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This thesis is an account of the experiences of eight elementary school teachers and their perceptions of their own practice in working with students who display behaviour that interferes with their ability to teach. Pre and post self-report measures are compared between the treatment group (N = 8), after experiencing a ten week (once-per-week) Victimless Teaching (VT) treatment program, and a comparison group (N = 24) who did not receive the treatment. The VT program uses both attributional training and classroom management skills as its foundation. A qualitative component was used to gain additional data about the effect the VT program had on the treatment group immediately following the training, and one year later. There was a significant influence of the VT program on the teachers' self-efficacy ratings. Interview data confirmed and expanded the nature of this influence through the teachers' testimony. The implication of the program for inservice and preservice teacher training is discussed in the context of the study's limitations.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This thesis is about teachers’ perceptions of their own efficacy with students who display confrontational, defiant, oppositional behaviour (CDO) and the effect this behaviour has on them. It is also about the malleability of these perceptions subsequent to a specific inservice program developed to increase the teachers’ efficacy perceptions when working with these kinds of students in their classrooms. This study presents both quantitative and qualitative data. In the quantitative section, a study is reported on the effects of a training program called Victimless Teaching (VT), on the pre and post-test scores of eight teachers using a self-report rating scale called the Confrontational, Defiant, Oppositional Perception Scale (CDOPS). This scale was designed to measure the perceptions of teachers’ own efficacy, emotionality, volitional control of students and the teachers’ sense of responsibility for students who display disruptive behaviour in classrooms. The changes in the teachers’ scores on this scale are compared with those of twenty four teachers who did not take part in the VT training program. The results report the development of the CDOPS scale and its reliability. A well-established scale of Personal Teaching Efficacy (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) was also administered. The correlation of scores on this scale with those of the CDOPS were intended to establish the construct validity of the latter.

The qualitative component was added to the study to supply additional information. In this section, the verbatim reports of the eight teachers who participated in the VT training are reported. The reports were derived from interviews conducted at two times, once within the weeks following the VT training and again one year later. In these interviews, teachers describe what they learned from the training program and how they have used it in their classroom practices. This section of the thesis serves to provide the teachers’ own accounts of classroom incidents and their handling of them, and to bring to life the reported differences in teachers’ confidence and skills in dealing with classroom disruptions.

The referent student population used to extract the teachers’ perceptions in this study are referred to as CDO students. This is a non-categorical descriptor for student behaviour and has no empirically-based symptom cluster such as ‘Conduct Disorder’ or ‘Emotionally Disturbed’. In order to establish some validity for the term the author conducted an informal survey of classroom teachers to identify the relevant characteristics of a CDO student. They considered the definition
offered by Lewis, Heflin and DiGangi (1991) and felt it to be appropriate for the type of student whose behaviour was less defined by psychological terms but nonetheless disturbing. The definition is paraphrased as student behaviour that is noticeably different from that which is expected in school or in the community, and is behaviour that is in need of remediation as it interferes with teaching and learning (Lewis, et al., 1991). CDO episodes are teacher/student interactions where CDO behaviours are experienced by teachers when they do not have a full understanding of the broad range of factors that may have prompted the disruption.

**Literature Review**

The literature reviewed below will provide substantiation for the negative effects CDO behaviour has on teachers and it will report on methods of measuring the effect. Three theoretical influences will be elaborated on in this review. Attributional theory (Weiner, Russel & Lerman, 1976; Weiner, 1983) will be used to inform the reader of the paths taken when the observer of a CDO episode forms causal ascriptions to explain the behaviour they are encountering. Secondly, the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1988) will be used to identify to the reader the role of teachers' beliefs and attitudes in the change process. Both these theories will serve as the foundation for the VT training program. Finally, the theoretical construct of teaching self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986; Pajares, 1996; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Guskey & Passaro, 1994) will be used to establish construct validity for the development of the CDOPS.

**Roots of Resistance**

There is some evidence that the regular education initiative (REI) to integrate students with various exceptionalities into mainstream classrooms has not been overwhelmingly embraced by general education teachers (Phillips, Allred, Brulle, & Shank, 1990; Pullis, 1991; Landrum & Kauffman, 1992). The unwillingness of these general education teachers has been shown to moderate with some exceptionalities and intensify with others. Phillips et al. (1990) reports that their survey of Illinois teachers indicated that this hesitation to serve particular students was most extreme for students exhibiting behaviour disorders. Conduct disorders correlate negatively with classroom competence and task orientation (Pullis, 1991) and pupils who are disruptive are reported to be among the greatest contributors to occupational stress for those involved in education (Frank & McKenzie, 1993; Kindsvatter & Levine, 1980; Pik, 1981; Sharp, 1984;
It is not surprising that teachers have hesitated to embrace REI. Anxiety might be generated by issues of professional efficacy in working with behavioural exceptionalities. Many general education teachers feel less 'able' to work with students who are behaviourally challenging than other populations of children (Ames, 1983; Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981; Rohrkemper & Brophy, 1983; Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1987; Phillips, Allred, Brulle & Shank, 1990). The push for mainstreaming exceptional students however, has increased the probability of general education teachers, who may be less predisposed to dealing with these types of students, to come in contact with a variety of exceptionalities. These teachers, although skilled in other areas, may not be as skilled or as experienced in dealing with behaviourally challenging students and may perceive themselves as 'less able' to provide a social and psychological environment conducive to learning (Brophy & Good, 1974; Rock, Rosenberg & Carran, 1994).

**Differentiated Teaching**

Negative learning environments have been studied under differentiated teaching behaviour. Covert rejection through differentiated teaching behaviour with children with learning disabilities (LD) who display aberrant behaviour characteristics have been noted (Siperstein & Goding, 1983; Siperstein & Goding, 1985; Sidel & Vaughn, 1991). Teachers have been observed spending a greater proportion of their instructional time with high achieving students, and a greater proportion of their classroom management interactions over behavioural issues with low achieving students (Wang, 1983). Studies of the 'rejection group' indicated the presence of a 'halo effect' as teachers' notions about achievement expectations of this group were far more pessimistic than objective testing scores indicated (Willis & Brophy, 1974). DeStefano,

---

1^For a more complete account of differentiated teaching behaviour see Pilling and Pringle (1978).

