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ABSTRACT

Classroom Management Preparation and New Teacher Retention

Many factors affect student achievement, however, an effective teacher has been found to be the most influential. A prerequisite of an effective teacher is the ability to manage his or her classroom. However, due to the high rate of attrition of teachers within the first five years of service, coupled with the paucity of the training, and time it takes to learn to effectively manage a classroom, often student achievement suffers. Because authors of many studies have found that new teachers cite student discipline problems and lack of classroom management preparation as major factors for their attrition, this author created a more nuanced approach to classroom management training. This in-service combines opportunities for self-reflection regarding teachers’ beliefs and values regarding control in the classroom, a presentation of research based classroom management and discipline approaches, and time to collaborate and work through scenarios of common discipline problems.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In order for a teacher to have an opportunity to affect student achievement, he or she must be able to effectively manage the learning environment. New teachers face a myriad of challenges in their first classroom. Teacher preparation and school district induction programs are the most common sources of information and support for those who enter the field of teaching (Ritter & Hancock, 2007). However, because of the emphasis on student achievement in the current educational climate, other important factors that influence student achievement have been short changed. Specifically, classroom management theories, strategies, and best practices have been distilled to either an afterthought or a series of quick fix tips.

Statement of the Problem

Among the top reasons for leaving the profession, cited by new teachers, was a lack of adequate classroom management preparation and student discipline problems (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005; Bolich, 2001; Ingersoll, 2001, 2002, 2003; Kelly, 1997; Meister & Melnick, 2003). The ability to effectively manage a classroom is the linchpin upon which successful teaching depends. Nearly one-half of those who become teachers leave the profession within 5 years (Ingersoll, 2003), and the impact of this attrition can be measured as both financial and student achievement losses. In the past, researchers described this disparity as a teacher shortage, when in fact there was an ample supply of new teachers who graduated from universities. The problem “is a
revolving door: an occupation in which there are relatively large flows in, through, and
out of schools” (Ingersoll, 2002, p. 21). Thus, a stronger emphasis on classroom
management strategies and best practices in the context of teacher preparation and
induction programs may serve to strengthen teacher retention efforts.

Purpose of the Project

The author of this project sought to connect teacher management style with an
appropriate classroom management approach. The purpose of this project was to develop
a training workshop for new and preservice elementary school teachers to help them
identify their own classroom management style. Through the use of an interactive
workshop, new and preservice teachers: (a) learned about the continuum of control
(Wolfgang & Glickman, 1980), (b) identified their management style, and (c) were
informed about all of the approaches that would be an authentic fit with their values,
beliefs and personality.

Chapter Summary

Ingersoll (2003) found that “high teacher turnover matters not simply because it
may indicate sites of potential staffing problems but because of its relationship to school
performance” (p. 148). The authors of many studies (Alliance for Excellent Education,
have found that new teachers cite student discipline problems and lack of classroom
management preparation as a major factor which contributes to their leaving the
profession.

It is clear that the use of better classroom management preparation can contribute
to teacher retention and, in turn, support higher student achievement goals. At no other
time in history has verifiable student achievement been as paramount as today. However, at this same time, school administrators experience a turnover rate for teachers that is notably higher than in other industries (Ingersoll, 2003). Teacher attrition not only costs school districts financially, but because of the nature of teaching as a social interaction, it affects student achievement as well.

In Chapter 2, the Review of Literature, this researcher will present an overview of: (a) classroom management scope and theory, (b) teacher attrition costs and reasons, and (c) influences on teacher classroom style and effectiveness. The contents of this overview will support the need for better and more precise professional development in regard to training new and preservice teachers how to find an effective classroom management strategy. In Chapter 3, Methods, the goals and procedures for the development of this workshop are detailed.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this project will be an attempt by this author to reduce the numbers of educators, who leave the teaching profession, by addressing one of the main reasons attributed to the problem. The authors of many studies (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005; Bolich, 2001, Ingersoll, 2001, 2002, 2003; Kelly, Stetson, & Stetson, 1997; Meister & Melnick, 2003) have identified a lack of classroom management preparation and the inability to address student discipline problems as a central reason for teacher attrition. Further, nearly one-half of those who become teachers leave the profession within 5 years (Ingersoll, 2003). The impact of this attrition can be measured in both financial and student achievement losses.

Teacher Attrition

Ingersoll (2001) sought to challenge the “substantial empirical research” (p. 502) which focused on the characteristics of individual teachers (e.g., age, teaching field) as the primary function of attrition (Bebbitt, Leich, Whitener, & Lynch, 1994; Chapman & Green, 1986; Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982; Grissmer & Kirby, 1987, 1992, 1997; Hafner & Owings, 1991; Haggstrom, Darling-Hammond, & Grissmer, 1988; Heyns, 1988; Marso & Pigge, 1991; Miech & Elder, 1996; Murnane, Singer, & Willett, 1988; Rumberger, 1987; Schlechty & Vance, 1981, 1983; Weiss & Boyd, 1990, all cited in Ingersoll). Ingersoll identified a notable limitation to these studies, in that, they failed to examine in detail the characteristics and conditions of the schools that were related to
teacher turnover. In order to address these shortcomings, Ingersoll used three annual cycles (i.e. 1987-1988, 1990-1991, 1993-1994) of the U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and its supplement, the Teacher Followup Survey (TFS), as his primary data source in order to approach this problem from an organizational viewpoint.

What Ingersoll (2001) found debunked the teacher shortage myth of the 1980s and 1990s and replaced it with a situation analogous to a “revolving door – where large numbers of qualified teachers depart their jobs for reasons other than retirement” (p. 499). In fact, “the data show that the amount of turnover accounted for by retirement is relatively minor when compared to that associated with other factors, such as teacher dissatisfaction and teachers pursuing other jobs” (p. 499). The cost of this turnover can be measured in both financial and student achievement deficits.

Costs of Teacher Attrition

According to the staff of the Alliance for Excellent Education (2005), a conservative national estimate of the cost to replace public school teachers that leave the profession is 2.2 billion dollars per year. In Colorado alone, officials from the Department of Labor (2003, as cited in Alliance for Excellent Education) estimated the cost of teacher attrition, excluding retirements, as nearly 80 million dollars per year. The officials from the Department of Labor formulated the cost of attrition as being 30 percent of the leaving employee’s salary. The burden of this cost is borne by the taxpayers, thus, it is a problem that extends beyond the immediate stakeholders of a school district to the nation as a whole. Additionally, “instead of using funds for needed school improvements, monies are spent re-teaching the basics each year to new teachers
who come in with few tools and leave before they become skilled” (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 2002, p. 9).

However, financial considerations are only part of the cost of attrition. Ingersoll (2002) found that schools, as organizations, “are unusually dependent on commitment, continuity, and cohesion among employees and are therefore especially prone to suffer when subjected to high rates of employee turnover. . . . which can disrupt the quality of school performance” (p. 19). Effective teachers have been identified by the authors (Haycock, 1998; Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedge, 2004; Sanders & Horn, 1998; Schacter & Thum, 2004; all cited in Schacter & Thum, 2005) of many studies as the single most important factor which is responsible for increased student achievement. Therefore, high teacher attrition rates within the first 5 years of teaching are associated with a negative impact on student achievement.

**Causes of Teacher Attrition**

Ingersoll (2002) categorized the reasons teachers \((N = 6733)\) reported for their turnover from three annual cycles of the SASS (1987-1988, 1990-1991, 1993-1994; as cited in Ingersoll) and TFS (1987-1988, 1990-1991, 1993-1994; as cited in Ingersoll) into five categories: (a) family or personal (e.g., 39%); (b) school staffing action (e.g., 28%); (c) job dissatisfaction (e.g., 26%); (d) to pursue another job (e.g., 25%); and (e) retirement (e.g., 12%). Further, Ingersoll grouped these reasons into two categories: individual and organizational. Personal reasons and retirement were causes of attrition, which were a reflection of individual characteristics, thus, they were excluded from his analysis. The remaining three reasons were categorized as organizational; however, Ingersoll excluded school staffing action from his analysis due to the fact this common
action usually resulted in the migration of teachers to other schools rather than attrition from the profession.

Teachers, who reported job dissatisfaction or the pursuit of another job as the reason for their turnover, represented 51% of the sample (Ingersoll, 2002). Ingersoll identified these “two reasons as directly related to the working and organizational conditions of teaching that are, together, the most prominent source of turnover” (p. 26). Most often, these teachers reported: (a) low salaries, (b) student discipline problems, and (c) lack of support from the school administration as the causes for their leaving. Surprisingly, large class size, lack of planning time, and intrusions on classroom time did not rank as serious enough to affect teacher turnover. Ingersoll (2001) concluded:

The data suggest that improvements in organizational conditions, such as increased support from the school administration, reduction of student discipline problems, and enhanced faculty input into school decision-making and increased salaries, would all contribute to lower rates of turnover, thus diminish school staffing problems, and ultimately aid the performance of schools. (p. 525)

The author of this paper proposes that the provision of an enhanced emphasis on classroom management strategies in teacher preparation and new teacher induction programs may alleviate some of the attrition due to student discipline problems.

Teacher Preparation Programs

It is clear that there is not a teacher shortage problem, but a teacher retention problem (Ingersoll, 2003). According to Cookson (2007), “If I were to choose one educational reform that would make a difference in the lives of students, I would choose supporting new teachers” (p. 14). However, the path to the classroom is as varied as the students who are served by each new teacher. Some new teachers graduate from university teacher preparation programs, others come to the classroom from another field.
to teach via alternative licensing programs (Ritter & Hancock, 2007). What most new
teachers have in common, however, is participation in a new teacher mentoring or
induction program provided by the school district during the first years of their
employment. What differs between new teachers is the quality of their preclassroom
preparation and the effect of that preparation on their retention in the teaching field.

