5-2023

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS AND USE OF BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

Lucia Mariah Smith-Menzies
California State University - San Bernardino

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS AND USE OF BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

A Dissertation

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

in

Educational Leadership

by

Lucia Smith-Menzies

May 2023

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS AND USE OF BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

A Dissertation

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

---

by

Lucia Smith-Menzies

May 2023

Approved by:

Dr. Joseph Jesunathadas, Committee Chair, Education

Dr. Jemma Kim, Committee Member

Dr. Anne Kalisek, Committee Member

ABSTRACT

Research indicates that punitive school discipline practices are ineffective and continue to marginalize students of color and students with disabilities. Historical and societal conceptions of punishment offer insight as to why these punitive practices persist. The legacies of school discipline and how teachers understand the role of punishment have implications for which behavior management strategies are employed in the classroom. This study examined the relationship between teacher perceptions of the effectiveness and use of behavior management strategies, their opinions of the utility of punishment, and their understanding of the outcomes of punishment. Descriptive analyses, an analysis of variance and correlational analyses were conducted to answer the research questions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my professor and chair of my committee, Dr. Joseph Jesunathadas. I am also grateful for my committee members, Dr. Jemma Kim and Dr. Anne Kalisek. This endeavor would not have been possible without my mother, Holly Menzies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

Despite extensive research showing how punishment-based discipline in school is unproductive and perpetuates negative student outcomes, teachers and schools still rely on punitive and reactive practices (Rydell & Henricsson, 2004; Skiba & Losen, 2016; Shook, 2012). Data from the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (2017-2018) reports that over a million students in the United States are excluded from school through suspension and 19 states still allow corporal punishment. Students who are punished are placed at risk for a wide-range of problems that reverberate throughout their lives. The inequitable application of school discipline policies targets students who are already at risk for poor academic outcomes with national data reflecting serious racial, socioeconomic, and disability disparities (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2019). Furthermore, there are significant state and nation-wide social and economic costs that come from excluding students from school. According to school discipline data, the cost of students dropping out of school due to suspension exceeded $30 billion annually. In California, reducing the suspension rate by half would save over $3 billion (Losen et al., 2015).

In the 2017-2018 school year, approximately 2.5 million K-12 students in the United States were excluded from school. A disproportionate percentage of

these students were Black, Hispanic students and students with disabilities (Office for Civil Rights, 2018). Black students are especially vulnerable to more frequent and harsher discipline than white students for the same offenses (Pesta, 2018). Exclusion starts at the very beginning of many students' academic experience with over 2,000 preschoolers suspended in 2017-2018 (Office for Civil Rights, 2018). In 2017-2018, Black students served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) represented 2.3% of the total student enrollment yet 8.8% of these students received out-of-school suspensions, 8.4% were referred to law enforcement, and 9.1% of students were arrested (Office for Civil Rights, 2018). Data show that over a million students were given office discipline referrals in one year (PBISApps, 2020). A systematic review of the research also revealed that experiencing punitive discipline is significantly associated with adverse mental, behavioral, and physical health outcomes among students (Duarte et al., 2022).

Many systemic problems are insidious in practices for managing student behavior. One consequential example is the stark connection between zero-tolerance approaches to school discipline, harsh discipline practices of the increasing use of school-based law enforcement officers or school resource officers, and the school-to-prison pipeline (King & Bracy, 2019). Students who are suspended are more likely to encounter the criminal justice system, placing them at risk for future incarceration. These students are already structurally marginalized.

Academic progress is also impacted by behavior management strategies. National concerns about student performance in reading could be, in part, addressed through the loss of instructional time due to exclusionary discipline practices. Research found that a fourth grader who missed three days of school in the month before taking the National Assessment of Educational Progress scored a full grade-level lower in reading (Ginsburg et al., 2014). In California, it is estimated that in 2016-17, students lost 783,690 days of instruction time from both in-school and out-of-school suspensions (Losen & Martin, 2018). Students of color with disabilities lost a disproportionate amount of this instructional time. Black students with disabilities lost approximately 77 more days compared to their White peers with disabilities (Losen & Martinez, 2020).

Even the use of punishment for minor misbehavior has been shown to be detrimental and counter-productive for correcting future behavior. Amemiya et al., (2020) found that minor infractions predicted more serious behavior infractions. After receiving punishment for minor misbehavior, students' behavior was likely to escalate and the probability of a student engaging in deviant behavior increased 64% (Amemiya et al., 2020). Amemiya et al. (2020) ascribed this escalation to the psychological reactance theory, which is a phenomenon where people feel hostility, anger, or aggression when their freedom to behave as they desire is threatened. This unpleasant state motivational arousal can result in people attempting to reestablish their freedom, sometimes by engaging in the restricted behavior (Steindl et al., 2015). Amemiya et al. (2020) theorized that

students who received minor infractions felt they have received unjust punishment, which elicited subsequent defiant behavior.

Not only are punishment-based discipline practices legally and ethically problematic, research and practice demonstrate they do not work. The negative outcomes of punishment are described extensively in the literature and include low academic achievement, social disruption, learned helplessness, and increased aggression in addition to long-term implications such as increased school dropout, increased contact with the criminal justice system, and negative outcomes in adulthood (Wolf & Kupchik, 2017). The continued high rate of exclusionary discipline and reliance on punitive and reactive practices suggests that administrators and educators have not completely disentangled themselves from the long history of American society's impulse to punish and its corresponding punitive model of school discipline (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2019). This not only has immediate repercussions for student achievement and school and classroom climate, but it perpetuates larger systems of inequity and exclusion.

Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in critical race theory as it relates to educational policies and practices that perpetuate racial inequity. This study also relies on Michel Foucault's (1975) conceptions of punishment and school as a disciplinary power. The word punishment is multi-layered and is used in this study to

describe punitive discipline strategies employed to decrease undesirable student behaviors. These include suspension, expulsion, office referrals, infractions, reprimands, shaming, disparagement, detention, time out or seclusion, isolation, loss of access to materials or privileges, corporal (physical) punishment, removal to another educational institution, or other aversive consequences. Punishment is the application of aversive consequences or the removal of stimuli to decrease or stop behaviors as understood and defined in Applied Behavior Analysis practice (Cooper et al., 2019). Furthermore, the word punishment denotes what Foucault (1975) describes as “definitions of normality” that modern society uses to discipline subjects in institutions such as prisons, which he also likens to factories, schools, barracks, and hospitals (p. 461). Foucault describes prisons, and, by extension, schools, in which individuals are surveilled by authorities who are “experts in normality” and are the “natural extension of a justice imbued with disciplinary methods and examination procedures” (Foucault, 1975, p. 462).

Punishment is characterized as everything that is “capable of making children feel the offence they have committed, everything that is capable of humiliating them, of confusing them: ...a certain coldness, a certain indifference, a question, a humiliation, a removal from office” (Foucault, 1975, p. 365). Foucault (1975) looks at the history of punishment to discern how modern society creates institutions and intellectuals who use discipline to enforce normality.

Research Questions

The use of punishment in American schools leads to the question, “Do teachers differ in their beliefs about the value of punishment in school discipline and classroom management practices?” It is likely teachers will vary in their understanding of the use of punishment as it relates to student behavior and classroom management. Some will have a conception of punishment where they value it because it is believed to rights a wrong and deters future behavior, as it is described in the literature (Carlsmith et al., 2002) while others may ascribe to an instructional approach to promoting prosocial behavior (Colvin & Sugai, 1988). The specific research questions addressed in this research study are as follows:

Research Questions

RQ1: How do teachers rate the effectiveness of proactive behavior management strategies compared to reactive behavioral management strategies?

RQ1a: Which strategies do teachers believe to be most and least effective?

RQ2: How do teachers rate their frequency of use of proactive behavior management strategies compared to their frequency of use of reactive behavior management strategies?

RQ2a: Which strategies do teachers believe they use most and least frequently?

RQ3: How do teachers compare in their ratings of the effectiveness of proactive behavioral management strategies versus reactive management strategies when

grouped according to their (a) teaching assignment, (b) education level and (c) years of experience?

RQ4: How do teachers compare in their ratings of the use of proactive behavioral management strategies versus reactive management strategies when grouped according to their (a) teaching assignment, (b) education level and (c) years of experience?

RQ5: What is the relationship between teachers' conceptions of the utility of punishment and their rating of use of (a) proactive behavior management strategies and (b) reactive behavior management strategies?

RQ6: What is the relationship between teachers' knowledge of the outcomes of punishment and their rating of use of (a) proactive behavior management strategies and (b) reactive behavior management strategies?

RQ7: Which role (caretaker, learning facilitator, or disciplinarian) do teachers percieve as the most important part of a teacher's job?

A survey was used to collect information about teachers' knowledge and use of classroom and behavior management strategies, their opinions of the utility of punishment, and their awareness of the short and long-term outcomes of using punishment as part of school discipline. Descriptive analyses, an analysis of variance and correlational analyses were conducted to answer the research questions.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to develop a theory about teachers' conceptions about the utility of punishment, knowledge about the negative effects of punishment, and its relation to their reported use of classroom management strategies. Survey data collected from teachers was used to help clarify why the phenomenon of punishment still exists in schools. The survey data was also used to determine whether the Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) framework is reflected in teachers' practices and beliefs about school discipline. The examination of teacher beliefs and knowledge about punishment and school discipline and their use of behavior management strategies were examined to offer insights in how to create more equitable, positive and effective learning environments.

Significance of the Study

The use of punishment-based classroom management strategies that are reactive and punitive are counterproductive to classroom management, classroom and school climate, teacher efficacy, and detrimental to student outcomes (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Sugai & Horner, 2002; Lewis et al., 2005; Mitchell & Bradshaw, 2013). Significantly, punishment perpetuates larger discriminatory systemic problems (Whitaker et al., 2021). While research shows the benefits of positive behavior support programs, there is less inquiry into why they are not more readily adopted and consistently implemented (Owens et al.,

2018). Schools continue to exclude groups of already at-risk students at reliably disproportionate rates including students of color, students with low socio-economic status, and students with disabilities (Office for Civil Rights, 2018). These students receive harsher and longer punishment, and they are excluded from school at an alarming rate. In addition to denying them their right to a free and appropriate public education and equal protection under the law, students lose valuable instruction time and have weak social ties to school. Ultimately, punishment undermines the democratic ideals of public education that expects teachers to engage and support students while providing an effective environment for learning. The California Teacher Association's *Code of Ethics* (1975) states that teachers shall make reasonable effort to protect the student from conditions harmful to their learning or to their health and safety and shall not intentionally expose the student to embarrassment or disparagement.

Implementing discipline reform has the unique capacity to start at the school level. Administrator and teacher decisions and beliefs about discipline have immediate and long-term consequences for students. It is at the classroom level that teachers create and implement their classroom management plan. Their attitude and tolerance determine whether students are sent out of the classroom or receive an office disciplinary referral (Skiba et al., 2014). At the administrative level, the principal or assistant principal make decisions about whether a student is suspended or expelled. Because such decisions are eventually left to the discretion of individuals there are widely varying rates of

suspension by school (Skiba et al., 2014). At the state level, California required a statewide elimination of “Disruption or Willful Defiance” as a reason for suspension in grade K-8 (California Education Code § 48900, 2019). The City of Los Angeles implemented this requirement at all grade-levels in 2012-2013 and has since seen a 75% decrease in suspensions in all categories of suspendable offences (Jones, 2019). Researchers found that district-level factors and policies can affect change at the school and school district-level (Losen et al., 2015; Gonzalez, 2015). This includes the selection and training of principals, as well as supporting teacher and leadership training (Losen et al., 2015). These policies and trainings have implications for the school discipline code of conduct and the implementation of the behavioral supports and services needed to prevent challenging behavior. Research shows that school and classroom-level factors and decisions predict the nature and likelihood of discipline, which attests to the potential to affect change at a very local level when it comes to transforming practices (Losen et al., 2015).

Delimitations

This research study is a snapshot in time meant to capture teachers’ perceptions and beliefs about punishment and classroom behavior management at a single point in time. A cross-sectional survey aims to understand the extent to which punitive discipline is believed to be acceptable practice. Because the study did not include a longitudinal design, it was not able to capture changes in

perceptions or opinions over time. As a result, the data did not pick up trends or keep track of survey participants and experiences that may have impacted their beliefs. Additionally, the survey relied on participants' self-report, which may have included teacher biases and reluctance to be fully transparent. However, despite relying on self-report, the data offered a starting point for examining the conceptions of what constitutes appropriate school discipline since Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) became mainstream.

Another delimitation was that the data were geographically bound to one region in the United States. Additionally, this study did not include the collection of interview data, which could have yielded different results and allowed probing or follow-up questions to help explain responses. The survey used structured items, which provided response options rather than allowing for open-ended response.

The identified research questions built on my knowledge of MTSS and PBIS and identified gaps in research. I attempted to understand teachers' use of behavior management strategies and their beliefs and knowledge about punishment and the implications these factors have for school discipline practices.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms are defined for the purpose of providing context and understanding of their use in this study.

1. Corporal punishment - inflicting physical pain on a student's body by way of hitting, slapping, spanking, as a form of discipline.
2. Natural consequence - something that happens as a result of an action without interference from someone (i.e. a student runs in the classroom, they trip and fall, injuring their arm. This student may learn from this natural consequence that it is best not to run in the classroom).
3. Logical consequence - a predetermined action that is related, respectful, and responsible and following an undesirable action.
4. Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports - Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day.
5. Exclusionary practices - any action that removes a student from the classroom or the school, strategies such as sending a student to the office or another setting, suspension, expulsion.
6. Classroom management - the strategies, skills, techniques teachers use in their classroom in order to minimize disruptive behavior and deliver instruction in the most effective way.

7. Teacher efficacy - teacher's confidence or feeling of competence in their role in supporting student learning, engagement and achievement.
8. School climate - the quality and character of a school that develops from the experience of students, teachers, school personnel, and parents of school life, relationships between those at school, norms, values, teaching practices, and organizational structure.

Assumptions

Several assumptions are implicit in the design of this study and include the following: Survey participants were truthful in their responses. The researcher assumed that punishment was not an effective discipline strategy for addressing challenging student behavior. Students should not be excluded from instruction. The researcher also assumed that instructional programs that use school-wide PBIS were effective for preventing or minimizing challenging student behavior. This study was based on the understanding that teacher beliefs are a critical part of what becomes practiced in schools.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of a literature review is to provide context and background information for the study. It also brings together several different bodies of knowledge to better understand the larger picture within which the research questions are situated. This literature review illuminates areas of knowledge that still need to be developed, but we cannot begin to answer questions about teachers' beliefs, classroom management and behavior strategies, or their conceptions and use of punishment without delving into what is already known.

Briefly, the literature tells us the following. Reliance on punishment-based strategies in schools to address challenging student behavior has negative outcomes including low academic achievement and even incarceration and impaired social relationships (Gewertz, 2018; Heitzeg, 2009). Practices such as sharp verbal reprimands, exclusionary strategies, or the loss of enjoyable activities such as recess appear to work in the short term, but have negative effects in the long term (Sugai & Horner, 2002). The discipline choices school staff make have repercussions for students not only in school, but also throughout students' lives beyond school. Students who experience reactive and punitive punishment at school are more likely to behave in a way that decreases engagement rather than encourages appropriate behavior or compliance. They

are more likely to experience social disruption, learned helplessness, and increased aggression. Alarmingly, post-school outcomes include dropout, under-employment, incarceration, domestic violence, and substance abuse (Heitzeg, 2009).

This chapter begins with a discussion of teachers' perceptions of the efficacy and their use of classroom and behavior management strategies. Then moves to why the use of punishment in schools is so harmful. The subsequent sections further expand and synthesize the literature about school discipline and include the following: the historical and societal context of using punishment in schools, outcomes of using proactive behavioral and instructional strategies to manage classroom and individual behavior.

Teachers' Perceptions of Using Behavioral and Instructional Strategies

Research about teachers' perceptions of classroom management and the use of behavior and instructional strategies uses teacher self-reports and observations of teachers in the classroom. These studies explore a broad range of behavioral and instructional strategies employed across all grade levels including elementary, middle, and high school. Teachers surveyed were both special educators and general educators. Researchers used both quantitative and qualitative methods to better understand teachers' perceptions and practices in regards to classroom management strategies as well as the relationship between proactive and reactive strategies and student behaviors.

Zoromski et al. (2021) examined teachers' opinions about their use and perceptions of the effectiveness of classroom and behavior management strategies (CBM). Teachers (*n* = 58) completed a survey and the researchers observed their classrooms and coded appropriate and inappropriate responses to student rule violations. Overall, they found low rates of appropriate responses. They also looked at the use and frequency of appropriate or inappropriate group and individual commands and labeled and unlabeled praise. Their findings revealed a great deal of variability in the use of CBM strategies, perceptions of effectiveness, and frequency of rule violations. Data from teachers' self-report survey show that about half of the teacher thought reprimands were moderately effective. A majority of teachers report the use of ignoring minor inappropriate behavior as a CBM strategy. Furthermore, observation data found a higher than average frequency of disruptive behaviors in the classrooms of those teachers who reported a high use of ignoring minor inappropriate behaviors. Observation data also indicated that appropriate responses were associated with less disruptive behavior and more on-task behavior.

Based on their findings, the authors state that teacher training may need to look at increasing teachers' response to rule violations due to the relationship between appropriate teacher responses, rate of violations, and on-task behavior. They also note that teacher perceptions of which classroom management strategies work may not reflect evidence-based strategies in the literature, which should be addressed through training.

Clunies-Ross et al. (2008) identified a divide between what is known about effective behavior management strategies and their actual use in the classroom. In their study, they administered questionnaires to 97 primary school teachers and conducted observations on a subset of 20 teachers. Their aim was to examine teachers' self-report and compare actual use of classroom management strategies. They also looked at the use of proactive and reactive strategies and their relationship to teacher stress and student behavior. Overall, the results demonstrated a strong relationship between self-report data and actual practice. They also found that, on average, only 70% of students displayed on-task behavior during their observations. Data analysis showed a positive relationship between teachers' reported use of reactive strategies and the observed negative responses in the classroom. The same positive relationship was found between proactive strategies and positive responses. Teachers were "somewhat unlikely" to use reactive strategies and "likely" to "somewhat likely" to use proactive strategies. While teachers used more positive responses, they were more frequently directed towards academic behavior rather than student behavior. Teachers responded with more negative responses to student social behavior. Researchers pose the question as to why teachers direct less positive responses to appropriate behavior and draw on previous research theorizing that teachers' focus on approval for academic behavior and less use of positive responses for social behavior may discourage appropriate behavior in the classroom (Clunies-Ross et al., 2008). The authors conclude with recommendations to determine the

extent to which teacher training courses and professional development emphasize effective classroom management practices. They argue that given the relationship between effective practices, teacher stress, and student behavior, preventative measures play an important role in teacher education and training.