2^The Rejection Group is defined as the group of students that teachers would like to eliminate from their classroom rosters. This group was studied and reported in Brophy and Good (1974).

3^A Halo Effect is defined as the attribution of unconfirmed characteristics based on confirmed characteristics (Willis & Brophy, 1974).
Wang and Gordon (1984) report that teachers regularly overestimate the ability of students with positive temperament patterns and underestimate the pupils with negative temperament traits. The adequate preparation of these teachers for the task they face could be forestalled by deeply entrenched, negative attitudes toward these students (Brophy & Good, 1974; Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981; Brophy and Evertson, 1976). Perhaps their lack of success with these students tends to inhibit their professional self-efficacy (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Siperstein & Goding, 1983) by interfering with their image of themselves as competent practitioners.

On another level, students exhibiting CDO behaviour may not be viewed as legitimate 'victims' of any viable disorder or any emotional catastrophe. On the contrary, some teachers tend to see these students as acting quite wilfully (Pullis, 1991), vandals if you will, defacing and rejecting what is provided for them. They are unable to legitimize the possible motives for CDO behaviour as symptomatic of more obscure etiologies like a dysfunctional family situation or a negative self-image.

In summary, teacher-held attitudes toward students exhibiting behaviour disorders appear to impair the ability of some teachers to objectively impart skills and knowledge in a warm and nurturing environment, and evaluate the progress of these pupils accurately, unaffected by conscious or subconscious bias.

**Effects of CDO Behaviour on Teachers**

Why does CDO behaviour evoke such strong feelings? The cultural void that exists between 'misbehaving students' and some high achieving adult teachers is enough to place strains on the relationship (Kozleski, Sands & French, 1993; Burstein, Cabello & Hamann, 1993). Some literature tends to suggest CDO behaviour interferes with the image teachers have of themselves as reasonable, sensitive people (Pik, 1981). The stereotypic, positive posture many teachers strive to project (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) may be compromised during a CDO episode. Escalating emotionality and a loss of control have been reported in connection with CDO experiences (Kindsvatter & Levine, 1980; Pik, 1981; Sharp, 1984). In Freudian terms, when our "narcissism is pricked" (Fromm, 1980, p.51) we become vulnerable and can respond with the extremes of emotions mentioned above (Fromm, 1980). When these emotions are acted upon, they can take the form of "...attack, retaliation or self-justification " (Kindsvatter & Levine, 1980, p. 691), or "...fear, anger, torment, embarrassment, anguish, hatred." (Sharp, 1984, p. 119).
It is helpful to consider the effect of CDO behaviour on teachers within the context of self-perception. Some theorists such as Harter (1986, 1989) visualize self-perception as a dynamic mechanism that can be kept relatively stable if our ability to make realistic evaluations of our various attributes and to perform within those parameters is not impaired. Conversely, if this is restricted, if something should distance us from the domains we value and our performance within those domains, lowered levels of self-perception would prevail. When self-evaluative judgements are made they elicit affective responses and these responses can mediate subsequent behaviour (Harter, 1989). Depression and anger has been mentioned as an expected affective response to a self-deprecating judgement about a valued domain within the self-concept (Harter, 1989). Adults who can 'discount' the value of the self-depricating judgement can minimize the negative effect it has on them. However, if they are unable to do so, the emotions mentioned above might be evident (Harter, 1989). In this way, teachers who value specific attributes that pertain to good teaching, but are unable to demonstrate those attributes, or are pushed into behaving in ways that are completely contrary to them may find themselves flooded with negative affect (ie. anger and depression).

The expression of anger or the suppression of it can generate a feeling of helplessness, especially when it fails to restore a sense of control over the situation (Tavris, 1989). People who have a strong need for approval are especially vulnerable to this side-effect of expressed anger (Tavris, 1989). CDO youngsters are usually expert at evoking angry responses in teachers. Unfortunately angry responses are associated with loss of control rather than the restoration of it (Kinsvatter & Levine, 1980; Pik, 1981; Sharp, 1984).

Exacerbating the problem further may be the ineffective support environment that the physical context of the classroom provides. Harter found correlations with the amount of social support one had and the corresponding level of self-worth (Harter, 1989). She also noticed differences in the degree of influence a particular source of support had over another. More specifically, she found that support from co-workers was far more influential in bolstering self-worth than support from close family or friends. Teachers may be restricted in their ability to garner support from their co-workers (Lyon, Vassen & Toomey, 1989) because of their rather unique operational environment. Opportunities for peer-to-peer interactions are compartmentalized (ie. recess, lunch break, etc.) and may not be available during times when
support would be most needed (ie. when the classroom doors are shut). Given the importance of this interaction and its influence on self-worth (Harter, 1989), we can see with increasing clarity the vulnerability of some teachers.

In summary then, students who display challenging behaviour are generally not well accepted by regular classroom teachers. Such teachers often find it difficult to be objective with these students and begrudge exercising their responsibility towards them. Interactions with these students have the potential to give rise to intense emotionality which may be incongruent with the way teachers would like to be perceived. This has the potential for reducing teachers' self-esteem and contributing to an overall sense of anxiety.

**Attributional Ascriptions**

Central to this thesis is the theoretical work of Weiner, Russell and Lerman (1976) on attributional ascriptions. Weiner et al.'s (1976) model was later expanded to include the role of affect and perceptions of causation in mediating help-giving (Weiner, 1983). The author is drawing upon this model to explain the range of emotions observers of CDO behaviour hold in connection with the behaviour and their subsequent response to it. This theory also forms the foundation of the VT training. The reader may wish to refer to Figure 1 as a guide.

Attributional theory distinguishes between stable and unstable elements of causation (Weiner, et al., 1976). A stable element, as the name would suggest, has its parameters strictly defined and is perceived to be immutable, whereas an unstable element can fluctuate from one instance to the next. In behavioural terms, 'ability' might be considered stable and 'effort' unstable. Placed in a social context, one's ability to behave appropriately might be severely restricted due to social, environmental, cultural, emotional, and/or biological limitations and be very much removed from the volitional control of the person. This would make it 'stable' in the sense that it would be perceived to be beyond the control of the person to alter it. However, one's effort to behave appropriately might be perceived to ebb and flow, somewhat whimsically, and be subject to volitional control therefore making it 'unstable'.