Alternative Certification Programs

According to Ingersoll (2003), “Few educational problems have received more
attention. . . than the failure to ensure that. . . classrooms are all staffed with qualified
teachers” (p. 146.). This concern, coupled with the perceived impending teacher
shortage, provided the impetus to develop quicker pathways for qualified people to
become teachers. Among these alternative certification pathways are career change
programs, such as Troops to Teachers and Teach for America. Additionally, the
administrators in many states have created their own alternative licensing programs that
allow college graduates to forgo formal education training and begin to teach
immediately.

Ritter and Hancock (2007), critics of alternative certification programs, contended
that such programs solve a problem that does not exist, that of a teacher shortage.
Further, the administrators of these programs deliver a high number of new teachers with
a negligible amount of preparation. A comment from an alternatively certified teacher
from Ritter and Hancock’s study supported this point:

[Alternative certification] programs like mine were geared to producing teachers
fast. . . As a result, I learned almost nothing about classroom management that
seemed applicable. I guess they figured that my life experiences before becoming
a teacher would be all that I needed to know about handling classroom activities
and students’ behaviors. They were wrong! (pp. 1212-1213)
The authors (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005; Bolich, 2001, Ingersoll, 2001, 2002, 2003; Kelly et al., 1997; Meister & Melnick, 2003) of many studies have found that classroom management and student discipline problems are a leading reason reported for teacher turnover. Therefore, the ultimate outcome of participation in alternative certification programs may be to exacerbate the attrition problem rather than remedy it.

Traditional Certification Programs

Ritter and Hancock (2007) stated that, “a sound teacher education background acquired through a traditional certification program combined with years of experience in the classroom is the best way to cause teachers to reflect upon best practices related to classroom management” (p. 1214). Particularly, the provision of the foundation courses, coupled with copious amounts of classroom experience, were found to produce teachers with stronger classroom management knowledge and skills vs. alternatively certified study participants.

Although traditional certification programs were found to more effectively prepare preservice teachers for the classroom vs. alternative certification programs (Ritter & Hancock, 2007), Kelly et al. (1997) contended that “current teacher education programs are not able to prepare teachers to meet the expectations that today’s classrooms demand” (p. 3). Specifically, in preservice programs: (a) preservice teachers were not exposed to the community and cultures in which they would most likely be employed; (b) the coursework was more theoretical than practical; and (c) often, classroom management was left out of the curriculum or minimally addressed (Bolich, 2001; Kelly et al.). Therefore, there are still gaps in traditional certification programs that contribute to the teacher attrition problem.


**Induction Programs**

Induction or mentoring programs provided by school districts are increasingly common due to the requirements of The No Child Behind Act of 2001 (as cited in Lynch, DeRose, & Kleindienst, 2006). Typically, the components of these programs are: (a) district orientation, (b) a mentoring relationship, (c) a committee support team, (d) opportunities for peer classroom observations, and (e) professional development and other interactive activities. The authors (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005; Honawar & Killer, 2006; Principal Perspectives, 2004; National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 2002) of many studies have found that the provision of induction and mentoring programs for new teachers is the most effective way to keep good teachers in the classroom. In fact, according to Bolich (2001), “teachers with less than five years of experience who have not participated in induction programs are nearly twice as likely to leave teaching” (p. 8). Therefore, the continued and increased use of induction programs provides a pathway to greater success in teacher retention, and a key opportunity to help teachers hone their classroom management skills.

**Scope of Classroom Management**

Classroom management is the linchpin on which the success of a teacher is achieved. Successful teachers are measured by student achievement. In a meta-analysis to review 11,000 pieces of research over a 50 year period, Wang, Haertel, and Walberg (1993) determined that there were 28 variables that influenced student achievement, and they ranked them in order of importance. Classroom management was identified as the number one factor.
The term, classroom management, is an umbrella designation that includes all of the activities that are required by the teacher to literally manage his or her classroom. Martin, Yin, and Baldwin (1998) observed that “although often used interchangeably, the terms classroom management and discipline are not synonymous” (p. 4). Further, they defined classroom management as “a multi-faceted construct that includes three broad, independent dimensions – instructional management, people management, and behavior management” (p. 4). In contrast, discipline, refers to the structures and rules for student behavior and is part of the behavior management dimension of the classroom management construct.

According to Martin et al. (1998), instructional management includes the: (a) procedures and classroom routines, (b) allocation of materials, (c) monitoring of seatwork, and (d) conveyance of positive academic expectations. Wong and Wong (1998) contended that this is the foundational dimension, in that, a classroom without set procedures and routines is destined to result in confusion. “Confusion leads to problems; problems lead to misbehavior; and misbehavior leads to constant tangling between teachers and students” (p. 91).

The second dimension, people management, “pertains to what teachers believe about students as persons and what teachers do to develop the teacher-student relationship” (Martin et al., 1998, p. 4). Numerous authors (Burden, 1995; Glasser, 1986; Ginott, 1972; Gordon, 1974; Evertson, Emmer, Clements, & Worsham, 1997; Weinstein, 1996; all cited in Martin et al) confirmed that student achievement and productivity are influenced by the quality of the teacher/student relationship. How a teacher communicates with the students, parents, and other staff members influences the climate
of emotional safety in the classroom. For example, according to Fay and Funk (1995), a child who feels that his or her self-worth is being attacked may act in a reckless manner to defend it no matter what the consequences. Thus, a cycle of misbehavior may be perpetuated, and the opportunities for learning are decreased if the teacher/student relationship is poor.

The last dimension, behavior management, is “similar to, but different than, discipline in that it focuses on pre-planned means of preventing misbehavior rather than the teacher’s reaction to it” (Martin et al., 1998, p. 5). A teacher’s behavior management strategy includes the determination of: (a) how classroom rules will be established, (b) which discipline approach he or she will employ, (c) the establishment of an effective reward structure, and (d) his or her level of flexibility in regard to consequences for inappropriate behavior. However this is dependent “on teachers’ theoretical orientations toward classroom management, considerably different strategies are suggested [sic] versus similar incidents” (Turanli & Durmuscelebi, 2006, p. 2). In other words, the personal values, beliefs, and personality of each individual teacher has a greater influence on his or her effectiveness in behavior management than discipline theory alone.

Influences on Classroom Management Style

Van den Berg (2002) stated, “One cannot help teachers develop their classroom management skills without addressing their emotional responses to the events around them and the attitudes, values, and beliefs that underlie these responses” (p. 586). The authors (Duck, 2007; Henson & Chambers, 2003; Martin & Baldwin, 1993; Martin et al., 1995; Martin & Yin, 1997; Maslovaty, 2000; Stoughton, 2007; van den Berg, 2002; Wolfgang, 1996; Wolfgang & Glickman, 1980; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990) of many studies
agree that teachers’ values, beliefs, and personality have an influence on their style of classroom management. Although some researchers found that the definition and measurement of personality characteristics “are limited by the quality of instruments presently available to measure the construct” (Martin & Yin, p. 6), there was an overall agreement with the hypothesis that “personality characteristics and classroom management behaviors seem to be related in patterns that are understandable” (p. 6).

According to Wolfgang (1996), everything that a teacher does to manage his or her classroom is a projection of the core of his or her values, beliefs, and personality. Each activity, from the establishment of rules to setting limits and enforcement of consequences, is a manifestation of who each teacher is as a person. Further, often, the reason that organizationally imposed classroom management and discipline approaches fail is that

Forcing you to practice techniques that are diametrically opposite to your personality core will make you false, mechanical, and ineffective – it simply won’t work. We may then say that some of the discipline models, because of their degrees of power and the development of rules, are a mismatch to your own personality core. There is a lack of personality fit- they are not your face. (p. 20)

Therefore, the more self-aware a teacher is about his or her own personality and value and belief systems, the more authentic he or she will be in the classroom (Wolfgang, 1996). According to Kagan (1992, as cited in Martin & Baldwin, 1993), “teachers are capable of focusing on their pupils and their learning only after they have negotiated a preliminary stage in which they develop an image of themselves as teachers” (p 7). Thus, it is the objective of this author to develop an opportunity for new and preservice teachers to explore and then match their values and beliefs with an appropriate classroom management approach.
While the beliefs, values, and personality of the teacher are crucial components of any classroom management approach or discipline strategy, they are not the only factors (Wolfgang & Glickman, 1980). The affected students and their manifested behavior also need to be taken into consideration. Thus, it is the balance of power between student and teacher in different situations that can serve as a starting point for managing discipline in the classroom. Wolfgang and Glickman sought to define individual teacher approaches to discipline on a continuum of control, and they connected classroom management strategies to different points on that continuum.

