



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION | UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

JOURNAL OF CURRICULUM, TEACHING,
LEARNING, AND LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

Volume 1 | Issue 1

Article 2

May 2016

The Redirect Behavior Model and the Effects on Pre-service Teachers' Self-Efficacy

Victoria Lentfer

University of Nebraska at Omaha, vlentfer@unomaha.edu

Bridget A. Franks

University of Nebraska at Omaha, bafranks@unomaha.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/ctlle>



Part of the [Educational Methods Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lentfer, Victoria and Franks, Bridget A. (2016) "The Redirect Behavior Model and the Effects on Pre-service Teachers' Self-Efficacy," *Journal of Curriculum, Teaching, Learning and Leadership in Education*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 1 , Article 2.

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/ctlle/vol1/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Curriculum, Teaching, Learning and Leadership in Education by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF
Nebraska
Omaha

THE REDIRECT BEHAVIOR MODEL AND THE EFFECTS ON PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY

Victoria S. Lentfer
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Bridget A. Franks
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Abstract: *The ability for a novice teacher to confidently address inappropriate behavior has a substantial impact on student achievement, teacher attrition, and the reduction of bullying instances (Allen, 2010; Marzano, 2003). Classroom management plays a critical role in the success of the student as well as the teacher. The authors propose an intervention that potentially may have considerable impact on a novice teachers' confidence regarding classroom management. The idea of providing guidelines for novice teachers to implement while redirecting student behavior could perhaps impact self-efficacy with classroom management. This paper describes the implementation of the Redirect Behavior Model with pre-service teachers during a five week practicum. The Redirect Behavior Model (RBM) is a proactive communication model that provides scripted guidelines for teachers to follow while they redirect inappropriate student behavior. The pre-service teachers were given extensive training on the RBM and were able to implement the model during an extensive field placement. Participants were 31 undergraduate pre-service teacher candidates, majoring in secondary education and enrolled in a junior-level classroom management course. The participants were trained in all three phases of the Redirect Behavior Model (RBM) prior to engaging in an extensive field practicum. Participants responded to an informal survey to explore students' self-efficacy about their knowledge and ability to manage student behavior. Paired samples *t* tests were used to evaluate possible differences between pre- and posttests for the two sets of items (knowledge and self-efficacy). The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of training in the RBM on pre-service teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management.*

Background

Classroom management is estimated to have twice the impact of school policy, curriculum, assessment, or community involvement on student achievement (Marzano, 2003). Yet managing classroom behavior can be one of the greatest stressors in the life of a beginning teacher (Moore, Anderson, & Kumar, 2005). Even though most teacher training programs provide new teachers with the knowledge and skills to successfully transition into the classroom, many new teachers still experience frustration, isolation, and failure within the first few years of teaching (Rubinstein, 2010). New teachers lack confidence in their classroom management skills and often report a lack of preparation to manage their classrooms (Latham & Vogt, 2007). Managing disruptive behavior is a particular source of stress (Hong, 2012). With nearly 50% of newly hired teachers leaving the teaching profession within five years (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010), it is vitally important for pre-service teachers to attain both the skills and the confidence to manage student misbehavior and create a positive, productive classroom environment. The RBM is a proactive communication model that provides scripted guidelines for teachers to follow while they redirect inappropriate student behavior. The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of training in the RBM on pre-service teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management.

Challenges faced by new teachers. Pearman & Lefever-Davis (2005) conducted an extensive study on new teachers and found that teacher efficacy was negatively impacted by student discipline and classroom management problems, which resulted in high levels of stress and early departures from the teaching profession. A factor that may contribute to this stress for new teachers is that they are placed in economically disadvantaged classrooms at a

higher rate than more experienced teachers (Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2005). The least experienced teachers thus begin their careers in the most challenging situations, before they have developed their classroom management skills.

Expectations for teachers remain high, even in classrooms with many at-risk learners. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004 place a high priority on improving achievement results for economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities (Donovan & Cross, 2002). Well-managed classrooms are considered a vital component in this effort because of their significant effects on student achievement (Harrell, Leavell, van Tassel, & McKee, 2004).