Owens et al. (2018) examined the use of three effective classroom behavior management strategies - praise, effective commands, and appropriate response to challenging behavior - and their effect on challenging student behavior. The researchers used observation data to explore how often the strategies were used and the relationship between teacher and student behaviors. More specifically, they examined the connection between teacher behaviors and student rule violations both at the classwide level and for students with or at risk of ADHD. Similar to Clunies-Ross et al. (2008), the researchers documented the frequency of appropriate teacher responses to student behavior based on best practices in the literature. Owens et al. (2018) used a sample of 55 elementary school teachers and 55 target student participants with or at risk for ADHD. One interesting finding was the rate of rule violations among the target students was significantly greater than the average student (9 to 17 per hour compared to 1 to 2 per hour, respectively). Each student with or at risk of ADHD accounted for 15% to 28% of the total violations. Given the prevalence of this type of high-need student in classrooms, the researchers point to the importance of behavioral strategies and interventions to reduce their impact on instructional time. Overall, they found that appropriate responses to challenging behavior was

low across grade levels. Their data indicated that using all three of the noted classroom management strategies together accounted for a significant portion of variance in classwide violations. Additionally, a greater percentage of appropriate teacher response resulted in lower rates of challenging behavior. They found that if teachers responded appropriately to at least 51% of student violations, they had lower overall rates of violations with approximately one per student per hour. Higher rates of appropriate responses did not change this. The authors argue that while 51% may represent a minimum threshold, training that targets a higher threshold can account for inconsistent implementation of classroom management strategies. Owens et al. (2018) encourage the use of their findings for professional development and teacher evaluation systems as well as further research.

Dutton Tillery and colleagues (2010) cited literature describing the relation between punitive behavior management strategies and frequent negative interactions between teachers and students with behavior challenges. Their study used a qualitative methodology to explore general education teachers' perceptions of negative and positive behavior and gain a deeper understanding of the strategies they used for behavior management (Dutton Tillery et al., 2010). They asserted that teachers are a critical part of programs such as PBIS, but may not have been adequately trained or were restricted by punitive school discipline policies. Researchers conducted individual, semi-structured interviews with 20 kindergarten and first-grade general education teachers.

They found several noteworthy themes, particularly in regards to discipline and negative student behavior. As a whole, the teachers reported limited training in behavior management. Almost every teacher used a response cost discipline system in which students received a more serious consequence. These include a warning, loss of recess time, and ended with an office referral and call home. Interviews indicated frequent use of verbal reprimands as a strategy to address negative behavior. One teacher reported using negative behavior management strategies that they characterized as punishment including loss of recess, taking away centers, and removing students. Teachers also suggested that students should learn from their behavior with one responding that “negative behavior requires a negative response” (p. 98). The researchers note that the teachers cited mainly strategies to address individual student behavior rather than classwide strategies aimed at managing groups of students, which is a critical part of classroom behavior management. When asked about preventative strategies, teachers reported creating a positive atmosphere, establishing rules and expectations, consistently enforcing rules, and avoiding situations that trigger negative behavior. The researchers noted that the teachers did not share more detail than could have been obtained through quantitative surveys. In their discussion of the findings, Dutton Tillery and colleagues (2010) described a need for more intensive training and support to target teachers’ behavior management needs. They also recommend that teacher training programs start to change their

instruction to reflect the turn away from reactive strategies to preventive school-wide strategies.

Also using a qualitative approach, Chen and colleagues (2021) conducted semi structured individual interviews of 18 early elementary teachers to investigate their perceptions of teacher–child relationships, student behavior, and classroom management. They described five major themes: (a) beliefs in children, (b) teaching strategies, (c) acknowledging individual differences, (d) challenges, and (e) relationships (Chen et al., 2021). The teachers described teaching strategies including supporting adaptive skills, encouraging appropriate conflict resolution, and the importance of providing time for social interactions. One participant also described allowing students flexibility when working such as letting students to stand up to work. Half of the teachers discussed paying attention to cultural differences and values of their students. They also spoke to the importance of positive teacher-student relationships. Challenges emerged as another major theme, which included managing disruptive classroom behavior. One teacher noted that behavior was the biggest challenge that was made more difficult by parents unable to be involved and help support social skill development. Others cited time constraints.

Chen and colleagues (2021) noted that most of the themes that emerged from their teacher interviews were related to teacher-child relationships as a critical part of teaching responsibilities. They emphasized the extant literature that highlights the importance of teacher-child relationships, because it affects

children's social-behavioral skills and academic outcomes. They also cited research proposing that teacher-child relationships are a protective factor for students' behavior problems. In addition to the teacher-child relationships, the researchers described the role of the larger context that includes classroom management practices. In their discussion, Chen et al. (2021) indicated that the role of professional school counselors should be to support teacher-child attachment, recognize the societal problems (i.e. trauma) many student experience, and train teachers to respond appropriately and effectively to student behavioral challenges and social-emotional concerns. They pointed to the lack of understanding about the meaning of students' behavior that emerged from teacher interviews. The authors described several stressors that can precipitate student misbehavior including abuse, divorce, domestic violence, and loss and grief. They recommend building teacher awareness of these types of experiences and building specific skills to encourage better teacher-child relationships. These, they argued, would support students' behavioral, emotional, and academic needs.

Martinussen et al. (2010) describe data indicating that teachers feel unprepared to work with students with attention and/or behavior difficulties and lack the appropriate training to manage behavior. The researchers' administered a survey to examine the relationship between teacher role (special or general education teacher) and training level in attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). They looked at the strategies used most frequently by both general and

special education teachers to manage behavior problems, examined the relationship between training in ADHD and use of recommended strategies, and analyzed whether general and special education teachers differed in their use of the strategies. They sampled 76 general and special education teachers spanning all grade-levels. They asked participants to rate the frequency that they used instructional and behavior management practices and to indicate the amount of training they had in managing behaviors associated with ADHD. Both general and special educators reported minimal training in ADHD, with general education teachers reporting significantly less training than special educators. Most of the respondents reported infrequent use of intensive behavior management strategies for individual students with behavior challenges such as behavior contracts or daily report cards. Less than 20% of the teachers reported using response cost frequently. Most of the teachers reported frequent use of preferential seating, proximity control, and positive teacher attention.

Overall, the researchers found that years of experience did not effect the use of recommended instructional and behavioral strategies. However, training appeared to be impactful. Interestingly, general education teachers were more likely than special education teachers to use the instructional strategies listed in the survey. Based on their findings, the authors called for more extensive preservice teacher training and professional development in the use of effective practices for students with ADHD and individualized behavior management strategies (Martinussen et al., 2010). They noted that effective teacher training

should be ongoing and collaborative, with opportunities for coaching and feedback (Martinussen et al., 2010).

Summary

There was wide variability in teachers' use of classroom behavior management strategies as well as their perceptions of the effectiveness, with many teachers relying on less effective strategies. One important theme was that teachers viewed managing student behavior as a challenge. Additionally, minor student infractions caused the most stress and time (Clunies-Ross et al., 2008). Teachers believed they have a strong influence on student behavior development, but studies reveal low rates of appropriate teacher response to challenging and disruptive behaviors (Dutton Tillery et al., 2010; Owens et al., 2018; Zoromski et al., 2021). They also tended to focus more on individual student behavior compared to group behavior when describing use of behavior management strategies (Dutton Tillery et al., 2010). However, one study found teachers reported less frequent use of intensive behavior management strategies that are individualized for students with behavior challenges (Martinussen et al., 2010).

Importantly, elevated teacher stress and student misbehavior can partially be attributed to relying predominately on reactive strategies (Clunies-Ross et al., 2008). Interviews revealed teachers' desire to build relationships and rapport with students (Chen et al., 2021). Other themes that emerged from the literature are the reported minimal teacher training received, under-utilization of positive

behavior strategies, and a reliance on negative responses compared to appropriate responses to challenging behavior. Teachers tended to use a higher rate of positive responses for academic behavior, but higher rates of negative responses for social behavior (Clunies-Ross et al., 2008). Increasing the use of appropriate classroom management strategies accounted for the largest reduction in classwide violation and appropriate teacher responses also resulted in lower rates of challenging behavior (Owens et al., 2018).

Overall, these findings suggest that students' behavior improved when teachers used more frequent and appropriate responses. The studies also demonstrate a need to implement evidence-based proactive practices. The literature centers on teachers' perceptions about classroom and behavior management strategies and described both self-report and observational data with an emphasis on practice. A noticeable gap in the literature is information as to the reasons *why* teachers relied so heavily on reactive and even punitive strategies for managing student behavior.

Negative Outcomes of Using Punishment

School-to-Prison Pipeline

The school-to-prison pipeline refers to the connection between the education and the justice systems created, in part, by punitive and exclusionary discipline practices in schools (Hemez et al., 2020). This pipeline can be literal and immediate such as when students are arrested on school grounds or it can

be practices that act as a precursor to incarceration. For example, students who are suspended have decreased engagement in school and an increased risk of drop-out, and it predicts involvement with the justice system later in life (Welsh & Little, 2018). The reliance on exclusionary discipline in schools is reflective of a larger carceral state, “where the mass criminalization and imprisonment of bodies different from the norm is the goal” (Alexander, 2012).

An analysis of several studies about the effects of exclusionary practices found a direct and significant association between exclusionary discipline practiced in schools and student contact with the justice system (Novak, 2018). Fabelo et al. (2011) found a student’s odds of justice contact was almost three times higher after a suspension or expulsion. Students were increasingly likely to be arrested during the month and year that they were suspended (Mowen & Brent, 2016). Being suspended and expelled during middle school was described as the single largest predictor of later arrest among adolescent females (Wald & Losen, 2003). Exclusionary discipline is a negative turning point in a student’s life and denies them opportunities to be prosocial (Novak, 2018). Exclusionary discipline alienates students, provoking negative emotions and feelings of being misunderstood or not wanted. Students who feel alienated from their teacher and school are denied the opportunity to participate academically and socially in ways that could be gratifying and productive.

Social Disruption

One of the unintended consequences of punishment is social disruption (Pierce & Cheney, 2017). While the teacher's intent is simply to extinguish unacceptable behavior, the punishment becomes associated with both the setting (e.g., the classroom and school) and the teacher, who is the person administering the punishment or consequence (Predy et al., 2014). This can be a significant contributor to a student's avoidance of school and school personnel. Sometimes avoidance itself manifests as more disruptive behavior that results in the student being removed from school or sometimes as somatic complaints where a student feels unwell and wants to stay home or go to the school nurse's office (McIntosh et al., 2014). Some students are frequently tardy or truant, and others simply stop attending school at all.

Social disruption will vary as a function of age, grade level, gender, and socio-economic status (Lewis & Sugai, 1999). For example, younger children cannot drop out of school so they may be more likely to say they do not feel well or to act out in class. Girls are more likely to demonstrate internalizing behaviors (somatic complaints) than externalizing ones (acting out) than boys (McIntosh et al., 2014). Social disruption is compounded over time, so students whose misbehavior is problematic will encounter more negative teacher attention thereby increasing the chances of social disruption in that individual. Likewise, students who struggle academically or socially will already have a difficult time in

school and any added challenges, such as aversive events, will negatively color their perceptions of school.

Learned Helplessness

One coping mechanism of students who are frequently punished is called learned helplessness. The student essentially shuts down and will not attempt tasks, or will do so at a level inconsistent with what they are capable of achieving (Sutherland & Singh, 2004). More troubling, students can experience a lack of reinforcement for correct responding, or lack opportunities to correctly respond, to such a degree that they do not recognize the relationship between their own actions and any subsequent event (Sutherland & Singh, 2004). Responding and reinforcement become completely independent of each other. Students do not believe or may not even know that their ability to respond can be successful or produce positive responses. In this case, students who develop learned helplessness will be slow to respond or don't bother to respond at all. There is a severe lack of motivation or persistence due to repeated past failures and a deprivation of reinforcement. Students who frequently experience school failure, such as those students with a learning disability or behavior challenges, including emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD), are particularly at risk for learned helplessness (Licht & Kistner, 1986).

Learned helplessness, avoidance strategies, and punishment become interlocked as students engage in inappropriate behavior as a strategy to avoid aversive stimuli. In an effort to avoid academic tasks or unengaging instruction,

students will use antagonistic behavior. Students also want to escape the teacher with whom they have a contentious relationship when they are the frequent recipient of punishment-based strategies. These avoidance strategies usually work - teachers tend to have fewer academic interactions with students who demonstrate problematic behavior. They are attentive to students who show appropriate behavior while avoiding interactions with students with inappropriate behaviors. As a result, teachers remove or significantly reduce academic expectations by providing lower instructional-level tasks, thereby creating an environment deficient of academic engagement (Carr et al., 1991; Wehby et al., 1998). This gives the student even less opportunity to engage in appropriate behavior or respond correctly. Classrooms that rely on reactive and harsh reprimands or exclusionary practices, like sending the student out of the classroom, essentially remove expectations of academic achievement and decrease the students' motivation to engage in appropriate behavior (Sutherland & Singh, 2004).

Increased Aggression

A side effect of punishment is increased aggression. Punishment creates a model of aggression (Landrum & Kauffman, 2006) where students learn how to behave by emulating the examples the adults around them provide. Angry verbal and physical responses become a normal mode of interaction between a student and teacher. Students who are frequently punished feel angry and resentful, causing them to act out. According to Landrum and Kauffman (2006) aggression

is created when punishment causes pain or is delayed and inconsistently applied. Aggression is also maintained when there are no positive alternatives to the punished behavior. There is no model of what appropriate behavior looks like or positive reinforcement from the teacher for engaging in prosocial behaviors. Students with aggressive behavior patterns are more likely to develop negative relationships with their teachers (Ladd & Burgess, 1999).

Aggressive student behavior may initially stem from academic problems. Students learn to use maladaptive behavior as a way to avoid academic tasks leading teachers to engage in reactive and punitive ways, which further reinforces the negative behavior model. When students experience frequent negative feedback from teachers, they develop a negative self-conception about their academic ability. These contentious relationships can develop as early as kindergarten, and have been associated with both academic and behavior problems that continue even to middle school (Hamre & Pianta, 2001).

Severe punishment practices such as suspension and expulsion have serious implications for students, including negative effects on academic performance and a higher risk of dropout. Suspension can increase the likelihood of inappropriate behavior while amplifying student anger or apathy (Morris & Perry, 2016). Research has found an association between suspension and expulsion with an increase in physically aggressive behavior in elementary schools (Jacobsen et al., 2019).

Students who experience stressful events or conditions at home, including economic hardship, may act out in school. Research proposes that maladjustment to these outside stressors is associated with increased aggression at school as physically aggressive behavior is a coping mechanism, especially for primary-age students who are still learning about appropriate emotional regulation (Attar et al., 1994; Brooks-Gunn & Duncan, 1997; Wildeman, 2010). If school and teachers provide a negative model of interaction and emotional regulation through aggressive reprimands, shaming, or excluding the student, students do not have the opportunity to learn appropriate responses. In essence, students at risk for aggressive behavior are more likely to be suspended, which increases their risk for engaging in further aggressive behavior.

Poor Classroom Climate

A punishment-based approach to managing behavior has pervasive and negative effects not only for individual students who experience the punishment, but is also felt classroom and school-wide (McGrath & Van Bergen, 2015). Even compliant students develop negative perceptions about school when exclusionary practices such as sending students out of the classroom and suspension are used. Strikingly, students have been found to attribute peers' inappropriate behavior to the use of punitive practices by their teachers. There is also a strong association between coercive discipline practices by teachers and a higher level of student misbehavior (Mitchell & Bradshaw, 2013).

Negative interactions between the teacher and student that lead to office discipline referrals (ODRs) are found to perpetuate the same types of interactions that led to the initial referral (Nelson & Roberts, 2000). The ODRs encourage the same behavior and never actually address the problem. In turn, negative, disruptive and coercive interactions between teacher and student become the norm in the classroom. Teachers tend to employ reactive and aggressive disciplinary practices when problem behavior makes them angry and frustrated. Students who engage in more disruptive behavior find their teacher's discipline strategies to be aggressive (Mitchell & Bradshaw, 2013).

A study examining the role of discipline on student perceptions of school climate noted that ideas of fairness, order and discipline, student–teacher relations, and achievement motivation were implicit in students' understanding of climate (Mitchell & Bradshaw, 2013). Creating a positive school climate has implications for academics, student behavior and aggression, and adjustment problems, as well as social and personal attitudes (Griffith, 1999; Kuperminc et al., 1997; Shochet et al., 2006). Schools with poor school climate exhibit decreased student engagement and increased truancy, dropout, delinquency, and bullying (Bradshaw et al., 2008; Bradshaw et al., 2009). Mitchell and Bradshaw (2013) found that students perceive the variables of "fairness" and "order and discipline" to be low when teachers rely more heavily on exclusionary discipline practices.

The far-reaching negative effects of using punishment is compelling evidence to discontinue its use in schools. The use of punishment leads to questions about its historical and societal context to better understand how it came to be prevalent in schools. This context is also helpful in understanding why there remains a tendency to use punishment as a discipline strategy despite contrary evidence of its effectiveness.

Historical and Societal Context

History of School Discipline

While there is evidence to suggest teachers do not comprehensively and consistently use proactive strategies to manage student behavior, the role of personal beliefs shaped by cultural and societal norms in moderating their use is underexplored. Punishment has a long tradition in the American school system. For example, the popular New-England Primer, a reader used in the colonies, used the adage “The Idle Fool/Is whipt in School” to illustrate the letter “f”, a not so subtle warning to lazy students (Ryan, 1994, p. 72). Methods of punishment included the rod, whips, flogging, and paddling. Even more alarming were instances in which students were forced to wear wooden shackles and walk around the room until they were tired or were suspended from the roof of the school in a basket as a form of public humiliation (Ryan, 1994).

Corporal punishment is part of a larger reliance on discipline in schools. Descriptions of classrooms in the American Frontier illustrate a time in which the

teacher “literally and figuratively wrestled with students to gain control over the classroom” (Rousmaniere, 1994, p. 51). School was a place where teachers were expected to dominate in a literal sense as a way to command order and respect. To this day, teacher-student relationships are constructed in terms of dominance and subordination (Rousmaniere, 1994).

In the mid 20th century, juvenile delinquency became a national concern in the United States. In the context of the civil rights movement and the Cold War, educational practices were at the forefront of national discussion. Schools were seen as a cause and a cure for the “deteriorating behavior of youth” (Kafka, 2008, p. 327). Progressive education philosophies were said to encourage bad behavior with students and allowed a “do as you please” attitude in which they ran “riot over the teacher and over each other” (p. 328). Up until this point, school discipline was seen as a local matter where teachers and principals had autonomy over disciplinary actions. Known as *in loco parentis*, educators traditionally acted in place of the parent when students were at school. In the midst of a surge in urban migration, lower-class subcultures were characterized as defiant and resistant to school norms. The 1955 film *Blackboard Jungle* depicted “warzones with criminal students and incompetent staff” (p. 329). Even the FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover described juvenile delinquency as a “menacing cloud, mushrooming across the nation” (Kafka, 2008, p. 327).

One of the first districts to formalize discipline, teachers in Los Angeles were galvanized to address what they described as “ungoverned and

unmanageable” schools rife with student misbehavior (Kafka, 2008). One teacher wrote to the school board expressing their concern and illustrating a shift from en loco parentis: “We are qualified to do a good job of teacher but we are not qualified as psychiatrists. We cannot take time out day after day to reprimand a small group, or to restore order, without cheating most of the students out of valuable instructional time” (Kafka, 2008, pp. 335-336). The implication was that students with behavior challenges should be taken out of class to preserve the quality of instruction for the other students. Kafka (2008) describes the “bureaucratization of school discipline” (p. 334) in which organized teacher committees, local teacher organizations, associations, clubs, and unions called for more special settings and specialized staff for students with serious discipline problems. In this effort, teachers differentiated instruction and discipline and effectively sought to reduce the scope of their responsibility and power over discipline decisions. If students with challenging behavior distracted the class, the “education of problem students was not the responsibility of regular classroom teachers.” (p. 336). Teachers did, however, want the power to send students out of the classroom, which had a disproportionate effect on Black and Mexican American students who were placed at special school at greater rates. Although no data was collected about student discipline, the media characterized a “breakdown of discipline” in Los Angeles’s schools as one letter to the Board of Education stated (p. 331). Despite the push to address student behavior, there was little evidence that there was a crisis. A 1957 survey of Los Angeles

elementary school teachers students misbehavior “speaking of turn” and “restless” (p. 332). National Education Association (NEA) conducted a survey in 1956 that found 95% of teachers described the students in their classroom as “exceptionally” or “reasonably” well-behaved (Kafka, 2008, p. 329).

