

Excerpt from
Understanding and Managing Children's Classroom Behavior
Second Edition

Sam Goldstein, Ph.D.

(Wiley, 2007)

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

It has been more than 10 years since the publication of the first edition of this volume. During that time there has been an increased emphasis on assessing the effectiveness of schools to teach basic skills, especially in the areas of mathematics, reading, and language. Terms such as “high stakes testing,” “accountability,” and “merit pay” have become a major part of the educational landscape. Some educators have lamented a focus on what they perceive to be “teaching to the test,” while others believe holding schools accountable for student success is long overdue.

At the same time that educators are feeling the pressure of high stakes testing, there is a renewed awareness that the social/emotional dimension of a student's life must not be neglected (Cohen, 1999). This awareness has been prompted, in part, by events such as the Columbine High School shootings, as well as the impact that the attack on the World Trade Center in New York City on September 11, 2001 has had on our nation's psyche. Unfortunately, rather than embracing the need to educate the “whole” child, a dichotomy has emerged prompting some educators to perceive that nurturing a student's emotional and social health is mutually exclusive from the task of teaching academic skills (Brooks, 2004). However, it is our position that strengthening a student's sense of self-esteem and emotional well-being is not an “extra” curriculum; if anything, a student's sense of belonging, security, and self-confidence provides the scaffolding that supports the foundation for enhanced learning, motivation, and self-discipline. Required is an educational atmosphere capable of instilling what we have called a resilient mindset in students. The schools must now provide social, emotional intervention hand in hand with academic education (Merrell, 2002; Weist, 2003). In fact, a sustainable school environment must be capable of meeting the social, emotional and academic needs of all students (Elias, Zins, Graczyk and Weissberg, 2003).

This second edition reflects our shift away from efforts to just manage classroom behavior, towards the creation of a framework to develop sustainable classroom environments by shaping the mindsets of educators, students and consultants. In this volume we examine the components of effective educators. Such educators are capable of appreciating the forces that truly motivate students, even those with behavioral and developmental challenges. These educators are capable of recognizing that their activities in the classroom day in and day out contribute not just to students' self-esteem and resilience but provides an essential foundation for successful transition into adult life.

Our hope for the future lies in our children; children instilled with the skills necessary to create a sensible world. The more effective teachers are in developing and implementing strategies for fostering learning and a sense of competence and optimism in their students, the better chance students have for success. The more effectively consultants can articulate the components of effective mindsets for teachers and students the more they make these frameworks conscious guides for educators. When students are actively involved in the learning process, when they feel connected and make contributions, discipline as author E.B. White once wrote, "Will take care of itself."

This second edition is built upon our work over the past ten years to bring a resilience model into the schools. The basic feature of resilient children is that their self-esteem and sense of competence are intact or if damaged, capable of repair. Resilient children possess feelings of hope and optimism, of ownership and personal control. They are nurtured by charismatic educators capable of providing experiences to reinforce their strengths and enhance their feelings of self-worth. In such an environment, all children, even those with challenging behavior can flourish. We acknowledge the goal for all students is to develop self-esteem, self-respect and compassion first and foremost. The school environment, as the late Dr. Julius Segal noted and Dr. James Comer reminds us, is a prime location for resilience to be nurtured. The mindset of effective educators and productive consultants provides a framework for understanding the life long impact adults can have upon their students based upon day in and day out classroom activities. Unlike our previous volume which focused on behaviors to be defined, changed or modified, this volume focuses first on the understanding, appreciation and building of assets and strengths and second on the management of weaknesses and liabilities.

We set out to achieve this goal through a consultation model. Behavioral consultation is a model in which a consultant assists the teacher in changing student behavior (Bergan and Kratochwill, 1990). The degree to which the consultee accurately and consistently implements treatment or intervention has been referred to as treatment/intervention integrity. Interventions may fail because the treatment itself is ineffective or has not been properly implemented (Watson, 2000). Failure of effective methods often reflects failure to ensure generalization and implementation. The model promoted in this volume is based on a framework for consultants to effectively utilize methods and means by which effective interventions are recommended, discussed and set into motion with teachers. Such means include direct training, availability by the consultant in the classroom, and strategies to facilitate generalization (Watson and Kramer, 1995; Sterling-Turner, Watson, Wildmon, Watkins and Little, 2001).

Four themes impact educator's effectiveness in the classroom. All must be considered by effective consultants. These are:

1. Impact of causal attributions on beliefs about student behavior and required interventions by teachers.
2. The manner in which direct and indirect services are combined.
3. The impact of causative beliefs and academic standards on teachers' perceptions of intervention effectiveness.
4. Opportunity for ongoing support within the consultant relationship.