Although dealing with disruptive behavior is critical to the functioning of classrooms in disadvantaged schools (Kellam, Ling, Merisca, Brown & Ialongo, 1998), students in those schools are often at risk for harsh or punitive discipline measures. In a report from the Equity Project at Indiana University, researchers Carter, Fine, & Russell (2014) noted that punitive discipline practices, especially suspension and expulsion, are disproportionately applied to students from marginalized populations in the United States. Discipline disparities for African American males and females, students with disabilities, Hispanic/Latino students, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and gender non-conforming students are well-documented, and associated with a wide range of negative outcomes, including lower academic engagement and achievement, risk of dropping out, and increased contact with the juvenile justice system. These researchers have called for nationwide action to develop classroom management techniques that will effectively reduce discipline disparities (Carter, Fine, & Russell, 2014).

Whatever their disciplinary consequences, disruptive behaviors invariably reduce the time students spend on learning (Christensen, Young, & Marchant, 2004). Disruptive students have lower grades, and score considerably lower on standardized tests than non-disruptive students (Emmer & Stough, 2001). Redirecting student misbehavior can be time intensive, further reducing valuable instructional time for all students. In economically disadvantaged schools, a new teacher's inability to manage a classroom effectively may result in lower achievement among students who are already at risk for academic failure (Harrell et. al., 2004). For these reasons, new teachers must be prepared with communication mechanisms or tools they can use to effectively and efficiently address student misbehavior.

There is no lack of interest in in such tools among either pre-service or beginning-level teachers. Pre-service teacher candidates place a high value on classroom management skills and often seek opportunities to develop techniques to increase their effectiveness (Anderson, Barksdale, & Hite, 2004). Among new teachers, behavior and classroom management techniques are the single most common resource request (Rose & Gallup, 2005). Despite this interest, however, classroom management and classroom disruptions continue to be major contributors to high levels of stress and teacher attrition (Hong, 2012).

Effective Classroom Management. A substantial body of literature has documented effective classroom management techniques. Proactive behavior management strategies (Good & Brophy, 2003) and positive interactions between teacher and students (Reinke, Lewis-Palmer, & Martin, 2007) have been linked to increased student engagement and decreased class disruptions (Sutherland, Wehby, & Copeland, 2000). Establishing and maintaining a clear communication system that involves the teacher and student does not guarantee a classroom without disruptions (Emmer & Stough, 2001). But a communication model that allows the teacher as well as the student to communicate appropriately and respectfully will assist in minimizing such disruptions. Training in such a model may help pre-service teachers to feel more confident and better prepared to manage their future classrooms. This study explored the effects of training with the RBM on pre-service teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management.

The Redirect Behavior Model

The Redirect Behavior Model, developed by the first author, is a proactive communication model that provides a scripted guideline for teachers to follow while they redirect inappropriate student behavior. The model is an aid in effective classroom communication. The author developed a script or guideline for teachers to use for the most common situations in which the teacher must address inappropriate behavior. The premise for developing the model was to effectively communicate behavior expectations while concentrating on appropriate communication skills in order to maintain a positive culture in an urban setting. Successful urban schools have concentrated on developing students' social interactions with the idea that the students will ultimately be able to self-regulate their

actions. RBM aims to assist teachers in helping their students develop appropriate communication skills, so that the students are able to manage their decision-making successfully. Students who develop appropriate communication skills reduce their tendency to participate in high-risk behavior and increase their academic success considerably (Solomon, Battistich, Watson, Schaps, & Lewis, 2000). A panel of experts from the Institute of Education Sciences (2012) strongly recommended that teachers intentionally teach appropriate behavior and social skills throughout the curriculum. A number of studies have found behavior and social skills interventions to dramatically decrease class disruptions, leading students to have more time on task (IES, 2012). Based on this research, the RBM was developed to address effective communication for teachers to maintain a calm, productive classroom.