The perception of these elements, as stable or unstable, is critical to defining the response in a potentially confrontational interaction. Attributional theory suggests such perceptions that people act on are in accordance to the motivating influences we ascribe to the behaviours, referred to as causal ascriptions. (Weiner, 1983; Frieze, Francis, & Hanusa, 1983). Weiner
(1983) describes the ascription sequence as observing an event, thinking about a causal attribution to explain it, followed by an affective response and then by a subsequent action. The attribution tells us what to feel and the feeling tells us what to do. Teachers can ascribe a full range of motives for observed behaviour, from wilfulness to physical or intellectual infirmity. According to Frieze, et al. (1983) and Weiner (1983) these ascriptions evoke affective responses which are consistent with the observer's subjective appraisal of the situation. In classroom contexts these appraisals and the corresponding affect mediate judgements of help-giving. When failure is seen as due to internal, controllable (ie. effort) attributions, a stronger affective response occurs and help is more likely to be witheld. Alternatively, if failure is seen as due to uncontrollable (ie. ability) attributions, help is more likely to be forthcoming. Moving from an academic to a behavioural context, if teachers attribute the behaviour to be within the volitional control of the person misbehaving, attributional theory would dictate the ascription of deliberateness and subsequent feelings of anger would result inhibiting empathy responses and encourage defensive posturing (Weiner, 1983; Rohrkemper, & Brophy, 1983).

Achieving an understanding of this process through attributional training may serve as an important bridge for teachers when they attempt to unravel the dynamics of a CDO episode. 'Hard-science' explanations such as the construct identified as 'Emotional Intelligence' (Goleman, 1995) may prove to be more viable and allow teachers to use 'objective' language to interpret the experience. Rooted in neurological science, authors in this field have discovered that the emotional mind can actually override the influence of the rational mind when 'threatening' sensory input is processed (Goleman, 1995; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Goleman (1995) explains that auditory and visual sensory input travels in two paths, a short route and a longer route. The short route has this input connecting right to the emotional center of the brain, the amygdala. The longer route involves a visit to the prefrontal cortex and then on to the amygdala. The emotional mind has the power to act first and either decides to suppress an emotional reaction (as in the case of a non-emergency) and allow the sensory input to be processed through the rational center of the brain, or to act on the input (as in the case of a perceived emergency) in an emotional way. Goleman (1995) points out that this neurological process may have been quite adaptive in primitive settings where quick, rather extreme responses would fend off or allow escape from, potential dangers. However, in more contemporary settings, strong emotional responses to
Figure: 1 Attribution Theory Model
perceived threats can be damaging to social relations, especially when they are in response to 'false alarms'. When circumstances are such that a more reasoned response is called for, the emotional mind allows the interplay of cognition and the life experiences stored in memory to prescribe the appropriate action (Goleman, 1995). This kind of 'objective' neuropsychological theory might provide an explanation for how we differ in making judgements about intentionality in interpreting a CDO episode.

Teachers' perceptions of problem ownership have been shown to promote attributions of intentionality. In Rohrkemper and Brophy's (1983) study of 93 experienced elementary school teachers, problem behaviours that were perceived to be teacher-owned problems were more likely to generate attributions of wilfulness. A student who repeatedly ignores a request by a teacher constitutes a teacher-owned problem whereas a student arguing with another student over a stolen item would be a student-owned problem. Rohrkemper and Brophy found teacher-owned problems tended to increase the subjectiveness in the teachers' interpretations of the student's motives. This study suggests more objective attributions, such as the possibility of the student having hearing difficulties, would be less likely to be selected as a probable explanation for the failure to respond to a teacher's request.

Elapsed time may contribute to the teacher's ability to adopt an objective perspective. In an essay on the attributional dynamics of construing misbehaviour, Sharp (1984) suggests that perceptions of misbehaviour are not stable and changes can occur from 'during' interpretations to 'after' interpretations. The element of elapsed time when inserted into the theoretical model as a mediating influence, may allow opportunities for the observer to alter his/her ascriptions. This would suggest that a teacher would be more likely to view a misbehaving student in the broader context of the student's family, school history, aptitude for social judgements after an altercation than during it.

In summary, attributional theory may explain divergent teacher responses to misbehaviour. This theory suggests that teachers who view offending students as possessing immutable characteristics are less likely to be objective in forming an opinion about a student's behaviour than a teacher who views the misbehaviour in broader context of his/her social/emotional development. Subjectiveness is more likely to guide teachers' assessment of misbehaviour when the misbehaviour is perceived to be directed at them as in the case of a
teacher-owned problem. Assistance offered to the offending student may be jeopardized when misbehaviour is viewed as intentional and directed at the teachers themselves. Assessment of misbehaviour may fluctuate with elapsed time.

Teaching Beliefs and Attitude Change

It would be overly simplistic to suggest that teachers' interactions with students who display CD0 behaviours could be improved by encouraging teachers to explore alternately viable etiologies for the behaviour. Convincing an otherwise reticent teacher that a particular student's motives are rooted in a dysfunctional family, a traumatic event or any other nonvolitional ascription of causation would most likely not be enough to alter his/her practice with these students. Information about a situation or about a particular student is not necessarily received as impartial, objective data, but rather it filters through the deeply entrenched layers of beliefs and attitudes taking on a subjective quality, opening the door for biased appraisals and errant judgements (Bandura, 1986; Pajares 1992, 1996). Such biases are multifaceted and influenced by the convergence of many factors. In addition to sociological factors (ie. culture, ethnicity, family background, socio-economic status, etc.) teachers' day-to-day interactions are influenced by their own particular experiences as students themselves (Pajares, 1992), the educational experiences they received as part of their training (Ross, Cousins & Gadalla, 1995; Rojewski & Pollard, 1993) and their experiences of success or failure with the population of students with whom they are interacting (Bandura, 1986; Pajares, 1996). The sum of these experiences defines the attitudes and beliefs of teachers as they encounter the students they serve.