School psychologists and other classroom consultants, the primary group charged with implementing the model in this volume, often focus on factors outside of the child such as home and school influences in explaining behavior (Athanasidou, Geil, Hazel and Copeland, 2002). In contrast, teachers tend to believe that family factors play a part but largely tend to not address these contributions to the child's problems. Teachers generally blame student failure or behavior problems on internal characteristics of the student or home (Soodak and Podell, 1994). In general, teachers have been found to believe that children's problems are due to something within the child. They place more emphasis than consultants on treatments aimed directly at the student, often suggesting the student needs to take ownership for the problem and solution. Athanasidou, Geil, Hazel and Copeland (2002) note that the internal attributional style of teachers is reflected in their beliefs about needed classroom treatment and that problems are caused by something wrong within the child. Teachers tend to attribute lack of progress to students while crediting either themselves or students when progress is made. Yet, teachers high in efficacy tend to de-emphasize home variables in students' success and failure, pointing instead to the instructional program and the teachers' role (Hall, Hines, Bacon and Koulianos, 1992). Consultants often view lack of progress as related to teacher behavior towards students and general issues related to stress. Teachers' stress and its impact upon withdrawal from the teaching profession has been increasingly recognized (Anderson, Levinsohn, Barker and Kiewra, 1999). In educator surveys, teachers uniformly complain of large classrooms, discipline problems, low salaries, unsupportive parents and the demands of a national educational curriculum. Effective consultants recognize this issue and set out to provide support without indicting teachers. Contrary to past theories of consultation as exclusively an indirect service, effective consultants not only consult but also when needed engage in direct service. In fact, even when teachers choose consultation as an intervention method they typically want direct services provided by the consultant to the student (Jones, Wickstrom and Friman, 1997). However, when consultants provide exclusively direct service, consultation is often unsuccessful in facilitating long term change in classroom behavior.

In 1997, Alderman and Gimpel reported that teachers in general did not find consultation to be their preferred method of service. They further reported consultation to be only moderately effective in changing students' behavior. Yet, direct consultee training led to higher treatment integrity. Treatments implemented with high integrity are more likely to lead to successful outcomes (Sterling, Turner, Watson and Moore, 2002). As noted, a number of mitigating factors are likely responsible for this lukewarm response. In fact, years of teaching experience has been found to be inversely proportional to the desired participation in consultation by teachers (Stenger, Tollefson and Fine, 1992). Teachers with good problem solving skills interestingly are more likely to seek out consultation. Severity of the child's behavior problems is also an issue. Further, teachers tend to value academic progress (e.g., work completion) over

behavioral progress (e.g., stay seated and don't speak out of turn). Studies of teacher-child relationships have examined children's adjustment in classrooms in terms of how the relationship develops during atypical classroom interactions such as instructions, socialization and management of activities and time (Pianta, 1999). Classroom interactions have social and affective components for both child and teacher. To the degree to which is a good fit for a child reflecting the child's needs and strengths.

A Crisis in Discipline

Annual Gallup education polls continue to find discipline as the public's primary educational concern (Gallup, 2005). Problems with discipline have been rated as second only to problems with drug use. Teachers have been reported to view lack of school discipline as a serious problem, often blaming the problem first on lack of discipline at home; second on lack of educational resources. As noted, this attributional style may interfere with the potential for effective interventions to be applied successfully (Lloyd, Kauffman and Kupersmidt, 1990). Though teachers today as a group are likely more effective educators and behavior managers than teachers years ago, many perceive fighting a losing battle. Focusing exclusively on a "bad behavior" does not appear to stem the tide of childhood problems. Thirty-seven years ago in 1971, a thousand teachers in Erie, Pennsylvania went on strike in part because of their principals' failure to provide support for discipline problems in the classroom. Nearly twenty years ago teachers reported believing they spent too much time on behavioral problems (Wheldall and Merrett, 1988). Boys are often described as more problematic and complained about three times more frequently than girls.

Psychiatric terms are increasingly used as explanations for children's school problems yet in reality they simply provide a convenient label for a cluster of behavioral, educational and/or emotional differences. Thus, it is not surprising that as educators report more problems in the classroom across all domains, the rates of psychiatric diagnoses has increased. Providing data that there are more children meeting psychiatric diagnoses does not necessarily provide an explanation for the phenomena nor clear paths for solutions. Yet it is important to note that rates of psychiatric problems in children have risen from approximately 17% to 22% in studies in the mid to late 80's (Costello, 1989a) to nearly 30% based upon recent surveys (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005). Further, the risk factors that appear to increase children's vulnerability for problems and ultimately receive diagnoses have increased as well over the last ten years (Commission on Children at Risk, 2003). The lifetime prevalence of psychiatric disorders is much greater than rates of diagnosis and treatment (Kessler, Berglund, Demler, et al., 2005).

