

EXAMINING TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE, CONFIDENCE, AND USE OF  
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES: A BOOK  
STUDY

BY

© 2015  
EMILY SWOGGER

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Special Education, School of Education and  
the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts.

---

Chairperson Kathleen Lynne Lane

---

Richard Simpson

---

Deborah Griswold

---

Wendy Peia Oakes

Date Defended: March 31, 2015

Emily Swogger

The Thesis Committee for EMILY SWOGGER certifies that this is the approved version  
of the following thesis:

EXAMINING TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE, CONFIDENCE, AND USE OF  
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES: A BOOK  
STUDY

---

Chairperson Kathleen Lynne Lane

---

Richard Simpson

---

Deborah Griswold

---

Wendy Peia Oakes

Date approved: March 31, 2015

## Abstract

Nation-wide schools are moving towards multi-tiered systems of support in an effort to prevent and reduce students' academic, behavioral and social challenges. In an effort to support schools with primary prevention or Tier 1, a project was designed in partnership with a school in a Midwest district to provide professional learning on evidence-based classroom management and instructional strategies. This paper presents the findings of a project, *Managing Challenging Behaviors in Tiered Systems of Support: A Book Study*, designed to support school-site faculty and staff in learning about the importance of addressing students' academic, behavioral, and social needs in an integrated fashion. In this paper, we focus on one middle school's journey as they conducted a book study, *Managing challenging behaviors in schools: Research-based strategies that work* (Lane, Menzies, Bruhn, & Crnobori, 2011), aimed at increasing their knowledge, confidence, and use of research-based strategies and practices.

## Dedication

*I thank first my Lord and Savior, to Him be the glory.*

*To my family- Mom, Dad, Ellie, Tyler, and Claire- without your continuous love and support, I would not be where I am today. Thank you for teaching me to always strive- to go above and beyond.*

*To Casey- for your never-ceasing love and encouragement... and for many years to come.*

*To Kathleen and Wendy- for your generous support and guidance, as well as having an unwavering confidence in me. I cannot begin to thank you for all you have done and continue to do. You are both my inspirations.*

## Table of Contents

## CHAPTER

I. LITERATURE REVIEW AND RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY.....	1
A Shift Towards Models of Prevention .....	2
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention .....	6
Mandates of Districts for Systems Level Change .....	8
Supporting Schools in Need within Systems Not Ready for Change .....	13
Professional Learning Framework.....	15
II. RESEARCH METHODS .....	18
Participants.....	18
Setting .....	18
Procedures.....	19
Measures .....	21
Classroom Management Self- Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use .....	21
Instructional Delivery Self- Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use.....	21
Low-Intensity Strategies Self- Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use .....	22
Demographics .....	23
Social Validity Survey .....	23
III. RESEARCH RESULTS .....	25
Knowledge .....	25
Confidence .....	26
Use .....	27
Overall.....	28
Social validity .....	30
IV. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH FOR PRACTICE AND FUTURE RESEARCH.....	32
Perceived Knowledge, Confidence, and Use of Strategies.....	33
Knowledge .....	33
Confidence .....	33
Use .....	34
Perceptions of Classroom Management, Instructional Delivery, and Low-Intensity Strategies.....	34
Classroom Management.....	35
Instructional Delivery .....	35
Low-Intensity Strategies .....	36
Social Validity .....	38
Future Directions and Limitations .....	40
Educational Implications .....	42
Summary .....	43

REFERENCES .....	45
APPENDIX: Tables .....	49
Table 1: Participant Characteristics .....	49
Table 2: School Characteristics .....	50
Table 3: Classroom Management, Instructional Delivery, and Low-Intensity Strategies: Self-Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use Survey Means .....	51
Table 4: Classroom Management Self-Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use Surveys .....	53
Table 5: Instructional Delivery Self-Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use Surveys.....	54
Table 6: Low-Intensity Strategies Self-Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use Surveys .....	55
Table 7: Social Validity Results .....	56

## CHAPTER I

### Literature Review And Rationale for the Study

The reauthorization of Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA, 2004) included a number of key changes from the 1997 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. One key shift was the promotion of early prevention and intervention efforts for students in need of academic support in place of previously sanctioned IQ-achievement discrepancy (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). Another key amendment was the initiation of Child Find, an approach to detect and support students with behavioral needs at the beginning stages of behavior challenges by identifying them with data-driven referral processes (Smith, 2005). In previous years, schools took a reactive stance to academic and behavior problems with school systems waiting until student achievement was at an elevated level of risk, before intervening. With this reactive approach, students were not being adequately identified or supported; having to wait until behaviors escalated and academics severely declined before qualifying for additional support services.

This reactive approach left schools unable to contend with the number students requiring additional support. Prevalence estimates suggest 20% of school-age students are at risk for at least a mild learning disability (Forness, Freeman, Paparella, Kauffman, & Walker, 2012), with only 5.8% are reported as being served under the category of specific learning disability according to the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau. Additionally, prevalence estimates indicate 12% of school-aged students have emotional or behavioral disorders (EBD, Forness et. al, 2012), but due to the narrow criteria for qualification, less than 1% of these students with EBD receive special education services under IDEA 2004

(Kauffman, Simpson & Mock, 2009; U.S. Department of Education, 2014). At the time of the reauthorization of IDEA, schools were only supporting 3.5 million students with special education services (Smith, 2005), leaving a large percentage of school-aged students at risk for learning or behavior challenges unidentified and unsupported. Due to the large number of students needing critical and intensive support, schools found themselves overextended for personnel and resources. Consequently, schools were unable to contend with the volume of students requiring support, amounting in an increased number of violence and discipline problems (U.S. Public Schools, 1996-1997). To address the scarcity of resources available, IDEA increased schools' ability to proactively respond by giving districts permission to use a larger portion of special education budgets to fund early prevention and intervention platforms by increasing whole-school approaches of positive behavior supports and systematic interventions (IDEA 2004, section 665-b).

### **A Shift Towards Models of Prevention**

With focus and financial support, districts nation-wide have moved towards school-wide, data-driven systems of prevention and behavioral supports, and have shifted away from traditional reactive programs (Horner & Sugai, 2002). Now, rather than waiting for learning and behavior challenges to occur to then provide reactive interventions and supports, schools have transitioned to proactive frameworks using three-tiered logic (Sugai & Horner, 2009). In response to the mandate (IDEA, 2004), these multi-tiered systems of support were established to promote the identification and prevention of developing learning and behavioral challenges and responding on a

graduated continuum of primary (Tier 1), secondary (Tier 2), and tertiary level (Tier 2) of supports.

Primary prevention includes school-wide practices with all students accessing Tier 1 supports by virtue of attending school; Tier 1 is anticipated to be sufficient for 80% of the student body (Sugai & Horner, 2002). Primary prevention efforts include use of effective instructional delivery and behavior management strategies (e.g., validated core academic curriculums, evidence-based classroom management strategies). School-wide data are collected and used to inform decision-making as a regular school practice to ensure students are making adequate progress and to identify early-on students in need of additional support in the areas of academics, and/or behavior, and/ or social domains (Hawken, Macloed, & Rawlings, 2007).

For students identified as needing additional supports, Tier 2 practices are provided with parental agreement. Approximately ten to fifteen percent of all students are eligible for secondary prevention and intervention, as they are often unresponsive to Tier 1 prevention efforts (Sugai & Horner, 2002). Students identified as potentially benefiting from additional support are connected to targeted practices, often delivered in small group settings. Tier 2 interventions are additive in nature; intended to be minimally invasive and take little time and effort for educators to implement.

Tier 3 is reserved for students who are not adequately responding to Tier 1 or 2 (Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009). Tier 3 interventions consist of intensive, individualized supports including functional assessment-based interventions (Umbriet, Ferro, Liaupsin, & Lane, 2007), Stepping Stones to Literacy (Nelson, Cooper &

Gonzalez, 2004), or other individualized supports. This level of support is anticipated to benefit 3-5% of all students (Sugai & Horner, 2002).

Nation-wide, schools have implemented a variety of models involving multi-tiered systems including academic (Response to Intervention; RTI; Gresham, 2006a), and behavioral systems (Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports; PBIS; Horner & Sugai, 2002). The RTI model was developed to meet the diversity of student academic needs in reading and mathematics (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). The framework involves the use a core curriculum school-wide at Tier 1, with progress monitoring of student success for early identification of students needing additional tiered supports. Students identified as not making adequate progress participating in the school-wide curriculum are provided with targeted academic interventions on a secondary level, including small group sessions, with emphasis on use of evidence-based practices (e.g., Self-Regulated Strategies Development; SRSD; Harris & Graham, 1992; Planning Pyramid; Schumm, Vaughn, & Leavell, 1994; Sugai & Horner, 2009). These low-intensity strategies can be integrated into regular teaching practices as they are minimally disruptive, while increasing student engagement and motivation. For example, low-intensity strategies including high rates of opportunities to respond, instructional choice, instructional feedback, appropriate use of praise, and precorrection are designed to be woven throughout regular classroom instruction to support all students, but can be intensified for students requiring additional support (Lane, Menzies, Ennis, & Oakes, 2014). Through progress monitoring, student progress is tracked and students who remain unresponsive are provided with more intensified and individualized instruction in Tier 3.

Academics, however, is just one facet of the multifaceted challenges that face educators. Since the mandate from the Department of Education in 1998 to make schools violence free, school reform involving the implementation of school-wide positive behavior supports has gained national attention (Dwyer, Osher, & Warger, 1998). PBIS takes an instructive approach to behavior management across the entire school by creating and teaching common expectations across all settings in the building and employs a school-wide curriculum for social skills training (Lewis & Sugai, 1991). For primary prevention, 3-5 positively and specifically stated expectations are identified for key settings in the school (e.g., classroom, hallway, restroom, hallways) to provide students with clarity on desired behaviors (Crone, Horner, & Hawken, 2004). When faculty and staff observe students meeting school-wide expectations, students receive a universal reinforcer (i.e., PBIS ticket) paired with behavior specific praise, increasing the probability of students learning and performing the expectation in the future. The majority of students receiving acknowledgement and reinforcement will adhere adequately to the school-wide expectations, however, some students will require more assistance. For students not responding to primary efforts, the model employs a continuum of tiered supports (Turnball, et. al 2002).

RTI and PBIS are two models that work to support students academically and behaviorally, yet alone, they lend to the creation of silos. Silos can cause disconnect and miscommunication between stakeholders, as well as hinder students' performance. Academics and behavior are codependent, having an interdependent relation to a student's success (DiPerna, Volpe, & Elliot, 2002). This relationship calls for a systems reform to a more comprehensive and complex model that systematically integrates

academic and behavior prevention and supports, as well as incorporating a social component.

