12-2020

Veteran Teachers' Perceptions on the Negative Implications of Classroom Disruptive Behavior and Redirection Strategies

Charvelia Sharae Lewis
csl17a@acu.edu

This dissertation, directed and approved by the candidate's committee, has been accepted by the College of Graduate and Professional Studies of Abilene Christian University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

Joe L. Cope

Dr. Joey Cope, Dean of the College of Graduate and Professional Studies

Date 11 / 11 / 2020

Dissertation Committee:

Irma Harper

Dr. Irma Harper, Chair

Karen Maxwell

Dr. Karen Maxwell

Christie Bledsoe

Dr. Christie Bledsoe

Abilene Christian University

School of Educational Leadership

Veteran Teachers' Perceptions on the Negative Implications of Classroom Disruptive Behavior and Redirection Strategies

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

by

Charvelia Sharae Lewis

December 2020

Dedication

"I know what I'm doing. I have it all planned out—plans to take care of you, not abandon you, plans to give you the future you hope for" (Jeremiah 29:11). Just when I thought my life was falling apart, You caught me and LED me on a divine detour. God, I am so thankful for who you are and what you have done in my life. I never shall forget your loving kindness and your tender mercies towards me.

God truly gifted me with the best parents a child could ask for, the late Rev. Charles Lewis and Sylvia Lewis. Momma, although you don't always recognize it, you are so strong, so courageous, and so beautiful. Thanks for always being there for me through every season of my life. Daddy, I miss you so much. I wish so badly that you were here with us to celebrate this accomplishment and to have a continued hand in raising the boys (there are two of them now) because I know they would love their Paw-Paw. But I find comfort in knowing that you are ever-present with us in spirit. The life you lived was so profound and impactful that 13 years later, everyone who knew you still speaks so highly of your character and kindness.

To my sisters, Jay, Kay, Tia, and Tamerra, as we wait on God to reveal to us what He wants us to do next, let us continue to genuinely love and support each other on this journey, because as we all know, life is short. I appreciate each of you for your relentless assistance during this process, and I love you deeply.

To my intelligent and tender-hearted God-sons, Jordan and Jaxon, your Me-Me adores you. God knew that we would need the day and night mix that you provide for our family. My prayer is that God will groom you to become mighty men of valor. The two of you are so very precious to me.

Acknowledgments

Dr. Irma Harper, where would I be without you? When I was stressed out and overwhelmed and at times impatient, you graciously guided me from one point to the next. Your diligence and patience with me were proof that you were a true co-laborer in this project. This would not have been possible without you. From the bottom of my heart, thank you.

I would be remised if I failed to acknowledge all of the hardworking teachers who are currently in the trenches, providing quality education to students in these uncertain times. I liken your value to that of the virtuous woman spoken of in Proverbs 31, for your value is far more than rubies.

Abstract

Classroom teachers are responsible for creating an environment where all students are able to receive an optimal educational experience. However, disruptive behavior demonstrated by students in classrooms often makes it more difficult for teachers to provide quality instruction to all students. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to understand the perceptions of veteran teachers related to student disruptive behavior as well as the redirection strategies utilized to decrease the occurrence of such behavior during instructional time. Along with completing an open-ended survey related to strategies used to address disruptive behavior, the veteran teacher participants shared their experiences in a focus group session. The survey data indicated that teachers utilized a variety of strategies to address behavior within their classrooms and schools, such as Class Dojo and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. The focus group interviews revealed that disruptive student behavior reduces instructional time and had an adverse effect on the teaching force. In addition, teachers stated that building relationships, increasing student engagement, and teacher support were beneficial when addressing disruptive behavior.

Keywords: behavior, redirection strategies, instructional time

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Disruptive student behavior demonstrated in many classrooms has steadily increased (Mires & Lee, 2017; Nelson, 2016). As a result, classroom teachers are required to repeatedly halt instruction to address these troublesome behaviors. These disruptive behaviors may include off-task talking during instruction, sleeping during class, throwing objects, and other demonstrations of defiant behavior aimed towards other students or the teacher (Ali & Gracey, 2013). In the worst-case scenario, some instances of disruptive in-class behavior have escalated to physical harm towards other students or the instructor (Griggs et al., 2016; Nelson, 2016).

Many of the disruptive behaviors demonstrated are exhibited in elementary classrooms by students in grades prekindergarten through fifth (Lopez Jimenez et al., 2016). Most elementary school teachers are informed and trained on how to address these types of problematic behaviors with students who receive special education accommodations due to a diagnosed disorder (Ramirez et al., 2019). They are also knowledgeable about how disruptive conduct is often triggered by extenuating circumstances that students experience at home. However, there are limited strategies shared with teachers on exactly how to address classroom incivility that occurs in many classrooms with regular education students.

The existence of disruptive classroom behavior yields several negative consequences. One such penalty is against student academic achievement. Established for each grade level are state-mandated instructional goals and standards that are to be strategically planned, presented, and assessed in order to gauge student learning. However, disruptive student behavior limits a teacher's ability to teach (Scott et al., 2007). Barton et al. (1998) asserted that incidents of disruptive student behavior have a clear, undesirable impact on academic achievement and a correlation exists between student behavior and academic performance for the individual student.

When student disruptions are alleviated, the classroom becomes a setting where teachers can provide a level of instruction that promotes student learning (O'Connor et al., 2014).

The implications of disruptive student behavior and its influence on the learning environment are argued with reference to the behaviorism theory, Kounin's model, and choice theory. Conceived by John Watson, the theory of behaviorism is based primarily on the idea humans respond to specific events or environmental influences and in order for responses to be deemed valid, they must be observable and measurable (Clark, 2018). Jacob Kounin's model discusses teacher actions such as "withitness," overlapping, and momentum that influences the classroom environment (Balli, 2011). Lastly, the choice theory is established on the precept that people have needs and all behaviors are demonstrated in an effort to meet those needs (Rouhollahi, 2016).

Statement of the Problem

A student's academic advancement and holistic development represent a portion of what teachers are expected to cultivate in the classroom setting (Shewark et al., 2018). However, because of the frequent occurrence of disruptive behavior incidences in many of today's classrooms, these expectations are becoming more difficult to realize. Bettini et al. (2015) argued that along with addressing student achievement shortfalls, teachers are to also facilitate a behavioral plan designed to reduce and eventually eliminate classroom disruptions. Unfortunately, the amount of time allocated to teaching instructional content and redirecting disruptive behavior might be comparable (Rosenberg & Jackman, 2003).

The problem this study addressed was the effects of disruptive classroom behavior on the learning environment and student achievement. In addition, it explored the factors that influence

negative behavior. It also examined strategies teachers used to cope with disruptive behavior inside the classroom.

Purpose Statement

Acccording to Ervin et al. (2018), "Disruptive student behavior can have a negative impact on everyone in the school—the students exhibiting the behaviors, their peers, and their teachers" (p. 106). Disruptive student behavior requires teachers to alter classroom instruction to address the conduct of distractive students, thereby reducing the teacher's ability to provide continuous quality instruction to the entire class (Gage et al., 2018).

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to provide in-depth insight into the negative implications that disruptive student behavior had on the classroom environment as well as the strategies teachers used to redirect disruptive behavior. It also provided a more concise understanding of the factors teachers attributed to disruptive student behavior, how teachers perceived such actions, and how it affected their instructional delivery.

This research employed a qualitative case study design to answer the research questions. A qualitative approach to research is often utilized in the social science arena to explore systems thinking, social interactions, and organizational processes (Cruz & Tantia, 2017). For this particular study, qualitative research provided an in-depth understanding of the way teachers experience disruptive behavior in the classroom.

Three separate focus groups convened to satisfy the purpose of this study. The participants consisted of veteran third through fifth-grade classroom teachers (teachers who currently have at least five consecutive years of teaching experience) who were employed in one of the four school districts located in the Southwestern region of Dallas County. Respondents for the focus groups were solicited, and once consent was received from individuals who satisfied

the specified criteria, a survey related to the study was distributed. Participants were required to complete a survey prior to attending the focus group session to help enhance and add depth to the interviews. In addition, an interview protocol was directly correlated to the research questions designed and utilized during the focus group sessions.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

RQ1. What are the negative implications of student disruptive behavior according to the perspective of veteran teachers?

RQ2. What strategies do veteran teachers use to redirect students' disruptive behavior?

Definition of Key Terms

To avoid vagueness and for ease of understanding, the following terms were designed to suit the framework of this study.

Academic performance. According to Haverinen-Shaughnessy et al. (2011), "Academic performance reflects long-term achievement assessed by standardized state and/or nation-wide tests" (p. 122). In the field of education, the terms academic performance and academic achievement are synonymous and will be utilized interchangeably as they both refer to a student's ability to demonstrate mastery of skills learned in core areas of academia.

Behavior. Bergner (2011) described the concept of behavior as the "observable physical activity" (p. 147) demonstrated by an individual. Lazzeri (2014) defined behavior as "the occurrence of an organism's action or reaction" (p. 67). These actions can either be positive or negative.

Classroom incivility. According to Feldmann (2001), "Classroom incivility is any action that interferes with a harmonious and cooperative learning atmosphere in the classroom" (p. 137).

Disruptive behavior (Misbehavior). Charles (1999) defined misbehavior as 'behavior that is considered inappropriate for the setting or situation in which it occurs" (p. 2). In a classroom setting, these behaviors are inclusive of a verbal outburst during instruction, students who move about the classroom without permission (e.g., walking, running, crawling, etc.), and physical or verbal aggression towards the teacher or other students.

Instructional time. Blank (2013) referred to instructional time as the student's opportunity to learn and time allotted to academic subjects. Although instructional time usually takes place within a classroom setting, instruction can extend to various areas within the school, (i.e., the cafeteria), the hallway as well as outside of the school (i.e., field trips).

Special education student. According to Mitchell et al. (2019), "Students who are found eligible for special education services, through appropriate evaluation and by meeting specified criteria, have access to a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment" (p. 70). An individualized education program (IEP), collaboratively created for special education students by instructional leaders, the student's teacher and their parents specify "instruction and support to which the student is legally entitled to meet his or her unique needs" (Mitchell et al., 2019, p. 70).

Summary

Disruptive student behavior is an aspect of school operation addressed through this research because of its negative effect on the classroom environment and academic achievement. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to provide in-depth insight into the negative

implications that students' disruptive behavior had on the learning process. I explored the factors teachers attributed to disruptive student behavior, how teachers perceived such actions, how it affected their instructional delivery, and the strategies used for addressing disruptive behavior.

Chapter 2 provides a literature review for the study. It offers further insight into disruptive behavior exhibited by students during classroom instruction and how it affects achievement and the classroom environment. In addition, the implications of the behaviorism theory, Kounin's model, and choice theory are discussed as the theoretical frameworks of the study. Furthermore, the literature review discusses the strategies utilized by teachers to address disruptive behavior demonstrated in many classrooms.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Teachers and students alike can be considered the primary stakeholders in a school setting. Within the confines of each classroom, teachers are responsible for imparting valuable information to students and are accountable for creating a classroom climate where students grow and succeed. However, research conducted by the Education Advisory Board (EAB) in a study titled, "Breaking Bad Behavior" (2019) revealed that instead of classroom disruptions being a rarity, according to the elementary teachers polled, the phenomenon is demonstrated by about 25% of their students (EAB, 2019, p. 5). Unfortunately, the increase in classroom disruptions has also caused a decline in the amount of time available to teachers to actually teach students. The EAB report (2019) denoted that elementary teachers lose insurmountable time, over a dozen days yearly, to disruptive classroom behavior demonstrated by students (p. 7).

The literature review begins with definitions used to provide in-depth variations of disruptive classroom behavior, as there are several interpretations of its meaning. In addition, the behaviorism theory, Kounin's model, and choice theory were examined to determine if there was a correlation between the components of the frameworks and disruptive student behavior. Furthermore, the literature focusses on the study's research questions:

RQ1. What are the negative implications of student disruptive behavior according to the perspective of veteran teachers?

RQ2. What strategies do veteran teachers use to redirect students' disruptive behavior?

The literature review consists of a range of causes that promote disruptive student behavior. These contributing factors include a list of commonly diagnosable disruptive behavior disorders, such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), oppositional defiant disorder (ODD), and conduct disorder (CD). Still, misbehavior is brought on in some instances by

instability in a student's family life and demonstrations of incivility by students, which is the intentional and purposeful disruption of a given environment.

This literature review contains a theoretical framework, information on how disruptive behavior impacts the learning environment, and how this type of behavior threatens the academic achievement of all students, both the student who causes the disruption as well as the other students who are subject to that particular classroom setting. Furthermore, this literature review was designed to explain how teachers address challenging students in their classrooms.

Several search engines were utilized to carry out the various portions of this research. These tools included the review of many scholarly, peer-reviewed articles provided via Brown Library, an online database provided through Abilene Christian University (ACU), published books, internationally published works supplied by ProQuest Dissertations as well as additional web searches conducted through the use of the internet. Phrases such as "behaviorism theory and disruptive behavior in children", "incivility" as well as "how teachers address challenging students" were used as part of this study.

Defining Disruptive Behavior

In a perfect world, students would come to school on the correct level in every aspect, socially, emotionally, and academically. However, as many teachers know firsthand, that is seldom the case. Although it is difficult to solidify a universal definition of disruptive behavior, C.M. Charles, author, and educational leader, surmised that disruptive behavior is conduct that does not fit the particular occasion in which it takes place (1999). In their study, Nash et al. (2016) asserted, "Disruptive behaviors refer to any behavior that is sufficiently off- task in the classroom, as to distract the teacher and/ or class peers from on task objectives" (p. 167). In

summary, disruptive student behavior can be defined as any and all actions caused by students that derail teaching and learning.

According to Stacks (2005), externalizing behaviors and internalizing behaviors are the two subcategories related to behavioral issues (p. 269). Griggs et al. (2016) defined externalizing behaviors as "aggressive, disruptive and defiant" (p. 690), while internalizing behaviors were described as a student's demeanor that appears to be "sad, anxious or withdrawn" (p. 690). Because of the visible actions that accompany externalizing behaviors, a student's disruptive conduct is likely to receive attention from other students as well as the teacher (Morin et al., 2017, p. 803). Although internalizing behaviors are less distractive, students who are often in a fragile emotional state lack the ability to fully engage in instruction, which requires the teacher to redirect the student. Of special interest is a Ukrainian study that focused on internalizing behaviors. This research noted that internalizing behaviors were more common with elementary students (children ages 6-12) than with older students (Burlaka et al., 2017).

Theoretical Framework

The concept of disruptive student behavior, was examined by reflecting on the theory of behaviorism, Kounin's model, as well as choice theory. In short, behaviorism theory describes how humans react to influences outside of themselves and provide deeper clarity and justification related to those responses. Kounin's model created a framework to decrease disruptions based on teacher responses in the classroom, and lastly, the choice theory explains how needs impact behaviors.

Behaviorism Theory

Disruptive behavior was examined through the behaviorism theory perspective. Known as a founding father of behaviorism, John Watson was among the first American psychologists

who broke the Freudian perspective that the unconscious mind was behind most of the human behavior (Malone, 2017; Watson, 1913). Watson's behaviorism theory refers to the science of observable behavior. He insisted only observable, recordable, and measurable behavior was of significant value to study (Rilling, 2000, p. 303).

In an extensive evaluation, John Watson's thoughts on behaviorism were critically influenced by the dynamics of theories from Russian psychologist Ivan Pavlov (Maslov, 2016, p. 10). Behaviorism renounced the concept of the unconscious and internal mental status of an individual because it could not be observed and was subject to a myriad of interpretations from psychologists. However, the spectrum of Watson's behaviorism theory focuses more on observable stimulus-response behaviors and affirms all responses are studied through interaction with the environment dynasties (Pritchard, 2008, p. 6).

Behaviorism theory, sometimes referred to as the stimulus-response theory, further asserts that behavior is prompted by the connectedness of a stimulus (event promoted by elements of the environment) and a response (feedback after the occurrence of an event; Clark, 2018). In Watson's most acclaimed research of Little Albert, a 9-month-old baby, he tested his theory of stimulus and response by combining the appearance of a white rat and a loud clanging noise. This event yielded the response of fear demonstrated by the baby. The findings from this experiment further support the idea that learning occurs via the interactions of the environment (Rilling, 2000).

Furthermore, the theory of behaviorism aligns with disruptive behavior because of its emphasis on stimulus and responses. In the classroom environment, the teacher's utilization of a classroom management system, which often includes the establishment and issuance of rewards and consequences, defined both desirable and undesirable behaviors (Clark, 2018). Clark further

asserted that learning is strengthened the more a stimulus and response are conjoined. When applied to the classroom setting, this thought process suggests when a teacher regularly rewards positive student conduct, the occurrence of such behavior will persist. Likewise, punishment for unfavorable conduct may also result in the continued practice of disruptive behavior.

Assumptions of Behaviorism Theory. Today, the study of the validity of behaviorism theory is not comprehensive without looking at the most vital assumptions. Perhaps one of the most compelling arguments against the behaviorism theory is the belief that all measurable and observable behaviors are an authentic response to a given stimulus (Dahan, 2017). For example, Dahan described a scenario where a person may be in pain but show no outward expression of such. Likewise, an individual could demonstrate the observable signs of discomfort, although the sensation is not present.

Another fundamental assumption associated with the learning component of this theory insists all behaviors are learned from observable dynamics derived from environmental influences (McLeod, 2003). Thus, this theory focuses more on the effects of environmental factors that influence human and animal behaviors and ignores the role played by cognitive processing (Arturo, 2013). In addition, the legitimacy of the behaviorism theory is supported by the assumption psychology should be viewed as a science. Watson pronounced psychology as a behaviorist perspective that is an objective experimental branch of natural science (Arturo, 2013, p. 379).

Kounin's Model

Jacob Kounin (1946), a classroom management theorist, was one of the first psychologists to examine the management of the learning environment. Contrary to the previous practice of addressing teaching and discipline as separate entities, Kounin maintained the

integration of the two concepts made for the most conducive classroom setting (Balli, 2011). In addition, Kounin's model was designed to prevent disruptive behavior from ever happening, as opposed to more traditional models that emphasized discipline as a response to misbehavior. Many educators appreciate Kounin's model because it provides an outline of direct actions that teachers should demonstrate to prevent disruptive student behavior (Baron & Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1992). The underlying current of this model is teachers who are always watchful and those who have well-planned instruction and transitions decrease the likelihood of disturbances during class. The core components of this model are the ripple effect, withitness, overlapping, and momentum/smoothness.

Through actions observed within his own classroom, Kounin reported a time when he corrected the inappropriate behavior of a student reading a newspaper during class. He noticed when he addressed particular student's behavior the conduct of other surrounding pupils in the class was subsequently improved (Baron & Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1992). The ability for the teacher to evoke change in the behavior of many by addressing a concern or rendering positive feedback with one student is referred to as the rippling effect. Furthermore, withitness, a term unique to Kounin's model, placed special emphasis on the teachers' level of alertness within the classroom and included their ability to see all aspects of the environment at all times (Balli, 2011). For example, when a teacher is assisting a small group with a task, the teacher maintains awareness of the precise actions of other students by ensuring all students can be seen and their behavior can be corrected if required.

Another portion of Kounin's model is the teacher's ability to transition the class from one task to the next in an effort to ensure students are constantly engaged. Overlapping, as it is known, further denotes the teacher's ability to perform two similar activities at the same time

(Van Der Sijdes & Tomic, 1993). An example of this concept would be the teacher providing some students with feedback to a guided practice assignment while assigning others an independent activity. Lastly, smoothness and momentum refer to the educator's ability to maintain a flow of instruction and maximize student engagement. To ensure instruction is seamless and time is well spent on teaching and learning requires teachers to effectively plan meaningful lessons (Baron & Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1992).

Choice Theory

Created by William Glasser, the choice theory asserted all demonstrated behaviors are choices motivated by the desire to realize both the physiological and psychological needs of people (Bradley, 2014). Leading these are physiological needs, which include food, water, and shelter, all elements needed for survival. In addition, there are four categories of psychological needs inclusive of mental and emotional needs that require fulfillment. Perhaps the greatest of these is an individual's need to feel loved and accepted by others (Lečei & Lepičnik Vodopivec, 2014). People also need to know they have power, which translates to feeling respected, recognized, and valued by others (Grace Olutayo, 2012). Power can also be demonstrated when a person reaches levels of accomplishment in life, such as the attainment of academic goals or advancements in their career. In addition, people have the need to feel a sense of freedom to make individual choices that affect them and allows for the exploration of personal interest. Lastly, people maintain a need to have fun, which means to learn, play, and create. According to Glasser, all behaviors are demonstrated for the purpose of satisfying these identified needs (Balli, 2011).

