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SUMMARY

This study describes the classroom practices of middle school general education teachers working with students with and without emotional disturbance (ED), including the predictability of those teacher behaviors for both groups of students. The data in this study also describe the ways in which the beliefs and experiences of this group of teachers aligns with their observed behaviors when working with students with and without ED.

Seven seventh and eighth grade literacy, math, and social science teachers, and fourteen seventh and eighth grade students with and without ED participated. Teacher and student interaction were coded across 600 minutes of systematic, direct observation. Descriptive statistics were calculated for each teacher, specific to the target students. Lag sequential analysis was run to identify conditional probabilities for specific teacher and student behaviors. Teachers completed a survey about their beliefs when working with students with ED. Data from surveys and observations describe the ways teachers' beliefs and experiences align to their classroom behaviors.

The results of this study show that teachers provide similar rates of opportunities to respond, use similar types of instructional groupings, and provide low levels of feedback for students with and without ED. While teacher behavior is different for both groups of students—including rates of praise, use of corrective actions, and predictability of feedback—the patterns that emerge were largely consistent with existing research. In general, teachers used low levels of praise, were more likely to have negative interactions with students with ED, and provided unpredictable feedback for students (Van Acker, Grant, & Henry, 1996; Wehby, Symons, & Shores, 1995). The data collected and analyzed in this study suggest that, for all students, research-based best practices are not being effectively implemented.
I. INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

In 1997, the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was amended to require that students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum. This was expanded upon in the 2004 reauthorization, which called for students to receive access to these curricula in the general education classroom, to the “maximum extent appropriate,” (The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act 2004, (IDEIA), 20 U.S.C. §1401(3)(A)(i)). These updated federal laws have resulted in general education teachers increasingly being called upon to provide academically rigorous instruction to a more diverse student population, including students with ED. This can present a daunting task for general educators who frequently report feeling underprepared to support students with disabilities in the general education classroom (Scruggs, Mastropieri, & Leins, 2011).

Additionally, students with disabilities must also be included in high stakes testing, and their scores must be included in schools’ Adequate Yearly Progress monitoring (AYP, U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Through this federal mandate, schools are being held more accountable than ever before for ensuring that all students, including those with disabilities, are instructed using grade-level standards. Schools are expected to assess 95% of students annually, including students with disabilities, and to have 100% of students showing proficiency levels on state testing by the 2013-2014 school year. Each year leading up to this deadline, schools are expected to make AYP. Even with specialized instruction, students with disabilities often struggle to perform with proficiency on grade-level content, which is often reflected in lower standardized test scores (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Students with disabilities may show huge relative gains. However, with their lower base scores, including their test scores
school-wide calculations can lower the overall school standardized test scores. Schools that fail to meet AYP can be sanctioned, which creates very high stakes for schools and for teachers who are responsible for improving all students’ achievement levels.

Since the passage of these laws, the number of students with disabilities who spend 80% or more of their day in the general education classroom has increased to 52.1% (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Some of the benefits to increased inclusion include a positive sense of self and community (Curic, 2009), increased social interaction across a broader range of activities and settings and larger, more durable friendship networks (Kennedy, Shukla, & Fryxell, 1997), increased exposure to content (Rea, McLaughlin, & Walther-Thomas, 2001). There have also been significant challenges. One of those challenges has been that more teachers without a special education background are providing instruction to more a diverse population of students, including students with disabilities, while working toward rigorous and high-stakes outcomes.

**Students with Emotional Disturbance**

The number of students labeled as ED is estimated to be as high as 1-2% of the entire school-aged population (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). This represents some 420,000 students receiving services and potentially more in need of them (Lane, Wehby, & Barton-Atwood, 2005; Sawka, McCurdy, & Mannella, 2002; Steinberg & Knitzer, 1992; Woolfolk, 2007). Students with ED comprise nearly 6.5% of students with disabilities in schools, making them the fourth largest group of students receiving specialized services (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Under federal mandates, students are identified with ED if they demonstrate one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree in ways that adversely affect their educational performance: (a) an inability to learn; (b) an inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers; (c)
inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances; (d) a general pervasive mood of anxiety or unhappiness or depression; or (e) a tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems (IDEIA, 2004; 20 U.S.C. § 1401 (3)(A)(i)).

The characteristics associated with ED reveal significant social, emotional, and academic challenges for the student, as well as for his or her teacher and classmates. For example, compared to typically developing peers, students with ED can experience moderate to severe academic deficits, with some evidence that these deficits do not improve over time (Greenbaum, Dedrick, Friedman, Kutash, Brown, Lardierh, & Pugh, 1996; Nelson, Benner, Lane, & Smith, 2004). Benner, Allor, and Mooney (2008) found that 57% of students with an ED label showed deficits in academic processing speed and scored significantly lower on IQ measures in language, academic achievement, and social adjustment. Students with ED also had academic fluency scores nearly one standard deviation below that of the norm group. According to Zionts, Zionts, and Simpson (2002) most students with ED will score lower on IQ tests than their nondisabled peers.

In addition to academic challenges, students with ED may struggle with interpersonal skills and relationships as well (Gresham & MacMillan, 1997; Lane, Carter, Pierson, & Glaeser, 2006). In the classroom, students with ED may exhibit externalizing or internalizing behaviors, both of which can be detrimental to students’ socialization. The focus of this study is on students with externalizing behaviors, which can be difficult to manage and can include volatile emotions, aggression, noncompliance, vandalism, defiance, or disruptive acts (Gresham, Ramsey, & Walker, 2003; Walker, Sprague, Close, & Starlin, 2000; Wehby, Symons, & Canale, 1998; Woolfolk, 2007) and “bizarre, inappropriate, unacceptable, and/or mal-adaptive,” behaviors
(Meadows & Stevens, 2007, p. 385). These behaviors may impede students with ED from executing appropriate social interactions, may prevent the formation of positive relationships, and can be difficult for the teacher and peers to tolerate. These various challenges increase the likelihood that students with ED will experience failure in school, work, and personal relationships (Meadows & Stevens, 2007).

Despite a clear link between academic and behavior challenges, the nature of this relationship is not fully understood. There is a body of evidence that indicates that challenging behaviors limit the amount of time students spend on task, thereby leading to academic challenges (Sutherland 2000); however, another body of literature suggests the opposite is also true, that frustration stemming from academic challenges leads students to act out disruptively, thereby avoiding academic tasks (Sutherland, Lewis-Palmer, Stichter, & Morgan, 2008). These seemingly conflicting conclusions suggest a complex, bi-directional relationship wherein learning and behavior problems rarely exist in isolation but rather can lead to and then perpetuate one another (Sutherland et al., 2008). Teachers who work with this population must therefore have a high level of specialization to support both areas of challenge or the cycle of behavioral and academic challenges may not be broken.

**Students with ED and Negative Outcomes**

Based on their academic, social, and behavioral challenges, students who are diagnosed with ED are at risk for more negative outcomes than their peers both with and without disabilities. Students with ED are less likely to have positive peer or teacher relationships (Cook, 2001; Mihalas, Morse, Allsopp, & McHatton, 2009). They are more likely to read below grade level, have lower grade point averages, fail more school courses, be retained more
frequently, miss more school, and have higher dropout rates, with nearly 55% leaving before graduation compared to 25% for students with other disabilities (Boreson, 2006; Shriner & Wehby, 2004; Carter & Lundsford, 2005; Gable, 2004; Goodman, Hazelkorn, Bucholz, Duffy, & Kittam, 2011). These negative outcomes also include higher arrest rates and increased involvement with the court system (Billingsley, 2004; Bullock & Gable, 2006).

As the number of students with ED being educated in the general education setting increases, it is unclear whether they are being instructed by the most efficacious educators. Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), general education teachers must have full certification or licensure for and be able to demonstrate subject matter competency in the subject matter they teach (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6319, 2008). However, general education teachers often report feeling underprepared, undersupported, anxious and lacking in confidence to effectively support this population of students, especially around behavior (Buell, Hallam, Gamel-McCormick, & Scheer, 1999; Cook, 2001; Lohrman & Bambara, 2006). In a meta-analysis of 28 studies assessing teachers’ beliefs about inclusion, Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) found that while the majority of teachers support the concept of inclusion, a majority believed they did not have enough time or sufficient expertise or training to effectively support students with disabilities. Nearly 14 years later, Scruggs, Mastropieri, and Leins (2011) conducted another meta-analysis of research from 1996-2010. In their second meta-analysis the authors found similar feedback from teachers. A majority of teachers reported that they did not have adequate time, training, or support for implementing inclusive practices.

Teachers who work specifically with students with ED report lower levels of confidence in working with parents, planning effective lessons, using appropriate instructional techniques
and managing instructional time, collaborating with related service providers and non-special educators, teaching reading, interpreting standardized test results, or using technology when compared to other special educators (Buell et al., 1999). Educators also report feeling less confident in assessing and managing behavior, developing behavior management plans, and accommodating culturally and linguistically diverse students’ needs (Billingsley, Fall, & Williams, 2006). Teachers who work with students with challenging and disruptive behaviors also report feelings of stress, a lack of success, and lower rates of job satisfaction (Nelson, Maculan, Roberts, & Ohlund, 2001; Sawka et al., 2002; Steinberg & Knitzer, 1992; Stempien & Loeb, 2002; Woolfolk, Rosoff, & Hoy, 1990).

Not surprisingly, the challenges associated with supporting students with disruptive behaviors can negatively impact the ways in which students with ED are treated by their teachers (Cook, 2001; Nelson et al., 2001). Teachers often struggle with or react negatively to disruptive behaviors, which can reinforce aversive behaviors or push students out of the classroom (Brophy & McCaslin, 1992; Coleman & Gilliam, 1983; Emmer & Stough, 2001). Even teachers who report feeling successful in supporting students with ED also report feeling least confident to support students who exhibit externalizing and thought-disordered behaviors (Nelson et al., 2001). In a study asking teachers to classify students into one of four student types—attachment, concern, indifference, and rejection—students with ED were more likely to be seen as falling into the “rejection” category (Cook, Tankersley, Cook, & Landrum, 2000). Students identified as “rejection” are often viewed by teachers as low achievers who require a significant amount of teacher time and effort, and those teacher-student interactions are rarely related to instruction. Students in the “rejection” category receive fewer reading turns, are given less feedback, and are
more likely to be criticized (Good & Brophy, 1972). This suggests that a disproportionate number of included students with ED may not be receiving appropriate educational opportunities, given that teacher behavior is significantly different toward students belonging to different groups. The result is that students classified as ED are more likely to have teachers who feel inadequately equipped and underprepared to effectively educate them and may in fact react aversely to supporting them. Those teachers supporting students with ED must be prepared to address multiple learning and behavioral needs.

**Interactions and the Ecobehavioral Framework**

Teaching is, by its very nature, an interactive process characterized by a series of exchanges: teacher to student, student to teacher, student to student, and student to instructional materials (Gunter & Jack, 1994; Shores, Gunter, & Jack, 1993). Both teacher and student are active participants who shape the outcomes of their interactions, contribute to the nature of the relationship that is established, and have the potential to modify each other’s behaviors. Teacher-student interactions can affect both parties’ behaviors as well as the quality of the relationship that develops between the two. Research suggests that many of the negative student and teacher outcomes associated with ED described above are related, at their core, to classroom interactions (Gunter & Jack, 1994). This study explores a specific set of teacher and student interactions across instruction, behavior management, and peer socialization. To understand these interactions, this study relies on an ecobehavioral approach, which posits that student behavior, teacher behavior, and classroom ecology are inter-related, interacting with and influencing one another (Simeonsson & Boyles, 2001). The focus of this study is on a specific set of variables focused on teacher behavior, collecting and analyzing data on how teachers
interact with students with and without ED, and whether or not there are differences in these patterns of interactions.

Ideally, all classroom interactions are positive; that is, both teacher and students behave in a manner that ultimately gets them a socially desirable outcome that they want. For example, a teacher provides a directive with the desirable outcome being student compliance; the student complies with a desired outcome of teacher praise. If the teacher then provides praise, both persons get their desired outcomes, thus reinforcing each other’s behaviors. This pattern of interaction, if accurate, suggests that student compliance reinforces the teacher behavior of giving praise which reinforces student compliance and as a result that specific, desirable behaviors are reinforced for and by each party.

Unfortunately, research in the field of ED shows that not all teacher-student interactions are positive and not all are mutually reinforcing of positive behaviors. In fact, some interactions provide reinforcement for undesirable behaviors for student and teacher alike. Students with chronically challenging behaviors like those exhibited by many students with ED often engage in higher rates of behaviors that are perceived by their teachers as aversive (Gunter, Denny, Shores, Thomas, Jack, & Nelson, 1994). Teachers, in turn, attempt to avoid or escape the undesirable student behavior, which ultimately allows students to escape or avoid the undesirable task. For example, if a teacher presents a student with a challenging academic task, the student may throw the paper on the ground and begin to shout. To end the disruption the teacher withdraws the task and replaces it with an easier task. Both parties get what they want (student avoids the work, teacher avoids the aversive behavior) and those behaviors are reinforced and are therefore more likely to be repeated in the future.
Research suggests that these negative interactions are far more common than positive interactions. Gunter and Jack (1994), for example, found that 22% of classroom time was spent in disruptive, aggressive, or otherwise negative behavior between teachers and students while specifically positive interactions that involved praise or positive consequences occupied only 3% of class time. Consistently negative interactions can have short- and long-term negative consequences for students, often in the form of poor relationships. Demaray and Malecki (2002) found that lack of adequate sustained relationships with caring and concerned adults has been linked to problematic behaviors in students, while poor social supports in the home and school have been linked to maladjustment indicators. Students themselves have identified that relationship, care, and respect from their teachers are crucial to their own learning (Demaray & Malecki, 2002). The extent to which they perceive teacher support is linked to rates of both internalizing and externalizing behaviors. The authors found that when students reported poor teacher support they had worse outcomes on school maladjustment scales. Students who perceived a strong level of social support from their teachers, on the other hand, had more positive ratings on school-related indicators.

There is a long history of research that demonstrates that children’s interpersonal relationships, built on the quality and type of interactions they experience, play a vital role in a variety of outcomes, including student development and school success (Demaray & Malecki, 2002; Good & Brophy, 1972). Rydell and Henricsson (2004) were able to establish a connection between teacher-student relationships and social and academic success. Sharkey, You, and Schnoebelen (2008) found that a strong sense of school assets, such as relationships with teachers and opportunities to participate, is positively correlated to a high sense of internal
resilience. School-based assets were shown to promote student engagement, which has been positively linked to a series of desirable outcomes, including academic engagement, school completion, and test scores, even in light of higher levels of risk and adversity.

Positive relationships are particularly important for middle school students. As students move into middle school, they are entering a period of developmental growth that is characterized by multiple changes—biological, social, and cognitive—happening at different levels and paces, more so than most other developmental periods (Carlo, Fabes, Liabel, & Kupanoff, 1999; Eccles, Midgely, Wigfield, Buchanan, Reuman, Flanagan, & Iver, 1993). Research suggests that middle school students often experience changes in teaching structures such as fewer opportunities to participate in class, switching classes and having to develop relationships with multiple teachers, a greater emphasis on teacher control and discipline, more whole-class activities, teachers with lower confidence and self-efficacy and an erosion of teacher-student relationships (Eccles et al., 1993). Middle school students may also experience a decline in grades, self-concept, motivation, and interest in school with an increase in dropout and arrest rates (Eccles et al., 1993). Additionally, students begin to select friendships based on shared interests and commonalities rather than convenience. When adolescent students develop stable relationships, they are more likely to have better grades and are less likely to engage in problem behaviors (Carlo et al., 1999).

It is clear that teacher-student interactions have the potential to shape students’ academic experiences and long-term outcomes in powerful ways (Murray & Greenberg, 2000). Students with ED are at a very high risk for negative outcomes, are increasingly being placed in general education classrooms, and are often being taught by teachers who feel underprepared,
undersupported, and lacking in confidence and skills. Educating students with disabilities to the maximum extent appropriate in the general education classroom is frequently referred to as inclusion. Inclusive practices are framed around restructuring the classroom to promote belonging and learning of all students (Woolfolk, 2007). For the purposes of this study, the term inclusion refers to age-appropriate general education classrooms where students with disabilities receive specialized instruction outlined by their IEPs, through general class activities within the context of the core curriculum.

While there is a growing body of literature indicating that inclusion promotes more social interactions across a broader range of activities and settings as well as increased exposure to content, among other benefits, thus far inclusion has not consistently resulted in positive academic outcomes for students with disabilities (Fitch, 2003; Kennedy et al., 1997; Koch & Robertson, 2003). However, inclusion has momentum as a philosophy, a manifestation of legislation, and an educational model for students with disabilities. It is therefore going to continue to impact schools for the foreseeable future. It is incumbent upon researchers to identify strategies that will enable general education teachers to successfully support students with ED in the classroom. This study is designed to contribute to that understanding.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study will build upon the existing literature related to the practices and beliefs of general education teachers supporting students with ED in inclusive settings. Teachers are among the most important adults in a youth’s life, spending nearly as much time with children each day as their families (Hamre & Pianta, 2001). Teacher-student interactions are often powerful levers that can set a student up for success or failure (Demaray & Malecki, 2002;
Sharkey et al., 2008). Too often for students with ED, negative interactions and relationships with their teachers contribute to poor outcomes for the student. Research findings show that teachers do not often implement the positive practices we know to be effective with this population (Sutherland, 2000; Van Acker et al., 1996; Wehby et al., 1995).

This proposed study will contribute to the understanding of middle school general education teachers’ classroom instructional, management, and socialization strategy choices and how teacher experiences and beliefs relate to their classroom behaviors.

This study addresses three specific research questions which serve as the basis for the study design and data analysis as well as interpretation and validation of the study’s findings:

1. Do middle school general education teachers differ on rates of instructional practices such as opportunities to respond, academic feedback, and types of instruction for students with and without ED? Are the conditional probabilities for specific teacher instructional practices the same for students with and without ED?

2. Do middle school general education teachers differ on the rate at which they employ management strategies such as reinforcement, verbal redirection, and other consequences for students with and without ED? Are the conditional probabilities for specific teacher management behaviors the same for students with and without ED?

3. What do middle school general education teachers believe about working with students with ED? Do their beliefs align with observed instructional and management practices?
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This literature review consists of three sections, with specific subsections elaborating on central ideas. In the first section, key terms are defined. The second section provides an overview of the guiding theoretical frameworks for this study. The final section reviews relevant research on teacher beliefs on inclusion for students with ED and outcomes for students in inclusive classes. The goal of this chapter is to synthesize the relevant research on the beliefs and practices of general education teachers of students with ED in inclusive settings.

Definition of Terms

**Emotional disturbance.** Throughout the last 30 years students who have significant behavior or emotional impediments to their learning have been classified or identified by a variety of labels. These labels have, at one time or another, included severe emotional disturbance or disorder (SED), behavioral disorder, behavioral disturbance (BD), and emotional and behavioral disturbance (EBD). Different labels such as SED, BD, and EBD have been used throughout the literature at different points in time to refer to different student behaviors and characteristics. An overarching theme is that they all refer to students who exhibit behaviors or emotions that are inappropriate for normal conditions and impact their academic performance.

Current legislation defines Emotional Disturbance (ED) as an inability to learn that is unrelated to other factors, an inability to build or maintain relationships, inappropriate feelings or behavior under normal conditions, frequent unhappiness, depression, or fear that relates to lower than expected academic outcomes. Because this federal legislation regulates specialized services for students with disabilities and the school systems that support them, ED is the classification used throughout this study, including in reference to research that may have used different forms
such as BD, EBD, and SED. It is important to note that eligibility for ED, among others, is not biologically-based or specifically data-driven. Instead, classification as ED is based on “clinical judgment” which is often concerned with the “elusive nature of the dividing line between low achievement and ‘disability’” (Harry, 2007, p. 76).

Since 1981 there is evidence of increasing numbers of students being diagnosed with ED (Sawka et al., 2002). Currently, the number of students being labeled with ED is estimated to be around 464,000 students, or 1-2% of the entire school-aged population, and 6.5% of all students receiving specialized services (Lane et al., 2005; Sawka et al., 2002; Steinberg & Knitzer, 1992; Woolfolk, 2007; U.S. Department of Education, 2011).

**Inclusion.** Parent groups and other advocacy organizations have a long history of working toward successful education of students with disabilities (SWD). In the 1970’s these groups began to fight for SWD to be included to a greater extent in “regular” schools (Evans, 2007; Soodak, 2003). Initially this was accomplished through mainstreaming, which involved moving SWD into general education classrooms as convenient. This practice evolved into integration, which is the process of fitting the child into existing class structures. More recently, however, the process has evolved to inclusion, which entails restructuring the classroom to promote belonging and learning of all students (Woolfolk, 2007). The term “inclusion” therefore, now most commonly refers to process of educating the child to the maximum extent appropriate in the school and classroom with same-age, non-disabled students. While not explicitly called for, inclusive practices extend from IDEA under the LRE provisions, found at §§300.114 through 300.117, and require that each public agency must:

“(i) To the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in
public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are nondisabled; and

(ii) Special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only if the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. [§300.114(a)]

The law calls for students to be educated in the least restrictive environment appropriate to meet the unique needs of the student. In order to accomplish this, schools must provide a broad range of placement options. In the developing a student’s Individualized Education Plan (IEP) the team must begin consideration of services in the general education setting. Only if that setting is inadequate based on student needs will other, more restrictive settings be considered.

In addition to a legal mandate and instructional setting, inclusion is a philosophical framework, which will be explored further in the section below. For the purposes of this study, the term inclusion will refer to chronologically age-appropriate general education classrooms in which students with disabilities, specifically ED, receive specialized instruction as outlined by their IEPs, through standard class activities within the context of the core curriculum. These classrooms may be led by a single general education teacher or a co-taught pair of general and special educators for part or all of the day.

**Theoretical Frameworks**

**Inclusion.** Inclusion is the practice of adapting the general education classroom to meet the needs of all students by providing individualized instruction and supplemental aids and services (Clampit, Holifield, & Nicols, 2004). It is founded on a belief that the student should receive specialized services in the school or classroom he would attend if he did not have an identified disability, rather than removing him from the class to receive services. Ainscow
In (2007) argues that inclusion is comprised of four elements. First, inclusion is designed to find better ways of responding to and including all types of diversity. Second, successful inclusion focuses on the identification and removal of barriers to education through data collection and analysis with strategic problem-solving. Third, inclusion is about the presence, quality of experience, and outcomes for all students. Finally, inclusion focuses on educational experiences of those groups of learners at risk for marginalization, exclusion, or underachievement.

Inclusion is therefore often considered a moral responsibility (Ainscow, 2007).

Inclusive practices are primarily concerned with the belonging, membership, and acceptance of all individuals, in a classroom structured to meet the needs of all students. These practices are grounded in the belief that all people with disabilities should be accommodated without restrictions or limitations of any kind (Soodak, 2003). Therefore, when trying to understand the inclusive setting, teacher and student behaviors are important factors to consider.

To fully explore inclusive practices, several contextual layers that impact its implementation must be considered, including administrative beliefs and practices, teacher beliefs and practices, and student variables (O’Connor & McCartney, 2007; Wagner, Friend, Bursuck, Kutash, Duchnowski, Sumi, & Epstein, 2006). Different approaches may be used to study and interpret inclusive practices. One such framework is the ecobehavioral framework. The ecobehavioral framework is guided by the belief that student behavior, teacher behavior, and classroom ecology all interact with and are influenced by one another. This framework describes, compares, and assesses the relationship between these classroom variables.

**Ecobehavioral framework.** The practice of studying and observing challenging behaviors has a long history, dating to the 19th century (Kauffman, Brigham, & Mock, 2007).
Teaching is an interactive, on-going process characterized by a variety of dyadic exchanges between teachers and students (Shores et al., 1993). These interactions have an impact on the quality of the student-teacher relationship which in turn has been shown to correlate to student social and academic successes (Hamre & Pianta, 2001; Murray & Greenberg, 2000). This study is focused on a specific set of interactions between teacher and students, as well as the ways in which teacher’s beliefs and experiences align with their practices. In order to study these nested and interactive variables, this study will take an ecobehavioral approach.

The ecobehavioral framework evolved out of four other traditions: ecological psychology, interbehavioral psychology, behavior analysis, and applied behavior analysis (Morris & Midgley, 1990). The ecobehavioral model is closely related to Bronfenbrenner’s ecological-contextual theory; both consider the various contextual features that impact and are impacted by student behaviors (Woolfolk, 2007). The theoretical assumption guiding both models is that student behavior, teacher behavior, and classroom ecology are nested within and influence one another and that students’ behaviors are interdependent parts of a total setting (Simeonsson & Boyles, 2001). Because of its unique consideration of a broad range of environmental variables, the ecobehavioral approach is often used to address classroom-based challenges (Utley & Obiakor, 2001). What follows is a brief description of ecobehavioral analysis.

Ecobehavioral analysis is grounded in the belief that children develop within various systems of interrelated components (O’Connor & McCartney, 2007). These systems surround and include the child, and consist of familial factors, classroom variables, and other cultural considerations. Because of their interrelated nature, the influences of a single factor in one
system cannot be evaluated without considering factors within the other systems. Behaviors are therefore inherently interactional in nature, impacting and being impacted by other contextual variables. Additionally, within each and across multiple systems are concurrent and sequential response co-variations such as response patterns, intrapersonal behavior, dispositions, physical environment and interpersonal, institutional, and cultural contingencies that impact behavior. Changing any one of these factors changes the likelihood of subsequent response patterns. It is therefore necessary to jointly assess the functional relationships between the two.

To study behavior, ecobehavioral analysts focus on holistic and naturalistic accounts that would have no meaning outside of their context and the presence of multiple responses and stimuli. The observer’s role is to observe and record events in a manner that is as unbiased and non-inferential as possible, only analyzing for patterns and sequences after all data have been recorded (Simeonson & Rosenthal, 2001). To accomplish this, ecobehavioral analysis relies on a series of procedures, drawn from behavior analysis, to gather information about antecedents, behaviors, and consequences, but then also considers co-variation possibilities at each point of the three terms (Morris & Midgley, 1990; Woolfolk, 2007). This changes the ways in which patterns of behavior are examined and the conclusions that can be drawn. No behavior can be examined without also considering the contexts in which it occurs.

Using the ecobehavioral approach, this study will look at a specific set of variables at the teacher level including teacher beliefs and classroom practices, as well as interactions between students and the teacher. This next section will review relevant literature on what is known about inclusion for students with ED.
Inclusion of Students with Challenging Behavior/ED and Teacher Beliefs

Students with disabilities, and specifically students with ED, present a unique set of challenges to the inclusion model. Research overwhelmingly suggests that teachers believe in inclusion as an instructional practice, but that they do not believe they have the necessary training, skills, or support to implement it successfully in their own classrooms. This is especially true when it comes to supporting students with ED, who teachers feel least prepared for and willing to include (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996; Scruggs et al., 2011). Teachers’ perceived challenges with and reluctance to include students with ED can be found in a large body of research spanning over three decades, and may be due to the nature of the behavior presented by students with ED.

In 1983, Coleman and Gilliam used seven vignettes describing clusters of disruptive behaviors based on the federal definition of emotional disturbance and an attitudinal survey to investigate the attitudes of 139 first- through sixth-grade general education teachers toward mainstreamed students who exhibit these behaviors. The authors used a 29-item inventory and seven vignettes to try and uncover whether or not different behavioral challenges affect the types of concerns teachers have about including students and which behaviors evoked the most negative attitudinal response from teachers. The vignettes depicted the following behaviors: avoidance of interactions with teachers and peers, depressive reactions, inappropriate behavior, aggressive interactions with teachers and peers, anxiety reactions, and physical reaction. In order to isolate the impact of the specific behaviors and control for bias, all other characteristics including race, gender, intelligence, and others were held constant.
The authors found that students who exhibited avoidance of peers were viewed with a more favorable perspective than any of the other behaviors. On the opposite end of the spectrum, aggressive behaviors evoked the most negative teacher reaction. The authors concluded that the reason for these findings rests in the nature of aggressive behavior, which described acts that were disruptive and interfered with the teacher’s ability to manage and instruct. While this is based on a relatively small sample size, the findings still have implications for working with students with ED, who often exhibit aggressive and disruptive behaviors.