The Continuum of Control

According to Glasser (1984), for psychological balance, it is necessary to have a measure of control in one’s life. This is true for both students and teachers. Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) found that:

Control is a salient feature of organizational life in schools. The importance of order in classrooms should not be surprising, especially in light of the involuntary nature of student participation and the fact that classes are made up of groups of young people being led, usually by only one adult, through a series of often difficult tasks that may hold little intrinsic interest. (pp. 83-84)

Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) sought to quantify this balance of control between teacher and student, in the context of classroom management, on a scale called the continuum of control. In order to be an effective teacher, the manifestation of his or her classroom management approach must be congruent with his or her own values, beliefs, and ideals. Thus, Wolfgang and Glickman,

took various psychological interpretations of child development and categorized them into three basic beliefs:
1. The child develops from an inner unfolding of potential.
2. The child develops as a result of external conditions.
3. The child develops from the interaction of inner and outer forces. (p. 11)
The researchers then used these explanations to label three schools of thought in regard to classroom management and discipline approaches: (a) noninterventionist, (b) interventionist, and (c) interactionalist. Although teachers may act, at times, according to all three models, usually, one is predominant in regard to beliefs and actions. “Therefore, the application of these various theories emphasizes teacher behaviors that reflect the corresponding degrees of power possessed by student and teacher” (Martin & Yin, 1997, p. 5).

Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) emphasized, however, that in order to be effective, a teacher needs to use techniques from each of the three points on the continuum in his or her repertoire to meet the needs of a particular student or situation. The authors conceptualized a Developmental Socialization Continuum (DSC) to “chart the ideal developmental path. . . of children as they progress and mature through age levels and stages of development” (p. 187). The stages are, in order of least mature to most mature: (a) passive, (b) physically aggressive, (c) verbally aggressive, (d) socialized interaction through language, and (e) conceptualization through language. The premise of this continuum is that as children learn to use language to solve and manage problems, they acquire the ability to think less egocentrically, and understand that their actions have an effect on the larger group. Therefore, students at different points on this continuum may need more or less power in relation to the teacher in order to mature. This is why teachers need to not only know themselves, but also have the ability to vacillate between levels of power in the teacher/student relationship at times.
Noninterventionist Approaches

Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) concluded that teachers of the noninterventionist style believe that the child’s behavior should not be the primary focus for understanding his or her development. It is the inner emotions and feelings that drive behavior; therefore, any “growth is found in facilitating expression of those inner dynamics” (p. 12). Noninterventionists are the least directive and controlling, thus, the student has the most power over his or her behavior, while the teacher has the least control. Because noninterventionist teachers have an abiding faith in the child as the master of his or her own destiny, the teacher’s role in the classroom is to provide a supportive environment where the child is free to vent and express feelings, and the teacher empathizes with the child’s struggle. However, students in the passive stage of the DSC would least likely benefit from this approach, while students at the more mature stages would most likely benefit. Gordon’s (1974) Teacher Effectiveness Training (TET) model is a classic example of a noninterventionist approach.

Teacher Effectiveness Training (TET)

The cornerstone of Gordon’s (1974) TET model is the relationship between the teacher and the student. Gordon contended that, when “teachers become skilled in using nonpower methods to achieve discipline and order, they find themselves using a whole new language in talking about discipline” (p. 16). He defined a good teacher/student relationship as based on five components:

1. openness and transparency in communication;
2. caring, when each knows he or she is valued by the other;
3. interdependence vs. dependence;
4. separateness to allow each to grow and develop; and
5. mutual needs meeting, so that neither’s needs are met at the expense of the others needs.

Gordon (1974) viewed student misbehavior through the lens of problem ownership. Each disruption is viewed as either the teacher’s or the student’s problem. For example, if the result of a student’s behavior is the disruption of a lesson, then it is considered to be the teacher’s problem. Conversely, if a student’s behavior causes a problem only for him or her, such as what grade will be received, then it is considered to be the student’s problem. Different steps are taken contingent upon who owns the problem.

According to Gordon (1974), when the teacher owns the problem, the following steps, called confrontive skills, may be taken: (a) modification of the learning environment to reduce distractions or temptations; (b) identification of the teacher’s own personal feelings about the problem and discussion of these feelings with the student as a model for problem solving; (c) the teacher must use “I” messages to describe how the misbehavior affected him or her personally; (d) if the student is defensive in the discussion, the teacher should shift gears and revisit the issue at another time; and (e) the final resolution must be a no lose solution that works for both the teacher and student. The purpose of the discussion is for the student to be confronted with the effect his or her misbehavior had on the teacher, without the assignment of blame.

In circumstances in which the student owns the problem, Gordon (1974) recommended the use of helping skills, as opposed to confrontive skills, in the discussion with the student. The teacher actively listens to the student and reflects back his or her
statements for greater clarity. Use of this approach allows the student, in essence, to hear and counsel him or herself; thereby, the student’s problem solving skills are strengthened.

Use of preventative activities provide the framework for the management of an effective TET classroom (Gordon, 1974). The purpose of these activities is to set a tone of collaboration and respect between students and teacher, as well as the students to each other. Examples of preventative activities are: (a) teachers humanize themselves by their use of “I” statements from the beginning of the year; (b) classroom rules are set collaboratively; and (c) participative classroom management, whereby students are regularly given a say in how the classroom is run.

**Interventionist Approaches**

On the opposite end of the continuum of control from the noninterventionist is the interventionist approach (Wolfgang & Glickman, 1980). Interventionists “share the assumption that a child develops according to the conditions of his or her environment. It is only with the implementation of a logical system of conditioning, serving as reinforcement, that socialized behavior can be assured” (p. 15). The roots of the interventionist approach are found in the behaviorist work of Skinner (1953), in which “operant conditioning shapes behavior as a sculptor shapes a lump of clay” (p. 91). In an interventionist classroom, the teacher is the sole authority and is responsible to clearly set and enforce expectations based on a predetermined set of positive and negative consequences. Students in the physically aggressive stage of the DSC would most likely benefit from this approach initially, with an interactionalist approach employed as the child matures as enters the next stage (Wolfgang & Glickman, 1980). Both Canter and
Canter (2001) and Wong and Wong (1998) identified approaches to classroom management that utilize components of the environment to affect student behavior.

**Assertive Discipline**

Canter and Canter (1976; as cited in Canter & Canter, 2001) conceptualized the Assertive Discipline model after many hours of classroom observations in their role as consultants to schools. It is one of the most widely used behavior management programs in U.S. schools (Brophy, 1999). The authors of this approach emphasized the right of teachers to define and enforce standards of student behavior to allow teachers to instruct successfully. The foundation of the approach can be distilled to four components (Brophy; Canter & Canter).

1. **Classroom rules.** Rules are to be created by the teacher prior to the beginning of the school year, and clearly communicated to students.
2. **Predetermined positive consequences.** Teachers identify the top five behaviors they would like to see in the classroom, and align rewards with each one.
3. **Predetermined negative consequences.** For each rule, a negative consequence is formulated and imposed with consistency for greatest effect. Examples of negative consequences include: (a) writing a student’s name on the board, with checkmarks added for each offense; (b) the use of a public behavior chart that is color coded to reflect each child’s compliance to the rules; (c) detention; and (d) a series of progressively more serious consequences, including notes home, time out of the classroom, and referral to the principal.
The teacher as the model of expected behavior. Canter and Canter identified three types of teachers: (a) submissive teachers who are unable to enforce standards, (b) hostile teachers who enforce standards with anger and humiliation, and (c) assertive teachers who enforce standards fairly and consistently with a focus on the choice the student made to misbehave.

According to Canter (1989), “For students to behave they must know the rules, the positive reinforcement they will receive if they choose to follow the rules, and the negative consequences that will result if they choose not to follow the rules” (p. 72). This statement reinforces the premise of the program which is that external forces are paramount to the management of student behavior in the classroom.

Lake (2004), a critic of the Assertive Discipline model, decried the use of punishment and possible humiliation that may damage the self-esteem of students. Lake stated:

A discipline system that relies on rewards and punishment allows the teacher to verbally highlight what “Johnny” did wrong and further humiliate the child by placing his name on the board or having him move his name to another level on the consequences chart. . . . while effective in the short term, does nothing to foster pro-social behaviors. (p. 568)

Skinner (1953) had similar reservations about the value of punishment. He wrote, “Punishment does not actually eliminate behavior from a repertoire, and its temporary achievement is obtained at tremendous cost in reducing the over-all efficiency and happiness of the group” (p. 190). Other criticisms include the lack of democracy in the formation of rules, and the assumption of the program that the root of all classroom
behavior problems lies with the students, and not the result of an ineffective teacher (Curwin & Mendler, 1989).

Wong and Wong

Wong and Wong (1998) endorsed a classroom management approach that has preparation at its core. Preparation, on the part of the teacher, provides a sense of security and predictability that serves as a preventative measure to counter misbehavior. “Readiness is the primary determinant of teacher effectiveness” (p. 94), and much of the success of the teacher is determined well before the first day of school. Wong and Wong emphasized the environment (e.g., both physical and procedural) as the primary factor that contributes to a well run classroom. Specifically, two areas of preparation determine the effectiveness of a teacher at the beginning of the year: readiness, and procedures.

According to Wong and Wong (1998), effective teachers have their room, lesson design, and themselves ready before the first day of school. To create an effective classroom environment, the following areas must be prepared: (a) the floor space (e.g., desk arrangement); (b) the work area (e.g., arrangement of appropriate materials in work areas around the room); (c) an area for students’ personal belongings; (d) the wall space (e.g., post classroom rules and consequences, create permanent locations on bulletin boards where students may consult to see what to do and how to do it); (e) the teacher area; (f) the teaching materials (e.g., first week lessons, communication systems for students and parents); and (g) themselves. Similar to the Assertive Discipline model (Canter & Canter, 1976; as cited in Canter & Canter, 2001), Wong and Wong espoused the establishment of rules and consequences prior to the first day of school, thereby student input is circumvented.
Whereas the preparation of the classroom amounts to the management of the physical space, the development and communication of procedures is the equivalent to the management of classroom systems (Wong & Wong, 1998). Once a procedure has been practiced over and over again, it becomes a routine. The purpose for the use of a routine is to further guide the students toward being self-responsible learners. At a minimum, a teacher should have procedures prepared on the first day of school for: (a) how students should enter the classroom, (b) how students may quietly request the teacher’s attention, (c) the cue from the teacher for silence and attention, (d) how a student should ask permission to use the bathroom, (e) where to find an assignment if the student was absent, and (f) classroom dismissal.

