Horner, R., Koegel, R., Turnbull, A., Sailor, W., et al. (2002, Winter). Positive behavior support: Evolution of an applied science. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 4*(1), 4-16, 20.

Carr, E., Horner, R., Turnbull, A., Marquis, J., McLaughlin, D., McAtee, M., et al. (1999, January). Positive behavior support for people with developmental disabilities: A research synthesis. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 439 580).

Cheney, D., Flower, A., & Templeton, T. (2008). Applying response to intervention metrics in the social domain for students at risk of developing emotional or behavioral disorders. *The Journal of Special Education, 42*(2), 108-126. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Christenson, L., Young, K. R., & Merchant, M. (2007). Behavioral intervention planning: Increasing appropriate behavior of a socially withdrawn student. *Education and Treatment of Children, 30*(4), 81-103.

Cochrane,W., & Laux, J. (2007, Summer2007). Investigating school psychologists' perceptions of treatment integrity in school-based interventions for children with academic and behavior concerns. *Preventing School Failure, 51*(4), 29-34.

Coie, J., & Krehbiel, G. (1984, August). Effects of academic tutoring on the social status of low-achieving, socially rejected children. *Child Development, 55*(4), 1465-1478. doi:10.111/1467-8624.ep730319

Colvin, G., & Kame'enui, E. (1993, November). Reconceptualizing behavior management and school-wide discipline in general education. *Education and Treatment of Children, 16*(4), 361. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Conroy, M., & Clark, D. (1999, Summer). Building competence in the use of functional behavioral assessment. *Preventing School Failure, 43*(4), 140. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Conroy, M., Clark, D., Gable, R., & Fox, J. (1998). Building competencies in the use of functional behavioral assessment. Paper presented at the Twenty-second Annual Conference of Teacher Educators of Children with Behavior Disorders. Scottsdale, AZ. Retrieved April 7, 2008, from Academic Search Premiere database.

Cook, N. (1991). Evaluation and validation: A look at the program effectiveness panel. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 333045).

Corey, G. (1982). Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy (2nd ed.) California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Cox, D. (2005). Evidence-based interventions using home-school collaboration. *School Psychology Quarterly, 20*(4), 473-497.

Crothers, L. M., & Kolbert, J. B. (2008). Tackling a problematic behavior management issue: Teachers' intervention in childhood bullying problems. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 43*(3), 132-139. doi:10.1177/1053451207311606

Deno, S. (2003). Developments in curriculum-based measurement. *The Journal of Special Education, 37(*3), 184-192.

Deno, S., Fuchs, L., Martson, D., & Shin, J. (2001). Using curriculum-based measurement to establish growth standards for students with learning disabilities. *School Psychology Review, 30*(4), 507-524.

Doggett, G., Edwards, R. P., Moore, J. W., Tingstrom, D. H., & Wilcynski, S. M. (2001). Research into practice: An approach to functional assessment in general education classroom settings. *School Psychology Review, 30*(3), 313-328.

Dunlap, G., & Lutzker, J. (2008). Todd R. Risley (1937-2007). *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 10*(3), 148-149.

Dunlap, G., Newton, J., Fox, L., Benito, N., & Vaughn, B. (2001, Winter2001). Family involvement in functional assessment and positive behavior support. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 16*(4), 215. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Dunlap, G., White, R., Vera, A., Wilson, D., & Panacek, L. (1996). The effects of multi-component, assessment-based curricular modifications on the classroom behavior of children with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Behavioral Education 9*(4), 481-500. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

DuPaul, G. (2003). Commentary: Bridging the gap between research and practice. *School Psychology Review, 32*(2), 178-180.

Durand, V. M., & Rost, N. (2005, Summer). Does it matter who participates in our studies? A caution when interpreting the research on positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 7*(3) 186-188.

Ellingson, S., Miltenberger, R., Stricker, J., Galensky, T., & Garlinghouse, M. (2000, Spring). Functional assessment and intervention for challenging behaviors in the classroom by general classroom teachers. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 2*(2), 85. Retrieved July 25, 2008 from Academic Search Premiere database.

Ervin, R. Radford, P., Bertsch, K., Piper, A., Ehrhardt, K., & Poling, A. (2001). A descriptive analysis and critique of the empirical literature on school-based functional assessment. *School Psychology Review, 30*(2), 193-210.