A weakness of this study is that it only looks at the self-reported attitudes and behaviors of teachers from a small urban district in Texas. It is unclear if and how these might actually play out in a classroom with real students and has limited generalizability. Among the strengths of the study was the control of variables that could impact teacher attitudes toward student behaviors, and a relatively well-spread out sample size of 139 first through sixth grade teachers.

Brophy and McCaslin (1992) also examined teachers’ perceptions of students with a range of challenging behaviors and how they work with those students. The challenging behaviors fell into one of the following categories: underachiever, failure syndrome, perfectionism, underachiever, hostile aggressive, passive aggressive, defiant, hyperactive, distractible, immature, rejected by peers, and shy/withdrawn. Completing a variety of tools, 98 teachers from both a small and large city, representing grades K through 6, participated. Each teacher had three or more years experience working in public schools with ethnically and economically diverse populations. These teachers were also ranked by their principals as excellent or average in their abilities to manage difficult behaviors. To validate these rankings, each teacher was observed over the course of two half-day observations. The relative diversity of
the subjects, the range of grade levels examined, and the use of observation to confirm principal beliefs are strengths to this study and the results it yielded.

Data included open-ended interviews about general and specific strategies for working with students who exhibit one or more of these 12 problem student types, a brief checklist, a questionnaire, and short-answer items on background information, as well as two half-day visits to the classroom. Defiant, hostile-aggressive behaviors were seen as intentional misbehavior and teachers felt least confident in supporting these students. Between 76-94% percentage of the teachers surveyed believed students to be the sole cause of all 12 problem behaviors. Roughly 2-13% of teachers shared responsibility for all but immaturity (no teachers shared responsibility), and only 2% accepted full responsibility for underachievement.

Teachers were more inclined to act with rejection and control or punishment with students exhibiting these disruptive or hostile problem behaviors than for any of the other problem behaviors. Students who persistently exhibited these traits were met with teacher rejection and punishment. When teachers believed student behavior interfered with the teacher’s own satisfaction or ability to run the classroom, they reported perceiving the student action as intentional misbehavior and were pessimistic about their own ability to change the students’ behavior. They found these students to be responsible and therefore blameworthy for the problems they exhibited. And while the teachers tended to mention relying on one or more supportive behaviors such as “kid gloves treatment” or “peer support,” teachers also reported being less likely to use encouragement and other forms of support for this population than for failure syndrome, perfectionism, and shy/withdrawn students.
In terms of intervention choice, the most common teacher responses to aggressive or defiant behavior tended toward demands for behavior change and threats for punishment. For vignettes depicting passive-aggressive and defiant students, typical responses contained almost no instructive elements. Teacher responses were primarily controlling or punitive for underachieving, hostile-aggressive, passive-aggressive, defiant, hyperactive, and mature students whereas responses tended to be sympathetic and focused on supporting students exhibiting failure syndrome, perfectionist tendencies, distractibility, rejection, and shy/withdrawn. This suggests that students with challenging behaviors are more likely to have negative interactions with their teachers.

While this article revealed much about teachers’ perceptions of students and their ability to support these students, there were some limitations to the findings. First, the authors selected participants who were considered exceptional or average in their classroom management ability by subjective view of their principals. The sheer quantity of data collected, combined with the range of grade levels examined, is a relative strength to this article’s findings. Focusing on this population of teachers suggests that even average and above-average teachers struggle to support this population of students.

Cheney and Barringer (1995) report on initial findings from the pilot phase of a 3-year research and training project geared toward enhancing the knowledge, skills, and strategies of educators working with students with ED in inclusive middle school settings. The pilot phase of this program solicited self-assessment data from 26 middle school teachers in suburban and rural areas regarding their levels of knowledge, skills, and strategies for working with students with
ED. While this sample represents one of the more diverse groups of teachers, its small size limits its generalizability and usefulness.

Teachers were given the Emotional and Behavioral Disorders Teacher Competency Survey which assessed teacher beliefs about characteristics of learners, managing the learning environment, communication and collaboration, managing individual students with ED, and monitoring individual students with ED using a 5-point Likert scale (1=little or no competence to 5=mastery). Teachers also completed two surveys about their students. The first was the 50-item Social Skills Rating System Teacher Form assessing teacher beliefs about student behavior on three scales: Social Skills, Problem Behaviors, and Academic Competence. The second was the Teacher Report Form, a 113-item scale looking at students’ Internalizing, Externalizing, and Total Problems. Students’ academic achievement was assessed based on their standardized achievement scores on three different tools. Based on teacher reports, the students included in this survey fell into one of three groups: externalizing behavior (n=27), internalizing behavior (n=30), and typically developing students (n=16). Students with ED were shown to have specific behavioral and academic challenges that teachers need to be able to address.

Based on responses from the Competency Survey, teachers overwhelmingly did not feel capable or prepared for working effectively with this population of students. The respondents rated themselves as having no greater than little-to-moderate competence in the skills or knowledge across all of the five domains. Their highest ratings were in managing the learning environment, which includes tasks like developing rules and organizing the classroom, with scores ranging from 2.62 to 3.51. Teachers were next most likely to report confidence in their ability to communicate and collaborate with other teachers and students’ families, rating
themselves as moderately competent. Teachers perceived themselves as only somewhat 
competent in areas related to the characteristics of students with ED.

Managing individual students with ED was the third highest domain for teachers, though 
only two of the nine elements indicated a moderate level of competence. The other seven 
indicated little to some competence in these areas, including ability to use materials promoting 
social development, strategies for reducing aggression or problem-solving, and strategies for 
crisis prevention or intervention. The lowest area of teacher report was knowledge of 
characteristics of students with ED, where teachers perceived themselves as being low to 
somewhat competent. Though these views represent a small sample size, the study included 
responding teachers from both suburban and rural communities. This indicates that both 
suburban and rural teachers believe they are unprepared to deal with the specific challenges 
presented by students with ED, which suggests that students with ED are not receiving the 
supports they require. For example, students with externalizing behaviors are more likely to 
engage in aggressive behaviors and yet teachers ranked their knowledge of strategies for 
reducing aggression as little or some.

In 1999, Heflin and Bullock interviewed nine general and nine special education teachers 
to gauge how full inclusion of students with ED affects teachers’ daily activities. Teachers came 
from three different size school districts: those with less than 2,000 students, those with up to 
10,000 students, and those with over 50,000 students. The authors found that none of the schools 
were able to fully include students with ED, regardless of size. They also found that students 
with ED were placed into general education classrooms strategically, based on what was known 
of the general education teachers, including their skills and dispositions. When prompted to
describe variables that they considered critical for success, the surveyed teachers listed natural proportions in the classroom, instructional support, training, and careful planning and systematic implementation. Both groups of teachers reported insufficient training and support, non-proportional ratios of students in the class, feeling unable to meet the educational needs of included students, and significant struggles finding time to make curricular modifications and collaborate with other teammates. Both groups also indicated that behavior management was a challenge, and that they did not believe that inclusion was for all students. While nine dyads is a very small sample, and teachers were once again reporting their perceptions, these data support the previous findings, and expand upon them by focusing specifically on students with ED.

Cook (2001) asked 70 general education teachers to classify students with different disabilities into four classifications, “attachment,” “concern,” “indifference,” and “rejection.” Each classification represented a student-type defined and studied by Brophy and Good (1972). These classifications correlate to a set of observed teacher behaviors that can either build student relationship, or degrade it. Students categorized by the teacher as “attachment” were more likely to be perceived as hard working and receive more praise, process questions, have more opportunities to respond, and rewards. Students considered “concern” were more likely to be seen as having academic challenges and are given more opportunities to respond, more praise, and more teacher support after an incorrect answer. “Indifference” students were seen as quieter and having a tendency to avoid the teacher. These students were less likely to have interactions with teachers and those that they have are brief and perfunctory. Those students viewed as “rejection” were most often viewed as low achievers who require a significant amount of teacher time and effort. They receive the significant amounts of praise but have almost no instructional
interactions with their teachers. They are also unlikely to get feedback in response to incorrect answers.

For this study, each teacher needed to have at least one student who had been identified as having an IEP or 504 Plan included in their classes. One hundred and seventy-three students had learning disabilities, behavioral disorders, attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, or other disorders that were physically indistinguishable from non-disabled peers. Another 48 students were diagnosed with disabilities that typically have physical and cognitive implications that are evidence of being a student with disabilities, such as mental retardation, hearing impairment, and orthopedic impairment. Teachers were asked to list three students who best matched each of the category prompts. Cook found that students with disabilities that were “hidden,” or did not have a physical, visible manifestation were significantly overrepresented in the rejection category. Students with visible disabilities were significantly underrepresented in this category. This indicates that students with significant needs are viewed with more acceptance than students who are more similar physically to their non-disabled peers.

Students with ED, as members of the “hidden” disabilities categorization, were more likely to be seen as falling into the “rejection” category which has some potentially devastating implications. Many of the students classified as rejection are identified as such due to their behaviors and attitudes (Cook et al., 2000). Good and Brophy (1972) found that rejection students need a great deal of teacher time and effort but that, unlike students of concern who also require additional support, teachers do not feel hope for rejection students. For students identified as rejection by teachers, their interactions were rarely related to instruction, they received fewer reading turns, got less feedback, and were more likely to be criticized (Good &
Brophy, 1972). This suggests that a disproportionate number of included students with ED may not be receiving appropriate educational opportunities, given that teacher behavior varies significantly toward students belonging to different groups.

Ntinas, Neila, Nikolaidoiu, Papadimitrious, Papadopoulou, Fsoulas, and Hatzikonstantinidis (2006) provided a questionnaire to 100 teachers to learn more about teacher practices with students with disabilities. Eighty-five elementary teachers in Northern Greece responded. Participants were asked to complete three tasks: classify five disability categories in descending order according to their difficulty to include, respond to two open-ended questions about obstacles to including students with special needs, and completed the Impact of Inclusion Questionnaire (IIQ).

Responses to the questionnaire indicate the 39% of teachers considered students with challenging behaviors as the most difficult to include. This represents the highest percentage out of all the categories. Fifty percent of respondents indicated that their own limited intervention skills impede their attempts at inclusion over any other factors, while 26% report lack of proper training. Additional challenges included students’ non-acceptance by peers and lack of cooperation with families.

Teachers also reported high levels of negative feelings in regards to the impact of including students with challenging behaviors on the teacher. These included feelings of helplessness and a belief that they were not properly trained. Teachers also reported that inclusion caused additional stress, made them feel emotionally exhausted, and excessively increased their workload. They agreed that the inclusion of this population disturbs the routine of the class and that including students with challenging behaviors upsets and distracts peers,
impedes their own access to learning, and leads to rejection from peers. However, teachers did not believe that including this population put other students in danger and they disagreed that inclusion impedes them from attending to other students, leads to physical exhaustion or nervousness, or makes them feel incompetent.

When looking specifically at teacher perceptions of the supports they need to successfully include students who engage in challenging behaviors, Lohrman & Bambara (2006) found that even general education teachers who viewed themselves as successful at inclusion questioned their abilities. Fourteen Caucasian general education teachers in K to sixth grade, deemed successful at inclusion, were included in this study. Teachers reported that they had limited direct experience with or training for working with this population, which impeded their understanding of students’ need and created initial worry, anxiety, or fear. Their concerns over their own abilities were compounded by rumors they heard from other teachers, which led many to question whether or not inclusion could even work for this population of students.

Teachers reported that they had minimal training in Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) and other behavior management for this population. The authors found that the perceived effectiveness of behavioral supports were especially important in shaping general education teachers’ core beliefs about inclusion. When strategies did not work and challenging behaviors persisted, teachers became overwhelmed and uncertain about whether inclusion was the best placement for these students. However, when they received supports in effectively addressing these behaviors, their uncertainty was quieted and their philosophy of education, particularly around the appropriateness of inclusive options for all students was strengthened. Teachers reported finding positive, proactive, and instructional strategies to be the most effective,
including flexibility, finding student strengths and positives, learning to understand the student, and setting the expectation that students were active members of the class. Most of these beliefs and strategies were developed through collaboration with other service providers.

General education teachers were also concerned with the level of students’ needs, the nature of the problem behaviors exhibited, and the amount of time necessary to successfully balance the needs of individual students with the needs of the larger class. Congruent with what Buell et al found, teachers reported that they needed support with adapting instructional materials, implementing behavior support strategies, working one on one with students.

In 2010, Westling conducted a survey of 38 special education and 32 general education teachers in pre-K to secondary using Likert-type scales to assess teacher beliefs about several traits and conditions describing themselves, their students with challenging behaviors, and their teaching environment. Responses to the survey revealed that special education teachers feel most challenged by students with ED, specific learning disabilities, and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), while general education teachers feel most challenged by students with no identified disability, LD, and ADHD. A majority of both groups agreed or strongly agreed that personality, physical or medical reasons, disability, home or community, or learned behaviors were sources of challenging behaviors.

When asked to assess the adequacy of pre-service and in-service training, only 31-60% felt adequately or extensively trained in any area, including applied behavioral analysis, functional behavior assessment, management, behavior interventions, data collection, and school wide positive behavior supports. Their highest rates of preparation were for data collection and assessment and classroom management, and their lowest rates were other training and functional
behavior analysis. General educators ranged from 26-70%, with highest percentages in classroom management and individual behavior management, and lowest scores in applied behavior analysis and functional behavior assessment. However, when asked to rate their implementation of a series of best practices, only four of the practices were used by a majority of special educators, and none of the practices were used by a majority of general educators. Fifty-three percent of special educators reported using reinforcement of desired behaviors, social reinforcement, and identifying behavior triggers. None reported sending students to the office while 3% reported ignoring behaviors or using time outs. General education teachers were most likely to report using changing the classroom arrangement (45%), changing curriculum or teaching (43%), or reinforcing desired behavior. They were least likely to report sending students to the office (1%), using time out (3%), or ignoring behavior (4%). The other 12 strategies were used by a range of 9-51% of special educators and 7-39% of general educators.

While both groups of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they had “increased ability to deal with most challenging behaviors since teaching,” fewer felt they had sufficient knowledge and skills. A majority of both groups agreed or strongly agreed that challenging behaviors take up a significant amount of their time, reduces the student’s learning, and makes other students learn less, and 44% of general education teachers reported that challenging behaviors make them think about quitting.

This study consisted of a nonrandom, convenience sample from a small geographical area, which limits the generalizability of results. It also relies solely on self-report data which has been repeatedly shown to be unreliable and may not align with actual practices or conditions (Mertens, 2005). The study also failed to determine the frequency, intensity, or type of
challenging behaviors, leaving an already subjective classification to the determination of the participant.

Overall, the research suggests that teachers do not feel prepared to effectively support students with challenging behaviors or ED. Given that students with ED are prone to a wide range of academic, social, and life-long outcomes, it is imperative that they have instructors who feel prepared to effectively support them, and who are able to implement practices that will improve students’ outcomes. The following section reviews the literature on the impact inclusion has on students with disabilities and emotional disturbance specifically.

**Impact of Inclusion on Students with Disabilities**

While there is a broad body of literature recommending school and classroom practices for successfully including students with disabilities (Muscott, 1995), there is a much smaller body of literature using empirical studies to examine the effectiveness of various inclusive programs and practices for students with ED. Instead, much of the research on inclusion has focused on teacher perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes. The push for including more students in the general education classroom for larger percentages of the school day has led to some concerns about the actual impact on students with and without disabilities. For students with ED, the most critical areas of effectiveness can be captured in the broader categories of interpersonal relationships, appropriate behaviors, and academic learning (Landrum, Tankersley, & Kauffmann, 2003). The following section provides a brief examination of the impact of inclusion on students with challenging behaviors or ED.

In 1991, Dishion, Patterson, Stoolmiller, and Skinner reported on data from 206 nine and ten year old males in fourth grade, their families, and members of their school community. The
The purpose of this study was to examine the variables contributing to male adolescent students’ risk for developing and perpetuating anti-social behaviors. Broken into two cohorts of 102 and 104 young men, the participating students and their families were predominantly white, lower class families with a high percentage of unemployed parents. The goal of the research was to look at students’ experiences with their family and school at age 10 and see how those scores correlated with antisocial peers two years later. The boys and their families were observed in their homes three times for one hour each using a direct observation tool with a follow up questionnaire, and the family participated in six interviews spread apart by 3-day intervals. Parents and teachers also completed the Child Behavior Checklist-Parent and Teacher Report Forms and a questionnaire about the student’s friendships, and researchers were given the boys’ standardized test results. After two years a similar assessment including measures of antisocial peer involvement was completed.

Dishion et al. (1991) found that, while students’ self-reports of their friends’ antisocial behavior decreased from age 10 to 12, their parents ratings showed no change and teachers’ ratings actually increased. They also found that at age 10, having low academic skills, not being well liked by peers, and engaging in antisocial behavior correlated with antisocial behaviors at age 12. Boys deemed popular at age 10 had lower levels of contact with antisocial peers by age 12 than those students perceived as rejected by peers. Cook (2001) found that teachers were more likely to consider students with disability in the “rejected” category. Dishion et al.’s work suggests this may hold true for students’ perceptions as well. If students view their disabled peers as “rejected,” students with disabilities would be at a higher risk of antisocial behaviors.
Dishion, working with Andrews and Crosby (1995), continued to follow this group of young men and in 1995 they reported on a study of 186 of the original 206 young men, now aged 13 to 14, and their relationships with their closest friends. The young men were asked to bring the friend with whom they spent the most amount of time. The dyads were assessed on behaviors they exhibited during a 25-minute series of activities referred to as Peer Interaction Task (PIT), where they were asked to plan an activity they could do together within the next week, solve a problem related to getting along with parents, and solve a problem related to getting along with peers. These interactions were video-taped and the videos were then coded by observers, with 18% of the video-taped sessions randomly coded by two independent observers, using the Peer Process Code (PPC). Using an entry-by-entry agreement approach, there was 86.4% agreement on code content and 73.4% agreement on the affective valence. The low rates of double-coded sessions and the low agreement rates for those sessions that were coded, create some challenges to interpreting the overall conclusions. However, the relatively large number of video-taped sessions negates some of that concern.

Following the problem-solving sessions, the boys were asked a series of questions about their friendship, including questions about relationship satisfaction. Only answers that matched across the young men were counted. One year later, the boys were again interviewed about their friendship. The authors then conducted correlational, analysis of variance, and nonparametric strategies to analyze the origins, characteristics, and qualities of adolescent boys’ friendships as they relate to antisocial behavior. They also computed lag-1 sequential scores for each possible sequences of four given behavior clusters to assess the interactional processes within the boys’ relationships. They found the greatest effect for antisocial dyads to have met outside of school
and live in the same neighborhood. However, the majority of students reported meeting in school (73%) while only a few met in the neighborhood (17%). The boys’ performance on each of the four behavior clusters of behavior, suggesting that, like teacher-student behaviors, student-student behavior is a dyadic process. Additionally, the authors found that deviant peer relationships had lower satisfaction rates and were more likely to end acrimoniously within the year. However, it appeared from the observations that despite higher rates of antisocial behaviors, these students did not have deficits in positive behaviors with their friends.

Dishion, Eddy, Haas, Li, and Spracklen (1997) examined the extent to which interpersonal friendships were associated with violent behaviors during adolescence. Following the same group of 206 boys at ages, 13-14, 15-16, and 17-18, the authors conducted three 45-minute observations in the home using the Family Process Code (FPC), and repeated the PIT.

For the PIT, only 13% of the boys brought in the same friend for the first two time points and only 22% brought in the same friend for the last two time points. Only 6% of boys brought in the same friend all three times. This seems to support the findings from 1995 that antisocial friendships tend to last for a shorter duration. The number of times the boys discussed violent behaviors decreased slightly from 13-14 to 17-18, though this was not at significant levels. Discussions of rule-breaking remained steady across all three time points. Perhaps more important, the authors found that adolescent violence was predicted by ongoing social interactions within the peer groups, particularly patterns between closest friendships, which tended to reinforce antisocial behaviors. This mirrors teacher-student interaction research that has found aversive student behaviors that yield desired results from teachers, results in increased aversive behavior. Antisocial behaviors are shaped, formed, and maintained within students’
social contexts, including home, social, and school. Students with ED struggle with building and maintaining appropriate relationships. This suggests that students with ED placed in self-contained classrooms with a higher ratio of students with challenging behaviors are at a higher risk for maintaining socially inappropriate behaviors.

Frederickson, Simmonds, Evans and Soulsby (2007) synthesized measures of peer group inclusion, social behavior, bullying, and feelings of belonging in included students with and without disabilities. Participants included 397 eight- to eleven-year-old students in 14 classrooms across 11 schools, 294 of whom were considered typically developing. Students with disabilities were divided into two groups. One group consisted of students with low incidence disabilities who previously received supports in a separate school. The other consisted of students with higher incidence disabilities. Of the participating students with high incidence disabilities, 24% had social, emotional, or behavioral-based disabilities, though data are reported in terms of impact on students with low incidence and high incidence disabilities generally.

Using the Social Inclusion Survey, the authors measured how willing children were to associate with specific classmates at school. Students also identified which students they would choose to fit six descriptors including cooperates, disrupts, shy, seeks, help, and leader. A final measure, The Belonging Scale, asked students to rate whether a set of statements was true about themselves. Students formerly placed in a separate school for students with special needs but now included were accepted at rates similar to their non-disabled peers, and were more popular than included students receiving specialized supports from the school. Students receiving services from the school were less accepted and more rejected in all social contexts. Students with high incidence disabilities were less likely to be seen as cooperative or leaders. Students
seen as uncooperative, disruptive, and constantly in need of help, regardless of disability status, had a lower sense of belonging. While not focusing specifically on students with ED, this implies that students with high incidence disabilities (including students with ED), were more likely to be viewed negatively and were less likely to feel as though they belong in the general education classroom.

Other research on quality of life measures supports this perception. Sacks and Kern (2007) found that middle and high school students with ED rated their perceived quality of life statistically significantly lower than their non-disabled peers across four domains, general, self, relationship, and environment. One hundred and eighty-five youth with and without disabilities completed the Youth Quality of Life-Revised survey. Students with ED being educated in general education schools reported lower quality of life perspectives about themselves and their environment than those educated in private schools for students with disabilities.

Taken together with Dishion’s longitudinal works, we can infer that students with disabilities who are included in the general education classroom interact more frequently and have more social contacts with peers without disabilities across a broader range of activities and settings. Additionally, they receive and provide higher levels of social support behaviors and have larger and more durable friendship networks. It is unclear, however, how much time a student must spend in the inclusive setting in order to begin to see these benefits. Also, placement in inclusive classroom appears to have a negative impact on quality of life and on students’ sense of belonging. The implications for educating students with ED are very important. Students with ED struggle, by definition, with building and maintaining appropriate relationships. Based on Dishion’s work, there is evidence that including students with ED in the
general education classroom may separate them from negative reinforcement of anti-social behaviors that would likely result if placed in separate classrooms where they are more likely to be with other peers with anti-social tendencies (Bradley, Dolittle, & Bartolotta, 2008). Including students in a general education classroom may provide models of and reinforcement for appropriate behaviors.

Janney, Snell, Beers, and Raynes (1995) were interested in understanding what factors contributed to teachers’ beliefs prior to and after implementing inclusion for students with a variety of disabilities in their classrooms. To find out, the authors used a semi-standardized interview comprised of demographic questions and eight primarily open-ended questions with five special education directors, ten principals or assistant principals, 12 special education and 26 general education teachers across five school districts in Virginia. These districts represented three rural and two urban communities and three elementary, two junior high/middle, and four high schools. Specifically the authors sought to answer two questions: (1) on what factors did interviewees base their judgments of successful inclusion efforts and (2) what factors were perceived to have facilitated and hindered successful inclusion efforts.

Overall the authors found that teachers ascribed a wide array of positive outcomes for students with and without disabilities to inclusive practices. These outcomes included increased independence, alertness, and self-esteem, and improved functioning skills, more age-appropriate behaviors and friendships, and a sense of belonging for students with disabilities. Teachers perceived a growth in self-esteem, more acceptance of individual differences, and a better school community when rating non-disabled peers specifically.
These positive outcomes were contingent, however, on teachers’ receiving the necessary and sufficient supports to implement inclusion. Teachers themselves reported needing training to address their attitudes, apprehensions, inaccurate assumptions, and fears, which they perceived to be the biggest barriers to inclusion. Over two-thirds of interviewees recommended that they be provided in-service workshops, on-site consultants, and opportunities to talk with colleagues and families. The most powerful aspect of these comments is perhaps also the study’s greatest weakness. The participants interviewed for this study all came from schools that intentionally designed inclusion action plans and had substantial district support. Despite all of these supports, these teachers still described a great need for professional development and training in order to be successful.

Other studies have shown that students in inclusive classrooms earn higher grades, achieve comparable or higher scores on standardized tests, commit similar rates of behavioral infractions and attend school more consistently than their peers in separate classrooms (Rea et al., 2001). Hayling, Cook, Gresham, State, and Kern (2007) analyzed data on student engagement, disruption, and destruction during 10 different types of instructional activities in 90 first through twelfth grade classrooms across a variety of instructional settings. Direct observation data were collected through two 30-minute observations focused around these student behaviors as well as the activity type, for example whether the instruction was delivered whole class, in small groups, or one-on-one. The majority of students studied in these classrooms were diagnosed with ED, while the remaining students had other psychiatric diagnoses including Oppositional Defiant Disorder, ADHD, and Conduct Disorder. Students were placed in public schools or private/nonpublic schools within General Education (35.6%),
Emotional Support (47.8%), Learning Support (8.9%), and Other (7.4%) settings, across elementary (25.6%), middle (44.4%), and high schools (81%).

The authors found that on average students were engaged for 77% of the observed intervals, and that disruptive behaviors were observed during 11% of intervals. Students’ academic engagement was highest in learning support classrooms (81%), followed by general education classrooms (80.7%), emotional support classrooms (74.1%) and other classrooms (73.7%). Disruptive behaviors, however, were highest in general education classrooms (12.8%) followed by emotional support classrooms (11.3%), other classrooms (10.6%), and learning support classrooms (6.8%), suggesting that successful strategies were not being implemented.

Despite seemingly high rates of engagement, a look at the correlations between instructional activity and misbehavior indicates these rates should be higher. In the general education, emotional support, learning support and other settings teachers were most likely to use whole class instruction and independent seat work, by a significant majority. In fact, independent seat work was used for 30.2% of the time for learning support teachers, 38.3% for general education teachers, 42.6% for emotional support teachers, and 63.7% for other teachers. However, independent seat work as an instructional strategy correlated most strongly with class wide behavior problems and had a significantly negative correlation with engagement. No other behavior had a statistically significant correlation with instructional behaviors. Though this study has significant limitations due to the limited observations (in both frequency and duration) and homogenous sample, these findings are concerning.

Curic (2009) conducted a meta-analysis of 48 qualitative articles from 18 countries to describe the practices and outcomes of inclusion in pre-kindergarten to twelfth grade classrooms.
These articles appeared in peer-reviewed journals between 1996 and 2006 and needed to include a description of the research methodology. From this review, four primary themes emerged. First, there are several successful student outcomes in inclusive settings. Students with disabilities placed in general education classrooms were shown to have an increased likelihood of obtaining vocational and academic competence, made more progress in mathematics and language, and performed better on state-level assessments. These students were also shown to have higher self-esteem and higher engagement in academics. However, there was some indication that some students with disabilities made similar or slightly more psychosocial development when educated in a special education placement.