The choice theory also contends everyone has a personal definition of a quality world. Bradley (2014) posited that a quality world is a place filled with positive memories created with

people with whom relationships have been built. Furthermore, Lečei and Lepičnik Vodopivec (2014) affirmed the disparity between an individual's real-world experience and their idea of what their quality world should be often bred frustration, therefore an adjustment in behavior is made to decrease anxiety. In addition, Glasser's theory states the combination of acting, thinking, feeling, and physiology construct total behavior (Rouhollahi, 2016). Of this subset, it is believed individuals have more control overacting and thinking than they do over how they feel and physiology and adjustments made to the former can adversely affect the latter (Suffield, 2017).

Negative Implications of Student Disruptive Behavior

There are obviously limited advantages of disruptive student behavior during classroom instruction. As previously stated, these interferences create a breach in the classroom environment and make the overarching goal of schooling more difficult to accomplish. In general, disruptive student behavior has an unfavorable impact on teaching and also diminishes student's ability to learn (Nash et al., 2016, p. 167).

Negative Effects on Teaching

Negative behavior minimizes instructional time for teachers attempting to adhere to rigorous curricular structures while undermining their authority to control the confines of the teaching space. Walker et al. (2003) reported disruptive student behavior was noted as the reason why nearly 20% of teachers surveyed by the American Federation of Teachers felt they lost two to three hours of instruction per week, while 17% felt they were deprived upwards of four instructional hours within a week's time-span.

In addition, the issue of disruptive student behavior is identified as a source of teacher stress. According to Kyriacou (2001), "Teacher stress may be defined as the experience by a

teacher of unpleasant, negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, tension, frustration or depression, resulting from some aspect of their work as a teacher" (p. 28). A study conducted with 12 classrooms teachers from three campuses located within the same city indicated that disruptive student behavior is a source of the stress that many teachers experience (Shernoff et al., 2011). This work-related stress can manifest itself by causing a strain on personal and professional relationships (Abdullah & Ismail, 2019, p. 1252) as well as create a detriment to the mental and physical health of an individual (Shernoff et al., 2011, p. 64).

Furthermore, there is evidence that suggests disruptive student behavior has an impact on teacher attrition. Although there are a variety of sources that contribute to teacher attrition including, low pay and high expectations handed down from school administration, disruptive behavior demonstrated by students is also noted as a cause of teacher attrition (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003, p. 32). In a special analysis of data collected from teachers by the U.S. Department of Education in 2005 (USDE), 53% of teachers who transferred to another school reported student behavior as their reason for doing so, and 44% of those who left the profession reported this as a reason for leaving (USDE, 2005, p. 18). According to Schaefer et al. (2012), "Beginning teachers' experiences with students are often seen as one factor that influences beginning teacher attrition and retention. In most studies, this factor involves issues around classroom management" (p. 113). It is reasonable to assume that disruptive behavior exhibited by students within the classroom environment can impact even experienced teachers negatively as well, causing many to become stressed and frustrated and therefore prompt them to leave the classroom.

Negative Effects for Students

The effects of classroom behavioral disruptions are widespread and impact more than just the disruptive student. Martella and Marchand-Martella (2015) explained that student misbehaviors affect the academic achievement of not just the student demonstrating the disruptive conduct, but it also limits the academic opportunity of other students in the same setting. A teacher who has one student who disrupts instruction either by making unnecessary noise or by distracting other students who are attempting to engage in classroom activities expend unnecessary time addressing the student and containing the situation (Cihak et al., 2009). This occurrence reduces instructional opportunity, and a decline in the academic achievement of students who are not deemed disruptive is a natural consequence (Duvall et al., 2010). Consequently, additional research states nondisruptive students may become disengaged in learning when their friends are distractive in light of the presumption that elementary-aged students are often influenced socially by their peers (Shin & Ryan, 2017). The harmful effects of disruptive student behavior are many, and so are the sources of such behavior.

Factors Contributing to Student Disruptive Behavior

In general, student's disruptive behavior can be attributed to one of three primary sources; students identified as having a disruptive behavioral disorder, students who live in a strained family environment, and students who practice classroom incivility (McNaughton-Cassill, 2013; Nordstrom et al., 2013; Rijlaarsdam et al., 2016). The side effects of such disruptions, regardless of the source, are significant, with the most severe consequence identified as the decline in student academic achievement, caused in part by the loss of valuable instructional time (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000, p. 242). For the average student, this

mismanagement of time robs them of the opportunity to grow academically, and even worse, it widens the achievement gap for students who already display academic deficits (Lumadi, 2019).

Many classrooms are plagued with student disruptions, which are inclusive of several negative student actions such as playing at inappropriate times or moving about the classroom without the teacher's permission. In a study conducted among 12 Hong Kong teachers, participants were asked to identify problematic behaviors experienced within the classroom setting (Sun & Shek, 2012). Among those identified as causing the most disruptions during class were students talking out of turn, either by making irrelevant comments or speaking at a rate that disrupted instruction. In addition, disrespecting the teacher and working on other tasks not directly associated with the taught curriculum were cited as disruptive behaviors by teachers (Sun & Shek, 2012).

Disruptive Behavioral Disorders

In some cases, the unruly actions displayed by students with a disruptive behavior disorder are considered to be an outward manifestation of the disorder (McDaniel et al., 2017, p. 54). The commonly identified disorders are conduct disorder (CD), oppositional defiant disorder (ODD), and attention-deficit hyperactivity (Garcia et al., 2018; Masi et al., 2018). The study of these disorders is extensive, and there is a plethora of strategies and techniques available teachers can utilize designed to decrease the effect of these disorders within the classroom setting.

Conduct disorder (CD) is often diagnosed in childhood and is categorized by antisocial behaviors that infringe on the rights of others. These antisocial behaviors may include delinquent behaviors like truancy and running away, irresponsibility, physical aggression toward people or animals, and violating the rights of others, such as stealing (Salvatore & Dick, 2018). Perhaps known as the most serious of this branch of disorders, the range of deviant behaviors consistent

with CD often originate from a sense of fear and isolation, which contradicts the overriding idea that students with CD act out in response to an abnormal degree of anger (Cochran & Cochran, 1999).

Less pervasive than CD students diagnosed with having oppositional defiant disorder (ODD) exhibit patterns of disobedient, uncooperative behavior, and, like those diagnosed with conduct disorder, do not get along with authority figures. Children with ODD demonstrate persisting anger and irritability, volatile emotions, and are often resentful toward others or past events (Souroulla et al., 2019).

Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is known as the most commonly diagnosed behavior disorder. Although there are many, some of the inattentive, hyperactive, and impulsive symptoms demonstrated in elementary classrooms include the following: excessive talking, running or climbing in inappropriate situations, interrupting others while speaking, and trouble following directions (Wüstner et al., 2019). Addressing such concerns within a classroom setting is especially difficult for teachers, often because they lack the necessary training to address both the social and academic gaps imposed by this disorder (Ohan et al., 2008). Perhaps the effect of this disorder would not be as impactful if there were just a few students within a school who suffered from this disorder. However, in English speaking countries, where ADHD is most common, there is at least one student in every elementary class of 20 students with ADHD (Ohan et al., 2008).

Unstable Home Environment

Children are most successful when they are reared in an environment that is positive and consistent. However, the introduction of changes in family structure brought about through divorce, step-parenting, cohabitation, and other situations are known to be factors related to an

increase in disruptive behavior in some children (Brown, 2004). The term "instability hypothesis" asserts that children are negatively affected by changes in the family makeup and that shifts in the composition of this unit are a source of stress (Hadfield et al., 2018). Cavanagh and Huston (2006) provided meaningful insight into their writing related to family instability and children's behavior. They discussed data related to a longitudinal study that tracked children from various parts of the United States for six years. They found that children who experienced at least one family transition (change in structure) demonstrated more externalizing behaviors and were more disruptive with peers and their teacher than those children whose family structure was more stable (Cavanagh & Huston, 2006).

When a student constantly disrupts instruction or fails to meet the desired behavioral expectations established by the teacher, factors connected to the student's home and family life should be considered (Driessens, 2015). Because students do not always know how to handle feelings prompted by unsettled home life, they look for ways to convey their suppressed emotions. According to Wagner et al. (2015), "Children may internalize family dysfunction as feelings of fear and isolation, hostility between family members, ambiguous roles and boundaries within the family, and a lack of cohesion within the family unit" (p. 937). To combat these emotions, students who are raised in dysfunctional families misbehave at school with the hopes of getting the attention they do not receive in their home environment (Fomby & Cherlin, 2007).

Classroom Incivility

Classroom incivility is believed to be another cause of disruptive behavior displayed by some students during instructional time. Merriam-Webster (2020) asserted the term "civility" takes its root form from the Latin word "civitas" or "community or city." However, incivility is characterized as utterances or actions that are essentially rude. It is also depicted as attitudes

show an absence of respect for others and generates an environment of disrespect, hostility, and strain (Anderson & Pearson, 1999). Issues related to student transgressions such as incessant talking in the classroom and using an improper tone of voice with the teacher and other students are frequent instances of incivility faced on a daily basis by teachers and other school authorities.

In an article that addressed behavior in terms of mental illness or incivility, McNaughton-Cassill (2013) recounted how students at both Harvard and Yale threw rotten fruit during class to express their displeasure towards their professors. This further supports the idea that incivility is categorized as deliberate disruptive conduct, impoliteness, misconduct, or rude behavior. The disrespect for others can target and affect individual students, the teacher, and the classroom environment as a whole.

As noted, there is an abundance of information available related to the impact that disruptive behavioral disorders and an unstable family environment have on the behavior of elementary students. However, there is a significant gap in the amount of information available related to the role that incivility plays in the elementary classroom. Furthermore, there is research that reveals data related to incivility in higher education and within the workplace (Anderson & Pearson, 1999; McNaughton-Cassill, 2013). However, there is minimal data related to incivility exercised in the elementary classroom (Farrell et al., 2016, p. 579). In addition, incivility during instruction could look like texting during instruction, interrupting others with talking or laughing, arriving to class unprepared, not listening, tardiness, not addressing others by their preferred name, and disrespect for teachers' authority (McNaughton-Cassill, 2013). For these reasons, the implications of classroom incivility are worthy of additional study.

Disruptive Behavior Effects on Student Academic Achievement

Disruptive student behavior in elementary school is a topic of great concern for educators considering its overall effect on student academic achievement. Mareš (2018) offered an analysis of how disruptive behaviors affect the learning process in particular. The findings suggest the major effect of disruptive student behavior is it inhibits academic achievement. Disruptive student behavior causes the goal of learning to become vague for students made to endure a setting filled with unorderly behavior because they have to contend with teachers spending valuable time disciplining unruly students at the expense of sharing knowledge about a particular subject (Musti-Rao & Haydon, 2011, p. 91). Blank and Shavit (2016) also examined student reports of how their classmates' behavior affects academic achievement. The study concluded that a disruptive classroom climate could stifle the instruction and decrease the academic performance of the entire class.

Moreover, the academic success of nondisruptive students declines when they are in the same class setting as disruptive pupils. A study by Kristoffersen et al. (2015) held in Danish schools highlights a significant finding that having potentially disruptive students in a classroom undermines the academic achievement of other students by about two percentile points. Another point in the study underlines the risk of having a disruptive student who has migrated into the classroom setting, citing his/her disruptive behavior will "infect" peers, causing lower academic achievement to become widespread (p. 25). Disruptive behavior that occurs during instruction is a lose-lose situation, and the student(s) causing such disruptions are most often the biggest losers in this scenario. Dolan et al. (1993) asserted that disruptive students are often less successful than their nondisruptive peers in various domains of academic achievement. For many students, this lack of achievement becomes cumulative, leaving most unable to recover academically.

According to Bru (2009), “Pupils’ lack of respect and disregard for their peers and teachers alike, as well as the amount of time spent on discipline rather than learning, has become a common concern expressed by teachers” (p. 462). In addition to minimizing the instructional opportunity for students, disruptive behavior also discourages student academic achievement on standardized assessments (Bru, 2009). In a Norwegian study that focused on disruptive student behavior, it was discovered that students who display behavior that consistently interrupt the learning environment underperform their counterparts (Bru, 2009).

Student Achievement Pressures

With understanding the correlation between disruptive behavior and student achievement, it is critical to understand how low student achievement may have an overall negative impact on a school campus. In the spring of 2012, the Texas Education Agency adopted a new assessment instrument known as the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR; Sahin et al., 2017). This series of tests administered in Grades 3 through 12 were formatted to ensure student’s ability to satisfy grade-level student achievement expectations established by the state of Texas (Barlow et al., 2018, p. 5). Akyuz et al. (2013) found the accomplishment of these objectives requires knowledgeable teachers skilled in planning and implementing effective classroom instruction. Unfortunately, the achievement of these goals has become more challenging for teachers due to interferences caused by disruptive student behavior.

Classrooms are filled with students who demonstrate varying levels of academic achievement. While there are some students in a classroom who are able to thoroughly understand new ideas and concepts relatively quickly, there are others within that same setting who need additional time and require multiple instructional techniques to fully glean the intent of instruction (Wood, n.d.). This predicament often creates an environment where the teacher feels

rushed to cover instructional content without having adequate time to ensure all students are learning. When teachers are forced to adhere to dogmatic curriculum timelines, the needs of students who struggle academically are left unmet. In response to trying to keep up with a rapidly moving instructional pace, students dealing with academic pressures may become unresponsive to instruction, experience a decline in self-esteem and self-efficacy (Rubin, 2011) or may become disruptive due to their inability to keep up. Mostafa (2017) added that curricular demands, which are often compounded by performance assessments, are a continued source of anxiety for students. In addition, these classroom conditions add to teacher stress and decrease their ability to operate efficiently (Woods, n.d.).

Classroom Instructional Time

According to Douglas et al. (2016), once initiated and left without proper reaction, disruptive behaviors that continue to occur in class cause a significant problem to lesson delivery. In turn, teachers lose their focus on making lessons comprehensive and understandable for all students. A great responsibility lies on teachers in moments of conflict situations with disruptive students. Douglas et al. (2016) stated, “It would appear that students are instrumental about their learning and when their learning opportunities are compromised by the behavior of others, they expect this behavior to be managed” (p. 5).

As mentioned, disruptive behavior during class robs the teacher of instructional time. According to Gage et al. (2018), “Disruption is more than simple disengagement in that it involves behaviors that draw the focus of the teacher, and perhaps the entire classroom, away from instruction or expected tasks” (p. 303). When students disrupt the learning environment, teachers must contend with issues related to discipline, which cause a decline in the allotted instructional time (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000).

Classroom Management

According to Westling (2010), “There may be no greater hurdle in public schools today than that presented by students who exhibit challenging behavior” (p. 48). These disruptive behaviors that, at times, become frequent, suppress the central goal of schooling, which is learning. Because the element of disruptive behavior demands attention, a variety of strategies are utilized by teachers to address this concern. Within the last two decades, a noticeable shift has occurred related to how educators respond to behavior.

One contemporary approach is commonly referred to as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS; Horner & Macaya, 2018). At its core, PBIS highlights the benefit of preventing disruptive behavior from ever happening within the context of the school setting and outlines how behavioral issues are to be addressed. This approach comes after the former practice of disciplining students or handing down consequences as a reactive response to problematic behavior (Palmer & Noltemeyer, 2019). Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports is supported by evidence-based practices, which, according to Kincaid and Horner (2017), are defined as observable actions within a classroom setting that yield the desired outcome. Examples of these actions are inclusive of protocols that establish routines and set expectations. The PBIS model also encourages the demonstration of prosocial behaviors, which are characterized as actions taken by an individual to serve to the advantage of someone else (Baumsteiger, 2017). In addition, PBIS also seeks to improve the academic outcomes of all students by integrating engaging objective-focused instruction. It is the hope the culmination of all aspects of PBIS will result in the improvement of the campus climate.

Although PBIS serves as the umbrella framework, there is a multitude of strategies that teachers utilize to promote PBIS. Within their class settings, many teachers rely on classroom

management tools such as ClassDojo, CHAMPS, Tootling, and on rare occasions, corporal punishment to curtail disruptive student behavior that often depreciates instructional time.

Considered as one of the most widely utilized behavior tracking systems, ClassDojo has gained notoriety in recent years because of its ability to connect teachers, parents, and students as they work collaboratively to monitor behavior (Krach et al., 2017). According to its website (https://www.classdojo.com), 95% of kindergarten through eighth-grade students in the United States as well as 180 other countries use the application and website because of the program's ease of use and accessibility (Lipscomb et al., 2018) and to primarily monitor student behavior via a virtual behavior management chart (Krach et al., 2017).

A study was conducted to compare the use of paper-based behavior management charts against computer-based (Krach et al., 2017). This research, conducted at an urban school located in the southeastern part of the United States with 169 kindergarten through fifth-grade students, revealed that teachers who used a paper-based were more inclined to denote negative comments related to student conduct than teachers who tracked behavior through an application such as ClassDojo. The study found that users of computer-based applications recorded almost twice as many positive comments related to behavior than those who opted to use the paper and pencil approach. Furthermore, the checks and balance aspect of ClassDojo integrates a facet of behavioral theory by allowing teachers to reward individual students, and in some cases, the entire class added points for demonstrating desirable behavior as well as deducting points for undesirable behavior (Lipscomb et al., 2018).

In a study created to discuss the effectiveness of ClassDojo is as it relates to enhancing students' ability to self-regulate behavior, there was a noted increase in positive learning conduct. The data suggested there to be an overall increase in the 23 third graders polled to self-

govern and respond favorably to guidelines outlined as part of ClassDojo (Maclean-Blevins & Muilenburg, 2013). Additional benefits of this program are that students favored the format of this particular type of behavioral management chart and parents were able to track their child's behavioral progress and regression.

Another technique sometimes integrated into the classroom setting is Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation, Success (CHAMPS); this framework is designed to create an outline of "look-fors" to clarify what should take place during instruction (Back et al., 2016). In summary, the components of this model require teachers to be specific about when and what students are able to converse about during class, identify the method in which students can solicit assistance with the concept being taught, and explain the details related to the activity. In addition, CHAMPS describes how and if students are permitted to move about the classroom during instruction, it makes clear what active participation during instruction looks like and identifies successful completion of a task (Zurawski, 2015). Although CHAMPS is based on a designated structure, the teachers' understanding of the specific needs of their students is imperative in order to tailor the program to increase student academic engagement while simultaneously reducing student disruptions (Zurawski, 2015).

At a school that serves kindergarten through eighth-grade students located in the mid-western region of the United States, 77% of teachers participated in a study conducted to test the usability of CHAMPS school-wide (Meidl & Vanorsdale, 2018). To initiate this qualitative study, specifics related to defining disruptive behavior and teacher perceptions related to misbehavior were identified. To collect data for this research, co-teachers, as well as campus administrators, observed the implementation of the program in various classrooms. Through the use of CHAMPS, some teachers noted there was a decrease in the number of times required to

redirect student behavior over the course of a few weeks. However, the highlight of this research reconfirmed that teachers, in general, are more inclined to correct misbehavior by reprimanding student conduct as opposed to praising appropriate conduct in an effort to discourage misbehavior (Meidl & Vanorsdale, 2018).

A pet peeve for many elementary teachers is students who tattle or report the negative behavior of other students. To circumvent this issue, the inventors of the Tootling intervention strategy placed a positive spin on this reporting approach by creating a system where students primarily reported instances where they observed their classmates helping other members within the class community (Kirkpatrick et al., 2019). Furthermore, the emphasis of Tootling is to reinforce positive or prosocial behavior in the classroom as opposed to the typical goal of reducing disruptive student behavior. An added benefit of this approach is it is designed to teach children how to acknowledge positive behavior, which is a skill set some students lack. Although there are various methods used to collect Tootles, the process usually involves a system where students record positive behaviors on a notecard and then place them in a designated location according to the teacher's instructions. As days elapse, the teacher continues the process of collecting Tootles, with the intended goal of reaching a predetermined number of Tootles, which often results in a reward the entire class would have worked together to attain (Cihak et al., 2009).

Since its inception, several studies have supported the overarching goal of Tootling, which is to increase prosocial behavior and teach students to identify the kind and helpful acts demonstrated by their classmates. In addition, research also indicated a decline in the amount of inappropriate conduct demonstrated by students when the Tootling intervention model is practiced. Cihak et al. (2009) performed the first investigation created to determine whether the

use of Tootling in a classroom impacted the occurrence of disruptive student behavior. This study was conducted with a rural elementary class of nineteen third grade students, four of which were categorized as having special needs. The teacher, whose class was the center of this study, used a paper bracelet to record the initials of students who demonstrated disruptive behavior throughout the course of the day to gather baseline data. After this, she held two learning sessions with the class, where she provided exemplars and trained them on the correct way to write a Tootle. On the day of the study, the teacher reviewed the rules of Tootling and provided each student with index cards. As the day progressed, she collected them and read them aloud during the last portion of the school day. After a detailed examination, the data collected through this investigation supported a connection between the use of Tootling and a decline in inappropriate behavior (Cihak et al., 2009).