According to Wong and Wong (1998), the purpose of this level of preparation is to provide the student with security. Security is a basic human need that, if not met, can be an impediment to learning. Wong and Wong stated, “students need to feel that someone is in control and responsible for their environment and not only sets limits but maintains them” (p. 151).

Interactionalist Approaches

Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) described the interactionalist teacher as one who believes that students are not formed exclusively from either internal or external conditions, but from a combination of both. “The Interactionalist theory of coping with child behavior is based on the teacher being able to assume the role of a clarifier, a boundary delineator, and finally as an enforcer” (p. 14). These teachers believe that students should take responsibility for their actions, but need active involvement from an empathetic yet firm teacher. Therefore, the solution to the discipline problem should be
acceptable to both student and teacher. Students in the verbally aggressive stage of the DSC would benefit most from an interactionalist approach, in that their verbal skills are developed enough for the teacher to help them make connections between their behavior and the consequences for them and the group. Glasser (1969) and Fay and Funk (1995) proposed classroom practices that are congruent with this approach.

**Reality Therapy**

Glasser’s (1969) Choice Theory is an early example of a shared control approach to classroom management. Glasser maintained that there is a direct correlation between the control a student feels that he or she has over his or her destiny and what that student will achieve in life. Glasser contended that a person’s actions are always within that person’s control. Originally, the Choice Theory was called the Control Theory due to this tenet.

According to Glasser (1984), human behavior is the result of human beings’ attempts to meet their basic needs: (a) survival, (b) love, (c) power, (d) freedom, and (e) fun. People exercise a choice in how to get their needs met. For example, this choice could look like inappropriate classroom behavior to gain power back from a domineering teacher. In order to address this type of behavior, the teacher must help the student to have a measure of control over the situation.

Glasser (1969) promoted the use of classroom meetings to group problem solve to reinforce to students that,

The world is not a mysterious and scary place of which they have little control – rather that, although the world may be difficult and appear hostile, they can use their brains individually and as a group to solve the problems of living in their school world. (p. 123)
Additionally, the use of classroom meetings help: (a) teachers stay actively involved with their students, (b) teachers check in on the learning and attitudes of each member of the group, (c) students think about problems and work out solutions, and (d) teachers model problem solving approaches to help students become more self-sufficient.

Glasser (1969) suggested that classroom meetings should be held daily for between 15-30 minutes in elementary classrooms. These meetings should be either: (a) social problem solving (e.g., concerned with students’ social behavior); (b) open-ended (e.g., students are asked to discuss any thought provoking questions related to their lives or classroom); or (c) educational/diagnostic (e.g., directly related to what the class is studying, used as an anecdotal assessment by the teacher). During the meetings, the participants sit in a tight circle, and the teacher acts as the facilitator.

Van Tassell (n.d.), a critic of Glasser (1969), noted that it takes considerable training and classroom time to implement this approach and recommended that teachers be trained in the model more than once and role play the scenarios frequently in order to be successful. Bourbon (n.d.), another critic, observed a contradiction between Glaser’s assertion that all behavior is internally motivated and controlled, yet when a need is not met, the blame is placed on the environment.

*Love and Logic*

Former teacher and school administrator, Fay and child psychiatrist, Cline developed the approach to classroom management called Love and Logic (Fay & Funk, 1995). Like Glasser (1969), Fay and Funk understand that students have a need for control, and “a child that has no control over his life will spend 100% of his time trying to get it” (p. 143). Similar to Gordon’s (1974) TET, Fay and Funk emphasized the
importance of a rapport built on genuine caring between teacher and student, and the
designation of problem ownership is a component of the problem solving process. A
fundamental principle of the Love and Logic model is a shared thinking process that
teaches students how to develop their own problem solving skills to enhance their self-
sufficiency and, thereby, improve their self-concept.

According to Fay and Funk (1995), there are four key principles of the Love and
Logic model: (a) the enhancement of the child’s self concept, (b) shared control, (c)
consequences with empathy, and (d) shared thinking. “A positive self-concept comes
from feeling capable” (p. 118), not just being told that one is capable. Previous attempts
by educators to shower adjectives on students in regard to how good they were actually
reinforced a dependence on external approval which is contrary to positive self-esteem.
Fay and Funk conceptualized a paradigm to illustrate how students’ self-concept can be
enhanced, which they described as a three legged table. The legs are:

1. The student feels loved by all of the important people in his or her life. It
   is important for a teacher to accept his or her students unconditionally
   even while the negative behavior is not accepted. The need for
   unconditional love is a strong one, and students who do not have that kind
   of love at home may feel unworthy and act as such;

2. The student knows more about his or her strengths than his or her
   weaknesses. It is critical that teachers focus not only on the areas the
   student needs to work on, but also give ample opportunity for the student
   to demonstrate skills with success; and
3. The student can handle the consequence of his or her behavior.

Consequences are a great teacher. Consequences can cause pain. Pain can spur thinking and growth, and result in permanent change.

Fay and Funk (1995) said, “Control is like love. The more you give away, the more you get in return” (p. 138). This shared control approach to problem solving avoids power struggles with students by the use of a technique termed, choices within limits. When students have many opportunities to participate in the decision making of the class, through simple choices, they feel empowered and invested in the class. With each shared decision and choice the student makes, the teacher accrues a savings deposit of control from which to draw when he or she needs to be the one to make the decision solely.

Next, teachers must impose consequences with empathy (Fay & Funk, 1995). Consequences and mistakes can cause emotional pain for a child, but as mentioned before, pain is a tremendous teacher. If a child’s pain is directed outward, the child may blame others and become more rebellious. If the pain is directed inward, and a child understands his or her role in the cause of the pain, a child can learn to change his or her behavior. As one of the most important people in a student’s life, the teacher should demonstrate compassion for the student as well as the discomfort associated with acceptance of consequences. However, teachers should not attempt to rescue or deny the feelings of the student, since these feelings can be the catalyst for real change.

According to Fay and Funk (1995), the final piece of the puzzle is in the power of shared thinking. To induce thinking on the part of the student, a teacher needs to utilize all of the principles of Love and Logic. Fay and Funk categorized the shared thinking techniques into seven guidelines.
1. Make the consequences as close to the time and place of the infraction as possible. This way it has high relevancy to the student.
2. Allow the student the opportunity to be involved in the consequence decision making.
3. Communicate the consequence with calm interest. Do not distract the child with the teacher’s emotions.
4. Give the student an opportunity to think through a new plan of behavior. Use prompts such as, “What would you like to happen?” or “Would you like to hear what other kids have tried?”
5. Let students make their own value judgments.
7. Allow students to feel empowered. (pp. 168-169)

Put into practice, the authors of the Love and Logic model intend to give students the skills to solve problems on their own (Fay & Funk, 1995). Students, who solve their own problems feel capable, and students who feel capable are likely to have a positive self-concept. Thus, the goal of the authors of the Love and Logic model is achieved.

Chapter Summary

Many factors influence student achievement, however, an effective teacher has been found to be have the most impact (Haycock, 1998; Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedge, 2004; Sanders & Horn, 1998; Schacter & Thum, 2004; all cited in Schacter & Thum, 2005). A precondition of an effective teacher is the ability to manage his or her classroom. In fact, classroom management was ranked as the primary influence on student achievement (Wang et al., 1993). Unfortunately, due to the high attrition rate of teachers, coupled with the paucity of the training, and time it takes to learn to effectively manage a classroom, often student achievement suffers (Bolich, 2001; Ingersoll, 2001, 2002, 2003; Kelly et al., 1997; Ritter & Hancock, 2007).

Because the authors (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005; Bolich, 2001, Ingersoll, 2001, 2002, 2003; Kelly et al., 1997; Meister & Melnick, 2003) of many studies have found that new teachers cite student discipline problems and lack of
classroom management as major factors for their attrition, the author of this project proposes a more nuanced approach to classroom management training to stem this outflow of teachers from the profession. In Chapter 3, the goals and procedures for the development of this workshop are presented. Detailed in Chapter 4 is the training workshop and collateral material. Peer assessment feedback and discussion of the project are presented in Chapter 5.
Chapter 3

METHOD

The purpose of this project was to connect the tangible theories of effective classroom management with the intangible proclivities of teacher beliefs, values, and personality. The content of this project served as an opportunity for new and preservice teachers to identify a classroom management approach that is an authentic fit to his or her beliefs, values, and personality. Nearly one-half of those that enter the teaching profession leave within 5 years (Ingersoll, 2003). A number of researchers (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005; Bolich, 2001; Ingersoll, 2001, 2002, 2003; Kelly, Stetson, & Stetson, 1997; Meister & Melnick, 2003) have reported that the teachers who left the profession reported a lack of adequate classroom management preparation and knowledge about student discipline problems to be among the top reasons for their attrition. Therefore, the intended result of this project was to help retain teachers through the provision of a more in depth and personal approach to effectively manage their new classrooms.