Further, the problems observed epidemiologically in the general population is not necessarily reflected in the classroom where incidence of problems varies greatly depending upon classroom demands, educator methods and ultimately methods of data collection.

When researchers ask a single question related to a label (e.g., behavior problem) but not a specific, operationally defined behavior, respondents usually identify a significant minority of children. Nonetheless, regardless of how the data are collected, teachers report frequent behavioral problems in the classroom and have done so for nearly a century. In 1929, Wickman reported an incidence of 42%. Reported incidence rates since have not been as high but have continued to represent a significant group of children. Rates of 10% with behavior problems (Bower, 1969); 20% with behavior problems, including 12% as mild, 5.5% moderate and 2% severe (Kelly, Bullock and Dykes, 1977); 20-30% (Riebin and Balow, 1978); 6-10% requiring special education services as behavior disordered (Kaufman, 1985); and 33% (Cullinan and Epstein, 1986) provide a representative sample of statistics over the past sixty years. Typically of these children, only a small group are ultimately served in the school setting under a defined disability criteria related to the Individuals with Disabilities Improvement Education Act (2004). Although a number of other students with behavioral or related problems may be served by school counselors or psychologists, classroom teachers are on their own when educating the majority of children with mild to moderate limitations and impairments in the classroom.

In a seven year longitudinal study still relevant today, Riebin and Balow (1978) found that 60% of children identified as having behavioral problems were rated in at least three different years by three different teachers as demonstrating such problems. Of the problems identified children, 7.5% were nominated by every teacher throughout the study. A significant group of children identified early on in their educational careers as problematic persist and appear treatment resistant. These researchers concluded that the tolerance limits of teachers may be as much a function of which children are labeled problematic as the children themselves. Eventually, almost every child's behavior will test some teachers. Further, child attributes such as age, ethnicity and gender are often identified as correlates of teacher ratings of children's classroom adjustment (Pianta and McCoy, 1997). Teacher-child communication patterns and teacher expectations vary by ethnicity of the student (Brady, Tucker, Harris and Tribble, 1992). First grade teachers responded differently to African American and Caucasian children displaying the same behavior, indicating

different ways of interpreting child behavior based on child ethnicity (Alexander and Entwisle, 1988). Further, teacher's own ethnicity has also been shown to relate to their perceptions of children's behavior independent of the child's ethnicity (Zimmerman, Khoury, Vega, Gil and Warheit, 1995). Child gender may be a predictor of teacher ratings for both conduct problems and academic achievement (Patterson, Kupersmidt and Vaden, 1990). Males are more often referred for remedial educational services and have higher levels of conflicts with female teachers in preschool (Brophy, 1985), whereas females are less likely to be criticized by teachers overall (Eccles and Blumenfeld, 1985). Females tend to receive less teacher attention than males (Morgan and Dunn, 1988). Interestingly, teachers' perceptions of relationships in kindergarten were found to predict eighth grade outcomes differently from males than females (Hamre and Pianta, 1999). When teachers experience more conflict with kindergarten males, these males had more disciplinary problems over time. Further, dependency on a kindergarten teacher was a stable predictor of poor long-term academic outcome for males but not females. Teacher perceptions of the negative and positive qualities of their relationships with students contributed for up to 27% of the variance in teachers' perceptions, most notably with predictions higher for aspects of relationships that teachers experience as negative such as conflict and dependency. The quality of teacher-child relationships is related concurrently and predictively to children's scholastic and behavioral competence in the early school years (Hamre and Pianta, 1999; Pianta, Steinberg and Rollins, 1995).

It should also be noted that measurement of teacher-child relationships has generally relied on teacher perceptions. Students are rarely queried (Birch and Ladd, 1997; Pianta, 1999). Yet, school drop outs retrospectively rated perceived school climates significantly lower than graduates. Graduates rated the importance of attending college significantly higher than dropouts. Dropouts and graduates who left school did not report differences on the risk factors measured nor do they differ on perceived school climate or the importance of attending college (Worrell and Hale, 2001). However, hope in the future significantly predicted dropout versus graduate status for these participants, particularly the perception participants had about relationships with teachers. Perceived social support has also been found to relate to clinical conditions such as anxiety (White, Bruce, Farrell and Klierer, 1998) and depression (Cheng, 1997, 1998). A statistically significant relationship has been found among perceptions of social support and academic indices including grades, teacher ratings and standardized test scores (Levitt, Guacci-Franco and Levitt, 1994). Students

with low perceived support particularly from teachers obtain significantly higher scores on problem behavior indicators and lower scores on positive behavior indicators (Demaray and Malecki, 2002).