Despite calls for its abolition, 19 states currently allow corporal punishment in their schools, particularly in the South. Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, and Texas account for 70% of corporal punishment instances. In Mississippi, where the rates are the highest, 9.3% of students were struck during the 2013–14 school year with Black boys twice as likely to be physically hit than White boys. Students with disabilities were hit more often than those without disabilities. In addition, Black girls account for the highest share of all corporal punishment incidents in Mississippi (Losen & Martin, 2018).

The persistence of corporal punishment in the South continues the disturbing and persistent legacies of slavery and the Jim Crow era in which racialized violence became ingrained in the culture. Ward et al. (2021) found a significant positive relationship between the rates of corporal punishment, particularly the rate of use for black students, and Southern counties’ history of lynching. Used for social control and to punish the marginalized, physical pain, especially whipping, is described as an explicitly racialized socialization strategy intended to ensure that slaves knew that they were slaves (Ward et al., 2021). In the 19th century, white reformers challenged corporal punishment in schools because of its roots in slavery, but with racist antebellum era sentiments. Major

education journals of the time called corporal punishment “slavish” and was better suited for the “negro plantation” than the schoolhouse (Ward et al., 2021). These reformers thought that this brutal form of discipline would encourage white students to develop the character and temper of a slave (Ward et al., 2021). They did, however, still find corporal punishment necessary for disciplining lower class and immigrant students (Ward et al., 2021).

More recent literature draws attention to Black girls’ experience with school discipline and how social constructions of gender and race shape their educational outcomes (Annamma et al., 2019; Blake et al., 2010; DeBlase, 2003). Black girls have seen the highest increase in suspension rates and are subjected to discipline at rates six times higher than White girls (Annamma et al., 2019). For Black girls, schools can become a place of “racialized and gendered terror” and are “incessantly” subject to punishment (Annamma et al., 2019; Wun, 2016).

Scholars argue that the experience of Black girls is evocative of dominant narratives, characterized by societal gender norms about femininity and race, as evidenced by racial disparities in discipline. Black girls are more often punished for defiance, inappropriate dress, using profane language, and physical aggression (Annamma et al., 2019). Research finds that Black students are referred to the office for subjective offenses such as disrespect and excessive noise while White students are referred for more objective misconduct (e.g. possession of a weapon, smoking, vandalism) (Bradshaw et al., 2010).

Furthermore, teachers refer Black students for special education for behavior challenges and White students for academic problems (Bradshaw et al., 2010). The discrepancy between referrals cannot be attributed to Black students engaging in more misbehavior, but to cultural bias in school discipline practices, excessive surveillance or “hypersurveillance” on Black students, and what educators see as normative cultural behavior (Bradshaw et al., 2010; Wun, 2016). That is, a student's behavior may be perceived as outside the racially mainstream or dominant ideas of acceptable. For example, a student may be found to be argumentative.

A study by Wun (2016) found that even “normal” behaviors such as chewing gum, throwing away trash, drinking Gatorade, or even completing an assignment too well were punished or incited teacher accusations that carried racial undertones. This highlights the insidiousness of discipline in the lives of many students of color - especially Black girls. Students are often excluded from instruction, reporting that they missed an entire class period (Wun, 2016). These incidents are not always captured in school discipline data because it’s so commonplace. More specifically, Annamma et al. (2019) argue that these dominant narratives are what support the school to prison pipeline specifically for Black girls and place “these already vulnerable girls in danger of pathologization and criminalization.” Even the genesis of zero tolerance policies can be traced back to backlash to black political protests in the 1960s (Wun, 2016). Scholars argue that the only way for schools to achieve equity for students of color is

through addressing the racial disparities in their discipline practices (Fenning & Rose, 2007; Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, 2010).

In addition to the historical development of punishment, from the earliest days of the American educational system through the midcentury and up to today, there is also an important cultural understanding of what punishment means and how it's used in the larger society. The use of punishment is part of a culture in schools. The theoretical underpinnings of punishment help clarify the use of it in cultural institutions like schools, which serve as a foundation of our cultural norms.

Cultural and Societal Desire for Punishment

The use of punishment is typically understood in two ways. The first is when it is used as a sanction against an individual who has violated a rule as a way to restore the balance of justice (Carlsmith et al., 2002). In this case, punishment is used purely to reprimand a wrong, not to promote another good. It is also referred to as the deservingness perspective (Carlsmith et al., 2002). Those who perpetuated the wrong are deserving of punishment. From a more benign perspective, punishment is a way to prevent future harm. Jeremy Bentham (1962) described this utilitarian or consequentialist point of view as "general prevention" (as cited in Carlsmith et al., 2002, p. 284). In this case, punishment is a means of preventing or deterring future wrongdoing.

Carlsmith et al. (2002) explored these two primary theoretical justifications for punishment - the just desert rationale and the deterrence rationale - and

hypothesized that people tend to be motivated by factors associated with just deserts when assigning punishment. To test their hypothesis, the researchers conducted three empirical studies that involved presenting respondents with vignettes that included various elements of a crime, which, based on the respondents' choice of sentence recommendation, would provide insight into their underlying motivation for the punishment. Each of the three studies varied the measures slightly to obtain deeper understandings of the results through their comparison. They concluded that people rely on the just desert rationale when assigning punishment despite expressing support for the deterrence rationale.

Many children experience punishment for the first time in school. Educational institutions employ punishment as a way to teach students what is right and wrong. Education is part of the cultural foundation and has implications on the practices of the larger society (Rector-Aranda, 2016). Practices and outcomes in schools that perpetuate societal injustices maintain cultural norms. For example, Rector-Aranda (2016) describes how prison metaphors such as procedures and language dominate students' lives where "their bodies, minds, and spirits have already been chained in the prison that is the mainstream public education system" (Rector-Aranda, 2016, p. 4).

Behavioral and Instructional Strategies

There is extensive research documenting how classroom and behavior management that relies on a range of proactive behavioral and instructional

strategies can create a learning environment conducive to meeting a wide range of academic and behavioral needs without the use of reactive or harsh discipline. Teachers make productive use of instructional time by anticipating student challenges and circumventing problems. Well-integrated behavioral and instructional strategies play a critical role in preventing maladaptive behavior and disengagement that leads to disruptions and reactive discipline. Strategies that work to prevent misbehavior are more effective than reactive responses (Lewis & Sugai, 1999).

Proactive *instructional* strategies are especially important because students who are at risk for or have behavioral challenges can also struggle academically and these instructional strategies can prevent behavior problems from impeding student learning by making the content accessible and facilitating participation. Classroom activities that promote high student engagement also foster an environment where misbehavior is less likely to occur (Simonsen et al., 2008). As a first line action to promote prosocial behavior and ameliorate problem behavior, teachers can use practices that improve their interactions with students and decrease problematic behavior. This reduces the reliance on reactive measures and more effective than punishment is redirecting students to positive behavior or reinforcing the use of desired behavior.

Classroom management has a significant impact on student behavior and includes establishing order, addressing whole group and individual student needs, delivering effective instruction, and appropriate discipline practices

(Emmer & Stough, 2001). Classroom management based on mutual respect and positive personal relationships has been shown to reduce the frequency of exclusionary discipline (Milner, 2015). Five evidence-based classroom management practices identified by Simonsen, et al. (2008) to promote positive behavior support include: (a) maximize structure and predictability, (b) post, teach, review, monitor, and reinforce expectations, (c) actively engage students in observable ways, (d) use a continuum of strategies to acknowledge appropriate behavior, and (e) use a continuum of strategies to respond to inappropriate behavior. Practices such as establishing rules and procedures, fostering engagement, planning engaging instruction, and arranging the physical environment, all support and maximize the academic and social-emotional learning of students and regulate behavior (Korpershoek et al., 2016). In a review of 12 studies, Oliver and colleagues (2011) found that implementing classroom management practices reduced disruptive, inappropriate, and aggressive behavior in treatment classrooms compared to control classrooms.

Research described the move towards school-wide prevention models to eliminate and ameliorate discipline problems and create a positive school climate after the introduction of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001 (Bradshaw et al., 2010). School-wide positive behavior support (SWPBS) was developed to address the behavioral and social needs of all students through a three-tier prevention model (Horner & Sugai, 2000; Horner et al., 2009). SWPBIS includes an emphasis on school systems that include clear positive behavior expectations,

positive reinforcement of those expectations, progress monitoring and early intervention, and data-based decision making. It also employs consistent strategies and procedures for addressing and preventing challenging student behavior (Sugai & Horner, 2002). Crucially, disciplinary data such as office discipline referrals and suspension are collected and analyzed to make informed decisions about program implementation (Bradshaw et al., 2010). School-wide prevention programs improved students' social behavior, reduced problem behavior and office discipline referrals, and improved academic outcomes (Horner et al., 2009; McIntosh, 2014).

Classroom management and school-wide positive behavior support programs rely on the important routines, procedures, expectations, discipline practices, and establishing a warm classroom climate that are familiar to teachers and students. In addition, there are many behavioral and instructional strategies designed to engage students in instruction and/or minimize or prevent problem behaviors to make classroom management much more effective. Several are detailed below.

Behavioral Strategies

Precorrection is the a priori identification of situations where problem behavior may occur and the use of prompts and reinforcement to remind and encourage students to use desired behavior (Colvin et al., 1997). This includes modifying the environment, defining and practicing expectations, creating a plan for prompting, and monitoring student responses (Lane et al.,

2015). Precorrection aims to eliminate the need to reprimand students for misbehavior. Teachers can identify predictably problematic times or situations where students may engage in disruptive behavior. This strategy may also involve modifying the context to help support appropriate student behavior such as changing the classroom set up, altering teacher behavior, or incorporating visual cues (Lane et al., 2015). Instead of raising their voice or experiencing frustration, teachers can deliver thoughtful and specific reminders that help prime students to engage in the next desired behavior. For example, before a teacher brings their students into the classroom after recess, they may say, “Remember, we enter the room quietly and walk straight to our seats.” This reduces the need to yell “Kenny, stop screaming and running in the classroom!”

Precorrection is often paired with active supervision to decrease problem behavior (Colvin et al., 1997; Lewis et al., 2000). Active supervision is premised on the idea of preventing problem behavior through consistent monitoring of student activity (Kounin, 1970). It is a structured system of observing students to proactively prompt appropriate behavior and provide redirection (De Pry & Sugai, 2002). Teachers purposefully move around, observe, and interact with students. Intentional and systematic supervision is a powerful tool that can ensure student safety and promote academic engagement. In doing this, the teacher is looking for potentially problematic situations or inappropriate behavior that can be averted with rapid intervention. It employs the use of scanning, escorting, and interacting to support appropriate student behavior both in the classroom and in

unstructured areas of the school such as the playground and hallways (Colvin et al., 1997). Teachers use their physical presence, or proximity, to prompt students to expectations. Proximity or other nonverbal gestures can be an effective reminder for students to engage in appropriate behavior. It actively helps students identify and remember appropriate behavior and expectations. Moreover, teachers can use active supervision to provide reinforcement and motivate students to be engaged.

Behavior specific praise (BSP) provides feedback on a specific behavior as a way to encourage further engagement in that behavior (Myers et al., 2011). BSP is contrasted with more ambiguous statements such as “Good job, Alice,” or “Nice work.” This low-intensity strategy is an effective way to communicate to all students, not just the recipient of the praise, what a teacher wants to see in the classroom. BSP can be employed to support students who are learning new appropriate behaviors by allowing teachers to positively acknowledge when students demonstrate part of or increasing fluency of expected behaviors. For example, if a student attends to a task for a longer period of time (Lane et al., 2015), a teacher can deliver a praise statement recognizing the student’s prosocial behavior. This makes BSP reflective of students’ present skill level, an essential part of the strategy’s effectiveness as students learn how to engage in desired behavior (Haydon & Musti-Rao, 2011). This strategy is easy to implement and can be used in all school environments. Several studies have documented how BSP decreases disruptive behavior and increases time on-task

and engagement (Allday et al., 2012; Myers et al., 2011) while creating positive teacher-student interactions and classroom climate (Hawkins & Heflin, 2011).

Instructional Strategies

Instructional strategies support classroom activities by promoting high student engagement, which helps foster an environment where misbehavior is less likely to occur (Simonsen et al., 2008). These teaching practices improve teacher-student interactions and decrease problematic behavior.

Opportunities to respond offers students multiple ways to respond to a teacher question or prompt, increasing on-task behavior and participation. It allows teachers to check for understanding and provide immediate feedback (Haydon et al., 2012). OTR can result in an increase in on-task behavior, academic engagement, and the number of correct student responses as well as a decrease in disruptive behavior (Carnine, 1976; Sutherland et al., 2003). This strategy is effective for both small and whole groups as a way to optimize instructional pacing and maintain engagement. Teachers use a set of questions or prompts based on an identified target skill presented to students at a quick pace. Teachers can quickly evaluate students' answers through several different student response systems such as thumbs up or down or individual whiteboards. Students may respond individually or chorally. The students receive immediate feedback from their teacher who will give predetermined visual or verbal cues to indicate if the responses are appropriate or model a correct response if needed. OTR allows for low-stakes participation and immediate feedback to students

multiple times throughout the instructional period. It encourages everyone to participate because it does put pressure on any one student and gives teachers more opportunities to provide positive feedback (Lane et al., 2015). Studies have shown that OTR significantly increased on-task behavior while disruptive behavior (Sutherland et al., 2003).

Instructional choice creates opportunities to choose from two or more options across or within activities (Lane et al., 2018). It fosters student autonomy which supports academic engagement. When students feel their preferences are being considered, they are more motivated and likely to take ownership of their learning thereby decreasing inappropriate behavior (Shogren et al., 2004). Choices can be offered across activities and within activities (Rispoli et al., 2013). A student may be offered a variety of tasks targeting the same skill such responding to either a video or a text passage. A within-activity may include choosing to type or handwrite a response. This strategy is effective in reducing problem behaviors because it may allow a student to choose an activity that they like and provide them with a sense of control that is often lacking in school. Additionally, giving choices allows students *not* to do something while still providing an opportunity for the student to be productively engaged in instructional tasks (Lane et al., 2015).

Instructional feedback is a teaching strategy in which students are given specific information about their performance (academic, social, behavioral) to clarify misinformation and confirm understandings (Butler & Winne, 1995).

Feedback does not focus on whether an answer is right or wrong. Effective instructional feedback is a process that supports students by confirming their current understandings, providing encouragement to continue, and giving reminders or clarification to remediate errors (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). This strategy is effective because it is a positive way to build students' feeling of competence by confirming or clarifying their current understandings. It is also effective because the feedback is nuanced, specific, and provides information.

High probability request sequence strategy begins with making requests the student is likely to engage in while providing reinforcement and then following these in close succession with a low-probability request. This is done in order to build momentum and increase behavior compliance. The momentum generated by the high probability requests is extended to low probability requests as the student receives a high level of reinforcement. It is an effective strategy because it circumvents the punishment procedures that sometimes maintain noncompliant behavior when students often try to escape tasks or non-preferred activities (Lane et al., 2015). This type of non-compliance often leads to disruptive behavior. High-p requests provide a context in which the student is willing and able to be compliant, rather than immediately disengaged. This strategy can be implemented across school environments including transition times and during instructional activities. Teachers may use a simple sequence of requests such as “Touch your head, touch your desk, pick up your pencil, and open your journal!”

Differentiated instruction is tailoring one's teaching to the needs of individual learners (Tomlinson, 2016). This includes thinking about the process and content that best allows students to access the information or material and demonstrate what they've learned by offering multiple options. Differentiated instruction is geared to meet the needs of not just the average student, but also consider the needs of students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who struggle academically to ensure that they can also access the curriculum. A differentiated classroom uses flexible grouping practices based on student level as well as offers a variety of choices in instructional tasks and content delivery options to present information in ways that meet various student ability levels (IRIS Center, 2021). This is a strategy that is student-centered because it determines each student's area of strengths and needs in order to support their growth.

Conclusion

Overall, the literature review offers compelling evidence documenting the negative outcomes of using punishment as part of school discipline policy. These included the creation and perpetuation of the school-to-prison pipeline, social disruption, learned helplessness, increased aggression, and poor classroom climate. The use of punishment puts students at risk for both short-term and long-term consequences. The historical and societal context of punishment reveals how and why we rely on culturally punitive practices when addressing

challenging behavior in schools. The literature also attempted to better understand teachers' perceptions and actual practice as they implement classroom management strategies. This research also began to define the relationship between proactive and reactive strategies and student behaviors. There is considerable information about the experiences and events that shape students' reaction to school discipline, as well as an understanding of more effective ways to promote prosocial behavior. An abundance of research supports the use of proactive instructional and behavioral strategies.

Looking Ahead to Chapter Three

The next chapter will review the research methodology and design including the construction of the survey instrument, the population and sample, as well as a description of the survey's reliability and validity. The study's implementation, data analysis and procedures, and ethical considerations will be discussed.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This research study was designed to provide information about teachers' beliefs and use of behavior management strategies. A survey was used to collect data about teachers' 1) beliefs about the efficacy and use of 28 behavior management strategies and seven instructional strategies, 2) conceptions about the utility of punishment in school discipline, and 3) knowledge about the negative effects of punishment. These data provided information as to whether the shift away from reactive discipline to proactive strategies has been powerful enough to overcome engrained societal beliefs that impact school policies and teacher praxis in classroom and behavior management.

Research Design

This research study used a cross-sectional web-based survey design to collect information from a sample of teachers to construct quantitative descriptors of the larger population and answer the research questions described in chapter one.

Instrumentation

The survey was created by selecting items from the research literature. A search of teachers' perceptions and use of classroom management strategies resulted in six studies that used both quantitative and qualitative methods. I

examined all the survey instruments from these studies. The survey items as well as interview questions included topics such as use of praise and commands, knowledge of PBIS, use of proactive and reactive strategies, and establishing classroom rules and routines. I chose to use discrete, specific discipline strategies rather than broad categories. I also chose discipline strategies that general educators should be using rather than intensive practices education specialists would be expected to use. The literature was also examined to document the negative outcomes of using punitive and/or exclusionary discipline practices.

The instrument, administered via Qualtrics™, included three sections that took approximately 15 minutes to complete. The instrument is in Appendix B. The first section of the survey consisted of close-ended questions. Items included demographic information of the respondents including age, gender, ethnicity, level of education, training on classroom management, credential status, years of experience, current grade-level teaching assignment, current teaching assignment area (i.e. special education or general education), geographic school site location, school type (i.e. public, private, charter), student demographics, and school climate.

The second section was designed to capture teachers' beliefs about their role, the utility of punishment, and knowledge of negative outcomes of punishment. First, respondents were asked to rank three different descriptions of a teacher's role (i.e., caretaker, learning facilitator, disciplinarian) that reflected

their perception of the importance of each. The next question asked respondents to describe statements about the use of punishment in school discipline as either effective, sometimes necessary, or not effective. The next set of items asked respondents if they ‘disagreed’, ‘somewhat agreed’, or ‘agreed’ to eight statements about negative outcomes of punishment. The next question asked respondents to rate how often they used eight instructional strategies. The teachers rated each item on a Likert-type scale with the following ratings: ‘never’, ‘rarely’, ‘occasionally’, ‘frequently’, and ‘always’.