Evers, W. G., Tomic, W., & Brouwers, A. (2004). Burnout among teachers: Students' and teachers' perceptions compared. *School Psychology International, 25*(2), 131-148.

Feuerstein, A. (2000). School characteristics and parent involvement: Influences on participation in children's school. *The Journal of Educational Research, 94*(1), 29-40.

Filter, K., Mankato, M., McKenna, M., Benedict, E., Horner, R., Todd, A., & Watson, J. (2007). Check in/ check out: A post-hoc evaluation of an efficient, secondary-level targeted intervention for reducing problem behaviors in schools. *Education and Treatment of Children, 30(*1), 69-84.

Foley, R., & Pang, L. (2006, February). Alternative education programs: Programs and student characteristics. *The High School Journal, 89*(3), 10-21.

Freeman, R., Eber, L., Anderson, C., Irvin, L., Horner, R., Bounds, M., & Dunlap, G. (2006). Building inclusive school cultures using school wide positive behavior support: Defining effective individual support systems for students with disabilities. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 31*(1), 4-17.

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (2006, January). Introduction to response to intervention: What, why, and how valid is it? *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*(1), 92-99.

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L., Thompson, A., Svenson, E., Yen, L., Otaiba, S., et al. (2001). Peer assisted strategies in reading: Extensions for kindergarten, first grade and high school. *Remedial and Special Education, 22*(1), 15-21.

Fuchs, L., & Fuchs, D. (1997, November). Use of curriculum-based measurement in identifying students with disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 30(3), 1.

Fuchs, L. S. (2007). National Research Center for Learning Disabilities update on responsiveness to intervention: Research to practice. [Brochure]. Lawrence, KS: National Research Center on Learning Disabilities.

Gable, R., & Hendrickson, J. (1999, Summer). Changing discipline policies and practices: Finding a place for functional behavior assessment in schools. *Preventing School Failure, 43*(4), 167. Retrieved April 7, 2008, from Academic Search Premiere database.

Gable, R., Bullock, L., & Evans, W. (2006, Fall2006). Changing perspectives on alternative schooling for children and adolescents with challenging behavior. *Preventing School Failure, 51*(1), 5-9. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

George, M. P., White, G. P., & Schlaffer, J. J. (2007). Implementing school-wide behavior change: Lessons from the field. *Psychology in Schools, 44*(1), 41-51.

Giangreco, M.F. (1993). Using creative problem-solving methods to include students with severe disabilities in general education classroom activities. *Journal of Education and Psychological Consultation, 4*(2), 113-135.

Glickman, C. D., & Tamashiro, R. T. (1980, March). Clarifying teachers' beliefs about discipline. *Educational Leadership, 37*(6), 459-464. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Greenwood, C. R., & Delquadri, J. (1995, Summer). Classwide peer tutoring and the prevention of school failure. *Preventing School Failure, 39*(4), 21-25. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Gresham, F. M. (2004). Current status and future directions of school-based behavioral interventions. *School Psychology Review, 33*(3), 326-343.

Gresham, F. M. (2007). Response to Intervention and emotional and behavioral disorders. *Assessment of Effective Intervention, 32*(4), 214-222.

Henley, P., Fuston, J., Peter, T., & Wall, L. (2000). Rescuing elementary school troublemakers. *The Education Digest,* 48-52.

Horner, R. H., & Sugai, G. (2000, Fall). School-wide behavior support: An emerging initiative. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 2*(4), 231-232.

Horner, R., Sugai, G., Todd, A., & Lewis-Palmer, T. (1999). Elements of behavior support plans: A technical brief. *Exceptionality, 8*(3), 205-215.

Horner, R., Todd, A., Lewis-Palmer, T., Irvin, L., Sugai, G., & Boland, J. (2004). The school-wide evaluation tool (SET): A research instrument for assessing school-wide positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 6*(1), 3-12.

IDEA Amendments of 1997, P. L. 105-17, 105th Congress, 1st session, June 4, 1997. Retrieved November 30, 2008 from http://www.nectac.org/idea/PL105-17.asp

IDEIA Amendments of 2004, P. L. 108-446, 108th Congress, December 3, 2004. Retrieved November 30, 2008 from http://www.copyright.gov/legislation/pl108-446.pdf

Ingram, K., Lewis-Palmer, T., & Sugai, G. (2005, Fall). Function-based intervention planning: Comparing the effectiveness of FBA function-based and non-function-based intervention plans. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 7*(4), 224-236.