Yet teachers alone, as we have noted, do not primarily define the optimal educational experience. Over the past thirty years, researchers and educators alike have recognized that student and classroom variables also play determining roles in the day in and day out functioning of the classroom and individual students. Student variables such as home experience, learning disability, temperament, language skills, social and interpersonal abilities exert a significant impact on the classroom. A student capable of following teacher directions and rules, completing classroom work and responding appropriately to conventional management techniques is going to experience far more success and positive feedback from teachers than a student who will not use or has not mastered these skills. Further, the structure of the classroom, including the number of students, range of student abilities and achievement, size of the room and the manner in which work is presented also contributes to successful educational experiences. The educational climate is contributed to by all of these factors and nurtured by educators competent in behavioral and educational strategies but first and foremost concerned with creating a safe, accepting climate. Thus, teacher, student and classroom variables at any given moment interact and contribute in varying degrees to the manner in which the classroom operates.

In 1928, Wickman suggested that the primary concern of most educators was aggressive-disruptive students rather than those who appeared depressed, anxious or withdrawn. Over the past century the primary educational mindset has been achievement oriented rather than person based. It has not typically been of concern to teachers how children feel but rather that they perform. Thus, it is not surprising that teachers and mental health workers report that shy, anxious, quiet children are easier to work with and respond better in the classroom than those who are disruptive (Cowen, Gesten and Destefano, 1977). Further, when a disruptive child also experiences achievement difficulties secondary to a specific learning disability, fitting into the classroom is even more difficult. These authors reported that teachers felt that this group of children was "hopeless."

In 1964, Cremin described the American School System as being founded on an authoritarian model and supported on that basis. The basis of an authoritarian model is corporal punishment. The National Association of School Psychologists defines corporal punishment as an intentional infliction of physical pain, physical restraint and/or discomfort on a student as a disciplinary technique (NASP, 1986). Though corporal punishment has been increasingly on the decline in schools, it is still banned in only twenty-seven U.S. states (Center for Effective Discipline, 2005). Every industrialized country in the world prohibits school corporal punishment except the United States, Canada and one state in Australia. In the 1999-2000 school year, 9% of children in Arkansas and Mississippi were reported to have been struck by educators (Center for

Effective Discipline, 2005). Yet the preponderance of the data generated suggests that when teachers focus on academics and effective teaching strategies, provide work that students are capable of understanding, provide an emotionally safe and supportive atmosphere and respond in a democratic way to behavioral problems, disciplinary difficulties in the classroom are at a minimum. As Marshall noted in 1972, successful classroom environments are conducive to learning and positive discipline and are constructive and preventive as well as remedial and ameliorative. For this model to be effective, a holistic approach must be taken. Applying various behavioral strategies in a band-aid fashion is not likely to be successful. The preponderance of the research data suggests that efficient teachers establish relationships of mutual respect and trust with their students; plan programming in the classroom carefully to meet students needs; set appropriate rules and limits; but most importantly, focus on helping students feel connected and competent in the classroom.

In the early 1800's, a Quaker named Joseph Lancaster, described pinching the young where they are most tender, as a philosophy of behavior management and education (Emblem, 1979). Lancaster's theory was that discipline worked when it hurt or embarrassed youngsters. His principles included making certain that punishments were novel and varied. According to Lancaster, punishments must create displeasure, be repeatable, not interfere with regular work and be self-administered. Interestingly enough, the teacher was advised to administer the punishment to him or herself before employing it with children (Lancaster, 1808). Lancaster also wrote that he believed school disciplinary procedures would be ineffective in managing behavior problems caused by poor home environments. Schools as he noted could not fix family problems. Punishable offenses in Lancaster's day included tardiness, hyperactivity, short attention span, profanity and immorality. Leg shackles and pillories were routine devices used for misbehavior.

Horace Mann (1855) described schools of his day as following the model of punishment and pain. Among the more severe forms of punishment was to place offending students in a sack or basket and suspend them from the room of the school for all to see. Among the more unusual interventions was one for inattention and restlessness. A cord was slipped over the head of a student attached to a six pound log that had to be balanced on the student's shoulders. The slightest motion one way or the other in the log would fall, putting weight around the neck. This intervention was described as effective because it did not completely hinder movement nor interrupt class work.