The Redirect Behavior Model is based on the Boys Town Teaching Model (Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, 2004). The RBM expanded upon the corrective teaching components of the Boys Town Model into three phases of communicating and addressing disruptive behavior. The Boys Town Model focuses primarily on teaching appropriate social skills, rules and procedures, and healthy relationships in order to maintain a well-managed classroom. The Boys Town Education Model (BTEM) is a multi-dimensional model specifically for schools that addresses three main components: a) well-managed schools (general education), b) specialized classroom management (high-risk classroom setting), and c) administrative intervention (office referrals) (Fluke, Peterson, & Oliver, 2013). The BTEM is based on applied behavior analysis and social learning theory and has expanded upon the initial Boys Town Teaching Model in order to support schools in building positive relationships, teaching and reinforcing social skills, and addressing problem behavior (Fluke, Peterson, & Oliver, 2013; Hensley, Powell, Lamke, & Hartman, 2011). The application of the model has been linked to a marked improvement of social skills and school adjustment (Fluke, Peterson, & Oliver, 2013; Thompson, Ruman, Nelson, & Criste, 1998), decrease in office referrals for the severely emotional and behavioral students (Fluke, Peterson, & Oliver, 2013; Duppong Hurley and Hyland, 2000), and a decrease in suspensions (Fluke, Peterson, & Oliver, 2013; Thompson, Nelson, Spenceri, & Maybank, 1999).

Phases of the Redirect Behavior Model. The model consists of a series of three phases: Initial Training, Questioning, and Firm. Each phase consists of three main tenets of clear, high quality communication. Using the communication model, an educator will indicate the student's misbehavior, identify the preferred appropriate behavior, and communicate the rationale for the preferred behavior. The phases are carried out in the following manner:

Phase I, Initial Training: Teacher Centered. In this phase, the classroom teacher communicates the behavior and academic expectations of the classroom. It is primarily teacher-centered; the educator takes every moment as a teaching moment to communicate the appropriate behavior for the classroom. Phase I is primarily used within the first 3-4 weeks of the new school year and its main objective is to establish and model the appropriate behavior that is expected throughout the school year. So the teacher will use every disruption as a teaching moment for a teachable moment. The teacher is truly guiding the redirection throughout this phase.

Phase II, Questioning: Student Ownership. In this phase, the students are at the center of the interaction. The teacher serves as the facilitator for the interaction, utilizing a series of questions that still maintain the three tenets of quality communication: identifying the undesirable behavior, the preferred behavior, and the rationale for the appropriate behavior. The teacher facilitates the interaction by asking the students questions regarding their behavior. For example, the teacher may ask the student "what are you doing," "what should you be doing," "why is this important". The students must identify the inappropriate behavior, indicate the appropriate behavior, and finally provide a rationale for why the appropriate behavior is a better choice.

Phase III, Firm. In this phase, the student is non-compliant and is unable to participate fully and successfully in the classroom. The educator states the two options, which are simply the easy way or the hard way. Option one, the easy way, is to fully comply with the educator's request and follow the instructions. Option two, the hard way, is to continue the inappropriate behavior, at which point the educator communicates the arduous process the student will have to withstand as a consequence of his/her behavior. This includes contacting of parent(s) or guardian(s), principal, dean of students, counselors, and any other persons of authority, for a series of meetings to discuss the appropriate consequences. After communicating the two options, the educator then gives the student a few minutes to decide which option he/she will choose to employ. Depending on the student's response or action, the educator then calmly either writes a ticket out of the room if the student is non-compliant, or praises the student for choosing to comply with the instructions.

Research Questions

Before and after their RBM training, we asked students to use self-reflection on a survey and utilized a focus group to inform the researches as to the effectiveness of the RBM. The survey measured two areas, knowledge of effective classroom management elements (e.g., *I know teaching behavior strategies contributes to a well-managed classroom*) and personal self-efficacy regarding classroom management (e.g., *I believe I am able to remain calm while redirecting misbehavior*). Thus, our research questions were:

1. Does RBM training affect pre-service teachers' knowledge of effective classroom management elements?
2. Does RBM training affect pre-service teachers' self-efficacy beliefs regarding their own classroom management skills?