Perhaps the oldest and certainly the most controversial technique used to decrease disruptive student behavior is corporal punishment. Still considered legal in the state of Texas, the rules and appropriate use of this form of punishment remain debatable. Often applied through the use of a wooden paddle, corporal punishment typically involves inflicting physical pain to the lower extremity of an individual's body (Gershoff et al., 2019). Gershoff et al. (2019) further asserted the purpose of corporal punishment is to decrease the presence of unfavorable behavior by associating such conduct with physical punishment as a response.

Another study stated that corporal punishment "includes spanking, swatting, smacking, slapping, or hitting with or without an instrument (e.g., a paddle, wooden spoon, belt, switch); having students stand for extended periods in painful or uncomfortable positions, or forcing them to exercise excessively" (Breshears, 2014, p. 2). Based on the provided definition alone, there appear to be many disadvantages of using corporal punishment. In addition to the physical pain

this form of punishment causes, it can leave bruises or marks on a student's body and could even render one to become physically ill (Gershoff, 2017). Along with causing physical discomfort, it has been declared that corporal punishment may result in a deprecation of an individual's mental health as well, with some students experiencing feelings of persistent embarrassment, depression, and anxiety (Deb et al., 2017; Gershoff, 2017).

Although most recent data related to corporal punishment focus solely on the negative implications associated with corporal punishment, which include an increase in aggression and the development of social and behavioral problems, there are still pockets of research that uphold this technique of punishment. Most often rooted in social morays, in Jamaica, an English-speaking sector of the Caribbean Island, corporal punishment is regarded as a necessary component needed to raise children effectively and is believed to discourage inappropriate behavior in children as they grow and mature (Smith, 2016).

Teachers Strategies for Coping With Disruptive Student Behavior

The United States Department of Education (2000) reported that fewer discipline issues lead to better quality instructional time. With fewer interruptions, students stay on task and are actively involved. Teachers use several strategies to alleviate disruptive behavior. There are proactive and responsive strategies teachers use in hopes of stopping the behavior before it is started. These strategies are important, but they do not always work. When these strategies are not successful, teachers must resort to actions that remove the student from the classroom. These strategies involve referring students to the campus administrator, in-school and out-school suspensions, and referrals to seek help from the school counselor.

Effective Classroom Teaching

According to MacSuga-Gage et al. (2012), "Effective teaching is both an art and a science. Successful teachers expertly weave together academic, behavioral, and social threads to achieve a unique classroom tapestry" (p. 1). Perhaps one of the most integral parts of the classroom design is effective teaching. Noted as a first step in successfully educating students is the teacher's knowledge of instructional content. In a study conducted with 14 teacher candidates enrolled in an elementary teacher practicum course, teachers described the outcomes related to learning science pedagogy in preparation for classroom instruction (Lewis, 2019). The findings of the study revealed participants grew in their understanding of scientific processes and concepts and the new-found knowledge made them more prepared to teach science instructional content (Lewis, 2019).

An additional effective teaching component is the teacher's ability to strategically build on student's prior knowledge to guide instruction, which in some contexts is referred to as scaffolding. When the teacher provides instruction using a cumulative approach, they are better able to diagnosis students' academic needs and are placed in a better position to dispel student frustration, which helps to cultivate a positive classroom setting (Haataja et al., 2019). Along with addressing academic gaps and strategically structuring instruction to increase the overall flow of teaching, it is just as important that instructional content is presented in a manner viewed as engaging for students. Lei et al. (2018) stated student engagement is demonstrated when students take an active role in their learning experience. Teachers encourage engagement when students are able to ask and answer questions related to instruction, work in flexible group settings and learn about topics that are of particular interest to them (Alford et al., 2016; Whitney et al., 2017).

Teachers can create fewer classroom disruptions if they create positive learning environments through high student engagement (Fransen, 2013). Student engagement is defined as meaningful student involvement in the learning environment (Martin & Torres, 2016). Bender (2017), stated that teachers have long realized that student engagement is absolutely essential for student learning; however, achieving student engagement is not an easy attainment. Student engagement is a complex concept that can be gaged with all the aspects connected. Student engagement typically includes three dimensions:

- Behavioral engagement, focusing on participation in academic, social, and co-curricular activities
- Emotional engagement, focusing on the extent and nature of positive and negative reactions to teachers, classmates, academics, and school
- Cognitive engagement, focusing on students' level of investment in learning (Martin & Torres, 2016, p. 1).

In order to accomplish student engagement in the classroom, it is important to understand these dimensions.

Lack of student engagement is caused by many things. Rischer (2008) indicated it is due to the student's frustration and boredom, and in turn, causes classroom disruption. It is the job of the teacher to elevate their instruction to help alleviate this frustration and boredom by making instruction relative and enjoyable. According to Guardino & Fullerton (2010), it can be difficult for teachers "to find classroom management strategies that are proactive, preventative, and relatively easy to implement, and which provide minimal disruption to the classroom" (p. 8). If teachers can accomplish this, then they could spend less time addressing student disruptive behaviors (Fransen, 2013).

Research by Skinner et al. (2009) revealed that “children’s interest, enthusiasm, and intrinsic motivation for learning in school deteriorate continuously from their entry into kindergarten until they complete high school (or drop-out), with striking losses during the transitions to middle school and high school” (p. 223). This creates a more difficult challenge for upper-level teachers to create a learning environment that is conducive to student engagement. Teachers can create these learning environments by making students perceive the following: (a) there are opportunities for them to succeed, (b) flexible avenues exist through which learning can occur, and (c) they are respected as learners because teachers convey the belief that students are capable of learning (Schussler, 2009, p. 114).

Cooperative learning and collaborative learning both help encourage student engagement within a classroom setting. Although the two terms are often utilized synonymously, they differ based on the technique used to achieve an outlined goal, especially within teaching and learning (Baek & Touati, 2020). Known as the oldest form of group learning (Davidson & Major, 2014), According to Luo (2015), “Cooperative learning involves students’ working together in groups to accomplish learning tasks or master subject matter content” (p. 135). In addition, Johnson et al. (2014) asserted that members of a cooperative learning group divide the workload to accomplish the desired goal. Using this learning framework, individual roles are either chosen or delegated, which encourage individual accountability and contributions (Baek & Touati, 2020). Furthermore, cooperative learning activities provide students a stable environment at school where positive character traits can be nurtured and developed (Kagan & Kagan, 2009).

Conversely, collaborative learning insists that all participants work together on all aspects of a project to satisfy a goal (Jarvela et al., 2008). The goals of collaborative learning are to collectively build student knowledge and to make students more responsible for their learning

(Davidson & Major, 2014). According to Dillenbourg (1999), there exist three aspects of collaboration: interactivity, synchronicity, and negotiability. The concept of interactivity suggests that members within a collaborative learning group work rigorously to develop the cognitive ability of all learners. In addition, synchronicity infers that members of collaborative learning groups work together to resolve problems and learn new instructional material. The final aspect of negotiability is included to ensure all members have the opportunity to share their individual points of view, to discourage anyone person from projecting their view on to others and to ensure the over-arching goals of group learning are met. Because all members have equal input as to how a task is accomplished, collaborative learning is sometimes slow and viewed as ineffective (McClellan, 2016).

McClellan (2016) made clear the difference between cooperative and collaborative groups by citing instances where both are demonstrated within a real-world context. McClellan (2016) compared the collective group settings to an athletic team where each player has a designated role based on their areas of strength and expertise, and collectively, they work to win a game. In comparison, the example used to illustrate collaboration referred to a musical team that joins together to create a musical production.

Proactive and Responsive Strategies

According to the Irish National Teachers Organization (2004), disruptive student behavior in part interrupts the learning environment and causes learning to become stagnant for students (p. 3). In their research, Madden and Senior (2018) evaluated how Irish teachers incorporated proactive and responsive strategies to manage challenging behaviors. Madden and Senior (2018) found proactive strategies such as identifying disruptive behavior triggers and

cultivating positive relationships with students were advantageous and the responsive strategy of considering the child's emotional state was most commonly used (p. 196).

Clunies-Ross et al. (2008) utilized the terms proactive and reactive to discuss strategies related to responding to disruptive behavior. According to Clunies-Ross et al. (2008), "Proactive discipline plans can be conceptualized as being preventative and taking a positive approach to classroom management" (p. 695). In this sense, a proactive strategy is defined as the teacher articulating the expectations for classroom operation and giving positive feedback for students adhering to directions or demonstrating desired behaviors because its purpose is to avert troublesome behavior from taking place, which aids in setting the stage for a more affirmative approach for responding to disruptive behavior.

To combat disruptive student behavior, it is advised that teachers dedicate more time to deliberate planning aimed at creating meaningful and interesting activities. Burden (2016) stated,

> Students may lose interest in a lesson if the teacher presents uninteresting lessons, does not plan meaningful activities or engage students in the lessons, is ineffective in instructional delivery, or does not deliberately plan to incorporate motivational elements into the instruction. (p. 12)

Effective lesson planning and delivery presuppose teachers' knowledge of their student population and serve as deterrents of disruptive student behavior (Lekwa et al., 2019). The research focused on the close relationship between students' engagement and their behaviors, and the teacher's role is strategically important in this context. When disruptive student behaviors are constantly going on, it signals the lack of these students' immersion in learning. According to Lekwa et al. (2019), "The impact of effective instruction is not only related to the content and

delivery of instruction but also student attention and active participation in that instruction" (p. 110).

Conversely, reactive response strategies occur after a disruptive incident has taken place and typically involves the assignment of a consequence for such actions. Research suggests that a reactive approach to responding to discipline is counterproductive as it relates to reestablishing classroom order (Clunies-Ross et al., 2008). The research of Romi et al. (2011) revealed that frequently used reactive strategies that can include the teacher yelling at students or being condescending towards them might increase classroom disruptions.

Student Discipline Referrals

When students demonstrate behavior within the classroom setting that teachers feel they are incapable of adequately addressing independently, they often seek support from campus administrators. In most schools, teachers document their need for outside student support through student discipline referrals. According to Martinez & Zhao (2018), "Students whose misbehavior causes interruption to classroom learning may find themselves subsequently being sent to the office for behavior redirection by a teacher seeking additional support from a counselor, social worker, or administrator" (p. 2).

A student discipline referral, also known as an office discipline referral (ODR), is a document completed by a teacher, or other school personnel who has observed the disruptive behavior of a student take place (Tidwell et al., 2003). This document, which often requires general demographic information pertaining to the student, also includes particular details relevant to the incident. For example, an ODR will include the student's name, grade, and age. The referral will also state the place of the incident, whether it was a student versus student or student versus adult encounter. The data derived from student discipline referrals assists in

identifying trends related to student disruptive behavior. Once evaluated by the campus administrative team or appropriate designee, a punitive consequence that aligns with the school/ district's student code of conduct is assigned. Some of the most commonly applied exclusionary consequences are in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, and counseling (Umeh et al., 2020).

With the number of office discipline referrals written every year, some researchers question whether office discipline referrals help classroom instruction. Demirdag (2015) studied the number of discipline referrals written in one school year at a middle school. Teachers weak in classroom management tended to have more discipline referrals (Demirdag, 2015). Teachers with strong classroom management skills had lower office referrals for discipline issues (Demirdag, 2015).

In-School and Out-of-School Suspension

In-school suspension allows a student to continue to report to the school; however, the student is excluded from their normal classroom setting and is often made to spend an allocated amount of time in a designated location (Jacobsen, 2013). On the other hand, out-of-school suspension prohibits a student from attending school for a predetermined amount of time. Both measures of punishment remove students from their normal learning environment, thereby decreasing instructional opportunity, oftentimes for students who already demonstrate academic deficits (Yang et al., 2018). Although both forms of punishment are widely utilized, Chu and Ready (2018) asserted there to be an insufficient amount a data that affirms suspension reduces disruptive behavior in schools.

Initially, out-of-school suspensions were the only strategy to remove disruptive children from the classroom. The issue with this strategy was it excluded students from learning, caused

students to have increased time unsupervised, promoted poor academic performance, and left room for students to engage in illegal activities (Peterson, 2005). As a result, schools initiated in-school suspension with the intent of not excluding students from the academic environment. In-school suspension programs allow the school administration to discipline students while the student remains in the school (Wallace et al., 2008). Effective in-school suspension programs can deliver the necessary elements to provide students an opportunity to succeed academically and correct disruptive behaviors (Eggleton, 2001). However, administrators and teachers must work together to create an environment that keeps students in a productive learning environment (Peterson, 2005).

Counseling

In addition, students who demonstrate disruptive behavior in schools are often referred to counseling services to receive additional behavioral and emotional support. Counselors are an asset to a school campus because they are able to provide beneficial strategies that can assist disruptive students with managing and correcting their behavior (Sherrod et al., 2009). Although it is not the job of the school counselor to serve as a disciplinarian, teachers depend on school counselors to both identify causes of disruptive behavior and assist in dissolving the occurrence of such conduct (Bryan et al., 2012).

The campus counselor can play a major role in helping with disruptive behavior in the classroom. Many school systems utilize Behavioral Education Programs (BEPs) to address behavioral issues (Simonsen et al., 2011). The BEP is a modified check-in, check-out intervention implemented with students who are at risk for more severe problem behaviors (Crone et al., 2004). Behavioral Education Programs offer tools for students to utilize instead of participating in unwanted behavior (Simonsen et al., 2011). Simonsen et al. (2011) discovered

through observational data that a statistically significant difference exists in off-task behavior for those students assigned to the BEP.

Related Studies

Active Supervision

A teacher's role in classroom management involves a myriad of tasks including development and organization of the curriculum, assessment of students' learning, as well as efficient management of the classroom (Berg & McFarlane, 2012). Decades ago, teachers were known to instruct students from a designated location, typically the front of the classroom. However, with the increase of disruptive student behavioral concerns (Berg & McFarlane, 2012), a need for a more involved teacher posture within the learning environment is warranted. A low-intensity approach modeled by teachers is referred to as active supervision. Active supervision promotes a setting where students are actively engaged in a designated task, be it instructional or recreational (Menzies et al., 2018). Active supervision is composed of four main components; teacher circulation around the class environment, teacher review of the classroom setting to monitor appropriate and inappropriate behavior, teacher/student conversations, and praise for observed demonstrations of positive behavior (Gage et al., 2020; Haydon & Kroeger, 2016).

As the term suggests, teacher circulation refers to the movement made by the teacher during instructional time or while any other school-related activity is taking place. The underlined benefit of circulation is it allows the teacher to use nearness to encourage students to demonstrate appropriate classroom behavior (Haydon et al., 2019). When teachers move about in their classrooms, which is also referred to as scanning the environment, they place themselves in a better position to readily provide support for students who are struggling with a task and redirecting or affirming classroom behavior.

The next step in active supervision, and perhaps the aspect that provides teachers the most leverage points in creating a positive classroom culture, is teacher/student interactions. These interactions most often refer to teachers engaging in conversations with students to encourage a sense of relationship. Crum et al. (2016) asserted the forming of relationships between teachers and students is beneficial even in situations where students have previously demonstrated conduct issues. These connective conversations between teachers and students help to transform classroom environments into classroom communities. When this type of culture is established, students are less likely to misbehave because they value the rapport they share with their teachers (Xu & Yang, 2019). Lastly, active supervision requires that teachers provide the appropriate form of positive feedback to recognize demonstrations of appropriate behavior. As teachers formulate relationships with their students, they are better able to determine whether particular students prefer verbal or nonverbal feedback (Haydon et al., 2019). Unfortunately, some teachers make the assumption all students prefer verbal feedback, when in reality there are some students who could easily become uncomfortable by such attention and would prefer teachers provide them with nonverbal feedback instead.

Whether the management strategy is as intricate as ClassDojo, CHAMPS or active supervision is as simple as Tootling or perceived as extreme like corporal punishment, the all-encompassing goal of any classroom management techniques is to incorporate a plan that is effective in promoting positive conduct and decreasing the occurrence of disruptive student behavior (Guardino & Fullerton, 2010).

Classroom Physical Environment

An additional element worthy of consideration is the role the physical classroom environment plays in contributing to disruptive student behavior. Stewart and Evans (1997)

asserted that “creating an orderly setting is the first step in establishing an environment conducive to learning and preventing behavior problems” (p. 53). To be clear, the physical environment of a classroom is inclusive of various factors, such as the way desks are arranged, the lighting in the room, and the accessibility to materials. When these environmental factors are not considered, the presence of disruptive student behavior is all but certain.

Guardino and Fullerton (2010) conducted a case study related to the impact the classroom environment has on student academic engagement and disruptive behaviors. In this study, Ms. Thompson, a fourth-grade teacher at an urban elementary school located in the southeastern region of the United States, discussed challenges with increasing student attentiveness and decreasing disruptions. In a classroom with seventeen students, one of which supported through special education services, while others were awaiting preliminary assessments, Ms. Thompson reported several occurrences of class misconduct. In addition to students talking without receiving permission, it was also noted that students used profanity, threw objects around the classroom, and failed to adhere to given directions. After an initial interview with Ms. Thompson, where she described student behaviors and defined academic engagement, and after rounds of classroom observations, changes were made to the physical design of the classroom. After adjusting the class set-up, such as arranging group space, increasing organizational resources such as shelves and labels, and providing each student with a chair bag to organize personal materials and supplies, there was a noticeable change in the climate within Ms. Thompson’s classroom. The follow-up observation found there to be a 42% increase in academic engagement and a decrease in the once 90% occurrence of disruptive behavior, with both improvements attributed to the organization of the class environment (Guardino & Fullerton, 2010). In addition to ensuring the learning space is organized and coordinated, the class

environment should also maintain flexibility. Teachers should regularly exercise the option of creating a class set-up that best aligns with the intended purpose of instruction. For example, teachers could choose to organize desks in pairs facing the same direction for an activity that requires students to complete a task in groups of two or could assemble all student desks into a circle for whole-class instruction (Zaheer et al., 2019).

Student Aggressive Behavior Towards Teachers

As explained, disruptive student behavior can be demonstrated in a number of ways. Although all disruptions interrupt the learning environment and make learning and teaching difficult, there are some actions committed by students specifically directed towards the teacher. Aside from defying instructions, using an inappropriate tone or profane language towards teachers, there are recorded instances where elementary students have ventured to show aggression and violence towards their teachers. Although research related to teachers being victimized by their students is limited, the article entitled, *Teachers bullied by students: Forms of bullying and perpetrator characteristics*, explained that some ways students bully their teachers are through using inappropriate gestures, harassing messages sent via text messages or by email and instances of physical abuse (Kauppi & Pörhölä, 2012b). In addition to confirming teachers were often victims of bullying by students, it was found the rate at which teachers were tormented by students was comparable to the rate at which students bully other students.

During the 2008-2009 school year, 251 urban and rural school teachers located in Finland participated in a study centered on school teachers being the object of bullying by their students. The participating teachers provided instruction to students in elementary through middle school. To initiate the research, which utilized a questionnaire, researchers Kauppi and Pörhölä (2012a) defined bullying against teachers as the “communication process in which a teacher is repeatedly

subjected, by one or more students, to the interaction that he or she perceives as insulting, upsetting or intimidating. Bullying can be verbal, non-verbal, or physical in nature" (p. 19). Sadly, 55 respondents reported they were subject to bullying from students, seven teachers expressed they were bullied on a weekly basis, and an alarming eight teachers stated they were bullied by their students on a daily basis.

A recently released empirical article cited the increase in the amount of violence against teachers as a "public health issue" because of the impact it can have on teaching and learning. According to the Task Force on Classroom Violence Directed Against Teachers, a subdivision of the American Psychological Association, 80% of teachers felt they had been victims of violence from a student at least once within the current or previous school year (Longobardi et al., 2019). There are fragments of data related to violence against teachers, and the concept is rarely covered by media or considered in policy change, which can be detrimental to the field of education (Espelege et al., 2013).

Summary

This literature review discussed various aspects of disruptive student behavior. It provided definitions of relevant terms and examined the concept of disruptive behavior through the perspectives of the behaviorism theory, Kounin's model, and the choice theory. The concept was also discussed as it relates to its impact on the classroom. Moreover, the effect that disruptive behavior has on the learning environment, other students' academic achievements, and teacher's strategy of lesson delivery were provided (Musti-Rao & Haydon, 2011). This review also addressed some of the additional negative features associated with disruptive student behavior, such as the academic disengagement of nondisruptive students and the loss of valuable

instructional time that many teachers experience in an effort to correct off-task conduct (Bru, 2009).