Johnson, S., & Smith, L. (2008). Implementation of response to intervention at middle school. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 40*(3), 46-52.

Killu, K. (2008). Developing effective behavioral intervention plans. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 43*(3), 140-149.

Killu, K., Weber, K., Darby, M., & Barretto, A. (2006, Fall). Behavioral intervention planning and implementation of positive behavior support plans: An examination of states' adherence to standards for practice. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 8*(4), 195-200.

Kincaid, D., Knoster, T., Harrower, J., Shannon, P., & Bustamante, S. (2002, Spring). Measuring the impact of positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 4*(2), 109-117.

Koehler, V. (1985). Research on preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(1), 23-30. doi:10.1177/002248718503600106

Lane, K. L. (1999, Winter). Young students at-risk for antisocial behavior: The utility of academic and social skills interventions. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 7*(4), 211-223.

Larry P. v. Riles. 343 F. Supp. 1306 (N.D. Cal.1972) (preliminary injunction). Aff'd 502 F. 2d 963 (9th cir.1974); 495 F. Supp. 926 (N.D. Cal.1979) (decision on merits). Order modifying judgment, C-71-2270 RFP, Sept. 25, 1986.

Larry P. v. Riles. United States Court of Appeals, 1984. 793F.2d 696 (9th Cir.)

Lewis, T., & Sugai, G. (1996). Functional assessment of problem behavior: A pilot investigation of the comparative and interactive effects of teacher and peer social attention on students in general education settings. *School Psychology Quarterly, 11*, 1-19.

Lewis, T., & Sugai, G. (1999 February). Effective behavior support: A systems approach to proactive school wide management. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 31*(6), 1. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Logue, J. M. (2008). Violent death in American schools in the 21st century: Reflections following the 2006 Amish school shootings. *Journal of School Health, 78*(1) 58-61. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Mapp, K. (2002). Having their say: Parents describe why and how they engaged in their children's learning. *The School Community Journal,* 42-46.

March, R. E., Horner, R. H., Lewis-Palmer, T., Brown, D.,Crone, D., Todd, A. E., et al. (2000). *Functional Assessment Checklist: Teachers and Staff (FACTS).* Eugene, OR: Educational and Community Supports.

Marshall et al. v. Georgia U. S. District Court for Southern District of Georgia, CV 482-238 June 28, 1984; Affd (11th cir.no. 84-8771, October 29, 1985). Note, the Court of Appeals decision was published as Georgia State Conference of Branches of NAACP v. State of Georgia.

Marston, D., Mirkin, P., & Deno, S. (1984). Curriculum-based measurement: An alternative to traditional screening, referral and identification. *The Journal of Special Education, 18*(2), 109-117.

Martin, N. K., & Baldwin, B. (1992, February). Beliefs regarding classroom management styles: The difference between pre-service and experienced teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Mid-South Educational Research Association. Knoxville, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED355213)

Martin, N. K., & Baldwin, B. (1994). Beliefs regarding classroom management styles: Differences between novice and experienced teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southwest Educational Research Association San Antonio, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 287471)

Martin, N. K., & Soho, A. R. (1999). Beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between traditional and alternative certification teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Education Research Association Montreal, Quebec, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED432544)

Martin, N. K., & Yin, Z. (1997). Attitudes and beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between male and female teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Education Research Association San Antonio, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.ED404738)

Martin, N. K., Yin, Z., & Baldwin, B. (1998). Classroom management training, class size and graduate study: Do these variables impact teachers' beliefs regarding classroom management style? Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED420671)

Martin, N. K., Yin, Z., & Mayall, H. (2006, February). Classroom management training, teaching experience and gender: Do these variables impact teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward classroom management style? Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southwest Education Research Association, Austin, Texas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED494050)

Martin, N. K., Yin, Z., & Mayall, H. (2007). The attitudes & beliefs of classroom control inventory-revised and revisited: A continuation of construct validation. *Journal of Classroom Interaction 42*(2), 11-20.

May, H., & Copeland, E. (1998, April). Academic persistence and alternative high schools: Students site characteristics. *High School Journal, 81*(4), 199. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

McCurdy, B. L., Mannella, M. C., & Eldridge, N. (2003, Summer). Positive behavior support in urban schools: Can we prevent escalation of antisocial behavior? *Journal of Positive Behavior Intervention, 5*(3), 158-170.