Deeply imbedded in the interpretation of events is the rather multi-dimensional and a somewhat variable construct of beliefs and belief systems. Bandura (1986), a major theorist in the field of human agency elaborates on the social/cognitive mechanisms that control beliefs and subsequent action. Generally, beliefs are formed as a result of direct personal experiences and/or vicariously from observing the actions of others. Aversive experiences tend to promote beliefs in one's lack of efficacy to control painful outcomes. This results in fear arousal and defensive conduct. Gains in averting painful outcomes tend to reinforce defensiveness. Beliefs about the aversive experience become entrenched when this happens and are difficult to eliminate. Bandura (1986) holds that only powerful disconfirming experiences or significant modeling by a perceived 'expert' can serve to erode the belief.

Chapter One
A central focus in this paper is to identify the role of dysfunctional beliefs on attitude formation about students who display CDO behaviour. Bandura (1986) posits that dysfunctional beliefs arise from coincidental associations that are interpreted as causal associations. The potential for misjudgement rises when the actor operates on the basis of dysfunctional beliefs. Inaccurate, incomplete, irrelevant or unreliable knowledge forms the basis for decision making and subsequent action in situations like this. Bandura (1986) claims that opportunities for misjudgement abound in stressful situations. Those who are prone towards high emotionality are most likely to be associated with errant judgement.

"...they tend to use what they do know in ways that lead them to overestimate the validity of their judgements. They favour confirmatory evidence but disregard contradictory evidence." (Bandura, 1986, p.223)

Beliefs are thought to form as atom-like constellations of 'attitudes' and are hierarchial in nature (Pajares, 1992). Several inconsistent beliefs about the same object could be sustained with the more centrally held belief dominating (Pajares, 1992). Thus a teacher may feel that students need rigid discipline in their schooling but at the same time recognize and admire their need for playfulness. This teacher might scold and reprimand students for undisciplined behaviour if it occurred in an inappropriate context, but may also regard the event with fondness and as something to be appreciated in children. In this way, the prominence of discipline over playfulness dictates the action taken. Attempts to predict this teacher's actions on the basis of his/her stated beliefs would be confounded by the contradictory nature of those beliefs. Teachers often experience situations where they do not have a fully developed schemata to interpret an event knowledgeably and are forced to rely on their belief system because they are unsure of what knowledge is appropriate to apply to their particular situation (Pajares, 1992). Many pieces of knowledge could be relevant and support subsequent action but there is no way of knowing for sure. So the problem of 'what to do' is left to their belief system which is often biased and unreliable (Bandura, 1986) making it professionally unreliable for the many thousands of interpersonal contacts that are made in teaching (Pajares, 1992).

The aspect of teachers' beliefs under consideration in this thesis is efficacy beliefs. Efficacy beliefs are beliefs about outcome expectancies when specific actions are performed (Bandura, 1986). They determine the effort people put into tasks, how well they will persevere

Chapter One
when they experience difficulties and how resilient they will be in adverse situations (Pajares, 1996). If teachers feel that there is something they can do to affect a more positive outcome in a student they are more likely to perform that action. This is referred to as Teaching Efficacy (Ross, et al., 1995) or Personal Teaching Efficacy (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). The predictive value inherent in this construct supports successful teaching practice generally. Teachers who have high teaching efficacy adopt challenging goals, try harder to achieve them, persist when they encounter obstacles and develop coping mechanisms to manage their emotional states (Ross, et al., 1995). Understanding how beliefs and attitudes translate into teaching behaviour and identifying ways to foster the development of functional beliefs and attitudes has been the focus of many researchers (Allinder, 1994; Ajzen, 1988; Landrum & Kauffman, 1992; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Jordan & Silverman, 1991; Jordan, Kircaali-iftar & Diamond, 1993; Jordan, Lindsay, & Stanovich, 1994; Pajares, 1992; Stanovich, 1994; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Teacher efficacy scales have evolved (Ashton & Webb, 1982; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Guskey & Passaro, 1994; Stanovich, 1994; Wolfolk & Hoy, 1990) that attempt to measure a teacher's sense of their ability to be effective with at-risk populations of children.

The Gibson and Dembo (1984) scale identified a two factor construct of teaching efficacy; Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) and General Teaching Efficacy (GTE). PTE is the perceived ability of the individual teacher to affect a positive outcome in the student, and GTE is the perceived ability of teachers generally to affect a positive outcome in the student in spite of out-of-school constraints. The two factors have a weak negative correlation (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) thus allowing for a high level of one but not necessarily the other. The predictive quality of either factor might be predicated on the specificity of the teaching situation under appraisal (Pajares, 1996). Guskey and Passaro (1994) reassessed the Gibson and Dembo (1984) data and found the factor distribution to be less dichotomous than originally reported. Guskey and Passaro (1994) suggest that the Teaching Efficacy measure developed by Gibson and Dembo (1984) reflects the relative contribution of internally oriented beliefs (PTE), and externally oriented beliefs (GTE) have to the total construct Teacher Efficacy. Each is independent of the other. As these authors note however the construct is an incomplete one (Guskey & Passaro, 1994).

There is support for conceptualizing Teaching Efficacy as a specific construct as opposed to a more general one (Pajares, 1996a, 1996b; Ross, et al., 1995). Within-teacher variances were
observed in Ross et al.'s (1995) study. Teachers' perception of student engagement, class size and preparation for teaching the subject all accounted for varying Teaching Efficacy scores within individual respondents. In other words, Teaching Efficacy could fluctuate with the teaching circumstances encountered. Because of this lack of constancy in the Teaching Efficacy measure, domain-specific measures would probably provide more accurate empirical information.

Researchers intent on validating specific constructs that relate to aspects of self-efficacy have used Teaching Efficacy measures for this purpose. Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) adapted the Gibson and Dembo (1984) scale for their study of preservice teachers' beliefs about classroom control. Using a dimensional scale ranging from custodial (very controlling) to humanistic (less controlling), they found high GTE teachers to be less custodial. Jordan et al. (1991) developed their restorative/preventive (R/P) construct, later renamed pathognomonic/interventionist construct (Jordan, Lindsay & Stanovich, 1997) to assess the belief systems of teaching personnel in providing service to exceptional students. Restorative teachers were characterized as seeing the 'problem' as residing in the student, whereas preventively oriented teachers visualized the problem as residing within the child's environment. This scale was later validated in a subsequent study (Jordan, Kircaali-Iftar, & Diamond, 1993) showing that high scores on the PTE scale correlated significantly with scores toward the preventive end of the R/P scale.