A second theme to emerge was that differences in teachers’ beliefs and classroom practices for students with and without disabilities. Teachers believed that inclusion increased social interactions and improved reasoning skills and exposure to literature. However, they also found themselves lacking in materials, support, or knowledge about this population of students, a trend that has emerged throughout the literature on inclusion. Curic’s review revealed that teachers do not necessarily change their classroom instruction drastically when including students with disabilities, and their beliefs about the sources of behaviors impact the ways in which they interact with the students in front of them. For instance, teachers who believed that disabilities were pathological tended to view their role as the teacher as minimal.

The third and fourth themes emerging out of this review involve the presence of both inclusionary and exclusionary practices. For example, Curic’s review indicated that school leadership, community building, and positive attitudes from teachers and students, all play a crucial role in establishing effective inclusion. However, inclusion did not always result in
positive outcomes for students. Cases of bullying, a failure to meet at least some academic needs, and a failure to successfully integrate students into the class culture were all reported.

Goodman, Hazelkor, Bucholz, Duffy, and Kitta (2011) explored graduation rates for included students with disabilities. The implications of this study are somewhat limited by the methodology used to gather the data. Specifically, the authors used a cohort method by which they looked at the average enrollment in Grade 8 and Grade 10 and compared it to Grade 12 graduation rates four years later. There was no way to ensure that the same students were followed; students may have moved in and out throughout the four year span. However, this particular method mirrors current federal guidelines for calculating graduation rates.

The data revealed that inclusion rates for all students with mild disabilities, including specific learning disabilities (SLD), emotional disturbance (ED), other health impairment (OHI), and mild intellectual delay (MID), increased from 28.0% to 38.2%. Similar patterns of growth were evident when looking across 12th grade classrooms over the same span of years, growing from 44.5% to 62.1%. In 1999 just over two thousand students were identified as MID, 137 (6.6%) of whom were placed in inclusive settings. In 2003, that same class had a total of 1,442 students with MID, 12.3% or 178 students, were placed in inclusive classes. Similar patterns hold true for students with ED, SLD, and OHI in the same time frame. Despite the jump in percentages, however, graduation rates remained stable across years. Graduation rates for all students with disabilities ranged from 22.0%-26.7%. Rates for students with ED remained even more stable, ranging from 13.1%-16.8%. Students with OHI and SLD had the highest and most variable rates, ranging from 33.7%-43.8% and 30%-37.1% respectively.
Rising inclusion rates are, in theory, a positive finding, though somewhat dampened by stagnant graduation rates. More disturbing though, the data reveal significant decreases in the number of students with disabilities still enrolled in the schools over the four year span. For example, in 1999 there were 9,232 students with disabilities enrolled but by 2003, this number had dwindled to 5,732. Looking specifically at patterns for students with ED, similar disturbing trends emerge. In 2003, there were 1,928 students with ED enrolled but by 2003, only 830 were enrolled. In 2004 there were 2,492 students identified as ED were enrolled. In 2008 there were 945 enrolled. It is possible that the percent of students included increased simply because students in more restrictive environments left. A review of the data indicates this is much too simplistic a view to take. While it may be a contributing factor, the reality is that despite lower numbers of students with disabilities, the raw number of included students is increasing. Despite this, however, the data indicates that despite increasing rates of inclusion, graduation rates are not matching the increase, and in fact, students with disabilities are leaving school at relatively high rates. While the study fails to recognize that some students with disabilities may remain in high school until they are 21, it is reasonable to conclude that this population of students is not large enough to dramatically impact the existing numbers. Therefore, these trends will hold true.

Summary

This review of the literature reveals some important considerations for inclusive education. First, there is clear evidence that general education teachers feel unprepared, lacking in support and resources and without the skills to support students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms (Scruggs et al., 2011; Westling, 2010). Second, teachers treat students with and without disabilities differently and are most likely to view students with ED negatively and with
rejection (Cook, 2001; Cook et al., 2000). Finally, there is mixed evidence toward the impact of inclusion on social, academic, or behavioral outcomes for students with ED. If teachers believe they are incapable of effectively supporting students with ED and the results are mixed, it becomes important to gain insights that will better support these instructors. The question then, of what practices general education teachers are currently using with students with ED emerges. This question, along with how these practices align to teacher beliefs about their practices, guides the following study. Having an improved insight into teacher beliefs and practices can lead to better support for general education teachers so that they are able to provide higher-quality education and more positive outcomes for students with ED.
III. METHODOLOGY

The following study has two purposes. The first is to describe the classroom practices of middle school general education teachers working with students with emotional disturbance (ED). Specifically, this study examines whether teachers differ on rates of instructional and management practices when working with students both with and without ED, and whether the conditional probabilities for teacher practices are similar for both groups of students. Second, this study examines whether teacher beliefs about working with students with ED align with their instructional and management practices in the classroom.

This chapter includes a discussion of the research design, a description of the research setting and participants, participant selection procedures, data collection sources and tools, study procedures, and data preparation and analysis procedures used to explore these questions. The chapter also outlines the threats to validity and limitations associated with the study.

Research Design

Quantitative research. Quantitative research involves the construction of scientific tools and procedures, while controlling for as many variables as possible, to gather empirical evidence to support or refute a particular knowledge claim. It is rooted in a postpositivist paradigm and tends to fall into one of two categories, defined largely by how the data are used: descriptive studies which use data to describe a phenomenon of interest, and causal or correlational studies which use data to discern relationships between variables of interest (Mertens, 2005). Quantitative researchers are driven by a desire to gather data from a variety of relevant sources as evidence for a particular claim (Locke, Silverman, & Spirduso, 2004; Mertens, 2005).
Two methods of quantitative data collection were used in this study: direct observation (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997) and Likert survey. Direct observation was selected because the first tenet of this study is to describe teacher practices when working with students with and without ED in a naturalistic (i.e. classroom) setting. The major operational observation codes used for this study were drawn out of the existing body of literature about students with ED and their teachers. The use of survey was selected because the second tenet of this study is to describe teacher beliefs about their experiences with students with ED. Teacher beliefs, while frequently unarticulated, often guide teachers’ expectations about students’ behavior and their own decision-making around planning, instruction, and classroom practices (Pajares, 1992; Vartuli, 2005).

In this chapter, data collected from the teacher surveys is compared with their observed classroom practices. From this, a descriptive picture of the classroom practices used to support students with and without ED in the general education classroom, as well as the alignment between these practices and teacher beliefs, is presented.

**Setting and participants.** Seven junior high school general education teachers from two schools in a large, suburban Midwestern school district participated in this study. The school district serves roughly 14,000 students in grades K-12. Five of the district’s schools are junior high schools serving students in seventh and eighth grade. The average class size for junior high school students in this district is roughly 23 students per class. Just under half of all the district’s students are Caucasian, while Hispanic and Asian-American/Pacific Islander students comprise roughly 20% of the student population each. African-American students make up just over 6% of students (“Illinois Interactive Report Card,” 2011). Students with Individual Education Plans
(IEP) represent nearly 14% of the total student population, and 18% of students qualify for Free and Reduced Lunch (“Illinois Interactive Report Card,” 2011). The specific criteria for inclusion in each group follow and a participant criteria checklist can be found in Appendix A.

**General education teachers.** The seven participating teachers in this study were certified to teach through a Type 03 and/or Type 09 Illinois State Board of Education certificate. They were the teacher of record for and taught seventh and/or eighth grade students in one of the core subjects: math, language arts, or social studies. Table I provides demographic information for all participating teachers. Teachers provided education to at least one student classified as emotionally disturbed in their class.

### Table I

**Teacher Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Total Years Teaching</th>
<th>Total Years Teaching Students w/ED</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Subject Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>7th Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>8th Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>8th Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>7th Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>8th S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>7th S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>8th Literacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participating students. Two students in each class teacher’s class participated, one with and one without ED. As much as possible participating students were matched on the following criteria: gender, ethnicity, and age. This demographic information is provided in Table II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Disability Status</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age/Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>13/8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>13/8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>14/8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>14/8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>12/7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>12/7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>13/8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>13/8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>13/8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>13/8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>13/7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>13/7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>13/8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>13/8th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students with ED. In order to participate in this study, students with ED needed to be classified as having an emotional disturbance as their primary and only disability on their IEP. According to the federal definition, students who have been classified as ED must have demonstrated one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree, in ways that adversely affect the child’s educational performance:

- An inability to learn that cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors;
- An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers;
- Inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances;
- A general pervasive mood of anxiety or unhappiness or depression; or
- A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems. (IDEIA, 2004; 20 U.S.C.§ 1401 (3)(A)(i))

In order to participate in this study, students with ED needed to exhibit externalizing behaviors as indicated by scores at or above the borderline (BL) or clinical (CL) range on both the Rule-Breaking and Aggressive Behaviors syndrome scales of the Child Behavior Checklist-Teacher’s Report Form (TRF, Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). They also must also have scored within five percentile points of the borderline range of the Adaptive Functioning portion.

All seven participating students with ED met these criteria. Six of the students with ED were rated BL in at least one additional syndrome scale. Of those students, two were rated BL on two additional scales, two were rated BL on three scales, and one was rated BL on four additional scales. Six students with ED were rated as BL on the Anxiety scale. Furthermore, four students with ED were rated as CL in at least one additional syndrome scale, with two of those students being rated CL on two scales, all which can be found in Table III. On the Attention Problems scale four students with ED were rated as BL and one was rated CL.
TABLE III

Students with EDs’ Scores on the Child Behavior Checklist-Teacher Report Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Anxious</th>
<th>Withdrawn</th>
<th>Somatic Complaints</th>
<th>Social Problems</th>
<th>Thought Problems</th>
<th>Attention Problems</th>
<th>Rule-Breaking</th>
<th>Aggressive</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students without ED. In order to identify students without ED to participate in this study, teachers first sent consent forms home to 100% of parents. From those returned, teachers identified two “average” students in terms of academics and behavior, without disabilities, who matched the participating student with ED in terms of age, ethnicity, and gender. Student assent was then obtained and teachers completed the Child Behavior Checklist-Teacher’s Report Form (TRF, Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001) for those students to determine whether or not one of them would qualify to participate. To be eligible to participate, the student without ED must have scored within the normal (N) range on the overall Adaptive Functioning profile and on at least six of the eight Syndrome Scales. Students’ scores are shown below in Table IV.

All seven of the participating students without ED met these criteria. Of the participating students, four were rated in the normal range for all Syndrome Scales as well as in Adaptive Functioning. Three students were rated by their teacher as BL on a single scale each: Withdrawn/Depressed, Thought Problems, or Attention Problems. These data suggest that teachers were accurate in assessing each of these students as being “average” for behavior and academics for students without ED.
TABLE IV

Students without EDs’ Scores on the Child Behavior Checklist-Teachers’ Report Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katrina</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The classrooms.** Participating teachers were observed for three to five 40-minute observations over four weeks. All observations were conducted between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. While observations of each teacher’s classroom occurred on different days of the week across the study, they occurred during the same 40-minute window for each observation. For example, all of “Bill’s” observations occurred from 9:02-9:42 and all of “Diane’s” observations occurred from 10:13-10:53. Observations occurred during the spring semester.

The classrooms consisted of an average of 23 students (range = 13 to 31, \(SD = 5.5\)), which is consistent with the district average. Each classroom had some variation in student attendance across the study, but none by more than five. “Bill’s” class ranged between 29 and 31 while “Laura’s” ranged from 27 to 30. “Katie’s” class size ranged between 17 and 19, “Brad’s” class ranged between 23 and 26, and “Ethan” had between 24 and 28. The range of students in both “Liz” and “Janet’s” classrooms were between 13 and 18 students across observations.

An average of 46.9% of all students were male (range = 4 to 18, \(SD = 5.5\)) and an average of 43.7% of all students were of African-American, Asian-American, or Latino descent (range = 9.68% to 76.47%, \(SD = 18\%\)), as shown in Table V. Each class had no more than two students with ED, and classes had an average of 12.8% students with disabilities (range = 8.3% to 17.8%, \(SD = 2.3\%\)). For confidentiality purposes, none of the other students with disabilities were identified to the Primary Investigator (PI).

All classrooms were general education classrooms. Five of the seven classrooms included both general and special education teachers for at least one observation, and two classrooms included both teachers for 100% of observations, shown in Table V below. For the purposes of this study, only interactions between the general education teacher and target student
were included. In the event a special education teacher worked with one of the target students one-on-one or in a small group, this was coded as “other” instructional grouping.

**TABLE V**

*Class Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total number of classroom observations</th>
<th>Mean class size</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Non-Caucasian Students</th>
<th>Observations where co-teaching was present</th>
<th>Total students with ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recruitment Procedures**

Before undertaking any recruitment of participants or beginning research, approval for this study was obtained from the university Institutional Review Board, a copy of which can be found in Appendix E. Using criterion, convenience sampling of public (noncharter, nonmagnet) schools, administrators from junior high schools that included seventh and eighth grade classes
were identified by the district Special Education Director. These administrators were contacted by the PI via email and were provided an overview of the project and participation requirements. Initially, two principals indicated interest and a willingness to participate in the study. Both principals granted permission to the PI and recommended potential teacher participants who taught a core subject (math, science, social studies, or language arts). A third principal indicated interest after the study commenced. Because the study had already begun, this school was not included in the study. Once principals made teacher recommendations, the PI emailed each teacher a thorough description of the study and participation expectations. The initial email included a request to meet in person to further discuss participation and obtain teacher consent. Meetings were held in person with potential participants at each school to review the study procedures and obtain teacher consent. Eleven teachers from the two junior high schools provided consent to participate in the study. A copy of the IRB-approved teacher consent form can be found in Appendix F. Of those 11 teachers, two did not provide services to a student with ED and one was unsure whether or not the class included a student with ED. These three teachers were therefore unable to participate. In a fourth classroom, the student with ED was transferred out of the class before the study began and therefore could not participate. This left seven participating teachers and classrooms.

After providing consent, the seven remaining teachers were given a project overview and consent forms to send home with all of their students. A copy of the IRB-approved parental consent form can be found in Appendix G. Students were asked to return their signed parental consent forms within two weeks. In all classrooms, 100% of students returned their signed
paperwork regardless of whether or not their parent provided permission, within a week. For this high rate of return, the classes were each provided $50 for a school-approved incentive.

Families completed the consent forms and returned them to the teacher in an envelope, either marking the "yes" box to indicate consent or marking the "no" box to decline to participate. After all consent forms were returned, the teacher identified those consent forms checked "yes." Only if a student with ED in the classroom provided parental consent, and later student assent, could that teacher participate in the study. Of the seven participating classrooms, six had only one student with ED in their class, all of whom provided parental consent and student assent. In a single classroom there were two students identified with ED. In that classroom, only one of those students provided parental consent. The guardian of the second student with ED in that classroom declined to allow the student to participate.

Once teachers had determined that a student with ED in their class had provided parental consent, they identified two students that they considered to be an example of an “average” student in that same class, both academically and behaviorally, whose parents had provided consent. The PI then arranged a time with the teacher to obtain assent from students. A copy of the IRB-approved student assent form can be found in Appendix H. Once both consent and assent were provided and the teachers had identified a student with ED and two without ED that they deemed “average,” teachers completed the Child Behavior Checklist–Teacher Report Form (TRF, Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001) for each student. The purpose of using this tool was to ensure that all students with ED exhibited externalizing behaviors and to ensure that the students without ED could in fact, be considered “average” students. Teachers completed the TRF for their students with ED, all of whom met the criteria for inclusion in the study: scores above the
borderline clinical range on the *Rule-Breaking, Aggressive Behaviors, and Adaptive Functioning* components of the TRF. Teachers also completed the TRF for students without ED. In each class, one of the suggested “average” students met participation criteria for students without ED, scoring in the average range on the *Adaptive Functioning* and on six of the eight Syndrome Scales of the TRF. Each TRF took approximately 20-30 minutes for teachers to complete on their own time. The PI scored each copy of the TRF with only students' identification numbers on top. All TRF data entry was double-checked for accuracy.

All consenting teachers who participated throughout the entire study were given a professional text related to students with ED and a $150 gift card to purchase instructional materials for their classroom at the completion of the study.

**Materials**

**Surveys.** This study was designed to examine teachers’ beliefs about their students with ED and their personal preparedness, abilities, confidence, and use of specific strategies to effectively instruct this population, specifically around two domains: instruction and management. A single survey was selected for this study as a measure of what teachers believe, know, need, and are comfortable with as it pertains to instructional and management practices when supporting students with ED in the general education classroom.

*Questionnaire about teachers and challenging behavior.* The tool used for this study is adapted from the *Questionnaire About Teachers and Challenging Behaviors* (Westling, 2010). The questionnaire requires teachers to record their perspectives on seven dimensions related to working with students with challenging behavior across a range of disability classifications. In order to focus specifically on students with ED and to provide alignment with observed
practices, several substantial changes were made to the original questionnaire. These changes are explored in detail below.

The original form of this individually-administered pencil-paper questionnaire consists of eight sections and 48 Likert-scale questions pertaining to teacher beliefs, preparedness, confidence, strategies, collaboration, and the effects of challenging behavior on the classroom. The original tool and each of the changes made for this study are explored below.

The first section of the original questionnaire consists of six Likert questions regarding beliefs about challenging behavior. This is followed by a second section collecting demographic data from teachers. Among the demographic questions are those regarding teaching assignment, years of experience, education level, and licensure. Following demographics is a third section titled, Your Students and Their Behavior, which consists of two components. One asks teachers to provide the number of students across a variety of disability categories. The other component asks for the number of students who exhibit nine different challenging behaviors. Section four assesses teachers’ perceptions of their professional preparation around specific skills such as Applied Behavior Analysis and Functional Behavioral Assessment. The fifth section consists of four Likert questions regarding confidence in supporting students with challenging behaviors. Section six assesses beliefs about strategies teachers use for dealing with challenging behaviors. The seventh section explores the specific supports and collaboration available, such as support from paraeducators or administrators. The final section of the original tool, The Effects of Challenging Behavior on You and Your Students assessed teachers’ perceptions of the impact challenging behaviors had on their teaching practices and on students with and without
challenging behaviors in their classrooms. With the exception of the demographics section, each section uses a Likert scale to assess teacher perceptions and beliefs.

The adapted version of this questionnaire begins with a section on demographics. Unlike the original tool, questions about grade level and class type are removed as this information is already known for all participating teachers. The adapted tool consists of six demographic questions including years of experience teaching, years of experience with students with ED, licensure, and level of education. The second section of the revised questionnaire includes revisions to the original section, *Your Students and Their Behavior*. Instead of two distinct sections, questions of student behaviors are combined into a single section. Teachers use a Likert scale (5=always and 1=never) to rate the extent to which target students with and without ED engage in each of eight challenging behaviors taken from the original tool (“Illegal behavior” was removed). This section in the adapted questionnaire also asks teachers to rate students on nine additional positive classroom behaviors.

Section three of the revised tool combines the ten questions included in sections one and five of the original tool. These ten questions were reworded to speak specifically to supporting students with ED. The original Likert scale for both questions was unchanged, with 5=strongly agree and 1=strongly disagree. Section six of the original tool assesses beliefs about strategies used for dealing with challenging behaviors. These questions were divided into three discrete sections, and the questions were adapted to address the specific instructional, management strategies used by teachers in the adapted version. The final section of the original tool, *The Effects of Challenging Behavior on You and Your Students* is left unchanged. The fourth and
seventh sections of the original tool are not included in the adapted version. A copy of this adapted tool can be found in Appendix B.

Questions for the original tool were developed through a review of relevant literature pertaining to applied behavior analysis (ABA), positive behavior supports (PBS), and teacher attitudes toward students with challenging behaviors (Westling, 2010). Fifteen reviewers assessed the questions, and suggestions for change made by reviewers were made by the survey developer. With content validity established, the designer used a test-retest model to determine reliability. Cronbach’s alpha was then run on these data to establish internal consistency across the dimensions. All but four items showed levels of reliability at .7 or higher (Westling, 2010).

The adapted survey includes 45 Likert-scale questions, all of which aligned more closely with direct observation measures. To ensure appropriate alignment, two special education doctoral students, two special education teachers, and two district-level special education support personnel reviewed the questions and their alignment with the observation code. Based on their feedback, six questions were revised. A copy can be found in Appendix B.

**Child behavior checklist-teacher’s report form.** In order to assess student eligibility, the Child Behavior Checklist-Teacher’s Report Form (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001) was selected. The TRF consists of ten sections of demographic and background information, as well as a 113-item checklist that asks teachers to rate students on a variety of internalizing and externalizing behaviors and a total score. The TRF provides a student profile on eight syndromes, including aggressive, anxious/depressed, delinquent, and withdrawn behaviors, as well as social, thought and attention problems, and somatic complaints (Achenbach, 2001). Students are considered at risk for behavior problems if they score within the borderline clinical range or higher on one or
more scores, or on the total index score. This standardized, norm-referenced behavior rating scale is one of the most widely used tools in education when it is used in its entirety (Benner, Uhing, Pierce, Beaudoin, Ralston, and Mooney, 2009).

**Direct observation.** Teachers were observed over three to five sessions for 40 minutes each session. Direct observation, also referred to as naturalistic observation, allows researchers a unique ability to observe and collect accurate information around behaviors and processes as they occur in the real world as opposed to a laboratory setting. This method of observation relies on either systematic or nonsystematic data collection to gather information about how a behavior or event actually unfolds, as it unfolds, in real time (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997; Mertens, 2005). Systematic observation, used in this study, has a specific purpose, targets certain behaviors and individuals (i.e. students with and without ED), records behaviors methodically, and creates fewer reliability and validity challenges.

The *Behavioral and Environmental Assessment of Students and Teachers-Revised* (BEAST-R, Van Acker & Associates, 1998) provided a framework for developing codes about the two elements of classroom practice being studied here: the behavior management and instructional strategies used by general education teacher. The BEAST-R (found in Appendix C) was developed through extensive review of the existing literature on ED and provides guidelines for data collection around six sections. A brief description of each section follows below. The complete coding scheme can be found in Appendix D.

**Section I. General information.** The first section of the BEAST outlines basic information about the classroom, including number of students and staff, approximate room size, whether or not the class appears crowded, neat, or noisy, and other elements that may impact
students’ learning. Data are collected by the observer primarily through qualitative notes. Given the focus of this study, only data about the number of students and staff, as well as the racial composition of the class, were recorded at the start of each observation.

**Section II. Classroom rules and instructional style.** This section consists of two parts that capture data about management and instructional strategies used by the teacher. The first asks the observer a series of five yes or no questions about the presence of rules and consequences in the classroom, followed by space to record the rules and types of responses teachers may give when rules are broken. This checklist was not used for this study.

The management strategies selected from this study emerged from a review of the literature as well as consultations with an expert in the field of emotional disturbance. It has been widely documented that praise is a powerful strategy for managing and supporting students with ED (Sutherland, Alder & Gunter, 2003), making this a natural behavior to include in this study. However, research has also frequently shown that teachers do not use it at high enough rates (Anderson & Hendrickson, 2007). Therefore, multiple other teacher responses were operationalized to include in this study. Event codes were created for management behaviors, while duration codes were created for instructional behaviors. A brief description of each code is provided below, with further detail in Appendix D.

- **Verbal Praise for Classroom Behaviors (tP):** teacher gives target student positive verbal feedback in response to-or that specifies-a specific behavior.
- **No Feedback (tF):** teacher offers no audible response or feedback when target student responds correctly or incorrectly to an academic question.
- **Consequence (tC):** teacher gives a verbal or demonstrable consequence to a target student.
- Redirection (correcting behavior) (tB): teacher repeats the expectations or directions for the target student.
- Redirection (verbal reprimand) (td): teacher provides verbal command or request to the target student to desist/stop behavior.
- Desist (tD): teacher uses a physical desist to stop behavior.
- Question behavior (tq): teacher questions target student about his/her behavior.
- Warning of future consequence (tw): teacher provides verbal warning of future consequence if target student continues to engage in behavior.
- Time Out (tT): teacher moves target student’s seating away from peers.
- Removal from Class (tR): teacher asks student to leave the classroom or asks a support person to remove student from the classroom.

Similar to management practices, there is a plethora of instructional best practices from which to draw when designing a study. The current study was concerned with the format with which instruction was delivered to students. Seven major duration codes were developed to capture the different types of instructional formats used by the teacher. Those categories have been defined as follows:

- Whole Group Lecture (W): teacher is presenting academic or other content in front of the whole class.
- Small Group Lecture (S): teacher presents academic or other content in front of a subset of students that includes the target student.
- Peer Group Directed (G): target students are working collaboratively with other students, with minimal or no interaction with adults in the classroom.
• One-on-One (O): adult is working one-on-one with a target student.

• Independent Work (I): target student works alone on a task given by the teacher.

• No Task (U): teacher is not leading whole group lecture, small group lecture, or working one-on-one; students are not provided a task to work on independently or with peers.

• Other (H): any other instructional interactions not captured by one of the six listed above including instruction from a special education teacher.

Section III. Distribution of teacher attention. Event recording was used to collect frequency counts of the following teacher management and instructional behaviors:

• Verbal Praise for Academics (tA): teacher gives one of the target students positive verbal praise in response to or that specifies an academic behavior.

• Verbal Praise for Classroom Behavior (tP): see above.

• Academic Corrections (tK): teacher corrects the response given by the target student by either providing the correct answer or providing a prompt for the student.

• Expands (te): given an academic response from a target student, teacher asks another question, restates the student answer, or provides another non-evaluative response.

• Provides Answer (tf): given a question from the target student, teacher provides an answer.

• Desist (tD): see above.

• Consequence (tC): see above.

• Redirection (correcting behavior) (tB): see above.

• Redirection (verbal reprimand) (td): see above.

• Question behavior (tq): see above.

• No Feedback (tF): see above.
• Warning (tw): see above.

Codes for verbal praise for academics, academic corrections, and no feedback all correspond with the domain of instructional strategies, while praise for social behaviors, reprimand, consequence, redirection, and no feedback are codes that align back to teachers’ management strategies.

Section IV. Task engagement and academic participation. This section uses duration and event codes to collect data around task engagement, which aligns to management considerations, and types of academic participation, which align with teachers’ instructional practices. Task engagement is operationally defined to include four behaviors: On-task: Active, On-task: Passive, Off-task: Active, Off-task: Passive.

• On-task: Passive (sM): target student complies with seat expectations and it can be inferred that s/he is attending to a teacher-given instruction or instructional task.

• On-task: Active (sL): target student demonstrates overt motor or vocal behaviors related to the completion of a teacher-given task.

• Off-task: Passive (sZ): target student not actively engaged in completing or appropriately seeking out teacher support for a teacher-given task. Remains seated or non-disruptive to peers.

• Off-task: Active (sY): target student not actively engaged in completing or appropriately seek out teacher support for a teacher-given task. Gets out of seat and/or disrupts others.

In order to examine academic participation, the observer recorded each time one of the target students volunteered, was called on, called out, was correct, and/or received a consequence for his/her response and whether that consequence was positive, negative, or neutral. These
codes align back to specific questions about instructional and management questions on the teacher survey. The following definitions were used to determine which behaviors to code:

- **Volunteers (sV):** target student raises his/her hand to answer an academic question or to otherwise contribute to a class/group discussion.
- **Called on (sN):** target student is selected by the teacher to respond to an academic question or request regardless of whether or not s/he has volunteered.
- **Call Out (sX):** target student verbalizes, academic or social, without being called on or given permission by teacher.
- **Correction (tK):** see above.
- **Consequence (tC):** see above.
- **Verbal Praise for Academics (tA):** see above.

**Section V. Compliance to teacher requests.** This section was used to collect data on student compliance, within 7 seconds, to teacher requests. Using event recording, the code for the request was recorded each time the teacher made a request of the target student. The student behavior was recorded within 7 seconds of the teacher’s request as “complies” or “ignores”. The MOOSES program provided a timer that was used to keep this timing consistent. Teacher response to student behaviors was also recorded using the codes listed above.