Disruptive problems of inattention, over-activity and non-compliance are still the most common complaints of teachers. Corporal punishment slowly has given away to the application of behavioral principles, problem solving and token economies. Yet as Sabatino (1983a) noted the model of authority, force, fear and pain was still likely practiced covertly if not overtly in many schools. Countless cases are reported in which students are inappropriately disciplined even today with excessive punishment, teacher

name calling or excessive time out. In 1980, Unks described an incident in which a child developed hyperactivity after recovering from encephalitis. This child's increased activity level was labeled as disobedient even though it was caused by incompetence rather than non-compliance or purposeful misbehavior. As a punishment the child was repeatedly restricted from participating with others with the intent that this punishment would change the child's neurologically based behavior. Keep in mind that even as of the mid-1970's, half of teachers and principals in the United States reported using corporal punishment as a primary means of discipline (Hyman and Wise, 1979). Though much has changed in the past thirty years, there are still many places in the United States and certainly other countries as well where corporal punishment is used to deal with childhood misbehavior and related problems. In 1968, only the state of New Jersey forbade corporal punishment. Even today, many states continue to permit its use. Yet corporal punishment teaches children to rule by aggression and bullying because teachers model the very behavior they are trying to eliminate (Fishbach and Fishbach, 1973). The risks and the use of corporal punishment outweigh the benefits. Students become angry. Teachers are likely more stressed than helped. The intervention suppresses but does not change behavior. Finally, it creates a climate that does not foster resilience. Thirty years ago the National Institute of Education concluded that corporal punishment is an inefficient way to maintain order, tends to lead to more frequent rather than less frequent punishments and has undesirable effects on students. This outcome has been reported across all settings as well (Gershoff, 2002).

A New Direction

Parts I and II of this volume set the foundation of a model to create resilient, sustainable environments in our schools. Such a model fosters effective behavior management in the classroom by thoroughly exploring teacher, student, setting and consultant variables. Part III of this volume focuses on interventions based upon a foundation of cognitive/behavioral theory. Teacher and student behavior can be impacted in general ways such as reinforcement or token economies (Walker and Buckley, 1974), active feedback (Drabman and Lahey, 1974), group consequences (Greewood, Hops, Delquadari and Guild, 1974), social approval (Becker, Madsen, Arnold and Thomas, 1967), motivation and attribution (Brooks, 1991), building educational opportunity (Elias, Parker and Rosenblatt, 2005) and violence prevention (Taub and Pearrow, 2005). These strategies are equally appropriate for children and adolescents with disruptive, non-disruptive or developmental problems. Further, an emphasis on preventive discipline through sound instructional strategies undoubtedly leads to the most efficient classroom management. Nearly forty years ago, Kounin (1970) suggest that teachers in both well and poorly managed classrooms respond similarly to student behavior. However, teachers of well-managed classrooms were much more efficient in monitoring student attention and performance, structuring beginning of the year

activities and implementing classroom rules and procedures (Emmer, Evertson and Anderson, 1980); Gettinger (1988). Note that the majority of these efforts are prophylactic or preventive rather than reactionary in punishing.

Kazdin (1975) describes five classes of techniques available to teachers to effectively manage their behavior:

1. Knowledge of the power of various stimuli in triggering certain good or negative behaviors increases the likelihood of successful student behavior.
2. Teachers can monitor their own behavior and make changes accordingly.
3. Teachers may reinforce or punish themselves contingent on their own behavior.
4. Teachers can learn to guide and instruct themselves more efficiently through self-monitoring.
5. Teachers can learn alternative responses or new ways of responding to problem behavior.

Teachers possess basic techniques to manage student behavior, including positive reinforcement, extinction, punishment modeling and desensitization (Clarizio, 1976). When used appropriately, all of these techniques can be quite effective across all student ages. These strategies are based on the premise that the consultant and teacher will first observe, define and target problem behaviors for intervention (Ulrich, Stachnik and Mabry, 1966). The consultant must then effectively communicate these five basic behavioral techniques to teachers.

A basic principle for teachers is that consequences determine behavior. A negative consequence decreases the likelihood that a behavior will re-occur; a positive consequence has just the opposite effect. If the behavior results in what we desire we will repeat it. If following the rules results in praise that a student values, he or she will respect those rules. If being disruptive results in sought after attention the student will repeat the objectionable action. All behaviors regardless of what they are lead to some kind of payoff. They attract attention, gain power, express hostility or achieve isolation (Dreikurs, Grunwald and Pepper, 1971). There is no doubt, however, that the offering of primary and secondary reinforcers constitutes a teacher's most valuable tool. Yet teachers frequently mis-use reinforcement by committing sins of either commission (rewarding unwanted behavior) or omission (ignoring positive behavior). For example, in 1970, Madsen and Madsen evaluated students' responses to teachers' commands to sit down. When teachers were directed to give this command every time a student stood up the incidence of standing behavior, not surprisingly, increased. This is basic premise of negative reinforcement. Yet teachers did not expect this outcome. The command appeared to serve as a reinforcer for the behavior. When teachers were trained to ignore the inappropriate behavior and reinforce more appropriate behavior by paying attention students when they were sitting down, sitting down behavior increased.