### **Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention**

The development of a comprehensive, integrated, three-tiered model of prevention (CI3T; Lane, Oakes, & Menzies, 2009) blended the model for academics (RTI), behavioral support (PBIS), and also incorporated a validated social skills curriculum to continue skill building with the use of evidence-based programs to address data-informed goals. This model received increased attention over the past several years as a validated approach to meeting students' multiple needs (Lane, Carter, Jenkins, Magill, & Germer, 2013). The addition of a social component integrated with academic and behavior systems of support is a key component to students' academic success. Social competencies are critical for enabling students to progress academically. Malecki and Elliott (2002) found social behavior to be an academic enabler, as social behavior is a predictor of academic competence, which in turn is a predictor of students' academic achievement. To support student social behavior to enable academic achievement, the CI3T model employs teaching, modeling, and reinforcing social skills, including self-determined behavior, problem-solving skills, and conflict resolution skills to all students. Within the CI3T framework, every student is given the opportunity to develop and practice skill sets needed to negotiate peer and teacher relationships throughout the classroom and additional school settings to facilitate instructional processes (Walker, Ramsey & Gresham, 2004).

The CI3T model, as with other multi-tiered systems, includes the use of data-informed decision making as a regular school practice. However, rather than using data

for academics, behavioral, and social components in isolation to make decisions, this model integrates early identification methods (e.g., academic screening, behavioral screening) at Tier 1 for academic, behavioral, and social components to inform decision-making. Data collected includes implementation fidelity measures (e.g., School-wide Evaluation Tool; SET; Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd, & Horner, 2005), social validity data from stakeholders - their views of acceptability and importance (i.e., Primary Intervention Rating Scale; PIRS; Lane, Robertson, et.al, 2002), and student's performance measures (e.g., AIMSweb [version 2.0], 2014). Data collected also include the use of school-wide academic and behavioral screening data to identify students for early interventions and supports, as well as progress monitoring of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 efforts (Lane, Oakes, & Menzies, 2014).

Lane, Oakes, and Menzies (2014) entail the necessary components for effective primary prevention efforts within the CI3T model, including the use of: a) core academic instruction using Common Core State Standards (Council of Chief State School Officers & the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, 2011), b) participation in a school-wide positive behavior support program, and c) school-wide social skills training using a validated social skills curriculum. With adequate fidelity to primary prevention efforts addressed in the model, Tier 1 is anticipated to benefit 80% of students with the goal of preventing harm; while Tier 2 is intended to reverse harm for 10-15% of students, and Tier 3 aimed at reducing harm for 3-5% of students.

To build a suitable and sustainable CI3T model, multiple stakeholders participate in the building process to create a transparent blueprint for implementation. The training

process allows for faculty and staff to be presented with multiple opportunities to provide feedback during the build. This ensures components of the plan address all stakeholders' ideas and concerns, as well as increase potential buy-in during implementation. To further make certain that all stakeholders' needs are being addressed and accommodated, team members representative of the school community are selected (i.e., administration, special educators, general educators, related service providers, staff, parents, and students). For issues of policy and sustainability, a district administrator is recommended to be included as an active participant of the CI3T design team.

### **Mandates of Districts for Systems Level Change**

It is recommended that implementation of CI3T models stem from district level initiatives as the process involves a systemic change and requires a high level of implementation fidelity. Enactment of CI3T as part of a district initiative aids success as schools are supported financially, technologically, and institutionally for the many systemic adaptations that will be made during the transition. Administrative support is required to ensure that (a) student outcomes are achieved, (b) evidence-based practices are utilized, and (c) data-driven decision making processes are occurring (Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009).

Sugai and Horner (2009) offer guidelines for successful implementation of school-wide programs, stating there should be a firm commitment to models and the programs should be given priority, along with ongoing facilitation by administration of resources, professional development, and coaching. Without district support, most schools lack the capacity and resources needed for this large-scale systemic reform. McIntosh et al. (2014) completed a mixed-method study, using both qualitative and

quantitative methods, across 257 school teams implementing school-wide models. The study was designed to identify the top features that facilitate successful implementation and sustainability of the school-wide programs. The study reported administrators, who actively supported and participated in the program and described the program as a top priority for the school, had the strongest impact on implementation and sustainability of school-wide systems of support (McIntosh et. al, 2014). This lends support to the notion that administrator and district participation is essential to ensuring the model is given priority status and is implemented with fidelity. District involvement is especially vital in the decision-making process of the build. Administrative leaders with decision-making authority need to be present and active members of the building team when decisions are made for primary components of the plan, as curriculums may need to be modified or selected. Implementing schools will be selecting school-wide core curriculums for their academics, as well as a validated social skills curriculum, which may require district approval.

A number of considerations should be noted when choosing core academic curricula, including selecting a curriculum that parallels district goals, along with close alignment to surrounding schools' curricula to create district cohesiveness. Another equally pressing factor is selecting evidence-based programs within a school's monetary resources, a factor made especially difficult without district endorsement or commitment to the model. Examples of evidence-based programs include the Behavior Education Program (\$80, BEP; Crone, Horner & Hawken, 2004), Social Skill Improvement System (SSIS): Rating Scales (approximately \$400 per elementary class, Elliot & Gresham, 2008) and self-monitoring (variety of resources and prices available, Mace, Belfoire, &

Hutchinson, 2001).

Similarly, it is imperative to have district collaboration in the procurement and selection of a validated, universal, social skills program, as decisions are made about which programs sufficiently address the school districts' social concerns (e.g., a bullying prevention program, equity program, drugs and alcohol prevention). Another consideration when selecting an evidence-based social skills program is ensuring the program includes a monitoring system for students who are unresponsive to the Tier 1 instruction and a plan for students identified as requiring additional social skills training. With fidelity to Tier 1 instruction and prevention efforts, it is anticipated that upwards of 25% of students benefit from additional small group or individualized training in prosocial behaviors (Sugai & Horner, 2002).

While there is no specific curriculum that is used to support behavior, all schools implementing the CI3T model will be using the PBIS framework. According to a randomized control trial, Bradshaw, Reinke, Brown, Bevans, and Leaf (2008) found that schools implementing the components of PBIS programs without formal training were less likely to teach the positive components, but more likely to implement the traditional discipline procedures of the model. Bradshaw and colleagues suggest to implement with fidelity the core proactive components of the PBIS program (e.g., teaching of expectations, re-teaching of expectations, and reinforcement), schools require additional training for faculty and staff in proper use of positive behavior interventions and supports including, but not limited to appropriate use of praise, precorrection, and teaching and re-teaching of expectations. It is important to have district initiatives inclusive of the CI3T model to provide professional learning opportunities promoting positive behavior

management strategies and avoid the risk of concurrently endorsing strategies in opposition to the ideals of PBIS.

In addition to the positive behavior components within a CI3T model, a reactive component to behavior is solidified during the building process. The reactive plan is made transparent with use of a flow chart and operational definitions for what constitutes a minor behavior infraction (teacher-managed) or a major behavior infraction (office-managed). District involvement is crucial as many districts find revisions to reactive components are needed to create a unified system for recording and reporting behavior data. The behavior data are used as a monitoring tool to inform instructional and behavioral decisions, first throughout Tier 1, and then for students in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3. Recording behavior data is an essential part to the CI3T model as the team relies on data-based decision making to systematically intervene for students identified as nonresponsive to Tier 1. Data recorded for behavior both proactively, by school-wide systematic behavior screening, and reactively, by discipline referrals, are considered simultaneously with academic data to inform instructional decision-making. When looking at both academic and behavior data together, educators grasp a more comprehensive understanding of the student and what elicits academic and/or behavioral challenges (i.e., are academic challenges driving the behavior or is the behavior driving the academic challenges).

As has been made evident, the CI3T model is a dynamic model comprised of various components and resources to meet the academic, social, and behavioral needs of students. Building stakeholders' knowledge base of evidence-based strategies, practices, and identification methods is critical to successful implementation and sustainability of

the CI3T model. The U.S. Department of Education (2006) outlined professional development activities necessary to increase school professionals' knowledge base including: "effective instructional strategies, methods, and skills... to improve teaching practices and student academic achievement," "improving student behavior in the classroom," and "identifying early and appropriate interventions to help students." All stakeholders will require professional development opportunities to enhance their capabilities as well as offering training in reform efforts.

As with all multi-tiered systems of support, the CI3T model requires a continuum of high quality of professional development (Kratochwill, Volpiansky, Clements, & Ball, 2007). During the CI3T training year, time is allocated for the identification of practices, strategies, and interventions requiring additional high-quality professional development. The U.S. Department of Education (2006) defined high-quality professional-development as opportunities developed with extensive participation of all school stakeholders, advancing knowledge of effective, researched-based, instructional strategies through intensive, sustained, classroom-centered multi-day workshops providing the necessary skills to support students in meeting challenging academic standards and improve classroom management skills. A national study conducted by Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, and Yoon (2001) found that in order to improve professional development the importance rested with "focus on the duration, collective participation, and the core features (i.e., content, active learning, and coherence)" rather than the type of professional development (e.g. traditional vs. reform activities). Garet et al. (2001) also discovered professional learning activities had the strongest and most sustained effects

when activities encouraged teachers to communicate, were linked to teacher experiences, and aligned with reform efforts.

### **Supporting Schools in Need within Systems Not Ready for Change**

The CI3T model will demand many shifts schools may not be prepared to make if they are not currently implementing a multi-tiered system for behavior and academics. Such is the case for many schools who find they are not yet foundationally equipped for a CI3T model or their districts are unable to support the model at the present time. While schools wait in anticipation to design and implement their own CI3T model, they are lacking supports needed to serve students academically, socially, and behaviorally. To support these schools and teachers, numerous high-quality professional learning opportunities are made available for educators nation-wide that promote systems to support academic and behavior challenges.

For schools looking ahead to the imminent reality of a CI3T model, professional learning should be planned with the framework in mind. Careful consideration must be given when selecting new systems of support to ensure that the selected system fits within the scope of the CI3T framework. Introducing systems that compete with the principles of the model (e.g., response cost systems, individual classroom management systems) will at best create a “quick-fix,” but will cause frustration and futility in the long run. Schools should spending valuable time, effort, and resources, schools should avoid training faculty and staff in programs or strategies that do not align with reform efforts (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001), and therefore can only be temporary. By keeping future implementation goals in mind, efforts and resources will not be wasted. Unfortunately, this is not always preventable when schools move forward with

implementation of the CI3T model without district buy-in or support. Without district commitment to the model, there is a possibility that competing systems may be introduced as part of separate district initiatives- yet another reason why district involvement is recommended for successful implementation by Sugai & Horner (2009).

To address the nation-wide call for multi-tiered systems of support, universities have established partnerships with districts to provide service opportunities which offer schools training in evidence-based practices that fit within the context of multi-tiered systems of support. These partnerships afford schools training and research needed in a cost-effective and convenient method, while universities facilitate the expansion of the research base. One such partnership was developed in this study to support a school within a district implementing CI3T models of support. At the onset of the study, the school was not selected to go through the building process, but still required support for students while they waited to go through the process the following year. In response to their need, a professional development opportunity, in alignment with their impending CI3T model, was created to support teachers in learning evidence-based practices to cultivate classroom management and instructional strategies using a book study.