The final section of the survey focused on teachers’ use and perceptions of effectiveness of different classroom management strategies. Respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of 28 behavior management strategies using a Likert-type scale of ‘not effective’, ‘marginally effective’, ‘somewhat effective’, ‘effective’, and ‘very effective’. Another set of questions asked respondents to rate their use of the same 28 behavior management strategies using a Likert-type scale of ‘never’, ‘rarely’, ‘occasionally’, ‘frequently’, and ‘always’.

The last question of the survey prompted respondents to follow a link to a separate Qualtrics form to enter their name and email address if they wanted to be entered in a drawing for a $50 Amazon gift card as a participation incentive.

Pilot Study

The survey had high face validity. The items related directly to the questions asked in the study. The content validity was supported by the research

literature from which the survey was constructed. Furthermore, survey items were reviewed by teachers and professors of education whose area of expertise included a deep understanding of student behavior. The survey was sent to eleven general education teachers at the primary and secondary levels, one speech pathologist, four special education teachers, three administrators, a school psychologist, and four non-educators for their review. The survey recipients were sent an email asking that they voluntarily take the survey and respond to the following two prompts via a Google form: “Did you find any errors in the survey? If so, please specify where. Please provide any feedback, comments, suggestions.”

Additionally the item evaluators were asked the following questions:

1. Is there additional demographic information that may predict a teacher's classroom management style that I should include?
2. Are any terms in the glossary that are confusing?
3. Should the glossary include examples?
4. How long did it take you to complete the survey?

Six of the survey recipients responded including a school psychologist, three special education teachers, one general education teacher, and one non-educator. They offered information on how to improve the survey for clarity and whether the individual items were appropriate. When asked about additional demographic information, one respondent suggested offering the option of more than one choice under credential type and teaching assignment. Another

respondent identified parent relationships as important. This respondent also suggested including long term goals of teachers (i.e., administration-track or career teacher). Respondents did not identify any errors in the survey. One suggested changing the word “elite” on an item that was later removed. Another suggestion was to include an option to return to previous pages of the survey. Finally, one respondent stated that examples would be helpful if included in the glossary. Revisions were made based on this feedback.

Second Pilot Study

A revised version of the survey was sent to two public school teachers and two non-educators. They were asked to take the survey using their mobile device to judge the ease of use and ability to navigate through the survey with a mobile device. Adjustments were made to facilitate use by participants completing the survey on their mobile devices.

Participants

Elementary school teachers from school districts in two large counties in western United States were sent the survey link via their school district email. District emails were retrieved from publicly available listings on district websites.

Procedure

The survey was distributed to participants after receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board at California State University, San Bernardino. The survey was emailed to identified participants with directions for responding to the survey. Identified participants were sent two follow-up emails as reminders to

complete the survey. Qualtrics was used to create the survey with an anonymous link for distribution. From the 3,295 emails sent, a total of 209 usable survey responses were completed.

Data Analysis

Constructs of Interest

Teachers sometimes use behavioral management strategies based on their prior experiences and cultural beliefs about punishment rather than best practice about behavior change. With the advent of positive behavior support (PBS) there has been a considerable shift from using a punishment-based approach to the adoption of positive, proactive behavior management strategies (Sugai & Horner, 2020).

The survey data were downloaded from Qualtrics and sorted to examine differences in teachers' use of discipline strategies by their credential type, education level, and years of experience. In addition, the survey measured teachers' orientations to punishment to see if there is a relation between self-reported use and beliefs about punishment and their orientation to school discipline (proactive or reactive). This was done using three survey elements: (a) knowledge of negative outcomes of punishment, (b) perception of which role is the most important part of a teacher's job, and (c) beliefs about using punishment to manage challenging behavior. These three elements were used to develop an overall construct of "orientation to punishment."

Descriptive Statistics of Demographic Variables

Descriptive statistics are reported for the demographic variables. These variables included the age of the participants, their gender, and ethnicity. Information about their level of education, years of experience, credential status, current teaching assignment and training are summarized and presented in Chapter Four. Additionally, information about their school site including geographic location, school climate, and student population information reflecting student body ethnicity and socioeconomic status is described.

Survey data were also used to summarize how participants' described their role as an educator, their opinion on the use of punishment in school discipline, and their degree of agreement with negative outcomes of punishment. A summary of the participants' frequency of use of seven instructional strategies and 28 behavioral strategies as well as their ratings of the effectiveness of 28 behavioral strategies is reported.

Analysis of Variance

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if mean differences between the variables were statistically significant at the .01 level of significance. Specifically, a one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of teaching assignments on the use of reactive and proactive behavior management strategies. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of education level on the use of reactive and proactive behavior management strategies. Finally, a one-way ANOVA was performed to compare

the effect of years of experience on the use of reactive and proactive behavior management strategies.

Correlation

Correlations were computed to examine the extent to which the variables related to one another. A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to assess the linear relationship between teachers' conception of the use of punishment and their use of reactive and proactive strategies. Additionally, a Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to assess the linear relationship between teachers' knowledge of the outcomes of punishment and their use of reactive and proactive strategies.

Ethical Considerations

This research study posed no more than minimal risk to the survey participants. Participants were aware that the survey was completely voluntary and their responses collected anonymously. The survey instrument was accessible via an electronic link and could be completed at any time. Some respondents may have felt uncomfortable reflecting on classroom management practices or may have thought the time spent answering the survey was not worthwhile. Beyond these considerations, there was no other anticipated harm. The data collected were non-identifiable. The anticipated benefits include providing insight about teachers' perceptions of classroom and behavior management to support professional development efforts to reform ineffective school discipline policies.

Looking Ahead to Chapter Four

This chapter summarized the research methodology and design of this study including the instrumentation, pilot tests, participants, constructs of interest, data analysis, and ethical considerations. Chapter Four will present the results of the data analysis attained using the SPSS software. The research questions and results will be presented in order of significance.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the quantitative survey study conducted to answer research questions about teachers' perspectives and use of behavior management strategies. Here also are presented the descriptive and inferential statistics that help answer the following research questions.

RQ1: How do teachers rate the effectiveness of proactive behavior management strategies compared to reactive behavioral management strategies?

RQ1a: Which strategies do teachers believe to be most and least effective?

RQ2: How do teachers rate their frequency of use of proactive behavior management strategies compared to their frequency of use of reactive behavior management strategies?

RQ2a: Which strategies do teachers believe they use most and least frequently?

RQ3: How do teachers compare in their ratings of the effectiveness of proactive behavioral management strategies versus reactive management strategies when grouped according to their (a) teaching assignment, (b) education level and (c) years of experience?

RQ4: How do teachers compare in their ratings of the use of proactive behavioral management strategies versus reactive management strategies when grouped according to their (a) teaching assignment, (b) education level and (c) years of experience?

RQ5: What is the relationship between teachers' conceptions of the utility of punishment and their rating of use of (a) proactive behavior management strategies and (b) reactive behavior management strategies?

RQ6: What is the relationship between teachers' knowledge of the outcomes of punishment and their rating of use of (a) proactive behavior management strategies and (b) reactive behavior management strategies?

RQ7: Which role (caretaker, learning facilitator, or disciplinarian) do teachers percieve as the most important part of a teacher's job?

Demographics

The sample for this study was drawn from ten public school districts located across two counties in the southwestern United States. The counties cover approximately 27,000 square miles of the state. These two counties account for a significant proportion of the state's population and closely reflect teacher and student state demographics. Survey data were collected from 209 elementary teachers spanning grades pre-kindergarten to sixth.

The survey was created using Qualtrics™ and disseminated to 3295 educators during the months of October, November, and December of 2022. The teachers' publicly available, district issued, email addresses were used for the purpose of disseminating the surveys. Two follow-up emails were sent out, two-weeks apart, to increase participation. Of those contacted, 209 usable surveys were returned. The response rate was 0.06%. The data for this study was limited to those available with the survey and no follow-up data were collected to determine any reservations among those who did not complete the survey.

Teacher Demographics

The sample of respondents roughly mirrored state and county demographics (California Department of Education, 2022; EdData, 2019) (see Table 15 for more detailed state and county demographics). The sample was predominately female (88.5%) (Table 1) and White (56.9%), with a substantial number of Hispanics (28.9%) (Table 2). The teachers' age ranged from 24 years to 66 years with a mean age of 44.8 years (Table 3). More than 80% of teachers held a post-baccalaureate degree (80.4% master's degree; 1.9% doctoral degree) and more than 90% were fully credentialed (80.4% clear credential; 12% preliminary credential) (Table 4 and Table 5). Teachers holding preliminary

credentials are eligible for the clear credential following successful completion of two years of induction at a public school.

Table 1. Gender

	N	%
Female	185	88.5%
Male	24	11.5%

Table 2. Teacher Ethnicity

	N	%
Asian	9	3.9%
Black	8	3.4%
Hispanic	67	28.9%
Native American	6	2.6%
Pacific Islander	3	1.3%
White	132	56.9%
Other	7	3.0%

Table 3. Teachers' Age in Years

N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Dev.
206	42	24	66	44.80	10.694

Note. Three respondents had missing data.

Table 4. Teachers' Education Level

	N	%
Bachelor's	35	16.7%
Master's	168	80.4%
Doctoral	4	1.9%
Missing	2	1.0%

Table 5. Teachers' Credential Status

	N	%
Clear	169	80.9%
Preliminary	25	12.0%
Intern	3	1.4%
Substitute	1	0.5%
Out of State	1	0.5%
Instructional Assistant	3	1.4%

Provisional Internship Permit (PIP)	2	1.0%
Substitute Teacher Incentive Plan (STIP)	1	0.5%
Other	4	1.9%

More than 71% of respondents were general educators while different types of special education teachers (e.g. mild/moderate, moderate/severe) comprised 15.3% of the respondents. The respondents who chose the “Other” category made up 9.1% of the total and, although not disclosed by the teachers, were most likely general educators who were assigned as “intervention teachers” who typically work with small groups of students from grades K-6 who need of some extra assistance in mathematics and/or English language arts. See Table 6 for a full reporting of all teaching assignments.

Table 6. Teaching Assignments

	N	%
Gen Ed Elementary	149	71.3%
Spec Ed Mild/Mod	23	11.0%
Spec Ed Mod/Severe	6	2.9%

Spec Ed Early Childhood	3	1.4%
Gen Ed Single Subject Academic	1	0.5%
Gen Ed Single Subject Elective	8	3.8%
Other	19	9.1%

The largest percentage of teachers were teaching at the fourth (15.7%) and fifth grade levels (15.0%). The smallest percentage of teachers were at the pre-kindergarten (1.7%) and transitional kindergarten levels (5.6%) (Table 7). Most teachers reported having received preparation in classroom and/or behavior management as part of their teacher credential preparation program (30.7%) or as school district in-service professional development (29.1%) (Table 8). Only 2% of respondents indicated having received no training at all in classroom or behavior management. More than half the teachers (68.4%) had ten or more years of teaching experience (Table 9).

Table 7. Teaching Assignments by Grade Levels

	N	%
Pre-Kindergarten	7	1.7%
Transitional Kindergarten	23	5.6%
Kindergarten	45	11.0%

First	52	12.7%
Second	53	13.0%
Third	56	13.7%
Fourth	64	15.7%
Fifth	61	15.0%
Sixth	47	11.5%
Total*	408	100.0%

*The total is greater than 209 because respondents were asked to indicate all grade levels they were currently teaching.

Table 8. Teachers' Classroom and/or Behavior Management Training

	N*	%
Undergraduate course	75	15.0%
Teacher credential program	153	30.7%
School District or site inservice	145	29.1%
Professional conference or seminar	94	18.8%
No training	10	2.0%
Other	22	4.4%

*The total is greater than 209 because respondents were asked to indicate all types of training they received.

Table 9. Years of Teaching Experience

	N	%
First year	9	4.3%

2-3 years	22	10.5%
4-10 years	35	16.7%
10 or more	143	68.4%

School Variables

Nearly half of the sample (45.9%) classified their school as being in a suburban area while 42.1% described their school as being in an urban area (Table 10). Teachers were asked to describe their school climate. A large majority of teachers (70.8%) described their school climate as “warm, positive, and cohesive.” Almost a quarter of the sample (22.5%) described their schools as “functional but not particularly warm and positive.” A verys small percentage of teachers, only 4.80%, described their schools as “dysfunctional” (see Table 11).

Table 10. Geographic Location

	N	%
Urban large city	43	20.6%
Urban small city	45	21.5%
Suburban	96	45.9%
Rural	23	11.0%
Missing	2	1.0%

Table 11. School Climate

	N	%
Warm, positive, and cohesive	148	70.8%
Functional but not particularly warm and positive	47	22.5%
Dysfunctional	10	4.8%
Other	4	1.9%

Student Demographics

A majority of the respondents (78%) indicated that more than 80% of their students received free or reduced price lunch at school. A very small percentage (i.e., 0.5%) of the respondents indicated that less than 20% of their students received free or reduced price lunch (Table 12). The survey respondents described their student population, on average, as majority Hispanic (65.78%). The next largest student ethnic groups reported were White (21.18%) and then Black (10.88%) (Table 13).

Table 12. Average Percentage of Students Receiving Free/Reduced Lunch

	N	%
More than 80%	163	78.0%
50-80%	28	13.4%
20-49%	16	7.7%
Less than 20%	1	0.5%
Missing	1	0.5%

Table 13. Average Percentage of Students by Ethnicity

	Number of Teachers Indicating Percentage of a Particular Ethnic Group at School Site	Mean Percentage
Hispanic	204	65.78%
White	201	21.18%
Black	196	10.88%
Multiracial	124	8.83%
Asian	168	5.90%
Native American	77	4.92%
Pacific Islander	93	3.88%
Other	41	3.85%

National, State, and County Overview

In the United States, a majority of public school teachers are female (76%) and White (84%). On average, 40% of teachers across the U.S. have between 10 to 20 years of experience. Fifty-eight of teachers hold a post-baccalaureate degree. See Table 14 for national public school teacher demographics.

Table 14. National Public School Teacher Demographics (2017-2018)

Years of Teaching	9% Less than 3 years 28% 3 to 9 years 40% 10 to 20 years 23 % Over 20 years
Gender	76% Female 24% Male
Ethnicity	9% Hispanic 84% White 2% Asian 8% Black 0% Pacific Islander 2% MultiRacial
Education Level	58% Postbaccalaureate degree

Note. The data is from *Characteristics of Public School Teachers*, National Center for Education Statistics, 2021, (https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/clr/public-school-teachers).

State and County Public School Teachers Demographics

Consistent with national averages, the elementary school teaching population in California and the two counties included in the study, were mostly

female (state 73.3%; county one 73.1%; county two 73.3%) and White (state 62%; county one 61%; county two 65.5%). Black teachers in the sample are underrepresented (3.4%) compared to state (3.9%) and county (county 1, 4.9%; county 2, 4.5%) averages, as well as compared to the national average (8%). Average years of experience for state and both counties is 12 years. One county had a much larger percentage of teachers holding a master's degree (63.1%) compared to the state average (41.7%). See state and county demographics in Table 15.

Table 15. California Public School Teachers Demographics

		State	County 1	County 2
Average Teaching Experience in years (2018-2019)		12	12	12
Number of Teachers in Public Schools (2018-2019)		319,004	19,304	19,633
Gender (2018-2019)	Female	73.3%	73.1%	73.3%
	Male	26.7%	26.9%	26.6%
Ethnicity* (2018-2019)	Hispanic	21.1%	22.0%	23.8%
	White	62.0%	61.0%	65.5%
	Asian	05.8%	02.8%	02.4%
	Black	03.9%	04.9%	04.5%
	Pacific Islander	00.3%	00.2%	00.2%
	Multi-Racial	01.0%	00.7%	00.7%
Education Levels (2018-2019)	Bachelor's	55.5%	54.4%	35.0%
	Master's	41.7%	43.7%	63.1%
	Doctorate	00.9%	00.5%	00.7%

Note. The data for the state is from *Fingertip Facts on Education in California*, California Department of Education, 2022 (https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/ceffingertipfacts.asp). The data for the counties is from *California Public Schools*, Ed-Data, 2019 (https://www.ed-data.org/state/CA).

State and County Student Demographics

Each county represents approximately 7% of the state's student population. The greatest percentage of students are male (approximately 51%) and Hispanic (approximately 62%). Compared to the state, the two counties in this study have a larger population of Hispanic students (66% and 65% compared to 55.9% state-wide). The counties also have a slightly larger percentage of Black students (6-8% compared to 5% state-wide). The second largest ethnic group at both the state and county levels is White (approximately 19%). In the state, 9.5% of students are Asian compared to both counties where they account for approximatley 3% of the student population.

The percentage of students who receieved free or reduced price lunch across the state was 57.8%. The percentage of students who received free or reduced price lunch is higher in both counties at 67.2% and 67.7%. The percentage of students who recieved special education services in the state was 12.7% and marginally higher at the county level (county 1 13.8% and county 2 13.9%). See Table 16 for state and county student demographics.

Table 16. State and County Student Demographics

	State	County 1	County 2
Number of Students (K-12) (2020-2021)	6,147,253	417,655	436,334

Percentage Receiving Free or Reduced Lunch (2021-2022)		57.8%	67.2%	67.7%
Percentage Receiving Special Education Services (2021-2022)		12.7%	13.8%	13.9%
Gender	Female	48.6%	48.7%	48.7%
	Male	51.4%	51.2%	51.3%
Suspension Rate (2018-2019)		3.1%	4.6%	3.9%
Ethnicity* (2021-2022)	Hispanic	55.9%	66.4%	64.9%
	White	21.1%	16.1%	18.9%
	Asian	9.5%	3.9%	3.3%
	Black	5.1%	8.2%	6.0%
	Pacific Islander	0.4%	0.39%	0.34%
	Multi-Racial	4.3%	2.5%	3.5%

Note. The data for the state are from *Fingertip Facts on Education in California*, California Department of Education, 2022 (https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/ceffingertipfacts.asp).
The data for the counties are from *California Public Schools*, Ed-Data, 2019 (https://www.ed-data.org/state/CA).

Teacher Perceptions

The purpose of this study was to examine teachers' perceptions about the effectiveness and use of two types of behavior management strategies i.e., proactive and reactive strategies. The survey included items that focused on teachers' 1) beliefs about the efficacy and use of 28 behavior management strategies and seven instructional strategies, 2) perspectives about the utility of

punishment in school discipline, and 3) perspectives about the negative effects of punishment. In this section the frequencies of teacher responses to these items are enumerated and analyzed. Tables 17 – 24 are used to present the data.

Teacher Roles

RQ7: Which role (caretaker, learning facilitator, or disciplinarian) do teachers percieve as the most important part of a teacher's job?

When teachers were asked to rank their perception of the importance of three teacher roles, i.e., Learning Facilitator, Caretaker, or Disciplinarian, 72.2% of them ranked Learning Facilitator first. 'Caretaker' was ranked first among 16.7% of the teachers, while 'Disciplinarian' was ranked first by only 2.4% of the teachers. Eighteen respondents (i.e., 8.6%) did not rank any of the teacher roles.