In summary, when teachers observe classroom events their appraisal of those events is essentially a subjective one in spite of their best efforts to remain objective. Their objectivity is compromised by the many divergent beliefs and attitudes that impinge on less biased appraisals. Part of their subjectiveness flows from a perception of their own efficacy to alter the outcome of the classroom event by acting in a prudent and specific way. For the purpose of this paper this is referred to as Teaching Efficacy. Measures of Teaching Efficacy have emerged that relate to actual teaching behaviour. The construct of Teaching Efficacy is evolving though and researchers in the field are finding that Teaching Efficacy is more accurately identified when measures of it have sufficient specificity to accurately reflect the factors that account for the variances they have been observing.
CHAPTER TWO

Method

Why this study is needed

If teachers' perceptions of student misbehaviour can be altered to include a broader, more ecological perspective, and if their sense of their own Teaching Efficacy could be made more positive through a process of skills training, a benefit to teacher development would be realized. Inservice initiatives intent on improving the interactions of teachers with students displaying CDO behaviour should incorporate the participants' understanding of their own beliefs and attitudes and how these same beliefs and attitudes influence their teaching behaviour. The less 'professional' beliefs and attitudes should be challenged in 'safe' forums of contemplative reflection (Gersten, Vaughn, Deshler & Schiller, 1997). It has been suggested that skill development has a reciprocal relationship with Teaching Efficacy (Ross, et al., 1995). If this is true well designed programs should address both in the professionalizing process through a well supported, collaborative framework (Gersten, et al., 1997; Stanovich, 1996). The VT training program (the independent variable) used in this thesis incorporates these qualities.

The measurement of belief orientation toward students who display CDO behaviours in particular, and the link this hypothetical construct might have to actual teaching behaviour is not well represented in the literature. Only one study (Rohrkemper & Brophy, 1983) has projected this intent. Through vignettes depicting CDO-type behaviour and interviews with teachers these authors attempted to isolate teachers' causal attributions for the behaviour and corresponding teacher action through follow-up interviews. Although this study was methodologically weak, lacking a control group and a reliable measure of both beliefs/attitudes and teaching efficacy, it examined the relationship between teacher efficacy and their behaviour with students exhibiting behaviour problems.

Self-perceptions of teacher efficacy has been reported to be mediated by student groupings based on ability (Guskey & Passaro, 1994). Ross et al. (1995) identified some factors that accounted for within-teacher variances in their study. Perceptions of student engagement, class size, preparedness and the memory of past successes or failures with specific classes mediated Teaching Efficacy. Ross et al. (1995) report that high levels of Teacher Efficacy could be anticipated with teachers who had orderly students and lower levels with teachers having
disorderly ones. This suggest that the construct of Teacher Efficacy may have a specificity about it that requires an equally specific measure to detect variations. Teachers could report high levels of Teaching Efficacy, but if the context is altered so that the referential population of students is of low ability, or problematic in some other way, these teachers may adjust their responses to the question items accordingly. For the purposes of this study, a measure of teacher efficacy that is specific to students exhibiting CDO behaviours is required to evaluate the effectiveness of the VT program.

What should the content of this measure incorporate? Conceptually, perceptions of Teaching Efficacy incorporate attitudes and beliefs about roles and responsibilities of teachers teaching exceptional children (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Guskey & Passaro, 1994; Jordan-Wilson, et al., 1991; Jordan et al., 1993, 1994; Stanovich, 1994). Beliefs and attitudes about teaching exceptional students have been shown to fall on the restorative/preventive dimensional scale mentioned previously (Jordan-Wilson, et al., 1991; Jordan et al., 1993), more recently renamed the pathognomonic/interventionist (P/I) scale (Jordan et al., 1997; Stanovich & Jordan, 1998). Teachers with interventionist perspectives view 'failure' in the broader context of the instructional environment and external to the student's volitional control. These teachers adapt instruction to reduce the influence of negative factors in the environment. Pathognomonically oriented teachers view the 'failing' student more endogenously. The conditions that promote interventionist orientations are gradually becoming clearer. The least efficacious dimension, the pathognomonic one, can be altered so that teachers holding this perspective can become more 'helpful' especially when such teachers work in interventionist oriented schools led by like-minded principals (Jordan, et al., 1994; Stanovich, 1994). Teachers with previously-held pathognomonic perspectives may be helped by training them toward interventionist perspectives about students exhibiting CDO behaviours, which in tum could alter their sense of teaching efficacy with these same students.

The instrument developed by the author (the CDOPS), has incorporated the components reviewed in the literature above. In addition to the items directly relating to Teaching Efficacy, the CDOPS also taps teachers' perceptions of students' volitional control when exhibiting disturbing behaviour, the teachers' emotionality during and after a CDO episode, and their sense of professional responsibility for correcting CDO behaviour.

The VT program is designed to provide training over a period of time that incorporates
belief orientation (Allinder, 1994; Pajares, 1992; Kozlewska, Sands & French, 1993; Rohrkemper & Brophy, 1983; Tatum, 1992) coupled with skill development specific to CDO behaviour and provided in a collegial supportive framework (Gersten, Vaughn, Deshler and Schiller, 1997; Jordan et al., 1993, 1994; Stanovich, 1994; Stanovich & Stanovich, 1997; Wong, 1997).

Pedagogical innovation and the willingness and/or ability of the teaching community to embrace such innovation has come under consideration in the past (Fullan, 1990 & 1992) and more recently (Gersten, Vaughn, Deshler, & Schiller, 1997; Stanovich & Stanovich, 1997; Wong, 1997). Gersten et al. (1997) claims that there is an epistemological gulf between educational researchers who propose innovations and the practising teachers charged with the responsibility for implementing the proposed innovations. This gulf is partly to blame for the rejection by teachers of innovations generated by researchers. Gersten et al. (1997) identifies violations of specific principles involved in the planning of educational change as the culprit here. Ajzen (1998), Pajares (1992), Stanovich and Stanovich (1997) have identified the importance of addressing the entrenched belief systems of teachers as they are being asked to consider a planned change initiative. Stanovich and Stanovich (1997) explain that change in practice must be predicated on allowing opportunities for belief shifts where "...teachers are free to accept, modify, or even reject findings according to their adequacy or appropriateness for the classroom setting" (Stanovich & Stanovich, 1997, p. 479) if an intended change is to be universally adopted.