Method

Participants. The participants were 31 undergraduate pre-service teachers majoring in secondary education. The course in which they were enrolled was a junior-level classroom management course, required for all secondary majors. As part of the course, students were individually placed for a field practicum with a clinical teacher in their endorsement area. The participants ranged in age from 20 to 52, with the majority between 20 and 24. There were 13 male participants and 19 female participants. The majority (94%) of the participants were Caucasian, two participants were Native American, and one participant was Hispanic.

Instrument. An informal survey was developed by the first author to explore students' self-efficacy about both their knowledge of classroom management and their personal efficacy in managing students' behavior, both before and after taking the classroom management course. The survey required students to rate themselves on a 1-5 Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree). The survey was adapted from the Attitudes Towards Science Inventory (ATSI), developed by Gogolin and Swartz, (1992). The questions were modeled from the ATSI, but the topic of science attitudes was changed to classroom management. The survey consisted of two types of items: 1) knowledge of effective classroom management elements (5 items) and 2) personal self-efficacy regarding classroom management (10 items). Scores on knowledge and self-efficacy items were analyzed separately; thus each student had a knowledge score and a self-efficacy score.

Reflective Journals. The reflective journals were assigned after the completion of the practicum experience. The reflective journals consisted of a series of critical thinking questions that allowed the student to explore their successes and challenges using the RBM. All names were not allowed and were discarded. The reflective journals will be used as evidence to further support a theme(s) throughout the research study.

Setting. The study was conducted in two large metropolitan school systems located in the Midwestern United States. The preservice teachers were placed in either one of two school districts. One district has an enrollment of 9,018 secondary students, of which 53% receive free or reduced-price lunches (Iowa Department of Education, 2014a). The district reported in 2013-14 school year that 23% were minorities, 7% were ELL, and 53% were eligible for Free and/or Reduced Lunches (Iowa Department of Education, 2014a). More specifically, the ethnicity of the district was composed of 77% White; 15% Hispanic; 3% African American; 5% Multi-Race (Iowa Department of Education, 2014a).

The second district has an enrollment of 9,726 students of which 32% receive free or reduced-price lunches and 2.2% are enrolled in the ESL Program. The ethnicity of the district was composed of 74.3% White; 9.2% African American; 9.3% Hispanic; 7.2% other (Bellevue Public Schools, 2013).

The clinical practice consisted of three consecutive hours each day, Monday through Thursday, for five weeks. The pre-service teachers had a total of 60 hours in the field and were individually placed with a cooperating teacher within their endorsement area. Each pre-service teacher delivered three whole group lessons, co-taught with the cooperating teacher, and developed a variety of classroom management skills.

Procedures. The survey was administered in a required university classroom management course with a field practicum. Because the intervention was taught to all participants as an assignment for university course work, the study involved an intact group of pre-service teachers in a quasi-experimental, pretest-posttest design. Students were asked to complete the survey both prior to the field practicum and after they had completed the practicum. Confidentiality of students' responses was assured via the use of a set of random codes assigned to each participating student so that pretest and posttest surveys could be kept together. The course instructor was given no information that could connect a student with a comment or rating on the Likert scale. Participants were required to participate in the training of the RBM and practice the model during the practicum, but completing the survey was optional or voluntary.

The reflective journals were assigned after they participated in the clinical practice. The students were asked a series of critical thinking questions regarding the implementation of the RBM and its effectiveness regarding the pre-service teachers' efficacy with redirecting inappropriate behavior. The questions allowed the students to express their successes and challenges using the RBM during their field placement. All names were not allowed and were discarded as the researchers used the journals as evidence to further support a theme(s) throughout the research study. Student grades in the course were not influenced by their survey responses or by participation in this research study, which was voluntary.