**Section VI. Consequences for target behavior.** This section of the BEAST-R is intentionally left to the researcher’s discretion and allows data to be collected around up to four distinct target behaviors. There is a large body of literature speaking to the importance of developing social skills for students with ED (Sutherland et al., 2008); therefore, the target
behaviors considered in this study included different types of socialization among students. The four target behaviors considered are:

- **Positive Social Interactions with Peers (tp/sp):** appropriate verbal and physical expressions of friendship or affinity, including laughing together, praise, talking about the weekend or previous experiences together, handshakes, or high fives.
- **Positive Academic Interactions with Peers (ta/sa):** appropriate verbal and physical expressions related to learning.
- **Negative Social Interactions with Peers (tn/sn):** inappropriate verbal and physical actions between target student and another student.
- **Negative Academic Interactions with Peers (tb/sb):** inappropriate verbal and physical expressions related to learning.

Each social interaction was coded as either “target student initiated,” to indicate that the target student engages in an interaction without prompting from another student, or “peer initiated,” to indicate that the target student is responding to another student’s prompt.

As with rules and consequences, event recording was used to collect data on both target students. Similarly, teacher responses were coded. The coded behaviors align back to specific questions on the adapted *Questionnaire About Teachers and Challenging Behaviors.*

**Data Collection**

Data were collected throughout the duration of each 40-minute observation. Each observation was divided into four sessions of equal length. The researcher’s focus alternated between collecting data about the teacher’s interaction with the students with and without ED in each session. For example, in the first observation, the observer collected data in an A-B-A-B
pattern; the observation started with interactions between the teacher and student with ED (A) for the first 10-minute sessions then the teacher and student without ED (B) for the second 10-minute session and so on until the end of the observation. During the second observation, this order reversed (B-A-B-A), with the observer first collecting data on interactions between the teacher and student without ED (B) for 10-minutes and then the teacher and the student without ED (A) for 10-minutes and so on until the end of the 40-minute observation. The order in which students were observed rotated between an A-B-A-B and a B-A-B-A pattern throughout the duration of data collection.

Actual real-time data was entered into the Multiple Option Observation System for Experimental Studies (MOOSES) computer program (Tapp, Wehby, & Ellis, 1995). This software system allows for continuous, real-time, parallel-entry data collection around user-defined codes using a laptop computer program. The resulting data stream reflects how events occurred in relation to one another and the sequence in which they occurred. Each code is therefore attached to the second in time during which it was recorded. MOOSES allows for multiple analysis options, including descriptive statistics such as frequency and duration and more complex options such as sequential analysis. These calculations can be made as part of the software package, which combines all the necessary direct observation data collection and analysis components. Additionally, computer software programs like MOOSES have been shown to increase reliability and accessibility for data collection and analysis (Repp, Karsh, Van Acker, Felce, & Harman, 1989; Van Acker, Grant, & Getty, 1991). The MOOSES software provides a visual timer and optional audible cue throughout the observation.
The coding scheme and recording programs described above were piloted by the PI using 5 hours of classroom observation and video to ensure that the appropriate data was collected and analyzed.

**Procedures**

Participating teachers were each assigned a random four-digit identification number that appeared on top of each document produced for the teacher, including classroom observation data printouts. Students were assigned a three-digit code using the same numbers as their teacher, followed by an A if they were classified as ED and a B if they were considered a match student based on participant criteria. This code appeared on top of all documents pertaining to the student. Only one copy of the teacher’s and students’ name and their assigned numbers was kept during the study. It was stored separately from all other documents in a password-protect electronic file accessible only to the PI.

Teachers distributed parental consent forms to their entire class after they had themselves consented to participate. The teacher and PI arranged time to obtain student assent from potential student participants. Once parental consent and student assent were returned for the students, the teacher completed the *Child Behavior Checklist-Teacher’s Report Form* (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001) for each student who also met the participant inclusion criteria. Once it was determined that students met the eligibility criteria, the teacher and the PI set up three to five observations. When an observation took place during a co-taught lesson, this was noted in the observation notes and the observation continued on as scheduled. Only the actions of the general education teacher were recorded as part of that observation. If target students
worked with the special educator in a whole group, small group, or one-on-one setting, this was coded as “other.”

After at least one observation, teachers completed the modified Questionnaire About Teachers and Challenging Behaviors. Teachers were provided a hard copy of the adapted survey (Appendix B) and given at least one week to complete it independently. Once completed, teachers put the survey into a manila envelope with no identifying information and the folder was collected by the PI at the next scheduled observation. Data collected by the survey was entered and checked for accuracy in an ongoing fashion. One hundred percent of surveys were checked for accurate entry.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Data were collected using continuous, real-time, parallel-entry around naturalistic behavioral codes using a laptop computer program. The result was a stream of data that could be analyzed in a variety of ways. Three questions guided the design, implementation, and interpretation of data collected throughout this study. Data were therefore analyzed around these guiding questions, with basic descriptive data and lag sequential analysis run and reported.

**Question 1: Instructional practices.** Data were collected around thirteen event and duration instructional codes across 600 minutes of observation per student group. The data collected around these instructional practices are organized into four sections: opportunities to respond, teacher responses, instructional grouping, and sequential associations.

*Opportunities to respond.* Two event codes were utilized to record opportunities for students to respond: volunteer and called on. The rate at which students with and without ED volunteered and were called on was calculated for each group. The total number of times each
group participated in a given code was divided by 60 minutes to produce a rate per hour. Data for each code were then combined for both groups of students in order to calculate what percentage of total opportunities to volunteer or be called on each student group experienced.

**Academic Feedback.** Five event codes were used to record data about teacher responses to target students after they were called on by the teacher: praise, expands student answer, answers student question, academic correction, and no feedback. The rate per hour of each teacher response was calculated separately for students with and without ED and the percentages of total academic interactions across both student groups was also calculated and reported.

**Instructional groupings.** Six duration codes, whole group, small group, peer group, independent work, no task, and other, were used to capture the type and length of time students were engaged throughout the observations. Mean duration of each of instructional type across the entire study is reported for each group of students.

**Sequential associations: Instructional practices.** Conditional probabilities based on lag sequential analysis of observational data (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997) were determined for the relationships between a student participating (volunteering or being called on) and the various teacher responses listed above. Lag sequential analysis has been shown to be a promising tool for understanding classroom events that contribute to disruptive behavior and for understanding more complex classroom interactions (Gunter & Jack, 1993). This methodology offers a unique perspective into the relationship between specific behaviors that, while not denoting causation, can contribute to our understanding of how behavior is sequenced moment to moment, how behaviors relate to one another, and how behavior functions within an ongoing interaction (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997).
Sequential analysis is the process of examining the sequence of a specified set of behaviors within an observation session. Using this method, coded behaviors are recorded in real-time, producing a stream of data from which the conditional probability that one behavior is associated with a subsequent behavior can be calculated. That is, given a target behavior $B$, the conditional probability of an event $A$ preceding $B$ is greater than if by chance (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997; Yoder & Symons, 2010). The significance of the relationship can be computed by comparing expected frequencies to observed frequencies (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997). To accurately describe the sequential associations between teacher and student behaviors in this study, the following terminology from the MOOSES software program will be used: given behaviors and target behaviors. A given behavior is the central behavior being explored; a target behavior describes the behavior immediately prior to or following the given behavior, with no other codes recorded between or within a prescribed time frame (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997; Yoder & Feurer, 2000).

In order to assess sequential associations between behaviors, several methodological features must first be in place. First, all sequential analyses require that codes be captured through continuous data collection. Continuous data collection requires that a researcher observe a particular research setting without interruption. For the duration of the observation, the researcher is continuously ready to record the data of interest or when a specified time interval elapses (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997). The key to continuous data collection lies in the unbroken nature of observation and data recording and is best used when there is interest in the relationship between or the sequence of behaviors. Researchers observe continuously, waiting for specific
events to occur, and when those behaviors occur, the researchers record them in sequential order, allowing for analysis of the relationships between behaviors (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997).

Second, in order to be considered sequential, there must be continuity between coded units. To establish continuity, sequential analysis requires a mutually exclusive and exhaustive coding scheme. This demands that each behavior code must be specific to one behavior and that the behavior must fit into only that code. This prevents coders from having to record a behavior using two different codes or having to make a difficult, subjective call that one observer might consider “out of seat” and another might consider “in seat” and still a third recorder might consider both. Only one category should be appropriate for each observed behavior. The coding scheme must also be exhaustive. This means that there must be some code for every event. These features allow a researcher, interested in sequential associations, to record all relevant behaviors and study their relationship.

Once these elements are in place and data are collected, unique analyses can be applied to the data including descriptive statistical reports such as frequency, rates, mean, median, mode, and percentages. In addition, conditional or transitional probabilities can also be calculated (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997; Yoder & Symons, 2010).

For the purposes of this study, given and target behaviors had to occur consecutively, with no other coded behaviors occurring in between. For example, when exploring the probability that the teacher behavior redirect follows a student shout-out, shout-out would be the given behavior and redirect would be considered the target behavior. Since the goal is to determine how likely it is that this shout-out is followed by the behavior redirect, these two behaviors would need to occur shout out, redirect, with no other coded behaviors occurring in
between. The analysis, known as lag-1, calculates the probability that a redirect immediately follows a shout-out. In cases of forward analysis such as this example and the rest of the analysis considered in this study, the MOOSES program considers all target behaviors immediately preceding the given behavior.

To accurately compute sequential relationships, Bakeman and Gottman (1997) and Yoder and Feurer (2000) recommend organizing all behaviors into a contingency table. This table can be calculated directly from a stream of raw data capturing behaviors in a consecutive order as they occurred in the classroom during the observation. During data collection each behavior is captured as it occurs and is therefore attached to the second in which it was observed. Therefore, strings of behavior can be analyzed by how closely they occurred with one another and, when close enough and consecutive, how predictable it is that one behavior will follow another. It is critical that the behaviors either occur within a given time frame of one another, for example, five seconds, or immediately after one another. Behaviors that occur either too far apart or with intervening other behaviors would not qualify for analysis. The MOOSES program utilizes contingency tables to analyze sequential associations across observed behaviors.

To calculate sequential analysis across two behaviors, four possible pairings are considered. First is a yes-yes (YY) relationship. This indicates that the given and target behaviors occur consecutively. Second is a yes-no (YN) relationship, wherein the given target occurs but is followed by any other behavior. Third is a no-yes (NY) relationship, which indicates that the given behavior does not occur but the target behavior does. The behavior immediately preceding the given behavior can be any other coded behavior, and this pairing will count as a NY. Lastly is a no-no (NN) relationship. In cases of a NN, neither the given nor the
target behavior occurs; that is, how many times did any other combination of any other two nongiven and nontarget behaviors occur? Figure 1 below is a sample contingency table depicting the relationship between a student being called upon and then getting praise from the teacher as a response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior 1</th>
<th>Behavior 2</th>
<th>Academic Praise</th>
<th>Any other behavior</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Called on</td>
<td>YY</td>
<td>YN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other behavior</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1.* Contingency table used to tally behavior pairs for sequential association.

Once lag sequential associations have been determined, Yule’s Q is calculated to establish the likelihood that the pair of behaviors will occur. While there are currently no definitive rules guiding the behavior sample size needed for Yule’s Q, it is generally agreed that the more often a behavior occurs, the more reliable Yule’s Q is, particularly in relation to the total number of coded behavior and the lengths of observations (Yoder & Feurer, 2000). Initial research suggested that only pairs of given and target behaviors occurring at least five times could be interpreted (Yoder & Feurer, 2000). More recently, however, it has been generally agreed that 10 occasions is adequate when the coding scheme is small and the inter-observer
accuracy of the coding scheme is at 80% or higher (Yoder & Feurer, 2000). Despite the large coding scheme used by this study, inter-observer accuracy ranged from 84.2%-94.8% (M=89.3%). This high rate of inter-observer accuracy, coupled with a consultation with an expert in sequential analysis, provides justification for calculating Yule’s Q for any behavior pairs occurring together at least on at least 10 occasions.

To calculate Yule’s Q, the following formula is used:

\[
\frac{(YY) (NN) - (YN) (NY)}{(YY) (NN) + (YN) (NY)}
\]

Similar to correlations, Yule’s Q is reported on a scale of -1 (highly negative) to +1 (highly positive), with 0 representing an absence of relationship between the two variables.

**Question 2: Management practices.** Data were collected around twenty-five event and duration management codes. The data collected around these practices are organized into six sections: shout-outs, behavioral feedback, student responses to teacher requests, engagement, student interactions, and conditional probabilities. Similar to the instructional practices above, basic descriptive data is reported.

**Shout outs.** The rate of shout-outs are reported for students with and without ED separately, while percentages are reported for both groups combined. For example, of all observed shout-outs, what percent were exhibited by students with ED?

**Behavioral feedback.** Nine possible codes for teacher response to shout-outs were studied: praise, consequence, physical desist, verbal correction, verbal reprimand, questioning behavior, issues warning, time out, and removal from class. The rates of each teacher behavior, as well as the percent of total behavioral interactions, are reported for each student group.
**Student response to teacher requests.** There were two possible student responses to code: comply or ignore. Rate and percent of student responses are calculated for each group.

**Engagement.** Five types of engagement, on-task active, on-task passive, off-task active, off-task passive, and no task, could have been coded to capture the duration students were engaged throughout the observations. Mean duration is reported for each group of students.

**Student interactions.** There were nine duration codes developed to capture types of student-to-student interactions: positive academic, positive social, negative academic, negative social, and no interactions. Each of the codes could have been recorded as “target initiates” or “peer initiates.” Mean duration is reported for each group of students.

**Sequential associations: Management practices.** Similar to instructional practices, conditional probabilities based on lag sequential analysis of observational data (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997) will be determined for teacher responses to student shout outs, engagement, and student interactions, as well as student responses to teacher requests. Data are reported in terms of Yule’s Q (Yoder & Feurer, 2000).

**Question 3: Teacher beliefs.** There are five sections to the modified *Questionnaire About Teachers and Challenging Behaviors*. Mean and standard deviation are provided for compiled teacher responses for questions in all five sections. One section comparing responses for students with and without ED also includes independent t-test. Survey data is compared to rates, durations, and percentages of teacher and student collected through direct observations to explore any relationship that might exist.

**Interobserver agreement.** The co-observer for this study was a veteran special education teacher with a Ph.D. in special education. Along with the PI, this co-observer
concurrently but independently coded teacher and target students’ behavior for 23.3% of observations. Each teacher was co-observed at least once, spread across the duration of the study. The second observer was trained extensively before going into participant’s classrooms. Both observers memorized the behavioral codes and showed 90% accuracy in identifying the appropriate code when shown a flashcard containing the definition. To achieve this, each code’s definition was placed on a single note card, so that each definition had its own card, and there was a flashcard for each code. The co-observer was then asked to read the definition and identify which code it described with at least 90% accuracy over multiple trials. Once this level of accuracy had been obtained, the observer was given opportunities to apply the technology while viewing a series of 10-minute classroom videos concurrently with the PI. During this time PI modeled how to use the computer-based data collection tool and how to code classroom behaviors using video-tape. The observer was then asked to code classroom-based video-tape independently. Once 80% interobserver agreement between the observer and the PI was established on pre-selected videos, the observer was included on classroom observations. Interobserver agreement was assessed after each session.

Interobserver agreement was obtained using the total number of agreements, divided by the total number of agreements and disagreements, multiplied by 100% (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997; Kennedy, 2005). MOOSES software examined each code in the PI’s file and searched the second observer’s file for a code that matched, within lag-1. When a match was found, an agreement was coded; codes that did not match were counted as disagreements. An agreement ratio was produced for each code by dividing the agreements by the sum of agreements by the
sum of agreements plus disagreements. Kappa was also assessed using MOOSE. Interobserver agreement ranged from 84.2%-94.8% and averaged 89.3%.

**Threats to Validity**

There are classes of extraneous variables that might produce effects or changes in the dependent variable that confound the impacts of the study’s independent variables. These include history, maturation, testing, instrumentation, statistical regression, selection biases, experimental mortality, selection-maturation interaction, experimental treatment diffusion, compensatory rivalry, and compensatory equalization (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Mertens, 2005). Of these threats to internal validity, several applied to this study.

First, there was potential for effects from history; that is, events could have happened over the course of this study such as students transferring in and out, teacher changes, and other similar changes, that may have affected the behaviors observed in the classroom over the course of the study (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Mertens, 2005). However, this proved an unnecessary concern, as no students or teachers dropped out, moved, or otherwise withdrew from the study.

Closely related to history is participant maturation, particularly on the part of the students (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Mertens, 2005). This study occurred over four weeks. The emotional, biological, social, and psychological changes experienced by students were minimal. Additionally, maturation in students was partially controlled for by including two students, one with ED and one without ED, within 12 months of age in the same class. Both students would have experienced similar changes.

A third threat came from bias from differential selection (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Mertens, 2005). Participants for this study were selected based on very specific criteria and, for
the student participants, represented a low-incidence population relative to the entire student body. Based on the purposes of this study and the quasi-experimental design, however, this was determined to be an acceptable threat.

This study also was at risk of threat of environmental or observer effects (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Cresswell, 2008; Mertens, 2005) caused by the presence of one or more observers. The researcher, as a nonparticipant observer, may be perceived as an outsider and therefore participants may act or respond in ways they believe the researcher wanted to see or hear (Cresswell, 2008). Students also may have acted differently with visitors in the classroom. This was controlled for by having observers seated in the back of the room, with minimal disruption on entry and exit, and by transitioning at the beginning and end of class periods, and through the practice of repeated observations over time.

External validity refers to representativeness or the extent to which a study’s findings can be applied to another situation. Campbell and Stanley (1963) identified four factors jeopardizing external validity, including reactive or interaction effect, selection and experimental interactions, reactive effects, and multiple-treatment interference, to which Mertens (2005) adds six other, most of which are relevant only to true experimental design. Because of this study’s small sample size, the degree to which these results can be generalized to other situations is an inherent limitation.
IV. RESULTS

Three questions regarding the instructional and management strategies utilized by general education teachers in middle school literacy, social studies, and math classrooms guide this study. The questions being studied are as follows:

1. Do middle school general education teachers differ on rates of instructional practices such as opportunities to respond, academic feedback, and types of instruction for students with and without ED? Are the conditional probabilities for specific teacher instructional practices the same for students with and without ED?

2. Do middle school general education teachers differ on the rate at which they employ management strategies such as reinforcement, verbal redirection, and other consequences for students with and without ED? Are the conditional probabilities for specific teacher management behaviors the same for students with and without ED?

3. What do middle school general education teachers believe about working with students with ED? Do their beliefs align with observed instructional and management practices?

To answer these questions, this chapter is divided into three sections, each of which align to one of the study’s guiding questions and include group-level descriptive results.

**Question 1: Instructional Practices**

The first question framing this study has two components. First is whether middle school general education teachers differ on rates of instructional practices for students with and without ED. To answer this question, data were gathered on a specific set of instructional behaviors surrounding students’ opportunities to respond (volunteering and being called upon to respond), teachers’ responses, and types of instructional groupings using event recording and duration
codes. The results are broken into three sections, opportunities for students to respond, academic feedback, and instructional groupings. The second component of the initial questions examines whether the conditional probability for specific teacher instructional practices are the same for students with and without ED. Sequential analyses of teacher responses to student behaviors are also are reported in terms of Yule’s Q (Yoder & Feurer, 2000).

Over the course of 30 observations, equaling sixty 10-minute data collection sessions per student group, all instructional codes were recorded for one student with and one student without ED in each class. Their data are combined across all participating students and observations and the results are presented in this chapter.

**Opportunities to respond.** In exploring opportunities to respond, two student codes were considered: volunteers to respond and being called on. Of the total instances of volunteering compiled across both groups of students, students with ED comprised 32.1%. This is less than half as many times as students without ED, who volunteered the other 67.9%. Of the total instances where students with and without ED were called on by the teachers, students with ED were called on 43.4% and students without ED were called on 56.6%, which is shown below in Table VI. These percentages were calculated by dividing the total events for one group (students with ED, for example) by the combined total number of events for both students with and without ED. In addition to volunteering, students with ED were called on without raising their hands on 30 separate occasions and students without ED were called on 18 times without raising their hands.

Table VI also shows the rate at which target students with and without ED volunteered or were called on per hour.
Table VI

*Rate Per Hour and Percent of Total Opportunities to Respond Experienced by Students With and Without ED*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Practices</th>
<th>Students with ED</th>
<th>Students without ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student volunteers</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student is called on</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic feedback.** The first research question also explores whether teachers differ on their rates of various types of academic feedback for students with and without ED. Both groups of students were both most likely to receive no feedback, at a rate of 9.0 and 12.4 occurrences per hour. The least frequent responses for students with ED were praise for academics, which only occurred 1.0 times, and academic correction, which occurred at a rate of 1.2 per hour. Students without ED also experienced these two behaviors least, but in reverse order, with academic corrections happening at a rate of 0.8 and praise happening 1.4 times per hour, as shown in Table VII below.
Table VII

*Rates Per Hour of Instructional Feedback for Students With and Without ED*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Practices</th>
<th>Students with ED Rate</th>
<th>Students without ED Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praise for academics</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expands student response</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers student question</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides academic correction</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No feedback or response</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 compares the percentages of total academic interactions types experienced by students with and without ED with their teacher in the general education classroom. For students with ED the most frequent teacher responses were no feedback (43.9%), and answering the students’ question (30.7%). Teachers provided academic corrections for 5.9% and praise for academics on 4.9% of academic interactions with students with ED. As Figure 2 demonstrates, the most likely teacher behaviors for students without ED were to provide no feedback or response (56.6%) and answer a question (19.2%). Teachers were slightly more likely to praise academics for students without ED (6.4%) and slightly less likely to provide an academic correction (3.7%) than for students without ED.
Figure 2: Percent of different academic feedback experienced by students with and without ED.

**Instructional groupings.** Duration data were also recorded for types of instructional groupings occurring throughout observations. The different types of groupings included whole group, small group, one-on-one, independent work, or “other,” which captures time spent working one-on-one or in a small group with the special educator. Figure 3 represents the percentage of total observations per student group that each group of target students spent engaged in different types of instructional groupings. The two most frequent instructional grouping for both students with and without ED were independent and whole group. Students with ED were assigned independent work for 35.20% of total observations while students without ED were instructed via independent work for 33.03% of observations. Classrooms were structured for whole group instruction for 30.80% of observations for students with ED and slightly higher for students without ED, at 40.39% of total observations. Students with ED worked one-on-one with the general education teacher for 1.40%, and one-on-one or in a small group with the special education teacher, coded as “other,” for 1.50%. Students without ED
were never instructed one-on-one with the general education teacher and were instructed for 2.60% of observations by the special educator, which can be seen in Figure 3 below.

![Figure 3](image)

Figure 3: Percent of total observation time students with and without ED spent in different instructional groupings.

**Sequential associations: Instructional practices.** The second component of the first guiding question is whether the conditional probabilities for specific teacher instructional practices are the same for students with and without ED. Several combinations of instructional behaviors were considered for sequential association. First, this study explored how predictably teachers called on students who volunteered. Second, this study looks at the nature of the teacher’s response after a student is called on to share. Lag sequential analysis was run for compiled data for students with and without ED. Only those behaviors with at least ten occurrences were included in final analysis and reporting.
Table VIII captures the sequential association between the target behavior student volunteers and the given behaviors reflecting various teacher responses. When students with ED volunteered to share, being called on was not a predictable response. For students without ED, being called was a predictable response, and it had a relatively high relationship (0.81).

After students were called on, sequential associations for several teacher response behaviors emerged. For students with ED, three out of five teacher behaviors had a sequential association, though only having their answer expanded upon by the teacher (0.97) had a strong sequential association. There was no relationship between either correcting or praising answers for students with ED. For students without ED the strongest relationship was also having their answer expanded upon (0.98). However, two other behaviors also had strong associations: being praised for their academics (0.95), followed closely by having their question answered (0.92). Once again, being given an academic correction had no relationship at all.

Table VIII

*Lag Sequential Analysis of Teacher Responses to Students Volunteering or Being Called Upon*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students Without ED</th>
<th>Students with ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Called On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise for academics</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expands Answer</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers Question</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Correction</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Feedback/Response</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2: Management Practices

The second question guiding this study is whether this same group of middle school general education teachers differs on the rate at which they employ management strategies such as reinforcement, verbal redirection, and other consequences for students with and without ED. Basic descriptive analyses were run to provide rate per hour and percentage of total interactions for each teacher and student behavior coded via event recording. Duration codes were used to collect data for time target students spent on-task active, on-task passive, off-task active, and off-task passive as well as on- and off-task and socialization codes. Lag sequential analysis were also run on a subset of teacher and student behaviors. Because of the large number of codes and behaviors explored in this section, the codes were broken into five categories: student shout outs, behavioral feedback, student responses to teacher requests, student engagement, and student interactions.

Student shout outs. Shout outs are defined as students verbalizing without being called on by the teacher. Because this captures students verbalizing without teacher permission, all shout outs, both academic-based and non-academic are analyzed under the category of management. That is, a shout out was coded both if a student provided an answer without raising their hand and if the student spoke out with non-related content without permission, despite the fact that academic-based shout outs may in fact be considered a positive behavior by some teachers. Students with ED shouted out 20.8 times per hour or 72.7% of all shout outs recorded, shown in Figure 4. This is two and a half times higher than students without ED, who accounted for 27.3% of all classroom shout outs and engaged in 7.8 shout outs per hour.
Behavioral feedback. All but two teacher behavioral interactions, issues a warning and time out, were observed throughout the course of all observations. Table IX explores the percent of total behavioral interactions, positive and negative, experienced by students with and without ED for each coded behavior. Students with ED accounted for 90.9% of all coded redirections (for both students with and without ED). Of the total behavioral interactions students with ED had with the teacher, 94.8% were redirections. In terms of redirections, students with ED were most likely to be redirected through corrections, which accounted for 50.0% of all behavioral interactions. This was followed by redirecting through reprimand, which accounted for 24.1% of all students with EDs’ behavioral interactions, followed by questioning behavior (12.9%), and issuing a consequence (5.2%). Teachers did not issue any explicit warnings or time outs for any students with ED. Praise accounted for 5.2% of behavioral interactions for students with ED.

When working with students without ED, teachers responded with verbal reprimand more often than any other management behavior (46.7%). They were next most likely to respond via praise (26.7%) and redirect by correcting (20.0%). Teachers did not issue consequences, question behavior, issue warnings or time outs, or remove students without ED from the class.
Table IX

*Percent of Total Behavioral Feedback and Rate of Teacher Use Per Hour*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Practices</th>
<th>Student with ED</th>
<th>Students without ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise for behavior</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues consequence</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical desist</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirects by correcting behavior</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirects by reprimand</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions behavior</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues warning</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time out</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removes student</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student responses to teacher requests.** Teacher requests were spread almost evenly between the two groups of students, with students with ED given 49.4% of requests and students without ED given 50.6%. Table X shows the rate at which teachers made requests, as well as student responses per hour.
Table X

Rate of Teacher Requests and Student Responses Per Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Practices</th>
<th>Student with ED Rate</th>
<th>Students without ED Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher makes behavioral request</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student complies with request</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ignores teacher request</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 examines the responses of each group of target students. For example, students without ED responded to 96.7% of the total teacher requests made of them by complying. This is almost twice as high a rate of compliance than students with ED who complied with 48.9% of the total teacher requests made of them. Students with ED ignored teachers’ requests 51.1% of the time, which is just slightly more than they complied. Students without ED ignored teacher requests 3.3% of the time.

Figure 5: Percent of students with and without EDs’ responses to teacher requests.
**Student engagement.** Students with ED spent a total of 48.8% on-task, with 31.0% of their time in class spent being actively engaged, meaning they demonstrated overt motor and/or vocal behavior directly related to the completion of an assigned task. The other 17.8% of time spent on task was engaged in passive activities from which it can be inferred, from body language and other behaviors such as eyes on the teacher, that the student is engaged with or attending to the instruction. In total, this represents 293 minutes of instruction that were spent on task for students with ED. As Figure 6 shows, the remaining 51.2% instructional time for students with ED was broken down in the following manner: actively off-task (14.8%), passively off-task (27.2%), or with no assigned task (9.2).