Targeted Audience

The target audience for this training workshop was new (e.g., first year) and preservice teachers of elementary school students. This workshop may be delivered as a part of a university teacher preparation course or a school district teacher induction program. New and preservice teachers, who want to find a balance between research
based best practices of classroom management and their own intrinsic teaching style, are the targeted audience for this workshop.

Goals of the Applied Project

The goal of this project was to dispel the myth that there is one approach to classroom management that can fit everyone. Because of the nature of teaching as a social interaction, the intangible nuances of a teacher’s beliefs, values, and personality can have a profound impact on student achievement (Ingersoll, 2003). Therefore, it is critical that teachers identify their own personal teaching style and need for control in the classroom in order to authentically and effectively manage their classrooms. Thus, the goal of the workshop was to match teachers’ beliefs, values, and personality to a research based classroom management approach.

Procedures

The workshop had three sections: (a) teacher self-examination of classroom management beliefs and practices, (b) Power Point presentation, and (c) independent practice and performance. New and preservice teachers began by an examination of their own beliefs about classroom management and identified the level of control that they are most comfortable with in the classroom. This was measured by using the Beliefs on Discipline Inventory (Wolfgang & Glickman, 1980). Teachers then classified themselves as interactionalist, interventionist, or noninterventionist based on the continuum of control scale.

The contents of the Power Point presentation included in depth information about classroom management approaches that match with each point on the continuum of control scale. Lastly, new and preservice teachers had an opportunity to work in small
homogeneous groups (e.g., interactionalist, interventionist and non interventionists) to find solutions to common classroom management issues with use of the proposed theories based on their need and the student’s need for control.

Peer Assessment

Assessment of the training workshop was obtained from four colleagues: (a) one second grade teacher, (b) two fifth grade teachers, and (c) one elementary school administrator. Each colleague based their assessments on: (a) the relevancy of the project, (b) the perceived effectiveness of the method of training, and (c) any gaps in execution that may exist. This author scheduled two meetings with each reviewer, one to deliver and provide an overview of the project, and one to discuss their feedback after reading this proposal.

Chapter Summary

It is clear that the high rate of teacher attrition affects student achievement negatively (Ingersoll, 2003). A lack of classroom management preparation and student discipline problems rank as top reasons for this attrition (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005; Bolich, 2001; Ingersoll, 2001, 2002, 2003; Kelly et al., 1997; Meister & Melnick, 2003). Through this project, this author provided a unique approach to the selection of a classroom management strategy for new and preservice teachers. Through the connection of new and preservice teachers’ management style to personal values and beliefs, this researcher sought to help teachers establish smoother classrooms from the beginning; thus, it was hoped the result would be more confident teachers who will choose to stay in the profession longer. Detailed in Chapter 4 is the training workshop
and collateral material. Peer assessment feedback and discussion of the project will be presented in Chapter 5.
Authors (Haycock, 1998; Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedge, 2004; Sanders & Horn, 1998; Schacter & Thum, 2004; all cited in Schacter & Thum, 2005) of many studies agree that the most important factor that influences increased student achievement is an effective teacher. However, nearly half of those entering the profession leave before the first five years (Ingersoll, 2001). This attrition accounts for both financial and student achievement losses (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005; Ingersoll, 2001, 2002, 2003; National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 2002). One reason cited by teachers who left the profession was student discipline problems (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005; Bolich, 2001; Ingersoll, 2001, 2002, 2003; Kelly, Stetson, & Stetson, 1997; Meister & Melnick, 2003).

Many of these teachers stated that they did not receive adequate classroom management preparation in their preservice program (Ritter & Hancock, 2007). This lack of information and practice has led to new teachers that cannot effectively do what any effective teacher must do first: manage their learning environment. Thus, the goal of this in-service is to provide new and preservice teachers an opportunity to delve into the construct of classroom management. New and preservice teachers will be provided: (a) an overview of the scope of classroom management, (b) a self-examination of their own beliefs and values with regard to student discipline, (c) strategies to use versus specific
student behaviors, and (d) an opportunity to evaluate and role play scenarios of common
discipline problems.

Professional Development Workshop

As participants arrive they are asked to sign in and take the notes packet that includes:
(a) the Beliefs on Discipline Inventory, (b) the Power Point presentation notes, and (c) the
set of scenarios. On the whiteboard, at the front of the room, are the following
instructions for the participants:

- Welcome, my name is Michele Deats, and this is Classroom Management
  and YOU.
- Please go to the east wall where there is a sheet titled “What do you
  believe is the aim of education”, and add your comment.
- While you are up, please add adjectives to the posters with animals on
  them around the room.
- Return to your seat and please complete the Beliefs on Discipline
  Inventory found in your packet.

Welcome to the first day of the rest of your lives! Today you will have an
opportunity to rethink what you have learned (or not learned) about how to effectively
manage your classroom. Additionally, you will find pathways to solutions to common
discipline problems that can be like the sand in your shoe on a journey of 1000 miles.

Icebreaker

But first, I’d like us to get to know each other. Let’s take a look at the posters marked
with animals that are around the room, and the adjectives you all chose to describe each
animal (hawk, dove, ostrich, hummingbird, seagull, owl, fox and shark). Review each animal by quickly moving around the room to read what the participants added.

I am going to ask you all to make two choices by standing by the animal that is most aligned with your answer to the following questions:

- First, please stand by your favorite animal, good;
- Now, please stand by the animal that is most like you in the face of confrontation.

- Let’s hear from some of you about your choices.
- Look around the room, what conclusion can we draw from this exercise? That people handle conflict in many different ways. Why? Past experience, personality, values, etc. Can we apply these findings to any other situations? Of course, how we teach, manage classrooms, and handle discipline issues are all projections of who we are, and we are all different.
- Participants may now return to their seats.

We ARE all different, and yet when it comes to discipline and classroom management approaches we are often given a set of tips, a 300 page book, or a school wide approach. While tips, books, and school wide plans are often valid and helpful, they leave out an important piece of the equation: you!

Researchers on classroom management styles have found that “considerably different strategies are suggested against similar incidents dependent on the teachers’ theoretical orientation” (Turanli & Durmuscelebi, 2006, p. 2). In other words, there are many effective approaches to use in response to the same problem, depending on your beliefs,
values and personality. Just look at how you teach. We all have the same state standards and the same district curriculum frameworks, yet each teacher delivers the material differently. We know there are many different ways to teach a concept effectively. The same is true of discipline. Thus, the objective of this workshop is to first, help you identify and align your discipline approach with your beliefs, values, and personality, and next, to use this information to help you best meet the needs of the students in your classroom.
The contents of this Power Point presentation will provide:

- An overview of the importance of being able to effectively manage your classrooms;
- An overview of the scope of classroom management;
- An opportunity for you to identify your discipline style based on your beliefs, values, and personality;
- A discussion about different approaches to classroom and behavior management and;
- A look at how it all fits together when dealing with different student behaviors.
What is the single most important factor which is responsible for increased student achievement?

An effective teacher*

*Haycock, 1998; Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Holroyd, 2004; Sanders & Horn, 1998; Schacter & Thum, 2004; all cited in Schacter & Thum, 2005

*Read the slide. No surprise here. At its core, teaching is a social interaction. And as we discussed before, in general, we work with the same standards, frameworks, and curriculums, yet some teachers are clearly more effective. What accounts for this? Let’s see what researchers have found that makes one teacher more effective than another.
What makes a teacher effective?

In a meta analysis to review 11,000 pieces of research over a 50 year period, researchers determined that there were 28 variables that influenced student achievement and ranked them in order of importance.

Classroom management skill was identified as the number one factor.*

*Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993

Read the slide. Before you can effectively teach students, you must be able to manage the classroom, set norms, and enforce them. I know from personal experience that a great, well planned, and engaging lesson can turn into a disaster with just one disruptive student. I also know from anecdotal experience (i.e., from an elementary principal friend of mine) that more first year teachers are non-renewed because of poor classroom management skills, than from weak teaching skills. Thus, it appears that administrators expect that new teachers master classroom management skills before others, confirming the fact that it is a foundation for student achievement.
How does a teacher become an effective classroom manager?

According to researchers, “a sound teacher education background...combined with years of experience in the classroom.”

Houston, we have a problem...

*Ritter & Hancock, 2007*

So, we now know that effective teachers are the most important factor responsible for increased student achievement. And we know that in order to be an effective teacher we must be able to manage our classrooms. So what does it take to be an effective classroom manager? *Read the slide.* Hmm, I see two problems with this assertion.
Read the slide. Well, here is the first problem, many new teachers do not stay in the profession long enough to gain the years of experience to be effective. The teaching profession has one of the highest turnover rates versus other industries (2003, Department of Labor, as cited in Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005). Why is this?
In the 1980s and 1990s experts attributed the high need for teachers as a result of a teacher shortage (Ingersoll, 2003). These experts claimed that due to demographic trends new teachers were desperately needed, and this was the catalyst for many alternative licensing programs that still exist today. However, researcher Richard Ingersoll saw something different in the numbers. He realized that there was not a teacher shortage, but a revolving door, “an occupation in which there are relatively large flows in, through, and out of schools” (Ingersoll, 2002, p. 21).

Ironically, many of the alternative licensing programs may have actually exacerbated the problem, by ushering in many new teachers into classroom without much, if any, classroom management preparation.