Intervention. The pre-service teacher candidates received extensive training using all three phases of the RBM prior to their field practicum. The training involved having the candidates deliver a 10-minute mini-lesson in class; while they delivered the lesson, another student would create a disruption and the candidate would have to redirect the misbehavior via using the model. The disruption was implemented according to the phase of the RBM; for example, when the candidates practiced Phase I, the disruptive student was compliant when redirected. In Phase II, the disruption was more intense and required the student to make a decision about his/her behavior. In Phase III, the disruption was serious and the student was non-compliant, therefore, the teacher candidate presenting the lesson delivered the Phase III redirection. The training process consisted of 20-30 hours of in-class practice prior to the field practicum. The class convened for five weeks before the students began their field practicum. Once they were placed in the field, the pre-service teachers implemented the RBM with all students in middle school and secondary classroom settings, for the purpose of supporting positive pre-teaching techniques to prevent or reduce inappropriate behavior. The RBM is considered universal because it was implemented with the entire class rather than an individual or subgroup requiring additional behavior support. The communication model reviewed was put into action by each pre-service teacher in the context of his or her classroom, with the expectation that the model reduces problem behavior in the classroom.

Results

Survey Results. Paired samples *t* tests were used to evaluate possible differences between pretest and posttest scores for the two sets of items (knowledge and self-efficacy); Table 1 illustrates the results obtained with the two sets of items. For knowledge of classroom management, the difference between pretest and posttest scores was significant, $t(30) = 3.55$, $p < .001$. Using Cohen's *d* formula for a paired samples *t* test, a moderate to high effect size of .64 was obtained. For self-efficacy regarding classroom management, the difference between pretest and posttest scores was also significant, $t(30) = 5.67$, $p < .001$. Using Cohen's *d* formula for a paired samples *t* test, a high effect size of 1.02 was obtained. Both knowledge and self-efficacy were significantly higher following training and practice with the RBM model (see Table 1).

Table 1

Paired samples t-tests with pretest and posttest scores on Classroom Management Knowledge and Self-Efficacy Beliefs regarding classroom management

Subscale	N	Mean, SD Pre	Mean, SD Post	t-value	Sig. (p)	Effect size*
Knowledge	31	21.87 (3.10)	23.22 (2.54)	3.55	< .001	.64
Efficacy	31	32.77 (8.41)	41.45 (6.44)	5.67	< .001	1.02

*Cohen's *d* values: .30 = small effect, .60 = moderate effect, >.60 = large effect (Cohen, 1988)

Reflective Journal Results

Assertion 1: Participation in the five week field placement was not immediately sufficient for all pre-service teachers to consistently redirect behavior to effectively teach their content. The key to a well-managed classroom is the ability to develop relationships. The pre-service teachers were not as comfortable using the model in their first two weeks of the practicum. However, by the fourth week, the students reported their confidence had increased.

“In the beginning I was not comfortable using the model. I tried it and found it worked.

As soon as I began to get to know the students, it was much easier to use the model.”

Pre-service teacher 8

“The last couple of weeks I was able to use the model with ease. And it worked! The students didn't question my request.”

Pre-service teacher 2

Assertion 2: The pre-service teacher initiated a positive, proactive approach to addressing inappropriate behavior. Some of the preservice teachers encountered a classroom that may not have had positive classroom management. The cooperating teacher would use an elevated voice and demand obedient behavior. However, the pre-service teacher demonstrated a more positive, calmer approach to redirecting behavior with the use of the RBM. In the beginning the pre-service teacher was unsure how to address the inappropriate behavior because they did not want to interfere with the classroom culture. However, with a steady implementation of the model, the students were able to establish positive, proactive communication with the students.

“ . . . I wasn't sure if my teacher (cooperating teacher) would think I was weird for using the model, but I didn't tell her about the model and began to use it.”

Pre-service teacher 3

“I was scared because the class did not have much classroom management. The students talked all the time. I used the model and it helped. I got better and it became more conversational. I use it with my own kids.”