Students without ED spent 78.3% on-task, for a total of 469 minutes. This is 176 additional minutes that this population was engaged in instructional activities over their peers with ED. Of that time, 55% were spent actively engaged in assigned tasks. The remaining engaged time, 23.3%, was spent passively engaged. Students without ED were off task or without a task for 21.7% of observed time.

*Figure 6:* Percent of total observation time students with and without ED spent engaged.
Student interactions. The final student behaviors being examined by the second research question involves peer-to-peer interactions. Student interactions were coded via nine duration codes, four representing behaviors initiated by the target student, four representing behaviors involving the target student but initiated by a peer, and one indicating there were no interactions. The breakdown of the percent of total interactions for students with and without ED that were spent engaged in each peer interaction can be found in Table XI.

Students with and without ED were most likely to have no social interactions during observations, at 84.4% and 86.5% of total observations respectively. Of their peer interactions, students with ED’s were positive for 9.5% of observations. Students with ED initiated positive interactions in 6.4% of observations and had peers make positive initiations in a total of 3.1%. These positive interactions were more social in nature (6.4%) than academic (3.1%). Students without ED engaged in positive interactions 11.3% of the observed time, initiating positive interactions for 5.8% of observations, and having a peer initiate positive interactions 5.4%. These interactions were slightly more social in nature (12.8%) than academic-based (4.2%).

Students with ED engaged in negative interactions for 6.1% of all observed time. These interactions were more likely to be social in nature (5.9%) and initiated by the target students themselves (3.4%) compared to 0.3% being academic in nature and 2.7% initiated by peers. Students without ED showed similar patterns, with more negative interactions being self-initiated (1.3%) and social in nature (1.8%), compared with 0.5% being academic and 0.9% being initiated by peers. However, as these numbers show, students with ED spent more than twice as much time engaged in negative interactions than students without.
Table XI

*Average Percent of Total Observations Students With and Without ED Spent In Peer Interactions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Interactions</th>
<th>Student with ED Percent of Total Observations</th>
<th>Students without ED Percent of Total Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiates Positive Academic Interactions</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates Positive Social Interactions</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates Negative Academic Interactions</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates Negative Social Interactions</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Initiated Positive Academic Interaction</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Initiated Positive Social Interaction</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Initiated Negative Academic Interactions</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Initiated Negative Social Interactions</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sequential associations: Management practices.** The second tenet of the question of teacher management behaviors is whether or not the conditional probability for specific practices is the same for students with and without ED. Similar to the calculation of instructional behaviors, lag-1 probabilities were run for teacher behaviors in response to student shout outs, on-task behavior, off-task behavior, and types of interactions. However, no combinations of teacher response to on/off–task or interactions yielded enough occurrences to analyze. Only data from teacher response to shout out and student responses to teacher request is reported here.

**Teacher response to shout outs.** When students with ED shouted out they were most likely to be met with an answered question (0.97) or no feedback (0.92), as shown in Table XII. Being told to stop via redirect (0.78) and having shout outs expanded upon by the teacher (0.73)
were the next most likely teacher responses. Physical desist, removal from class, warning, time out, having behavior questioned, and receiving a consequence or academic correction did not occur at rates high enough for analysis. For students without ED, only having questions answered (0.95) or receiving no feedback (0.87) were predictable teacher behaviors.

Table XII

*Lag Sequential Analysis of Teacher Responses to Student Shout outs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students with ED Shout outs</th>
<th>Students without ED Shout outs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Desist</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct via Redirect</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirect (reprimand)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Behavior</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal From Class</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Out</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Feedback/Response</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expands</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers Question</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Correction</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student response to teacher request.** In regards to teacher requests, students with and without ED were equally as likely to respond by complying to the teacher request (0.99) and had similarly low levels of ignoring to not qualify for analysis.

Further analysis was run on teacher response to student compliance, looking at how often this was followed by teacher praise. However, only no feedback occurred at rates high enough for analysis, and the relationship between student compliance and no feedback was similarly high for students with ED (0.98) and students without ED (0.95).

**Question 3: Teacher Beliefs and Practices**

Teacher beliefs and their alignment back to classroom practice is the focus of the final question explored in this study. A survey adapted from Westling’s (2010) *Questionnaire about Teachers and Students with Challenging Behaviors* was selected to answer this question.

**Specific behaviors exhibited by students with and without ED.** Teachers were provided an opportunity to rate how frequently target students with and without ED engaged in 15 behaviors using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1=never agree to 5=always agree. As shown in Table XIII, which presents mean and standard deviations for teacher survey responses, teachers perceived that students without ED completed significantly more in-class ($M=4.71$, $SD=0.49$) and homework ($M=4.57$, $SD=0.78$) than their peers with ED, who had lower ratings for both in-class work ($M=2.71$, $SD=1.3$) and homework ($M=2.86$, $SD=1.2$). They also perceived students without ED as working better with ($M=4.57$, $SD=0.54$) and talking respectively to peers ($M=4.57$, $SD=0.79$), following directions ($M=4.57$, $SD=0.54$), and solving conflict appropriately ($M=4.29$, $SD=0.95$) at significantly higher rates than students identified as having ED. The means and standard deviations of teacher reports can be found in full in Table
XIII. Teachers also reported that students with ED were significantly more likely to engage in socially inappropriate behaviors ($M=3.14$, $SD=0.9$), withdraw socially ($M=3.29$, $SD=1.25$), and be disruptive ($M=3.29$, $SD=1.25$), destructive ($M=2.0$, $SD=0.58$), and defiant and non-compliant ($M=2.86$, $SD=1.07$).

Teachers reported that students with ED engaged most frequently in respectful talk to adults ($M=3.86$, $SD=0.9$) and peers ($M=3.57$, $SD=0.79$). Students with ED were perceived as engaging least in physically aggressive ($M=1.57$, $SD=0.79$) and self-injurious behavior ($M=1.14$, $SD=0.38$). Students without ED’s most infrequent behaviors were those classified as negative, and include self-injurious ($M=1.0$, $SD=0.0$), disruptive and destructive ($M=1.29$, $SD=0.49$), verbal aggression ($M=1.43$, $SD=0.79$), socially withdrawn ($M=1.71$, $SD=0.95$), disruption ($M=1.86$, $SD=0.69$), and socially inappropriate behaviors ($M=1.86$, $SD=0.9$).
Table XIII

*Mean Score of Teacher Perceptions of Specific Behaviors Exhibited by Students With and Without ED*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Students with ED</th>
<th>Students Without ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes in-class work</td>
<td>2.71**</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes HW</td>
<td>2.86**</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works well with peers</td>
<td>2.43**</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows directions</td>
<td>2.86**</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks respectfully to adults</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks respectfully to peers</td>
<td>3.57*</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solves conflicts appropriately</td>
<td>2.71**</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant and non-compliant</td>
<td>2.86**</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption</td>
<td>3.29*</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Aggressive</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Injurious</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Withdrawal</td>
<td>3.29*</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially inappropriate behavior</td>
<td>3.14*</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal aggression</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p<.05, **p<.01; Likert scale is based on 5=always, 4=most of the time, 3=sometimes, 2=rarely, 1=never.*
Teacher beliefs about working with students with ED. The second section of the questionnaire uses a 5-point Likert scale from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

Teachers unanimously agreed that it was very important to reach students with ED academically ($M=5.0$, $SD=0.00$) and were highly likely to agree that it is important to teach behavior to students with ED ($M=4.71$, $SD=0.47$) as shown in Table XIV. When asked about sources of challenging behavior, teachers were most likely to agree that they originate in the home or community ($M=4.57$, $SD=0.51$), are due to medical or physical reasons ($M=3.71$, $SD=0.47$), or to come from a student’s personality ($M=4.29$, $SD=0.73$) or disability ($M=4.29$, $SD=0.73$). They were least likely to agree that challenging behaviors are learned, though they still had a high overall rate of agreement with this statement ($M=4.14$, $SD=0.86$).

When rating their levels of preparedness and skill, teachers agreed most strongly that their abilities had improved since teaching ($M=4.29$, $SD=0.73$). They felt less agreement when asked if they had sufficient knowledge and skills to work with this population ($M=3.57$, $SD=0.76$) or adequate pre- and in-service training ($M=2.29$, $SD=1.07$; $M=3.0$, $SD=1.36$). These scores had higher standard deviations indicating a higher range of scores across teachers.
Table XIV

*Mean Teacher Beliefs About Working With Students with ED*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most challenging behaviors can be improved.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had adequate pre-service professional training to deal with students with ED.</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had adequate in-service professional training to deal with students with ED.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since I have been teaching, I have increased my ability to deal with students with ED.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this time, I have sufficient knowledge and skills to work successfully with students with ED.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some challenging behaviors are due to the student’s personality.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some challenging behaviors are due to a medical or physical reason.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some challenging behaviors are due to a student’s disability.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some challenging behaviors originate in the home or community.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some challenging behaviors are learned.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to teach behavior to students with ED.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with ED should be managed differently than their non-disabled peers.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for me to reach students with ED academically.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Likert scale is based on 5=I strongly agree, 4=I agree, 3=I do not agree or disagree, 2=I disagree, 1=I strongly disagree.
Beliefs about the effects of challenging behavior on self and other students. Teachers were most likely to agree that students with challenging behavior learn less because of their challenging behaviors ($M=3.86$, $SD=0.66$), shown in Table XV. Teachers also believed more strongly that they had the tools to successfully support students with challenging behaviors ($M=3.29$, $SD=0.91$) and that challenging behaviors increased their levels of stress ($M=3.29$, $SD=1.07$). Teachers showed lowest levels of agreement in response to statements that students’ challenging behavior did not disrupt the learning of others ($M=1.71$, $SD=1.07$) or take up significant amounts of time ($M=2.29$, $SD=0.73$) indicating that teachers do in fact believe challenging behavior negatively impacts other’s learning as well as teachers’ time distribution.

Table XV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Teacher Beliefs About the Effects of Challenging Behavior on Self and Other Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging behaviors do not disrupt other students’ learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the tools I need to effectively address challenging behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging behavior does not take up a significant amount of my time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging behaviors increase my level of stress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging behaviors do not impact my effectiveness as a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student with challenging behavior learns less because of his/her behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Likert scale is based on 5=I strongly agree, 4=I agree, 3=I do not agree or disagree, 2=I disagree, 1=I strongly disagree.
**Instructional practices.** Teachers responded to several questions about their perceptions of types of instructional practices they utilized in their classrooms using a 5-point Likert scale from 1=never to 5=very often found in Table XVI. Teachers reported that they used the following instructional groupings most frequently when working with students with ED: whole group (\(M=4.42, SD=0.51\)), independent work (\(M=4.00, SD=1.11\)) and small group instruction led by the teacher (\(M=3.86, SD=1.17\)). Teachers showed high levels of agreement that provided a variety of opportunities for students with ED to respond (\(M=4.57, SD=0.51\)) and that they praised appropriate responses (\(M=4.86, SD=0.36\)).

Table XVI

*Mean Teacher Rating of Current Instructional Strategies Used When Working with Students with ED*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I emphasize whole group instruction.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I emphasize small group instruction led by the teacher.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I emphasize peer groups.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I emphasize independent seat work.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I emphasize one-on-one support from a teacher.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use praise to reinforce correct answers.</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide a variety of opportunities for students with ED to respond in class.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Likert scale is based on 5= Very often, 4= Often, 3= Sometimes, 2=Rarely, 1= Never
Management practices. Teachers also responded to several questions about their perceptions of types of management practices they utilized in their classrooms. Once again, their responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale of 1=never to 5=very often. Teachers reported frequently using positive reinforcement of behaviors that followed classroom rules (M=4.43, SD=0.51). In response to challenging behaviors, teacher reported using the following responses: verbal reprimand (M=3.44, SD=0.94), ignoring (M=2.43, SD=0.51), sending students to the office (M=2.14, SD=1.03) and time out (M=1.57, SD=0.51). They also reported high rates of consistent use of consequences across all students (M=3.57, SD=1.09), shown in Table XVII.

Table XVII

Mean Teacher Rating of Current Classroom Management Strategies Used When Working With Students with ED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I positively reinforce behaviors that follow my class rules.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When challenging behavior occurs, I ignore it.</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When challenging behavior occurs, I place the student in time out.</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When challenging behavior occurs, I verbally reprimand the student.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When challenging behavior occurs I send the student to the office.</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When challenging behavior occurs I am consistent in my use of my class consequences for all students.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Likert scale is based on 5= Very often, 4= Often, 3= Sometimes, 2=Rarely, 1= Never
Summary of Findings

Data collected through direct observation reveal much about the experiences of students with and without ED in the general education classrooms. Similarities and differences in educational experiences emerged from these observations, as well as trends in both student and teacher behaviors. These patterns and trends will be explored in relation to teachers’ beliefs and experiences, which were collected via survey, in the following chapter. All students, regardless of their disability status were provided different opportunities to respond in a variety of instructional groupings. They all interacted with teachers positively, negatively, and in relation to both academics and behavior. However, students behaved differently, with students with ED engaging in more shout outs and more off-task behaviors than their non-disabled peers, and complying with teacher requests less frequently, which in turn led to different teacher behaviors and different levels of predictability for teacher responses. These similarities and difference, as well as the implications of these patterns and the relationship between teacher beliefs and behaviors, are explored in more detail in the following chapter.
V. DISCUSSION

Students with emotional disturbance (ED) often face significant social, emotional, and academic challenges (Lane et al., 2006; Nelson et al., 2004). Based on their challenges, students who are diagnosed with ED are at risk for more negative outcomes than their peers both with and without disability (Carter & Lundsford, 2005; Goodman et al., 2011; Mihalas et al., 2009). Because of this, teachers supporting students with ED must be specially prepared to address multiple learning, behavioral, and social needs. Unfortunately, there is a substantial body of literature that suggests teachers, especially general education teachers, report feeling underprepared, under-supported, anxious and lacking in confidence to effectively support students with ED (Cook, 2001; Lohrman & Bambara, 2006; Scruggs et al., 2011). Research also suggests that teachers are not using identified best practices for supporting this population of students (Landrum et al., 2003).

With the call for educating students to the “maximum extent appropriate,” in the general education setting, more and more teachers are being called upon to support students with ED (The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act 2004, (IDEIA), 20 U.S.C. §1401(3)(A)(i)). There is a growing body of literature indicating that inclusion promotes more social interactions across a broader range of activities and settings as well as increased exposure to content (Fitch, 2003; Kennedy et al., 1997; Koch & Robertson, 2003). Given the diverse needs of students with ED, however, it is not always clear that general education teachers have the appropriate training, resources and supports to effectively instruct this population of students.

In 2006, using survey data from the Special Education Longitudinal Study (SEELS) and National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2), Wagner, Friend, Bursuck, Kutash,
Duchnowski, Sumi, & Epstein, found that school stakeholders reported the instructional experiences of students with ED in the general education classroom to be mostly similar to their non-ED counterparts. The results from classroom observations and surveys collected in the present study support the work of Wagner et al. (2006) in several ways. For example, students with and without ED experienced similar rates of opportunities to respond, instructional grouping, and low levels of teacher responses. Where teacher behavior was different for students with and without ED, including rates of praise, use of corrective actions, and predictability of feedback, the patterns that emerged were mostly consistent with existing research: teachers used low levels of praise, were more likely to have negative interactions with students with ED, and had unpredictable feedback for students (Van Acker, Grant, & Henry, 1996; Wehby, Symons, & Shores, 1995). These findings reveal important implications for the future of the field of emotional disturbance, including that for all students, what research has shown to be successful in general education classrooms is not being effectively implemented.

**Question 1: Instructional Practices**

**Opportunities to respond.** Among the practices recommended for students with ED are opportunities to respond (George, 2010; Landrum et al., 2003). Teachers who design and implement instruction that calls for high levels of correct, on-level academic responses have seen improvements in several critical student behaviors and outcomes. Among the benefits for students with ED are increased academic engagement, a reduction of instances of inappropriate behavior, greater accuracy on task, and more correct answers (Lewis, Hudson, Richter, & Johnson, 2004; Sutherland et al., 2003; Skinner, Belfore, Mace, Williams-Wilson, & Johns, 1997). Opportunities to respond also provide teachers with data about student progress and can
be used to inform teachers’ future instruction, and are therefore an important practice for supporting students with ED in any instructional setting.

Students without ED included in this study volunteered to respond at a rate that was twice as high as students with ED. And yet, teachers called on students with ED enough to close this gap by half, calling on students with ED only one quarter less often than students without ED. This indicates that teachers called on both groups of students without them volunteering, and in fact, did so enough for students with ED that they were provided nearly as many opportunities to respond as students without ED. This is markedly different from previous research showing that students at-risk for ED were called on at much lower rates than their lower-risk peers (Van Acker, et al, 1996).

Despite increasing both groups’ opportunities to respond by calling on students who both had and had not volunteered, both students with and without ED were provided opportunities to respond at rates far below the recommended rate of once every three minute interval. This is the rate that research indicates is needed to reduce challenging behaviors (Shores, Jack, Gunter, Ellis, DeBriere, & Wehby, 1993). The Council for Exceptional Children recommends eliciting 4 to 12 responses per minute from students with high incidence disabilities during the introduction of new material or independent practice (CEC, 1987). The findings from the present study are similar to previous research looking at teacher practices for all students in general education classrooms, which found that rates of opportunities to respond were below those recommended in the literature (Gunter, Reffel, Barnett, Lee, & Patrick, 2004). Research into the use of opportunities to respond for students with ED specifically also shows rates below the recommended levels (Sutherland et al., 2003; Sutherland & Wehby, 2001).
Increasing the frequency in which students in this study were given opportunities to actively respond to academic questions could possibly decrease some of the off-task behaviors that were observed, while also increasing more appropriate classroom behaviors (Lewis et al., 2004; Sutherland et al., 2003). Increasing the number of opportunities to respond may also contribute to the quality of teacher-student interactions (Wehby et al., 1995). Improved relationships have been shown to correlate to further improved social and academic successes (Hamre & Pianta, 2001; Murray & Greenberg, 2000).

**Academic feedback.** Research has frequently found that students with ED experience more negative interactions with their teachers than their typically developing peers, as well as in relation to their positive teacher interactions (Kennedy & Jolivett, 2008; Van Acker & Grant, 1995). Much of the research around the powerful impact of positive interactions such as praise and positive reinforcement has centered on behavior. However, there is some evidence that supportive teacher feedback such as positive verbal responses are associated with gains in student achievement and engagement (Heward, 2003).

Teacher reactions to students’ opportunities to respond during this study revealed some unique patterns for students with and without ED. For both groups of students, the most likely teacher response was no feedback, which represented a slight majority of academic interactions for students without ED and a substantial minority for students with ED. Students with and without ED were unlikely to receive meaningful academic feedback that reinforced, elaborated, or corrected their responses. Teacher feedback is an important and powerful lever for student engagement and achievement and, like opportunities to respond, has the potential to impact
student-teacher relationships and a sense of belonging in the classroom (Kennedy & Jolivett, 2008; Shores et al., 1993) and it appeared at low levels for both groups of students.

The next most likely teacher response for both student groups was to have questions answered, though this occurred more frequently for students without ED. Having questions answered can be a form of academic feedback and therefore has the potential to check for and improve understanding as well as help clarify misconceptions.

Interestingly, the least likely teacher responses for each student group were academic correction and praise. Praise, frequently demonstrated to be an important part of a teacher’s repertoire (Kennedy & Jolivett, 2008), was the least likely academic response for students with ED, and the second least likely for students without, followed only by academic corrections. For students with ED, academic praise occurred slightly less than academic corrections. While praise and academic correction were the least likely teacher interactions for students with and without ED, it is interesting to note that students without ED were slightly more likely to have their answers praised and slightly less likely to receive academic correction than students without ED. This is consistent with the large body of literature showing that students with ED are more likely to engage in negative interactions rather than positive (Van Acker et al., 1996; Shores et al., 1993). The present research is consistent with previous findings, but also suggests that low rates of praise are not specific to students with ED but to all students.

**Sequential associations: Instructional practices.** In terms of the predictability of teacher responses to students volunteering, no teacher behaviors were predictable for students with ED, including being called on. After they were called on, two positive interactions (expands answer and answers question) and a single negative or neutral interaction (no feedback)
were predictable responses for students with ED. Of those teacher responses, only expands answer were high enough to consider strong. Predictable responses to a behavior can be an important lever for either increasing or decreasing the occurrence of a given behavior. For students with ED, responses to volunteering were unpredictable, which may impact their willingness to volunteer.

For students without ED, this looked drastically different. When they volunteered, being called upon was a predictable teacher response. This suggests that students without ED can rely on being called upon to share when they volunteer, while students with ED cannot. This may lead students with ED to opt out of volunteering if they believe it to be a fruitless endeavor. Students without ED could rely on having their answer expanded, receive academic praise, and have their questions answered. All had highly predictable teacher responses with Q scores being above 0.90 and may be considered positive interactions. From this data, it appears that students without ED could predictably receive positive teacher responses for volunteering and sharing out, which can increase both behaviors as students strive for teacher acknowledgement.

**Instructional groupings.** Research suggests, and the participating teachers in this study agree, that students with ED present significantly different academic, behavior, and social needs than typically developing peers and peers with other disabilities (Landrum et al., 2003; Lane et al., 2006). Among the recommendations for how to differentiate support are small group instruction, one-on-one teaching, and additional supports from related service providers and special educators (Logan & Malone, 1998). Despite these documented differences, the data collected in this study highlight similar instructional groupings and activity design for both groups of students.
Students with and without ED spent the majority of their instructional time engaged in whole group lessons and independent work. Students without ED spent slightly more time engaged in whole group instruction compared to their peers with ED, but slightly less in independent work. For both groups, these were the most common instructional groupings. This is consistent with teachers’ self-report, which indicated that they believed they were used these two strategies most frequently, despite the fact that research offers other best practices, and despite the presence of a second teacher for many of the observed periods.

Of the recommended practices, students with ED spent more time in small group than students without ED, though for both students this grouping was utilized far less often than either whole group or independent work. Peer grouping, which has shown some promising results for students with ED (Cartledge & Johnson, 1996) also occurred less frequently for both students with and without ED. Neither group of students spent much time one-on-one with the general education teacher or being instructed by the special educator in any form.

**Question 2: Management Practices**

**Student behaviors.** Teachers frequently express concern about working with students with ED (Scruggs et al., 2011) and these students frequently exhibit difficult to manage behaviors (Woolfolk, 2007). Participating students with ED in this study were almost twice as likely to be off-task than their non-disabled peers, spending a slight majority of instruction off-task active, passive, or without a given task, compared to less than a quarter of instructional time off-task for students without. Keeping students engaged contributes to increased achievement and reductions in disruptive behavior (Lewis, et al, 2004). Data from this study shows that students with ED lost out on over 40% of instructional time to off-task behavior. This is twice as
much as students without ED, who lost just over 20% of instructional time. Students with ED in this study were also half as likely to comply as their non-disabled peers to ignore teacher requests and were just slightly less likely to comply than to ignore teacher directives.

With regards to peer interactions, students with ED spent slightly more time engaged in negative peer-to-peer interactions compared to students without ED. This is concerning given the importance of positive relationships to student sense of belonging and academic success (Demaray & Malecki, 2002; McMahon, Parnes, Keys, & Viola, 2008). However, it is possible the instructional design in these content classes, where the majority of class time was spent in whole group or independent work, limited the opportunities for interactions of any kind between students, making it difficult to generalize the interaction data.

Finally, students with ED accounted for just shy of three-quarters of all shout outs. In the present study, shout outs included both academic and non-academic verbalizations without teacher permission. While verbalizations without permission are typically considered a disruptive and therefore undesirable behavior, some teachers may view academic shout outs as a more positive and engaged behavior, and may even accept or encourage that behavior. It is unclear how many of students with EDs’ shout outs were of the academic variety or whether teachers viewed this as acceptable before. It is therefore it is possible that at least that some of the shout outs were seen as a more positive behavior. Regardless, students with ED engaged in more than twice as many shout outs as their peers without ED.

In addition to observable differences in student behaviors, teachers’ self-report indicated some notable differences in their perceived experiences working with students with and without ED. For example, teachers reported statistically significant differences in the rates at which
students with and without ED completed in-class work, homework, work well with peers, follow directions, talk respectfully to peers, and solve conflicts appropriately. Teachers reported that students without ED were more likely to engage in each of these behaviors. On the flip side, teachers reported students with ED as engaging more frequently, at significant levels, in the following behaviors: defiant and non-compliant behaviors, destruction, disruption, socially inappropriate behavior, and social withdrawal.

**Behavioral feedback.** Teacher responses are among the most important factors in determining subsequent and future student behaviors (Sutherland, 2000). Given the distinctive patterns of student behaviors revealed through this study, one might expect instruction and management to look different in order to support the disparate student needs. Even the teachers surveyed in this study showed high levels agreement that students with ED required differentiated management. Yet, with the exception of negative reinforcement, teacher responses were remarkably similar and generally very low for both students with and without ED.

In response to inappropriate classroom behaviors such as shout outs, off-task, and negative peer-to-peer interactions, what is most noteworthy is the low rates of overall teacher response. Students with ED received very little redirection, including consequences, desists, redirects, questioning behavior, warnings, time out, or removal from class, despite spending a majority of time off-task and engaging in high rates of shout-outs and non-compliance. Teachers did not issue a single warning to students with ED. Although students without ED engaged in these inappropriate behaviors at lower levels, they did exhibit off-task, non-compliant behaviors and shout-outs. Like students without ED, teachers’ rates of redirect for students without ED were lower than one would expect given the rates of off-task behavior. The low rates of teacher
responses indicate that the majority of student’s off-task behaviors are not responded to by the
teacher. However, as is found in the literature, when teachers responded to students’ behavior
they were more likely to respond to students with ED with redirection than for students without
ED (Sutherland, 2000; Van Acker et al., 1996).

It is also worth noting that teachers’ responses were frequently unpredictable for both
students with and without ED. These low and unpredictable rates of responses may
inadvertently lead to increases in student behaviors. Teachers’ responses to shout outs are worth
exploring here. First, when lag sequential analyses were run, the most likely teacher response to
students with ED was to respond by answering the student, followed closely with being provided
no feedback. It was almost as likely that students’ shout outs garnered a desired response as it
was that the teacher ignored the shout out. Being redirected and having their shout out expanded
upon were the next most predictable teacher responses to a shout out. Taken together, this
indicates that when students with ED shout out, they are almost as likely to receive an answer as
they are to be ignored by the teacher, to be redirected as they are to have their shout out
elaborated upon. This suggests a highly unpredictable teacher response pattern for shout outs
that at times may inadvertently reinforce the behaviors by yielding a desirable response for
students, while at other times, seeks to redirect and correct the behavior. The lack of
predictability sends very mixed signals to students (Van Acker et al., 1996).

Lag sequential analysis was also run to explore the relationship between teacher
corrective behaviors and both off-task student behavior and negative peer-to-peer interactions.
There were no combinations of these behaviors that occurred at a high enough frequency, over
the entire observation schedule for each student groups, to calculate sequential relationships.
This indicates very low levels of teacher redirection for both off-task behavior and negative peer-to-peer interactions for both students with and without ED. These low levels of teacher responses suggest that students with ED were not redirected from spending high percentages of class time unengaged in academic learning.