Table 17. Teacher's Role Ranking

	Learning Facilitator		Caretaker		Disciplinarian	
Ranking Position	N	%	N	%	N	%
First	151	72.2%	35	16.7%	5	2.4%
Second	32	15.3%	115	55.0%	44	21.1%
Third	8	3.8%	41	19.6%	142	67.9%
Missing	18	8.6%	18	8.6%	18	8.6%

Beliefs about the Use of Punishment

Teachers were asked to select one of three perspectives about punshiment,i.e., “Punishment is effective”, “Not desirable, but sometimes necessary”, and “Not effective, rely on instructive approach.” The majority (58.9%) selected punishment is “not desirable but is sometimes necessary.” Of interest was that there were 18 teachers (i.e., 8.6%) who reported that they believed punishment is effective.

Table 18. Beliefs about the Use of Punishment

	N	%
Punishment is effective	18	8.6%
Not desirable, but sometimes necessary	123	58.9%
Not effective, rely on instructive approach	68	32.5%

Teachers’ Understanding of the Negative Effects of Discipline

Teachers were asked to describe their beliefs about the effects of discipline on the children. They were asked to indicate whether they 'disagreed, somewhat agreed, or agreed with statements about the effects of discipline. The

eight statements were selected because they were included in previous research studies (i.e., Colvin et al., 1997; Lane et al., 2015; Simonsen et al., 2008).

The largest percentage of teachers agreed with the following three statements: (a) Students sometimes misbehave to escape academic tasks they feel unable to complete (78.4%), (b) suspension can lead to school dropout (42.6%), and (c) use of punishment may lead to somatic complaints (42%). Furthermore, a sizeable percentage of teachers indicated they 'somewhat agreed' with the following statements: (a) the use of punishment can negatively impact classroom climate (43%), (b) the use of punishment may lead to somatic complaints (43%), (c) suspension can lead to school dropout (42.6%), and (d) the use of punishment may lead to student absenteeism (42.1%). More than a third (i.e., 39.1%) of the teachers 'somewhat agreed' or 'agreed' with the notion that, "punishment can result in learned helplessness".

Most teachers somewhat agreed or agreed that students of color, particularly Black students, experienced harsher discipline for the same offense compared to white students (56.2%). On the other hand, a sizeable percentage of teachers (i.e., 43.8%) indicated that they 'disagreed' with the statement that students of color, particulary Black students, experienced harsher discipline for the same offense compared to white students. Furthermore, approximately a third (31.4%) of teachers also disagreed that harsh discipline contributes to the school to prison pipelinet, while 68.6% of teachers somewhat agreed or agreed.

Table 19. Teachers' Understanding about the Effects of Discipline

	Disagree		Somewhat Agree		Agree	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Dropout	31	14.8%	89	42.6%	89	42.6%
Absenteeism	46	22.0%	88	42.1%	75	35.9%
Somatic	31	15.0%	89	43.0%	87	42.0%
Helplessness	45	21.7%	81	39.1%	81	39.1%
Harsher Discipline	91	43.8%	62	29.8%	55	26.4%
Escape Task	6	2.9%	39	18.8%	163	78.4%
School to Prison Pipeline	65	31.4%	74	35.7%	68	32.9%
Class Climate	39	18.8%	89	43.0%	79	38.2%

Teachers' Ratings of Use of Instructional Strategies

Teachers were asked to rate how often they used each of seven instructional strategies on a five-point Likert-type rating scale (i.e., Always, Frequesntly, Occasionally, Rarely, and Never). A majority of teachers reported using five of the seven instructional strategies frequently or always ('pacing', 'Universal Design for Learning', 'differentiate learning', opportunity to respond', and 'instructional feedback'.) The remaining two strategies, i.e., 'high probability request sequence' and 'choice', were used 'occassionally' by the greatest proportion of teachers. 'High probability request sequence' was rated the highest

for never (9.9%) and rarely (12.9%). As shown in the table below, several instructional strategies, including ‘differentaite instruction’, ‘opportunities to respond’, and ‘instructional feedback’, did not receive a rating for “Never” and “Rarely”.

Table 20. Teachers’ Ratings of Use of Instructional Strategies

	Never		Rarely		Occasionally		Frequently		Always	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Pacing	1	0.5%	2	1.0%	20	9.7%	93	44.9%	91	44.0%
Universal Design for Learning	6	2.9%	9	4.4%	46	22.3%	85	41.3%	60	29.1%
Differentiate Instruction	0	0.0%	2	1.0%	16	7.7%	83	39.9%	107	51.4%
High Probability	20	9.9%	26	12.9%	74	36.6%	54	26.7%	28	13.9%
Choice	2	1.0%	13	6.3%	84	40.4%	74	35.6%	35	16.8%
Opportunity to Respond	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	8.2%	92	44.2%	99	47.6%
Instructional Feedback	0	0.0%	4	1.9%	14	6.8%	104	50.5%	84	40.8%

Teachers' Opinions About the Effectiveness of Behavior Management Strategies and Their Use

RQ1: How do teachers rate the effectiveness of proactive behavior management strategies compared to reactive behavioral management strategies?

RQ1a: Which strategies do teachers believe to be most and least effective?

Teachers were asked to rate their opinions about the effectiveness of behavior management strategies using a five-point, Likert-type rating scale (i.e., "not effective", "marginally effective", "somewhat effective", "effective", and "very effective".) This section of the instrument included 28 behavior management strategies. Teachers were asked to rate their perceptions of the effectiveness of, and their reported use of those 28 strategies. Table 23 provides the list of strategies ordered from those receiving the highest mean scores to the lowest mean scores. Accordingly, the following three strategies that had the highest average ratings for effectiveness were "rapport", "routines and procedures", and "a predictable schedule". There were four strategies that were rated the lowest in efficaciousness were "send to the principal's office", "detention", "suspension", and "expulsion". In general, teachers ranked proactive strategies ("explicit teaching expectations", "behavior specific praise") as being more effective, while the reactive strategies ("remove privileges", "time out", and "verbal reprimand") were on the average rated as less effective.

Table 21. Teacher Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Proactive Strategies

	N	Mean (sd)
Establishing Rapport	200	4.68 (.64)
Teaching Routines and Procedures	199	4.62 (.58)
Following a Predictable Schedule	199	4.61 (.60)
Explicit Teaching of Expectations	199	4.53 (.75)
Intrinsic Motivation	199	4.48 (.67)
Reinforcement of Desired Behavior	199	4.41 (.71)
Fostering Students' Sense of Autonomy	198	4.36 (.75)
Active Supervision	200	4.34 (.88)
Proximity	201	4.34 (.66)
Reteaching of Expected/Desired Behavior	199	4.29 (.76)
Behavior Specific Praise	202	4.21 (.80)
Offering Choices	200	4.18 (.87)
Redirection of Misbehavior	200	4.09 (.77)
Cue or Reminder	201	4.00 (.83)
Precorrection	195	3.91 (.93)
Restorative Justice	185	3.62 (1.0)
Token Economy	196	3.42 (1.1)
Behavior Contract	202	3.24 (.97)

Table 22. Teacher Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Reactive Strategies

	N	Mean (sd)
Call or Message Home About Misbehavior	201	3.22 (.91)
Removal of Privileges	199	3.10 (.99)

Cost Response (removal of earned points/reward)	200	2.94 (1.1)
Time Out	199	2.92 (1.0)
Verbal Reprimand	196	2.91 (1.0)
Public Warning of Misbehavior	201	2.49 (1.1)
Send to Principal's Office	199	2.43 (1.0)
Detention	199	2.35 (.98)
Suspension	198	2.21 (1.0)
Expulsion	197	1.88 (1.0)

RQ2: How do teachers rate their frequency of use of proactive behavior management strategies compared to their frequency of use of reactive behavior management strategies?

RQ2a: Which strategies do teachers believe they use most and least frequently?

Teachers were also asked to rate their use of the same behavior management strategies using a five-point Likert-type scale ("never", "rarely", "occasionally", "frequently", and "always"). The strategies that had the highest average rating for use were rapport, routines and procedures, and a predictable schedule. The strategies ranked lowest for use were "send to the principal's office", "detention", "suspension", and "expulsion". Again, the teachers ranked the proactive strategies as more frequently used. The reactive strategies were less frequently used.

Table 23. Teacher Mean Ratings of Use of Proactive Strategies

	N	Mean (sd)
Establishing Rapport	203	4.77 (.48)
Teaching Routines and Procedures	203	4.66 (.55)
Following a Predictable Schedule	203	4.61 (.56)
Explicit Teaching of Expectations	203	4.52 (.67)
Reinforcement of Desired Behavior	201	4.49 (.62)
Cue or Reminder	202	4.46 (.61)
Behavior Specific Praise	203	4.44 (.66)
Intrinsic Motivation	201	4.37 (.71)
Proximity	202	4.36 (.67)
Active Supervision	203	4.31 (1.0)
Redirection of Misbehavior	203	4.31 (.71)
Reteaching of Expected/Desired Behavior	202	4.30 (.77)
Fostering Students' Sense of Autonomy	203	4.22 (.80)
Offering Choices	202	3.91 (.90)
Precorrection	202	3.85 (.86)
Token Economy	202	3.22 (1.4)
Restorative Justice	196	3.20 (1.1)
Behavior Contract	203	2.66 (1.0)

Table 24. Teacher Mean Ratings of Use of Reactive Strategies

	N	Mean (sd)
Verbal Reprimand	202	3.12 (1.0)
Call or Message Home About Misbehavior	203	3.09 (.93)
Removal of Privileges	202	2.93 (1.0)

Cost Response (removal of earned points/reward)	202	2.65 (1.0)
Time Out	203	2.51 (.94)
Public Warning of Misbehavior	203	2.31 (1.2)
Send to Principal's Office	203	1.86 (.82)
Detention	203	1.65 (.90)
Suspension	203	1.36 (.67)
Expulsion	201	1.17 (.56)

Analysis of Variance

In addition to the descriptive statistics reported above, inferential statistics were used to examine differences among the teachers' mean scores regarding the 'use' and the 'effectivenenss' of behavior management strategies. This section reports the results of one-way analyses of variance to determine if there were a statistically significant differences in the mean scores of teachers classified according to their (a) teaching assignment (three levels), (b) education level (three levels), and (c) years of experience (four levels). The survey included two types of behavior management strategies of interest. i.e., reactive strategies and proactive strategies. Of interest was how teacher ratings regarding use and effectiveness for the two behavior management types differed within teaching assignment, education level, and years of teaching experience. The following reasearch questions are addressed.

RQ3: How do teachers compare in their ratings of the effectiveness of proactive behavioral management strategies versus reactive management strategies when grouped according to their (a) teaching assignment, (b) education level and (c) years of experience?

RQ4: How do teachers compare in their ratings of the use of proactive behavioral management strategies versus reactive management strategies when grouped according to their (a) teaching assignment, (b) education level and (c) years of experience?

Teaching Assignment and Use of Strategies

Use of Reactive Strategies. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the mean ratings of teachers classified as general educators, special educators and intervention teachers with regard to their use of reactive behavior management strategies. Group sizes were unequal (n_1=158, n_2=32, n_3=19). For purposes of analyses, the special teachers who classified themselves into one of eight different types of special education assignments were combined into a single group. A Levene's test was conducted to assess the homogeneity of variances among the groups. The results of the test showed that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not violated (i.e., $p > .05$).

The one-way ANOVA indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in the use of reactive strategies among the groups ($F_{2,200} = 3.529$, $p =$

.031), however, a post-hoc analysis using Tukey's HSD test for multiple comparisons showed that there was no statistically significant difference between any of the pairs of means.

Use of Proactive Strategies. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of teaching assignment on the use of proactive behavior management strategies. Group sizes were unequal. A Levene's test was run to assess the homogeneity of variances. The assumption of equal variances was not violated ($p > .05$). The one-way ANOVA indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference in the use of proactive strategies among the groups ($F_{2,200} = 1.771$, $p = .173$), consequently, no post-hoc analyses were conducted.

Education Level and Use of Strategies

Use of Reactive Strategies. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of education level on the use of reactive behavior management strategies. Group sizes were unequal. A Levene's test was run to assess the homogeneity of variances. The assumption of equal variances was not violated ($p > .05$). A one-way ANOVA indicated there was not a statistically significant difference in the use of reactive strategies between the groups ($F_{2,198} = 0.105$, $p = .901$). Failure to obtain a statistically significant F-test procluded the need for a post-hoc test.

Use of Proactive Strategies. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of education level on the use of proactive behavior

management strategies. Group sizes were unequal. A Levene's test was run to assess the homogeneity of variances. The assumption of equal variances was not violated ($p > .05$). A one-way ANOVA indicated there was not a statistically significant difference in the use of proactive strategies among the groups ($F_{2,198} = 0.064$, $p = .938$). Failure to obtain a statistically significant F-test procluded the need for a post-hoc test.

Years of Experience and Use of Strategies

Use of Reactive Strategies. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of years of experience on the use of reactive behavior management strategies. Group sizes were unequal. A Levene's test was run to assess the homogeneity of variances. The assumption of equal variances was not violated ($p > .05$). A one-way ANOVA indicated there was not a statistically significant difference in the use of reactive strategies between the groups ($F_{3,199} = 0.391$, $p = .760$). Failure to obtain a statistically significant F-test procluded the need for a post-hoc test.

Use of Proactive Strategies. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of years of experience on the use of proactive behavior management strategies. Group sizes were unequal. A Levene's test was run to assess the homogeneity of variances. The assumption of equal variances was not violated ($p > .05$). The one-way ANOVA indicated there was not a statistically significant difference in the use of proactive strategies between the groups

($F_{3,199}$= 1.249, p = .293). Failure to obtain a statistically significant F-test procluded the need for a post-hoc test.

Teaching Assignment and Rating of Effectiveness of Strategies

Effectiveness of Reactive Strategies. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of teaching assignment on the rating of effectiveness of reactive behavior management strategies. Group sizes were unequal. A Levene's test was run to assess the homogeneity of variances. The assumption of equal variances was not violated (p > .05). The one-way ANOVA indicated there was not a statistically significant difference in rating of effectiveness of reactive strategies between the groups ($F_{2,199}$= 2.826, p = .062). Failure to obtain a statistically significant F-test procluded the need for a post-hoc test.

Effectiveness of Proactive Strategies. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of teaching assignment on the rating of effectiveness of proactive behavior management strategies. Group sizes were unequal. A Levene's test was run to assess the homogeneity of variances. The assumption of equal variances was not violated (p > .05). A one-way ANOVA indicated there was not a statistically significant difference in the rating of effectiveness of proactive strategies among the groups ($F_{2,199}$= 2.557, p = .080), consequently, no post-hoc analyses were conducted.

Education Level and Effectiveness of Strategies

Effectiveness of Reactive Strategies. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of education level on the rating of effectiveness of reactive

behavior management strategies. Group sizes were unequal. A Levene's test was run to assess the homogeneity of variances. The assumption of equal variances was not violated ($p > .05$). A one-way ANOVA indicated there was not a statistically significant difference in the rating of effectiveness of reactive strategies between the groups ($F_{2,197}=1.130$, $p = .325$). Failure to obtain a statistically significant F-test procluded the need for a post-hoc test.

Effectiveness of Proactive Strategies. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of education level on the rating of effectiveness of proactive behavior management strategies. Group sizes were unequal. A Levene's test was run to assess the homogeneity of variances. The assumption of equal variances was not violated ($p > .05$). A one-way ANOVA indicated there was not a statistically significant difference in the rating of effectiveness of proactive strategies among the groups ($F_{2,197}= .204$, $p =.816$). Failure to obtain a statistically significant F-test procluded the need for a post-hoc test.

Years of Experience and Effectiveness of Strategies

Effectiveness of Reactive Strategies. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of years of experience on the rating of effectiveness of reactive behavior management strategies. Group sizes were unequal. A Levene's test was run to assess the homogeneity of variances. The assumption of equal variances was not violated ($p > .05$). A one-way ANOVA indicated there was not a statistically significant difference in the rating of effectiveness of reactive strategies between the groups (F [df=3,198] = .527, $p = .664$).

Effectiveness of Proactive Strategies. A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of years of experience on the rating of effectiveness of proactive behavior management strategies. Group sizes were unequal. A Levene's test was run to assess the homogeneity of variances. The assumption of equal variances was not violated ($p > .05$). The one-way ANOVA indicated there was not a statistically significant difference in the rating of effectiveness of proactive strategies between the groups ($F [df=3,198] = .293$, $p = .830$).

Correlation

RQ5: What is the relationship between teachers' conceptions of the utility of punishment and their rating of use of (a) proactive behavior management strategies and (b) reactive behavior management strategies?

Conceptions about Utility of Punishment and Use of Proactive Strategies

A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to assess the linear relationship between teachers' conception of the use of punishment and their use of proactive strategies. There was a very weak, positive correlation between the variables, $r = .097$, $p = .168$. However, the relationship was not statistically significant.

Conceptions about Utility of Punishment and Use of Reactive Strategies

A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to assess the linear relationship between teachers' conception of the use of punishment and their use

of reactive strategies. There was a moderately large negative correlation between the two variables that was statistically significant (r = -.408, p = <.001.). The effect size, measured by the coefficient of determination r^2=.166, indicating that the two variable shared 16.6% of their variance.

RQ6: What is the relationship between teachers' knowledge of the outcomes of punishment and their rating of use of (a) proactive behavior management strategies and (b) reactive behavior management strategies?

Knowledge of the Outcomes of Punishment and Use of Reactive Strategies

A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to assess the linear relationship between teachers' knowledge of the outcomes of punishment and their use of reactive strategies. There was a significant, moderately large, negative correlation between the two variables, r = -.447, p = <.001.

Knowledge of the Outcomes of Punishment and Use of Proactive Strategies

A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to assess the linear relationship between teachers' knowledge of the outcomes of punishment and their use of proactive strategies. There was a weak, positive correlation between the variables, r = .155, p = .027, however, the relationship was not statistically significant at the .05 level.

Summary of Findings

The results of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) did not reveal statistically significant differences in the mean scores of teacher groups (teaching assignement, education level, and years of experience) and their use of reactive behavior management strategies or proactive behavior management strategies. There was also not a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of teacher groups and their ratings of efficacy of reactive and proactive strategies.

Additionally, the correlation analysis did not find strong relationship between teachers' conception of the use of punishment and their use of reactive or proactive behavior management strategies. Similarly, the correlation analysis did not find a strong relationship between teachers' knowledge of the outcomes of punishment and their use of reactive or proactive behavioral management strategies.

Looking Ahead to Chapter Five

Chapter Five provides a discussion of the research findings. This chapter will also detail the implications of the findings for educational leaders, classroom practitioners and policy. Chapter Five will conclude with the limitations of the study and the recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Overview

The purpose of this study was to examine teachers' conceptions about the utility of punishment, knowledge about the negative effects of punishment, and the relationship of these variables to their reported use of behavior management strategies. Research and practice indicate that punishment-based, exclusionary, and reactive discipline practices are ineffective, inequitable, and have serious negative implications for student outcomes (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Sugai & Horner, 2002; Lewis et al., 2005; Mitchell & Bradshaw, 2013; Wolf & Kupchik, 2017). Reliance on punitive models of school discipline has long been ingrained in American public education – from colonial schoolhouses to zero tolerance policies, and more recently the institutionalization of school-based law enforcement officers and their often violent response to student behavior (Goldstein, 2020). These ideas and policies remain evident in the continued high rate of exclusionary discipline and reliance on punitive and reactive practices.