Research recognizes the significance of teachers' effect on student learning and the need to address teacher preparation to make meaningful impact on student and school outcomes (Ball & Forzani, 2009). With the move toward inclusive classrooms, specifically within a multi-tiered system of support, teachers are responsible for student success in multiple domains including academic, behavioral, and social. While teacher preparation prepares teachers for the instructional component of their profession, studies suggest many novice teachers feel ill-equipped in behavior management strategies and

report low confidence in their abilities to effectively manage student behavior (Hertzog, 2002; Meister & Melnick, 2003; Woolfolk-Hoy & Burke-Spero, 2005). McCann and colleagues (2005) surveyed 111 universities, finding a vast number of teacher training programs offered little to no formal education in behavior management. Fewer than 30% of the programs surveyed offered courses that specifically addressed theories and practices for behavior management.

The lack of confidence in teachers' ability to manage student behavior goes beyond the scope of novice teachers. In a nationwide study, 30% of teachers reported their primary reason for leaving the educational field was behavior management issues (Ingersoll, 2001). These studies clarify the need for further teacher education in the realms of behavior management strategies. Furthermore, research consistently identifies continued teacher learning as a critical element to increasing the quality of schools (Darling & Hammond, 1993). However, due to schools' limited amount of allocated professional learning hours and resources, professional learning selections must be practical and effective in both scope and practice.

### **Professional Learning Framework**

To confront this issue, research has been conducted to pinpoint features of professional learning that are most desired by educators within a multi-tiered system of support. Lane, Carter, Jenkins, Magill, and Germer, (in press) conducted a study across schools in Tennessee to determine what professional learning opportunities were desired when designing, implementing and evaluating CI3T models, as well as obtaining information regarding feasibility and practicality of professional learning structures. Administrators reported favorable attributes for professional learning would be: a)

workshops within their district during regular school hours, b) brief practical guides developed by technical assistance projects that could be conveniently accessed by teachers, and c) collaboration components that allow teachers to interact and capitalize on their expertise and experiences. In addition to these attributes, administrators also ranked topics for professional learning they desired to assist their development and implementation of a CI3T model. Approximately 80% of administrators expressed their school had a desire for professional learning on tiered strategies (e.g., small group reading instruction, increasing behavior specific praise to students, inclusive supports, behavioral contracts, increasing opportunities to respond).

With these desired professional attributes and topics in mind, we created a professional learning opportunity that was within a school, comprised of brief practical strategy guides, and using a book study format to facilitate collaboration. While no studies were found through a systematic search of the literature concerning book studies for teacher learning, the framework of the book study incorporated the three favorable attributes for professional learning described by administrators designing, implementing and evaluating CI3T models (Lane et al., in press).

In this study will describe how to support teachers and schools with effective strategies for managing challenging behavior by building on-site experts through professional learning in the form of a book study for schools preparing for implementation of tiered-systems of support. In this study, we first examined participants' perceptions of their knowledge and confidence of concepts and strategies, as well as their views of the usefulness of the concepts and strategies presented in the book study. Specifically, we examined the extent participants viewed themselves as

knowledgeable about concepts and strategies related to classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies supports. The extent to which participants felt confident in their ability to implement concepts and strategies related to classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies supports. The extent participants viewed the concepts and strategies related to classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies supports as useful and/or relevant to their teaching. In addition, we also examined the relation of participants' overall self-reported knowledge, confidence and use scores in the areas of classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies. Second, we examined participants' views about this book study experience.

## CHAPTER II

### Research Methods

#### Participants

Participants were 61 middle school professionals including teachers, administrators related service providers, and staff, with the majority being educators ( $n=39$ , 63.94%). Most participants were women ( $n = 46$ , 75.41%) and predominantly white ( $n = 57$ , 93.44%). Participants had an average of 10.5 years ( $SD = 15.07$ ) in the field of education and 7.3 years ( $SD = 9.13$ ) at their current grade level. Approximately two-thirds of the participants earned a graduate level degree (62.29%). Approximately two-thirds of the participants (76.67%;  $n = 46$ ) reported having taken a course in classroom management.

#### Setting

The setting was a sixth-eighth grade middle school ( $N = 635$ ) located in a small Midwestern city (see Table 2 for School Characteristics). The majority of students enrolled were White (77.01%), followed by 7.56% Hispanic, 7.24% Asian, 2.99% Black, 2.05% American Indian/ Alaskan, and 3.15% reporting mixed race. Approximately one-fifth of the school was free and reduced-price lunch eligible.

The participating school was part of a district of 22 public schools, including 14 elementary schools, 4 middle schools, 2 high schools, and 2 virtual schools ( $N = 11,835$ ). The students for this district were evenly split in gender with the majority of students being non-economically disadvantaged (62.06%). The district subscribed to a CI3T system of support model from pre-kindergarten-twelfth grade with building for the

elementary school for the 2013-2014 year with plans to move forward with the secondary schools in following year.

### **Procedures**

The administrator of the middle school in a district moving towards CI3T contacted University researchers with interest in participating in professional learning activities, to prepare her faculty and staff for the district initiative. A key goal was to make certain any professional learning activities would complement the districts' vision of designing and implementing CI3T plans district wide. The Primary Investigator (PI) suggested implementing a book study using Lane Menzies, Bruhn, and Crnabori (2011) *Managing challenging behaviors in schools: Research-based strategies that work* for the staff's professional development and offered to design a research study that would support understanding not only faculty and staff's views about the book study, but also assessing faculty and staff's initial knowledge and confidence about the strategies and concepts taught as well as their views about the utility of content in supporting students. The intent was to use this information to inform future professional learning activities and identify on-site experts.

Next, the PI received university and district approval. The PI followed up with the school administrator to explain the purpose of the study, answer questions, and schedule a consenting meeting with faculty to obtain consent for those interested in participating in the research component of the book study. The consenting meeting was conducted in person in early spring at the school site in the afternoon. The purpose of the research study was explained to the faculty and staff and all were invited to participate. Informational letters were left for those absent. Independent from the study, the

administrators of the middle school arranged for participants to receive either university credit through a local university, professional development points through the district, or both.

To examine participant learning, self-assessment surveys taken from *Managing challenging behaviors in schools: Research-based strategies that work* (Lane, et. al., 2011), were administered to all participants in the book study. The survey included participant ratings of perceived knowledge, confidence, and usefulness of classroom management concepts and strategies within *Managing challenging behaviors in schools: Research-based strategies that work* content (a description of each self-assessment is provided below). They provided three ratings for each item: how knowledgeable they perceived themselves to be about each concept or strategy, how confident they were in their ability to use the concept or strategy, and their perceived usefulness of each concept or strategy. The design of the study was for the participants to take knowledge, confidence, and use self-assessments for concepts and strategies related to classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies after reading and before discussing specific sections of the book. After reading the first three chapters, *Preventing and Managing Learning and Behavior Problems: An Overview, Classroom Management, and Instructional Delivery*, the participants took the first two self-assessments on classroom management and instructional delivery along with a brief demographic survey, immediately following the consenting meeting in spring. The third self-assessment for low-intensity strategies was taken after participant had read chapter 4 on *Low-Intensity Strategies*. All measures were emailed via a link to Qualtrics.com and completed electronically. At both time points, upon completion of the self-assessment surveys

participants were given time (during regularly scheduled school hours) to participate in discussion about topics pertaining to their recently assigned chapter contents. A second option, participation in online forum discussion, was provided for teachers unable or disinclined to collaborate in person.

Upon completion of the book study, the participants completed a short social validity survey to provide their perceptions of the study in terms of feasibility and importance.

### **Measures**

**Classroom Management Self- Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use Survey (CM: KCU).** The CM: KCU is a self-report tool developed to assess participants' knowledge, confidence and use of classroom management concepts and strategies. Participants rate 16 concepts and strategies including items: *academic learning time, classroom climate, managing paperwork, building rapport with students, nonverbal and verbal interactions* (see Tables 3 and 4). Ratings are completed using a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 to 3 (e.g., 0 = *I have no knowledge of this concept or strategy*, 1 = *I have some, but not much knowledge of this concept or strategy*, 2 = *I have more than average knowledge of this concept or strategy*, 3 = *I have a substantial amount of knowledge about this concept or strategy*). Item level data are summed to create three composite scores ranging from 0-48 for classroom management knowledge, classroom management confidence, and classroom management use, with higher scores indicating greater knowledge, confidence, and use.

**Instructional Delivery Self- Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use Survey (ID:KCU).** The ID: KCU is a self-report tool developed to assess participants'

knowledge, confidence and use of instructional delivery concepts and strategies.

Participants rate 16 concepts and strategies including items: *curriculum design, mediated scaffolding, strategy instruction, cooperative learning, and differentiating produce* (see Tables 3 and 4). Ratings are completed using a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 to 3 (e.g., 0 = *I have no knowledge of this concept or strategy*, 1 = *I have some, but not much knowledge of this concept or strategy*, 2 = *I have more than average knowledge of this concept or strategy*, 3 = *I have a substantial amount of knowledge about this concept or strategy*). Item level data are summed to create three composite scores ranging from 0-48 for instructional delivery knowledge, instructional delivery confidence, and instructional delivery use, with higher scores indicating greater knowledge, confidence, and use.

**Low-Intensity Strategies Self- Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use Survey (LIS:KCU).** The LIS: KCU is a self-report tool developed to assess participants' knowledge, confidence and use of low-intensity strategies concepts and strategies. Participants rate 16 concepts and strategies including items: *active supervision, pre-correction, appropriate use of praise, instructive feedback, choice and preferred activities* (see Tables 3 and 4). Ratings are completed using a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 to 3 (e.g., 0 = *I have no knowledge of this concept or strategy*, 1 = *I have some, but not much knowledge of this concept or strategy*, 2 = *I have more than average knowledge of this concept or strategy*, 3 = *I have a substantial amount of knowledge about this concept or strategy*). Item level data are summed to create three composite scores ranging from 0-48 for low-intensity strategies knowledge, low-intensity strategies

confidence, and low-intensity strategies use, with higher scores indicating greater knowledge, confidence, and use.

### **Demographics**

Participant demographic survey items included their gender, age, professional role at the school, years of experience, and participation in course pertaining to classroom management (see Table 1). School demographic items included enrollment by grade and gender, student-teacher ratio, attendance rate, Annual Measurable Objectives status, percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunches, locale and similar school characteristics (see Table 2).

### **Social Validity Survey**

The social validity survey was developed for participants to provide their perceptions of the book study in terms of feasibility, acceptability, and importance of topics and outcomes. Participants rate 16 social validity items including: this book study fits within the resources of my school, I would suggest this book study to other teachers, these practices will benefit students (see Table 7). The survey consists of 16 items that are rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 to 6 (i.e., 1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *slightly disagree*, 4 = *slightly agree*, 5 = *agree*, 6 = *strongly agree*) and 4 open-ended questions (e.g., what do you feel were the most beneficial parts of the book study, what suggestions do you have for improving this professional learning experience). Item level data were totaled to see the number and percentage of participants for each Likert-type scale rating as well as mean and standard deviation for each item, with higher scores indicating higher social validity.

The following guidelines specified in Kettler, Elliott, Davies, and Griffin (2012) were used to interpret correlations: .00 to .10 were nonexistent, .10 to .30 were small, .30 to .50 were medium, .50 to .70 were large, .70 to .90 were very large, and .90 to 1.00 were close to perfect (Hopkins, 2002; Kettler, Elliott, Davies, & Griffin, 2010). Effect sizes were computed using the Hedges's *g* formula.