Next, Ingersoll looked at the reasons that teachers reported for their attrition, and found that nearly half left due to personal reasons, as one would expect. However, the other half left due to reasons directly related to the job. Let’s take a closer look at those teachers in the next slide.
Read the slide. Let’s face it, no one enters the teaching field for the money, yet it is the first reason listed. I see these reasons as interrelated. Try this on for size, “You don’t pay me enough, or support me enough, to deal with these kids, I quit!”
Let’s briefly look at who pays for this attrition. *Read the slide.* First the dollars and cents, do you know who pays for the 80 million dollar tab in Colorado? Yes, you the tax payer! And your mom, your granddad, and your childless neighbor, the taxpayer too! Thus, it is in everyone’s best interest to support new teachers. As we discussed in the beginning of this presentation, the key to student achievement is an effective teacher, so if teachers leave early in their careers and are replaced by other new teachers who have a 50/50 chance of leaving early in their careers, student achievement is bound to suffer. Additionally, money that could be going to the schools for much needed improvements, curriculum, and staff, are usurped by the costs of recruiting, hiring, and training new teachers, of whom 50% will leave before teaching for five years. Thus, the cycle of costs is perpetuated.
Classroom Management Scope

- Classroom management versus discipline
- Components of classroom management:
  - Instructional management
    - Classroom procedures, routines, allocation of materials, conveyance of positive academic expectations
  - People management
    - Teacher/student relationship
  - Behavior management
    - Development of classroom rules, discipline approach, reward structure, and flexibility of consequences

Although the terms classroom management and discipline are often used interchangeably, they are two different things. Classroom management refers to all of the things a teacher does to literally manage his or her classroom, whereas discipline refers to only the structure and rules for student behavior.

Let’s look at the three components of classroom management. Your instructional management processes are your foundation, and according to Wong and Wong, the most important thing you plan before the first day of school. This sets the tone and creates an environment that cultivates self-responsible learners. We will discuss this in more detail later in the presentation.

Next is people management. Authors (Duck, 2007; Henson & Chambers, 2003; Martin & Baldwin, 1993; Martin, Yin, & Baldwin, 1998; Martin & Yin, 1997; Maslovaty, 2000; Stoughton, 2007; van den Berg, 2002; Wolfgang, 1996; Wolfgang & Glickman, 1980; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990) of many studies found that student productivity is greatly influenced by the quality of the teacher/student relationship. Therefore, how a
teacher communicates with the students, parents, and other staff members influences the
climate of emotional safety and productivity in the classroom.

Finally, the biggie, the behavior management component of the classroom
management construct. This is “similar to, but different than, discipline in that it focuses
on pre-planned means of preventing misbehavior rather than the teacher’s reaction to it”
(Martin et al., 1998, p. 5). Specifically, a teacher’s behavior management strategy
includes the determination of:

• How the classroom rules will be established;
• Which discipline approach will be employed;
• The establishment of an effective reward structure, and
• His or her level of flexibility regarding consequences for inappropriate behavior.

Much of your work today will focus on this component.
Read the slide. This is where you come in. What are the beliefs, values, personality, and experiences that you bring to the classroom? Let’s look back to the opening exercise. It was a snap shot of how people respond to confrontation and conflict in different ways, thus, this needs to be taken into account as we select the way in which we choose to manage our classrooms. Authenticity is the cornerstone of an effective teacher. As we discussed before, teaching is, at its root, a social interaction. If you are working with an approach to discipline that is incongruent with your values, it will not be effective. We all know that children have an innate ability to sniff out insincerity, rendering your words and actions meaningless if you do not believe in what you are doing and saying.
Read the slide. These are the three primary influences that we are going to examine in order to help you select, not only, your overall approach, but also, how you will use the techniques from other approaches to support different situations.
The Continuum of Control

- For psychological balance, it is necessary to have a measure of control in one's life (Glasser, 1984)
- What do you most believe?
  A child develops from an inner unfolding of potential (noninterventionist);
  A child develops as a result of external conditions (interventionist);
  A child develops from the interaction of inner and outer forces (interactionist).

Read the quote. This holds true for both students and teachers. And it is this balance of control that will provide you a roadmap for finding solutions to many discipline problems. I’m sure we all have worked with the smart-aleck that has emerged as a class leader when given leadership opportunities that help him or her get power in appropriate ways. This continuum is designed to help you see why that works, as well as strategies for other behaviors.

According to Wolfgang and Glickman (1980), your natural classroom management style should be based on your beliefs regarding child development. Look at these three statements. Which statement seems like it is most aligned with your beliefs?

Read each statement. Please note that while many of you may see validity in all three statements, one usually predominates your actions. Note the terms associated with each statement: (a) noninterventionist, (b) interventionist, and (c) interactionalist. Using these terms, please rank your beliefs on page one of the Beliefs on Discipline Inventory.
I am handing out the “answer key” to the Beliefs on Discipline Inventory, please calculate your results. Look at each of the three columns titled: (a) Table 1, (b) Table 2 and (c) Table 3. Underneath each column are eight sets of question and answer combinations. Look back at your answer sheet and circle each of your answers under the corresponding column. Next, total up the number of question and answer combinations you matched in each column and write them in the space below. If you had the largest amount of matching responses in Table 1, then you may most identify with the Interventionist approach. If Table 2 represented the majority of your answers, then you may be aligned with a more Noninterventionist school of thought. Finally, if you had the highest number of matching answers under the Table 3 column, you fall in the middle of the two previous approaches, and are considered an Interactionalist.

How did your answers match with your prediction? I am hoping that this exercise helped you clarify your beliefs and values as they relate to managing the behavior of the students in your classroom. Next, we are going to delve into each of these approaches, and corresponding classroom management strategies, using the continuum of control as our framework.
The thick blue line represents the continuum of control. Please note that to the far left and far right are the two initials, c and t. The c stands for child and the t stands for teacher. The capitalized letter represents who controls the behavior of the child, therefore, the farther to the left you go the more power you are giving a child in a situation, and the farther to the right, the less power the child has. Each school of thought has been identified on this continuum.

Although you have identified your natural disposition with regard to the amount of power you prefer, it is important to note, that as I introduce each strategy, that an effective teacher must be able to use components from each strategy in order to be successful. In other words, just because you are a noninterventionist at heart, you will still have to employ more powerful techniques at times with certain students.
Noninterventionist Approaches

- **Teacher Effectiveness Training** (Gordon, 1974)

  The foundation is a good teacher/student relationship based on openness, caring, interdependence, separateness, and mutual needs meeting.

  **Problem ownership: teacher or student**
  - If the teacher owns the problem then use confrontive skills.
  - If the student owns the problem then use helping skills.

Teacher Effectiveness Training or TET has its focus in the people management component of the classroom management construct. Gordon believed that “when teachers become skilled in using nonpower methods to achieve discipline and order, they find themselves using a whole new language in talking about discipline (Gordon, 1974, p. 16). He asserts that both the development of classroom rules and the management of the classroom be collaborative exercises. Next, when a rule is broken, the problem must be dealt with after the determination of whose problem it is. For example, if a student is being disruptive during a lesson, this is deemed to be the teacher’s problem. If a student is concerned about a grade he or she received on an assignment, then it is deemed to be the student’s problem.

If the teacher owns the problem, then confrontive skills are employed. The teacher would: (a) modify the environment to reduce distractions; (b) identify their own personal feelings; (c) meet with the student to discuss these feelings by using “I” statements; (d) discontinue and revisit at another time, if the student gets defensive; and
(e) find a resolution that is a win/win solution for both student and teacher. The overriding purpose of the discussion is for the student to be confronted with the effect his or her misbehavior had on the teacher, without the assignment of blame.

When the student owns the problem, Gordon recommends the use of helping skills. In this situation the teacher would actively listen and reflect back the student’s statements for greater clarity. The purpose of this approach is to allow the student to hear and counsel him or herself to strengthen his or her problem solving skills.
*Read the slide.* Lee Canter developed this method of classroom management in the 1970s, yet it is still the most popular approach used in classrooms today. Have you ever seen a color coded behavior chart on the wall? How about names of disruptive students written on the board? Does anyone work in a school that issues “caught you” tickets for good behavior? If so, you have seen the Assertive Discipline approach in action. Why is it so popular? In short, because it works! But, critics ask, at what cost?

This approach is at the farthest right on the continuum of control, with the teacher as the sole authority, and the child in the least powerful position. It has its roots in the work of B.F. Skinner’s operant conditioning. By reinforcing the behavior, either positively or negatively, teachers can manage and shape the behavior of their students. This approach can be highly effective with some students and a breeding ground for power struggles with others.
Read the slide. Harry Wong’s *The First Days of School* is a popular book, that I recommend everyone have no matter what your approach. It focuses on the instructional component of the classroom management construct. The Wongs contend that your classroom management approach begins before you even meet your students. It is all that you do to arrange your environment that will facilitate students’ evolution into self-responsible learners.
Interactionalists, as you may recall, believe that students develop from both external and internal influences. These approaches are found near the center of the continuum of control, meaning the power is balanced between the student and teacher.

Glasser (1984) contends that misbehavior is only a vehicle to get one of our basic needs met (e.g., survival, love, power, freedom, and fun). Students exercise choices in how to get these needs met. Glasser suggests classroom meetings to help students move from an egocentric place, to a more collective perspective that encourages them to choose to get their needs met with consideration to the group as a whole.