However, there has been a concentrated effort both nationwide and in California to reduce reliance on punishment-based approaches and use proactive and responsive approaches to discipline such as Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) (Skiba & Losen, 2016). The California

Department of Education's letter to district superintendents and school administrators emphasizes alternatives to punitive practices (Thurmond & Darling-Hammond, 2021).

This study surveyed teachers in Southern California about their knowledge, practices, and beliefs regarding school discipline. Examining beliefs and knowledge about punishment and school discipline, and teachers' self-reported use of behavior management strategies, can offer insights for how to create more equitable, positive and effective learning environments.

The survey collected information about teachers' 1) beliefs about the efficacy and use of 28 behavior management strategies and seven instructional strategies, 2) conceptions about the utility of punishment in school discipline, and 3) knowledge about the negative effects of punishment. Two hundred and nine usable surveys completed by elementary teachers from San Bernardino and Riverside counties were collected over a three-month period.

The sample roughly mirrored state and county demographics. Descriptive statistics were reported for demographic variables as well as how participants' described their role as an educator, their opinion regarding the use of punishment in school discipline, and their degree of agreement with negative outcomes of punishment. Descriptive statistics were also reported for participants' frequency of use of seven instructional and 28 behavioral strategies as well as their ratings the effectiveness of these 28 behavioral strategies. One-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted to determine group

differences with regard to the dependent variables. Teacher were grouped by years of teaching experience, education level, and teaching assignment. These groups were compared to their ratings of behavior management strategies to determine if the differences between variables were statistically significant. Correlations coefficients were computed to examine the extent to which variables related to one another.

Discussion

Overall, the teacher responses showed strong alignment with a positive and responsive classroom management style that did not overly rely on reactive behavior management strategies. The following discussion illustrates how teachers described their role, their beliefs about the utility of punishment, their knowledge of the negative effects of punishment, their self-reported use of evidence-based instructional strategies, and their ratings of the use and effectiveness of behavior management strategies.

Teacher Role

Teacher participants were asked to choose one of three descriptions that most closely matched how they would describe their role as a teacher to examine whether role orientation might be related to discipline style. Teachers could choose among the following three descriptors: a) learning facilitator, b) caretaker or c) disciplinarian. The vast majority of teachers described their role as being learning facilitators. The emphasis of this role is to create an effective

environment to deliver academic content and support student learning. A small percentage of participants ranked their role as one of caretaker or disciplinarian. In general, participants did not see the most important role of a teacher as one that provides physical or emotional support to students. Nor did the majority of teachers believe their most important role was to enforce the school rules and deliver punishment. This finding supports the notion that teachers do not want to take time from instruction to handle student discipline issues (Kafka, 2009). These findings are unsurprising as a predominant goal of schooling is to help students gain mastery of the designated curriculum. This may also be a reflection of the high-stakes accountability movement that put a premium on students' test scores (Nelson, 2013) and pressure on teachers to show improved academic outcomes.

Beliefs about the Utility of Punishment

Most teachers reported that punishment was 'sometimes necessary, although not desirable'. This indicates that discipline strategies such as loss of privileges, office referrals or suspensions, while not viewed as preferable, were common reactions to inappropriate student behavior. In addition, many student offenses described in the California State Education Code are subject to suspension and may necessitate the use of exclusionary punishment by school staff (CA Edu Code §48900, 2019) leaving the type of response out of their hands. Additionally, teachers have several constraints including having to manage many students, pressure to follow pacing charts to cover the required

curriculum, and improve students' standardized test scores that seemed to have made reactive discipline an efficient choice.

A smaller proportion of teachers indicated they felt punishment was not effective and instead, relied on an instructive approach to student behavior (32.5%). Less than 10% of teachers described punishment as effective. It is encouraging, and surprising, that there was a subset of teachers who completely eschewed the use of punishment. This understanding of punishment as not effective may be informed by a teacher's knowledge of the negative effects of punishment. There are still teachers who believe punishment is effective or necessary as evidence by the 67.5% who chose one of the statements: "Punishment is effective" or "Punishment is not desirable, but sometimes necessary."

Knowledge of Negative Effects of Discipline

The findings showed that the teachers were knowledgeable about the negative effects punishment has on students. They generally agreed that punishment has a negative impact on classroom climate, which, in turn, has far-reaching implications for both academics and student behavior as a positive climate is known to enhance prosocial behavior and increase academic achievement. Teachers agree students' challenging behaviors are often efforts to escape academic tasks they feel unable to successfully complete. Most teachers believed that negative student outcomes such as dropping out of school,

absenteeism, somatic complaints and learned helplessness can be the results of exclusionary discipline and punishment practices.

A large proportion of teachers (43.8%) disagreed that students of color, particularly Black students, experienced harsher discipline for the same offense compared to white students. Relatedly, many also disagreed (31.4%) that harsh discipline contributes to the school to prison pipeline. This is in stark contrast to the research that describes Black students as especially vulnerable to frequent and harsher discipline compared to white students for the same offenses (Pesta, 2018). There is sufficient evidence supporting reports that students of color are disproportionately disciplined, subject to excessive surveillance, and are more often referred for discipline for subjective offenses (rather than objective infractions) (Annamma et al., 2019; Bradshaw et al., 2010; Office for Civil Rights, 2018; Wun, 2016). Research findings also report that there is a strong and direct relationship between a students' experience of exclusionary discipline and their contact with the criminal justice system (Fabelo et al., 2011; Monahan et al., 2014; Mowen & Brent, 2016; Novak, 2018; Wald & Losen, 2003). These students are disproportionately students of color (Welsh & Little, 2018).

Use of Instructional Strategies that Reduce Behavioral Issues

An important aspect of managing student behavior is attention to instructional strategies that promote students' engagement (Simonsen et al., 2008). These strategies support a productive environment for learning by proactively meeting students' academic and behavioral needs, making the

content accessible, and facilitating participation. The use of these strategies help minimize the need for reactive or punitive strategies by preventing challenging or disruptive behaviors. Participants overwhelmingly reported frequently using all seven instructional strategies as part of their classroom management program. Over 88% of teachers reported using frequently or always using differentiating instruction, opportunities to respond, instructional feedback, and (instructional) pacing. The frequent use of these strategies demonstrates attention to teaching practices that are more proactive and positive in managing students' behavioral problems.

Self-Reported Use of Proactive and Reactive Strategies

Teachers reported frequent use of proactive, evidence-based instructional strategies that are known to support effective classroom management (Simonsen et al., 2008). These strategies are part of a learning environment that foster learning and engagement while minimizing disruptive behavior. There were no differences in reported use by years of experience, teaching assignment, or grade level. This may indicate districts are successfully communicating the ideas and practices of PBIS to all teachers through professional development. There was also no significant relationship between teachers' opinions on the utility of punishment and their reported use of proactive or reactive strategies. This further supports the power of instructional and behavioral programs that emphasize proactive approaches.

Only one strategy, ‘high probability request sequence’, was described as “never” or “rarely” used. This strategy is defined as making requests the student is likely to engage in while providing reinforcement and then following these in close succession with a low-probability request to build momentum and increase behavior compliance. The low use of this strategy by teachers may indicate less familiarity with the procedure or lack to time to incorporate it regularly into instruction.

Teachers overwhelmingly reported high use of proactive strategies compared to reactive strategies. The proactive strategies that teacher reported using most often were low intensity, easily implemented elements often considered a baseline of classroom management. These included teaching routines and procedures (i.e. the step-by-step teaching and practicing of classroom movements and expectations), following a predictable schedule (i.e. adhering to a set daily schedule), and establishing rapport with students (i.e., building a positive and caring relationship with students).

Also ranked highly was explicit teaching of expected and desired behavior, reinforcement of desired behavior, and cues or reminders. Teachers reported less use of the proactive strategies that are more individualized and time intensive including restorative justice practices and token economy. Restorative justice practices are time-consuming and require appropriate training. Implementing a token economy often requires additional supplies, high implementation fidelity, and time during the instructional day that teachers may

not want to undertake. Similarly, offering students autonomy and choices ranked lower than the top and may indicate constraints that limit teachers' time or ability to regularly implement these strategies.

All the reactive strategies were rated low. Exclusionary strategies including expulsion, suspension, detention and sending students to the principal's office were the lowest. Reactive strategies rated as less used than the proactive strategies included verbal reprimand, call home, and removing privileges. The low ranking of reactive strategies echo teachers' understanding of punitive measures as ineffective and detrimental to students.

Effectiveness of Proactive and Reactive Strategies

In line with their knowledge of the negative effects of reactive discipline, teachers overwhelmingly reported proactive strategies as more effective than reactive strategies. They reported establishing rapport, teaching routines and procedures, and following a predictable schedule as the most effective strategies. This directly mirrored their self-reported use of the strategies. Again, there were no statistically significant differences in perceived effectiveness by years of experience, teaching assignment, or grade level or a relation between teachers' opinions about the utility of punishment and effectiveness of proactive and reactive strategies.

Teachers reported reactive strategies including removing privileges, cost response, and time out as more effective than exclusionary strategies (sending students to the principal, detention, suspension, and expulsion). Teachers seem

to rely on less exclusionary strategies and report them as least effective. Reactive strategies such as removing privileges and cost response (removal of earned points or reward) are usually used in the classroom. The reported use and effectiveness of proactive and reactive strategies by participants shows that teachers are using and believe in evidence-based practices. This reflects an awareness of the positive benefits of a proactive approach when dealing with challenging student behavior.

Summary

Teachers' self-reported use and beliefs about the effectiveness of responsive discipline strategies indicate that PBIS and other positive discipline approaches are present in schools. This is encouraging on several accounts. First, it means teachers increasingly believe it is important to use proactive practices and not those that are reactive and punitive. It also indicates teacher-education programs, school districts, and superintendents and administrators are making this knowledge available and changing the culture around school discipline. Knowledge and belief in the efficacy of research-based practices is the first step in changing from a culture of punishment to responsive stance.

Implications for Educational Leaders, Classroom Practitioners and Policy

While the findings of this study are encouraging because they support the conclusion that teachers have extensive knowledge of best practices for fostering a proactive and positive environment, extant research shows that this knowledge

may not be as evident in practice with many instances of harsh or inappropriate discipline used in classrooms (Office for Civil Rights, 2018). Administrators are critical in helping teachers make frequent use of these proactive strategies in everyday practice because they are essential in establishing the school climate that facilitates their use (Curran, 2017; McIntosh, 2021; Thurmond & Darling-Hammond, 2021; U.S. Department of Education, 2014). Given the above finding and ensuing conclusions, the following recommendations are suggested.

Teachers should be provided with more professional development to address the issues related to the disproportional effects of discipline on students of color and the uneven application of discipline strategies. This need for additional professional development has been identified by both the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (2019) and the California Department of Education (Thurmond & Darling-Hammond, 2021) as a priority for moving away from punitive practices by addressing bias of educators through training and resources.

Institutional barriers that reduce teachers' flexibility in addressing behavioral issues and limit their ability to practice more proactive strategies without feeling the pressure of removing students from the classroom should be identified and remediated. Teachers should feel encouraged and empowered to work with students and be able to offer alternatives to punitive measures (i.e., loss of recess, office discipline referral, time out). There should be an emphasis

on a climate of responsiveness and viewing behavior as an instructional issue rather than a punishment choice.

School administrators can create a culture in which student equity and students' social-emotional well-being and academic success are prioritized through a proactive, positive, and responsive approach instead of defaulting to exclusion and punishment. Principals' perspectives are instrumental in transforming the discipline practices that systematically fail certain groups of students. As part of this change, principals have to communicate to their teachers that they are supported in using proactive strategies, which may look chaotic or be time-consuming in the early stages, but are worth the investment of their time and school resources. If teachers feel supported by their principal in trying new strategies, even if it doesn't feel productive, they will become more successful in addressing challenging student behavior and could reduce the need for reactive responses. Removing those restraints by norms or pressures to react quickly with punitive strategies in order to meet the demands of curricular goals or high-stakes testing would allow new opportunities for teachers to meet students' needs. Teachers should also feel knowledgeable and competent about the use of proactive behavior management strategies. This study has revealed that teachers know what to do, but they need institutional support to implement these strategies regularly and with fidelity, because there are still frequent reports of reactive, punitive-based discipline (Skiba & Losen, 2016; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2019).

Supportive school district policies would also help alleviate the constraints on schools and teachers. The focus on high-stakes accountability testing should be reimagined with an emphasis on supporting and prioritizing students' social and emotional well-being, which would have significant positive impact on student achievement. Suggestions to increase the number of school counselors and social workers, and to re-examine the role of school-based resource officers and similar law enforcement personnel is on the rise (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2019). Furthermore, more emphasis on site administrators' discretion in applying state education codes regarding discipline may be warranted. While the state legislators urge alternatives to suspension and other punitive practices, school administrators may need more tools and resources to do so.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

This study had several limitations. One was that the research sample was restricted to a single geographic area and may not be representative of areas across the United States. However, due to its diverse populations of teachers and students, information collected from this area may be reflective of other rapidly growing urban areas although not generalizable to the U.S., as a whole. California is the nation's most populous and diverse state with the two counties included in this study being located in a fast-growing region (Johnson et al., 2023). Thirty-nine percent of Californians are Latino, 35% are white, 15% are

Asian American or Pacific Islander, 5% are Black, 4% are multiracial, and fewer than 1% are Native American or Alaska Natives (Johnson et al., 2023).

The study garnered a low response rate at 0.06%, which may indicate that there is something different about the sample of teachers who chose to respond to the survey compared to those who did not. A greater response rate would have ameliorated that concern. Despite the low response rate, the sample size was robust enough to conduct the appropriate statistical tests with 209 usable survey responses. According to the Qualtrics' Sample Size Calculator, an ideal sample size at 95% confidence would be 384 participants based on the state's population of approximately 150,000 elementary school teachers according to the California Department of Education (2022). Yet, the surveys' participant demographics such as age, ethnicity, years of experience, credential status, and education level mirrored those of state averages making the sample representative of state demographics.

Another limitation is that information collected relied on the teachers' self-report. The accuracy of the findings relied on participants answering the survey items truthfully. Participants may have answered based on what they view as socially acceptable or desirable. They also may have not had an accurate understanding or unbiased assessment of their own practices. Participants may not have understood the questions or may hve answered the Likert-scale with a tendency to choose extreme ratings or the the middle rating. To help address these concerns, participants were informed the survey was anonymous and that

the researcher would not collect any identifying information. To help teachers understand the behavior management strategies included in the survey they were provided definitions for each strategy.

Future research should include one-on-one and focus group interviews including classroom observations to document discipline practices. Classroom observations would more accurately report the strategies teachers use in the classroom. One-on-one and focus group data would offer opportunity to gather feedback and insight on teachers' thoughts and motivations for their choice of strategies. It would also allow researchers to ask clarifying questions related to their survey responses.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to develop a theory about teachers' conceptions about the utility of punishment, their knowledge about the negative effects of punishment, and its relation to their reported belief of effectiveness and their use of classroom and behavior management strategies. This study also attempted to help clarify why the phenomenon of punishment still exists in schools. It appears teachers' understanding of punishment has been impacted by the literature on Positive Behavior Support and they prefer to use proactive strategies and have a high awareness of the negative effects of harsh and punitive discipline. Despite these changes in perception, the documented use of punishment in schools remains high; therefore, we still do not understand the

discrepancy between beliefs and practice. Overall, the findings of this study are encouraging and show promise in progressing towards more equitable, positive and effective learning environments for all students.

APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL LETTER

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN BERNARDINO

Lucia Smith-Menzies <007437073@coyote.csusb.edu>

IRB-FY2022-12 - Initial: IRB Expedited Review Approval Letter

1 message

do-not-reply@cayuse.com <do-not-reply@cayuse.com> Tue, Aug 23, 2022 at 9:17 AM
To: jjesunat@csusb.edu, lucia.smithmenzies7073@coyote.csusb.edu

August 22, 2022

CSUSB INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Expedited Review
IRB-FY2022-12
Status: Approved

Prof. Joseph Jesunathadas and Lucia Smith-Menzies
COE - TeacherEduc&Foundtn TEF
California State University, San Bernardino
5500 University Parkway
San Bernardino, California 92407

Dear Prof. Joseph Jesunathadas and Lucia Smith-Menzies:

Your application to use human subjects, titled "Classroom Management Practices and Beliefs" has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of CSU, San Bernardino. The CSUSB IRB has weighed the risk and benefits of the study to ensure the protection of human participants. The study is approved as of August 22, 2022. The study will require an annual administrative check-in (annual report) on the current status of the study on August 21, 2023. Please use the renewal form to complete the annual report.

This approval notice does not replace any departmental or additional campus approvals which may be required including access to CSUSB campus facilities and affiliate campuses. Investigators should consider the changing COVID-19 circumstances based on current CDC, California Department of Public Health, and campus guidance and submit appropriate protocol modifications to the IRB as needed. CSUSB campus and affiliate health screenings should be completed for all campus human research related activities. Human research activities conducted at off-campus sites should follow CDC, California Department of Public Health, and local guidance. See CSUSB's COVID-19 Prevention Plan for more information regarding campus requirements.

If your study is closed to enrollment, the data has been de-identified, and you're only analyzing the data - you may close the study by submitting the Closure Application Form through the Cayuse Human Ethics (IRB) system. The Cayuse system automatically reminders you at 90, 60, and 30 days before the study is due for renewal or submission of your annual report (administrative check-in). The modification, renewal, study closure, and unanticipated/adverse event forms are located in the Cayuse system with instructions provided on the IRB Applications, Forms, and Submission Webpage. Failure to notify the IRB of the following requirements may result in disciplinary action. Please note a lapse in your approval may result in your not being able to use the data collected during the lapse in the application's approval period.

You are required to notify the IRB of the following as mandated by the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP) federal regulations 45 CFR 46 and CSUSB IRB policy.

- **Ensure your CITI Human Subjects Training is kept up-to-date and current throughout the study.**

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino.

You are invited to take part in a research project conducted by Lucia Smith-Menzies, a doctoral student at California State University, San Bernardino under the supervision of Dr. Joseph Jesunathadas, Professor of Teacher Education, California State University, San Bernardino. This study is designed to collect information about classroom and behavior management.

You are invited to participate in this study because you work with K-12 students. The goal of this research is to provide professional development about effective strategies for managing student behavior. You may share your opinions about classroom and behavior management by completing this survey.

Reports resulting from this study will not identify you as a participant. All information gathered in this study is anonymous. If you elect to provide your email address to be entered into a drawing, it will not be connected to your survey responses. Your email will be collected via a separate link if you choose to provide it.

Risks are minimal. Some respondents may feel uncomfortable reflecting on classroom management practices or may feel the time spent answering the survey was not worthwhile. Only aggregated findings, and no individual-level data, will be reported to the public.

Your participation is completely voluntary. The survey is anonymous and takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. You may skip any questions you do not wish to answer or choose to exit the survey at any time.

If you have any questions about this research at any time, please contact Lucia Smith-Menzies at 007437073@coyote.csusb.edu or Dr. Joseph Jesunathadas at jjesunat@csusb.edu.

Consent Block By selecting "I agree," you have read the information above and agree to participate in the study.