Assertion 3: The introduction of a positive, guided model such as the RBM, enabled the pre-service teachers to introduce a new method of communication to their cooperating teacher. Reciprocal teaching occurred between the cooperating teacher and the pre-service teacher.

“My teacher (cooperating teacher) did not have great classroom management, so when I began to use the RBM, he started to ask me about it (RBM). I taught him what I was learning in the classroom.”

Pre-service teacher 7

“I taught my teacher (cooperating teacher) how to use the RBM method!”

Pre-service teacher 14

“I felt good because not only did I teach my students how to talk respectfully, but I taught my teacher (cooperating teacher). It was AWESOME!”

Pre-service teacher 16

Discussion

This investigation represents an examination of preservice teachers' self-efficacy about their knowledge of classroom management techniques and their skill at using them after training and experience with the RBM. We asked junior-level preservice teachers to reflect on how the RBM impacted their knowledge of basic classroom management strategies and their self-efficacy with regard to redirecting inappropriate classroom behavior.

Our purpose in this study was not to provide a test of the effectiveness of RBM (or any other classroom management model) for reducing disruptive behaviors in the classroom. Preservice teachers were trained in the model and used it at their practicum sites, but no data were collected on the behavior of students in their practicum classrooms. Nor does this study provide an experimental test of the effects of learning and using RBM, as compared with some other model or no model, on the self-efficacy of preservice teachers. Education majors in our program are required to take a classroom management course, so a control group that was not taught such skills would not be possible. We also did not have the resources to teach different models to different classes in the same semester and compare their effects.

As an action research study, however, this investigation offered several useful findings for our teacher preparation program. First, it demonstrated that training in RBM, followed by the opportunity for consistent practice in real classrooms, is one effective strategy for increasing education students' confidence that 1) they have learned useful information about classroom management, and 2) they have the skills they need to manage disruptive behavior in a classroom. Given the pervasive anxiety reported by new teachers about their classroom management skills (Moore, Anderson, & Kumar, 2005; Latham & Vogt, 2007) any strategy that effectively increases preservice teachers' confidence in this area is worthy of further exploration.

Second, since the experience took place in a junior-level class, the study illustrates an effective way to increase students' self-efficacy *before* they have taken the senior-level methods classes (including practicum experiences) for which expectations of their proficiency will be higher. Thus, starting early with training in RBM may help preservice teachers enter not only their upper-level methods classes, but also their student teaching, confident they have the knowledge and proficiency to manage classroom behavior.

Limitations. Due to the considerations expressed above, this study of necessity employed a quasi-experimental design. In addition, the majority of both the preservice teachers and the students in the participating school districts were Caucasian, so the results may not generalize to a more ethnically diverse sample of preservice teachers and students, or to high-poverty or rural school districts. As noted earlier, only one classroom management model was explored here. These factors, as well as the relatively small sample size, suggest that our findings must be interpreted with caution. It is also important to note that we explored only the preservice teachers' self-evaluations regarding knowledge and efficacy; we did not formally evaluate their proficiency at managing disruptive behavior.

Future Directions and Recommendations. Coursework and field experiences do not provide sufficient information about all of the skills teachers need to manage classroom behaviors effectively. Longitudinal studies could explore the possibility that extensive classroom management training early in the course of a teacher education program may be associated with lower levels of stress and teacher attrition in the first few years of their careers. It would also be useful to compare the effects of RBM training with those of other classroom management systems on teachers' self-efficacy, and to see if feelings of efficacy change throughout the course of teacher education and the first few years of professional teaching. Knowing how much training in this area teachers really need to have before they start their careers will be important for balancing classroom management skills with other twenty-first century expectations of the knowledge base of beginning teachers. Longitudinal methods would also be useful to determine if consistent use of the Redirecting Behavior Model, during teacher training as well as in the first few years of teaching, has a positive impact on student achievement. If preservice teachers feel comfortable and confident in their ability to use the model, and are able to use it over a period of years, a more solid body of knowledge about the model's effectiveness could be obtained.