## CHAPTER III

### Research Results

In this study, we first examined participants' perceptions of their knowledge and confidence of concepts and strategies, as well as their views of the usefulness of the concepts and strategies presented in the book study. Specifically, we examined the extent participants viewed themselves as knowledgeable about concepts and strategies related to classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies supports. The extent to which participants felt confident in their ability to implement concepts and strategies related to classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies supports. The extent participants viewed the concepts and strategies related to classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies supports as useful and/or relevant to their teaching. In addition, we also examined the relation of participants' overall self-reported knowledge, confidence and use scores in the areas of classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies. Second, we examined participants' views about this book study experience.

#### **Knowledge**

Overall, participants rated themselves as knowledgeable regarding the concepts and strategies related to classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies, with classroom management having the highest mean score ( $M = 38.87$ ;  $SD = 6.51$ ; see Table 3). More than 80% of participants reported having more than average knowledge (score of 2) or having a substantial amount of knowledge (score of 3) for concepts and strategies related to classroom management (see Table 4). Item level means

ranged from 2.08 ( $SD = 0.70$ ) for contextual and cultural variables of classroom climate (student, teacher, school) to a high of 2.83 ( $SD = 0.38$ ) for building rapport with students.

For concepts and strategies related to instructional delivery, the mean score was 33.23 ( $SD = 8.23$ ), which was slightly lower than the mean score for classroom management. More than 70% of participants rated a score of 2 or score of 3 for 11 of the 16 items related to instructional delivery (see Table 5). Item level means ranged from 1.52 ( $SD = 0.77$ ) for planning pyramid to a high of 2.78 ( $SD = 0.42$ ) for differentiating content.

For concepts and strategies related to low-intensity strategies, the mean score fell between the means of classroom management and instructional delivery with a mean score of 36.00 ( $SD = 6.70$ ). With the exception of three items (Locus of control to enhance intrinsic motivation, Principal of optimal challenge, and the use of natural and fantasy contexts to enhance intrinsic motivation), more than 75% of participants' rated a score of 2 or score of 3 for concepts and strategies related to low-intensity strategies (see Table 6). Item level means ranged from 1.71 ( $SD = 0.76$ ) for principal of optimal challenge to a high of 2.73 ( $SD = 0.49$ ) for proximity.

### **Confidence**

Overall, participants rated themselves as confident in their ability to use or implement concepts and strategies related to classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies, with classroom management having the highest mean score ( $M = 37.19$ ;  $SD = 7.09$ ; see Table 3). More than 70% of participants reported they were confident (score of 2) or they were very confident (score of 3) in their ability to use or implement the concepts and strategies related to classroom management (see Table

4). Item level means ranged from 1.97 ( $SD = 0.78$ ) for contextual and cultural variables of classroom climate (student, teacher, school) to a high of 2.78 ( $SD = 0.42$ ) for building rapport with students.

For concepts and strategies related to instructional delivery, the mean score was 31.23 ( $SD = 8.18$ ), which again was slightly lower than the mean score for classroom management. More than 60% of participants rated a score of 2 or score of 3 for items related to instructional delivery, with the exception of strategic instruction and planning pyramid (see Table 5). Item level means ranged from 1.38 ( $SD = 0.82$ ) for planning pyramid to a high of 2.34 ( $SD = 0.66$ ) for student engagement.

For concepts and strategies related to low-intensity strategies, the mean score fell between the means of classroom management and instructional delivery with a mean score of 35.00 ( $SD = 6.50$ ). More than 70% of participants' rated a score of 2 or score of 3 for 12 out of 16 items related to low-intensity strategies (see Table 6). Item level means ranged from 1.73 ( $SD = 0.70$ ) for principal of optimal challenge and 1.17 ( $SD = .81$ ) for the use of natural and fantasy contexts to enhance intrinsic motivation to a high of 2.73 ( $SD = 0.49$ ) for proximity.

## Use

Overall, participants rated the concepts and strategies related to classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies as useful and/ or relevant to their teaching, with classroom management once again having the highest mean score ( $M = 41.95$ ;  $SD = 6.49$ ; see Table 3). More than 75% of participants reported the concepts and strategies as useful and/ or relevant to their teaching (score of 2) or very useful and/ or relevant to their teaching (score of 3; see Table 4). Item level means ranged from 2.25

( $SD = 0.86$ ) for seating arrangements to a high of 2.90 ( $SD = 0.30$ ) for building rapport with students.

For concepts and strategies related to instructional delivery, the mean score was 37.85 ( $SD = 8.34$ ), which was slightly lower than the mean score for classroom management. More than 70% of participants rated a score of 2 or score of 3 for usefulness of items related to instructional delivery (see Table 5). Item level means ranged from 1.89 ( $SD = 0.90$ ) for planning pyramid to a high of 2.70 ( $SD = 0.53$ ) for student engagement.

For concepts and strategies related to low-intensity strategies, the mean score fell between the means of classroom management and instructional delivery with a mean score of 39.02 ( $SD = 6.26$ ). More than 75% of participants' rated a score of 2 or score of 3 for 15 of the 16 items related to low-intensity strategies, with the exception of the use of natural and fantasy contexts to enhance intrinsic motivation (see Table 6). Item level means ranged from 1.94 ( $SD = 0.85$ ) for the use of natural and fantasy contexts to enhance intrinsic motivation and 1.94 ( $SD = 1.03$ ) for Token economies to a high of 2.82 ( $SD = 0.44$ ) for proximity.

### **Overall**

Overall, participants reported high knowledge, confidence and use of the concepts and strategies across all three domains of classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies (see Table 3). The mean scores ranged respectively for knowledge, confidence and use from 32.82 ( $SD = 8.15$ ) for instructional delivery to 38.87 ( $SD = 6.51$ ) for classroom management, 31.23 ( $SD = 8.18$ ) for instructional delivery to 37.19 ( $SD = 7.09$ ) for classroom management, and 37.85 ( $SD = 8.34$ ) for instructional

delivery to 41.95 ( $SD = 6.49$ ) for classroom management. Use (e.g., this concept or strategy may be useful and/ or relevant to my teaching, this concept or strategy is very useful and/ or relevant to my teaching) was consistently rated the highest, followed by knowledge. Although the lowest ratings were assigned to Confidence, scores were still indicative of participants views being confident to use or implement the concept or strategy, with mean scores ranging from 31.23 ( $SD = 8.18$ ) for instructional delivery to 37.19 ( $SD = 7.09$ ) for classroom management

Across all three domains, the largest magnitude in differences of means scores for knowledge confidence and use was found between classroom management and instructional delivery, with mean score differences ranging from large to very large in use (0.55), knowledge (.76), and confidence (0.78). These magnitudes suggested that there was a large difference in teachers' perceived knowledge, confidence, and use of classroom management and instructional delivery, with classroom management mean scores consistently reported higher. For classroom management and low-instructional delivery, there was found to be a medium magnitude difference between mean scores across knowledge (0.44), confidence (0.32), and use (0.46). These magnitudes indicated that there was a moderate difference in teachers' perceived knowledge, confidence, and usefulness of strategies presented in classroom management and low-intensity strategies. Between instructional delivery and low-intensity strategies, the magnitude of the difference between mean scores ranged from small to medium for use (0.16), knowledge (0.37), and confidence (0.50). Magnitudes indicated that there was small to moderate difference teachers' perceptions of their knowledge, confidence and use of strategies and concepts within instructional delivery and low-intensity strategies.

There was a small magnitude difference between knowledge and confidence mean scores across all three domains of classroom management (0.247), instructional delivery (0.244), and low-intensity strategies (0.151). These findings indicated that there was little difference between how participants perceived their knowledge of the concepts and strategies and their confidence in using them, with knowledge being slightly higher across all three domains. However, there was found to be a medium magnitude difference between knowledge and use mean scores for both classroom management (0.474) and low-intensity strategies (0.466), and a large magnitude difference for instructional delivery mean scores (0.558). These magnitudes suggest that participants found the concepts and strategies to be moderately more useful than they were knowledgeable about them. A large to very large magnitude was found between confidence and use for classroom management (0.70), low-intensity strategies (0.63), and instructional delivery (0.801), suggesting that participants perceived the concepts and strategies to be largely more useful than they were confident in their ability to use or implement them.

### **Social Validity**

Overall, participants viewed the book study as socially valid with a total mean score of 76.72 ( $SD = 9.08$ ; Table 7) for all items ranging from 0-96. The highest overall mean at the item level was for the item “the book study fit within the goals of my school” ( $M = 5.25$ ;  $SD = 0.64$ ). The lowest overall item level mean score reported was “this book study fits within the resources of my colleagues at my school (time)” ( $M = 4.25$ ;  $SD = 1.39$ ).

Of the 57 participants who left comments, all of the participants supplied a response for the first question, “What do you feel were the most beneficial parts of the

book study?” Themes among responses were: creation of common vocabulary among teachers, the facilitation of collaboration among peers using a discussion format, tiered interventions, book’s use of case examples, book’s supplication of research. The most cited benefit was the use of the book study as a reminder or refresher course for classroom management. Of the 57 participants leaving comments 52 responded to the second question, “What were the least beneficial parts of the book study?” Common responses included: rushed timeframe, content redundancy, poor timing (end of the year), poor discussion facilitation using online format, and lack of concept originality. For the third survey question, 52 participants provided suggestions for improving the professional learning experience with common suggestions including: schedule book study at the beginning of year, make some chapters optional, meet in smaller groups, and modify discussion to be in-person rather than electronic format. Over half of the participants also provided additional information about the overall experience, which was predominantly positive citing satisfaction with: optional college credit, built-in time during school hours, and amount of content and strategies learned.

## CHAPTER IV

### **Discussion Of Results And Implications Of The Research For Practice And Future Research**

Teachers face the responsibility to meet students' academic needs as well as behavior; yet, teachers report feeling unknowledgeable or incompetent in their abilities to manage classroom behavior. To better proactively support teachers and students, CI3T models of prevention have been employed to meet students' needs across academic, social, and behavioral domains. School professionals within these tiered systems of support have identified a continuum of high-quality professional learning as overwhelmingly necessary for successful implementation of multi-tiered models (McIntosh, et. al 2013). Given school professionals are the ones who require and directly benefit from professional learning, we conducted this study to: (a) support school professionals in expanding their knowledge base of classroom management and instructional strategies; (b) assess participants' perceived knowledge, confidence, and usefulness of concepts and strategies related to classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies upon reading the book; (c) assess social validity of the book study. To increase the number of students adequately responding to primary prevention efforts, teacher preparation and learning must be sufficient to address students' needs academically, behaviorally and socially; however, due to limited resources for these learning opportunities, schools are struggling to adequately support students. This study addresses the issue of the restricted resources available for creating high-quality professional development by using a professional learning model that increases participants' confidence in using practical management and instructional

strategies as well as systematically identifying on-site experts to coach less knowledgeable or confident colleagues.