- ○ I agree. I have read the information above and agree to participate in your study. (1)
- ○ I disagree and wish to exit this survey. (3)

Q1 Your age

_____

Q2 Gender

- ○ Female (1)
- ○ Male (2)
- ○ Non binary (4)

Q3 Ethnicity (choose all that apply)

- [ ] Asian (14)
- [ ] Black (15)
- [ ] Latinx/Hispanic (16)
- [ ] Native American (17)
- [ ] Pacific Islander (18)
- [ ] White (19)
- [ ] Other (20) _____

Q4 Highest Level of Education Completed or Currently Enrolled In

- ○ Bachelor's degree (1)
- ○ Master's degree (2)
- ○ Doctoral degree (3)

Q5 Where do you receive coursework or training on behavior or classroom management. Choose all that apply:

- [ ] Undergraduate course (1)
- [ ] Teacher training program (2)
- [ ] School site or district inservice (3)
- [ ] Professional conference or seminar (4)
- [ ] Have not received specific training (6)
- [ ] Other (5) _____

Q6 Credential or Professional Status

- ○ Clear Teaching Credential (2)
- ○ Preliminary Teaching Credential (1)
- ○ Intern Teaching Credential (3)
- ○ Substitute Teacher (7)
- ○ Out of State Teaching Credential (6)
- ○ Instructional Assistant or Paraeducator (11)
- ○ PIP - Provisional Internship Permit (4)
- ○ STIP - Substitute Teacher Incentive Permit (5)
- ○ Other (13) _____

Q7 Years of Experience

- ○ first year of teaching (1)
- ○ 2 - 3 years (4)
- ○ 4 - 10 years (2)
- ○ 10 or more years (3)

Q8 Current Teaching Assignment Grade Level - choose as many that apply

- [ ] Pre-Kindergarten (2)
- [ ] Transitional Kindergarten (3)
- [ ] Kindergarten (1)
- [ ] 1st grade (4)
- [ ] 2nd grade (5)
- [ ] 3rd grade (6)
- [ ] 4th grade (7)
- [ ] 5th grade (8)
- [ ] 6th grade (9)
- [ ] 7th grade (10)
- [ ] 8th grade (11)
- [ ] 9th grade (12)
- [ ] 10th grade (13)
- [ ] 11th grade (14)
- [ ] 12th grade (15)
- [ ] Transition to age 22 (16)

Q9 Current Teaching Assignment

- ○ General Education: Elementary (1)
- ○ General Education Single Subject Academic: for example Math, Lang Arts, Foreign Language, etc. (6)
- ○ General Education Single Subject Elective: for example Art, Music, PE, Technology, etc. (8)
- ○ Special Education: mild/moderate (2)
- ○ Special Education: moderate/severe (3)
- ○ Special Education: early childhood (4)
- ○ Special Education: deaf and hard of hearing (5)
- ○ Special Education: orientation & mobility (10)
- ○ Special Education: visual impairments (9)
- ○ Special Education: adapted physical education (7)
- ○ Special Education: physical and health impairments (12)
- ○ Other (14) _____

Q10 Which best describes your school site location?

- ○ Urban - large city (1)
- ○ Urban - small city (12)
- ○ Suburban (2)
- ○ Rural (3)

Q11 Which best describes your school type?

- ○ Public (1)
- ○ Private - non religious (2)
- ○ Private - religious (3)
- ○ Charter (12)
- ○ Non Public for students with special needs (13)
- ○ Other (14) _____

Q12 What is the approximate percentage of each student demographic group at your school site?

	0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
Latinx/Hispanic ()	
Asian ()	
Black ()	
White ()	
Pacific Islander ()	
Native American ()	
Multi-racial ()	
Other ()	

Q13 Which best describes the percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch at your school site? (approximately)

- ○ More than 80% free or reduced lunch (1)
- ○ 50% - 80% free or reduced lunch (2)
- ○ 20% - 49% free or reduced lunch (4)
- ○ Less than 20% free or reduced lunch (3)

Q14 Which best describes your school climate?

- ○ warm, positive, and cohesive (1)
- ○ functional but not particularly warm and positive (2)
- ○ dysfunctional (3)
- ○ other (4) _____

Q15 A teacher's job is comprised of different roles. Given the following roles, rank them in order of what best reflects YOUR perception of their importance with #1 being most important.

_____ caretaker (1)
_____ learning facilitator (2)
_____ disciplinarian (3)

Q16 Choose the statement that best matches your opinion on the use of punishment in school discipline:

- ○ Punishment is an effective tool because it teaches children right from wrong and deters them from future misbehavior, so I use it when necessary. (1)
- ○ Punishment is not desirable, but sometimes necessary in addition to using proactive strategies to manage misbehavior. (3)
- ○ Punishment is not effective in the long term, so I try to rely on an instructive and proactive approach to reduce misbehavior. (2)

Q17 Rate your agreement with the following statements:

	Disagree (1)	Somewhat Agree (2)	Agree (3)
Suspension can lead to school dropout (1)	○	○	○
Use of punishment may lead to student absenteeism (2)	○	○	○
Use of punishment may lead to somatic complaints (student says they feel unwell) (3)	○	○	○
Punishment can result in learned helplessness (student feels they can't do anything right and will no longer make an effort) (4)	○	○	○
Students of color, particularly Black students, experience harsher discipline for the same offense compared to white students (5)	○	○	○
Students sometimes misbehave to escape academic tasks they feel unable to complete (6)	○	○	○
Harsh discipline contributes to the school to prison pipeline. (7)	○	○	○
Use of punishment can negatively impact classroom climate (8)	○	○	○

Q18 Rate how often you use the following ***instructional*** strategies.
Scroll down to the glossary below for an explanation of terms if needed.

	1. Never (1)	2. Rarely (2)	3. Occasionally (3)	4. Frequently (4)	5. Always (5)
Instructional Feedback (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Opportunities to Respond (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Instructional Choice (3)	○	○	○	○	○
High Probability Request Sequence (4)	○	○	○	○	○
Differentiated Instruction (5)	○	○	○	○	○
Universal Design for Learning Principles (6)	○	○	○	○	○
Attention to Instructional Pacing (7)	○	○	○	○	○

Q19 Instructional Feedback: A teaching strategy in which students are given specific information about their performance (academic, social, behavioral) to clarify misinformation and confirm understandings. Opportunities to Respond: Offering students multiple opportunities, in short period of time (e.g. 3 per min), to respond to teacher questions and prompts using a variety of response methods (visual, verbal). to review information, acquire skill fluency, and commit information to memory. All children respond at the same time through individual (e.g. hold up a card with the answer) or choral response. Instructional Choice: Giving students opportunities to make choices during the school day (i.e. choice of tasks, how the task is completed, where they can complete the task, with whom students can work with on the task), both across-activities (choose this assignment or that assignment) and within-activities choices (choose where or how to complete). High Probability Request Sequence: Making requests the

student is likely to engage in while providing reinforcement and then following these in close succession with a low-probability request in order to build momentum and increase behavior compliance. Differentiated Instruction: Tailoring one's teaching to the needs of individual learners. Includes thinking about the process and content that best allows students to access the information/material and demonstrate what they've learned. Providing students multiple options for taking in information.

Universal Design for Learning Principles: Instructional guidelines that offer a set of concrete suggestions that can be applied to any discipline or domain to ensure that all learners can access and participate in meaningful, challenging learning opportunities.The goal is to remove learning barriers and make the content accessible to all students. UDL focuses on three areas: representation, action and expression, and engagement.

Attention to Instructional Pacing: When planning and delivering instruction, thinking about the rate of delivery during a lesson that promotes student learning and engagement. Not so slow that you lose students' interest or so rapid that they cannot acquire the concepts.

Q20

Rate how ***effective*** you think each of the following strategies is for managing student

behavior. Scroll below to the glossary for an explanation of terms if needed.

	Not Effective (1)	Marginally Effective (2)	Somewhat Effective (3)	Effective (4)	Very Effective (5)
Active supervision (12)	○	○	○	○	○
Behavior contract (25)	○	○	○	○	○
Behavior specific praise (11)	○	○	○	○	○
Call or message home about misbehavior (24)	○	○	○	○	○
Cost response (removal of earned points/reward) (9)	○	○	○	○	○
Cue or reminder (4)	○	○	○	○	○
Detention (8)	○	○	○	○	○
Establishing rapport (14)	○	○	○	○	○
Expelling students from school (29)	○	○	○	○	○
Explicit teaching of expected/desired behavior (17)	○	○	○	○	○
Following a predictable schedule (27)	○	○	○	○	○
Fostering intrinsic motivation (13)	○	○	○	○	○
Fostering students' sense of autonomy (20)	○	○	○	○	○

Offering choices (15)	○	○	○	○	○
Precorrection (5)	○	○	○	○	○
Proximity (3)	○	○	○	○	○
Public warning of misbehavior (e.g.name on board; red, yellow, green clip chart) (6)	○	○	○	○	○
Redirection of misbehavior (16)	○	○	○	○	○
Reinforcement of desired behavior (7)	○	○	○	○	○
Removal of privileges (31)	○	○	○	○	○
Restorative justice practices (30)	○	○	○	○	○
Reteaching of expected/desired behavior (18)	○	○	○	○	○
Send to principal's office (23)	○	○	○	○	○
Suspension from school (28)	○	○	○	○	○
Teaching routines and procedures (26)	○	○	○	○	○
Time out (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Token economy (2)	○	○	○	○	○

Verbal reprimand (10)	○	○	○	○	○

Q21
Rate how often you ***use*** the strategy. Scroll down to the glossary below for an

explanation of terms if needed.

	Never (2)	Rarely (3)	Occasionally (4)	Frequently (5)	Always (6)
Active supervision (12)	○	○	○	○	○
Behavior contract (25)	○	○	○	○	○
Behavior specific praise (11)	○	○	○	○	○
Call or message home about misbehavior (24)	○	○	○	○	○
Cost response (removal of earned points/reward) (9)	○	○	○	○	○
Cue or reminder (4)	○	○	○	○	○
Detention (8)	○	○	○	○	○
Establishing rapport (14)	○	○	○	○	○
Expelling students from school (29)	○	○	○	○	○
Explicit teaching of expected/desired behavior (17)	○	○	○	○	○
Following a predictable schedule (27)	○	○	○	○	○
Fostering intrinsic motivation (13)	○	○	○	○	○
Fostering students' sense of autonomy (20)	○	○	○	○	○

Offering choices (15)	○	○	○	○	○
Precorrection (5)	○	○	○	○	○
Proximity (3)	○	○	○	○	○
Public warning of misbehavior (e.g.name on board; red, yellow, green clip chart) (6)	○	○	○	○	○
Redirection of misbehavior (16)	○	○	○	○	○
Reinforcement of desired behavior (7)	○	○	○	○	○
Removal of privileges (31)	○	○	○	○	○
Restorative justice practices (30)	○	○	○	○	○
Reteaching of expected/desired behavior (18)	○	○	○	○	○
Send to principal's office (23)	○	○	○	○	○
Suspension from school (28)	○	○	○	○	○
Teaching routines and procedures (26)	○	○	○	○	○
Time out (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Token economy (2)	○	○	○	○	○

Verbal reprimand (10)	○	○	○	○	○

Q22

GLOSSARY OF TERMS *Active supervision*: A structured system of observing students to proactively prompt appropriate behavior and provide redirection. Teachers purposefully move around, observe, and interact with students. *Behavior contract*: A written behavior contract spells out, in detail, the expectations for student and teacher (and sometimes parents) in carrying out an intervention plan. When a student meets their part of the contract, they are reinforced by the teacher or parent. Sometimes the student earns a reward when they have met a specified number of expectations. *Behavior specific praise:* A statement directed toward a student or group of students that describes a desirable behavior in specific, observable, and measurable terms. *Call or message home about misbehavior*: When the teacher notifies a student's parent of their misbehavior. *Cost response*: The loss of reinforcement due to undesirable or disruptive behavior, that is, taking away a preferred item or access to reinforcement. *Cue or reminder*: Visual, verbal, or physical signal to prompt or facilitate an action. *Detention*: Detaining students for a set period of time (i.e. during lunch or after school) usually to complete work or sit quietly in response to a behavior infraction. *Establishing rapport*: Building a positive and caring relationship with students. *Expelling students from school*: A student is prohibited from attending school at their designated school site, or sometimes any school in the district, as a punishment for a behavior infraction. *Explicit teaching of expected/desired behavior*: Review, step-by-step, what the expected behavior looks like. *Following a predictable schedule:* Adhering to a set daily schedule, for example, the same morning routine before recess. *Fostering intrinsic motivation*: Encouraging students' mastery, autonomy, and sense of purpose without reliance on external rewards. *Fostering students' autonomy*: Allowing students to have a sense of control by providing options, choices, flexibility, and/or differentiated tasks as a way to make them feel powerful and safe. *Offering choices*: Providing more than one option for students in terms of activities and tasks. *Precorrection*: Specific reminder about behavioral expectations before an activity or entering a context that the teacher anticipates may be difficult for the student. *Proximity*: Moving close to a student as a way to influence behavior without any verbal intervention. *Public warning of misbehavior*: A verbal or visual warning or caution directed at a student in front of their peers or others. *Redirection of misbehavior*: Using a calm tone, neutral body language, and clear, concise wording to tell students exactly what they are doing incorrectly and what they should be doing

instead. *Reinforcement of desired behavior*: Providing favorable verbal feedback, a desired activity or tangible in response to demonstrating appropriate behavior. *Removal of privileges:* Preferred tasks or play activities that a student enjoys is removed as a punishment for a behavior infraction. *Restorative justice practices:* Processes that school sites and teacher use to proactively build healthy relationships and a sense of community to prevent and address conflict and wrongdoing. Part of the process typically includes allowing individuals who may have committed harm to take full responsibility for their behavior by addressing the individual(s) affected by the behavior. *Reteaching of expected/desired behavior*: Step-by-step practicing and rehearsing of the expected behavior after it has been introduced. This is typically done when students appear to have difficulty in performing the behavior even though they have been taught it in the past. *Send to principal's office*: When a teacher is unable to manage a student's behavior on her own and she sends the student to an administrator to be disciplined. *Suspension from school*: A student is temporarily prohibited from going to regular classes and/or school site as a punishment for a behavior infraction. *Teaching routines and procedures*: Step-by-step teaching and practicing of classroom movements and expectations. (i.e. entering and exiting the classroom, accessing classroom materials, obtaining teacher attention). *Time out*: Removing the student from the reinforcing activity or environment for a period of time, usually the student will be isolated from the classroom. *Token economy*: A system where students earn tokens for engaging in specific behaviors and then can exchange those tokens for desired items. *Verbal reprimand*: A severe and formal rebuke to a student about his/her behavior that communicates disapproval.

Q23
If you would like your name entered into a drawing for a $50 Amazon gift card, go to this link and enter your name and email address: https://csusb.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_d5P9fFRRMICfOaq

REFERENCES

Alexander, M. (2012). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of color-blindness*. The New Press.

Allday, R. A., Hinkson-Lee, K., Hudson, T., Neilsen-Gatti, S., Kleinke, A., & Russel, C. S. (2012). Training general educators to increase behavior-specific praise: Effects on students with EBD. *Behavioral Disorders, 37*(2), 87–98. https://doi.org/10.1177/019874291203700203

Amemiya, J., Fine, A., & Wang, M.-T. (2020). Trust and discipline: Adolescents' institutional and teacher trust predict classroom behavioral engagement following teacher discipline. *Child Development, 91*(2), 661–678. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13233

Annamma, S. A., Anyon, Y., Joseph, N. M., Farrar, J., Greer, E., Downing, B., & Simmons, J. (2019). Black girls and school discipline: The complexities of being overrepresented and understudied. *Urban Education, 54*(2), 211-242. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916646610

Astor, R. A., Benbenisty, R., & Estrada, J. N. (2009). School violence and theoretically atypical schools: The principal's centrality in orchestrating safe schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*, 423-461. doi:10.3102/0002831208329

Attar, B. K., Guerra, N. G., & Tolan, P. H. (1994). Neighborhood disadvantage,

stressful life events, and adjustment in urban elementary-school children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 23*(4), 391–400. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp2304_5

Blake, J. J., Butler, B. R., Lewis, C. W., & Darensbourg, A. (2011). Unmasking the inequitable discipline experiences of urban black girls: Implications for urban educational stakeholders. *The Urban Review, 43*(1), 90–106. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-009-0148-8

Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Examining the effects of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes: Results from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *12*(3), 133–148. doi:10.1177/1098300709334798

Brooks-Gunn, J., & Duncan, G. J. (1997). The effects of poverty on children. *The Future of Children, 7*(2), 55–71. https://doi.org/10.2307/1602387

Brouwers, & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management*. Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(2), 239–253. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(99)00057-8

Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 65*(3), 245–281. https://doi.org/10.2307/1170684

California Education Code. CA Educ Code § 48900, (2019).

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&sectionNum=48900.

California Department of Education. (2022). *Fingertip Facts on Education in California*. https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/ceffingertipfacts.asp

California Teachers Association. (1975). *Code of Ethics*. https://www.cta.org/about-us/code-of-ethics

Carlsmith, K. M., Darley, J. M., & Robinson, P. H. (2002). Why do we punish? Deterrence and just deserts as motives for punishment. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 83*(2), 284–299. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.2.284

Carnine, D. W. (1976). Effects of two teacher-presentation rates on off-task behavior, answering correctly, and participation. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *9*(2), 199–206. doi: 10.1901/jaba.1976.9-199

Carr, E. G., Taylor, J. C., & Robinson, S. (1991). The effects of severe behavior problems in children on the teaching behavior of adults. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 24*(3), 523–535. https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.1991.24-523

Chen, S., Lindo, N. A., Blalock, S., Yousef, D., Smith, L., & Hurt-Avila, K. (2021). Teachers' perceptions of teacher–child relationships, student behavior, and classroom management. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice (Minneapolis, Minn.), 11*(1). https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2020.11.1.11

Clunies-Ross, P., Little, E., & Kienhuis, M. (2008). Self-reported and actual use of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and their relationship with teacher stress and student behaviour. *Educational Psychology, 28*(6), 693–710. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410802206700

Colvin, G., & Sugai, G. (1988). Proactive strategies for managing social behavior problems: An instructional approach. *Education and Treatment of Children, 11*(4), 341-348. http://www.jstor.org/stable/42899082

Colvin, G., Sugai, G., Good, R. H., & Lee, Y.-Y. (1997). Using active supervision and precorrection to improve transition behaviors in an elementary school. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *12*(4), 344–363. doi: 10.1037/h0088967

Cooper J. O., Heron T. E., & Heward W. L. (2019). *Applied behavior analysis*. Prentice Hall.

Curran, F. C. (2017). Influence over school discipline policy: Variation across levels of governance, school contexts, and time. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 25*(119). https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.25.3141

Curran, F. C., & Finch, M. A. (2021). Reforming school discipline: Responses by school district leadership to revised state guidelines for student codes of conduct. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 57*(2), 179–220. doi:10.1177/0013161X20925893

DeBlase, G. L. (2003). Missing stories, missing lives: Urban girls (re)constructing race and gender in the literacy classroom. *Urban Education, 38*(3), 279–329. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085903038003002

De Pry, R., & Sugai, G. (2002). The effect of active supervision and pre correction on minor behavioral incidents in a sixth grade general education classroom. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, *11*, 255–267. doi:10.1023/A:1021162906622

Duarte, C. dP, Moses, C., Brown, M., Kajeepeta, S., Prins, S. J., Scott, J., & Mujahid, M. S. (2023). Punitive school discipline as a mechanism of structural marginalization with implications for health inequity: A systematic review of quantitative studies in the health and social sciences literature. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1519*(1), 129–152. https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14922

Dutton Tillery, A., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., & Collins, A. S. (2010). General education teachers' perceptions of behavior management and intervention strategies. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *12*(2), 86–102. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300708330879

Eccles, J. S., Wigfield, A., Midgley, C., Reuman, D., Maclver, D., & Feldlaufer, H. (1993). Negative effects of traditional middle schools on students' motivation. *Elementary School Journal, 93*, 553-574. doi:l 0.1086/461740

Ed-Data. (2019). *California Public Schools*. https://www.ed-data.org/state/CA

Emmer, E. T., & Stough, L. M. (2001). Classroom management: A critical part of educational psychology, with implications for teacher education. *Educational Psychologist, 36*(2), 103–112. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3602_5

Fabelo, T., Thompson, M. D., Plotkin, M., Carmichael, D., Marchbanks, M. P., & Booth, E. A. (2011). *Breaking Schools' Rules: A Statewide Study of How School Discipline Relates to Students' Success and Juvenile Justice Involvement.* The Council of State Governments Justice Center & Public Policy Research Institute. https://csgjusticecenter.org/publications/breaking-schools-rules/

Fenning, P., & Rose, J. (2007). Overrepresentation of African American students in exclusionary discipline the role of school policy. *Urban Education, 42*, 536-559. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085907305039

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage Books.