Research Questions

The current study has as its objective, to assess the effectiveness of a specifically designed inservice training program, Victimless Teaching, to significantly improve teachers' perceptions of their own efficacy while working with CDO students. The following research questions arise from this objective.

1. What are the relationships among teachers' perceptions of their own Personal Teaching Efficacy and a) their teaching efficacy while working with CDO students b) their emotionality while working with CDO students c) their perception of the student's volitional control, and d) their sense of responsibility for CDO students?

2. Can teachers significantly improve their sense of efficacy about, their emotionality towards, their sense of confidence about and their sense of responsibility for
working with CDO students through participation in the Victimless Teaching program?

**Procedures**

The reader may wish to refer to Figure 2 as a guide to trace the various phases of the study. This study is a pre/post treatment study. The subjects were divided into two groups; a comparison group (n=24) and a treatment group (n=8). Pre-test measures of Gibson and Dembo’s (1984) Teacher Efficacy Questionnaire (TEQ) and the Confrontational, Defiant, Oppositional Perception Scale (CDOPS) were administered to both groups. Post-test measures of the CDOPS were administered to both groups following a 10 week Victimless Teaching (VT) training program. Special procedures were administered to assure anonymity of the respondents. Participants were given a package containing the TEQ and two CDOPS measures (pre & post) along with a tear-off sticker with no identifying marks on it. The package was presented in a plain manilla envelope. All three of these components were numbered identically. After the two pretest measures were completed the participants were directed to place their completed forms in the envelope, seal them and place the tear-off sticker over the seal and sign it.

Arrangements were made to begin the VT training with the teachers who volunteered following the initial session described above. The VT program format proceeded as follows. An initial introductory session was presented to a group of teachers. This initial session introduced the participants to an examination of belief systems and how these systems surface as actions in teaching behaviour. Suggestions for increasing teaching efficacy with CDO students were presented in a general format. Teachers who were interested in further exploration of these techniques were encouraged to commit to a once-a-week sequence of 30-40 minute sessions of VT training for 8-10 weeks. Teachers who volunteered for these subsequent sessions were presented with a topic for consideration each week and were given an assignment to be carried out in their teaching practice over the following week. The beginning of each session involved a report on their experiences with the technique over the preceding week. The author intended to establish a mentoring relationship with the teachers as they gained familiarity with the procedures. In-class modelling, observation and coaching were offered to interested participants. To achieve optimization, the VT program is provided to teachers in the context of their own teaching culture. Realistic classroom topics, manageable components, mentoring support, active participation,
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Figure 2: Study Design
guided reflection and collegial feed-back is considered ideal for achieving optimal change in teaching behaviour (Fullan, 1990; Gersten et al., 1997; Stanovich & Stanovich, 1997; Wong, 1997).

At the conclusion of the VT training sessions the sealed envelopes were returned to the participants in both groups. Follow-up interviews were conducted with the treatment group within a month of completing the VT training. A second interview was conducted one year later to assess the long term implications of the VT training on the teachers’ reflections about their beliefs and practices following training.

The Instruments:

Teacher Efficacy Questionnaire (TEQ): A subscale of the TEQ (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) measuring Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) was used for the study to assess the relationship this previously established factor has with those identified in the CDOPS measure (see below). In their analysis of the TEQ Guskey and Passaro (1994) define PTE as an internal orientation of a teacher to hold “…perceptions of personal influence, power and impact in teaching and learning situations.” (Guskey & Passaro, 1994, p. 639) Adaptations of the scale have been used extensively (Allinder, 1994; Johnston, 1993; Jordan, Kircaali-Iftar & Diamond, 1993; Jordan, Lindsay & Stanovich, 1997; Wolfolk & Hoy, 1990). The version of the TEQ used by the author in the current study employs 21 question items that tap PTE and GTE (General Teaching Efficacy, see Appendix B). A forced polarity Likert-type scale with 6 response categories ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree was used in this measure. The PTE subscale, represented by 10 question items was used for the purpose of this investigation. The remaining items of the original scale, and the GTE subscale were discarded because of their questionable validity (Guskey & Passaro, 1994). Questions like “When a student does better than usual, many times it is because I exerted a little extra effort” and “If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him” reflect the PTE subscale with its internal orientation which Guskey and Passaro (1994) demonstrate as having good validity.

Confrontational, Defiant, Oppositional Perception Scale (CDOPS): This instrument was developed by the author to measure the effectiveness of the VT training. Preliminary forms of the CDOPS were field tested with approximately 120 teachers, educational assistants and youth-
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care workers before the final form was established. These field tests involved interviews with some respondents to establish the face validity for the question items following viewing of two video vignettes used to simulate a CDO episode. The vignettes portray the following. The first is about an angry girl, about age 12, whose body language elicits hostility. The girl has difficulty complying to the instructions provided by the teacher and a confrontation ensues. The second, depicts a young man about age 13 or 14 who is tapping his desk with pencil while a lesson is in progress. The teacher initiates a confrontation. In both vignettes, the teachers are male. Those interviewed were asked to identify the different feelings the 'staged' events evoked and comment on the effectiveness of the vignette to focus the respondent on an actual event within the realm of the respondent's own experience. Approximately nine tenths of the respondents reported that they could either recall similar experiences or that they had heard about or witnessed similar experiences. Subsequently, it was felt that the video episodes served to position the respondents in the recalled context of their own experience with CDO episodes.