### **Perceived Knowledge, Confidence, and Usefulness of Strategies**

**Knowledge.** Participants perceived knowledge of the concepts and strategies related to the book study were high across all domains of classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies. Based on the literature, we recognize behavior and social skills are academic enablers (Malecki & Elliott, 2002); yet, most universities do not offer nor require courses in classroom management in their teacher preparation programs (McCann et. al, 2005). We have identified behavior management as being essential to student academic and social success; still, we fail to provide teachers with pre-training programs that sufficiently prepare them with management strategies. However, in the present study, nearly 75% of participants reported having taken a course in classroom management, which may offer some insight to why their reported knowledge of the concepts and strategies were high for the classroom management domain. For the domains of instructional delivery and low-intensity strategies, scores of knowledge remained high; though not as high as their perceived usefulness, indicating the need for additional learning to build their knowledge base of these domains.

**Confidence.** Confidence was found to be the lowest amongst knowledge, confidence, and use across all three domains. For participants who were educators, these findings align with studies done by Meister and Melnick (2003) and Hertzog (2002), where teachers reported low confidence in their abilities to manage behavior. Participants' lower reported confidence perceptions in this study again illustrate the dire need for teacher preparation programs to provide courses presenting strategies to engage,

motivate, and manage student behavior for teachers to gain familiarity and practice, which in turn will lend to increased teacher confidence. It should be noted all participants were not educators, as the study included: school staff, related service providers and administrators. Only 39 of the 61 participants were educators and therefore not all participants had nor did they necessarily require opportunities to use the concepts and strategies presented in the study, which could be the cause of the lower self-reported confidence in their ability to use the concepts and strategies.

**Use.** We found across all three domains of classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies, participants reported they viewed the concepts as more useful than they felt knowledgeable or confident about them. Since the KCU surveys were completed after teachers read the content-related chapters, this is indicative of teachers requiring additional learning and practice in said strategies viewed as useful. The findings suggest teachers are aware of the necessity of supporting student behaviorally to enable academic success, yet they lack the knowledge base and confidence of these essential strategies. One attribute making this professional high-quality was facilitation of collaboration amongst colleagues (Garet et al., 2001), which could allow for potential on-site coaching. On-site experts, as identified by the survey, could provide colleagues with potential coaching and practice with colleagues reporting higher knowledge and confidence of the concepts and strategies (Oakes, Lane, & Germer, 2014).

Although teachers' perceived knowledge and confidence were lower than their perceived usefulness of the concepts and strategies, both knowledge and confidence were still high. This implies that along with their previous knowledge, the book study assisted

in the retention and/or new learning of the concepts and strategies related to classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies.

### **Perceptions of Classroom Management, Instructional Delivery, and Low-Intensity Strategies**

**Classroom Management.** Of the three domains, classroom management was found to have the highest overall mean scores. One possible explanation for this is classroom management may be intuitive or naturally learned through experiences with students; whereas instructional delivery and strategies often require explicit and formal training such as Self-Regulated Reading Strategy (SRSD; Santangelo, Harris & Grahman, 2008) and the Planning Pyramid (Schumm, Vaughn, & Leavell, 1994). Another explanation could be the high average of teaching experience reported by participants (15.07 years). As reported by Hertzog (2002) and Meister and Melnick (2003), novice teachers report lack of knowledge and confidence in their ability to manage behavior. However, since the participants in this study reported an average of 15.07 years experience (see Table 1), this may have resulted in higher reported knowledge and confidence in their management abilities than would be reported had the participants been novice teachers. One item that draws special attention is “contextual and cultural variables of classroom climate (Table 3).” This item resulted in a larger gap than consistently observed across other items between usefulness ( $M= 2.49$ ) and confidence ( $M=1.97$ ). With increased focus on equity in schools nationwide, researchers and practitioners are being made aware of culturally responsive teaching and its usefulness (Klingner, et al., 2005). However, they may lack training in culturally responsive

teaching, which could explain why their self-reported confidence for this item was particularly low.

**Instructional Delivery.** Instructional delivery was the lowest across all three domains. Two possible explanations are suggested for the differences, these include: (a) the language used could have been unfamiliar to participants and (b) participants' demographics could affect their prior access to the concepts and strategies. Despite possibly having actual knowledge of the strategy, naming conventions for the items may have been unfamiliar or otherwise termed (e.g., big ideas framework, strategic instruction, strategic integration, planning pyramid, advanced organizers). On the other hand, participants' average age was 42, making their teacher preparation prior to when some instructional delivery strategies were developed or promoted. One example of this would be the Planning Pyramid (Schumm, Vaughn, & Leavell, 1994), which was not developed until 1994, and then required integration into teacher preparation courses. This is also evidenced in responses to the social validity survey in which nearly 20% of participants indicated that they were not previously familiar with all the concepts and strategies presented (e.g., *I was previously familiar with all of the strategies discussed in the book study*; Table 7). Teachers may not have had access to instruction on these instructional strategies during their preparation programs, and therefore would not have a knowledge base previous to the book study to build one. This explanation further supports the consistently higher rated items, which are terms that have been commonplace in education (e.g., student engagement, explicit instruction, cooperative learning).

**Low-intensity strategies.** Low-intensity strategies mean scores were slightly higher to those of instructional delivery; conceivably due to the fact that the language of the strategies was perhaps more familiar or did not require background knowledge of the strategies to interpret meaning. For example, the items' pacing, proximity, and instructive feedback are self-descriptive in name and require brief explanation of implementation procedures (Lane et al, 2011).

In addition to our findings of teacher perceptions of their knowledge and confidence of strategies and their perceived usefulness of the concepts and strategies, the book study served purposes beyond the scope of this study. The study served as a support for a school by offering professional learning establishing on-site experts and providing faculty and staff with an opportunity to engage in readiness activities as they considered designing, implementing, and evaluating a CI3T model of prevention. For the purposes of professional learning, the book's content in isolation expands a teachers' instructional repertoire, but paired with the book study's collaborative format this expansion proliferates. Although some case studies and examples were provided in the book, the discussion among faculty during the book study may have facilitated experience-sharing among colleagues, which has been identified as a highly desired professional learning feature (Lane et al., in press). Experience-sharing amongst colleagues may be viewed as more applicable or generalized to the school's specific settings and therefore may increase confidence in the use of the strategies.

Another consideration is the book study served to identify existing talent within the school building through the surveying of teachers to determine their perceived expertise of concepts and strategies (Oakes, Lane, & Germer, 2014). Teachers who self-

reported as knowledgeable and confident in using specific concepts or strategies, as well as reporting its usefulness, could become on-site coaches in the concept or strategy for colleagues. By capitalizing current skill-sets within the building, the school could save time, money, and other resources on outside professional development, as they would now have on-site experts in tiered strategies to support students multiple needs. To this end, school professionals could create brief practice guides for faculty and staff, or present a 10-min professional learning opportunity during a regularly scheduled faculty meeting- another desired professional learning trait identified to sustain CI3T models (Lane et. al., in press). Whereas, items that were reported low across all participants on their self- assessment surveys data informed decision-making can be made for seeking professional learning opportunities elsewhere. For example, for the school in this study may elicit outside professional development on strategic integration.

### **Social Validity**

To assess whether the learning experience was socially valid, participants' views are an especially important feature. Overall, participants reported a positive view of the book study. They reported their participation in the book study would increase their use of strategies in supporting students, with the exception of four participants. As this survey was given to educational professionals, not exclusive to teachers, some participants (e.g., related service providers, administrators, staff) may not have ample opportunity to use the strategies presented which could provide clarification to the response of the four such participants. Participants identified the book study as being cost effective as well as practical (e.g., *this book study fits within the resources of my school (cost); the book*

*selected was easy to read*; see Table 7) which was one of the desired traits of professional learning as identified by Lane et al. (in press).

The highest form of appreciation in education is recommendation, as teachers would not recommend programs to their colleges they find to be unprofitable, especially considering teachers' limited time and resources for professional learning. It is noteworthy to mention more than 94% of participants reported that they would recommend this book study to their colleagues (Table 7).

Participants identified within their comments the creation of a common language among teachers assisted in facilitating and enhancing collaboration between stakeholders, which is fundamental in the CI3T model (Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009). As previously mentioned, an additional benefit of the book study identified by participants was the capacity for collaboration among teachers for experience-sharing. This benefit was cited by Kratochwall et al., (2007), who suggested the use of teacher networks and study groups as critical to high quality professional development within tiered systems of support. To further enhance collaboration, one option would be to create smaller study groups (e.g., grade-level teams) with the sole use of on-site discussion, rather than through online discussion forums.

We learned from participants that an extended timeframe would have been beneficial, as participants felt rushed. This was evident in both their comments and in their item level responses (i.e., *this book study fits within the resources of my colleagues at my school (time)*;  $M = 4.25$ ;  $SD = 1.39$ ). However, due to the limited amount of days left in the school year, the administration's timeline could not be modified in order to complete the book study before the end of school year

Participants also noted that content redundancy and unoriginality of strategies were least beneficial. However, the book was not intended to introduce novel strategies, but rather to translate the most effective, practical research-based concepts and strategies for managing challenging behavior into practice. Participants noted this goal was met by their satisfaction with the amount of content and strategies learned, as reported in their comments, as well as all participants' agreement that the practices presented in the study would benefit their students (i.e., *these practices will benefit students*; see Table 7). Furthermore, more than 92% of participants agreed the book study would result in improved practices for addressing challenging behaviors; social validity reports were indicative of the book study meeting its intended purpose.

### **Limitations and Future Directions**

As is important in every study, limitations need to be addressed. The first limitation addresses the study's small sample size. The study only included one participating middle school making certain variables unable to be measured which include teacher characteristics (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, years of experience) that could affect teachers' knowledge, confidence, and use. The analysis of the difference between general education teachers' knowledge base and special educators' knowledge base of concepts and strategies related to managing challenging behavior would have been especially meaningful. The small sample size also does not allow for the generalization of results beyond the participating school. Future research needs to be conducted to broaden the range of participant and setting characteristics (e.g., grades, locations, NCLB status) for results to be generalized. Research should also be done with a larger participant base within a single study to further identify the effect of teacher

characteristics on their perceived knowledge, confidence and use of the concepts and strategies.

A second limitation was the study did not employ multiple time points for surveying participants' knowledge, confidence, and use and can therefore not assess growth. While one of the items on the social validity survey approached the topic of participants' prior knowledge of strategies (i.e., *I was previously familiar with all of the strategies discussed in the book study*; Table 7), the social validity measure was also only completed at one time point and therefore also cannot assess growth of participants' familiarity with the concepts and strategies. We suggest future research designs incorporate a pre and post measure to examine participant growth as well as confirm its relation to the professional learning.

The third limitation identified was the limited amount time available for school to conduct the study. The study was conducted towards the conclusion of the school year, causing participants to feel the process was rushed. We respectfully suggest the one modification to be considered would be to schedule the book study towards the beginning of the year to allow for strategies learned to be introduced at the beginning of the year. This would allow for an extension of the timeline as necessary, as well as relieve pressure associated with end of the school year proceedings. By presenting these strategies at the beginning of the year, novice teachers, previously reporting feeling ill-equipped to manage behaviors (Hertzog, 2002; Meister & Melnick, 2003), would now have an expanded repertoire of evidence-based behavior and instructional strategies. Teachers would also have the expanse of the school year to practice and seek out on-site

coaching, as well as identifying supplemental outside professional development opportunities.