Gewertz, C. (2018, July). These disciplinary practices can lead students to drop out of school. *Education Week*. https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/these-disciplinary-practices-can-lead-students-to-drop-out-of-school/2018/07

Ginsburg, A., Jordan, P., & Chang, H. (2014). *Absences add up: How school attendance influences student success*. Attendance Works. https://www.attendanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Absenses-Add-Up_September-3rd-2014.pdf

Goldstein, D. (2020, June). Do police officers make schools safer or more dangerous? *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/12/us/schools-police-resource-officers.html

González, T. (2015). Socializing schools: Addressing racial disparities in discipline through restorative justice. In D. J. Losen (Ed.), *Closing the discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion* (pp. 151–165). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gregory, A., & Cornell, D. (2009). "Tolerating" adolescent needs: Moving beyond zero tolerance policies in high school. *Theory Into Practice, 48*, 106-113. doi: 10.1080/00405840902776327

Gregory, A., Cornell, D., Fan, X., Sheras, P., Shih, T., & Huang, F. (2010). Authoritative school discipline: High school practices associated with lower student bullying and victimization. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*, 483-496. doi: 10.1037/ aOO18562

Gregory, A., Skiba, R., & Noguera, P. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher, 39*, 59-68. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09357621

Griffith, J. (1999). The school leadership/school climate relation: Identification of school configurations associated with change in principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *35*(2), 267-291. https://doi.org/10.1177/00131619921968545

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

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hawkins, S. M., & Heflin, L. J. (2011). Increasing secondary teachers' behavior specific praise using a video self-modeling and visual performance feedback intervention. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 13*(2), 97–108. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300709358110

Haydon, T., Macsuga-Gage, A. S., Simonsen, B., & Hawkins, R. (2012). Opportunities to respond: A key component of effective instruction. *Beyond Behavior*, *22*(1), 23–31. doi: 10.1177/107429561202200105

Haydon, T., & Musti-Rao, S. (2011). Effective use of behavior-specific praise: A middle school case study. *Beyond Behavior, 20*, 31-39. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24011804

Heitzeg, N. A. (2009). Education or incarceration: Zero tolerance policies and the school to prison pipeline. *Forum on Public Policy, 2009*(2). https://csu-sb.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/01CALS_USB/1nhgh2e/cdi_eric_primary_EJ870076

Hemez, P., Brent, J. J., & Mowen, T. J. (2020). Exploring the school-to-prison

pipeline: How school suspensions influence incarceration during young adulthood. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 18*(3), 235–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204019880945

Horner, R. H., & Sugai, G. (2000). School-wide behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *2*(4), 231–232. doi: 10.1177/109830070000200407

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Smolkowski, K., Eber, L., Nakasato, J., Todd, A. W., & Esperanza, J. (2009). A randomized, wait-list controlled effectiveness trial assessing school-wide positive behavior support in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 11*(3), 133–144. doi:10.1177/1098300709332067

Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., Stuckey, D., & Collins, G. (2018). *Seven trends: The transformation of the teaching force*. CPRE Research Reports. doi:10.1037/e579212012-001

IRIS Center. (2021). What is differentiated instruction? https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/di/cresource/q1/p01/

Jacobsen, W. C., Pace, G. T., & Ramirez, N. G. (2019). Punishment and inequality at an early age: Exclusionary discipline in elementary school. *Social Forces, 97*(3), 973–998. doi:10.1093/sf/soy072

Johnson, H., McGhee, E., & Cuellar Mejia, M. (2023). *California's population*. Public Policy Institute of California. https://www.ppic.org/publication/californias-population/

Jones, C. (2019). L.A. Unified's ban on willful defiance suspensions, six years later. *EdSource*. https://edsource.org/2019/how-l-a-unifieds-ban-on-willful-defiance-suspensions-turned-out-six-years-later/620949

Kafka, J. (2008). "Sitting on a tinderbox": Racial conflict, teacher discretion, and the centralization of disciplinary authority. *American Journal of Education, 114*(3), 247–270. https://doi.org/10.1086/529501

King, S., & Bracy, N. L. (2019). School security in the post-columbine era: trends, consequences, and future directions. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 35*(3), 274–295. https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986219840188

Korpershoek, H., Harms, T., de Boer, H., van Kuijk, M., & Doolaard, S. (2016). A meta-analysis of the effects of classroom management strategies and classroom management programs on students' academic, behavioral, emotional, and motivational outcomes. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(3), 643–680. doi:10.3102/0034654315626799

Kounin, J. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kunesh, C. E., & Noltemeyer, A. (2019). Understanding disciplinary disproportionality: Stereotypes shape pre-service teachers' beliefs about black boys' behavior. *Urban Education, 54(*4), 471–498. doi:10.1177/0042085915623337

Kuperminc, G. P., Leadbeater, B. J., Emmons, C., & Blatt, S. J. (1997).

Perceived school climate and difficulties in the social adjustment of middle school students. *Applied Developmental Science, 1*(2), 76–88. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532480xads0102_2

Ladd, G. W., & Burgess, K. B. (1999). Charting the relationship trajectories of aggressive, withdrawn, and aggressive/withdrawn children during early grade school. *Child Development, 70*(4), 910–929. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00066

Landrum, T. J., & Kauffman, J. M. (2006). Behavioural approaches to classroom management. In C.M. Everton & C.S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Erlbaum.

Lane, K. L., Menzies, H. M., Ennis, R. P., & Oakes, W. P. (2015). *Supporting behavior for school success: A step-by-step guide to key strategies*. The Guilford Press.

Lane, K. L., Menzies, H. M., Ennis, R. P., Oakes, W. P., Royer, D.J., & Lane, K. S. (2018). Instructional choice: An effective, efficient, low-intensity strategy to support student success. *Beyond Behavior*, *27*(3), 160-167. doi: 10.1177/1074295618786965

Lewis, T. J., Colvin, G., & Sugai, G. (2000). The effects of precorrection and active supervision on the recess behavior of elementary students. *Education and Treatment of Children, 23*, 109–21. https://www.jstor.org/stable/42940520

Lewis, R., Romi, S., Qui, X., & Katz, Y. J. (2005). Teachers' classroom discipline and student misbehavior in Australia, China and Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 729–741. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.05.008.

Lewis, T. J., & Sugai, G. (1999). Effective behavior support: A systems approach to proactive school-wide management. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 31*(6), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.17161/fec.v31i6.6767

Licht, B. G., & Kistner, J. A. (1986). Motivational problems of learning disabled children: Individual differences and their implications for treatment. In Torgesen, J. K., Wong, B.Y. L. (Eds.), *Psychological and educational perspectives on learning disabilities* (pp. 225–255). Academic Press.

Losen, D., Hodson, C., Keith II, M. A., Morrison, K., & Belway, S. (2015). Are we closing the school discipline gap? *The Center for Civil Rights Remedies*. https://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/resources/projects/center-for-civil-rights-remedies/school-to-prison-folder/federal-reports/are-we-closing-the-school-discipline-gap

Losen, D. & Martin, K. (2018). *The unequal impact of suspension on the opportunity to learn in California: What the 16-17 rates tell us about progress*. The Center for Civil Rights Remedies. https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/school-discipline/the-unequal-impact-of-suspension-on-the-opportunity-to-learn-in-ca

Losen, D., & Martinez, P. (2020). *Lost opportunities: How disparate school discipline continues to drive differences in the opportunity to learn*. University of California, Los Angeles. https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/school-discipline/lost-opportunities-how-disparate-school-discipline-continues-to-drive-differences-in-the-opportunity-to-learn/Lost-Opportunities-REPORT-v17.pdf

McGrath, K. F., & Van Bergen, P. (2015). Who, when, why and to what end? Students at risk of negative student–teacher relationships and their outcomes. *Educational Research Review, 14*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.12.001

McIntosh, K., Girvan, E. J., McDaniel, S. C., Santiago-Rosario, M. R., St. Joseph, S., Fairbanks Falcon, S., Izzard, S., & Bastable, E. (2021). Effects of an equity-focused PBIS approach to school improvement on exclusionary discipline and school climate. *Preventing School Failure, 65*(4), 354–361. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2021.1937027

McIntosh, K., Ty, S. V., & Miller, L. D. (2014). Effects of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports on internalizing problems: Current evidence and future directions. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 16*(4), 209–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300713491980

Milner, H. R. (2015). Research on classroom management in urban schools. In

Emmer, E. T., Sabornie, E. J. (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management* (2nd ed., pp. 167-185). New York, NY: Routledge.

Mitchell, M. M. & Bradshaw, C. P. (2013). Examining classroom influences on student perceptions of school climate: The role of classroom management and exclusionary discipline strategies. *Journal of School Psychology, 51*(5), 599–610. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2013.05.005

Morris, E. W., & Perry, B. L. (2016). The punishment gap: school suspension and racial disparities in achievement. *Social Problems, 63*(1), 68–86. https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spv026

Mowen, T., & Brent, J. (2016). School discipline as a turning point: The cumulative effect of suspension on arrest. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 53*(5), 628–653. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427816643135

Myers, D. M., Simonsen, B., & Sugai, G. (2011). Increasing teachers' use of praise with a response-to-intervention approach. *Education & Treatment of Children*, *34*(1), 35-59. doi: 10.1353/etc.2011.0004

National Center for Education Statistics. (2021). *Characteristics of Public School Teachers*. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/clr/public-school-teachers

Nelson, H. (2013). *Testing more, teaching less: What America's obsession with*

student testing costs in money and lost instructional time. American Federation of Teachers. http://www.aft.org/pdfs/teachers/testingmore2013.pdf

Nelson, J. R., & Roberts, M. (2000). Ongoing reciprocal teacher–student interactions involving disruptive behavior in general education classrooms. *Journal of Emotional and Behavior Disorders, 8*, 27–37. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/106342660000800104.

Novak, A. (2018). The association between experiences of exclusionary discipline and justice system contact: A systematic review. *Aggression & Violent Behavior, 40*, 73–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.04.002

Office for Civil Rights. (2018). *2017-18 State and National Estimations*. U.S. Department of Education. https://ocrdata.ed.gov/estimations/2017-2018

Oliver, R. M., Wehby, J. H., & Reschly, D. J. (2011). Teacher classroom management practices: effects on disruptive or aggressive student behavior. *Campbell Systematic Review, 7*(1), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2011.4

Owens, J. S., Holdaway, A. S., Smith, J., Evans, S. W., Himawan, L. K., Coles, E. K.,Girio-Herrera, E., Mixon, C. S., Egan, T. E., & Dawson, A. E. (2018). Rates of common classroom behavior management strategies and their associations with challenging student behavior in elementary school. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 26*(3), 156–169. https://doi.org/10.1177/1063426617712501

PBISApps. (2020). *SWIS summary*. University of Oregon Educational & Community Supports. https://files.pbisapps.org/pub/pdf/SWIS-Data-Summary-2019-20.pdf

Pesta, R. (2018). Labeling and the differential impact of school discipline on negative life outcomes: Assessing ethno-racial variation in the school-to-prison pipeline. *Crime and Delinquency, 64*(11), 1489–1512. doi:10.1177/0011128717749223

Pierce, W. D., & Cheney, C. D. (2017). *Behavior analysis and learning: A biobehavioral approach (6th ed.)*. Routledge.

Predy, L., McIntosh, K., & Frank, J. L. (2014). Utility of number and type of office discipline referrals in predicting chronic problem behavior in middle schools. *School Psychology Review, 43*(4), 472–489. https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR-13-0043.1

Rector-Aranda, A. (2016). School norms and reforms, critical race theory, and the fairytale of equitable education. *Critical Questions in Education, 7*(1). https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A546433067/AONE?u=anon~6e39ac17&sid=googleScholar&xid=7ca931f3

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Storm, M., Sawyer, B., Pianta, R. C., & La Paro, K. M. (2006). The Teacher Belief Q- Sort: A measure of teachers' priorities and beliefs in relation to disciplinary practices, teaching practices, and beliefs about children. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*(2), 141-165.

Rispoli, M., Lang, R., Neely, L., Camargo, S., Hutchins, N., Davenport, K., &

Goodwyn, F. (2013). A comparison of within-and across-activity choices for reducing challenging behavior in children with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 22*(1), 66–83. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10864-012-9164-y

Rousmaniere, K. (1994). Losing patience and staying professional: Women teachers and the problem of classroom discipline in New York City schools in the 1920s. *History of Education Quarterly, 34*, 49–68. https://doi.org/10.2307/369228

Ryan, F. J. (1994). From rod to reason: Historical perspectives on corporal punishment in the public school, 1642-1994. *Educational Horizons, 72*(2), 70–77. https://www.jstor.org/stable/42925046

Rydell, A., & Henricsson, L. (2004). Elementary school teachers' strategies to handle externalizing classroom behavior: A study of relations between perceived control, teacher orientation and strategy preferences. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 45*(2), 93–102. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2004.00384.x

Shochet, I. M., Dadds, M. R., Ham, D., & Montague, R. (2006). School connectedness is an underemphasized parameter in adolescent mental health: results of a community prediction study. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 35*(2), 170–179. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp3502_1

Shogren, K. A., Faggella-Luby, M. N., Bae, S. J., & Wehmeyer, M. L. (2004). The

effect of choice-making as an intervention for problem behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *6*(4), 228-237. doi: 10.1177/10983007040060040401

Shook, A. C. (2012). A study of preservice educators' dispositions to change behavior management strategies. *Preventing School Failure, 56*, 129–136. doi:10.1080/1045988X.2011.606440

Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., Myers, D., & Sugai, G. (2008 Evidence based practices in classroom management: Considerations for research to practice. *Education and Treatment of Children, 31*(3), 351–380. https://doi.org/10.1353/etc.0.0007.

Skiba, R. J., Chung, C.-G., Trachok, M., Baker, T. L., A., & Hughes, R. L. (2014). Parsing disciplinary disproportionality: Contributions of infraction, student, and school characteristics to out-of-school suspension and expulsion. *American Educational Research Journal, 51*, 640–670. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831214541670

Skiba, R. J., & Losen, D. J. (2016). From reaction to prevention: Turning the page on school discipline. *American Educator, 39*(4). https://eric.ed.gov/?id=eJ1086522

Steindl, C., Jonas, E., Sittenthaler, S., Traut-Mattausch, E., & Greenberg, J. (2015). Understanding psychological reactance: New developments and findings. *Zeitschrift fur Psychologie*, *223*(4), 205–214. doi:10.1027/2151-2604/a000222

Stevenson, N. A., VanLone, J., & Barber, B. R. (2020). A Commentary on the misalignment of teacher education and the need for classroom behavior management skills. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 1–12. doi:10.1007/s43494-020-00031-1

Stough, L. M., Montague, M. L., Landmark, L. J., & Williams-Diehm, K. (2015). Persistent classroom management training needs of experienced teachers. *The Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 15*(5), 36–48. doi:10.14434/josotl.v15i5.13784

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2002). The evolution of discipline practices: School-wide positive behavior supports. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy, 24*(1-2), 23–50. https://doi.org/10.1300/J019v24n01_03

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2020). Sustaining and scaling positive behavioral interventions and supports: Implementation drivers, outcomes, and considerations. *Exceptional Children, 86*(2), 120–136. https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.csusb.edu/10.1177/0014402919855331

Sutherland, K. S., Alder, N., & Gunter, P. L. (2003). The effect of varying rates of opportunities to respond to academic requests on the classroom behavior of students with EBD. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *11*(4), 239–248. doi: 10.1177/10634266030110040501

Sutherland, K. S., Singh, N. N., Conroy, M., & Stichter, J. P. (2004). Learned

helplessness and students with emotional or behavioral disorders: Deprivation in the classroom. *Behavioral Disorders, 29*(2), 169–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/019874290402900208

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D' Alessandro, A. (2013). A Review of School Climate Research. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(3), 357–385. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24434163

Thurmond, T., & Darling-Hammond, L. (August 19, 2021). *California Department of Education state guidance for new laws on discipline*. Retrieved from https://www.cde.ca.gov/nr/el/le/yr21ltr0819.asp

Tomlinson, C. A. (2016). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the of all learners*. Pearson.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (2019, July). *Beyond suspensions: Examining school discipline policies and connections to the school-to-prison pipeline for students of color with disabilities*. https://permanent.fdlp.gov/gpo171269/www.usccr.gov/files/pubs/2019/07-23-Beyond-Suspensions.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2014, January). *Guiding principles: A resource guide for improving school climate and discipline*. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED544743.pdf

Wald, J., & Losen, D. J. (2003). Defining and redirecting a school-to-prison pipeline. *New Directions for Youth Development, 2003*(99), 9–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.51

Ward, G., Petersen, N., Kupchik, A., & Pratt, J. (2021). Historic lynching and corporal punishment in contemporary southern schools. *Social Problems, 68*(1), 41–62. https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spz044

Wehby, J. H., Symons, F. J., Canale, J. A., & Go, F. J. (1998). Teaching practices in classrooms for students with emotional and behavioral disorders: discrepancies between recommendations and observations. *Behavioral Disorders, 24*(1), 51–56. https://doi.org/10.1177/019874299802400109

Welsh, R. O., & Little, S. (2018). Caste and control in schools: A systematic review of the pathways, rates and correlates of exclusion due to school discipline. *Children and Youth Services Review, 94*, 315–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.09.031

Whitaker, A., Cobb, J., Leung, V., & Nelson, L. (2021). *No Police In Schools: A vision for safe and supportive schools in CA*. American Civil Liberties Union Foundations. https://www.aclusocal.org/sites/default/files/field_documents/no_police_in_schools_-_report_-_aclu_-_082421.pdf

Wildeman, C. (2010). Paternal incarceration and children's physically aggressive behaviors: Evidence from the fragile families and child wellbeing study. *Social Forces, 89*(1), 285–309. https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2010.0055

Wolf, K. C. & Kupchik, A. (2017). School suspensions and adverse experiences

in adulthood. *Justice Quarterly, 34*(3), 407–430. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2016.1168475.

Wun, C. (2016). Unaccounted foundations: Black girls, anti-black racism, and punishment in schools. *Critical Sociology, 42*(4–5), 737–750. doi:10.1177/0896920514560444

Zoromski, A., Evans, S. W., Owens, J. S., Holdaway, A., & Royo Romero, A. S. (2021). Middle school teachers' perceptions and use of classroom management strategies and associations with student behavior. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 29*(4), 199–212. https://doi.org/10.1177/1063426620957624