The next chapter details the methods utilized to conduct the research for this study. Three separate focus groups of veteran classroom teachers were utilized for this qualitative research. A detailed description outlining the instruments used, the facilitated coding process, as well as the analysis of the data will also be shared. Furthermore, the measures used to ensure the study's trustworthiness and ethical considerations are included. Lastly, the related assumptions and limitations are provided.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Classroom teachers expect to remind their students from time-to-time to be courteous to their classmates. Teachers also know they need to redirect the occasional mischievous conduct of students; however, the level of disturbance caused by disruptive student behavior is an element of classroom management that many teachers find challenging. Gage et al. (2018) contended, "Disruption is more than simple disengagement in that it involves behaviors that draw the focus of the teacher, and perhaps the entire classroom, away from instruction or expected tasks" (p. 303). These unwanted interruptions cause a breach in the intended continuum of instruction and cause both the teacher and students to lose quality instructional time.

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to provide in-depth insight into the negative implications that disruptive student behavior has on the classroom environment according to the perspective of veteran teachers. This research addressed teachers' perceptions of disruptive classroom behavior and its impact on academic achievement among students in third through fifth grade. This study explained the strategies that teachers use to redirect disruptive behavior. The guiding research questions for this study were as follows:

Q1. What are the negative implications of student disruptive behavior according to the perspective of veteran teachers?

Q2. What strategies do veteran teachers use to redirect students' disruptive behavior?

This chapter explains the research method and design of the study. The outline of the research includes a brief introduction and an explanation of the research design and method. It discusses the population and the sample population as well as the materials used for the study. This chapter focuses on the collection and analysis of the data, the methods for establishing

trustworthiness, and the role of the researcher. In addition, Chapter 3 includes ethical considerations, assumptions, limitations, and delimitations.

Research Methodology and Design

This study employed a qualitative case study design. The qualitative research approach seeks to understand the lived experiences of individuals or a group to gain a deeper understanding of occurrences that are unique to a particular population (Kalman, 2019). That information was reviewed and sorted to find commonalities and to decipher whether a new theoretical framework existed (Williams & Moser, 2019). I chose this method because it provided rich and detailed insight into teachers' perceptions of disruptive student behavior demonstrated during instructional time. Ospina et al. (2018) contended that qualitative research is especially beneficial because it allows researchers to observe and gain a better understanding of the realistic perspectives of people directly affected by a process, event, or situation.

In addition, a case study is a tool designed to provide in-depth information using a variety of sources to gain knowledge into the real-life experiences of the respondents in connection with a theme or organization (Alpi & Evans, 2019). Hence the purpose of the utilization of a case study for this research was to get a perspective of what dealing with disruptive student behavior is truly like. Crowe et al. (2011) affirmed that a case study is appropriate when a researcher seeks to ascertain answers related to "who", "what" or "how" questions. This study met the identified criteria because the researcher was interested to know, according to the perception of the participating teachers, the negative implication related to disruptive behavior and strategies used to address the concern.

Furthermore, the qualitative case study method supported the purpose of this research, and it was the most appropriate choice as the goal of the study was to gain a deep understanding

of teachers' perception of disruptive classroom behavior and how it affected academic achievement. Moreover, this study viewed each focus group's responses as an independent case study. Yin (2009) asserted the case study design allows for cross-comparison of case studies and makes it possible to receive insight on multiple perspectives of a particular phenomenon. Unlike a quantitative approach, qualitative research maintains flexibility, meaning the direction of the study is subject to change at any point based on contributions of the case study participants (Docherty & Sandelowski, 1999).

Study participants were interviewed through the use of focus groups. Belzile and Öberg (2012) stated the intentional conversations produced through focus groups allow for the disclosure of the authentic thoughts and feelings related to a particular phenomenon or experience. Although the lived experiences of the respondents vary, the allowance of a focus group created an environment that was both connective and collaborative (Bazrafkan & Kalyani, 2018). In this case study, the goal was the same, to converse with teachers about their experiences with disruptive behavior.

In addition, the focus groups discussed disruptive student behavior and how it affected classroom instruction. I was especially interested in observing whether the conversations would reveal that participants experienced the same type of disruptions during instruction, although they came from different schools/ districts within the Southwest region of Dallas County. Khuwaja et al. (2019) asserted that focus groups aim at maximizing exchanges between group members while ensuring the discussion remains focused on a particular issue and every participant has the opportunity to share their opinions and experiences (p. 162).

The focus group discussions were conducted using Zoom video recording. This website/application allows groups of people to meet virtually. In addition, this software has the

capacity to both record and transcribe the sessions. A content analysis was used based on the transcription of the discussion to analyze the data. Egmir et al. (2017) stated that content analysis refers to the strategic methodology utilized to summarize the findings derived from research. I also incorporated a coding matrix that assisted in the process of qualitative data analysis.

Although this was a qualitative study, there was a simple quantitative component used to gather data, which added depth to the interview guide and interview process. The participants were provided with the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey (Appendix B) prior to the focus group sessions. This survey was comprised of three questions and was useful in gathering preliminary data related to any classroom management strategies currently utilized campus-wide as well as those used independently within the cooperating teachers' classrooms. These questions were open-ended and required that respondents answer in sentence format. The results of the survey supplied information that guided the focus group interviews. According to Creswell (2012), surveys are purposeful because they reveal the perspectives and thoughts of participating respondents, determine the effectiveness of programs, and describe trends within a specific area.

Population

The broader group of people to whom one intends to draw generalizations from is the population (Leavy, 2017). The nature of this study was to examine the perceptions of third through fifth-grade classroom teachers in the Southwestern region of Dallas County related to disruptive student behavior and its effect on the classroom environment and academic performance. This population was selected because all four school districts are relatively close in the distance and serve similar student populations. Furthermore, these particular settings were

included because they may face similar challenges related to addressing disruptive student behavior.

At the time of this research, there was an estimated 125 third through fifth-grade classroom teachers in the Southwest region of Dallas County serving at 29 campuses. For the sake of this study, the term classroom teachers referred to those who taught core content subjects to whole groups of students, including mathematics, reading, language arts, science, and social studies. The population did not include art teachers, dance teachers, and other specialty teachers and it also excluded special education teachers and talented and gifted teachers.

Sample Population

It would be difficult for a researcher to gather the perceptions of all classroom teachers in the Southwest region of Dallas County, so the use of population sampling is most appropriate. A sample population is a group of individuals who take part in a study and whose contribution is representative of the population from which they derive (Leavy, 2017). To attain a fair assessment, the selected sample group of participants were teachers who had at least five consecutive years of experience within the classroom setting, with the 2018-2019 school year being at least their fifth year. The rationale for choosing teachers with this level of experience was to reduce the likelihood that disruptive student behavior was incited by the absence of classroom management skills that many novice teachers lack. In addition, an underlying justification for selecting veteran teachers as part of this study was they would be able to provide practical insight into new teachers related to effective strategies for managing classroom behavior. Furthermore, this group was selected based on the assumption they serve as representatives of teachers who teach third through fifth-grade students in the Southwestern region of Dallas County.

The participants of this study were chosen via purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling was utilized when the researcher sought to select participants according to predetermined criteria specific to a particular research study (Creswell, 2014). Purposeful sampling, also known as purposive or judgment sampling, emphasizes the researchers' capability of selecting the best candidates for the intended research (Leavy, 2017). According to Leavy, there are a few strategies associated with purposeful sampling. However, the specific technique of this study utilized was homogenous sampling. Jager et al. (2017) asserted homogenous sampling requires imposing limits or constraints based on a commonality possessed by the study's participants. Members of each focus group had the same minimum amount of years of teaching experience in common.

A list of elementary teachers from the Southwest region of Dallas County was retrieved from school websites. At that point, the names and email addresses of the teachers were arranged in alphabetical order according to their last name and assigned a number from 1 to 100. The randomization of this research was carried out by selecting all teachers assigned an even number. These teachers were sent an email informing them of the study and asking for their participation. The Initial Teacher Eligibility Survey (Appendix A), generated by Survey Monkey, was included in the email. The purpose of this survey was to determine if teachers meet the eligibility of the study. Potential participants were asked their years of teaching experience, their grade level, and the subject area of teaching. For those that met the requirements, a formal invitation to participate was presented. Once the positive responses were accumulated, I intentionally chose the 15 teachers who served on the focus group panels according to their years of experience. It was my goal to separate the participants according to their years of experience. Once the focus groups were formed, an email was sent to the potential participants with the study's consent

form. This consent form explained the protocol and purpose of the research, the focus group interview process, and the procedures for ethical considerations. The electronic form, which arrived in a portable document format (pdf), was electronically signed by respondents and emailed back to the researcher. Once all forms were signed and received, the researcher sent participants the "Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey" through email. Although only five candidates were required for each focus group session, an alternate candidate for each group was selected and prepared in the event a slated participant was unable to attend.

Materials and Instruments

This was a qualitative study with a simple quantitative component. The primary materials and instruments utilized in the study were derived from the responses gathered from the Initial Teacher Eligibility Survey, Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey, the three focus group discussions, and the interview guide. Prior to the convening of the focus groups, the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey was sent to selected participants. The purpose of this survey was to aid in the development of the interview guide and to provide the background needed to add depth to the focus group interviews. This survey was helpful in the preparation of the interviews because it allowed the researcher to learn more about the participants and their experiences with classroom disruptive behavior.

Survey Instrument

Once the participants were chosen, they were asked to complete the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey. The researcher created this instrument and designed it to gain information related to classroom management procedures. A pilot study was conducted to determine if the items on the survey yielded the kind of information needed. This pilot study included a small panel of three teachers who met the eligibility requirements of the study.

Teijlingen and Hundley (2002) emphasized the benefits of conducting a pilot study, citing that it aids in ensuring the efficiency of the data tool being utilized.

Once the pilot study was completed, and the revisions were made to the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey, it was provided to the study participants (Appendix B). The teacher participants were asked to provide short answer responses to the questions. After all replies were submitted, I reviewed and tabulated the participant's responses to the survey and incorporated the findings into the second phase of data collection.

Interview Guide

The second phase of data collection was initiated by the introduction of the interview guide (Appendix C). The primary purpose of the interview guide was to set the agenda for the focus group discussions. The interview guides began with an expression of appreciation to all participants. In addition, the interview guide discussed group norms and revealed to participants the cumulative results of the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey previously conducted. The most important portion of the interview guide was based on the research questions included in this study. These questions helped to navigate this semistructured interview and kept the discussion aligned to the purpose of the study in its entirety.

In summary, the participants were asked to talk about the impact that disruptive behavior has on instruction and what they felt were the contributing factors that caused students to misbehave. Furthermore, teachers were asked to describe the effect disruptive student behavior has on academic achievement as well as strategies used to address the occurrence of conduct that is inappropriate for the classroom setting. Lastly, focus group attendees were invited to share any additional relevant comments connected to the study.

Data Collection

Case study research includes multiple data collection techniques, and data were collected from multiple sources (Yin, 2014). According to Flick (2018), "The use of multiple data collection techniques and sources strengthens the credibility of outcomes and enables different interpretations and meanings to be included in data analysis. This is known as triangulation" (p. 23). This study included presurveys, three diverse focus group interviews, and applicable documents.

Once responses from the Initial Teacher Eligibility Survey were received, the selected 15 participants and three alternates were sent the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey through email and asked to complete it and to return it via email. I contacted all respondents by email and phone to confirm their participation in the study once the survey data were compiled. I then arranged the respondents into focus groups based on their range of full-time classroom experience.

Stalmeijer et al. (2014) asserted the purpose of focus groups is to gather data from different participant's points of view. For this study, one focus group consisted of participants who have served as full-time classroom teachers consistently for at least the last five academic school years. Another group consisted of teachers who have served as full-time classroom teachers for at least the last 10 academic school years. The additional focus group was composed of full-time teachers who taught for the previous 15 consecutive academic school years. This diversity added value to the triangulation process.

Once the focus group interviews were complete, I examined any applicable documents. These documents included campus discipline policies, campus behavior management plans, and

programs. This material helped me understand the information I obtained from the interviews and was retrieved through campus websites and the study's participants.

One of the primary responsibilities of the researcher was to ensure all data gathered represented a true depiction of the problem being studied. To achieve this goal, many researchers depend on the triangulation process. Lawlor et al. (2016) claimed triangulation is a method used to aid in assuring the validity of answers ascertained from conducted research. This process required the researcher to use data provided through divergent sources to address the same questions with the intended goal of getting the same responses each time (Fusch et al., 2018). Triangulation for this study involved a presurvey, three focus group discussions, and applicable documents.

Data Analysis

According to Gale et al. (2013), "The Framework Method sits within a broad family of analysis methods often termed thematic analysis or qualitative content analysis" (p. 2). Made up of seven steps, The Framework Method allows the researcher to locate similarities and differences in data to ascertain the underlying theme of the study.

The first stage is the process of transcription. Lapadat (2000) stated the procedure of transcription allows for the review of language data gleaned from participants in a study. During the second stage, I worked to ensure that I was familiar with the findings discussed within the focus groups. To accomplish this, I read the written transcripts and reviewed the recorded videos of the focus group discussions several times. After this, the third stage of coding the information took place. Leavy (2017) stated the coding process allows the researcher to chunk and categorize collected data within a study. The coding process is also instrumental in locating themes present in the data (Leavy, 2017).

The fourth stage required the development of an analytical framework. This framework was cultivated by the grouping together of similar codes found in the data. The fifth stage involved applying the analytical framework to all sets of data related to the data derived from all focus group discussions. The sixth stage consisted of the creation of a framework matrix where summaries were formulated based on the data. The seventh and final stage required an additional layer of data analyzation and synthesis. This stage is where I solidified similarities and differences discovered in the data (Gale et al., 2013, p. 5).

Methods for Establishing Trustworthiness

This study incorporated various techniques, such as member checking and triangulation, to confirm trustworthiness (Creswell, 2012; Yin, 2009). According to Madill and Sullivan (2018), "Member checking was developed in qualitative research as a way of assessing validity" (p. 322). Creswell (2012) stated that member checking affords participants the opportunity to review documents and transcripts to ensure the data collected accurately represent their viewpoints (p. 259). To ensure this step occurred, two members from each focus group were contacted in a timely manner after the interview transcripts had been received to ensure the information recorded was representative of the actual discussion. Likewise, the practice of triangulation was utilized to encourage the reliability of a study (Stavros & Westberg, 2009). The study used a presurvey, three diverse focus groups, and other related documents to satisfy the triangulation process. The use of varying data sources helped to create a holistic understanding of a phenomenon, and much like member checking, is viewed as a qualitative research strategy to check validity (Carter et al., 2014).

Also, transferability refers to the extent to which a qualitative study can be applied in another context (Burchett et al., 2013). This case study was designed for implementation in third

grade through fifth-grade classrooms in four suburban school districts located in the Southwestern region of Dallas County; however, the concept of transferability suggests this study can be duplicated in other settings as well, such as in an urban or rural school district.

All ethical considerations related to this research, the analysis and collection of data, and the reporting of pertinent findings were conducted with permission obtained through Abilene Christian University's IRB committee. At the conclusion of the research, subsequent literature may be discovered, and new information may be established as a result of this case study.

Researcher's Role

As an educator who has experience as a classroom teacher, math instructional coach, and assistant principal within the elementary school setting, I have worked to support teachers in all areas of classroom operation. Student behavior and classroom management are areas of emphasis during my tenure. The researcher's role in the focus group sessions was to facilitate the conversations using the research questions as a guide. Furthermore, the researcher interjected when points of clarity were required. To ensure the validity of the study, I solicited participants with whom I have no personal relationship. All parameters established by the IRB when dealing with human subjects were followed and fully satisfied.

Ethical Considerations

Permission for participation in the research was obtained from the ACU IRB committee. Participants in the study willfully volunteered to do so and were adequately informed of their role in the research. A cover letter and consent form accompanied the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey (Appendix B). All focus group participants were required to sign the consent form which affirmed their willingness to serve as a participant in the study and to further declare their contributions to the discussion were permitted to be used as part of the study. The

respondents of the study were informed their identity would remain anonymous and all information relating to them would be kept confidential. All data collected related to the study was stored in a security safe to maintain security. The results from the study were shared with participants through the use of a summative oral presentation once all data were collected and analyzed.

Assumptions

There were several assumptions made related to the studied population. One such assumption was all teacher participants with at least five consecutive years of teaching experience had encountered a disruptive student at least once during their tenure. I also assumed all respondents answered honestly and truthfully to the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey, which required them to discuss disruptive behaviors and classroom management. In addition, it was largely assumed that disruptive student behavior during instruction has a negative impact on student academic achievement. Lastly, I assumed the participants' contributions to the focus group discussions were based on their personal experiences in the classroom and not based on the experiences or thoughts of others.

Limitations

Along with the stated assumptions, there are also recognized limitations related to this study. For example, the sample size was small, having only 15 participants. This is indicative that if the study were conducted with a larger population pool, the results obtained would be different. Secondly, the study aimed to learn the perceptions of elementary classroom teachers in four suburban school districts located in the Southwest region of Dallas County without consideration of elementary classroom teachers located in other regions of Dallas County.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to the perspectives of Southwestern Dallas County third-grade through fifth-grade general education teachers. It was a requirement for this study that teacher participants are currently employed on a full-time basis and they have at least five consecutive years of teaching experience (2014-2015 school year to present).

Special education teachers were not allowed to take part in this study because most of the students they serve have diagnosed disabilities that often prompt misconduct in students. These teachers were also excluded from the study, because in many cases, special education teachers receive more in-depth training and support that equip them to best address and deal with disruptive students. Additionally, because disruptive behavior is often a side-effect of students who have been identified as autistic or emotionally disturbed, the teachers may not note their behavior as disruptive or concerning. Furthermore, ancillary teachers, such as those who teach art, dance, physical education, or computer classes, were excluded because students typically spend an abbreviated about of time in those classrooms in comparison to the amount of time spent in core curricular classes.

Summary

Students' disruptive behavior during instructional time negatively impacts learning because it diverts the teacher's focus away from teaching and causes them to focus more on managing disruptive behavior. Such interruptions negatively impact the academic achievement of all students who are subject to that environment and can cause long-term harmful effects.

This case study design, which utilized a survey, three focus groups, as well as other related documents, were intended to gain insight related to how veteran classroom teachers perceive disruptive student behavior. The perspectives of teachers were sought primarily because

they are first to encounter classroom disruptions and because they are deemed to be responsible for ensuring that learning takes place within the classroom setting. For this qualitative research, the focus group discussions were transcribed, and the researcher identified commonalities, trends, and differences in the perspectives offered by the participating teachers of the study.

The population, research instruments, as well as the setting, were discussed in detail in Chapter 3. In addition, limitations, assumptions, delimitations, and the techniques used to garner trustworthiness and validity were described. Chapter 4 details the results of the study and includes additional descriptive details related to the research. The conclusions are drawn from the study, as well as all relevant themes derived from it are included.

Chapter 4: Findings

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to ascertain from veteran teachers the negative implications of disruptive student behavior in the classroom. It was also the intent of the study to uncover common strategies they use to redirect student behavior. Data were collected that addressed the following research questions:

RQ1. What are the negative implications of student disruptive behavior according to the perspective of veteran teachers?

RQ2. What strategies do veteran teachers use to redirect students' disruptive behavior? This chapter reports the results of the analysis of data obtained from three semistructured teacher focus group interviews. In addition, there is an analysis of the presurvey that correlated with the research questions and had a direct effect on the development of the focus group interview protocol. The chapter is organized as follows: introduction, a summary of the research process, research design, analysis of the data, themes resulting from focus group interviews, and a summary of the chapter.

Summary of Research Processes

This study used a qualitative approach to data collection. The three semistructured focus group interviews were used to identify how veteran teachers viewed disruptive behavior within the context of the classroom setting and pinpointed strategies used to redirect student behavior. The approach was appropriate because the personal experiences, thoughts, and feelings of veteran teachers were needed to adequately respond to the research questions. In preparation for the study, 77 teachers within the Southwest region of Dallas County were sent the doctoral study invitation via email. This invitation explained the purpose of the study, participant eligibility requirements, and the three components related to the study, which included the completion of

(a) the Initial Teacher Eligibility Survey (Appendix A), (b) Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey (Appendix B), and (c) participation in focus group interviews.