Why do teachers commit sins that reinforce omission? Despite their best intentions teachers frequently miss opportunities to strengthen desirable behaviors because of personal bias, motivation, expectation and likely their past history. Many teachers develop misconceptions about difficult students and as noted come to focus on misbehavior overlooking occasions to reward positive behavior. Due to these biases, teachers often fail to reward a problem child, even when he or she is behaving appropriately. When such children are not behaving in bothersome ways, teachers like parents appear to have a tendency to leave them alone so as not to "rock the boat." Finally, teachers expect all students much beyond kindergarten age to behave. Therefore, they often find it difficult to consistently reward appropriate behavior in the students who may need such reinforcement most. Data consistently suggests that the quickest way to gain teacher attention in the classroom is to misbehave.

Successful classroom management includes the use of group contingencies to keep the group on task and functioning smoothly without disruption as well as management techniques to keep individual students involved in productive work (Grossman, 1990). Management techniques must include strategies for dealing with disruptive and non-disruptive behavior as well as peer directed behaviors (Heward and Orlansky, 1990). However, management must also be placed within a framework of an appreciation for each student's developmental capabilities and level of achievement. The message is clear. With understanding and preventive planning techniques, anticipatory responses and systematic interventions, teachers can avoid behavioral problems by motivating students to want to behave in desirable ways (Linn and Herr, 1992). Preventive planning techniques, because they are proactive rather than reactive, represent a key component in creating a resilient classroom and sustainable school.

To assure positive classroom behavior, teachers must possess a basic system to identify and deal with problems. They must be able to target specific behavioral problems and define them in a predictable, consistent and measurable fashion. They also must be able to define an acceptable end point behavior. They must prioritize problems that require intervention first based upon their impact on the child's academic or social adjustment and the ease with which they can be measured, reinforced across a variety of settings and eliminated by focusing on a more appropriate substitute. Once the behavior has been identified teachers must carefully evaluate the antecedents and consequences. This stage requires finding answers to questions about the problem - when, where, how and by whom - as well as gauging its impact on others. Third, teachers must select a strategy that either develops a new behavior eliminates the aversive behavior. Finally, they must develop a system for tracking progress and measuring success.

It is critical for educators to learn to state problems in ways that lead directly to intervention. The problem statement must allow them to focus on a specific situation, develop practical strategies, monitor the target behavior and consistently provide

consequences or alter interventions if necessary. Using this model, Schoen (1983) focuses on how students learn compliance:

1. Students must understand the relationship between the teacher's request and the appropriate response.
2. They must have the opportunity for consistent practice of that response with reinforcement.
3. The behavior must be generalized to other settings.

In the initial phase, compliant responses must be reinforced quickly and consistently every time with non-compliant responses resulting in consistent consequences every time. The next phase relies on two basic sets of management strategies. The first set uses positive approaches such as different attention, token economy and the PREMACK principle (using a frequently occurring behavior to reinforce a low frequency behavior). The second set of interventions is reductionist and involves interventions such as response cost, reprimand, time out and in the extreme, physical manipulation. In the last stage, teachers must make an effort to generalize appropriate behavior across settings, class situations and with a variety of activities.

In the next chapter we describe the basic model to create sustainable school environments. Effective teachers are a key component of this environment. The consensual description of the effective teacher is based on a wide variety of classrooms educating many different students. To truly understand an effective teacher and to help all educators be effective requires an appreciation of attitudes, beliefs, teacher behaviors and instructional strategies. Though some believe these characteristics are generic to good teaching (Kauffman and Wong, 1991), others suggest that generic skills may serve the general population but not be as effective for students with specific problems (Zabel, 1987). Yet as was noted by Hobbs in 1966 and is still consistent today, within the special education field little is known about the requirement for effective teaching of behaviorally impaired students.

Four classes of behavior appear to disturb teachers most. These are: social immaturity, disobedience, motor and physical activity and outright disruptive behavior (Curran and Algozzine, 1980). Among classroom teachers, outright student defiance towards authority is found consistently to be the most disturbing classroom problem. Aggression and poor peer cooperative are also rated as quite aversive to teachers (Safran and Safran, 1984, 1985, 1987). In contrast as described, teachers find anxiety and learning difficulties as least disturbing and most tolerable.