On the flip side, when students were engaged in positive behaviors such as being on-task, engaged in positive interactions, or complying with teacher requests, similar patterns of low levels of teacher response emerged. Praise has been shown as a powerful in decreasing disruptive behaviors, increasing engagement, and building positive interactions between teacher and students (Ducharme & Harris, 2005). Students with ED were on task for and complied with nearly half of all observations and teacher requests. However, students with ED garnered an average of 1.6 incidences of praise per hour. For students without ED, who were on task for over three quarters of all observations and complied with nearly all teacher requests, similar low rates of praise emerged at 1.8 per hour. These low rates of praise per hour are consistent with what has been found in previous research, which showed praise for students with ED ranging between 0.2 to 4.4 instances per student per hour (Sutherland & Wehby, 2001; Sutherland, Wehby, & Copeland, 2000). Also worth noting is that despite such low rates of praise for both groups of students per class period, praise comprised over a quarter of teachers’ behavioral feedback to students without ED, suggesting very low overall rates of behavioral feedback for this group of students.

Once again, further sequential analysis was run on teacher response to student compliance, looking at how often this was followed by teacher praise. However, only no feedback occurred at rates high enough for analysis, and the relationship between student
compliance and no feedback was similarly high for students with ED and students without ED. This suggests that when students comply with teacher requests, teachers often do not acknowledge or reinforce. For all students, but especially for students with ED, teachers can increase the likelihood that students will engage in desired behaviors such as compliance and engagement through the use of positive reinforcement (Hester, Hendrickson, & Gable, 2009). It appears from this study that teachers are not effectively utilizing this strategy.

**Question 3: Teacher Beliefs and Practices**

**General beliefs.** The final question explored by this study is how teacher beliefs align to observed classroom behaviors. Before exploring this relationship, there are some notable results from teachers’ survey responses about working with this population of students more generally.

Students with ED are frequently considered among the most difficult to work with because of their challenging and often disruptive behaviors (Cook, 2001). Teachers in this study had similar rates of self-report. First, when comparing students with and without ED, teachers reported that students with ED engaged more frequently in behaviors typically perceived as inappropriate for school such as defiance and non-compliance, destructive or disruptive, socially withdrawn, or socially inappropriate than students without ED, at statistically significant levels of difference. In contrast they rated students without ED as engaging more frequently in behaviors perceived as appropriate such as completes in-class and homework, works well with and talks respectfully to peers, follows directions, and solves conflicts appropriately than students with ED. Once again, for each of these behaviors teachers reported statistically significant differences in frequency by student groups.
When looking only at scores for students with ED the two behaviors teachers reported as most likely to be exhibited were talk to peers and adults respectfully, both of which are generally considered desirable school behaviors. Teachers’ lowest ratings for students with ED were for two undesirable behaviors: physical aggression and self-injurious. Both scores also had among the lowest standard deviations for teachers, indicating relatively high level of agreement across teachers’ ratings. In between these extremes, disruption, socially withdrawn, and socially inappropriate behaviors were considered the next most likely behaviors. Solves conflict appropriately, verbal aggression, works well with peers, and destructive behaviors were the next least likely. Unlike students without ED, who were seen as most likely to engage in appropriate behaviors and least likely to engage in inappropriate behaviors, students with ED were perceived with a mixture of desirable and undesirable behaviors.

When considering students with ED, teachers’ self report scores had relatively high standard deviations for disruptive and socially withdrawn behaviors, homework completion, and engaging in defiant and non-compliant behaviors. This suggests that teachers’ perceptions were less consistent across students, with the average difference from each mean score being over a full point. That is, there is a greater range between the lowest and highest teacher reported scores with some teachers perceiving students to have much higher rates of these behaviors, while others saw these behaviors as occurring much less frequently. These different perceptions may be due to differences in students, differences in how teachers perceive these behaviors, and/or differences in teachers’ own experiences and training. Overall, though, teacher beliefs in this study are consistent with existing research on teacher perceptions of students’ behavior and may
give insight into the reasons why students with ED are frequently seen as the most challenging to include in a general education classroom (Scruggs et al., 2011).

In terms of their own sense of preparedness, the teachers surveyed in this study felt neutral about the adequacy of their in-service professional training, with the largest standard deviation for any question in the study. This suggests that teacher responses to this question were more variable than others and that some teachers felt they had adequate in-service training and others believing that they did not. Teachers showed lower levels of agreement when asked to evaluate their pre-service training. Despite this, teachers had higher levels of agreement when asked if they had sufficient knowledge and skills to work with students with ED and if their abilities have improved since teaching. This may be considered a slight move in the right direction given that previous studies have consistently shown that teachers tend to report feeling underprepared and supported (Scruggs et al., 2011).

When asked about the impact of challenging behaviors on other students in the classroom, teachers were neutral about whether that they had necessary tools to address behaviors, with high standard deviations. This indicates that some teachers felt they did have the tools and others believed they did not. Teachers were similarly neutral in their perceptions that challenging behaviors increase stress levels or impact teacher effectiveness and that challenging behavior can be changed. However, they felt strongly that challenging behaviors disrupted the learning of all students in the classroom, including the student exhibiting said behaviors.

When working with students with challenging behaviors and with ED specifically, teachers overwhelmingly agreed that it was important to reach students with ED academically. Despite neutral feelings about whether or not behavior can be changed, teachers showed high
rates of agreement that it is important to teach behavior to students with ED and to manage
students with ED differently than their non-disabled peers. Unfortunately, the data observed in
this study suggest many similar patterns of behavior for instructing and managing students with
and without ED. The biggest difference in teacher behavior between student groups was found
in rates of negative interactions. Students with ED were more likely to have negative academic
and behavioral interactions with their teachers than students without ED. This indicates that not
only were there few differences in supports between groups but that the differences that were
present were not necessarily in the best interests of students and not aligned with what is known
about best practices for supporting students with ED.

**Beliefs and observed instructional practices.** Teachers reported that they used the
following instructional groupings most frequently when working with students with ED: whole
group, independent work, small group instruction led by the teacher, one-on-one support from
the teacher, and peer groups. Teachers reported using small groups, peer groups, and one-on-one
instruction at just slightly lower rates as whole group and independent work. Based on
observational data, teachers spent at least twice as much time in either independent or whole
group than in any other instructional style. Similar to previous research, this indicates that
teachers’ perceptions about their practices are somewhat inaccurate (Anderson & Hendrickson,
2007; Jack, Shore, Denny, Gunter, DeBriere, & DePaepe, 1996) and that teachers do not spend
as much time interacting directly with students in each group as they believed.

Teaches also showed high levels of agreement that they provided a variety of
opportunities for students with ED to respond and the data, to some extent, support this. While
students with ED were less likely to volunteer to respond, teachers called on them almost as
frequently as they called on students without ED, who were more likely to volunteer. That teachers called on students with ED more often than the students volunteered suggests that they made attempts to provide students with ED opportunities to respond. Teacher attempts to build opportunities for students to respond led to students with ED being called upon at rates much more similar to students without ED than students would have gotten to on their own. However, despite attempts to increase opportunities to respond, the observed rates were much lower than what is recommended in the literature (Shores et al., 1993).

Teachers also reported that they frequently praised appropriate student responses. However, actually observations revealed extremely low rates of academic or behavioral praise for students with and without ED. An examination of the sequential associations for praise following students with ED volunteering and being called on were not high enough to even calculate. Similarly, when students with ED were called on, neither praise for correct responses nor academic corrections occurred frequently enough to be calculated. However, teachers did expand upon or answer at calculable rates. Both of these behaviors can be considered positively reinforcing, which would lend some support to the belief that teachers offer positive responses to students’ with ED sharing out. The use of direct praise, however, does not occur on high enough levels to calculate, indicating that teachers do not use as much praise as they believe.

**Beliefs and observed management practices.** Teachers also reported frequently using positive reinforcement for behaviors that followed classroom rules. However, data collected via observations reveal that teachers used positive reinforcement with students with and without ED less than once per hour. This suggests that teachers have overestimated their actual use of positive reinforcement. In response to challenging behaviors, teacher reported using the
following responses from most to least frequent: verbal reprimand, ignoring, sending students to the office and time out. Students with ED were issued some form of redirection for the vast majority of their total behavioral interactions. Ignoring a challenging behavior was the most predictable response for students with ED when they were off-task or engaged in a shout out. Differences in the sequential analysis suggest that teachers are not as consistent in their use of consequences for all students as they believe.

Limitations

Several limitations must be considered when reviewing the data and implications from this study. First, this study included a small sample of teachers and students from a single school district. This limits the ways in which data can be analyzed and interpreted, what conclusions can be drawn, and the generalizability of the results. It is possible that similar observation and analysis of a different group of teachers in a different setting may yield different results (Mertens, 2005). Conducting observations across two schools reduced the likelihood of confounding variables. This study was also conducted over a relatively short period of time, making it difficult to determine the degree to which the observed instructional and management practices are typical (Patton, 2002).

A second limitation is the use of a survey that relies on teacher self-report. Self-report data has a high risk for inaccuracies due to its reliance on participants honestly and accurately providing data about their own practice and beliefs. Additional challenges to self-report data includes participants’ reluctance to reveal information for fear of self-incrimination (Goh, Lee, & Salleh, 2010) or an overly ambitious view of their actual practices. To control for these common
limitations, surveys were kept entirely anonymous and items on the adapted *Questionnaire About Teachers and Challenging Behavior* were aligned to actual observed practices.

Observer accuracy also presented a series of threats to the validity of the data collected and inferences made, including recording procedure characteristics, observer characteristics, and conditions of observation (Van Acker et al., 1991). To limit the impact of these threats, the coding scheme was designed in alignment with principles laid out by Bakeman and Gottman (1997), and was reviewed and approved by two experts in direct observation. Additionally, significant piloting using video and observation occurred.

Finally, there were potential observer effects wherein the researcher as a nonparticipant observer may have been perceived as an outsider and therefore participants acted or responded in ways they thought the researcher wanted to see or hear (Cresswell, 2008). For example, because they were aware that this study was focused on teachers’ work with students with ED, the participating teachers may have been more intentional in providing students with ED opportunities to respond or interacting with them in other ways. Similarly, students with ED, aware they were being observed, may have been on their “best” behavior or chosen to act out more frequently or intensely than they would have without an observer in the room. To minimize the impact of the observer effects on teachers and students the observer(s) sat in the back of the room, out of students’ line of sight. Conducting multiple observations over time may also have de-sensitized participants to the presence of the observer.

**Implications for Practice**

It is widely documented that the classroom teacher is the single most powerful determinant of student learning (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future,
With the increase in the number of students with ED being educated in the general education classroom, effectively reaching these students and improving the highly negative outcomes they experience is dependent on teachers’ ability to effectively engage, instruct, and manage them. The results of this study have specific implications for teachers, both general and special education, and those who train and support them.

Specific to instructional practices, teachers need to increase their use of several identified best practices. First, teachers need to provide students with ED with more opportunities to respond across instruction. The recommended rates are between one and six per minute of instruction (CEC, 1987; Shores et al., 1993), both of which are far above the rates observed in this study. Increasing opportunities to respond can increase on-task behavior while also decreasing inappropriate behaviors (Lewis et al., 2004; Sutherland et al., 2003). Teachers can increase their rate of providing response opportunities by adding choral responses, call and response, gesturing, and cuing (Conroy, Sutherland, Snyder, & Marsh 2008).

Most successful attempts to provide response opportunities will also include wait time and providing feedback (Stichter & Lewis, 2006), which relates to the second implication to emerge from this study: teachers must provide more consistent feedback to students, including more praise and more differentiated corrections, and in more predictable patterns. Rates of praise for both academics and behavior were far below what is recommended in the literature for both students with and without ED. Additionally, praise did not predictably follow any student behaviors, meaning that students could not predict what behaviors would earn them praise from the teacher. Predictability, or how consistently positive reinforcement is linked to a desired behavior, is one of the critical aspects of effective praise: If a behavior garners praise sometimes
but not others, students may be unclear about the desirability of the behavior, and may not be as likely to repeat that behavior (Hester et al., 2009). The same holds true for corrections, which occurred at low, unpredictable rates. Like praise, redirections must be consistent in order for students to understand that a behavior is undesirable or unacceptable. Stakeholders must continue to identify ways to improve teachers’ utilization of praise, increasing the rate and intentionality of which behaviors garner positive reinforcement, and support teachers in effectively preventing and responding to behavior that is inappropriate for school.

Teachers supporting students with ED also need additional instructional strategies, and support for successful implementation, that may prevent some challenging behaviors while also reaching students with ED academically. One such strategy is to utilize more flexible types of instructional grouping. Teachers in this study used similar patterns of grouping for both students with and without ED and also were least likely to utilize one-on-one instruction or small group, teacher-led instruction, despite the fact that research suggests students with ED benefit from these groupings (Logan & Malone, 1998). Even when a second instructor was present in the observed classrooms, these patterns of instructional groupings still largely consisted of whole group and independent instruction.

In regards to management, this study provides additional support for much of the existing literature identifying areas of growth for teachers supporting students with ED. Praise, which has consistently proven to be an effective strategy for supporting students with ED, continues to be under-utilized in the classroom. Teachers need to use more positive responses, particularly when students with ED are behaving appropriately. None of the appropriate behaviors exhibited by students with ED in this study, including raised hands, on-task behavior, and complying with
teacher requests reliably predicted positive acknowledgements from teachers. When students can anticipate which of their positive behaviors will yield positive attention from the teacher, they are more likely to engage in those behaviors more often.

In addition to reinforcing appropriate choices, praise can contribute to more positive student-teacher relationships, which are important to creating a sense of belonging, building potent relationships, and pushing academic achievement (Demaray & Malecki, 2002; Murray & Greenberg, 2000). When used consistently, praise can also lead to more predictable patterns for students with ED. Teachers also need to be more predictable in their responses to negative student behaviors. This study revealed that, with the exception of no feedback or answering student shout-outs, no combination of student and teacher behaviors were reliably predictable for students with ED. Teachers must have access to strategies that will both increase positive behaviors and decrease negative behaviors.

One possible reason that teachers did not effectively implement these recommended best practices for instruction and management is that they had exposure to the practices but not the training or support for actual implementation. Research on teachers’ beliefs about inclusion often suggests that teachers believe they do not have the necessary training or resources for successful inclusion, especially for students with ED (Scruggs et al., 2011). For example, praise and use of small group instruction are frequently documented research-based strategies that can positively impact students with ED. Teachers in this study believed they used praise frequently to reinforce appropriate student answers and that they often use small group and one-on-one instruction, suggesting they are familiar with both and deem them valuable practices. However, actual observed rates of praise were extremely low for both students with and without ED and
teachers believed they used small group and one-on-one instruction more frequently than they actually did. Similarly, even though teachers increased students with EDs’ opportunities to respond to rates near those of their non-disabled peers, the implementation still failed to meet the expectations laid out in the research. As the American classroom becomes more and more diverse, general education teachers are not prepared for this diversity. In order to build teachers’ capacity to effectively instruct students with ED, training and support around effective teaching and management practices for all students, differentiated across teachers’ pre- and in-service programs, is necessary (Feiman-Nemser, 2001).

This study provides a range of instructional and management practices around which pre-service teacher educators and in-service professional development providers must address to effectively support educators who are working with students with ED. Research on improving rates of specific teacher behaviors suggests that effective training and support will include a combination of asking teachers to predict their use of the strategy, exposing them to the benefits of increasing the use of the strategy, goal-setting, explicit training, and performance feedback (Simonsen, Myers, and Deluca, 2010; Sutherland et al., 2003).

In addition to pre- and in-service training and support, another avenue of building teacher capacity with these recommended practices is to develop teachers’ ability to accurately self-monitor, assess, and change their own professional practices. In order to effectively acquire, implement, and then ultimately maintain new practices, teachers must have immediate, specific, and continuous feedback, much like their students (Denton, Vaughn, & Fletcher, 2003). While teachers are often incorrect in their assessment of their classroom practices (Anderson & Hendrickson, 2007; Jack, Shore, Denny, Gunter, DeBriere, & DePaepe, 1996), building their
capacity in these areas has the potential to meaningfully improve teacher practice in both the short and long term, for students with ED and without. Teacher in co-taught classrooms, like many of the classrooms observed in this study, have unique opportunities for self- and peer-observation, feedback and professional development. Schools could improve teacher practices by investing in strategies to support these collaborative efforts.

**Future Research**

The current study establishes several implications for future research in the field of emotional disturbance. First and foremost is continued research into how to effectively bridge the research to practice gap (Landrum, Tankersley, & Kauffman, 2003). There is an extensive body of research that has identified effective strategies for differentiating instruction (Lane, 2007), teaching academic and social behaviors (Kavale, Mathur, & Mostert, 2007), for reinforcing positive behaviors (Lewis et al., 2004), and for engaging students with ED in meaningful ways through instruction (Witt, VanDerHeyden, & Gilbertson, 2007). However, despite high rates of self-report, the teachers in this study did not effectively use many best practices. It appears that teachers have exposure to or at least value many of the identified best practices available for supporting students with ED but are lacking some element for effectively implementing them in their classroom. More research is needed to determine what prevents teachers from implementing research-based practices in their classrooms, as well as what has worked when teachers are successfully utilizing evidence-based practices.

Closely related to the need to close the research-to-practice gap is future research that explores effective pre-service and in-service teacher preparation, training, and support programs for all teachers, but especially general educators. The call for improved teacher preparation and
support to effectively work with students with ED, and for closing the gap between research and practice, are not new (Lane, 2007). The data collected in this study clearly reveal the need for extensive training in how to effectively implement classroom tools (Landrum, Tankersley, & Kauffman, 2003). Future research should look to determine the most effective methods for providing sustainable, continuous training on evidence-based instructional and instructional practices, which must address teachers in at least two phases: pre-service and in-service.

Closely related to improving teachers’ use of best practices for students with ED is exploring their knowledge and understanding of the disability. Specifically, what it means for a student to be diagnosed as ED, the different ways ED is manifested in students, how it is diagnosed, characteristics of students who are identified as having ED, and how ED impacts learning and behavior. It is possible that part of teachers’ ineffectiveness with best practices and supporting students with ED is a lack of understanding the underlying disability. Building their knowledge base may improve their ability to implement best practices effectively.

Throughout their careers, teacher’s progress along a continuum of learning that requires different levels of differentiated support and training (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Pre-service teachers need access to practical systems, structures, and strategies to effectively meet a wide variety of student academic and behavioral needs, not just for students who have been identified as having an emotional disturbance. Once they are in their classrooms, there is evidence teachers become more knowledgeable and skilled through their own experiences (Bransford, Darling-Hammond, & LePage, 2005) and therefore require access to differentiated training and support to ensure that research-based practices are implemented appropriately and with fidelity, in an ongoing and timely fashion.
Much of the on-going, in-service support needed for teachers must come from administrators, as they play a critical role in supporting the successful inclusion and education of all students. Principals set the tone for the level of truly inclusive practices (Fox & Ysseldyke, 1997; Lohrman & Bambara, 2006). Teachers report that a school-wide culture, where there is a school vision for inclusion with direct support from administrators were critical variables for successful inclusion (Lohrman & Bambara, 2006). Additionally, with the inclusion of students with disabilities in school-wide assessment, principals are also more responsible than ever for ensuring academic achievement for students with disabilities (The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act 2004, IDEIA, 20 U.S.C. §1401(3)(A)(i)). Administrators must assume a more active role in ensuring that special education services are developed based on student needs and data, and that those services are being delivered with fidelity. To create an inclusive environment and ensure that students with disabilities are receiving the services they require to achieve positive academic and personal outcomes, including meeting standardized test benchmarks, principals must understand the legal, instructional, and management aspects of special education.

And yet, like general education teachers, principals often report having limited preparation in special education (Angelle & Bilton, 2009; McHatton, Boyer, Shaunessey, & Terry, 2010). Angelle and Bilton (2009) found that 53% of principals reported taking no classes as part of their principal preparation programs. Lasky and Karge (2006) found that 72% of principals reported having “no” or “some” experience working with students with disabilities during their credentialing process. Despite the limited exposure, principals themselves identify that training in special education is moderately or very important (Lasky & Karge, 2006).
Principals need better training in special education law and effective instruction, assessment, and discipline. Without this training, principals will struggle to develop, monitor, support, and enhance their faculty’s professional skills and knowledge to effectively support students with disabilities, specifically students with ED. It is critical that future research examines how to build principals’ capacities for training and supporting their teachers.

Finally, there is a need for more research on the short and long term effects of inclusion on students with ED, who have among the worst academic and personal outcomes of all students. The current research into the effectiveness of inclusion is mixed (Curic, 2009). However, researchers have also argued that, when given appropriate supports for students with ED and their teachers, students with ED can be successful in inclusive classrooms (Cook et al., 2003). Future studies must link actual classroom practices and specific supports to student achievement to see what impact, if any, different practices utilized in inclusive classrooms have on academic, social, and behavioral outcomes for students with ED. Researchers must continue to look at short term outcomes such as how teachers’ practices impact in-class learning and mastery, formative and summative assessment data, time spent out of the classroom, time spent on task, and correct response rates. The field must also consider longer-term outcomes such as impact on retention, graduation, higher education, incarceration, and job placement. Without research into how to improve teachers’ abilities to reach students with ED, how principals can support these teachers and students, and which practices will most positively impact the largely negative outcomes experienced by students with ED, these negative outcomes will continue to be the norm for students with emotional disturbance.
Conclusion

Inclusion is the practice of adapting the general education classroom to meet the needs of all students by providing individualized instruction and supplemental aids and services (Clampit, Holifield, & Nicols, 2004). For the purposes of this study, inclusion referred to chronologically age-appropriate general education classrooms in which students with disabilities, specifically ED, receive specialized instruction as outlined by their IEPs, through standard class activities within the context of the core curriculum.

Students with ED, because of the broad range of negative social, academic, and behavioral outcomes they commonly experience, require specially designed instructional and management supports (Lane et al., 2006; Nelson et al., 2004). Over the last three decades, researchers have found a wide range of instructional and management strategies that can effectively support students with ED. And yet research, including this study, largely shows that inclusion teachers do not implement these differentiated strategies at the recommended levels and that the experiences of students with ED in the general education classroom are similar to the experiences of their non-disabled peers (Wagner et al., 2006).

This study contributes to our understanding of the educational experiences for students with ED in the general education classroom by exploring the practices used by their teachers. Supporting students with ED, whose academic, social, and emotional skill sets by definition are different from those of their peers, requires general education teachers to acquire a differentiated instructional and management toolkit. Teachers and schools need more support in cultivating and implementing best practices for supporting students with ED if we are to improve the outcomes for students with ED.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Teacher Participation Criteria Checklist

☐ I have an Illinois Type 03/Type 09 Certificate.

☐ I teach students in 7th and/or 8th grade.

☐ I have 7th or 8th grade student with Emotional Disturbance for at least 40 minutes in one of my classes.

☐ I am willing to complete the required observations, checklists and surveys as outlined in the provided consent form.
APPENDIX A (continued)

Student with ED Checklist for Participation

☐ Is identified as ED on a current IEP.

☐ Spends at least 40 consecutive minutes in my class.

If you answered yes to both questions, please provide student with consent/assent packages. If they are not returned within 3 days, please send a second package. If still not returned within 3 days, please send a third and final packet.

☐ Has returned parental consent and student assent indicating willingness to participate.

☐ Scored above borderline range in the following externalizing components on the CBCL-TRF:
  o Rule-Breaking
  o Aggressive Behaviors
  o Adaptive Functioning

Student Matching Checklist for Participation

☐ Student does not have an IEP or 504 Plan.

☐ Student is in the same 7th and/or 8th grade class as the student with ED identified above.

☐ This student:
  o Is of the same Ethnicity
  o Is of the same age (within 12 months)
  o Is of the same gender

As the student above.

If you answered yes to both questions, please provide student with consent/assent packages. If they are not returned within 3 days, please send a second package. If still not returned within 3 days, please send a third and final packet.

☐ Student has returned a signed parental consent and personal assent to participate in this study.

☐ Student falls within the average range on the following subsections of the CBCL-TRF.
  o Adaptive Functioning
  o 6/8 Syndrome Scale
### You and Your Teaching Assignment

**Directions:** Please provide the appropriate response(s) for each of the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What type of state certificate or license do you have for your current teaching assignment? (Check one only)</td>
<td>□ Regular, standard or advanced    □ Probationary, provisional or temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Emergency Certified                                                   □ Not certified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your highest college degree? (Check one only)</td>
<td>□ Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Masters</td>
<td>□ Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Bachelors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many years have you been teaching? (Enter the number of years including the current year)</td>
<td>_____ year(s) including the current year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many years have you worked with students with ED in your class?</td>
<td>_____ year(s) including the current year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many students with ED would you estimate you have worked with?</td>
<td>_____ student(s) including in the current year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate your experiences working with students with ED?</td>
<td>Very Positive  Neutral  Very Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5     4     3     2     1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Your Students and Their Behavior

**Directions:** Indicate whether or not the target students in your classroom exhibit behaviors in the following categories. Please use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5: Always</th>
<th>4: Most of the time</th>
<th>3: Sometimes</th>
<th>2: Rarely</th>
<th>1: Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of Behavior</td>
<td>Student with ED</td>
<td>Student without ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes in-class work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works well with peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks respectfully to adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks respectfully to peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solves conflicts appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant and non-compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-injury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social withdrawal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially inappropriate behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Your Beliefs about Students with ED

**Directions:** Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements about your experiences with students with ED. Use this scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5: I strongly agree</th>
<th>4: I agree</th>
<th>3: I do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>2: I disagree</th>
<th>1: I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Most challenging behaviors can be improved. 5 4 3 2 1
- I had adequate pre-service professional training to deal with students with ED. 5 4 3 2 1
- I had adequate in-service professional training to deal with students with ED. 5 4 3 2 1
- Since I have been teaching, I have increased my ability to deal with students with ED. 5 4 3 2 1
- At this time, I have sufficient knowledge and skills to work successfully with students with ED. 5 4 3 2 1
- Some challenging behaviors are due to the student’s personality. 5 4 3 2 1
- Some challenging behaviors are due to a medical or physical reason. 5 4 3 2 1
- Some challenging behaviors are due to a student’s disability. 5 4 3 2 1
- Some challenging behaviors originate in the home or community. 5 4 3 2 1
- Some challenging behaviors are learned. 5 4 3 2 1
- It is important to teach behavior to students with ED. 5 4 3 2 1
- Students with ED should be managed differently than their non-disabled peers. 5 4 3 2 1

### Current Classroom Management Strategies You Use for Dealing with Students with ED

**Directions:** Please indicate how often you use each of the following strategies when attempting to improve the behavior of students with ED. Use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5: Very often</th>
<th>4: Often</th>
<th>3: Sometimes</th>
<th>2: Rarely</th>
<th>1: Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- I positively reinforce behaviors that follow my class rules. 5 4 3 2 1
- When I use positive reinforcement, I use social reinforcement such as praise and attention for appropriate behavior. 5 4 3 2 1
When I use positive reinforcement, I use tangible reinforcement such as food, rewards, or free time for appropriate behavior.  

I change my curriculum or teaching approach with some students to try to improve their behavior.  

When challenging behavior occurs, I ignore it.  

When challenging behavior occurs, I place the student in time out.  

When challenging behavior occurs, I take away a privilege or desirable activity.  

When challenging behavior occurs, I verbally reprimand the student.  

When challenging behavior occurs I send the student to the office.  