There were 32 teachers who responded to the invitation expressing their interest to participate in the study. To determine if the respondents were eligible for the study, they were sent the Initial Teacher Eligibility Survey. This questionnaire was sent through Survey Monkey and asked participants to provide demographic information, including name, school district affiliation, and grade level taught during the 2019-2020 school year. The information gathered from this initial survey also helped determine which focus group the potential participants would be assigned. Of the interested candidates who completed the Initial Teacher Eligibility Survey, 17 teachers met the stated criteria. These 17 teachers were sent the consent form to solidify their participation. Because the focus groups were designed for 15 total participants, the remaining two volunteers were asked to be on standby in case a participant dropped out of the focus group. Subsequently, all 17 teachers were sent the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey and asked to return responses via email.

Once results were gathered from the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey, I consolidated the responses and proceeded to formulate three focus groups based on teachers' years of experience. Focus group participants were given pseudonyms to conceal their identity. Focus Group A was composed of five teachers who had at least 15 years of classroom teaching experience. Participants were identified with the Pseudonym VT1, VT2, VT3, VT4, and VT5. Focus Group B consisted of five teachers with 10-14 years of experience. Participants were identified with the Pseudonym VT6, VT7, VT8, VT9, and VT10. The third and final focus group, Focus Group C, was made up of five teachers who had five to nine years of classroom experience. Participants were identified with the Pseudonym VT11, VT12, VT13, VT14, and

VT15. The focus group interviews were designed to address the perceptions the selected veteran teachers have towards disruptive student behavior and their preferred redirection strategies. All focus group interviews were conducted, recorded, and transcribed via the Zoom application.

A pilot study was conducted to ensure the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey and the interview questions for veteran teachers were appropriate and adequately addressed the stated research questions. The survey and interview questions were then sent to two teachers who met the stated criteria of the study, but who were not participants in the research. Their feedback provided insight and was utilized to increase the reliability and validity of the study.

Research Design

This study applied a qualitative case study approach. This approach was designed to determine teachers' perceptions of how students' disruptive behavior affects the classroom. The data were collected from 15 selected veteran teachers who served as third through the fifth-grade core content teachers (math, reading, language arts, social studies, and science) during the 2019-2020 school year. To protect their privacy, each teacher volunteer was assigned a pseudonym.

Commonly known as the best school districts in the Southwest region because of their geographical location to Dallas County, these school districts are a cluster of suburban school districts and were the identified focus area of this study. As planned, five teacher participants had at least five consecutive years of teaching experience, five teachers had at least 10 consecutive years of experience, and five teachers had at least 15 consecutive school years of experience. Of these teachers, four taught third, four third grade teachers, six fourth grade teachers, and five fifth grade teachers participated in the study. Lastly, all teacher volunteers were female.

Once the data from the focus group interviews were received, the analysis process began through the use of The Framework Method (Gale et al., 2013). The seven steps aligned with this model were carried out and are as follows:

1. All three focus group interviews were recorded and transcribed through a Zoom application. Once completed, a transcript of all three interviews was sent to an email account created solely for the purpose of this study.
2. Once transcripts were completed, they were reviewed by the researcher and compared to the video version of the interviews as well as written notes to ensure transcript accuracy. Through this process, I became more familiar with the content of each of the focus group interviews. Because automated transcripts were sometimes difficult to interpret, I thoroughly reviewed all transcripts.
3. Coding data. The coding process required me to intensely review and dissect the responses provided by veteran teachers to each of the interview questions. As teacher volunteer answers were reviewed, key concepts that permeated throughout the sessions were identified and color-coded using highlighters and stick-it notes. As I pursued the coding process, I asked the following questions:
    - What exactly were the teachers saying?
    - What were the teachers indirectly stating that was important to them?
    - What was been reiterated throughout the sessions?

Becoming familiar with the written transcripts, as well as the notes, enabled me to identify common keywords that represented the lived experiences and thoughts of the participating veteran teachers. The process of thoroughly reviewing the data initiated the analysis of data for categories and patterns.

4. Development of analytical framework. After the initial transcripts were coded and labels were assigned, I began to group the codes into categories. The process began the process of cultivating an analytical framework and was continuously applied until all codes were identified.
5. Applying the analytical framework. The developed analytical framework was applied to subsequent focus group interviews. To better manage the utilized categories derived from the codes, I created abbreviations on transcripts to streamline the process.
6. Charting data into a framework matrix. A coding matrix was utilized to help analyze the data from the research. This summarization of data were arranged using a spreadsheet that included columns and rows that recorded paraphrased and direct quotes from veteran teacher participants to preserve the implied sentiments and feelings of the interview.
7. Interpreting the data. At the completion of the coding matrix, data were studied for interpretation and to solidify themes. Grubs and Piantanida (2010) suggested that continuous comparative data analysis calls for the researcher to make two distinctions related to codes revealed through the data; whether the codes were similar or dissimilar, in which case similar codes were combined and unlike codes were separated and whether codes considered to be alike, possessed strong similarities. This type of constant comparison was repeated until all codes were determined.

Findings

The findings of the study were generated from the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior survey and three focus group interviews. The surveys were sent to the participants prior to the focus group. This process allowed for additional information to help conduct the interview.

Survey Results

The participants completed the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior survey prior to the interview. The purpose of this survey was to gain knowledge that would help add depth to the focus groups. The first question on the survey asked what classroom management strategy or plan teacher participants utilized within their classroom. Four respondents shared they utilized CHAMPS (Meidl & Vanorsdale, 2018). Recognized as an acronym for Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation, CHAMPS is a comprehensive system aimed at motivating students to become active participants in their own learning process. In addition, six respondents stated they utilized Class Dojo (Krach et al., 2017), a virtual behavior management tool that teachers find to be useful because it allows them to provide real-time feedback to students related to conduct. Although not cited as formal management plans or strategies, the remaining five participants stated that incentives such as lunch with the teacher, class parties and the recognition of a student of the week were used as part of their classroom management plan.

Question 2 of the survey inquired whether teachers worked at a school that utilized a campus-wide behavior management plan and strategy. Two participants stated their school used CHAMPS (Meidl & Vanorsdale, 2018) as their campus-wide management plan. One veteran teacher stated that teachers at her campus were encouraged to send students to members of the administrative staff with positive office referrals. The teacher stated this approach removed the negative stigma usually associated with a visit to the principal's office and highlighted the positive conduct of students. In addition, three teachers stated their campus had a school "bucks system" that awarded students for positive behavior, such as turning in homework, providing assistance to their classmates, or teachers or participating in class. Students could trade "bucks" for a reward from the school store, much like they could purchase items from a regular store.

Two respondents offered that on their campus, an added component of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports required teachers to track student behavior, and those who demonstrated appropriate behavior were invited to participate in positive behavior celebrations hosted by the school every three weeks. Examples of positive behavior celebrations were grade-level soccer games, popcorn parties, and a dance.

Question 3 of the survey asked teachers to share the strategy or plan they perceived to be beneficial when addressing disruptive student behavior in the classroom. Six teachers stated Class Dojo was the most beneficial strategy because of the real-time feedback and communication the application allowed. Four teachers stated strategies placed emphasis on student rewards such as positive behavior celebrations and lunch with the teacher were beneficial. Four teachers expressed the consistent issuing of consequences to students who did not adhere to the outlined rules of the classroom was beneficial.

The final question of the survey asked teachers to share the impact student engagement played in addressing classroom management. Every teacher expressed when students were engaged in learning, they were less likely to demonstrate disruptive behavior during instruction.

Focus Group Findings

The focus group interview guide began with restating the purpose of the study and asked an introductory question, “What does disruptive behavior in the classroom tell us?” The teachers stated disruptive behavior in the classroom suggested the teacher may not have an effective classroom behavior plan in place or students were bored with the curriculum. Teachers also stated disruptive behavior was demonstrated by students who have academic deficits and those who do not know how to deal with the social/emotional problems they have. There were two

sections to the interview guide, “Negative Implications of Disruptive Behavior” and “Management Techniques for Disrupting Behavior.”

Negative Implications of Disruptive Behavior. The first question related to the negative implications of disruptive behavior. Veteran teachers were asked to share what classroom disruptive behaviors occurred in their classrooms. All teachers reiterated that disruptive behavior decreased the amount of instructional time because they had to stop their instruction to address the disruptive student. Participants also stated that disruptive behavior in the classroom often interrupted the flow of instruction and could cause the teacher to lose focus on the lesson.

The second question asked about the effect of misbehavior on the academic achievement of the disruptive student. Teachers stated the behavior of disruptive students often caused them to be removed from the classroom setting, which further limited their ability to receive quality instruction from their teachers. The teachers also stated they observed disruptive students often had academic difficulties, and the inappropriate behavior widened the achievement gap between disruptive students and nondisruptive students.

Lastly, teachers were asked to share the negative implications of disruptive behavior on the entire classroom environment. Teachers stated the disruptive behavior had a “ripple effect” within the classroom environment that encouraged other students to also become disruptive during instructional time. In addition, teachers stated disruptive behavior within the classroom could cause other students to become anxious, withdrawn, or nonparticipatory in classroom activities.

Management Techniques for Disruptive Behavior. Veteran teachers were asked, “What strategies do you use most often to redirect disruptive student behavior?” Teachers stated that outlining class rules and procedures, along with establishing appropriate boundaries, were

essential to redirecting student behavior. In addition, teachers stated that ignoring some disruptions and encouraging other students to do the same helped to reduce disruptions because it established that behavior shown by disruptive students was unacceptable for the class environment.

All teachers noted the importance of formulating relationships with students. Teachers reported when they formed relationships with students, students were less likely to demonstrate disruptive behaviors. Teachers also cited getting to know students individually helped them to better assess students and their behaviors. For example, when teachers were acquainted with students and became familiar with their temperaments, they were in a better position to identify behavior triggers of students and could implement plans to deter the disruptive behavior.

Lastly, teachers were asked, "What impact, if any, does student engagement play in student behavior?" The teachers reported that designing instruction that encourages student engagement is helpful in managing student behavior. The veteran teachers stated that students who were engaged perceive learning as fun and something they want to be a part of; therefore, they are less likely to demonstrate conduct that could jeopardize their involvement in engaging activities.

Themes From the Findings

This qualitative study was conducted using a constant-comparative method to identify themes and understand how veteran teachers perceive disruptive student behavior. Based on the results from the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey and the three focus group sessions, several themes were developed related to the two research questions, which include "What are the negative implications of disruptive student behavior?" and "What strategies do

veteran teachers use to redirect students' disruptive behavior?" From both sources of data, a total of five themes were presented.

Theme 1: Effect on Quality Instructional Time

The time allocated for instruction during class was viewed as valuable to classroom teachers for many reasons. Teachers agreed that students have varying levels of academic readiness and abilities and the appropriate amount of time is needed to ensure all students experience academic success. In addition, the amount of instructional content expected to be taught requires that teachers have efficient time in which to teach the curriculum. Instructional time is already lost due to normal school operations, including restroom breaks, lunch, recess, and fire drills, so teachers are cautious about how time is spent. However, disruptive student behavior often required the teacher to stop instruction to address the specific disruption caused by students, which had an adverse effect on all students' academic achievement.

In the dialogue related to the impact of disruptive behavior on the learning environment, VT2 stated, "If there are constant disruptions, you cannot teach period. If you cannot teach, there will be no academic achievement." VT6 echoed those sentiments and added that learning becomes limited because one person can disrupt the whole class, which causes the teacher to stop teaching in order to de-escalate disruptive behaviors right away. VT9 stated in addition to causing the teacher to stop instruction to redirect behavior, disruptive conduct increases inattentiveness among other students as well. VT1 expressed she witnessed teachers who evacuated their classrooms due to disruptive behavior for the safety of the disruptive students, as well as that of nondisruptive students. Instances like this made it nearly impossible for students to reset for a day of learning. VT8 further supported by stating:

> The teacher has to stop teaching to correct the behavior, which is a loss of instructional time. I know what it is like to have your class shift into the hallway or into another teacher's room so that the disruptive student can calm down and regain composure.

The teachers polled expressed that disruptive student behavior made the overarching goal of school achievement less attainable.

Theme 2: Effect on Teaching Force

The job of a classroom teacher is demanding because of all of the responsibilities associated with the position, teaching instructional content, ensuring student safety, and responding to emails. The amount of stress linked to being a classroom teacher could be overwhelming and disruptive behavior can add even more anxiety. Clunies-Ross et al. (2008) asserted that teacher stress and student behavior are closely associated. VT7 expressed she has witnessed a lot of teachers unable to survive within the classroom because of disruptive student behavior. VT1 stated when disruptive behavior is a constant, it negatively affects teacher morale, which has a chain reaction effect on the classroom environment. VT5 went into detail describing the possible link between disruptive student behavior and teacher stress by stating,

> If you have a teacher who is agitated, irritated, and frustrated because you have a student that was continuously disrupting instruction and also encouraging others to be disruptive, they could cause stress on the teacher. … you know they can make the teacher not be at their best, you know as far as it relates to the delivery of instruction… that's when teachers want to be absent or call-in to work.

Veteran teachers also noted that disruptive behavior could result in teacher attrition. VT3 spoke on the impact that disruptive student behavior had, especially on novice teachers, when she said, "I've seen teachers that could have potentially been good, but they left because of student

behavior and because of the way the administration reacted." VT2 referred to the long-term effects of disruptive behavior and teacher retention and stated, "I think that the long-term implications are the ratio of teachers leaving the field because they don't see the return on their teaching and educating students." She reiterated, "Some of the great teachers that we have are leaving due to this very reason." Participant VT8 agreed and stated she has seen teachers on social media talk about how disruptive behavior has been a contributing factor in why they chose to leave the field of education.

Theme 3: Building Relationships

To combat disruptive student behavior, 12 of the 15 participants discussed the importance of creating relationships with their students. When asked how teachers build relationships with students, the general consensus was they use various avenues to get to know their students. VT4 said her campus started the process of building relationships with students before the school year began by reaching out to parents and conducting visits to the student's homes. She stated the school staff intentionally scheduled such visits prior to school, starting to focus on getting to know students and their families and to avoid talking about academics or conduct. VT5 also shared that home visits and a community walk are incorporated as part of the professional development with her school. She stated, "It introduces novice teachers and those new to the campus and gives them an opportunity to see the community."

Participant VT2 offered that she built relationships by greeting students daily. She added by doing this, she was able to observe how students are feeling and decipher their mood by observing their overall disposition. Participant VT4 added that each morning when she greets students, she was intentional about making eye contact with each of them to discern their mood. She also stated she was careful to initiate a brief conversation with any student who appears to be

unsettled or bothered and often assigns them a task within the classroom setting to distract them from whatever may be upsetting them.

Participant VT9 added the rapport and relationships developed with students allowed her to quickly determine how the day will go for a particular student. She also noted when she discovers a student may not be in the "right headspace," she will have the students run a special errand as a means of distracting them from whatever may be bothering them. She stated by doing this, they became more focused on helping her than their problem. For example, she has them retrieve copies or deliver something to another teacher. She stated, "It gives them a sense of responsibility, and it further affirms that I trust them to do things for me because we have a relationship. And they love that. It works out well."

In addition to gauging student's temperament prior to them entering class, several teachers noted the utilization of a mood meter and of peace corners help to get students acclimated to the class environment. These spaces are beneficial in de-escalating student disruptive behavior before it occurs. Depending on the teacher's preference, a mood meter is a chart, divided typically into four quadrants that include either words or pictures students can use to alert their teacher of how they are feeling. Participant VT7 noted she found a mood meter to be especially beneficial because all students are not able to verbally articulate how they feel.

Participants VT2, VT7, and VT11 also discussed the use of a peace corner. The peace corner is an isolated space within the classroom equipped with objects such as lava lamps, books, sensory objects like bean bags, and journals where students can make the necessary adjustments so they can be reintegrated into the classroom environment. Participant VT7 stated this space was needed because, "We have a lot of kids who do not know what to do when they are upset or when they can't do what they want to do, they go to the peace corner to find some peace."

Several teachers stated the establishment of boundaries early on in the school year was advantageous when solidifying relationships with students. A portion of these boundaries included outlining classroom routines and procedures. VT8, a teacher with more than 30 years of classroom teaching experience, stated:

> I laid down the rules for operation from the very beginning. Disruptive behavior was not going to happen in my classroom. I had parents ask me to call them if their child became disruptive, which I always swiftly decline. I do not have time for that. I am teaching; I am not stopping what I am doing to call parents. I am not removing anybody from their seat. The rules are the rules. We are at school to learn, and that's what we are going to do.

Participant VT2 also stated she finds her greatest leverage points in her attempt to build relationships with students when they share a common interest. VT4 stated, "Once I shared with my class that I was interested in whales, and it just so happened that another student had the same interest. That tiny thing we had in common kick-started our relationship." Although it may cause the teacher to sacrifice some of their personal time, two teachers stated they often attend events for students that occurred outside of school hours, such as sporting events or a dance recital. They both agreed that students exhibit a sense of pride when they see them at these events, and presence further affirmed to parents their child had a teacher who cared. VT6 stated that most students like music, and so she intentionally found ways to include the music they enjoy into her instruction. Ironically VT6 stated the common interest she and one of her students shared with science strengthened their relationship and assisted in deterring him from being disruptive in her classroom, although he was mildly disruptive in other teachers' classrooms.

Theme 4: Student Engagement

According to Shi and Tan (2020), "Student engagement is characterized by student interest, effort, and investment in learning and school activities" (p. 249). In light of this, it comes as no surprise the teacher's ability to engage students in learning is extremely important. Participant VT4 stated, "Engaging instruction helps to keep instruction moving, even with disruptive students in the classroom. Fun activities make all students want to learn. But as the teacher, it really takes time to prepare truly engaging instruction." VT6 affirmed that poorly planned activities that are low on engagement serve as an invitation to classroom disruptions. According to VT8, disruptive behavior arises when students are bored, so the inclusion of activities that are able to captivate students' attention is necessary to increase learning. In her analogy related to student engagement, VT2 expressed, "Engagement puts the kids in the driver's seat, so they are basically in charge of their learning." VT6 discussed how music helped build relationships with her students, and VT9 mentioned that she uses music to keep students engaged during instruction, "Sometimes I play jazz, sometimes I play Kidz Bop… but when the Cha-Cha slide comes on, I have them stop what they are working on and get up to do the dance." To further emphasize the use of movement and its impact on engagement, VT9 spoke on the inclusion of station activities within instruction to get students motivated to learn. She stated once they are organized according to the specific student expectation with aligned appropriate activities and materials, and once the proper training has taken place in reference to how stations will operate, that students become excited about taking ownership of their learning. Participant VT9 asserted,

> Station activities keep a lot of them [students] engaged too because they think it's playing, but they are learning, you know hands-on games and music, just having a good

time. Then the next thing you know, it's time to go home, and they are like, "Wow, the day went by fast."

Participant VT11, a teacher with more than 20 years of experience, admitted that originally she was not a fan of station/small group activities, but once she observed the benefits, she incorporated them into the regular flow of her classroom instruction. Much like VT4 and VT9, VT11 spoke on the importance of purposeful planning for engaging activities and provided an example of an engaging lesson she taught centered on teaching students the different types of genre in literature. The students were playing the roles of doctors clothed in scrubs, gloves, and face masks, and the classroom was arranged to mimic a real operating room. As they worked on operating on their patient, the more answers the students got correct, the better their patients began to feel. Participant VT11 stated this lesson was so engaging all students were on task because no one wanted to miss out on the fun learning. Participant VT2 also elaborated on her need to make instruction more engaging. She stated when she recognized the fact that today's students learn differently and they feel the need to be a part of their learning prompted her decision to make learning more engaging even though it was outside of her personal comfort zone. Participant VT3 further confirmed this stance when she stated, "I think we as educators, we have to be willing to take risks to keep it pushing and keep moving with the engagement because I think that the engagement piece will help with classroom management."

Theme 5: Teacher Support

The study revealed that teachers rely on support. They rely on other staff members, including other teachers and administrators, to support them in their effort to properly educate students. Participant VT3 stated she relied on the support of co-teachers, teachers with whom she served on the same grade level or who teach the same content as her, to make general decisions

related to classroom operation. Participant VT3 asked her teammates, “How do you have your desks, who do you have sitting with each other in small groups.” She contended that she found paying attention to such details helped her decrease disruptive behavior.

There were other teachers who shared they depended strongly on the school community of teachers, counselors, and administrators in instances when students need a place to “cool off” or work independently. Participant VT4 referred to the concept as teacher mentorship and noted there were instances where she sent a student to another teacher’s class, one with whom the student was more familiar to de-escalate potential disruptions during class. To further emphasize the importance of support for teachers, VT8 stated, “If I had to choose between an uncooperative teammate or a disruptive student, I’d rather take the disruptive student, because if I have a good team, we can handle any disruptive students. We can conquer all.”