Although most teachers perceive disruptive behavior and those behaviors that threaten their authority as unacceptable, educators effective in dealing with these problems are more demanding, set standards and stick with them. There appears to be positive correlation between teachers' effective instructional practices and their demands for appropriate behavior, lack of tolerance for misbehavior and general tolerance for behavioral problems (Gersten, Walker and Darch, 1988; Walker and Rankin, 1983). Teacher variables include those problems owned by the teacher that

present difficulties because student behavior interferes with the teacher's satisfaction or causes the educator to feel frustrated, irritated or angry (Gordon, 1974). Some teachers react aggressively when their need for authority and control is threatened. In contrast, student-owned problems, such as feeling inadequate or experiencing anxiety come primarily from within the student. Finally, some problems are shared by students and teachers. Teachers perceive situations involving teacher-owned problems more negatively than those involving student owned problems (Brophy and Rohrkemper, 1981). Most teachers, as noted, view children as responsible for intentionally causing a teacher owned problem and capable of exercising self-control. This is a critical issue for consultants. The assumptions of these educators is that the child was purposely non-compliant rather than lacking in skill to meet the teacher's expectations or reacting to past reinforcement for that pattern of behavior. Teachers confronted with teacher-owned problems are more pessimistic about their ability to achieve positive outcome and change student behavior. In the Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981) study, these teachers were less committed to helping such students. In contrast, when dealing with student owned problems, teachers seem to perceive these students as victims of incompetence rather than as perpetrators of deliberate non-compliance. In these situations teachers appeared to be more positive, committed and willing to attempt classroom interventions. Thus, student-owned problems do not represent as great a threat as teacher owned problems, especially those related to student defiance, aggression or disruption.

Effective Teachers

Since teachers form the lynch pin in the model proposed in this volume, we will briefly review effective teacher variables in this introduction. Regardless of interventions used, consultants must always keep these issues in mind. An appreciation of the mindset of effective educators forms a critical foundation in the consultation model. For example, elementary teachers frequently utilize strategies using threat or punishment (e.g., loss of privilege or suspension) to pressure aggressive students into controlling their behavior (Brophy, Bevis, Brown, Echeverria, Gregg, Haynes, Merrick & Smith, 1986). However, teachers found to be more effective based upon direct classroom observation use instructive positive interventions much more successfully to deal with aggressive non-compliant students than these reductionist interventions. In 1985, Larrivee reported fifteen basic teacher behaviors that were found to have a positive correlation with improved behavior and performance in children exhibiting behavioral problems in the classroom. These fifteen behaviors form the foundation for this volume:

1. Providing positive feedback to students.
2. Offering sustained feedback to students.
3. Responding supportively to students in general.
4. Responding even more supportively to low-ability students.

5. Responding supportively to students with behavioral problems.
6. Asking questions that students are able to answer correctly.
7. Presenting learning tasks for which students have a high probability of success.
8. Using time efficiently.
9. Intervening at in misbehavior at a low rate.
10. Maintaining a low ratio of punitive to positive interventions.
11. Being punitive at a low rate.
12. Using criticism at a low rate.
13. Keeping the need for disciplinary interventions low through positive classroom interventions.
14. Wasting little time on student transitions.
15. Keeping off task time to a minimum.

When standards and tolerance of educators is measured accurately a good fit between teacher and misbehaving students could be made by using one or more of the following strategies as described by Kauffman and Wong (1991):

1. Modifying the student's behavior to match the teacher's standard and tolerance.
2. Placing the student with a teacher whose standards and limits the teacher can meet.
3. Modifying the teacher's standards and tolerance to match the student's.

These three strategies constitute the basic alternatives available to the classroom consultant. By evaluating student, teacher and setting variables, the consultant must initially determine which options stand the best chance for success. In general, effective teachers for misbehaving students - likely those who can quickly bring about change for the better in behavior - may be less demanding and more tolerant as well as willing to modify their behavior in dealing with problem students.

Effective educators also include higher demands for students' academic performance and conduct, carefully design activities to maintain high rates of corrective responding and low rates of off task behavior, frequently praise students for appropriate behavior, minimally utilize criticism or punishment and are generally confident in their ability to help students learn and behave appropriately (Kauffman and Wong, 1991). As noted by these authors twenty-five years ago and still of concern: "Researchers need to establish effective teaching strategies for students with different types of behavioral disorders (e.g. internalizing versus externalizing behavior) and to distinguish effective teaching of students with behavioral disorders from effective teaching of those with other disabilities" (pp. 233-234).