McIntosh, K., Borgmeier, C., Anderson, C., Horner, R., Rodriguez, B., & Tobin, T. (2008). Technical Adequacy of the Functional Assessment Checklist: Teachers and Staff (FACTS) FBA Interview Measure. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 10*(1), 33-45 (2008). doi:10.1177/1098300707311619

McTesting. School Psychology in Minnesota, 20(2), 27-32. Marshall et al. v. Georgia. U. S. District Court for Southern District of Georgia, CV482-233, June 28, 1984; Aff'd (1I th cir. no 848771, Oct. 29,1985).

Menendez, A. L. (2007, Winter). Supports and enhancements designed for alternative programming. *Preventing School Failure, 51*(2), 19-22.

Metzler, C., Biglan, A., Rusby, J., & Sprague, J. (2001). Evaluation of a comprehensive behavior management program to improve school-wide positive behavior. *Education and Treatment of Children, 24*(4), 448-479.

Mitchem, K., Young, K., West, R., & Benyo, J. (2001, May). CWPASM: A classwide peer-assisted self-management program for general education classrooms. *Education and Treatment of Children, 24*(2), 111-140.

Morin, J., & Battalio, R. (2004). Construing misbehavior: The efficacy connection in responding to misbehavior. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 6* (4), 251- 254. doi:10.1177/10983007040060040601

National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved September 21, 2008, from NCES Web site: http://nces.ed.gov/

Neel, R. S. (2006, November). Consider the opportunities: A response to No Child Left Behind. *Education and Treatment of Children, 29*(4), 583-537.

Nelson, J. R., Roberts, M. L., Rutherford, R. B., Mathur, S. R., & Aaroe, L. A. (1999). A statewide survey of special education administrators and school psychologists regarding functional behavior assessment. *Education and Treatment of Children, 22*(3) 267-279.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, §1119. Retrieved July 18, 2008 from, http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf

Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). Discipline Guidance, 26 IDELR 923 (OSEP, 1997). Retrieved July 18, 2008, from, http://www.idea.ed.gov/explore/view/p/%2Croot%2Cdynamic%2CTopicalBrief%2C6%2C

OSEP (2000)

Public Agenda, (2004, May). Teaching interrupted: Do discipline policies in today's public schools foster the common good? Retrieved July 27, 2008, from, http:// www.publicagenda.org.commongood.org/learn-reading-cgpubs-polls-3.html

Quinn, M., Poirer, J., Faller, S., Gable, R., & Tonelson, S. (2006). An examination of school climate in effective alternative programs. *Preventing School Failure, 51*(1), 11-17.

Raywid, M. A., & Oshiyama, L. (2000, February). Musings in the wake of Columbine. *Phi Delta Kappa, 81*(6), 444.

Raywid, M.A. (1994). Alternative school: The state of the art. *Educational Leadership, 51*(1), 26-31.

Safran, S. (2006, Winter). Using the effective behavior support survey to guide development of schoolwide postivie behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 8*(1), 3-9.

Sailor, W., Stowe, M. J., Turnbull, H. R., & Kleinhammer-Trammill, J. (2007, November). A case for adding social-behavioral standards to standards-based education with schoolwide positive behavior support as its basis. *Remedial and Special Education, 28*(6), 366-376.

Samuels, C. (2006). Education department backs research plans for RTI method. *Education Week, 26*(11), 20-22. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Sasson, J., & Austin, J. (2002). Performer-level systems analysis: How systematic are behavioral interventions? A ten-year review of the journal of organizational management. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 22*(4), 27-58. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Schneider, B. H., Kerridge, A., & Katz, J. (1992). Teacher acceptance of Psychological interventions of varying theoretical orientation. *School Psychology International, 13*, 291-305. doi:10.1177/0143034392134001

Scott, T. M., Anderson, C. M., & Spaulding, S. A. (2008). Strategies for developing and carrying out functional assessment and behavioral intervention planning. *Preventing School Failure, 52*(3), 39-49.

Senate Bill No. 2003. An Act to Amend Section 37-151-83, Mississippi Code of 1972, Retrieved November 30, 2008 from, http://billstatus.ls.state.ms.us/documents/2003/pdf/SB/2001-2099/SB2003IN.pdf

Senate Bill No.2338. An Act to Amend Section 37-13-92, Mississippi Code of 1972. Retrieved November 30, 2008 from, http://billstatus.ls.state.ms.us/documents/2007/pdf/SB/2300-2399/SB2338SG.pdf

Skiba, R., & Strassell, A. (2000, February). Creating a positive climate: Parent involvement. *Safe and Responsive Schools* .Retrieved July 18, 2008 from, http://www.indiana.edu/~safeschl/ParentInvolvement.pdf

Snell M., & Janney, R. (2000, Summer). Teachers' problem-solving about children with moderate and severe disabilities in elementary classes. *Exceptional Children, 66*(4), 472-491.