As stated by VT6, “Discipline could be tough, but a good team makes the difference… that and a good leader. A good administrative staff help to set the tone for the whole school.” As mentioned, in addition to garnering support from other teachers, teachers rely heavily on the advocacy of their administrators when addressing disruptive students. Participant VT8 stated, “A good principal will have your back… they will not let you be mistreated by a kid or a parent… as long as they know that you are doing your part to address student behavior.”

Summary

Chapter 4 detailed the data revealed from the survey and focus group discussions. The survey data revealed the strategies used by teachers in their classrooms as well as those used campus-wide to encourage positive student behavior. Through the focus group sessions, veteran teacher participants were able to share real-world experiences related to the impact that disruptive student behavior have on the learning environment. The focus groups also discussed

the wide array of proven strategies utilized to redirect disruptive behavior. In addition, teachers shared the importance of having the support of members of the school community when addressing disruptive behavior. Chapter 5 further discusses those findings and suggest the implications for current practice. Lastly, the chapter discusses the limitations associated with the study and make recommendations for future studies.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Disruptive student behavior during instruction is problematic in many classrooms (Latif et al., 2016). The misconduct that occurs within the learning environment reduces the amount of quality instructional time available to teachers, decreases students' academic achievement, and is noted to hurt the teaching force (Ervin et al., 2018). Evidence provided through survey data and focus group interviews revealed that building relationships, ensuring classroom engagement, and providing teacher support, effectively reduce and redirect disruptive classroom behavior in classrooms.

The purpose of this research was to understand the perceptions of veteran teachers related to disruptive student behavior. For this qualitative study, veteran teachers shared their perceptions related to the causes of disruptive behavior, discussed the impact of disruptive behavior on the classroom environment, and shared strategies utilized to redirect disruptive behavior to increase learning. The researcher conducted this study with teacher volunteers from the Southwest region of Dallas County. This study centered around two research questions.

RQ1. What are the negative implications of student disruptive behavior according to the perspective of veteran teachers?

RQ2. What strategies do veteran teachers use to redirect students' disruptive behavior?

Teacher volunteers were first given the Initial Teacher Eligibility Survey. This data-gathering tool included questions related to years of teaching experience, school district affiliation, specific content, and grade level taught. After this, teachers were given the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey to complete. Results revealed utilized campus-based and classroom-based management plans and strategies. The survey also provided teacher volunteers the opportunity to share their preferred approach when addressing disruptive behavior and to

discuss the correlation between student engagement and disruptive behavior. Responses collected from this survey helped formulate the interview protocol utilized with the three focus groups, each composed of five participants.

The purpose of Chapter 5 is to interpret the findings of the research and their connection to relevant literature related to teacher perceptions and student behavior. This chapter also presented the limitations associated with the study. Lastly, this final chapter suggests recommendations related to the research and provides a culminating conclusion to the study in its entirety.

Discussion of Findings

During the data analysis, I discovered emerging themes throughout the data analysis process. These themes were the effect on quality instructional time, impact on the teaching force, building relationships, student engagement, and teacher support. These themes provided responses to the stated research questions.

RQ1. What are the negative implications of student disruptive behavior according to the perspective of veteran teachers?

Veteran teacher participants answered this research question during the focus group interview sessions. Teachers' most common response referenced the loss of instructional time as the most detrimental effect of disruptive student behavior during instruction. McDaniel and Flower (2015) asserted that disruptive student behavior causes a decline in students' instructional opportunities because of class time deprivation. Participant VT2 was adamant when she stated that disruptions during class disable the teacher's ability to teach students, which ultimately hinders students' ability to learn. Participant VT9 noted that disruptive behavior initiated by one student has the potential to encourage other students to engage in disruptive behavior as well,

and according to Participant VT4, these “pop- up” disruptors made the goal of teaching and learning more difficult. Williford and Vitiello (2020) supported this claim and affirmed that class disruptions caused by one or more students derail the intended goal of teaching and diminish instruction.

Through the exchanges made in the focus group sessions, respondents commented that disruptive behavior during instruction causes teacher stress and is damaging to the retention of quality teachers. Participant VT9 talked about her attempts to assist new teachers with managing disruptive student behavior and expressed that she found it to be the root of stress, especially for those who lack an efficient plan to address such conduct. Floress et al. (2017) confirmed that disruptive behavior causes teacher burnout and stress and contributes to teacher attrition. Participant VT8 agreed that disruptive episodes that occur during instruction could cause teachers to become frustrated or stressed and leads to teachers taking days off from work or, in some cases leaving the classroom altogether. The literature supported that behavioral issues contributed to some teachers' decision to leave the profession (Mellor et al., 2020; Ouyang & Paprock, 2006).

Based on teacher responses, a corresponding theme that offered a response to this research question was the effect that student disruptive behavior had on quality instructional time. The teachers stated they had to stop instruction to redirect disruptive students. They strongly felt academic achievement was hindered by student disruptive behavior. They mentioned that depending on the severity of the disruption, the teacher might have to stop instruction to remove the disruptive student from the classroom setting. These actions affected quality instruction time.

Another theme that helped answer the research question was the effect disruptive behavior had on the teaching force. Several teachers mentioned instances about the stress related to student disruptions. They stated some teachers leave the field of education due to a lack of disruptive student behavior in the classroom. They also mentioned stress was increased when they did not receive the administrative support they needed.

RQ2. What strategies do veteran teachers use to redirect students' disruptive behavior?

Responses gleaned from both the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey and focus group interviews revealed that veteran teachers work to build relationships with students as the primary redirecting technique and to reduce disruptions within classrooms. Participant VT7 and VT11 spoke of how beneficial creating relationships with students had been throughout their years of teaching. Participant VT6 spoke of how relationships with students encouraged a sense of community within her class and decreased disruptive incidents during instruction. According to Scherzinger and Wettstein (2019), effective classrooms are cultivated by establishing positive teacher-student relationships that operate with clear and consistent class procedures. Participant VT4 reiterated the importance of relationships and shared that at her campus, efforts to create relationships with students are initiated before the school year begins through home visits and community walks.

Teachers also responded via the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey and focus group discussions on the positive impact of engaging instruction on the learning environment. According to the Glossary of Education Reform (2016), "Student engagement refers to the degree of attention, curiosity, interest, optimism, and passion that students show when they are learning or being taught, which extends to the level of motivation they have to learn and progress in their education" (n.p.). Participant VT11 stated that when learning was

engaging, students were less disruptive and were motivated to learn. Participant VT2 stated she realized she had to become more intentional about making learning more engaging for her students at a certain point during her tenure as a teacher. Although she admitted her reluctance, she knew she needed to change her instructional practices, due in part because today's students learn differently than students in the past. Several teachers in the focus groups talked about how the inclusion of station activities, music, and a change in the classroom setting was beneficial and overall made students more excited about learning. Furthermore, classroom disruptions are often minimized when the teacher can establish student behavioral expectations and facilitate engaging activities (Williford & Vitello, 2020).

Teachers also shared through the focus group discussions how they have come to rely on administrative staff and their colleagues' support when it comes to redirecting disruptive student behavior. Several veteran teacher participants shared how sending a potentially disruptive student to another teacher's classroom for a few minutes to work independently and regroup was helpful because it provided that particular student with a needed break and prepared them to rejoin the learning community. Also, VT8 elaborated on the advantage of having a supportive administrative staff when dealing with students' disruptive episodes in the classroom and stated the support rendered is helpful. According to Bennett et al. (2013), administrative staff's assistance related to disruptive incidents helps create a more positive campus culture.

Building relationships was a theme that related to this research question. The participants felt they formulated relationships with students at the beginning of the school year through activities such as icebreakers used in the classroom and making home visits. The veteran teacher participants mentioned that greeting the students at the door and using other strategies helped them to be aware of the student's disposition before the class instruction began. These exchanges

not only helped teachers guide their interaction with the student during the instructional time but also showed the student they cared about them. All of these activities were instrumental in building a good relationship with the students.

Another theme that was prevalent was student engagement. The participants felt if the students were engaged in learning the disruptions decreased. They mentioned small group and station activities and also providing instruction at the student's learning level. These activities required more planning but were found to be an essential strategy in increasing student engagement and decreasing student disruptions.

The final theme that helped answer Research Question 2 was teacher support. The focus groups revealed that teachers often work collaboratively in teaching teams and depend on each other to resolve/address student disruptions. Teachers experience the same type of experiences. Being able to share with each other and capitalize on each other's experiences are valuable when working with student disruptions.

Implications of the Theoretical Framework

Veteran teacher's perceptions of disruptive student behavior and methods used to redirect such conduct were examined through behaviorism theory, Kounin's model, and the choice theory. All three theories explain either the student's behavior within the classroom setting or the teacher's actions. The data derived from both the survey and the focus group sessions explain why the identified theories applied to this research.

According to Saari (2019), the core of the behaviorism theory suggests that humans are conditioned to respond to specific influences and that an individual's response to a stimulus is observable and measurable. Within the classroom setting, it is the teacher that establishes the behavioral expectations for students. They utilize classroom management plans/strategies to

encourage positive behavior, establish classroom procedures, and outline both incentives and consequences for observed behavior. Teacher participants stated the incorporation of management plans promote their ability to increase desirable behavior and decrease unfavorable conduct, thereby supporting the idea that behavior is motivated by external forces.

Perhaps the most connected theory related to this study is Kounin's model, which centers entirely on the concept of the teacher's ability to manage the classroom environment (Sahin-Sak et al., 2018). Consistent with this model is the use of overlapping and "withitness." Although they did not necessarily use the term, teachers stated that overlapping was demonstrated by the types of tasks and transitions included in instruction such as station activities and other hands-on assignments that limit the idle time during instruction and encourage continuity from activity to the next. Identified as a prevalent theme in the study was the concept of withitness (Balli, 2011, p. 246), which described in the research was referred to as building relationships. Withitness or building relationships means the teacher is always aware of the happenings in the classroom setting, even down to what happens with individual students. This aspect also helps the teacher gain a better understanding of the students to readily know potential triggers related to students and their behavior.

Lastly, the overarching concept of disruptive student behavior according to veteran teachers' perception was compared to the choice theory. Choice theory suggests that behavior is often prompted by an individual's attempt to fulfill both physiological and psychological needs (Rouhollani, 2016). However, classroom teachers may not be accountable for addressing students' physiological needs, which include the provision of food, water, and shelter. Teachers do share in the responsibility of ensuring a student's psychological needs are met. Although not presented enough to be classified as a theme, there were a few teachers through this study, who

believed that students demonstrating disruptive behavior do so in an attempt to satisfy psychological needs. These needs include the desire to feel loved and accepted and the longing to exercise freedom of choice and to gain a sense of value.

Implications for Practice

The views expressed by veteran teachers through this research revealed the hazards of disruptive behavior within the classroom environment and the methods used to circumvent such conduct. Furthermore, the study's findings revealed implications for the improvement of practice related to behavior and classroom management. Their years of experience provided veteran teacher participants the opportunity to distinguish between effective and ineffective strategies related to addressing and redirecting disruptive student behavior. This discovery emphasizes the importance of paring effective veteran teachers with novice teachers to provide the much-needed insight and support they need. Ponte and Twomey (2014) affirmed the partnership between mentor teachers and novice teachers helps to improve the competency of those new to teaching. It is also important to note that veteran teachers must be intentional about providing support to novice teachers (Sezer, 2017). A veteran teacher who waits on a new teacher to seek guidance is sometimes ineffective because those new to teaching often do not know what they do not know.

In the field of education, there lies a set of related terms or jargon frequently utilized by many educators. Furthermore, it is often assumed that terms like redirection strategies and classroom engagement are widely understood by the general population, when they are not. When training new teachers for the classroom, a more thorough understanding of these concepts and practices should be conscientiously modeled and explained. Novice teachers should also be provided with ongoing professional development opportunities to exercise the ideas and concepts

that align with good teaching. In addition, novice teachers should be afforded adequate time and resources to create lessons that encourage all students to learn.

During the focus group interviews, teachers also expressed the overwhelming importance of building positive relationships with students to promote learning. Although this concept may seem simple to some, the purpose and the required boundaries connected to forming such relationships can be challenging to navigate. Much like teachers need support with planning effective instruction; they also require guidance in this area. According to Simonsen et al. (2008), the skill of classroom relationship building should be developed. Veteran teachers can share the purposeful strategies they have used and found to be helpful in establishing and maintaining teacher-student relationships.

Limitations

The first limitation of this study was the use of the selected population of participants, which consisted only of teachers within the Southwest region of Dallas County. The selection of the identified school districts also disregarded veteran teachers' perceptions in both rural and urban school settings who have experienced disruptive student behavior during instruction. Of the teachers selected, only third through fifth-grade teachers' insights were considered as part of the study, which negated the feedback of prekindergarten through second-grade teachers within the elementary school setting. Only teachers of core subjects (math, reading, social studies, and science) were invited to participate in the research, which excluded fine arts teachers (e.g., art, dance, music, etc.), SPED teachers, and gifted and talented teachers. Furthermore, only 15 teachers within the identified school districts participated in the study, representing a small fraction of teachers who were eligible to participate in the study.

Another possible limitation of this study was related to the context of the study. This study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic. The spread of this virus led to the closure of educational institutions all over the world. Teachers and students across the elementary and secondary levels were thrust into a new teaching and learning environment that most had not experienced before (Middleton, 2020). The impact of COVID-19 has caused stress for teachers and this stress may have affected their response in the interview process.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and identified limitations related to this study, there exist recommendations for future research. First, future researchers may desire to study the perceptions of disruptive behavior in alternate settings. For example, early childhood and secondary veteran teachers' prospective related to the disruptive behavior of their prospective student groups could be explored. Because students in both of the proposed settings have different maturity levels and likely demonstrate disruptive behavior in different ways, these elements are worthy of further study. It is also recommended that this study be duplicated in both urban and rural school settings to determine if the research will yield similar results.

Second, future researchers may choose to carry out this study using an alternate method such as quantitative. This study utilized a qualitative approach to research, primarily due to the researcher’s desire to learn more about the lived experiences of the participating veteran teachers related to classroom behavior. However, different tools, such as more structured surveys or questionnaires that contain a rating scale, can be included to study the concept through a more quantitative lens. It might also be interesting to conduct this study using novice teachers and see how their perspectives differ from veteran teachers. Novice teachers bring new ideas into the classroom. They also tend to rely on theoretical approaches to discipline rather than “learned

experiences" that veteran teachers rely upon. Lastly, a researcher may decide to conduct more detailed research specifically with veteran teachers who have decades of experience exploring how behavior has evolved through the years and how their response to such behavior has changed.

Reflections

Two months after my college graduation and in desperate need of a job, I attended a teacher job fair where I was selected to serve as a first-grade teacher. Void of any experience related to teaching children, I was fortunate to be surrounded by a host of veteran teachers who supported and guided me through my formative years as an educator. The veteran teachers I worked with offered advice related to making learning engaging for students, creating assignments, and planning for instruction effectively. Their expertise helped me to get better faster.

Although we currently live in a society where youth are often celebrated and preferred, the wealth of knowledge that veteran teachers bring to education is invaluable. When veteran teachers can share their experiences and make recommendations related to classroom management, the entire school environment can benefit. Therefore, more emphasis should be placed on the contributions that veteran teachers can offer.

Conclusion

This study's intended purpose was to understand the perceptions of veteran teachers related to disruptive student behavior and effective redirection strategies. This qualitative research utilized a survey and focus group interviews to better understand the experiences of veteran teacher participants. This study revealed that students' disruptive behavior in many third through fifth-grade classrooms significantly reduces the amount of time available for quality

instruction. In addition, this misconduct was noted as a source of teacher stress and burnout that could ultimately have an adverse effect on the teaching force. This research also suggested strategies that veteran teachers deemed were effective in reducing and redirecting disruptive student behavior. These strategies include building positive teacher-student relationships, encouraging student engagement, and the availability of support for teachers.

References

Abdullah, A., & Ismail, S. (2019). A structural equation model describes factors contributing teachers' job stress in primary schools. *International Journal of Instruction*, *12*(1), 1251–1262. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12180a

Akyuz, D., Dixon, J. K., & Stephan, M. (2013). Improving the quality of mathematics teaching with effective planning practices. *Teacher Development*, *17*(1), 205–212. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2012.753939

Alford, B., Rollins, K., Padrón, Y., & Waxman, H. (2016). Using systematic classroom observation to explore student engagement as a function of teachers' developmentally appropriate instructional practices in ethnically diverse pre-kindergarten through second-grade classrooms. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *44*(6), 623–635. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-015-0748-8

Ali, A., & Gracey, D. (2013). Dealing with student disruptive behavior in the classroom: A case example of the coordination between faculty and assistant dean for academics. *Issues in Informing Science & Information Technology*, *10*, 1–15 http://iisit.org/Vol10/IISITv10p001-015Ali0124.pdf

Alpi, K. M., & Evans, J. J. (2019). Distinguishing case study as a research method from case reports as a publication type. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, *107*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2019.615

Anderson, L., & Pearson, C. (1999). Tit for tat: The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management*, *24*(3), 452–472. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.220213

Arturo, C. A. (2013). The psyche as behavior. *Revista Colombiana de Psicología*, *22*(2), 377–387. https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=80429824011

Back, L., Polk, E., Keys, C., & McMahon, S. (2016). Classroom management, school staff relations, school climate, and academic achievement: Testing a model with urban high schools. *Learning Environments Research*, *19*(3), 397–410. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-016-9213-x

Baek, Y., & Touati, A. (2020). Comparing collaborative and cooperative gameplay for academic and gaming achievements. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *57*(8), 2110–2140. https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633118825385

Balli, S. J. (2011). Pre-service teachers' episodic memories of classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(2), 245–251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.004

Barlow, K., Weber, N., Koch, N., & Hendricks, K. (2018). Understanding curricular student expectations in Texas: Readiness standards vs. supporting standards. *Educational Research Quarterly*, *42*(2), 3–43. http://erquarterly.org/index.php?pg=content

Baron, E. B., & Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, B. I. (1992). *Discipline strategies for teachers. Fastback*, *344*. http://teacherlink.ed.usu.edu/yetcres/catalogs/reavis/344.pdf

Barton, P., Coley, R., & Wenglinsky, H. (1998). Order in the classroom: Violence, discipline, and student achievement. *Educational Testing Service.* https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/PICORDER.pdf

Baumsteiger, R. (2017). Looking forward to helping: The effects of prospection on prosocial intentions and behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *47*(9), 505–514. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12456

Bazrafkan, L., & Kalyani, M. N. (2018). Nursing students' experiences of clinical education: A qualitative study. *Investigacion & Educacion En Enfermeria*, *36*(3), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.iee.v36n3e04

Belzile, J. A., & Öberg, G. (2012). Where to begin? Grappling with how to use participant interaction in focus group design. *Qualitative Research*, *12*(4), 459–472. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794111433089

Bender, W. (2017). 20 strategies for increasing student engagement. *Learning Sciences International.* https://www.learningsciences.com/media/catalog/product/2/0/20ise_lookinside.pdf

Bennett, S. V., Brown, J. J., Kirby-Smith, A., & Severson, B. (2013). Influences of the heart: Novice and experienced teachers remaining in the field. *Teacher Development*, *17*(4), 562–576. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2013.849613

Berg, P., & McFarlane, R. (2012). Teacher gin the face of disruptive behaviors and their effects on learning and assessment in an EFL classroom context. *International Journal of Learning*, *18*(9), 55–68. https://doi.org/10.18848/1447-9494/CGP/v18i09/47725

Bergner, R. (2011). What is behavior? And so what? *New Ideas in Psychology*, *29*(2), 147–155. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2010.08.001

Bettini, E., Kimerling, J., Park, Y., & Murphy, K. M. (2015). Responsibilities and instructional time: Relationships identified by teachers in self-contained classes for students with emotional and behavioral disabilities. *Preventing School Failure*, *59*(3), 121–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2013.859561

Blank, R. (2013). Science instructional time is declining in elementary schools: What are the implications for student achievement and closing the gap? *Science Education*, *97*(6), 830–847. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21078

Blank, C., & Shavit, Y. (2016). The association between student reports of classmates' disruptive behavior and student achievement. *AERA Open*, *2*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858416653921

Bradley, E. L. (2014). Choice theory and reality therapy: An overview. *International Journal of Choice Theory & Reality Therapy*, *34*(1), 6–13. https://www.wglasserinternational.org/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/18_IJCTRTFALL2014.PDF

Breshears, E. (2014). Is it time for a U.S. policy to ban corporal punishment of schoolchildren? *International Journal of Educational Reform*, *23*(1), 2–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/105678791402300101

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

Brown, S. (2004). Family structure and child well-being: The significance of parental cohabitation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*(2), 351–367. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2004.00025.x

Bru, D. (2009). Academic outcome in school classes with marked by disruptive pupils. *Social Psychology of Education*, *12*(4), 461–479. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-009-9095-1

Bryan, J., Day-Vines, N., Griffin, D., & Moore-Thomas, C. (2012). The disproportionality dilemma: Patterns of teacher referrals to school counselors for disruptive behavior.