The fourth limitation identified is the entirety of measures was self-report. Self-report measures are not always reliable which can be due to bias (Adams, Soumerai, Lomas, & Ross-Degnan, 1999). A recommendation for future studies would be to incorporate the use of direct observation measures (e.g., observing teachers for use of strategies) to increase reliability of measures, but as it was, the resources were not available for this small-scale study.

The final limitation of the study to note is the absence of treatment integrity of procedures followed the faculty and staff. Throughout the study, no documentation of the actual reading or discussions was acquired. Teachers were responsible for completing the readings on their own time within the schedule outlined by administrators. While the opportunities for discussions were provided on-site and via online format, the PI's never had access to these discussions to ensure they were actually taking place with fidelity. Future recommendations would be to conduct on-site discussion with using component checklists to assess fidelity.

### **Educational Implications**

Through this study we have learned the format of a book study for professional learning was a socially valid option, as it provided needed collaboration, brief practical strategy guides, and was a feasible option in terms of resources as was cited as the most desired professional learning attributes (Lane et al., in press). We also find that participants perceived usefulness of a concept and strategy, directly affects their perceived knowledge, and in-turn their confidence in using the concepts or strategies.

Teachers may have familiarity of a certain concept or strategy, but may require additional training or expertise-sharing to feel confident in their use of these said strategies. To further equip teachers with the knowledge and confidence needed to manage behavior, continued professional development can be found within the confines of a building, such as on-site coaching and expertise sharing, rather than seeking outside opportunities as a first line of defense. This is especially important for schools considering the reality of a CI3T model, as this eliminates the possibility of competing principles and ideologies from trainings outside the context of CI3T models, while further increasing capacity of expertise at the school level.

### **Summary**

We hope the findings of this study, *Managing Challenging Behaviors in Tiered Systems of Support: A Book Study*, and the participants self-assessment and social validity results provide (a) information regarding teachers' perceived knowledge, confidence, and usefulness of concepts and strategies related to classroom management, instructional delivery, and low-intensity strategies upon reading the book; (b) evidence for the social validity of the book study; and (c) direction for future studies to examine variables that may relate to participants knowledge, confidence, and use of these strategies. The book study was designed to increase knowledge, confidence, and use of research-based practices and provide information about using data to build on-site coaches for said strategies and concepts for schools look ahead to the implementation of CI3T models of prevention. Further replications using objective measurement tools and a broader sample may help to generalize the findings and confirm the findings of this study. With the call to support students' multiple needs within tiered-systems of support,

it is important to determine and create practical, effective professional learning that fits within the vision of the model and resources of the school.

## References

- AIMSweb (Version 2.0) [Web-based computer software]. (2014). Bloomington, MN: Pearson Assessments.
- Adams, A. S., Soumerai, S. B., Lomas, J., & Ross-Degnan, D. (1999). Evidence of self-report bias in assessing adherence to guidelines. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 11(3), 187-192. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/11.3.187
- Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 497-511. doi: 10.1177/0022487109348479
- Bradshaw, C. P., Reinke, W. M., Brown, L. D., Bevans, K. B., & Leaf, P. J. (2008). Implementation of School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) in Elementary Schools: Observations from a Randomized Trial. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 31(1), 1-26.
- Council of Chief State School Officers & the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. (2011). Common Core State Standards. Washington, DC: Author.
- DiPerna, J. C., Volpe, R. J., & Elliott, S. N. (2002). A model of academic enablers and elementary reading/language arts achievement. *School Psychology Review*, 31(3), 298-312.
- Dwyer, K. P., Osher, D., & Warger, W. (1998). Early warning, timely response: A guide to safe schools. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Elliot, S. N. & Gresham, F. M. (2008). *Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS): Rating Scales*. Bloomington, MN: Pearson Assessments.
- Forness, S. R., Freeman, S. F. N., Paparella, T., Kauffman, J. M., & Walker, H. M. (2012). Special education implications of point and cumulative prevalence for children with emotional or behavioral disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 20(1), 4-18. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1063426611401624>
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (2006). Introduction to Response to Intervention: What, why, and how valid is it? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(1), 93-99. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.41.1.4>
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American educational research journal*, 38(4), 915-945. doi: 10.3102/00028312038004915

- Hawken, L. S., MacLeod, K. S., & Rawlings, L. (2007). Effects of the behavior education program (BEP) on office discipline referrals of elementary school students. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 9(2), 94-101. doi: 10.1177/10983007070090020601
- Hertzog, H. S. (2002). "When, how, and who do I ask for help?" Novices' perceptions of problems and assistance. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29, 25-41.
- Hopkins, W. G. (2002). *A scale of magnitudes for effect statistics*. Retrieved February 22, 2009 from the New View of Statistics Website: <http://www.sportsci.org/resource/stats/effectmag.html>
- Horner, R. H., & Sugai, G. (2000). School-wide behavior support: An emerging initiative. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 2(4), 231. doi: 10.1177/109830070000200407
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 499-534. doi: 10.3102/00028312038003499
- Kauffman, J. M., Simpson, R. L., & Mock, D. R. (2009). Problems related to underservice: A rejoinder. *Behavioral Disorders*, 34, 172-180.
- Kettler, R. J., Elliott, S. N., Davies, M., & Griffin, P. (2012). Testing a multi-stage screening system: Predicting performance on Australia's national achievement test using teachers' ratings of academic and social behaviors. *School Psychology International*, 33, 93-111. doi:10.1177/0143034311403036
- Klingner, J. K., Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E., Harry, B., Zion, S., Tate, W., Durán, G. Z., & Riley, D. (2005). Addressing the disproportionate representation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education through culturally responsive educational systems. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(38). Retrieved [date] from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n38/>.
- Kratochwill, T. R., Volpiansky, P., Clements, M., & Ball, C. (2007). Professional development in implementing and sustaining multitier prevention models: Implications for response to intervention. *School Psychology Review*, 36, 618-631.
- Lane, K. L., Carter, E., Jenkins, A., Magill, L., & Germer, K. (in press). Supporting comprehensive, integrated, three-tiered models of prevention in schools: Administrators perspectives. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*.
- Lane, K. L., Kalberg, J. R., & Menzies, H. M. (2009). Developing schoolwide programs to prevent and manage problem behaviors: A step-by-step approach: Guilford Press, New York, NY.

- Lane, K. L., Oakes, W. P., & Menzies, H. M. (2014). Comprehensive, integrated, three-tiered models of prevention: Why does my school — and district — need an integrated approach to meet students' academic, behavioral, and social needs? *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 58(3), 121-128. doi: 10.1080/1045988X.2014.893977
- Lewis, T. J., & Sugai, G. (1999). Effective behavior support: A systems approach to proactive schoolwide management. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 31(6), 1-24.
- Mace, F. C., Belfiore, P. J., & Hutchinson, J. M. (2001). Operant theory and research on self-regulation. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk, (Eds.) *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement theoretical perspectives*, (pp.39-66) New Jersey, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publisher.
- Malecki, C. K., & Elliot, S. N. (2002). Children's social behaviors as predictors of academic achievement: A longitudinal analysis. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 17(1), 1. doi: 10.1521/scpq.17.1.1.19902
- McCann, T. M., Johannessen, L. R., & Ricca, B. (2005). Responding to new teachers' concerns. *Educational Leadership*, 62(8), 30–34.
- Meister, D. G., & Melnick, S. A. (2003). National new teacher study: Beginning teachers' concerns. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(4), 87–94. doi: 10.1080/01626620.2003.10463283
- McIntosh, K., Predy, L. K., Upreti, G., Hume, A. E., Turri, M. G., & Mathews, S. (2014). Perceptions of contextual features related to implementation and sustainability of school-wide positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 16(1), 31-43. doi: 10.1177/1098300712470723
- Nelson, J. R., Cooper, P., & Gonzalez, G. E. (2004). *Stepping Stones to Literacy*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West
- Oakes, W. P., Lane, K. L., & Germer, K. (2014). Developing the capacity to implement Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports: How do we support our faculty and staff in preparing for sustainability? *Preventing School Failure*, 58, 183-190, DOI: 10.1080/1045988X.2014.895575
- Santangelo, T., Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (2008). Using self-regulated strategy development to support students who have "Trouble Getting Things Into Words." *Remedial and Special Education*, 29, 78-89.
- Schumm, J. S., Vaughn, S., & Leavell, A. G. (1994). Planning pyramid: A framework for planning for diverse student needs during content area instruction. *Reading Teacher*, 608-615.

- Smith, T. E. C. (2005). Idea 2004 Another Round in the Reauthorization Process. *Remedial and Special Education*, 26(6), 314-319. doi: 10.1177/07419325050260060101
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2002). Introduction to the special series on positive behavior support in schools. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 10, 130–135.
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2009). Responsiveness-to-intervention and school-wide positive behavior supports: Integration of multi-tiered system approaches. *Exceptionality*, 17(4), 223-237.
- Sugai, G., Lewis-Palmer, T., Todd, A., & Horner, R. H. (2005). *School-wide Evaluation Tool Version 2.1*. Eugene: University of Oregon.
- Turnbull, A., Edmonson, H., Griggs, P., Wickham, D., Sailor, W., Freeman, R., Park, J. (2002). A blueprint for schoolwide positive behavior support: Implementation of three components. *Exceptional Children*, 68(3), 377-402. doi: 10.1177/001440290206800306
- Umbreit, J., Ferro, J., Liaupsin, C., & Lane, K. (2007). *Functional behavioral assessment and function-based intervention: An effective, practical approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- U. S. Department of Education. (2006). *Improving teacher quality state grants ESEA Title II, Part A non-regulatory guidance*. Washington DC: Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.
- U.S. Public Schools (1996–1997). *Violence and discipline problems in U.S. public schools*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Walker, H. M., Ramsey, E., & Gresham, F. M. (2004). *Antisocial behavior in school: Evidence-based practices* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Woolfolk-Hoy, A., & Burke-Spero, R. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 343–356. Doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2005.01.007

## APPENDIX

Table 1

*Participant Characteristics*

Variable	% (N)	M (SD)
Participants N	61	
Gender		
Male	24.59 (15)	
Female	75.41 (46)	
Age		41.63 (13.1)
Ethnicity		
White	93.44 (57)	
Black	1.64 (1)	
Hispanic	3.28 (2)	
Pacific Islander/Asian	1.64 (1)	
Professional Role		
General Educator	52.46 (32)	
Special Educator	11.48 (7)	
Administrator	3.28 (2)	
Related Service Provider	9.84 (6)	
Staff	22.95 (14)	
Grade level taught <sup>1</sup>		
Grade 6	61.54 (16)	
Grade 7	53.95 (14)	
Grade 8	53.95 (14)	
General Education	52.46 (32)	
Special Education	11.48 (7)	
Years of experience in education: Range (1-45)		15.07 (10.5)
Years of experience in current level taught: Range (1-31)		9.13 (7.3)
Highest Degree Earned		
High School Diploma	3.28 (2)	
Associate's	3.28 (2)	
Bachelor's	31.15 (19)	
Master's	36.07 (22)	
Master's +30	22.95 (14)	
Doctoral	3.28 (2)	
Course in Classroom Management	76.67 (46)	

Note. <sup>1</sup>More than one option could be selected

Table 2

*School Characteristics*

Variable	School (N=635)
Enrollment by gender <i>n</i> (%)	
Male	343 (54.02)
Female	292 (45.98)
Enrollment by grade <i>n</i> (%)	
Grade 6	184 (28.98)
Grade 7	242 (38.11)
Grade 8	209 (32.91)
Enrollment by ethnicity <i>n</i> (%)	
American Indian/ Alaskan	13 (2.05)
Asian/ Pacific Islander	46 (7.24)
Black	19 (2.99)
Hispanic	48 (7.56)
White	489 (77.01)
Mixed race	20 (3.15)
Attendance Rate <sup>a</sup> %	95.7%
Classroom teachers <i>N</i>	51.46
Teacher: Student Ratio	12.34
FRPL %	21.57
Locale	City: Small
AMO status <sup>a</sup>	
Reading	Met
Math	Not Met
Title 1 eligible	No

*Note.* Sources: National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core Data 2011-2012. <sup>a</sup>2012-2013 school report card data. FRPL= free and reduced-prices lunch eligible; NCLB = No Child Left Behind Act (1997); AMO = Annual Measurable Objectives.