Concluding Thoughts

This volume as with its predecessor, begins with the premise that classrooms are vibrant, dynamic, complex settings in which teacher, student and setting variables

contribute to varying degrees in determining students' educational experiences, behavior and the development of a resilient mindset. Because variables in each of these key areas play a critical role, they must be understood in and of their own as well as in their interactions. This text is written for classroom consultants, including school psychologists, special educators, social workers, counselors, principals or master teachers. The titles after an individual's name and his or her degrees take a back seat to interest in the subject and ability to combine scientific knowledge with practical interventions facilitating the development of an effective, sustainable educational setting. This text provides a comprehensive, research based exploration of the classroom, a model to understand and assess behavior as well as well defined guidelines for consultation and intervention. The regular education (mainstreaming) initiative has gathered steam over the past ten years culminating in significant changes in the current version of the Individuals for Disabilities Improvement Education Act (2004). Within this model in which response to intervention and problem solving are emphasized, consultants assume an increasingly important position. Effective consultants provide many invaluable services: they develop a consistent and practical referral system; they empower teachers to identify and begin evaluating behavioral problems in a comprehensive, scientific fashion; they are readily available, knowledgeable and capable of offering a variety of interventions. This scenario represents a biopsychosocial model at its best. At any given moment, teacher, student and setting variables interact and in turn are affected by learning history, biology, temperament, development and cognition. The effective and efficient consultant must understand all of these issues, how they interact and, most importantly, how they impact the school environment.

Classroom consultation has become an increasingly popular means of providing cost effective assistance to teachers. Research in this area has steadily increased over the past ten years. Recent trends in education to deal with problems as they occur rather than through a special education maze place an even greater emphasis on the consultant's role. When teachers are presented with a rationale for intervention that matches their perspectives greater intervention acceptability incurs (Conoley, Conoley, Ivey and Scheel, 1991). When consultants join consultees by framing interventions in a way that is in line with the consultee's causal notions and classroom system, effective change occurs (Wickstrom and Witt, 1993). Classroom consultation has become an increasingly prevalent and effective means of offering service to a broad group of children (Lepage, Kratochvil and Elliott, 2004). Consultation reflects an indirect service model in which the consultant helps teachers solve classroom problems as well as increase their ability to prevent or deal with similar problems effectively in the future (Gutkin and Curtis, 1990). We have come to realize that consultation involves more than simply providing intervention. Intervention does not guarantee significant success (Kovelesky, Burgon, Sheridan and Elliott, 1998; Noell, Gansle and Allison, 1999). Implementation becomes unstable or exhibits a downward trend in effectiveness in the

absence of follow-up. Consultation is an ongoing process. Brief meetings that review the intervention are essential. Performance feedback results in more stable implementation. As Noell, Duhon, Gatti and Connell (2002) note, "Despite its fundamental importance to the practice of school psychology and the broad advocacy for its expanded use, the empirical basis for consultation remains a work in progress" (pp. 217). These authors also note that "although consultation interactions typically focus on the students or clients' behavior, supporting behavior change on the part of the consultee is frequently the initial challenge confronting consultants." As Foxx (1996) noted, it has been argued that insuring plan implementation is frequently more challenging than developing an appropriate intervention. Thus, the model proposed in this volume places an initial emphasis on understanding and examining teachers' mindsets. Although relatively little research has documented the preventive or long lasting benefits of classroom consultation (Aldrich and Martens, 1993) indirect evidence supports this intervention to suggest that the data simply await collection (Ponti, Zins and Graden, 1988).

There is an increased need to examine better ways to create and deliver mental health services for all children within our schools (Bierman, 2003). Sustainable school environments must include attention to children's mental health. Effective and sustainable implementation of mental health services in the schools needs to consider the use of local data to guide ongoing decision making, invest in team-based implementation, develop local training capacity, establish ongoing coaching support, give priority to evidence based practice, establish district level support systems and have a long-term plan in mind (Sugai, 2003). Consultation in the classroom must today and into the future provide a balanced focus on behavior for those in need as well as stress hardiness and the development of a resilient mindset for all students. Twenty-five years ago it was reported that classroom conduct was deteriorating at a rate equivalent to the escalation of felonies committed by underage youth (Stoops, Rafferty and Johnson, 1981). Discipline problems are rated by most adults as a primary example of ineffectiveness in the American Educational System. This is equally true today as children's medical, mental health and general adjustment continues to be eroded away, making it increasingly more difficult for children to negotiate every day life successfully. The enormity of the task defined by Lloyd, Kauffman and Kupersmidt in 1990 has continued to grow. Yet, inroads have and continue to be made. As Seligman has pointed out (1998a, 1998b), attending to those issues that are preventative and that create a resilient mindset and wellness will require a significant paradigm shift in mental health professionals and the educational community. Seligman has suggested that the shift will not be easy to make. It is the intent of this volume to introduce and advocate for the implementation of a model of effective prevention and positive social science.