Journal of Counseling & Development, *90*(2), 177–190. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-6676.2012.00023.x

Burchett, H., Mayhew, S., Lavis, J., & Dobrow, M. (2013). When can research from one setting be useful in another? Understanding perceptions of the applicability and transferability of research. *Health Promotion International*, *28*(3), 418–430. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/das026

Burden, P. (2016). *Classroom management: Creating a successful K-12 learning community.* John Wiley & Sons.

Burlaka, V., Kim, Y., Crutchfield, J., Lefmann, T., & Kay, E. (2017). Predictors of internalizing behaviors in Ukrainian children. *Family Relations*, *66*(5), 854–866. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12289

Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, *41*(5), 545–547. https://doi.org/10.1188/14.ONF.545.547

Cavanagh, S., & Huston, A. (2006). Family instability and children's early problem behavior. *Social Forces*, *85*(1), 551–558. https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2006.0120

Charles, C. (1999). *Building classroom discipline.* Addison Wesley Longman.

Chu, E., & Ready, D. (2018). Exclusion and urban public high schools: Short-and long-term consequences of school suspensions. *American Journal of Education*, *124*(4), 479–509. https://doi.org/10.1086/698454

Cihak, D., Kirk, E., & Boon, R. (2009). Effects of classwide positive peer "tootling" to reduce the disruptive classroom behaviors of elementary students with and without disabilities.

Journal of Behavioral Education, *18*(4), 267–278. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10864-009-9091-8

Clark, K. R. (2018). Learning theories: Behaviorism. *Radiologic Technology*, *90*(2), 172–175. http://www.radiologictechnology.org/content/90/2/176.extract

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

Cochran, J. L., & Cochran, N. H. (1999). Using the counseling relationship to facilitate change in students with conduct disorder. *Professional School Counseling*, *2*(5), 395–403. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Using-the-Counseling-Relationship-to-Facilitate-in-Cochran-Cochran/1cb11307f6f2e2981197ca76ad718a9ca6d8f8f6

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.) Sage.

Crone, D. A., Horner, R. H., & Hawken, L. S. (2004). *Responding to problem behavior in schools: The behavior education program*. Guilford Press.

Crowe, S., Creswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *11*, Article 100. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-11-100

Crum, K. I., Waschbusch, D. A., & Willoughby, M. T. (2016). Callous-unemotional traits, behavior disorders, and the student-teacher relationship in elementary school students.

Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, *24*(1), 16–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/1063426615569533

Cruz, R., & Tantia, J. (2017). Reading and understanding qualitative research. *American Journal of Dance Therapy*, *39*(1), 79–92. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10465-016-9219-z

Dahan, O. (2017). The problem of other (group) minds (response to Schwitzgebel). *Philosophia*, *45*(3), 1099–1112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11406-017-9876-2

Davidson, N. S., & Major, C. H. (2014). Boundary crossings: Cooperative learning, collaborative learning, and problem-based learning. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, *25*, 7–55. https://northweststate.edu/wp-content/uploads/files/BoundaryCrossings.pdf

Deb, S., Kumar, A., Holden, G. W., & Rowe, L. S. (2017). School corporal punishment, family tension, and students' internalizing problems: Evidence from India. *School Psychology International*, *38*(1), 60–77. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034316681378

Demirdag, S. (2015). Classroom management and students' self-esteem: Creating positive classrooms. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *10*(2), 191–197. https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2014.2000

Dillenbourg, P. (1999). What do you mean by collaborative learning? In P. Dillenbourg (Ed.), *Collaborative-learning: Cognitive and computational approaches* (pp. 1–19). Elsevier. https://telearn.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00190240/document

Docherty, S., & Sandelowski, M. (1999). Focus on qualitative methods: Interviewing children. *Research in Nursing & Health*, *22*(2), 177–185. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-240X(199904)22:2<177::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-H

Dolan, L., Kellam, S., Brown, C., Werthamer-Larsson, L., Rebok, G., Mayer, L., Laudolff, J., Turkkan, J., Ford, C., & Wheeler, L. (1993). The short-term impact of two classroom-based preventive interventions on aggressive and shy behaviors and poor achievement. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *14*(3), 317–345. https://doi.org/10.1016/0193-3973(93)90013-L

Douglas, J., Moyes, D., & Douglas, A. (2016, September). The impact of disruptive behavior in the classroom: The student perspective. *Education Excellence*, *6*(4), 1–8. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309390995_The_Impact_of_Disruptive_Behavior_in_the_Classroom_the_student_perspective

Driessens, C. M. (2015). Extracurricular activity participation moderates impact of family and school factors on adolescents' disruptive behavioural problems. *BMC Public Health*, *15*(1), 1110. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-2464-0

Duvall, S. F., Jain, S., & Boone, D. (2010). An observational case study of four second grade general education students' academic responding and inappropriate behavior in the presence of a disruptive student with disabilities. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *37*(4), 308–316. http://www.projectinnovation.biz/jip_2006.html

Education Advisory Board (EAB). (2019). Breaking bad behavior: The rise of classroom disruptions in early grades and how districts are responding. *District Leadership Forums*. http://pages.eab.com/rs/732-GKV-655/images/BreakingBadBehaviorStudy.pdf

Eggleton, T. (2001). Discipline in the school. *Eric Digest*, 1–13. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED451554.pdf

Egmir, E., Erdem, C., & Koçyigit, M. (2017). Trends in educational research: A content analysis of the studies published in international journal of instruction. *International Journal of Instruction*, *10*(3), 277–294. https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2017.10318a

Ervin, T., Wilson, A. N., Maynard, B. R., & Bramblett, T. (2018). Determining the effectiveness of behavior skills training and observational learning on classroom behaviors: A case study. *Social Work Research*, *42*(2), 106–117. https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svy005

Espelage, D., Anderman, E. M., Brown, V. E., Jones, A., Lane, K. L., McMahon, S. D., Reddy, L. A., & Reynolds, C. R. (2013). Understanding and preventing violence directed against teachers: Recommendations for a national research, practice, and policy agenda. *American Psychologist*, *68*(2), 75. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031307

Farrell, A., Provenzano, D., Spadafora, N., Marini, Z., & Volk, A. (2016). Measuring adolescent attitudes toward classroom incivility. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, *34*(6), 577–588. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282915623446

Feldmann, L. (2001). Classroom civility is another of our instructor responsibilities. *College Teaching*, *49*(4), 137. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2001.10844595

Flick, U. (2018). *Doing triangulation and mixed methods.* Sage.

Floress, M. T., Rock, A. L., & Hailemariam, A. (2017). The caterpillar game: A classroom management system. *Psychology in the Schools*, *54*(4), 385–403. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22000

Fomby, P., & Cherlin, A. (2007). Family instability and child well-being. *American Sociological Review*, *72*(2), 181-204. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3171291/

Fransen, S. (2013). *A study of student engagement activities, discipline referrals, and student achievement in reading first schools* (Publication No. 3598022) [Doctorate dissertation, Lindenwood University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis Global.

Fusch, P., Fusch, G. E., & Ness, L. R. (2018). Denzin's paradigm shift: Revisiting triangulation in qualitative research. *Journal of Social Change*, *10*(1), 19–32. https://doi.org/10.5590/JOSC.2018.10.1.02

Gage, N. A., Haydon, T., MacSuga-Gage, A. S., Flowers, E., & Erdy, L. (2020). An evidence-based review and meta-analysis of active supervision. *Behavioral Disorders*, *45*(2), 117–128. https://doi.org/10.1177/0198742919851021

Gage, N. A., Scott, T., Hirn, R., & MacSuga-Gage, A. S. (2018). The relationship between teachers' implementation of classroom management practices and student behavior in elementary school. *Behavioral Disorders*, *43*(2), 302–315. https://doi.org/10.1177/0198742917714809

Gale, N., Heath, G., Cameron, E., Rashid, S., & Redwood, S. (2013). Using the framework method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *13*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-13-117

Garcia, A., Ros, R., Hart, K., & Graziano, P. A. (2018). Comparing working memory in bilingual and monolingual Hispanic/Latino preschoolers with disruptive behavior disorders. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *166*(1), 535–548. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2017.09.020

Gershoff, E. T. (2017). School corporal punishment in global perspective: Prevalence, outcomes, and efforts at intervention. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, *22*(sup1), 224–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2016.1271955

Gershoff, E. T., Sattler, K., & Holden, G. (2019). School corporal punishment and its associations with achievement and adjustment. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *63*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2019.05.004

Glossary of Education Reform. (2016). Student engagement. *In great school partnership*. http://edglossary.org/student-engagement/.

Grace Olutayo, B. (2012). Using Glasser's choice theory to foster creativity. *International Journal of Choice Theory & Reality Therapy*, *32*(1), 20–26. https://www.wglasserinternational.org/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/22_IJCTRT_FALL2012.PDF#page=20

Griggs, M., Mikami, A., & Rimm-Kaufman, S. (2016). Classroom quality and student behavior trajectories in elementary school. *Psychology in the Schools*, *53*(7), 690–704. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21941

Grubs, R., & Piantanida M. (2010). Grounded theory in genetic counseling research: an interpretive perspective. *Journal of Genetic Counseling*, *19*(2), 99–111. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10897-009-9270-8

Guardino, C. A., & Fullerton, E. (2010). Changing behaviors by changing the classroom environment. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *42*(6), 8–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/004005991004200601

Haataja, E., Garcia Moreno-Esteva, E., Salonen, V., Laine, A., Toivanen, M., & Hannula, M. S. (2019). Teacher's visual attention when scaffolding collaborative mathematical problem solving. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *86*, 102877. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102877

Hadfield, K., Amos, M., Ungar, M., Gosselin, J., & Ganong, L. (2018). Do changes to family structure affect child and family outcomes? A systematic review of the instability hypothesis. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, *10*(1), 87–110. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12243

Haverinen-Shaughnessy, U., Moschandreas, D. J., & Shaughnessy, R. J. (2011). Association between substandard classroom ventilation rates and students' academic achievement. *Indoor Air*, *21*(2), 121–131. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0668.2010.00686.x

Haydon, T., Hunter, W., & Scott, T. M. (2019). Active supervision: Preventing behavioral problems before they occur. *Beyond Behavior*, *28*(1), 29–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/1074295619835190

Haydon, T., & Kroeger, S. D. (2016). Active supervision, precorrection, and explicit timing: A high school case study on classroom behavior. *Preventing School Failure*, *60*(1), 70–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2014.977213

Horner, R. H., & Macaya, M. M. (2018). A framework for building safe and effective school environments: Positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS). *Pedagogická Orientace*, *28*(4), 663–685. https://doi.org/10.5817/PedOr2018-4-663

Ingersoll, R., & Smith, T. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, *60*(8), 30–33. http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/may03/vol60/num08/The-Wrong-Solution-to-the-Teacher-Shortage.aspx

Irish National Teachers' Organization. (2004). Managing challenging behaviour, guidelines for teachers. *Irish National Teachers' Organization*. https://www.wtc.ie/images/pdf/Classroom_Management/cm13.pdf

Jacobsen, K. (2013). *Educators' experiences with disruptive behavior in the classroom*. Clinical Research Paper, University of St. Thomas, Minnesota. https://ir.stthomas.edu/ssw_mstrp/198/

Jager, J., Putnick, D. L., & Bornstein, M. H. (2017). More than just convenient: The scientific merits of homogeneous convenience samples. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *82*(2), 13–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/mono.12296

Jarvela, S., Jarvenoja, H., & Veermans, M. (2008). Understanding the dynamics of motivation in socially shared learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *47*(2), 122–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2007.11.012

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (2014). Cooperative learning: Improving university instruction by basing practice on validated theory. *Journal on Excellence in University Teaching*, *25*(4), 1–26. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/e2ff/349ff6ca86232e4b463796ba0e2ccfa3102e.pdf?_ga=2.148668215.1214764917.1588528476-159214303.1586897673

Kagan, S., & Kagan, M. (2009). *Kagan cooperative learning.* Kagan.

Kalman, M. (2019). It requires interest, time, patience and struggle: Novice researchers' perspectives on and experiences of the qualitative research journey. *Qualitative Research in Education*, *8*(3), 341–377. https://doi.org//doi:10.17583/qre.2019.4483

Kauppi, T., & Pörhölä, M. (2012a). School teachers bullied by their students: Teachers' attributions and how they share their experiences. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*(7), 1059–1068. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.05.009

Kauppi, T., & Pörhölä, M. (2012b). Teachers bullied by students: Forms of bullying and perpetrator characteristics. *Violence and Victims*, *27*, 396–413. https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.27.3.396

Khuwaja, H., Karmaliani, R., McFarlane, J., & Jewkes, R. (2019). Use of activity-oriented questions in qualitative focus group discussions to explore youth violence in Sindh, Pakistan. *Nursing Practice Today*, *6*(4), 162–166. https://doi.org/10.18502/npt.v6i4.1938

Kincaid, D., & Horner, R. (2017). Changing systems to scale up an evidence-based educational intervention. *Evidence-Based Communication Assessment & Intervention*, *11*(3–4), 99–113. https://doi.org/10.1080/17489539.2017.1376383

Kirkpatrick, B. A., Wright, S., Daniels, S., Taylor, K. L., McCurdy, M., & Skinner, C. H. (2019). Tootling in an after-school setting: Decreasing antisocial interactions in at-risk students. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *21*(4), 228. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300719851226

Krach, S. K., McCreery, M. P., & Rimel, H. (2017). Examining teachers' behavioral management charts: A comparison of class dojo and paper-pencil methods. *Contemporary School Psychology*, *21*(3), 267–275. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-016-0111-0

Kristoffersen, J. H., Kraegpoth, M. V., Nielsen, H. S., & Simonsen, M. (2015). Disruptive school peers and student outcomes. *Economics of Education Review*, *45*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2015.01.004

Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review*, *53*(1), 27–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910120033628

Lapadat, J. (2000). Problematizing transcription: Purpose, paradigm and quality. *Social Research Methodology*, *3*(3), 203–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645570050083698

Latif, M., Khan, U. A., & Khan, A. N. (2016). Causes of students' disruptive classroom behavior: A comparative study. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, *32*(1), 44–52. file:///C:/Users/cslewis/Downloads/139-Article%20Text-323-1-10-20190323.pdf

Lawlor, D. A., Tilling, K., Smith, G. D., & Davey Smith, G. (2016). Triangulation in aetiological epidemiology. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, *45*(6), 1866. https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyw314

Lazzeri, F. (2014). On defining behavior: Some notes. *Behavior & Philosophy*, *42*, 65–82. https://www.behavior.org/resources/866.pdf

Leavy, P. (2017). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches.* Guilford Press.

Lečei, A., & Lepičnik Vodopivec, J. (2014). Implicit theories of educators and William Glasser's choice theory. *Methodological Horizons*, *9*(2), 35–46. https://doi.org/10.32728/mo.09.2.2014.04

Lei, H., Cui, Y., & Zhou, W. (2018). Relationships between student engagement and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *46*(3), 517–528. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.7054

Lekwa, A. J., Reddy, L. A., & Shernoff, E. S. (2019). Measuring teacher practices and student academic engagement: A convergent validity study. *School Psychology*, *34*(1), 109–118. https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000268

Lewis, A. D. (2019). Practice what you teach: How experiencing elementary school science teaching practices helps prepare teacher candidates. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *86*, 102886. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102886

Lipscomb, A. H., Anderson, M., & Gadke, D. L. (2018). Comparing the effects of class dojo with and without Tootling intervention in a postsecondary special education classroom setting. *Psychology in the Schools*, *55*(10), 1287–1301. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22185

Longobardi, C., Badenes-Ribera, L., Fabris, M. A., Martinez, A., & McMahon, S. D. (2019). Prevalence of student violence against teachers: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Violence*, *9*(6), 596–610. https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000202

López Jiménez, J., Valero-Valenzuela, A., Anguera, M., & Díaz Suárez, A. (2016). Disruptive behavior among elementary students in physical education. *Springer Plus*, *5*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-2764-6

Lumadi, R. (2019). Taming the tide of achievement gap by managing parental role in learner discipline. *South African Journal of Education*, *39*(4), S1–S10. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v39ns1a1707

Luo, Y. (2015). Design fixation and cooperative learning in elementary engineering design project: A case study. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *8*(1), 133–146. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1078851.pdf

Maclean-Blevins, A., & Muilenburg, L. (2013, June). Using Class Dojo to support student self-regulation. In *EdMedia+ Innovate Learning* (pp. 1684–1689). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/112192/

MacSuga-Gage, A. S., Simonsen, B., & Briere, D. E. (2012). Effective teaching practices that promote a positive classroom environment. *Beyond Behavior*, *22*(1), 14–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/107429561202200104

Madden, L., & Senior, J. (2018). A proactive and responsive bio-psychosocial approach to managing challenging behaviour in mainstream primary classrooms. *Emotional & Behavioural Difficulties*, *23*(2), 186–202. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632752.2017.1413525

Madill, A., & Sullivan, P. (2018). Mirrors, portraits, and member checking: Managing difficult moments of knowledge exchange in the social sciences. *Qualitative Psychology*, *5*(3), 321–339. https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000089

Malone, J. C. (2017). John B. Watson. Vonk, J. T. Shackelford (eds.). *Encyclopedia of animal cognition and behavior. Living edition*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47829-6_936-1

Mareš, J. (2018). Students' indiscipline in the classroom. *Pedagogická Orientace*, *28*(4), 556–598. https://doi.org/10.5817/PedOr2018-4-556

Martella, R., & Marchand-Martella, N. (2015). Improving classroom behavior through effective instruction: An illustrative program example using SRA FLEX literacy. *Education & Treatment of Children*, *38*(2), 241–271. https://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2015.0010

Martin, J., & Torres, A. (2016). What is student engagement and why is it important? *National Association of Independent Schools.* https://www.nais.org/Articles/Documents/Member/2016%20HSSSE%20Chapter-1.pdf

Martinez, T., & Zhao, Y. (2018). The impact of mindfulness training on middle grades students' office discipline referrals. *Research in Middle Level Education Online*, *41*(3), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1080/19404476.2018.1435840

Masi, G., Milone, A., Brovedani, P., Pisano, S., & Muratori, P. (2018). Psychiatric evaluation of youths with disruptive behavior disorders and psychopathic traits: A critical review of assessment measures. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *91*, 21–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.09.023

Maslov, K. S. (2016). Enmity rather than a competition. *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, *53*(2), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/10610405.2016.1230991

McClellan, C. (2016). Teamwork, collaboration, and cooperation as a student learning outcome for undergraduates. *Assessment Update*, *28*(1), 5–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/au.30045

McDaniel, S., Bruhn, A., & Troughton, L. (2017). A brief social skills intervention to reduce challenging classroom behavior. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, *26*(1), 53–74. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10864-016-9259-y

McDaniel, S. C., & Flower, A. (2015). Use of a behavioral graphic organizer to reduce disruptive behavior. *Education & Treatment of Children (West Virginia University Press)*, *38*(4), 505–522. https://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2015.0016

McLeod, G. (2003). Learning theory and instructional design. *Learning Matters*, *2*(3), 35–43. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0f20/69063f35553917aca882cddfb6cd6e361c3f.pdf

McNaughton-Cassill, M. E. (2013). Is it incivility or mental illness? Understanding and coping with disruptive student behavior in the college classroom. *Journal of Effective Teaching*, *13*(2), 94–108. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1092150.pdf

Meidl, C., & Vanorsdale, C. (2018). Application of PBS through CHAMPS. *Educational Foundations*, *31*(3–4), 27–46. http://www.caddogap.com/periodicals.shtml

Mellor, C., Gaudreault, K., & Fadale, C. (2020). The veteran and the novice: Investigating teacher-coach role conflict from two perspectives. *Physical Educator*, *77*(2), 313–331. https://doi.org/10.18666/TPE-2020-V77-I2-9173

Menzies, H. M., Lane, K. L., Oakes, W. P., Ruth, K., Cantwell, E. D., & Smith-Menzies, L. (2018). Active supervision: An effective, efficient, low-intensity strategy to support student success. *Beyond Behavior*, *27*(3), 153–159. https://doi.org/10.1177/1074295618799343