Conclusion

As noted above, this study explored only the self-evaluations of preservice teachers with regard to knowledge and efficacy in classroom management. However, feelings of confidence and self-efficacy matter; for without them, teachers may not persist. Teachers' high levels of stress about disruptive behavior and their strong interest in improving their skills at managing such behavior (Anderson, Barksdale, & Hite, 2004; Rose & Gallup, 2005) both suggest that practicing teachers have strong feelings and concerns about their classroom management skills. Paying attention to these feelings early in teacher training, and providing tools that give preservice teachers confidence, may reduce the level of concern they feel later, and reinforce their effectiveness as they move into real-world classrooms.

References

- Allen, K.P. (2010). Classroom Management, Bullying, and Teacher Practices. *The Professional Educator*, 34 (1), 1-15.
- Anderson, N. A., Barksdale, M. A., Hite, C. E. (2004). Preservice teachers' observation of cooperating teachers and peers while participating in an early field experience. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(4), 97-117.
- Brophy, J., McCaslin, M. (1992). Teachers' reports of how they perceive and cope with problem students. *The Elementary School Journal*, 93(1), 3-66.
- Carter, P., Fine, M., Russell, S. (2014). Discipline disparities: A research-to-practice collaborative. *The Equity Project at Indiana University*. Retrieved from http://www.indiana.edu/~atlantic/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Disparity_Overview_040414.pdf
- Christensen, L., Young, K.R., & Merchant, M. (2004). The effects of a peer-mediated positive behavior support program on socially appropriate classroom behavior. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 27(3), 199-234. Retrieved from: <http://search.ebscohost.com.leo.lib.unomaha.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=15056567&site=ehost-live>
- Creswell, J.W., (2012). Educational Research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., Vigdor, J. L. (2005). Who teaches whom? Race and the distribution of novice teachers, *Economics of Education Review*, 24, 377-392.
- Donovan, M. S., Cross, C. T. (2002). Minority students in special and gifted education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Duppong Hurley, K., & Hyland, T. (2000). Girls and Boys Town Education Model shows promise with elementary and adolescent SE/BD students. *Teaching-Family Association*, 26, 7.
- Emmer, E. T., Stough, L. M. (2001). Classroom management: A critical part of educational psychology, with implications for teacher education. *Educational Psychologist*, 36(2), 103-112.
- Father Flanagan's Boys' Home. (2004). *The Well-managed classroom*. National Resource and Training Center, Boys Town, NE.
- Fluke, S., Peterson, R., & Oliver, R. (2013). Boys town education model: Program description. Retrieved from <http://k12engagement.unl.edu/strategy-briefs/Project%20Boys%20Town%2010-18--2013.pdf>
- Ginott, H. G. (1972). *Teacher and Child*. New York: Macmillan.
- Ginott, H. G. *Teacher and Child: A Book for Parents and Teachers*. New York: Colliers, 1993, c1972.
- Gogolin, L., Swartz, F. (1992). A quantitative and qualitative inquiry into the attitudes towards science of nonscience college students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 29(5), 487-504.
- Good, T., Brophy, J. (2003). *Looking in classrooms*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Harrell, P., Leavell, A., van Tassell, F., McKee, K. (2004). No teacher left behind: Results of a five-year study of teacher attrition. *Action in Teacher Education*, 26, 47-59.
- Hensley, M., Powell, W., Lamke, S., & Hartman, M. (2011). *Well-managed schools: Strategies to create a productive and cooperative social climate in your learning community*. Omaha, NE: Boys Town Press.
- Hong, J. Y. (2012). Teacher efficacy and pupil behavior: The structure of teachers' individual and collective beliefs and their relationship with numbers of pupils excluded from school. *British Journal of Educational*