The first page of the CDOPS gathers biographical information about the sample (Appendix 'A') listing gender, years of teaching experience, types of teaching experience and professional qualifications. The question items that comprise the CDOPS reflect many of the concepts presented in the literature review, and the author's extensive experience in the field of teaching students with behaviour disorders. The question content of the CDOPS was hypothesized to identify four variable clusters: perceptions of volitional control, responsibility for behaviour change initiatives, perceived emotionality and perceptions of self-efficacy in working with students who exhibit CDO behaviour.

The sample question items that follow are presented to the reader to illustrate how these clusters were represented. "I would feel suspicious that he/she was manipulating the situation to get out of doing the assignment." was thought to represent perceived volitional control, whereas "I would feel that the student was acting-out because of frustrations experienced at home." was thought to represent a non-volitional perspective. The reader is reminded that this concept is reflected in the attributional theory (Weiner, 1983) described above. The next cluster involves perception of responsibility for behaviour change. "I feel that this student should assume the responsibility for changing his/her attitude toward authority figures", and alternatively, "I feel the responsibility for improving the student's behaviour should be the classroom teacher's" provides
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the respondent with two polarities in which to respond. Presumably, those responding strongly to the latter would share similarities with teachers falling into the interventionist category identified by Jordan et al, (1996). The third variable cluster reflects perceived emotionality. "I would feel angry at the disrespect shown by the student," contrasts with "I feel the student deserves a lot of empathy." Question items in this cluster appear to reflect the range of emotions experienced by the respondent. The hypothesized emotionality resulting from a CDO experience is quite complex. It could flow from the formation of dysfunctional ascriptions (Weiner, 1983), the challenge to one's beliefs (Pajares, 1992), the incongruence with the experience and the teacher's sense of self (Harter, 1989) or a combination of the above. The fourth cluster is thought to represent CDO efficacy. "I would feel self-doubt about my ability to be effective with this kind of student" contrasts with "I would feel optimistic about the prognosis this student has for achieving appropriate behaviour while in my class". This cluster relates directly with the construct of teacher efficacy (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Guskey & Passaro, 1994). Procedurally, the vignettes were alternated for each phase of the study. The respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire after viewing one of the vignettes. Fifty three question items comprise the total scale employing a 5 category, Likert-type scale; 0 = not a feeling I would have; 1 = a weak feeling; 2 = a moderate feeling; 3 = a strong feeling; and 4 = a very strong feeling.

The reliability of the two vignettes was assessed using a Cronbach's (1951) alpha coefficient measure on alternative viewings of the videos. The final form of the CDOPS generated alpha levels of .74 and .75 for each vignette on 42 completed forms. As a result, the author concluded that the alternate video formats were sufficiently reliable to proceed.

The Victimless Teaching Treatment Program: The study examined the possibility of altering attitudes/beliefs of teachers towards CDO students through inservice skills training. The VT program has been written by the author for the purpose of providing in-service classroom management training for teachers. It achieves face validity through the author's extensive teaching experience working with behaviour disorders in classroom settings and through several workshops where VT concepts were presented to groups of teachers were conducted. Formative evaluations of these sessions were used to shape the VT approach into its current form.

A detailed description of the components of VT training follows.

VT training begins with a reflective investigation of the dynamics of construing
misbehaviour. Participants are led through a series of narratives that attempt to allegorically represent the various incongruities involved in making subjective judgements about student behaviour. Personal vulnerabilities are explored. The weight of personal and systemic expectation to ward off such CDO episodes is discussed as a contributing variable and related to these personal vulnerabilities. The relative efficacy of conflict resolution as a pedagogical skill compared to other teaching skills is discussed. In addition, the issue is raised of the legitimacy of the social curriculum as a viable classroom activity in a literacy-orientated educational system.

Motives that underlie student misbehaviour are discussed and possible sources of ambiguity in the interpretation of these motives are highlighted. Neuropsychological explanations of various forms of impulsiveness are introduced. These are cursory explanations that flow from publications such as Emotional Intelligence (Goleman, 1996) and they are introduced to the participants as evidence of a 'hard science' explanation for 'misbehaviour'. It is felt that explanations of motives that lean toward 'non-volitional' interpretations assist the teacher in keeping his/her emotions in check. In this way, the extremes of behaviour encountered in a CDO episode can be understood more objectively (perhaps as instinctive-like reactions uninhibited by the reasoning centres of the brain). An anecdote of a brain-injured student is provided to illustrate this point. Several other anecdotes follow involving the interaction of belief systems, knowledge, perceptions and teaching responses. These anecdotes are delivered in a narrative form. Each illustrate how even the best intentioned teacher can be adversely influenced by dysfunctional attributions. All of the above was covered in the initial half-day session.

The quasi-theoretical approach described above sets the stage for the skills component of VT training. The skills phase of VT training is designed to raise the efficacy level for teachers who participate in the sessions. These sessions are preventative in the sense that they provide specific strategies for teachers to better manage their classroom environment. However, some coaching is supplied to the participants to assist them in their direct verbal interactions with CDO students as a method of deescalating tensions. The skill sessions are elaborated on below. The actual hand-outs that accompanied each of the following topics are included in Appendix 'E'.

---

6Refer to the section covering attributional ascriptions for a discussion on the mediating affect of non-volitional ascriptions for explaining motives for misbehaviour.
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VTSkill 1. Correcting behaviour without using consequences. This approach interrupts the cycle of negative attention which CDO pupils are expert at orchestrating when they volitionally disrupt a class in progress. The approach uses the principles of operant conditioning which suggest that behaviours that go unreinforced are eventually extinguished (Becker, Engelmann, & Thomas, 1971). Participant teachers are taught to ignore most of the 'attention draining' types of behaviours CDO students exhibit. They are also taught techniques for directing attention toward students who are behaving appropriately. These techniques are then demonstrated and rehearsed in the context of the group. At the end of the session (approximately 30-40 minutes) the teachers are assigned the responsibility for trying this technique for a week. The next week, teachers report on their relative success with the technique and get some feedback and support from their colleagues. In this session and the others that follow, a topic guide is provided that identifies a situation where the VT skill could be used, a VT approach is described and the rationale for the approach is offered. Examples of these topic guides are provided in the appendix.