Glasser proposed that, ideally, classroom meetings would be conducted for 15 to 30 minutes per day. There are three types of meetings: (a) social problem solving, where students openly discuss problems and brainstorm solutions; (b) open ended meetings, where students can ask thought provoking questions related to their lives or classroom, and; (c) educational/diagnostic meetings, that are directly related to what the class is studying, and may be used as an anecdotal assessment by the teacher.
According to Love and Logic founder, Jim Fay, “a child that has no control over his life will spend 100% of his time trying to get it” (1995, p. 143). Like the TET approach, the authors of Love and Logic emphasize the importance of a rapport built on genuine caring between teacher and student, and the designation of problem ownership as a component of the problem solving process. Fay and Funk conceptualized four key principles of their approach.

The foundational component is the enhancement of the child’s self-concept. A child’s self-concept can be enhanced by employing the paradigm of the three-legged table:

1. The student feels loved by all of the important people in his or her life.
2. The student knows more about his or her strengths than weaknesses.
3. The student can handle the consequences of his or her behavior.

Next, the authors proposed creating a savings deposit of control with the class. This is achieved by allowing students to make many decisions in the classroom. With each
decision the students make, the teacher is accumulating a savings deposit of control from which to draw when the teacher needs to be the sole decision maker. Third, the teacher must impose consequences with empathy, and resist the urge to rescue the child from the pain and discomfort these consequences may invoke. It is important to realize that pain can be a tremendous teacher and catalyst for internalized change. Finally, the shared thinking process helps students, with the guidance of a loving teacher, find their own solutions to their problems.
Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) conceptualized this continuum describing the social development of children. The premise of this continuum is that as children learn to use language to solve and manage problems, they acquire the ability to think less egocentrically, and understand that their actions have an effect on the larger group. Therefore, students at different points on this continuum may need more or less power in relation to the teacher in order to mature. This is why teachers need to not only know themselves, but also have the ability to vacillate between levels of power in the teacher/student relationship at times. There are five points on this continuum, the other two are on the next slide and represent more mature developmental stages. However, for our work today we are going to focus on these three types of behaviors. Allow me to describe each student:

- The passive student may be in a dream world or fog. According to this model his or her goal may be helplessness or to remain a victim of circumstances. The student may reject comfort in both physical and verbal forms from the teacher and
classmates. He or she is socially reclusive. He or she may drift from activity to activity without completing anything. He or she says “I can’t” without trying first. He or she may be perceived as lazy or listless in class. Many times this child is described by busy teachers as well behaved and may just vanish into the woodwork. However, based on this continuum, this is the child with the greatest emotional difficulty. Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) describe this child as being, “in the grey area between normality and pathology” (p. 190). As this child acquires the use of language as a tool to express his or her needs, he or she may mature into the next stage, the physically aggressive student.

• The physically aggressive student is physically defiant. He or she may have the goal of revenge as their motivation. To them the world is a prohibitive place, and these restrictions feed their anger and defiance. If he or she becomes frustrated, a tantrum may ensue. He or she may punch, kick, and physically harass his or her classmates as well as put themselves in danger by taking unreasonable risks. He or she may misbehave during class by throwing spitballs, airplanes, grabbing books and papers, and even chairs, to get the teacher’s constant physical attention. As this child acquires the use of language as a tool to express his or her needs, the child may mature into the next stage, the verbally aggressive child.

• The verbally aggressive student makes fun, teases, and ridicules other students. He or she may be seeking power through the behavior. He or she may swear at others, joke when asked to be serious, sass the teacher, yell out inappropriate comments during class, and laugh openly when others are reprimanded. This child is using language to express his or her needs, however he or she is still very
egocentric and needs to be guided to realize the negative social impact his or her words are having on others, and ultimately, him or herself.
The last two points on the continuum represent more socially mature behaviors. Although, the child at the socialized interaction through language stage may still engage in annoying behaviors to gain attention, he or she is mature enough to be redirected by the teacher without much recourse. The ultimate goal is to be able to communicate with, and understand, the world through the use of language. Children at the most mature level have a more collective, than egocentric, perspective on their actions and words.

Let’s refer back to our comments regarding the ultimate aim of education. *Walk over to the poster and read the comments.* I can infer from these comments that the aim of education is to foster the growth of children into productive, self-responsible citizens, who care for others and the world around them. Well, this child, in the most mature stage, is our goal. What balance of power do you think would be most effective in working with this student? That of the interventionist, where the teacher holds all of the cards? That of the interactionalist where power is balanced between teacher and student? Or would the noninterventionist non-power methods be most effective? I agree, a child
with this level of maturity is ready to lead and discipline him or herself. Thus, the
ultimate goal of classroom management is aligned with the aim of education; to create
self-responsible and self-disciplined people who care about themselves and others.
Now let’s put it all together and see how the balance of power and the strategies we have discussed dovetail into a classroom management approach. Beginning with the passive child, it is suggested to begin from the interventionist point on the continuum of control. In this approach, the teacher has the most power and the student, the least. Why do you suppose it was not suggested to start at the other two points (noninterventionist, interactionalist)? Based on what we know about the passive child, he or she has not developed enough verbal skills to be effectively guided by the other two approaches. Our goal with this child is to encourage interaction, both physical and verbal, with other people.

Using the Assertive Discipline model is suggested for this student. As the teacher, you would first choose no more than five behaviors you would like to see from the student. Then you would select the positive rewards each behavior. Next, the teacher communicates these new expectations and rewards to the student. The teacher may create a chart and tape it to the student’s desk to remind him or her. Before the teacher
begins the process of reinforcing the desired behavior he or she will create a record with baseline observations and a chart to assess growth over the period of reinforcement. As the child successfully begins to interact with the environment the teacher may begin to employ more interactionalist strategies with the student in order to help them use their words to solve their problems and get their needs met. However, a sign that the child has successfully evolved from passivity may be entry into the next stage, the physically aggressive child.
Believe it or not, it is progress for some children to reach this stage! The physically aggressive child would not benefit from noninterventionist approaches because he or she is not yet master of his or her words. The goal is to begin in the interventionist perspective to assure the safety of the class, and quickly move to the interactionalist approaches to help this child get his or her needs met in a more socially acceptable way. In other words, to channel those physical acts into expressions of language.

Beginning with the Assertive Discipline approach, the teacher would identify behaviors he or she wants to see and align rewards to each. The teacher would also identify unacceptable behaviors and align negative reinforcement tactics for each. Such negative reinforcement may look like: (a) time out, (b) removal from the classroom for short periods of time, (c) an office referral, and/or (d) parent contact. The teacher is sending the message that the physical acts of aggression will not be accepted in the
classroom, period. Counterbalancing this negative reinforcement, the teacher is looking for even the briefest glimpse of the desired behavior to reward.

Once the child is no longer a physical threat to the other students, the teacher switches into the Interactionalist mode. Together, with the student, it is suggested that the teacher begin to employ the Love and Logic techniques of: (a) enhancing the child’s self-concept, (b) shared control, and (c) shared thinking to help the child, problem by problem, and incident by incident, begin to use their words to get their needs met. Additionally, as a class, the teacher may employ the use of classroom meetings to have an open discussion about the effects the bully’s behavior has had on the individuals in the classroom.

If the child successfully matures through this stage, he or she may evolve into to the next stage, the verbally aggressive child.
Whew, can you see why this never feels like progress? No wonder half of us quit! This child has the use of his or her words, yet, he or she is still probably having a tough time getting his or her needs met. This is because they are still very egocentric. For this child, a powerful teacher represents a worthy opponent for endless power struggles, thus, it is best to begin from the least powerful position (noninterventionist) and move to a shared power position (interactionalist).

Employing the helping and confrontive skills discussed in TET would be a good starting point. The teacher models how to express oneself and the effect the student’s misbehavior has had on him or her and the classroom, in a non-emotional, pragmatic way, without the assignment of blame. The teacher then actively listens and reflects back what the student says in order to help the student hear him or herself.

Once the student is ready, the teacher may create a savings deposit of control with the student. The teacher will let this student make many choices to assuage their need for power. The teacher will also more deeply discuss with the student (using the shared
thinking paradigm) problem solving strategies to help him or her get his or her needs met in a more appropriate manner.
Please direct your attention to the rear of the classroom. There are three tables, labeled: (a) interventionist, (b) interactionalist, and (c) noninterventionist. Please go to the table that represents the results of your Beliefs on Discipline Inventory. Bring your scenario packet with you. As a group, please work through the scenario that corresponds with the number on your table. Please begin by following the steps on this slide. First, interpret the child’s behavior on the DSC (e.g., passive, physically aggressive, verbally aggressive). Next, using the continuum of control, determine your pathway to success. Then, identify the first three steps you would take with this child. Be as specific as you can. Finally, select a reporter for your group to describe your scenario and agreed upon actions.
Chapter Summary

New and preservice teachers face many challenges in their first years of teaching. The greatest of which may be how to effectively manage their new classrooms. Teachers that are unable to master this skill may find student discipline problems so pervasive that they leave the profession early into their careers. It is this author’s opinion that this is a preventable cause of attrition. By gaining knowledge about classroom management theories and strategies, coupled with opportunities to practice these new skills, teachers may be able to overcome these initial obstacles and be able to enjoy a long career in education. This in-service is only part of the process of learning and practice, however. The author of the information presented intended to lay the foundation for understanding how to take into account not only student behavior, but also, teacher disposition, and child development, to solve discipline problems in the classroom. The ultimate goal of such preparation is higher teacher retention, which in turn supports higher student achievement.
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

The ability of a teacher to effectively manage a classroom not only enables the teacher to increase student achievement, but also may contribute to the longevity of his or her career. Of the nearly one half of teachers who leave the profession within the first five years, many reported student discipline problems as their primary reason (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005; Bolich, 2001; Ingersoll, 2001, 2002, 2003; Kelly, Stetson, & Stetson, 1997; Meister & Melnick, 2003). However, student discipline problems are the symptom and not the disease. The problem is not necessarily the behavior of the students, but the lack of knowledge and preparation on the part of the teacher to be able to efficiently handle those problems. Whether a teacher has entered the profession via traditional preparation programs or alternatively licensed pathways, he or she may have received little to no information regarding how to manage a classroom. Thus, the purpose of this project was to create a workshop that will help new and preservice teachers identify their own personal discipline style and effective strategies to manage all of the components of the classroom management construct.