When challenging behavior occurs I am consistent in my use of my class consequences for all students.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Instructional Strategies You Use for Dealing with Students with ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directions:</strong> Please indicate how often you use each of the following strategies when planning for the inclusion of students with ED. Use the following scale:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Very often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I emphasize whole group instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I emphasize small group instruction led by the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I emphasize peer groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I emphasize independent seat work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I emphasize one-on-one support from a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use praise to reinforce correct answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I offer corrections when students with ED provide incorrect answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide a variety of opportunities for students with ED to respond in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for me to reach students with ED academically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Current Socialization Supports You Use for Dealing with Students with ED

**Directions:** Please indicate how often you use each of the following strategies when attempting to improve challenging behavior of students with ED. Use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5: Very often</th>
<th>4: Often</th>
<th>3: Sometimes</th>
<th>2: Rarely</th>
<th>1: Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use peer grouping to encourage socialization.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I allow students to work together on assignments.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I observe positive peer interactions I use positive social reinforcement such as praise and attention.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I observe positive peer interactions I use tangible reinforcement such as food, rewards, or free time.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I see inappropriate peer interactions, I ignore them.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I see inappropriate peer interactions, I separate the students.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I see inappropriate peer interactions, I take away a privilege or desirable activity.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I see inappropriate peer interactions, I reprimand both students.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Effects of Challenging Behavior On You and Your Students

**Directions:** Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements about the effect challenging behavior of students with ED has on you or your students. Use this scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5: I strongly agree</th>
<th>4: I agree</th>
<th>3: I do not agree or disagree</th>
<th>2: I disagree</th>
<th>1: I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenging behaviors do not disrupt other students’ learning.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the tools I need to effectively address challenging behaviors.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging behavior does not take up a significant amount of my time.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging behaviors increase my level of stress.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging behaviors do not impact my effectiveness as a teacher.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student with challenging behavior learns less because of his/her behavior.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please write any other comments you wish to add about students with challenging behaviors on a separate sheet.
The Behavioral and Environmental Assessment of Students and Teachers - Revised

Richard Van Acker, Ed.D.
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The Behavioral and Environmental Assessment of Students and Teachers - Revised (BEAST-R) is an assessment tool designed to guide the systematic observation of classroom interaction. Information is collected on either an event or a time-sampled basis in an effort to capture important aspects of the student and teacher interaction within a classroom. The measure targets a variety of important types of interactions and allows for data collection of user specified target behaviors. This measure can help identify contingencies between student and teacher behaviors that might serve to maintain or inhibit the display of target behaviors. There also are options that would allow the observer to collect data on a non-target child for the purposes of social comparison.

This instrument provides a wide variety of data collection options, however, there is no expectation that all of these options would be selected for any given child. The observer must determine what types of data are relevant for the specified target student. At the start of each section is a brief description of the data to be collected, procedures, and possible implications of the results.

Please note, data are gathered using a variety of behavior sampling techniques. When first learning to employ this measure, you may wish to collect data on one section at a time. As you become more accustomed to the process, data may be collected on multiple sections simultaneously. At times, the observer must indicate which data collection procedure was employed and the specified length of the observation interval. Reliability for this instrument is dependent upon inter-observer agreement. If data are to be employed for research purposes and/or to make important placement decisions for children, the use of two simultaneous observers and the calculation of inter-observer agreement is highly recommended. A guide to observer training and the interpretation of results is available from the senior author. A modified version of the BEAST is available for use with any IBM compatible laptop computer. Contact the author for additional information on this computer-based version.
I. General Information

Target Student: _____________________________  Teacher: ___________________
School: ______________________________   Grade: ___________  Room No. _____

Type of class:
Regular Division _____, Resource Class _____, Related Services Pull-out _____, Self-
Contained Special Education ________, Other _____________________________.

Number of Students: ________  Boys: ______  Girls: _______  No. Absent _______

Number of Staff: ________  Teachers _____  Instructional Aides ________
Other (Please Specify) ____________________________

Classroom:
Approximate Size of Room: ____ ft. x ____ ft.  Notes: ____________________________

Does room appear crowded?  yes ____  no _____, If no explain __________________

Classroom appears neat and orderly: yes ____  no ____. If no, explain _________

Adjacent rooms : ________________________________________________________
Extraneous Noise (or other environmental distractions) _______________________

Is the classroom isolated from regular division classes?  no ____  yes _____. If yes, please
explain ________________________________________________________________

Ventilation (comfortable, hot, cold, etc) ______________________________________
Lighting (type and adequacy) ______________________________________________

Equipment:
Desk Size (or chairs if tables are used):  Too large ___, Too small ___, Correct ___.
Are the blackboards of adequate size and located appropriately? _______________

Indicate what types of technology are available within the classroom (e.g., overhead
projector, computers) _____________________________________________________

Other Information:
Are there any unusual features of the classroom (e.g., shape, location, excessive damage present,
clutter) or the instructional materials (e.g., lack of text books, outdated materials, outdated
technology) that might add or detract from the students ability to function successfully?  If so,
please describe.____________________________________________________________
II. Classroom Rules and Instructional Style

Classroom Rules:
Does the teacher have an established set of classroom rules? Yes ____ No ____
Are the classroom rules posted? Yes ____ No ____
Are there established consequences? Yes ____ No ____
Are these consequences posted? Yes ____ No ____
Are consequences modified to meet individualized student needs? Yes ____ No ____

In the spaces below, list each classroom rule. Observe the classroom interaction and indicate how frequently classroom rules are violated and what consequences are provided. Simply indicate the consequence observed following the specific rule violated. Data in this section is based on class-wide responding. If you wish to denote target student behavior, circle those violations committed by this student. Data is collected using event recording.

The violation codes include:
1 = praise, 2 = No response, 3 = Gestural reprimand, 4 = Verbal Reprimand,
5 = Time-out, 6 = ________________________, 7 = ___________________________

Sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Violation and Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please raise your hand before speaking</td>
<td>2 4 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Violation and Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there behaviors other than those covered in the stated rules that are frequently displayed by students and that result in teacher delivered sanctions? If so, what are these behaviors and consequences?

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
Instructional Style:

This section is designed to capture information on the instructional style of the teacher. Data on instructional methods employed may help to identify potential problems when examined in light of specific child needs. For example, a teacher employing high rates of lecture format could be problematic for children with auditory processing problems.

Subject Taught: _____________________________________________________________
Lesson Objective: __________________________________________________________

In the space provided, simply enter the appropriate code for the instructional format being employed at the end of each 1 minute Momentary Time Sampling interval. For the purposes of data collection mark the box that indicates the instructional format employed with the target student.

Instructional Format Codes: 1 = Whole Group Lecture, 2 = Small Group Lecture, 3 = Question/Answer Format, 4 = Teacher Demonstration, 5 = Peer Group Directed, 6 = One-to-One Instruction, 7 = Independent Seat Work, 8 = No Task, 9 = Other ______________________, 10 = Other _____________________________

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Time

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following instructional aids did the teacher employ in the observed lesson?
Chalk Board ____ Overhead Projector ____ Handouts ____ Texts ____
Audio Tapes ____ Films ____ Slides ____ Computer ____ Models ____
Manipulatives ____ Other __________________________________________

How would you rate the pacing of the lesson for the typical classroom student?
Too fast ____ About right ____ Too slow ____

How would you rate the pacing of the lesson for the target student?
Too fast ____ About right ____ Too slow ____

The nature of the lesson called on students to demonstrate (check all that apply):
Knowledge ____ Comprehension ____ Analysis ____ Synthesis ____
III. Classroom Sketch and Distribution of Teacher Attention

Provide a schematic drawing of the classroom. Indicate the general shape of the room, location of major structural features, and furniture. Place a five compartment data box in the place of each student (Use rubber stamp if provided). Employing event recording, indicate the number of opportunities to respond (OTR), verbal praise statements for academics (VPA), verbal praise statements for social behavior (VPB), academic corrections (AC), and verbal reprimands for social behavior (VRB) are delivered to each student. The box at the base of the sketch should be used to record responses delivered to the class as a whole or to an unspecified group of students.
IV. Task Engagement and Academic Participation
This section will be used to gather data on the student’s on-task behavior and his or her willingness to participate in class activities. The form provides space for the observer to record the behavior of the target student along with that of another student (generally selected at random from others in the class) for comparison purposes.

Task Engagement – the observer will need to develop an operational definition for what they deem to be task engagement or on-task behavior.

**Task Engagement:** 
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

The observer should employ momentary time sampling – observe the student at the last second of a pre-selected time interval and record whether the student is engaged in the task/activity (+) or not engaged (-). The observer must specify the time interval employed (e.g., 15 sec., 1 min., 3 min., etc)

**Task Engagement** (Employ Momentary Time Sampling - Interval Length = ____ seconds)

**Nature of the task:**
_____________________________________________________________________

(Target Student)

Nature of the task:

______________________________

(Target Student)

Nature of the task:

______________________________

(Other Student)

Nature of the task:

______________________________

(Other Student)

Nature of the task:
**Academic Participation** examines the extent and the manner in which the student displays a willingness and/or the teacher involves the student in oral participation during classroom activities. The observer simply places an (x) in the appropriate box for each opportunity provided and response given. For example, if the student if the student volunteers to answer a question, is called upon by the teacher, responds correctly, and is praised – the box would be marked as shown.

**Academic Participation:**  (Employ Event Recording - Tally marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>Called On</th>
<th>Called Out</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Consequence (+/-/0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Target Student)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>Called on</th>
<th>Called out</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Consequence (+/-/0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Other Student)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Compliance to Teacher Requests

Students who display challenging behaviors often demonstrate low levels of compliance to teacher requests. Academic and social success requires a basic level of compliance (approximately 70 – 80 percent). Most students comply with about 85-90 percent of all requests made of them within approximately 7 seconds of the time the request is made of them. The observer simply indicates by marking the appropriate boxes for each request made of the target student. Requests made to the individual student, as well as those made to the group (that includes the target student) should be recorded. The teacher’s response of praise (+), reprimand (-), or no response (0) should be indicated.

**Example:** This student is given a request, but simply ignore it. The teacher provides no response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignores</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence (+/-/0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compliance:** (Employ Event recording - Tally marks)

(Target Student)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Complies</th>
<th>Ignores</th>
<th>Resists</th>
<th>Consequence (+/-/0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence (+/-/0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Other Student)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Complies</th>
<th>Ignores</th>
<th>Resists</th>
<th>Consequence (+/-/0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence (+/-/0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Often compliance will need to be increased before academic success can be anticipated. The teacher may need to become more attentive and reinforce those times the student does comply. At other times, we may need to increase compliance by “trapping the student” into a greater understanding of the positive outcomes of compliance. This will require us to identify the type of request for which the student is most likely to comply. The teacher then increases the number of times this type of request is made of the student and provides reinforcement for compliance. Is there any observable pattern to the type of requests for which the target student complies?
VI. Consequences for Target Behavior

One of the major interests in conducting a functional assessment is to examine the immediate consequences of the target behavior. Often teachers provide inconsistent consequences or inadvertently provide a consequence that may actually strengthen the probability of the future display of the undesired behavior.

The observer simply indicates each time the student displays the specified target behavior and records the code for the teacher (or peer) response below each. The observer should indicate the nature of the consequence codes in the spaces provided (e.g., verbal reprimand, time-out, sent to office, peer laughter, teasing).

**Behaviors and Consequences** *(Employ Event recording - Tally marks)*

**Behavior: ____________________________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Consequence (Teacher)</th>
<th>Consequence (Peer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = No Consequence, 2 = ________, 3 = ________, 4 = ________, 5 = ________, 6 = ________, 7 = ________, 8 = ________, 9 = ________, 10 = ________.

**Behavior: ____________________________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Consequence (Teacher)</th>
<th>Consequence (Peer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = No Consequence, 2 = ________, 3 = ________, 4 = ________, 5 = ________, 6 = ________, 7 = ________, 8 = ________, 9 = ________, 10 = ________.

**Behavior: ____________________________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Consequence (Teacher)</th>
<th>Consequence (Peer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = No Consequence, 2 = ________, 3 = ________, 4 = ________, 5 = ________, 6 = ________, 7 = ________, 8 = ________, 9 = ________, 10 = ________.

Does the data indicate that the consequence provided the target student was consistently delivered? What was the nature of the consequence delivered? How did the student appear to react to the consequence(s)?
### Coding Scheme

#### Teacher Behaviors
- tA=Praise for Academics
- te=Expands upon student response
- tf=Answers student question
- tK= Academic Correction
- tP=Praise for Classroom Behavior
- tC=Consequence
- tD=Desist (physical)
- tB=Redirection (correcting behavior)
- td=Redirection (verbal reprimand)
- tq=Question behavior
- tR=Removal From Class
- tw=Warning of future consequence
- tT=Time Out
- r=Teacher Request
- tF=No Feedback/Response
- o=Other response

#### Student Behaviors/Activities
- sL=On Task Active
- sM=On Task Passive
- sY=Off Task Active
- sZ=Off Task Passive
- U=No Task
- sV=Volunteers
- sX=Call Out
- sN=Called on by teacher

#### Academic Groupings
- G=Peer Groups
- H=Other
- I=Independent Work
- O=One-on-One
- S=Small Groups
- W=Whole Group

*Will be coded to designate whether the behavior was instigated by the target student or in response to behaviors from other students.*
Codes: Observational Codes with Operational Definitions:

**Classroom Rules and Instructional Style.** These codes will be collected using Event Coding.

- **(tP) Verbal Praise for Classroom Behaviors:** target student receives positive feedback from the teacher in response to the child’s behavior as an individual or as part of a group. This does not include praise for academic successes.

  Examples:
  
  - target student lines up at the door and teacher says, “Well done. Thank you.”
  - target student works well with a partner and the teacher says, “I like the way you two are working so quietly.”
  - target student raises hand and teacher says, “Thank you for raising your hand and waiting quietly.”

  Non-Examples
  
  - target student shares out an answer, with or without permission, and teacher says, “Excellent job!”
  - target student completes an academic task and teacher says, “Really good effort on this worksheet!”

- **(tF) No Feedback:** the target student has responded correctly/incorrectly to an academic question or behavior request and the teacher does not tell the child whether or not the response is correct/incorrect.

  Examples:
  
  - teacher asks the child an academic question and the student responds, the teacher moves on to the next student.
  - target student lines up at the door incorrectly and the teacher redirects. When the student corrects his/her line behavior, teacher says nothing.
  - teacher asks the target student a question, gets a response, and immediately moves on to the next student.

  Non-Examples:
  
  - target student lines up correctly and the teacher gives a thumbs up.
  - teacher tell student, “Nice job” when she walks past and student is working

- **(tC) Consequence:** teacher gives a verbal consequence or a demonstrable consequence in response to target student behavior.
Examples:

- teacher says to the target student, “You have a warning for getting out of your seat.”
- teacher goes up to the behavior chart and switches the student’s card from green to yellow.

Non-Example:

- target student shouts profanity across the room and teacher ignores.
- target student gets out of seat and walks around the room, the teacher asks, “What is the problem? Why won’t you sit in your seat?”

- **(tD)** Desist: target student is reprimanded for inappropriate behavior or teacher uses a physical desist to stop aggressive behavior.

  Examples:

  - the teacher puts her arm up to prevent the target student from physically assaulting another student.
  - the teacher asks, “You are acting foolishly. Sit down now”

  Non-Examples:

  - target student shares out an answer, with or without permission, and teacher says, “That’s not quite right…”

- **(tT)** Time Out: this will be coded if the teacher removes a target student from his or her seat to a separate place in the room, in response to a student’s behavior.

  Examples:

  - target student repeatedly using calling other student’s names. Teacher asks student to move to seat in back of the room to “Think about his actions.”
  - target student refuses to complete work so teacher moves student from his group to a single desk at the front of the room.

  Non-Examples:

  - teacher asks student to leave the classroom.
  - teacher threatens to move student to a separate seat.

- **(tR)** Removal From Class: if the teacher asks a target student to leave the class or calls for a support person to remove the student from class, this will be coded as a Removal From Class.
Examples:

- target student becomes violent toward another student and the teacher pushes the call button and asks the office to sent a person to remove the student from the classroom. The support person comes and removes the student from the class.
- target student moves through the classroom consequences and is told by the teacher to go to the office. Student leaves the room.

Non-Examples:
- target student refuses to complete work so teacher moves student from his group to a single desk at the front or back of the room.

● **(tB) Redirection (correcting behavior):** teacher provides the expectations or repeats directions for the student.

Examples:

- teacher says, “John, I asked you to sit in your seat.”
- teacher says, “I want you to work silently”
- teacher says, “You need to sit down.”

Non-Examples:

- the teacher puts her arm up to prevent the target student from physically assaulting another student.
- the teacher asks, “What is the problem? Why won’t you sit in your seat?”

● **(td) Redirection (verbal reprimand):** teacher provides verbal command or request to student to desist behavior.

Examples:

- teacher says, “John, stop walking around the room.”
- teacher says, “Stop talking.”

Non-Examples:

- the teacher says, “John, I need you to sit in your seat.”
- the teacher asks, “What is the problem? Why won’t you sit in your seat?”

● **(tq) Question behavior:** teacher questions target student about his/her behavior.
Examples:

- teacher says, “John, why can’t you sit down?”
- teacher says, “Stop! Why are you doing that?”

Non-Examples:

- the teacher says, “John, I need you to sit in your seat.”
- the teacher asks, “Stop that right now!”

● (tw) Warning of future consequence: teacher provides verbal warning of future consequence if student continues to engage in behavior.

Examples:

- teacher says, “Next time I am going to change your color.”
- teacher says, “If you don’t stop, I am going to take a point.”

Non-Examples:

- the teacher says, “John, you need to sit in your seat.”
- the teacher asks, “Stop! Why can’t you stay quiet?”

Instructional Style. These codes will be recorded using Duration Codes.

● (W) Whole group lecture: teacher is presenting academic or other content in front of the whole class. Teacher may be writing on board, using technology, reading aloud, or other formats which utilize the teacher as the sole presenter of information.

Examples:

- teacher is leading instruction at the white board at the front of the classroom.
- teacher is modeling the steps of a laboratory experiment for the whole class.

Non-Examples:

- teacher is at a small table working with a group of 5 students.
- teacher is sitting at the desk while students all work in their seats.

● (S) Small group lecture: teacher is presenting academic or other content in front of a subset of students rather than the whole class. Teacher may be writing on a white board, using technology, reading aloud, or other formats which utilize the teacher as the sole presenter of information.
Examples:
- teacher is working at a small table with 5 students.
- teacher is demonstrating a problem on the white board for a select group of students while other students work on an assigned task in their seats.

Non-Examples:
- teacher is modeling the steps of a laboratory experiment for the whole class.
- teacher is circulating the room while students work in their seats.

- (G) Peer group directed: students are working collaboratively with one another, with minimal or no interaction with adults in the classroom.

Examples:
- students are seated in groups and groups are working collaboratively on a task without support from the teacher.
- students have been directed by teacher to work in pairs and they do so.

Non-Examples:
- teacher is circulating the room while students work in their seats.
- students are seated in groups and groups are working collaboratively on a task with support from the teacher.

- (O) One-to-one: adult is working one-on-one with a target student.

Examples:
- teacher and student are sitting next to or across from each other and the teacher is working exclusively with the student.
- paraprofessional or special educator is sitting next to or across from a student and is working exclusively with the student.

Non-Examples:
- students are seated in groups and groups are working collaboratively on a task with support from the teacher.
- teacher is circulating the room while students work in their seats.
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- **(I) Independent Work:** students are independently (without support from peers or adults in the room) working on an assigned task including but not limited to a worksheet or reading a book.

  Examples:
  
  - target student completes a worksheet independently
  - target student is reading from a book.

  Non-Examples:
  
  - student is working on a worksheet with peers.
  - student is engaged in a conversation about the given academic topic with a peer.

- **(U) No Task:** teacher is not providing instruction or directions to the class and students are not actively engaged in work or classroom routines.

  Examples:
  
  - teacher is called into the hallway and students sit in seat without an activity or task to complete.
  - students are sitting without a task to complete.

  Non-Examples:
  
  - student has been given a selected reading but does not work on it.
  - student has been given worksheet and once finished stops working.

- **(H) Other:** any other instructional interactions not captured by one of the six listed above.

  **Distribution of Teacher Attention.** Event recording will be used to collect frequency counts of teacher behaviors.

- **(tA) Verbal Praise for Academics:** teacher gives one of the target students positive verbal praise in response to or that specifies an academic behavior that earned the student praise.

  Examples:
  
  - target child receives an A on an assignment and as the teacher passes them out, the teacher says, “You did an awesome job!”
  - target student shares out an answer, with or without permission, and teacher says, “Excellent job!”
Non-Examples:
- teacher asks the student a question and the student answers correctly. Teacher responds by repeating the answer.
- target child offers an answer and the teacher moves on to another student.

- (te) Expands upon student response: given an academic response from a target student, teacher responds by asking another question, re-states the student answer, or provides another non-evaluative response.

Examples:
- teacher says, “Do you mean to say that…”
- teacher says, “John just suggested that the answer is…”
- teacher says, “That is an interesting thought.”

Non-Examples:
- target child offers an answer and the teacher moves on to another student.
- teacher says, “That’s right!”

- (tf) Provides answer to student question: given a question from a target student, teacher responds by providing an answer.

Examples:
- student asks, “how did you get 4?” and teacher says, “I got 4 by…”
- student asks, “what do I do next?” and teacher says, “The next step is…”

Non-Examples:
- target child offers an answer and the teacher moves on to another student.
- teacher says, “That’s right!”

- (tP)=Verbal Praise for Classroom Behaviors: target student receives positive feedback from the teacher in response to the child’s behavior as an individual or as part of a group. This does not include praise for academic successes.

Examples:
- target student lines up at the door and teacher says, “Well done. Thank you.”
- target student works well with a partner and the teacher says, “I like the way you two are working so quietly.”
- target student raises hand and teacher says, “Thank you for raising your hand and waiting quietly.”
Non-Examples

- target student shares out an answer, with or without permission, and teacher says, “Excellent job!”
- target student completes an academic task and teacher says, “Really good effort on this worksheet!”

● **(tK) Academic Corrections**: teacher corrects the response given by a student. Teacher may provide the correct answer or provides prompts to help student answer correctly.

Examples:

- target child offers an answer and the teacher responds by saying, “Not quite, what is the rule about multiplying by 0?”

Non-Examples:

- target child offers an answer and the teacher responds by saying, “Not quite…”

● **(tD) Desist**: target student is reprimanded for inappropriate behavior or teacher uses a physical desist to stop aggressive behavior.

Examples:

- the teacher puts her arm up to prevent the target student from physically assaulting another student.
- the teacher asks, “What is the problem? Why won’t you sit in your seat?”

Non-Examples:

- target student shares out an answer, with or without permission, and teacher says, “That’s not quite right…”

● **(tC) Consequence**: teacher gives a verbal consequence or a demonstrable consequence to student behavior.

Examples:

- teacher says to the target student, “You have a warning for getting out of your seat.”
- teacher goes up to the behavior chart and switches the student’s card from green to yellow.
Non-Example:
- target student shouts profanity across the room and teacher ignores.
- target student gets out of seat and walks around the room, the teacher asks, “What is the problem? Why won’t you sit in your seat?”

- (tB) Redirection (correcting behavior): teacher provides the expectations or repeats directions for the student.

  Examples:
  - teacher says, “John, I asked you to sit in your seat.”
  - teacher says, “I want you to work silently”
  - teacher says, “You need to sit down.”

Non-Examples:
- the teacher puts her arm up to prevent the target student from physically assaulting another student.
- the teacher asks, “What is the problem? Why won’t you sit in your seat?”

- (td) Redirection (verbal reprimand): teacher provides verbal command or request to student to desist behavior.

  Examples:
  - teacher says, “John, stop walking around the room.”
  - teacher says, “Stop talking.”

Non-Examples:
- the teacher says, “John, I need you to sit in your seat.”
- the teacher asks, “What is the problem? Why won’t you sit in your seat?”

- (tq) Question behavior: teacher questions target student about his/her behavior.

  Examples:
  - teacher says, “John, why can’t you sit down?”
  - teacher says, “Stop! Why are you doing that?”
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Non-Examples:

- the teacher says, “John, I need you to sit in your seat.”
- the teacher asks, “Stop that right now!”

● (tw) Warning of future consequence: teacher provides verbal warning of future consequence if student continues to engage in behavior.

Examples:

- teacher says, “Next time I am going to change your color.”
- teacher says, “If you don’t stop, I am going to take a point.”

Non-Examples:

- the teacher says, “John, you need to sit in your seat.”
- the teacher asks, “Stop! Why can’t you stay quiet?”

● (tF)= No Feedback: the target student has responded correctly/incorrectly to an academic question or behavior request and the teacher does not tell the child whether or not the response is correct/incorrect.

Examples:

- teacher asks the child an academic question and the student responds, the teacher moves on to the next student.
- target student lines up at the door incorrectly and the teacher redirects. When the student corrects his/her line behavior, teacher says nothing.
- teacher asks the target student a question, gets a response, and immediately moves on to the next student.

Non-Examples:

- target student lines up correctly and the teacher gives a thumbs up.
- teacher tell student, “Nice job” when she walks past and student is working

Task Engagement and Academic Participation. This section uses Event Recording to collect data around task engagement and types of academic participation.

● (sM) On Task Passive: Student is complying with seat expectations and it can be inferred that student is engaged with/attending to a teacher-given task and/or instruction. No overt motor response beyond visual orientation toward the teacher or instructional prop.
Examples:

- teacher is presenting academic content at the front board and the target student is focused on the teacher
- the class has been assigned a reading and the target student is reading silently
- target student is facing a peer who is talking

Non-Examples:

- target student is seated at his/her desk reading outloud to the class
- target student is taking notes in his/her notebook
- teacher is presenting instructions and target student is working on a worksheet

(sL) On Task Active. Target student shows overt motor/vocal behavior that is related to the completion of a teacher-given task. If the student is working but begins to talk to a partner, off task behavior should be recorded immediately.

Examples:

- teacher gives content to students while students listen, and then the teacher pauses to allow students to copy it down
- teacher gives directions to journal and student writes

Non-Examples:

- teacher assigns a task and student works on a different task
- teacher assigns a task and student talks with peer

(sZ) Off Task Passive. Target student is assigned a task but is not actively engaged in completing the teacher-given task or appropriately seeking out teacher support. Student remains in seat and does not disrupt other peers through vocalizations, beating on the desk, or physical touch or movements.

Examples:

- teacher assigns a task and the target student is staring at the clock
- teacher assigns a peer/partner task or indicates talking is allowed and the student talks with a peer
- teacher assigns a task and student works on a different task
Non Examples:
- teacher gives content to students while students listen, and then the teacher pauses to allow students to copy it down
- teacher gives directions to journal and student writes

(\textbf{sY}) Off Task Active. Target student is assigned a task but is not actively engaged in completing the teacher-given task or appropriately seeking out teacher support. Student gets out of seat or disrupts other peers through vocalizations, beating on the desk, or physical touch or movements.

Examples:
- teacher assigns a task to be completed silently and the target student talks to others around the room
- teacher assigns an in-seat task and student gets up without permission and walks around the room

Non Examples:
- teacher assigns a peer/partner task or indicates talking is allowed and the student talks with a peer
- teacher assigns a task and student works on a different task

\textit{Academic Participation.} Event recording will be used to collect data for these behaviors.

\textbullet\ (\textbf{sV}) Volunteers: target student raises his/her hand to answer an academic question or otherwise contribute to a class/group discussion.

Examples:
- teacher asks a question of the class and target student raises his/her hand
- students are working independently and the target student raises his/her hand

Non-Examples:
- teacher is systematically calling on students using a cold-call method, either by pulling students names randomly, etc.
- students in the class are being allowed to shout out answers, read chorally

\textbullet\ (\textbf{sN}) Called on: target child is selected by the teacher to respond to an academic question or request regardless of whether or not s/he has volunteered.
Examples:

- teacher asks the class a question and target child raises hand to volunteer to answer. Teacher calls on that student to share answer.
- target student is talking to a peer and the teacher cold calls the student to respond to a question.

Non Examples

- teacher asks a question and the target student is not called on but says, “number 7.”

(\textbf{sX}) Call Out: the target child verbalizes a response, on or off topic without being called on by the teacher.

Examples:

- teacher asks a question and the target student is not called on but says, “number 7.”
- target student yells out, “I hate this class!”

Non Examples:

- teacher asks the class a question and target child raises hand to volunteer to answer. Teacher calls on that student to share answer.

(\textbf{tK}) Academic Corrections: teacher corrects the response given by a student. Teacher may provide the correct answer or provides prompts to help student answer correctly.