Sprague, J., & Horner, R. (in press). School wide positive behavior supports. In S.R. Jimerson & M.J. Furlong (Eds.), *The handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Retrieved on July 17, 2008, from,

http://starfsfolk.khi.is/ingvar/agi/Greinar/Sprague%20%20Horner%20PBS%20paper.pdf

Sprague, J., Sugai, G., & Walker, H. (1998). Antisocial behavior in schools. In S. Watson & F. Gresham (Eds.), *Child behavior therapy: Ecological considerations in assessment, treatment, and evaluation* (pp. 451-474). New York: Plenum Press

Stahr, B., Cushing, D., Lane, K. & Fox, J. (2006). Efficacy of a function-based intervention in decreasing off-task behaviors exhibited by a student with ADHD. *Journal of Positive behavior Interventions, 8*(4), 201-211.

Stewart, R., Benner, G., Martella, R., & Merchand-Martella, N. (2007). Three tier models of reading behavior: A research review. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 9*(4), 239-253.

Sugai, G., Lewis-Palmer, T., Todd, A., & Horner, R. (2001). Teaching schoolwide behavior expectations. *Report of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders in Youth, 1*(4), 77-79, 93-96.

Sugai, G., Lewis-Palmer, T., & Hagan-Burke, S. (1999-2000). Overview of the functional behavioral assessment process. *Exceptionality, 8*(3), 149-160. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Taddeo, I. S. (1977, February). Do teachers' attitudes effect learning? *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 61*(406), 7-13.

Tobin, T., & Sprague, J. (2000). Alternative education strategies: Reducing violence in school and the community. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 8*(3), 177. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Todd, A., Campbell, A., Meyer, G., & Horner, R. (2008).The effects of a targeted intervention to reduce problem behaviors: Elementary school implementation of check in – check out. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 10*(1), 46-55. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Todd, A., Horner, R., & Sugai, G. (1999, Spring). Self monitoring and self-recruiting praise: Effects on problem behavior, academic engagement, and work completion in a typical classroom. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 1*(2), 66-122.

Trussell, R. P. (2008, January). Classroom universals to prevent problem behaviors. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 43*(3), 179-185.

Van Acker, R. (2007, Winter 2007). Antisocial, aggressive, and violent behavior in children and adolescents within alternative education settings: Prevention & intervention. *Preventing School Failure, 51*(2), 5-12.

Vaughn, S., & Fuchs, L. (2006). A response to "competing views: A dialogue on response to intervention" Why response to intervention is necessary but not sufficient for identifying students with learning disabilities. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 32*(1), 58-61.

Warren, J., Bohanon-Edmonson, H., Turnbull, A., Sailor, W., Wickham, D., Griggs, P., & Beech, S. (2006). School-wide positive behavior support: Addressing behavior problems that impede student learning. *Educational Psychology Review, 18*: 187-198.

White, R. (1996). Unified discipline. In B. Algozzine (Ed.), *Problem behavior management: An educators resource service* (pp. 11:28 -11:36). Gaithersburg, MD:Aspen.

White, R., Algozzine, B., Audette, R., Marr, M., & Ellis, E. (2001). Unified discipline: A school-wide approach for managing problem behavior. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 37*(1), 3-8.

Williams, G., & Reisberg, L. (2003). Successful inclusion teaching social skills through curriculum integration. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 38*(4), 205-210.

Witt, J., VanDerHeyden, A., & Gilbertson, D. (2004). Troubleshooting behavioral interventions: A systematic process for finding and eliminating problems. *School Psychology Review, 33*(3), 363-383. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Yell, M. L., & Shriner, J. G. (1998, August). The discipline of students with disabilities. Requirements of the IDEA amendments of 1997. *Education & Treatment of Children, 19*(3), 282-298. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Yell, M. L., & Shriner, J. G. (1997, September). The IDEA amendments of 1997: Implication for special and general educators, administrators, and teacher trainers. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 20*, 1-19. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.