Contribution of the Project

The contents of the in-service provided new and preservice teachers an opportunity to examine their own beliefs about discipline and classroom management by using the Beliefs on Discipline Inventory. Next, teachers were introduced to several research based approaches to classroom management that corresponded to points on the
continuum of control between the teacher and the student. Finally, the new and preservice teachers put this knowledge into practice by employing these strategies against scenarios of different student behaviors. The intent of the project was to serve as a launching pad for new and preservice teachers to learn more about which strategies to use in different situations.

Limitations to the Project

The topic of classroom management is an enormous one, thus, it is difficult to stem the flow of educators leaving the profession with just one in-service. Expanding this workshop into a four part series may provide an opportunity to more fully address and practice new skills. Additionally, follow up in-services would be helpful to each cohort that moves through the expanded introductory series of seminars, to practice, refine, challenge, and add to, what they have learned.

Peer Assessment

Four colleagues reviewed this thesis and provided feedback. Three of the four colleagues were elementary school teachers (i.e. representing both primary and intermediate grades), and one colleague was a school district administrator. This author arranged to meet with each colleague twice. At first meeting, this author provided an overview of the project and direction regarding what kind of feedback was requested (e.g., the relevancy of the project, the perceived effectiveness of the method of training, and any gaps in execution that may exist in the project). The next meeting was to discuss and record each colleague’s feedback after he or she read the proposal. The feedback was overwhelmingly positive. Two of the teachers strongly suggested that the workshop would be beneficial to veteran teachers in addition to new and preservice teachers. The
school district administrator said she would be interested in providing this author a forum for this presentation next August for her staff. The overall consensus was that the presentation was relevant, effective and comprehensive.

Recommendations for Further Study

Surprisingly, a website devoted to classroom management does not exist. It is this author’s opinion that the development of such a website would contribute greatly to the field. The content of this website could serve a multitude of purposes including: (a) a link to the latest research on the topic, (b) a training calendar with dates of upcoming seminars on the topic, (c) guest experts could answer questions posted by users, and (d) links to blogs and open forums to discuss issues and support each other.

Research Project Summary

Wong and Wong (1998) contended that preparation of the classroom prior to the first day of school was the key to teacher effectiveness. Their theorem can be extended beyond classroom preparation to preservice teacher preparation as well. A teacher that is prepared with self-knowledge, research based strategies, and practice may have a greater chance at longevity in the teaching profession. It seems obvious that it is impossible to affect student achievement without first being able to manage the learning environment, yet most preparation programs discount this practicality and address it minimally if at all. The eventual cost to the future students of these poorly prepared teachers is paid in student achievement losses. In the current educational climate, this could contribute to devastating results for a school. One in-service alone cannot solve this problem. However, the recognition and commitment of university preparation and school district
induction programs to have a greater emphasis on classroom management will pay dividends in the not so distant future.
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Beliefs on Discipline Inventory

Scenarios
Beliefs on Discipline Inventory*

PART 1: Prediction  Please skip this section until later in the presentation.

Rank the discipline models according to how you think you generally believe. Place 1 next to the model you think most dominates your beliefs, 2 next to the second, and 3 next to the third.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interventionist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noninterventionist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactionalist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 2: Forced Choices  Please begin with this section.

Select either A or B. You might not completely agree with either choice, but choose the one that is closer to how you feel.

Question 1
A. Although children think, the decisions they make are not yet fully rational and moral.
B. Students’ inner emotions and decision making processes must always be considered legitimate and valid.

Question 2
A. Generally, I assign students to specific areas or seats in the classroom.
B. Generally, my seating assignments are open to negotiation.

Question 3
A. No matter how limited the students’ opportunities may be, students should still be given the responsibility to choose and make decisions.
B. Teachers need to realize that, in addition to their effect on students during school hours, the students are greatly influenced by their families, the neighborhoods where they live, their peers, and the media.

Question 4: When the high noise level in the classroom bothers me, I will more likely:
A. Discuss my discomfort with the students and attempt to come to a compromise about noise levels during activity periods.
B. Allow the activity to continue as long as the noise is not disturbing or upsetting any students.
Question 5: If a student breaks a classmate’s MP3 player that she brought to school, I, as the teacher, will more likely:

A  Scold both students, one for disrespecting other people’s property, and the other for breaking a rule prohibiting her from bringing electronics to school.
B  Avoid interfering in something that the students (and possibly their parents) need to resolve themselves.

Question 6: If students unanimously agree that a classroom rule is unjust and should be removed, but I (the teacher) disagree with them, then:

A  The rule should probably be removed and replaced by a rule made by the students.
B  The students and I should jointly decide on a fair rule.

Question 7: When a student does not join in a group activity:

A  The teacher should explain the value of the activity to the student and encourage the student to participate.
B  The teacher should attempt to identify the student’s reasons for not joining, and should create opportunities that respond to those reasons.

Question 8: During the first week of class, I will more likely:

A  Let the students interact freely and let the students initiate any rule making.
B  Announce the classroom rules and inform students how the rules will be fairly enforced.

Question 9

A  The students’ creativity and self-expression should be encouraged and nurtured as much as possible.
B  Limits on destructive behaviors need to be set without denying students their sense of choice and decision.

Question 10: If a student interrupts my lesson by talking to a neighbor, I will more likely:

A  Move the child away from other students and continue the lesson, because time should not be wasted on account of one student.
B  Tell students how angry I feel and conduct a dialogue about how the students would feel about being interrupted.
Question 11

A  A good educator is firm but fair in taking disciplinary actions on violators of school rules.
B  A good educator discusses several alternative disciplinary actions with the student who violates a school rule.

Question 12: When one of the more conscientious students does not complete an assignment on time:

A  I will assume the student has a legitimate reason and that the student will turn in the assignment when he or she completes it.
B  I will tell the student that she or he was expected to turn in the assignment when it was due, and then, with the student, we will decide on next steps.

*Wolfgang & Glickman, 1980, pp. 253-256*
Scoring Key and Interpretation

Circle your responses on the following table and tally the totals in each table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I</th>
<th>Table II</th>
<th>Table III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A 2A</td>
<td>1B 4B</td>
<td>2B 4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B 5A</td>
<td>5B 6A</td>
<td>3A 6B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A 8B</td>
<td>8A 9A</td>
<td>7B 9B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A 11A</td>
<td>10B 12A</td>
<td>11B 12B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of responses in Table I __________
Total number of responses in Table II __________
Total number of responses in Table III __________

The responses in Table I represent the Interventionist model of discipline; the responses in Table II are Noninterventionist; and Table III represents the Interactionalist responses.

By examining which table contains the largest number of responses, you can identify the model of discipline that dominates your beliefs. The table with the second largest total of responses represents your second most prominent belief model. Of course, the table with the fewest total responses represents the discipline model that you least believe in.

If you have an equal number of responses from each table (or close to equal), this may indicate that you are an eclectic rather than one who identifies clearly with any of the discipline models.

You may be interested in comparing your results on Part 2 of the Inventory with what your predicted in Part 1 of the Inventory.

This will give you an idea of how your predictions are to your beliefs, as measured by this inventory.

Naturally, this brief inventory is not definitive. However, it ought to give you a general picture of how much you believe in each of the three discipline models.
Scenario One
Joe manages to get most of his work done, but in the process he is constantly disruptive. He teases the girls sitting around him, keeping them constantly laughing and competing for his attention. Joe makes wisecracks in response to almost anything you say. When confronted, he grins charmingly and responds with exaggerated courtesy, leading you to feel as if the student is patronizing you. However, his antics delight the rest of the class. What will you do to curb such behavior?

Scenario Two
Jessica reluctantly came to school in August. She was withdrawn, did not smile, and would not interact with the other students. Her attendance was poor. The only time she speaks to the teacher is to ask when the school day will be over. Over the course of the school year, her behavior has not changed. She sits alone in the same location at each recess. If someone spoke to her, she would lower her head and not respond. She is not regarded as attractive and her clothes are old and shabby. Her schoolwork is poor; however, she will attempt any work that is given to her. The school psychologist has tested Jessica and reports that she is within the average IQ range. She has had medical checkups, and records indicate she is physically normal.

Scenario Three
Jacob is an attractive, well dressed, and healthy looking boy. However, he seems very tense, loud, and he handles materials, equipment, and games roughly. He sometimes stays outside for a few minutes after lunch is over or remains in the restroom after the class has gone back to class after a break. He then enters the room, after the other students are settled and quiet, making a lot of noise and disrupting whatever activity is taking place. Jacob likes to take his time getting into lines in the room whenever the class is moving to another room. He usually then ends up at or near the end of the line. As soon as the teacher turns the other way to lead the class to its destination, Jacob knocks over displays in the room, takes things off the bulletin board by the door and drops them in to the wastebasket, and drops books in the wastebasket. In addition, he kicks, pushes, fights, and otherwise causes a commotion at the end of the line, or leaves the line and takes another route to the place the class is going.