- Psychology*, 82(4), 564-584.
- Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (2004).
- Institute of Education Sciences, (2012). Reducing behavior problems in the elementary school classroom. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/behavior_pg_092308.pdf
- Iowa Department of Education, (2014). Retrieved from <http://reports.educateiowa.gov/Home/reportWrapper>
- Kellam, S., Ling, X., Merisca, R., Brown, C. H., Ialongo, N. (1998). The effect of level of aggression in the first grade classroom on the course and malleability of aggressive behavior in middle school. *Development and Psychopathology*, 10, 165-185.
- Latham, M. I., Vogt, W. P. (2007). Do professional development schools reduce teacher attrition? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(2), 153-167.
- Manning, M. Lee, Bucher, Katherine T. (2001) Revisiting Ginott's congruent communication after thirty years. *The Clearing House*, March/April 2001.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools*. Alexandria, VA; ASCD.
- Moore, D., Anderson, A., Kumar, K. (2005). Instructional adaptation in the management of escape-maintained behavior in a classroom. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 7(4), 216-23.
- Morris, R. C. (1996). Contrasting disciplinary models in education. *Thresholds in Education*, 22(4) 7-13.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). *The condition of education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- NCTAF. (2010). Who will teach? Experience matters. Retrieved from http://nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/NCTAF-Who_Will-Teach-Experience-Matters-2010-Report.pdf
- NEA. (2014). NEA and partners ramping up efforts to end school discipline disparities. Retrieved from www.nea.org/home/5846.htm
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6310 (2008). U. S. Department of Education. ED Pubs, Education Publications Center.
- Jessup, MD Osborne, J., Simon, S., & Collins, S. (2003). Attitudes towards science: a review of the literature and its implications. *International Journal of Science Education*, 25 (9), 1049-1079. UK: Taylor and Francis.
- Pearman, C. J., Lefever-Davis, S. (2005). Roots of attrition: Reflections of teacher candidates in title I schools. Retrieved from http://education.missouristate.edu/assets/AcadEd/Roots_of_Attrition.pdf
- Reinke, W.M., Lewis-Palmer, T., Marin, E. (2007). The effect of visual performance feedback on teacher behavior-specific praise. *Behavior Modification*, 31, 247-263.
- Rose, L. C., Gallup, A. M. (2005). The 37th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(1), 41-57.
- Rubinstein, G. (2010). *Beyond survival: how to thrive in middle and high school for beginning and improving teachers*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Solomon, D., Battistich, V., Watson, M., Schaps, E., Lewis, C. (2000). A six-district study of educational change. *Social Psychology of Education*, 4, 3-51.
- Sutherland, K., Wehby, J., Copeland, S. (2000). Effect on varying rates of behavior-specific praise on the on-task behavior of students with EBD. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 8, 2-8.
- Thompson, R. W., Ruma, P. R., Nelson, C. S., & Criste, A. H. (1998). Implementation of the Boys Town Education Model in four Georgia Psychoeducational Network programs: Initial impact on student social skills and adjustment. *GPN Research Report*, 7, 31-40. Athens: University of Georgia.
- Thompson, R., Nelson, C., Spenceri, M., & Maybank, D. (1999). Safe and effective schools: The Boys Town Model. *Caring*, 15, 10-11.

Victoria S. Lentfer, Ed.D., is a STEM Instructor in the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. She holds an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, with a research background in teacher education, classroom management, and STEM learning.

Bridget A. Franks, Ph.D., is an assistant professor in the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. She teaches courses in human development and research methods. Her research interests include teacher preparation for STEM education, the development of scientific reasoning, and developmental frameworks for promoting children's welfare.

Appendix

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THIS PAPER

Read each of the following sentences and indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS. What counts is what you believe.

Using the following 1-5 scale, please indicate, by circling the most correct response, the degree to which you agree with the statements listed below:

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-----------|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| | strongly disagree | disagree | neutral | agree | strongly agree |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 1. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 2. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 3. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 4. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 5. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 6. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 7. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 8. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 9. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 10. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 11. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 12. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 13. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 14. | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 15. | | | | |