Merriam-Webster. (2020). *Unabridged dictionary*. https://www.merriam webster.com/dictionary/civility

Middleton, K. V. (2020). The longer-term impact of COVID-19 on K–12 Student learning and assessment. *Educational Measurement, Issues and Practice*, *39*(3), 41–44. https://doi.org/10.1111/emip.12368

Mires, C., & Lee, D. (2017). Calvin won't sit down! The daily behavior report card: A practical technique to change student behavior and increase school-home communication. *Beyond Behavior*, *26*(2), 89–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/1074295617711716

Mitchell, B., Kern, L., & Conroy, M. (2019). Supporting students with emotional or behavioral disorders: State of the field. *Behavioral Disorders*, *44*(2), 70–84. https://doi.org/10.1177/0198742918816518

Morin, A., Arens, A., Maïano, C., Ciarrochi, J., Tracey, D., Parker, P., & Craven, R. (2017). Reciprocal relationships between teacher ratings of internalizing and externalizing

behaviors in adolescents with different levels of cognitive abilities. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, *46*(4), 801–825. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016-0574-3

Mostafa, T. (2017). Is too much testing bad for student performance and well-being? *PISA in Focus*. https://doi.org/10.1787/2109a667-en

Musti-Rao, S., & Haydon, T. (2011). Strategies to increase behavior-specific teacher praise in an inclusive environment. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, *47*(2), 91–97. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451211414187

Nash, P., Schlösser, A., & Scarr, T. (2016). Teachers' perceptions of disruptive behaviour in schools: A psychological perspective. *Emotional & Behavioural Difficulties*, *21*(2), 167–180. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632752.2015.1054670

Nelson, P. (2016). Student-on-teacher violence: A proposed solution. *Brigham Young University Education & Law Journal*, *2016*(2), 309–323. https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1389&context=elj

Nordstrom, T., Ebeling, H., Hurtig, T., Rodriguez, A., Savolainen, J., Moilanen, I., & Taanila, A. (2013). Comorbidity of disruptive behavioral disorders and attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder-indicator of severity in problematic behavior? *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, *67*(4), 240–248. https://doi.org/10.3109/08039488.2012.731431

O'Connor, E. E., Cappella, E., McCormick, M. P., & McClowry, S. G. (2014). An examination of the efficacy of insights in enhancing the academic and behavioral development of children in early grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *106*(4), 1156–1169. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036615

Ohan, J., Cormier, N., Hepp, S., Visser, T., & Strain, M. (2008). Does knowledge about attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder impact teachers' reported behaviors and

perceptions? *School Psychology Quarterly*, *23*(3), 436–449. https://doi.org/10.1037/10453830.23.3.436

Ospina, S., Esteve, M., & Lee, S. (2018). Assessing qualitative studies in public administration research. *Public Administration Review*, *78*(4), 593–605. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12837

Ouyang, M., & Paprock, K. (2006). Teacher job satisfaction and retention: A comparison study between the U.S. and China. *Online submission*. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED492688.pdf

Palmer, K., & Noltemeyer, A. (2019). Professional development in schools: Predictors of effectiveness and implications for statewide PBIS trainings. *Teacher Development*, *23*(5), 511–528. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2019.1660211

Peterson, R. (2005). Ten alternatives to suspension. *Impact*, *18*(2), 10–11. https://ici.umn.edu/products/impact/182/over5.html

Ponte, E., & Twomey, S. (2014). Veteran teachers mentoring in training: Negotiating issues of power, vulnerability and professional development. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, *40*(1), 20–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2013.864015

Pritchard, A. (2008). *Ways of learning: Learning theories and learning styles in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Ramirez, L., Hawkins, R., Collins, T., Ritter, C., Haydon, T., & Codding, R. (2019). Generalizing the effects of group contingencies across instructional settings for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *School Psychology Review*, *48*(1), 98–112. https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR-2017-0122.V48-1

Rijlaarsdam, J., Tiemeier, H., Ringoot, A., Ivanova, M., Jaddoe, V., Verhulst, F., & Roza, S. (2016). Early family regularity protects against later disruptive behavior. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *25*(7), 781–789. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-015-0797-y

Rilling, M. (2000). John Watson's paradoxical struggle to explain Freud. *American Psychologist*, *55*(3), 301–312. https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066X.55.3.301

Rischer, A. D. (2008, November). Management strategies help to promote student achievement. *Education Digest*, *74*(3), 47–49. http://www.eddigest.com/index.php

Romi, S., Lewis, R., Roache, J., & Riley, P. (2011). The impact of teachers' aggressive management techniques on students' attitudes to schoolwork. *Journal of Educational Research*, *104*(4), 231–240. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671003719004

Rosenberg, M., & Jackman, L. (2003). Development, implementation, and sustainability of comprehensive school-wide behavior management systems. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, *39*, 10–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/10534512030390010201

Rouhollahi, M. (2016). Choice theory: Investigating human behavior in four dimensions. *International Journal of Choice Theory & Reality Therapy*, *36*(1), 31–34. https://www.wglasserinternational.org/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/IJCTRT_Fall2016_200.pdf

Rubin, C. M. (2011, November 15). The global search for education: On success. *Education News.* https://www.educationnews.org/education-policy-and-politics/the-global-search-for-education-on-success/

Saari, A. (2019). Out of the box: Behaviourism and the mangle of practice. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *40*(1), 109–121. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2018.1549707

Sahin, A., Almus, K., & Willson, V. (2017). A comparisons of state test performances of public schools and a charter school system in old and new testing in Texas. *Journal of STEM Education: Innovations & Research*, *18*(4), 5–16. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/181985/

Sahin-Sak, I. T., Sak, R., & Tezel-Sahin, F. (2018). Preschool teachers' views about classroom management models. *Early Years: An International Journal of Research and Development*, *38*(1), 35–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2016.1242118

Salvatore, J., & Dick, D. (2018). Genetic influences on conduct disorder. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Review*, *91*(1), 91–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.06.034

Schaefer, L., Long, J. S., & Clandinin, D. J. (2012). Questioning the research on early career teacher attrition and retention. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *58*(1), 106–121. https://cjc-rcc.ucalgary.ca/index.php/ajer/article/view/55559

Scherzinger, M., & Wettstein, A. (2019). Classroom disruptions, the teacher-student relationship and classroom management from the perspective of teachers, students and external observers: A multimethod approach. *Learning Environments Research*, *22*(1), 101–116. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-018-9269-x

Schussler, D. L. (2009). Beyond content: How teachers manage classrooms to facilitate intellectual engagement for disengaged students. *Theory into Practice*, *48*(2), 114–121. https://doi.org/10.1080/0040584090277637

Scott, T. M., Park, K. L., Swain-Bradway, J., & Landers, E. (2007). Positive behavior support in the classroom: Facilitating behaviorally inclusive learning environments. *International Journal of Behavioral Consultation & Therapy*, *3*(2), 223. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0100800

Sezer, S. (2017). Novice teachers' opinions on students' disruptive behaviours: A case study. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER)*, *69*, 199–219. https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2017.69.11

Shernoff, E., Mehta, T., Atkins, M., Torf, R., & Spencer, J. (2011). A qualitative study of the sources and impact of stress among urban teachers. *School Mental Health: A Multidisciplinary Research and Practice Journal*, *3*(2), 59–69. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-011-9051-z

Sherrod, M. D., Getch, Y. Q., & Ziomek-Daigle, J. (2009). The impact of positive behavior support to decrease discipline referrals with elementary students. *Professional School Counseling*, *12*(6), 421–427. https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2010-12.421

Shewark, E., Zinsser, K., & Denham, S. (2018). Teachers' perspectives on the consequences of managing classroom climate. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, *47*(6), 787–802. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-018-9461-2

Shi, M., & Tan, C. Y. (2020). Beyond oral participation: A typology of student engagement in classroom discussions. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, *55*(1), 247–265. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40841-020-00166-0

Shin, H., & Ryan, A. (2017). Friend influence on early adolescent disruptive behavior in the classroom: Teacher emotional support matters. *Developmental Psychology*, *53*(1), 114–125. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000250

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

Simonsen, B., Myers, D., & Briere, D. E. (2011). Comparing behavioral check in/checkout (CICO) intervention to standard practice in an urban middle school setting using an experimental group design. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *13*(1)*,* 31–48. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300709359026

Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (2009). *Engagement as an organizational construct in the dynamics of motivational development.* In K. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation in school* (pp. 223–245). Erlbaum.

Smith, D. E. (2016). Corporal punishment of children in the Jamaican context. *International Journal of Child, Youth & Family Studies*, *7*(1), 27–44. https://doi.org/10.18357/ijcyfs.71201615415

Souroulla, A. V., Panteli, M., Robinson, J. D., & Panayiotou, G. (2019). Valence, arousal or both? Shared emotional deficits associated with attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder and oppositional/defiant-conduct disorder symptoms in school-aged youth. *Biological Psychology*, *140*, 131–140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2018.11.007

Stacks, A. (2005). Using an ecological framework for understanding treating externalizing behavior in early childhood. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *32*(4), 269–278. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-004-0754-8

Stalmeijer, R. E., McNaughton, N., & Van Mook, W. N. (2014). Using focus groups in medical education research: AMEE Guide No. 91. *Medical Teacher*, *36*(11), 923–939. https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2014.917165

Stavros, C., & Westberg, K. (2009). Using triangulation and multiple case studies to advance relationship marketing theory. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, *12*(3), 307–320. https://doi.org/10.1108/13522750910963827

Stewart, S. C., & Evans, W. H. (1997). Setting the stage for success: Assessing the instructional environment. *Preventing School Failure*, *41*(2), 53. https://doi.org/10.1080/10459889709603268

Suffield, J. S. (2017). A leap into the future with choice theory®. *International Journal of Choice Theory & Reality Therapy*, *37*(1), 69–73. https://search.proquest.com/openview/0fa94d8c2ce7ff3b49b7d6745969790d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=1046401

Sun, R. C., & Shek, D. T. (2012). Student classroom misbehavior: An exploratory study based on teachers' perceptions. *Scientific World Journal*, *2012*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1100/2012/208907

Teijlingen, E., & Hundley, V. (2002). The importance of pilot studies. *Nursing standard: Official Newspaper of the Royal College of Nursing*, *16*(40), 33–36. https://doi.org/10.7748/ne2002.06.16.40.33.c3214

Tidwell, A., Flannery, K. B., & Lewis-Palmer, T. (2003). A description of elementary classroom discipline referral patterns. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, *48*(1), 18–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2003.10871075

Umeh, Z., Bumpus, J. P., & Harris, A. L. (2020). The impact of suspension on participation in school-based extracurricular activities and out-of-school community service. *Social Science Research*, *85*, 102354. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2019.102354

U.S. Department of Education. (2000). *The class-size reduction program: Boosting student achievement in schools across the nation. A first-year report* (Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office, September, 2000). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED446349.pdf

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *The condition of education 2005*. U.S. Government Printing Office. https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2005/2005094_Analysis.pdf

Van Der Sijde, P. C., & Tomic, W. (1993). A model for classroom management activities. *Education*, *113*(3), 439–449. https://research.ou.nl/ws/files/996435/A%20MODEL%20FOR%20CLASSROOM%20MANAGEMENT%20ACTIVITIES.pdf

Wagner, N., Mills-Koonce, W., Willoughby, M., Zvara, B., & Cox, M. (2015). Parenting and children's representations of family predict disruptive and callous-unemotional behaviors. *Developmental Psychology*, *51*(7), 935–948. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039353

Walker, H., Ramsey. E., & Gresham, F. (2003). How early intervention can reduce defiant behavior: And win back teaching time. *American Educator*, *27*(4), 1–21. https://www.aft.org/periodical/american-educator/winter-2003-2004/heading-disruptive-behavior

Wallace Jr, J. M., Goodkind, S. G., Wallace, C. M., & Bachman, J. (2008). Racial/ethnic and gender differences in school discipline among American high school students: 1991-2005. *Negro Educational Review*, *59*(1–2), 47–62. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2678799/

Watson, J. B. (1913). Psychology as the behaviorist views it. *Psychological Review*, *20*(2), 158–177. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0074428

Westling, D. L. (2010). Teachers and challenging behavior: Knowledge, views, and practices. *Remedial & Special Education*, *31*(1), 48. https//doi.org/10.1177/0741932508327466

Whitney, T., Lingo, A. S., Cooper, J., & Karp, K. (2017). Effects of shared story reading in mathematics for students with academic difficulty and challenging behaviors. *Remedial & Special Education*, *38*(5), 284–296. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932517698964

Williams, M., & Moser, T. (2019). The art of coding and thematic exploration in qualitative research. *International Management Review*, *15*(1), 45–55. http://www.imrjournal.org/uploads/1/4/2/8/14286482/imr-v15n1art4.pdf

Williford, A. P., & Vitiello, V. E. (2020). Who's in charge? Child behavior predicts teacher subsequent classroom management practice for preschoolers reported to display disruptive behavior. *School Psychology*, *35*(5), 299–310. https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000402

Wood, K. (n.d). Students, teachers and the pressure to achieve: Have we got it back-to-front? *Unimed Living*. https://www.unimedliving.com/education/the-future-of-education/students-teachers-and-the-pressure-to-achieve-have-we-got-it-back-to-front.html

Wüstner, A., Otto, C., Schlack, R., Hölling, H., Klasen, F., & Ravens-Sieberer, U. (2019). Risk and protective factors for the development of ADHD symptoms in children and adolescents: Results of the longitudinal BELLA study. *PLoS ONE*, *14*(3), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0214412

Xu, L., & Yang, Q. (2019). Modeling and analysis on teacher-student relationship. *Discrete Dynamics in Nature & Society*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/5481926

Yang, M., Harmeyer, E., Chen. Z., & Lofaso, B. (2018). Predictors of early elementary school suspension by gender: A longitudinal multilevel analysis. *Children and Youth Service Review*, *93*(1), 331–338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.08.008

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research design and methods* (5th ed.). Sage.

Zaheer, I., Maggin, D., McDaniel, S., McIntosh, K., Rodriguez, B. J., & Fogt, J. B. (2019). Implementation of promising practices that support students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*, *44*(2), 117–128. https://doi.org/10.1177/0198742918821331

Zurawski, L. (2015). Utilizing positive behavioral interventions and supports to reinforce therapeutic practices in the schools. *Perspectives on School-Based Issues*, *16*(1), 4–10. https://doi.org/10.1044/sbi16.1.4

Appendix A: Initial Teacher Eligibility Survey

Initial Teacher Eligibility Survey

Question Title

1. Name

Question Title

2. Gender

- Male
- Female
- N/A

Question Title

3. Which school district are you employed by?

- [redacted]
- [redacted]
- [redacted]
- [redacted]
- N/A

Question Title

4. What grade level did you teach during the 2019- 2020 school year?

- 3rd grade
- 4th grade
- 5th grade
- N/A

Question Title

5. How many years have you served as a full- time classroom teacher? (math, science, social studies and/ or reading)

- less than 5 years
- At least the last 5 consecutive school years (Since the 2015- 2016 school year)
- At least the last 10 consecutive school years (Since the 2010- 2011 school year)
- At least the last 15 consecutive school years (2005- 2006 school year)

Appendix B: Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey

Please answer the following questions related to classroom management strategies.

1.) What classroom management plan/ strategy (if any) do you utilize within your classroom? If so, name the plan/ strategy.

2.) Does your campus implement a campus- wide behavior management plan/ strategy? If so, name the plan/ strategy.

3.) What role do you think student engagement plays in classroom management?

Appendix C: Interview Guide: Teacher Focus Group

- Thank all teachers for agreeing to take part in the focus group session.
- Remind focus group participants the facilitation of an effective session is made possible when everyone respects the opinions and experiences of all respondents.
- Review the results from the Strategies to Address Disruptive Behavior Survey with each focus group.
- Ask each of the following research questions.

Introductory Question: What does disruptive behavior in the class room tell us?

Negative Implications of Disruptive Behavior:

1.) Tell me about some of the negative implications that you see in your classroom due to classroom disruptive behaviors.

- Let's focus on student achievement, how does disruptive achievement effect the disruptive student?
- How does disruptive achievement effect the rest of the students?

Management Techniques for Disruptive Behavior:

2.) What strategies do you use most often to redirect disruptive student behavior?

Ask the participants if there are any last comments related to student disruptive behavior and academic achievement.

Appendix D: IRB Approval Letter

ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY
Educating Students for Christian Service and Leadership Throughout the World

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
320 Hardin Administration Building, ACU Box 29103, Abilene, Texas 79699-9103
325-674-2885

July 20, 2020

Charvelia Lewis
Department of Graduate and Professional Studies
Abilene Christian University

Dear Charvelia,

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board, I am pleased to inform you that your project titled "Veteran Teachers' Perceptions on the Negative Implications of Classroom Disruptive Behavior and Redirection Strategies",

was approved by expedited review (Category 6 & 7) on 7/20/2020 (IRB # 20-085). Upon completion of this study, please submit the Inactivation Request Form within 30 days of study completion.

If you wish to make any changes to this study, including but not limited to changes in study personnel, number of participants recruited, changes to the consent form or process, and/or changes in overall methodology, please complete the Study Amendment Request Form.

If any problems develop with the study, including any unanticipated events that may change the risk profile of your study or if there were any unapproved changes in your protocol, please inform the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and the IRB promptly using the Unanticipated Events/Noncompliance Form.

I wish you well with your work.

Sincerely,

Megan Roth

Megan Roth, Ph.D.
Director of Research and Sponsored Programs

Appendix E: Coding Matrix

Research Question 1: What are the negative implications of student disruptive behavior according to the perspective of the veteran teacher?

Theme	Description	Evidence
Effect on quality Instructional time	The teacher has to stop instruction often to redirect disruptive students. Academic achievement is hindered by disruptive behavior. Depending on the severity of the disruption, the teacher may have to stop instruction to remove the disruptive student from the class or remove non- disruptive students from the classroom setting.	"Lost of instruction… there are many times I've known teachers who have had to evacuate the classroom due to a child's disruptive behavior." "Pop up disruptors also, because they don't see a real consequence happening… the teacher has got to stop teaching to correct the behavior which is a loss of instructional time" "… if there are constant disruptions, you cannot teach period. If you cannot teach, there will be no academic achievement"
Effect on teaching force	Some teachers leave the field of education due to lack of support and the occurrence of disruptive student behavior in the classroom.	"In the case where a continuously disruptive student is in the classroom and administration has done nothing… the teacher morale goes down…" "I think that the long term implication is the ratio of teachers leaving the field, great teachers, because they don't see the return on their teaching and educating students" "And I've seen teachers that could have potentially been good, they end up leaving… because of the administration and how they have done them"

		"I have seen a lot a lot of teachers not make it because of what happens when they have a disruptive class."

Research Question 2: What strategies do veteran teachers use to redirect students' disruptive behavior?

Theme	**Description**	**Evidence**
Build Relationships	Formulate relationships with students through activities such as icebreakers, home visits Begin with clear classroom operation guidelines (rules) Gauge student's demeanor before they enter the classroom (greet students daily, use of mood meter, Peace Corner) "Withitness" (Kounin's model) teachers are constantly aware of student actions within the classroom	"You really want to build that relationship; you can get more out of students" 'At my campus we began building relationships before school starts… we do home visits where we just talk to the student and their families (non- academic discussions). The kids remember that throughout the school year." "I think a good strategy is connecting before you correct… I use it as a teacher philosophy." "Just let me have a conversation outside before the kids walk in and listen to them to see what they're bringing, because every kid brings something in everyday." "I greet them to make that eye to eye contact, so that I can feel what is happening… I can maybe have a conversation, even before school starts while they eat breakfast… As I talk to them, I am making them accountable for something

		and distracting them with something else."
Student Engagement	Small group/ station activities Provide instruction on students' learning level Provide normally disruptive students opportunities for leadership roles within the group setting Requires purposeful planning on the part of the teacher	"Engagement puts the kids in the driver's seat, so they are basically in charge of their learning." "That keeps them engaged too, because they think it's just playing, but they are learning… hands on learning, games and music… just having a good time." "Engaging instruction also helps to keep instruction moving, even with disruptive students in the classroom… fun activities make all students want to be a part of learning."
Teacher Support	Teachers in 3rd- 5th grade often work collaboratively in teaching teams and depend on each other to resolve/address student disruptions	"If I had to choose between a disruptive student or a disruptive coworker, I would prefer the disruptive student. If I have a good team, we can handle disruptive students." "If you have a good team, you can conquer all." "I've learned that it helps when you're on a team and everybody is on the same page… our notebooks are the same, restroom procedures are the same… it cuts down on disruptions."