Table 3

*Classroom Management, Instructional Delivery, and Low-Intensity Strategies: Self-Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use Survey Means*

	Knowledge	Confidence	Use
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
<b>Classroom management</b>	38.87 (6.51)	37.19 (7.09)	41.95 (6.49)
Academic learning time	2.21 (0.65)	2.14 (0.69)	2.51 (0.64)
Classroom climate	2.63 (0.49)	2.57 (0.50)	2.73 (0.54)
Managing student behavior	2.41 (0.64)	2.33 (0.72)	2.76 (0.50)
Classroom routines	2.67 (0.51)	2.49 (0.50)	2.79 (0.41)
Seating arrangements	2.46 (0.62)	2.49 (0.67)	2.48 (0.86)
Classroom procedures	2.48 (0.53)	2.40 (0.64)	2.68 (0.53)
Managing paperwork	2.33 (0.70)	2.19 (0.82)	2.52 (0.72)
Classroom transitions	2.37 (0.70)	2.21 (0.74)	2.52 (0.76)
Approach to discipline	2.37 (0.63)	2.10 (0.76)	2.63 (0.58)
Classroom rules/ expectations	2.57 (0.56)	2.44 (0.64)	2.76 (0.50)
Responding to disruptive behaviors	2.22 (0.66)	2.05 (0.75)	2.65 (0.51)
Contextual and cultural variables of classroom climate (student, teacher, school)	2.08 (0.70)	1.97 (0.78)	2.49 (0.59)
Building a rapport with students	2.83 (0.38)	2.78 (0.42)	2.90 (0.30)
Room decorating	2.37 (0.70)	2.27 (0.83)	2.25 (0.86)
Classroom flow	2.37 (0.73)	2.30 (0.71)	2.51 (0.76)
Nonverbal and verbal interactions	2.52 (0.62)	2.46 (0.62)	2.75 (0.44)
<b>Instructional Delivery</b>	33.23 (8.23)	31.23 (8.18)	37.85 (8.34)
Curriculum Design	2.00 (0.75)	1.93 (0.79)	2.33 (8.33)
Zone of proximal development	2.08 (0.82)	2.07 (0.79)	2.36 (0.75)
Explicit Instruction	2.25 (0.72)	2.18 (0.70)	2.54 (0.62)
Mediated Instruction	1.97 (0.84)	1.92 (0.88)	2.33 (0.77)
Student engagement	2.54 (0.59)	2.34 (0.66)	2.70 (0.53)
Evaluating teaching practices	2.00 (0.77)	1.87 (0.74)	2.25 (0.77)
Big Ideas framework	1.98 (0.81)	1.84 (0.80)	2.28 (0.80)
Strategy instruction	1.90 (0.77)	1.77 (0.80)	2.43 (0.67)
Strategic integration	1.74 (0.81)	1.72 (0.78)	2.25 (0.77)
Primed background knowledge	2.10 (0.75)	2.02 (0.74)	2.39 (0.71)
Cooperative learning	2.41 (0.69)	2.23 (0.74)	2.48 (0.65)
Planning pyramid	1.52 (0.77)	1.38 (0.82)	1.89 (0.90)
Differentiating content	2.78 (0.42)	2.00 (0.88)	2.46 (0.74)
Differentiating process	2.20 (0.79)	2.00 (0.77)	2.46 (0.67)
Differentiating product	2.28 (0.80)	2.10 (0.85)	2.44 (0.70)
Advance organizers	1.98 (0.72)	1.87 (0.81)	2.28 (0.80)
<b>Low-Intensity Strategies</b>	36.00 (6.70)	35.00 (6.50)	39.02 (6.26)
Locus of control to enhance intrinsic motivation	1.82 (0.73)	1.82 (0.70)	2.29 (0.74)
Principal of Optimal challenge	1.71 (0.76)	1.73 (0.70)	2.16 (0.72)
Using curiosity to enhance intrinsic motivation	2.27 (0.67)	2.10 (0.74)	2.49 (0.71)
The use of natural and fantasy contexts to enhance intrinsic motivation	1.73 (0.78)	1.73 (0.81)	1.94 (0.85)
Active supervision	2.57 (0.68)	2.55 (0.65)	2.69 (0.55)
Precorrection	2.06 (0.69)	2.06 (0.69)	2.37 (0.67)
Proximity	2.73 (0.49)	2.71 (0.54)	2.82 (0.44)
Overlappingness	2.00 (0.76)	1.94 (0.75)	2.18 (0.73)
With-it-ness	2.20 (0.74)	2.16 (0.69)	2.41 (0.67)

Pacing	2.45 (0.58)	2.27 (0.64)	2.59 (0.54)
Appropriate use of praise	2.71 (0.46)	2.59 (0.54)	2.76 (0.43)
Opportunities to respond	2.41 (0.64)	2.39 (0.64)	2.65 (0.48)
Instructive feedback	2.49 (0.58)	2.41 (0.61)	2.65 (0.52)
Choice of preferred activities	2.47 (0.65)	2.45 (0.65)	2.63 (0.53)
Token economies	2.18 (0.78)	1.94 (0.83)	1.94 (1.03)
Formal teaching of social skills	2.18 (0.67)	2.14 (0.76)	2.45 (0.74)

*Note.* Percentages are based on the number of participants who completed the given item

Table 4

*Classroom Management Self-Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use Surveys*

Classroom Management <i>M (SD)</i>	Knowledge				Confidence				Use			
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
Academic learning time	0 (0.00)	8 (12.70)	34 (53.97)	21 (33.33)	1 (1.59)	8 (12.70)	35 (55.56)	19 (30.16)	0 (0.00)	5 (7.94)	21 (33.33)	37 (58.73)
Classroom climate	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	23 (36.51)	40 (63.49)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	27 (42.86)	36 (57.14)	0 (0.00)	3 (4.76)	11 (17.46)	49 (77.78)
Managing student behavior	0 (0.00)	5 (7.94)	27 (42.86)	31 (49.21)	0 (0.00)	9 (14.29)	24 (38.10)	30 (47.62)	0 (0.00)	2 (3.17)	11 (17.46)	50 (79.37)
Classroom routines	0 (0.00)	1 (1.59)	19 (30.16)	43 (68.25)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	32 (50.79)	31 (49.21)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	13 (20.63)	50 (79.37)
Seating arrangements	0 (0.00)	4 (6.35)	26 (41.27)	33 (52.38)	1 (1.59)	3 (4.76)	23 (36.51)	36 (57.14)	4 (6.35)	3 (4.76)	15 (23.81)	41 (65.08)
Classroom procedures	0 (0.00)	1 (1.59)	31 (49.21)	31 (49.21)	0 (0.00)	5 (7.94)	28 (44.44)	30 (47.62)	0 (0.00)	2 (3.17)	16 (25.40)	45 (71.43)
Managing paperwork	0 (0.00)	8 (12.70)	26 (41.27)	29 (46.03)	2 (3.17)	10 (15.87)	25 (39.68)	26 (41.27)	2 (3.17)	2 (3.17)	20 (31.75)	39 (61.90)
Classroom transitions	0 (0.00)	8 (12.70)	24 (38.10)	31 (49.21)	0 (0.00)	12 (19.05)	26 (41.27)	25 (39.68)	2 (3.17)	4 (6.35)	16 (25.40)	41 (65.08)
Approach to discipline	0 (0.00)	5 (7.94)	30 (47.62)	28 (44.44)	0 (0.00)	15 (23.81)	27 (42.86)	21 (33.33)	0 (0.00)	3 (4.76)	17 (26.98)	43 (68.25)
Classroom rules/ expectations	0 (0.00)	2 (3.17)	23 (36.51)	38 (60.32)	0 (0.00)	5 (7.94)	25 (39.68)	33 (52.38)	0 (0.00)	2 (3.17)	11 (17.46)	50 (79.37)
Responding to disruptive behaviors	0 (0.00)	8 (12.70)	33 (52.38)	22 (34.92)	1 (1.59)	13 (20.63)	31 (49.21)	18 (28.57)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.59)	20 (31.75)	42 (66.67)
Contextual and cultural variables of classroom climate (student, teacher, school)	0 (0.00)	13 (20.63)	32 (50.79)	18 (28.57)	1 (1.59)	17 (26.98)	28 (44.44)	17 (26.98)	0 (0.00)	3 (4.76)	26 (41.27)	34 (53.97)
Building a rapport with students	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	11 (17.46)	52 (82.54)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	14 (22.22)	49 (77.78)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	6 (9.52)	57 (90.48)
Room decorating	0 (0.00)	8 (12.70)	24 (38.10)	31 (49.21)	3 (4.76)	6 (9.52)	25 (39.68)	29 (46.03)	1 (1.59)	14 (22.22)	16 (25.40)	32 (50.79)
Classroom flow	1 (1.59)	6 (9.52)	25 (39.68)	31 (49.21)	1 (1.59)	6 (9.52)	29 (46.03)	27 (42.86)	1 (1.59)	7 (11.11)	14 (22.22)	41 (65.08)
Nonverbal and verbal interactions	0 (0.00)	4 (6.35)	22 (34.92)	37 (58.73)	0 (0.00)	4 (6.35)	26 (41.27)	33 (52.38)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	16 (25.40)	47 (74.60)

*Note.* Percentages are based on the number of participants who completed the given item.