Examples:

- target child offers an answer and the teacher responds by saying, “Not quite, what is the rule about multiplying by 0?”

Non-Examples:

- target child offers an answer and the teacher responds by saying, “Not quite…”

(\textbf{tC}) Consequence: teacher gives a verbal consequence or a demonstrable consequence to student behavior.

Examples:

- teacher says to the target student, “You have a warning for getting out of your seat.”
- teacher goes up to the behavior chart and switches student’s card from green to yellow.
Non-Example:
- target student shouts profanity across the room and teacher ignores.
- target student gets out of seat and walks around the room, the teacher asks, “What is the problem? Why won’t you sit in your seat?”

• (tA) Verbal Praise for Academics: teacher gives one of the target students positive verbal praise in response to or that specifies an academic behavior that earned the student praise.

Examples:
- target child receives an A on an assignment and as the teacher passes them out, the teacher says, “You did an awesome job!”
- target student shares out an answer, with or without permission, and teacher says, “Excellent job!”

Non-Examples:
- teacher asks the student a question and the student answers correctly. Teacher responds by repeating the answer.
- target child offers an answer and the teacher moves on to another student.

Compliance to Teacher Requests. This section is uses Event Recording.

• (tr) Teacher Request: each time the teacher makes a request of one of the target students.

Examples:
- teacher asks students to line up at the door.
- teacher asks target student to work silently.

Non-Examples:
- teacher says, “Today we are going to work on multiplying decimals.”

• (sc) Complies: target student responds in an appropriate manner within 7 seconds of a behavioral request or demand

- teacher requests students take out a worksheet and target student produces the worksheet within 7 seconds.
- teacher asks target student to be silent, or puts finger over mouth, and student does so immediately
Non-Examples:
- teacher requests that students take out a worksheet and target student does not attempt to produce it
- teacher requests that student works silently or puts finger over mouth, and student continues to talk

● (si) Ignores: target student does not comply with teacher request, choosing to engage in a different activity or do nothing.

Examples:
- teacher asks target student to sit down and student walks around the room for a full minute
- teacher asks students to take out a worksheet and student makes no attempt to produce it.

Non-Examples:
- teacher asks student to take out a worksheet and target student does not make an attempt to produce the worksheet.

**Target Behaviors.** Event recoding will be used to capture data about these behaviors.

● (tp/sp) Positive Social Interactions with Peers: This includes appropriate verbal and physical expressions of friendship or affinity including laughing together, praise, talk about the weekend or previous experiences together, handshakes, or high fives.*

Examples:
- target student asks a peer a question, for example, “Did you see Scream 4?”
- target student asks a peer, “Can I borrow a pencil?”

Non-Examples:
- target student asks, “What did you get for number 4?”

● (ta/sa) Positive Academic Interactions with Peers: This includes appropriate verbal and physical expressions related to learning: praise, on-topic, and positive or neutral conversations about the learning together, handshakes, or high fives.*
Negative Social Interactions with Peers: This includes inappropriate verbal and physical expressions related to non-academic topics and can include teasing, taunting, name-calling, arguing, or other physical posturing.*

Examples:
- another student says to the target student, “Your fat self.”
- target student says, “I hate you.”

Negative Academic Interactions with Peers: This includes inappropriate verbal and physical expressions related to learning: teasing, taunting, name-calling, arguing, or other physical posturing.*

Examples:
- target student says, “You dummy.”
- another student says to the target student, “You can’t even read!”

Non-Examples:
- another student says to the target student, “Your fat self.”

* Initiated: target student engages in target behavior without prompting from another student or adult. Behaviors denoted with the asterisk will be designated as either “Initiated” or “Response” to indicate whether the target student started the interaction or responded to a student’s initiation.

Examples:
- target student turns to a classmate and says, “You dummy.”
- target student says, “I hate you.”

Non-Examples:
- another students says to the target student, “You’re and idiot,” and the target student responds, “Your mom is an idiot.”
- another student asks, “How do you do number 3?” and target student answers.
*Response: target student engages in target behavior in response to words or actions of another student or adult. Behaviors denoted with the asterisk will be designated as either “Initiated” or “Response” to indicate whether the target student started the interaction or responded to a student’s initiation.

Examples:

- a student says to the target student, “You’re LD,” and the target student responds, “You can’t even spell that, idiot.”
- another student asks, “How do you do number 3?” and target student answers.

Non-Examples:

- target student turns to a classmate and says, “You dummy.”
- target student says, “I hate you.”
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RE: Protocol #2011-0653
“Experiences and Practices of General Education Teachers Supporting Students with Emotional Disturbance”

Dear Ms. Weisling:

Members of Institutional Review Board (IRB) #2 have reviewed this amendment to your research and consent forms under expedited procedures for minor changes to previously approved research allowed by Federal regulations [45 CFR 46.110(b)(2)]. The amendment to your research was determined to be acceptable and may now be implemented.

Please note the following information about your approved amendment:

Please remember to submit a copy of the letter of support from as well as a letter of support from the Principal of each school, on letterhead and outlining the research activities that the school agrees to host/participate in prior to accessing/analyzing information and/or recruiting/enrolling subjects at those schools. Letters must be accompanied by an Amendment form when submitted to the UIC IRB.

Amendment Approval Date: March 15, 2012
Amendment:
Summary: UIC Amendment #1 (response to modifications), dated and submitted to OPRS 13 March 2012, is an investigator-initiated amendment regarding the following: (1) submission of revised data collection instruments reversing the Likert scales used, changing the language on several questions to reflect a more positive tone towards students with ED and their teachers, and adding six items that describe students with ED and their teachers in a more positive tone; adding 10 qualitative codes to the observation coding system; adding three levels of incentives
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to provide teachers with a $50 school-approved incentive if 60% of students return the parent
permission form within two weeks (whether parents have given permission or not), $150 credit
on Amazon when teachers complete the full study, and a presentation of findings to
participating schools (revised Initial Review, version 3, 3/7/2012; revised Protocol, version 2,
3/7/2012; Data Collection Tool Survey Draft, version 3, 3/7/2012; Data Collection Tools
Codes Draft, version 3, 3/7/2012); (2) changing the research site from
(Appendix K); (3) adding as key research
personnel (Appendix P); and (4) submission of revised recruitment and consent documents
reflecting the above (Teacher Contact Email Draft, version 3, 3/7/2012; Teacher Consent to
Participate Draft, version 4, 3/13/2012; Parental Consent to Participate Draft, version 3,

Approved Subject Enrollment #: 30
Performance Site: UIC
Sponsor: None

Research Protocol:
- Experiences and Practices of General Education Teachers Supporting Students with
  Emotional Disturbance; Version 2; 03/07/2012

Recruiting Material:
- Teacher Contact Email; Version 3; 03/07/2012

Informed Consent:
- Teacher Consent to Participate; Version 4; 03/13/2012

Parental Permission:
- Parental Consent to Participate; Version 3; 03/13/2011

Please note the Review History of this submission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipt Date</th>
<th>Submission Type</th>
<th>Review Process</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Review Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/07/2012</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Expedited</td>
<td>03/08/2012</td>
<td>Modifications Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/2012</td>
<td>Response To Modifications</td>
<td>Expedited</td>
<td>03/15/2012</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please be sure to:

➔ Use only the IRB-approved and stamped consent documents when enrolling subjects.

➔ Use your research protocol number (2011-0653) on any documents or correspondence with the
IRB concerning your research protocol.

➔ Review and comply with all requirements on the enclosure,
"UIC Investigator Responsibilities, Protection of Human Research Subjects"

Please note that the UIC IRB #2 has the right to ask further questions, seek additional
information, or monitor the conduct of your research and the consent process.

Please be aware that if the scope of work in the grant/project changes, the protocol must be
amended and approved by the UIC IRB before the initiation of the change.
APPENDIX E (continued)

We wish you the best as you conduct your research. If you have any questions or need further help, please contact the OPRS at (312) 996-1711 or me at (312) 926-2014. Please send any correspondence about this protocol to OPRS at 203 AOB, M/C 672.

Sincerely,

Sandra Costello
Assistant Director, IRB # 2
Office for the Protection of Research Subjects

Enclosures:

1. **UIC Investigator Responsibilities, Protection of Human Research Subjects**
2. **Data Security Enclosure**
3. **Informed Consent Document:**
   a) Teacher Consent to Participate; Version 4; 03/13/2012
4. **Parental Permission:**
   a) Parental Consent to Participate; Version 3; 03/13/2011
5. **Recruiting Material:**
   a) Teacher Contact Email; Version 3; 03/07/2012

cc: Lisa Cushing (faculty advisor), Special Education, M/C 147
    Christine L. Salisbury, Special Education, M/C 628
APPENDIX E (continued)

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT CHICAGO

Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS)
Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research (MC 672)
203 Administrative Office Building
1737 West Pekin Street
Chicago, Illinois 60617-7227

Approval Notice
Amendment to Research Protocol – Expedited Review
UIC Amendment # 2

March 28, 2012

Nina Weisling, M. Ed.
Special Education

Phone:

RE: Protocol # 2011-0653
“Experiences and Practices of General Education Teachers Supporting Students with Emotional Disturbance”

Dear Ms. Weisling:

Members of Institutional Review Board (IRB) #2 have reviewed this amendment to your research under expedited procedures for minor changes to previously approved research allowed by Federal regulations [45 CFR 46.110(b)(2)]. The amendment to your research was determined to be acceptable and may now be implemented.

Please note the following information about your approved amendment:

Amendment Approval Date: March 28, 2012

Amendment:
Summary: UIC Amendment #2, dated 26 March 2012 and submitted to OPRS 27 March 2012, is an investigator-initiated amendment adding Junior High School (letter 3/20/2012), Junior High School (letter 3/21/2012), and Junior High School (letter 3/6/2012) as research sites.

Approved Subject Enrollment #: 30

Performance Sites:
UIC, Junior High School - Senior High School -
Junior High School -
Junior High School -

Sponsor: None

Phone: 312-996-1711
http://www.uic.edu/depts/ovcr/opr/
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Please note the Review History of this submission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipt Date</th>
<th>Submission Type</th>
<th>Review Process</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Review Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/27/2012</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Expedited</td>
<td>03/28/2012</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please be sure to:

➔ Use your research protocol number (2011-0653) on any documents or correspondence with the IRB concerning your research protocol.

➔ Review and comply with all requirements on the enclosure, “UIC Investigator Responsibilities, Protection of Human Research Subjects”

Please note that the UIC IRB #2 has the right to ask further questions, seek additional information, or monitor the conduct of your research and the consent process.

Please be aware that if the scope of work in the grant/project changes, the protocol must be amended and approved by the UIC IRB before the initiation of the change.

We wish you the best as you conduct your research. If you have any questions or need further help, please contact the OPRS at (312) 996-1711 or me at (312) 996-2014. Please send any correspondence about this protocol to OPRS at 203 AOB, M/C 672.

Sincerely,

Sandra Costello
Assistant Director, IRB #2
Office for the Protection of Research Subjects

Enclosures:

1. UIC Investigator Responsibilities, Protection of Human Research Subjects
2. Data Security Enclosure

cc: Lisa Cushing (faculty advisor), Special Education, M/C 147
    Christine L. Salisbury, Special Education, M/C 628
I am conducting a research study to learn about teacher beliefs and classroom practices when supporting students with emotional disturbance (ED) in inclusive settings. This study outlines the details of this study as well as the requirements. Please read through and complete the form at the end of the document.

- I will observe you and two of your students, one who has been identified as having an emotional disturbance (ED) on an Individualized Education Program (IEP), and one who has not been identified as having a disability. I will observe you as you interact through a 40-120 minute segment of the school day. You must teach the student with ED for at least 40 consecutive minutes in language arts, math, science, and/or social studies.

- If you and your students agree to participate, you will be observed in your classroom once a week/bi-weekly for 40-120 minutes, depending on the length of your instructional block. During each of those observations data about your instructional and management practices will be collected using a real-time data recording device on a laptop computer.

- If you agree to participate, you will be assigned an identification number so that your name will not appear on any document. This ID number will be linked to your name only once, on a master list, which will be kept in a locked file that only the Principal Investigator (PI), Nina Weisling, will have access to, and it will be kept confidential. The master list will be destroyed at the completion of the study. Once you have been assigned your ID number I will collect some basic background information, including gender, age, number of years teaching, class size, degree, and certificate type. All of this information will be tied to the ID number rather than your name.

- Data that is collected through observations will only be shared anonymously and in combination with data from several other classrooms at the end of the study. Your school contact information will be retained in order to provide you with a copy of the results and subsequent write up.

- Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and can be stopped at any point in the study. Even if you agree to participate initially, you can refuse or ask for the study to be stopped at any time.
APPENDIX F (continued)

Why is this research being done?
The purpose of this study is to examine what teachers believe about their experiences and practices when working with students diagnosed with emotional disturbance (ED), and how those beliefs align to actual classroom practices. The results of this study will help me to better understand how teacher beliefs shape their classroom practices, and how that impacts the educational experiences of students with and without ED. This valuable information will also contribute to a broader body of research about how we can best serve students with and without ED in inclusive, general education classrooms.

What procedures are involved?
The focus of this study is on teacher behaviors and interactions with two students: a student with and a student without emotional disturbance. You will help me determine if you have a student with ED and a student without a disability who potentially meet the inclusion criteria. I will then ask you to distribute parental consent and student assent forms to the students up to three times, directing any and all questions to me at the contact information below. Within two weeks, if 60% of family consent forms are returned signed, regardless of whether families agree to participate or not, your class will receive $50 to purchase a school-approved celebration such as a popcorn party or individual snacks for each student. The incentive must be approved by your principal. If you and students agree to participate, you will complete a 20-30 minute behavior checklist on each student. If the students meet criteria, we will set up four to five observations lasting 40-120 minutes each. I will conduct the majority of observations, though it is possible a research assistant may conduct one observation. During at least one of the observations, two researchers will be present to ensure data-collection is accurate. After at least two observations, you will be asked to complete a 20-30 minute survey. None of the data collected will be linked in any way back to you or your students. You will be provided with a copy of the results and subsequent write up.

What are the potential risks and discomforts?
There are minimal risks associated with this research study. The primary risk is that you may feel uncomfortable being observed. A second risk is an accidental disclosure of information that would let others know of your participation in this research. This may impact how others view your professionalism or conduct in the classroom. In order to minimize this risk, only your administrator, your participating students and their families, and you will be informed of the purpose of this study. All identifying information will be removed from any and all documents and files will be kept in a secured location to which only the P.I. has access. If at any time you feel uncomfortable, just notify the researcher and observations will be stopped.

Are there benefits to taking part in the research?
There are no direct benefits for you. This study will offer insight into the experiences with and classroom behaviors of general education teachers working with students with and without emotional disturbance. The data collected from this study will shed critical light on what practices are currently being utilized to support this population of students in general education classrooms. This information will help the field better support teachers of students with ED as well as the students themselves.

Will I be compensated for taking part in this research?
For your participation in this study, you will receive a professional text related to working with students with ED and a $150 gift card.
What about privacy and confidentiality?
All of your information will be kept confidential. Your name will be matched with an identification (ID) number. The paper linking the two will be seen only by the PI and will be kept in a secured location for the duration of the study and will be destroyed at the end. Every subsequent document will contain this ID number and only I will have access to this information. You as the teacher will be aware of the identity of the students who are being observed and discussed, and it is likely that other teachers and staff in the school will be aware that you are participating in a research project, though only your administrator will know the purpose of the study.

No information that will link your name to any aspect of the study will be included in any published reports. All data will be kept in a locked cabinet or password protected computer hard drive. The hard drive will be kept in a locked location. After the data has been analyzed and evaluated, it will be kept, de-identified, for up to 5 years. The master list connecting names to ID numbers will be destroyed at the end of the study. After 5 years, all other data will be destroyed.

I will not release any information about or your classroom unless it is protects your welfare or the welfare of your students (e.g. the UIC Institutional Review Board monitors the study or consent process) or if required by law. Please note the UIC Office for the Protection of Research Subjects/Institutional Review Board and Auditors from UIC or the State of Illinois always have the right to inspect research records for research conducted at UIC.

What are the costs for participating in this research?
There are no costs to you for participating in this study.

Can I withdraw or be removed from this study?
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You can withdraw at any point during the study, including before, during, or after observations and data collection has begun. Also, if you become uncomfortable at any point, you can withdraw from the study.

You can choose whether or not you will participate in this study. If you sign the permission form now, but later change your mind and decide you do not want to participate, you may withdraw your consent at any time without any consequences. To withdraw from this study, please contact me, Nina Weisling, at . You can email me as well at , or my faculty advisor, Dr. Lisa Cushing at or .

Who should I contact if I have questions?
Please feel free to contact Nina Weisling, primary researcher, at . You can also email me at . At any point you may also contact my UIC faculty advisor Dr. Lisa Cushing at or .

What are my rights as a research subject?
If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may call the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 312-996-1711 or via email at uicirb@uic.edu.
APPENDIX F (continued)

Signature of Teacher

I have read (or someone has read to me) the preceding information. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions, and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have been given a copy of this form.

___ YES, I will participate in the study, "Experiences and Practices of General Education Teachers Supporting Students with Emotional Disturbance in Inclusive Settings" as described above.

___ NO, I DO NOT wish to participate in the study, "Experiences and Practices of General Education Teachers Supporting Students with Emotional Disturbance in Inclusive Settings" as described above.

Signature of Teacher

Date

Printed Name of Teacher

Signature of Researcher

Date
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University of Illinois at Chicago
Nina Weisling, PhD Candidate, Special Education

Your child’s teacher has agreed to participate in a study about teacher beliefs and practices when working with students with emotional disturbance (ED) in the general education classroom. I am asking your permission to potentially observe your child in order to collect data about teacher behaviors. I am also asking for permission for the teacher to share information with me about your child’s behavior and whether or not s/he has an Individualized Education Program (IEP). Only students who meet the eligibility criteria and sample size requirements will be considered for participation. Even if you give permission, your child may not be selected if s/he does not meet the eligibility criteria. Please read this letter, which outlines the specifics of the study for those students who meet the eligibility criteria. Please fill out the last page, and return this form in this envelope with your child as soon as possible. If 60% of your child’s class returns this form signed within two weeks of today’s date, regardless of whether or not you agree to let your child to participate, the class will be provided $50 for a school-approved incentive such as a popcorn party or individual snacks for each student. The incentive will be approved by the school principal.

- I am planning to record data about the teacher and the way s/he responds to student behavior. This would require me to collect minimal data about your child’s behavior in the classroom and at no time would I view your child’s records or files. This study is interested in how the teacher behaves—not about your child’s behavior.

- If you agree to let your child participate in this study, a researcher will come to his/her class for between 40 and 120 minutes four to five times over the semester. I will conduct the majority of observations, though it is possible a research assistant may conduct one observation. During at least one observation, two researchers will be present to ensure data-collection is accurate. During these observations, the researcher(s) will be seated in the back of the room. No one other than the teacher and your child will know who the researcher(s) is/are observing or for what reason.

- Your child will not be taken out of class except to learn about the study and decide if s/he wants to participate. S/he will not be asked to complete any additional tasks. Your child will not lose any additional instructional time.

- I will keep your child’s name and all of his/her information completely confidential, and will never view his/her files or records.

- The data I collect will only be shared anonymously and in combination with data from several other classrooms at the end of the study. Your child’s name will not be on any forms used to collect this data. Data will not be linked in any way back to your child. You will be provided with a copy of the results and the write up.
APPENDIX G (continued)

- If at any point you become uncomfortable with your child’s participation, inform the teacher or the researcher at , and data collection will stop immediately.

- You or your son/daughter’s current or future relations with the school district, me, or the University of Illinois at Chicago will not be affected in any way if you do or do not choose to let your child participate in this study.

**Why is this research being done?**
The purpose of this study is to examine what teachers believe about their experiences and practices when working with students diagnosed with emotional disturbance (ED), as well as how those beliefs align to actual classroom practices when working with students with and without ED. The results of this study will help me better understand the educational experiences of students with and without ED. This valuable information will also contribute to a broader body of research about how we can best serve students with and without ED in inclusive, general education classrooms.

**What procedures are involved?**
The focus of this study is on teacher behaviors and interactions with two students: a student with and a student without emotional disturbance. I am asking to collect data around the teacher’s interaction with your child. This would require me to collect minimal data about your child’s behavior in the classroom. If your child has been identified as ED, you will know this based on his/her Individualized Education Program (IEP). If your child has not been identified, s/he will not be evaluated or identified during this study. Regardless of whether or not your child has an IEP and has been diagnosed with ED, s/he is a potential participant and his/her participation in this study will contribute to improving the educational experiences of all students, especially students with ED. If, for any reason, you are upset that you and your child are being approached for this study, please contact the PI, Nina Weisling. Her contact information is provided below.

If you agree to allow your child to participate, I will arrange a time with his/her teacher to meet with your child for 10 minutes to review the assent forms. Your child will then have a chance to decide whether or not s/he would like to participate. If s/he agrees to participate, s/he will be assigned an identification number so that her/his name will not appear on any document. This background information, including gender, age, and whether or not s/he has an IEP, will be tied to the ID number rather than your child’s name. Your child’s teacher will provide information whether or not s/he has an IEP so that the researcher will never access his/her files or records.

Your child’s name will not be on any forms or data used to collect this data and the data will only be shared anonymously, when it is combined with other data. It will not be linked in any way back to your child. All information will be kept completely separate from your child’s name and only the Principal Investigator will have access to it. All data will be stored in a locked file. Parents please be aware that under the Protection of Pupil Rights Act. 20 U.S.C. Section 1232(c)(1)(A), you have the right to review a copy of the questions asked or materials that will be used with your students. If you would like to do so, you should contact Nina Weisling at in order to obtain a copy of the questions or materials.
APPENDIX G (continued)

What are the potential risks and discomforts?
There are minimal risks associated with this research study. At no time during the course of this study will your child be pulled from class or lose instructional time. His/her files will not be accessed by anyone but the teacher. The observers will at no time talk to or engage your child unless the child has questions. There is a slight chance that your child may feel uncomfortable being observed. If your child’s status as a participant in the study is revealed to other students, there is a risk that s/he might feel stigmatized by other students. However, the researchers will not directly interact with your child unless s/he has questions, so it is unlikely other students will find out. If at any time either you or your child feels uncomfortable, simply ask the teacher or PI and I will stop the observations.

Are there benefits to taking part in the research?
There are no direct benefits for you or your child. However, this study will offer insight into the the instructional experiences of students with and without special needs and will contribute to improving those experiences. Additionally, if 60% of your child’s class returns this form signed within two weeks of today’s date, regardless of whether or not you agree to let your child to participate, the class will be provided $50 for a school-approved incentive such as a popcorn party or individual snacks for each student. The incentive will be approved by the school principal.

What about privacy and confidentiality?
All information about your child will be kept confidential. Your child’s name will be matched with an identification (ID) number. The paper linking the two will be seen only by the PI and will be kept in a locked location for the duration of the study and will be destroyed at the end. Every document for this study will contain this ID number and only I will have access to this information. Other teachers, the school staff, and students may know that the teacher is participating in research and may know that your child is participating.

No information that will link your child’s name to any aspect of the study will included in any published reports. All data will be kept in a locked file, kept on a computer hard drive that is password protected. The hard drive will be kept in a locked location. After the data have been analyzed and evaluated, it will be kept for up to 5 years. None of the data will have your child’s name or any other identifying information on it. After 5 years, all data will be destroyed.

I will not release any information about your child unless it is to protect his/her welfare (e.g. the UIC Institutional Review Board monitors the study or consent process) or if required by law. Please note the UIC Office for the Protection of Research Subjects/Institutional Review Board and Auditors from UIC or the State of Illinois always have the right to inspect research records for research conducted at UIC.

What are the costs for participating in this research?
There are no costs to you or your child for participating in this study.

Can I withdraw or be removed from this study?
Your child’s participation in this study is completely voluntary. S/he can withdraw at any point during the study, including before, during, or after observations and data collection has begun with no penalty. Even if you and your child have agreed to participate earlier, at any point in the study, you can withdraw.
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The school will be provided with a copy of your signed consent form. They will not be informed if you choose not to participate. They will also not be informed if you have consented and at any time in the study you decide to withdraw your child’s participation. Your decision, therefore, will not affect you or your son/daughter’s current or future relations with the school district, me, or the University of Illinois at Chicago.

You can choose whether or not your child participates in this study. If you sign the permission form now, but later change your mind and decide you do not want your child to participate, you may withdraw your consent at any time without any consequences. To withdraw from this study, please contact me, Nina Weisling, at . You can email me as well at or my faculty advisor, Dr. Lisa Cushing at or .

Who should I contact if I have questions?
Please feel free to contact Nina Weisling, Primary Investigator, at . You can also email me at . At any point you may also contact my UIC faculty advisor Dr. Lisa Cushing at or .

What are my rights as a research subject?
If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may call the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 312-996-1711 or via email at uicirb@uic.edu.
APPENDIX G (continued)

Study Summary:
• Even if you give permission, only students who meet the eligibility criteria will be included in this study. The following information applies to students who meet those criteria.

• If you agree to let your child participate in this study I will come to his/her class for between 40 and 120 minutes four to five times over the semester. During observations, I will be seated in the back of the room. No one other than the teacher and your child will know who I am observing or for what reason. I will not view your child’s file at any time.

• Your child’s teacher will provide the PI with basic information about your child including age and whether or not s/he has an Individualized Education Plan (IEP).

• Your child will not be taken out of class at any time and s/he will not be asked to complete any additional tasks. Your child will not lose any instructional time.

• I will keep your child’s name and all of his/her information completely confidential, and will never view his/her files or records. The data I collect will not be linked in any way back to your child. You will be provided with a copy of the results and the write up.

• If at any point you become uncomfortable with your child’s participation, inform the teacher or the researcher at , and data collection will stop immediately. You or your son/daughter’s current or future relations with the school district, me, or the University of Illinois at Chicago will not be affected in any way if you do or do not choose to let your child participate in this study.

Signature of Parent/Guardian: Please complete and return to school with your child. I have read the above items and (please check one):

  ___ YES, I give permission for my child to participate in the study, “Experiences and Practices of General Education Teachers Supporting Students with Emotional Disturbance in Inclusive Settings” as described above.

  ___ NO, I DO NOT give permission for my child to participate in “Experiences and Practices of General Education Teachers Supporting Students with Emotional Disturbance in Inclusive Settings” as described above.

_________________________________________  ______________________________________
Signature of Parent/Guardian                                  Date

Printed Name of Parent/Guardian

_____________________________  __________________________
Print Name of Child (first and last names)                Age

_________________________________________  ______________________________________
Signature of Researcher                                  Date
Parental Consent to Participate Draft #3
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Nina Weisling, PhD Candidate, Special Education

Hello! I am a student at the University of Illinois at Chicago. I am asking you to participate in a research study that I am conducting here at your school. I would like to observe and record the way your teacher works with you as you participate in your school day.

1. If you agree to be in this study, I will come into your class for one to two hours four to five times. During those observations I will be collecting data on my computer. Sometimes another researcher will come with me and we will both collect data. Other times s/he might come without me.

2. I am planning to record data about your teacher and the way s/he teaches you and responds to your behavior. If at any point you become uncomfortable, just say so and I will stop recording that data.

3. I will keep your name and all information I gather about you confidential, or private. No one but you, your family, and your teacher will know you are participating in this study or what this study is about.

4. I have asked your parent/guardian(s) for permission for you to participate in this study, but I need to make sure you understand what is being asked of you. Also, you can choose not to participate in this study if you want to. You won’t get into any trouble for saying you do not want to participate.

5. Please feel free to ask me any questions you have. You can email or call me if you think of any questions. My email is and my phone number is

Please read this and fill out the information below. Thank you.

I have read the above items and (please check one):

___ Yes, I want to participate in this study

___ No, I do not want to participate in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s Signature</th>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researcher’s Signature Date
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EDUCATION
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