Table 5

*Instructional Delivery Self-Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use Surveys*

Instructional Delivery <i>M (SD)</i>	Knowledge				Confidence				Use			
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
Curriculum Design	0 (0.00)	17 (27.87)	27 (44.26)	17 (27.87)	3 (4.92)	12 (19.67)	32 (52.46)	14 (22.95)	2 (3.28)	8 (13.11)	19 (31.15)	32 (52.46)
Zone of proximal development	1 (1.64)	15 (24.59)	23 (37.70)	22 (36.07)	0 (0.00)	17 (27.87)	23 (37.70)	21 (34.43)	1 (1.64)	7 (11.48)	22 (36.07)	31 (50.82)
Explicit Instruction	0 (0.00)	10 (16.39)	26 (42.62)	25 (40.98)	0 (0.00)	10 (16.39)	30 (49.18)	21 (34.43)	0 (0.00)	4 (6.56)	20 (32.79)	37 (60.66)
Mediated Instruction	1 (1.64)	19 (31.15)	22 (36.07)	19 (31.15)	3 (4.92)	17 (27.87)	23 (37.70)	18 (29.51)	0 (0.00)	11 (18.03)	19 (31.15)	31 (50.82)
Student engagement	0 (0.00)	3 (4.92)	22 (36.07)	36 (59.02)	0 (0.00)	6 (9.84)	28 (45.90)	27 (44.26)	0 (0.00)	2 (3.28)	14 (22.95)	45 (73.77)
Evaluating teaching practices	1 (1.64)	15 (24.59)	28 (45.90)	17 (27.87)	1 (1.64)	18 (29.51)	30 (49.18)	12 (19.67)	1 (1.64)	9 (14.75)	25 (40.98)	26 (42.62)
Big Ideas framework	0 (0.00)	20 (32.79)	22 (36.07)	19 (31.15)	1 (1.64)	22 (36.07)	24 (39.34)	14 (22.95)	2 (3.28)	7 (11.48)	24 (39.34)	28 (45.90)
Strategy instruction	1 (1.64)	18 (29.51)	28 (45.90)	14 (22.95)	2 (3.28)	22 (36.07)	25 (40.98)	12 (19.67)	1 (1.64)	3 (4.92)	26 (42.62)	31 (50.82)
Strategic integration	2 (3.28)	24 (39.34)	23 (37.70)	12 (19.67)	2 (3.28)	23 (37.70)	26 (42.62)	10 (16.39)	1 (1.64)	9 (14.75)	25 (40.98)	26 (42.62)
Primed background knowledge	0 (0.00)	14 (22.95)	27 (44.26)	20 (32.79)	0 (0.00)	16 (26.23)	28 (45.90)	17 (27.87)	1 (1.64)	5 (8.20)	24 (39.34)	31 (50.82)
Cooperative learning	0 (0.00)	7 (11.48)	22 (36.07)	32 (52.46)	0 (0.00)	11 (18.03)	25 (40.98)	25 (40.98)	0 (0.00)	5 (8.20)	22 (36.07)	34 (55.74)
Planning pyramid	5 (8.20)	24 (39.34)	27 (44.26)	5 (8.20)	8 (13.11)	27 (44.26)	21 (34.43)	5 (8.20)	4 (6.56)	16 (26.23)	24 (39.34)	17 (27.87)
Differentiating content	0 (0.00)	13 (21.31)	18 (29.51)	30 (49.18)	1 (1.64)	20 (32.79)	18 (29.51)	22 (36.07)	0 (0.00)	9 (14.75)	15 (24.59)	37 (60.66)
Differentiating process	0 (0.00)	14 (22.95)	21 (34.43)	26 (42.62)	0 (0.00)	18 (29.51)	25 (40.98)	18 (29.51)	0 (0.00)	6 (9.84)	21 (34.43)	34 (55.74)
Differentiating product	0 (0.00)	13 (21.31)	18 (29.51)	30 (49.18)	0 (0.00)	19 (31.15)	17 (27.87)	25 (40.98)	0 (0.00)	7 (11.48)	20 (32.79)	34 (55.74)
Advance organizers	1 (1.64)	13 (21.31)	33 (54.10)	14 (22.95)	2 (3.28)	18 (29.51)	27 (44.26)	14 (22.95)	1 (1.64)	10 (16.39)	21 (34.43)	29 (47.54)

*Note.* Percentages are based on the number of participants who completed the given item.

Table 6

*Low-Intensity Strategies Self-Assessment: Knowledge, Confidence, and Use Surveys*

<b>Low-Intensity Strategies <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)</b>	Knowledge				Confidence				Use			
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
Locus of control to enhance intrinsic motivation	1 (2.04)	15 (30.61)	25 (51.02)	8 (16.33)	1 (2.04)	14 (28.57)	27 (55.10)	7 (14.29)	0 (0.00)	8 (16.33)	19 (38.78)	22 (44.90)
Principal of Optimal challenge	2 (4.08)	17 (34.69)	23 (46.94)	7 (14.29)	2 (4.08)	14 (28.57)	28 (57.14)	5 (10.20)	0 (0.00)	9 (18.37)	23 (46.94)	17 (34.69)
Using curiosity to enhance intrinsic motivation	0 (0.00)	6 (12.24)	24 (48.98)	19 (38.78)	0 (0.00)	11 (22.45)	22 (44.90)	16 (32.65)	1 (2.04)	3 (6.12)	16 (32.65)	29 (59.18)
The use of natural and fantasy contexts to enhance intrinsic motivation	2 (4.08)	17 (34.69)	22 (44.90)	8 (16.33)	2 (4.08)	18 (36.73)	20 (40.82)	9 (18.37)	2 (4.08)	13 (26.53)	20 (40.82)	14 (28.57)
Active supervision	0 (0.00)	5 (10.20)	11 (22.45)	33 (67.35)	0 (0.00)	4 (8.16)	14 (28.57)	31 (63.27)	0 (0.00)	2 (4.08)	11 (22.45)	36 (73.47)
Precorrection	0 (0.00)	10 (20.41)	26 (53.06)	13 (26.53)	0 (0.00)	10 (20.41)	26 (53.06)	13 (26.53)	0 (0.00)	5 (10.20)	21 (42.86)	23 (46.94)
Proximity	0 (0.00)	1 (2.04)	11 (22.45)	37 (75.51)	0 (0.00)	2 (4.08)	10 (20.41)	37 (75.51)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.04)	7 (14.29)	41 (83.67)
Overlappingness	1 (2.04)	11 (22.45)	24 (48.98)	13 (26.53)	0 (0.00)	15 (30.61)	22 (44.90)	12 (24.49)	0 (0.00)	9 (18.37)	22 (44.90)	18 (36.73)
With-it-ness	1 (2.04)	6 (12.24)	24 (48.98)	18 (36.73)	0 (0.00)	8 (16.33)	25 (51.02)	16 (32.65)	0 (0.00)	5 (10.20)	19 (38.78)	25 (51.02)
Pacing	0 (0.00)	2 (4.08)	23 (46.94)	24 (48.98)	0 (0.00)	5 (10.20)	26 (53.06)	18 (36.73)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.04)	18 (36.73)	30 (61.22)
Appropriate use of praise	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	14 (28.57)	35 (71.43)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.04)	18 (36.73)	30 (61.22)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	12 (24.49)	37 (75.51)
Opportunities to respond	0 (0.00)	4 (8.16)	21 (42.86)	24 (48.98)	0 (0.00)	4 (8.16)	22 (44.90)	23 (46.94)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	17 (34.69)	32 (65.31)
Instructive feedback	0 (0.00)	2 (4.08)	21 (42.86)	26 (53.06)	0 (0.00)	3 (6.12)	23 (46.94)	23 (46.94)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.04)	15 (30.61)	33 (67.35)
Choice of preferred activities	0 (0.00)	4 (8.16)	18 (36.73)	27 (55.10)	0 (0.00)	4 (8.16)	19 (38.78)	26 (53.06)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.04)	16 (32.65)	32 (65.31)
Token economies	2 (4.08)	5 (10.20)	24 (48.98)	18 (36.73)	2 (4.08)	12 (24.49)	22 (44.90)	13 (26.53)	6 (12.24)	9 (18.37)	16 (32.65)	18 (36.73)
Formal teaching of social skills	0 (0.00)	7 (14.29)	26 (53.06)	16 (32.65)	1 (2.04)	8 (16.33)	23 (46.94)	17 (34.69)	0 (0.00)	7 (14.29)	13 (26.53)	29 (59.18)

*Note.* Percentages are based on the number of participants who completed the given item

Table 7

*Social Validity Results*

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	<i>M (SD)</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
							76.72 (9.08)
This book study fits within my resources of my school (cost).	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	10.71 (6)	58.93 (33)	30.36 (17)	5.20 (0.62)
This book study is/ was a good investment of my professional development time.	0.00 (0)	3.57 (2)	5.36 (3)	21.43 (12)	51.79 (29)	17.86 (10)	4.75 (0.94)
This book study will result in improved practices for addressing challenging behaviors.	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	7.14 (4)	19.6 (11)	53.5 (30)	19.6 (11)	4.86 (0.82)
I would suggest the book study to other teachers.	0.00 (0)	3.57 (2)	7.14 (4)	21.43 (12)	46.43 (26)	21.43 (12)	4.75 (1.00)
The book study aligns with the goals of my school.	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	1.79 (1)	5.36 (3)	58.93 (33)	33.93 (19)	5.25 (0.64)
This book study fits within the resources of my colleagues at my school (time).	7.14 (4)	5.36 (3)	10.71 (6)	25.00 (14)	35.71 (20)	16.07 (9)	4.25 (1.39)
I would be willing to participate in a book study again for professional development.	0.00 (0)	1.79 (1)	7.14 (4)	17.86 (10)	42.86 (24)	30.36 (17)	4.93 (0.97)
This book study will have positive effects on the practices of adults at my school.	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	3.57 (2)	26.79 (15)	55.36 (31)	14.29 (8)	4.80 (0.72)
These practices will benefit students.	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	10.71 (6)	58.93 (33)	30.36 (17)	5.20 (0.62)
I was previously familiar with all of the strategies discussed in the book study.	1.79 (1)	8.93 (5)	8.93 (5)	26.79 (15)	32.14 (18)	21.43 (12)	4.43 (1.28)
I regularly use the strategies discussed in the book study.	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	3.57 (2)	25.00 (14)	51.79 (29)	19.64 (11)	4.88 (0.76)
I think my participation in the book study will increase the use of these strategies in supporting students.	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	7.14 (4)	23.21 (13)	55.36 (31)	14.29 (8)	4.77 (0.79)
I like the format of the book study.	1.79 (1)	5.36 (3)	12.50 (7)	14.29 (8)	48.21 (27)	17.86 (10)	4.55 (1.19)
The book selected was easy to read (e.g., interesting, good use of applicable examples, etc.)	1.79 (1)	0.00 (0)	7.14 (4)	19.64 (11)	53.57 (30)	17.86 (10)	4.77 (0.95)
Participating in the book study was a positive learning experience.	0.00 (0)	3.57 (2)	3.57 (2)	26.79 (15)	57.14 (32)	8.93 (5)	4.64 (0.84)
Overall, I would recommend this book study to a colleague.	1.79 (1)	1.79 (1)	1.79 (1)	26.79 (15)	55.36 (31)	12.50 (7)	4.70 (0.91)

*Note.* Managing Challenging Behaviors in Tiered Systems of Support: A Book Study: A Social Validity Survey (Lane & Oakes, 2014).