VTSkill 2. Issue management. Issue management is the ability of a teacher to select issues judiciously and designate the remaining issues to be settled by the students themselves. This topic is subdivided in two separate skill tracks. The first one involves training the students to solve their own issues and the second one outlines strategies for notifying offending students and staging the correction procedure. This topic is covered in two sessions. Teachers are trained to examine their own teaching behaviour by making a list of issues they become directly involved with over the period of a week. These lists are examined with the intention of rating the issues on a 1-3 scale (1 = least imperative, 2 = marginal, 3 = imperative). The teachers are then prompted to postulate how much of their working day is spent on the marginal or least imperative issues. The teachers are taught to practice the principle of parsimony in issue selection. It has been the author's experience that teachers in general are not economical about the issues they choose to react to and subsequently their intellectual and emotional energy drains away to a 'resource depletion level' (RDL). This level is when teachers are the most vulnerable in terms of their ability to cope with a CDO episode. Teachers are taught to avoid approaching their RDL by operating more selectively when issues occur. Again, teachers will be challenged to use these
techniques in subsequent weeks and report on their relative successes.

**VTSkill 3. Establishing consequences.** This topic emphasizes the process of deriving the consequence as being the most important component and not the strength of the consequence itself. The desire for retribution is examined here. Teachers have been observed operating under retributitional motives (Rohrkemper & Brophy, 1983) when establishing consequences. Teachers are taught that issuing consequences to offending students has the capacity to make an ally or an enemy out of the offending student. Techniques for negotiating a consequence are taught to the VT participants. Teachers are prompted to view the episode in the full spectrum of the students' cognitive, social and emotional issues and not just the context of the behavioural difficulties. They are reminded that CDO behaviours are usually symptomatic of other difficulties. The futility of punishing symptoms when more primary issues go unresolved is posed as a confounding element in setting consequences. An additional caution is raised about the seemingly paradoxical effect when some students incur a consequence. Often the negative attention derived when a consequence is being administered inadvertently reinforces the objectionable behaviour.

**VTSkill 4. Establishing consequences for groups.** This session addresses the issue teachers' experience when individual culpability is difficult to ascertain with respect to an objectionable behaviour. Here again, the vulnerability of the teacher in these situations is highlighted. Teachers are taught to manage students' perceptions of 'unfairness'. They are given techniques for controlling the group receiving the consequence so that the consequence doesn't become reinforcing for some of the students.

A subtopic of setting consequences for students is raised in topics 3 and 4. This is the topic of issuing a delayed consequence. A delayed consequence is defined as a consequence that can not be administered immediately (ie. it has to wait until recess or after school). VT participants are taught to avoid 'bankrupting' students in these situations. It is explained to them that a student(s) who has been notified of an impending consequence may perceive his/her situation to be bankrupt. This is especially true of CDO students. A 'nothing-to-lose' psychology can serve to exacerbate the behaviour the consequence was designed to correct. Techniques for administering a delayed consequence are taught in topics 3 and 4.

**VTSkill 5. Verbal navigation skill.** This skill is important to have when a behaviour requires correction and the student is being completely uncooperative. Teachers are given verbal
exchange scenarios. They are instructed to identify the issues in the scenarios. For example, a scenario depicts a situation where a student has been notified that his/her behaviour is inappropriate. The student doesn't respond to the prompt(s). The teacher invites the student for a 'side-bar' conversation in the hall and the student refuses to go. VT participants are trained to observe the escalation from the relatively minor first misbehaviour to defiance; the latter being much more serious than the former. VT participants are taught scripted formats to use in situations like the one mentioned above. Scripted formats are intended to insulate the teacher from intense emotionality. Techniques are taught that act as levers to motivate the student to move toward a solution. Reentry processes are outlined. These processes assist the teacher in preparing the student for his/her return to the situation where the initial incident occurred.

*VTSkill 6.* Academic programs for CDO students. This topic deals with the objectionable behaviour as being a symptom of academic frustration. The topic is covered in two sessions. Teachers are taught to recognize how academic frustration can arise from a combination of low skill level, low self-esteem, attentional deficits, hypo-stimulation and environmental constraints. Time is spent examining the requirements of a school day for CDO students. Areas where student competency can be accentuated are identified. Opportunities for less-capable students to get positive attention are outlined. Lesson formats are presented to the teachers. The issue of intrinsic and extrinsic motivators is discussed. Teachers are encouraged to rely on specific intrinsic motivators for their students. Examples are provided to the participants. VT participants are taught ways of 'legitimizing' non-academic strengths CDO students might possess. Instructional management techniques are outlined so that performance-shy students can participate in less intrusive ways. Some attention is devoted to published academic programs that are specifically designed for CDO students.

*VTSkill 7.* Communication in mainstream environments. CDO students exhibit objectionable behaviours more frequently than non-CDO students. Usually these behaviours have the potential for becoming amplified episodes. Teachers are taught to separate their sense of personal responsibility for the objectionable behaviour from their personal responsibility for correcting the objectionable behaviour. Differentiating the former from the latter is critical. Knowing that CDO students will most likely exhibit inappropriate behaviour in a variety of contexts for reasons that may have nothing to do with the teacher's behaviour is a liberating
concept for most teachers. Teachers are taught that they do not have to apologize for these episodes. They do however, have to orchestrate preventative skills (already covered in VT training) to limit misbehaviour in their classrooms and they do have to initiate corrective skills should CDO behaviour surface. For example, planned ignoring is taught to VT participants as a preventative measure. To the uninitiated observer, planned ignoring might look as if the teacher is failing to take action. VT participants are encouraged to communicate techniques such as these to their colleagues in order to eliminate ambiguities and to clear up possible incongruities with existing disciplinary policies. Teachers are taught to view VT techniques as serving the broader issues of social development for CDO students like self-control, intrinsic motivation, self-awareness and social confidence. VT techniques contrast significantly with 'cease and desist' approaches to correcting behaviour. The rationale for the techniques may not be obvious to all who witness education in the schools. Teachers are encouraged to seek forums to communicate their approaches to colleagues, administrators and parents. Getting affirmation from these sources by articulating the rationale for the techniques is encouraged in VT training.

Sample Description

The study was conducted in a mid-sized school system comprising communities in the main transportation corridor in South Eastern Ontario. Permission was obtained to use two elementary K-8 school staffs, one with 15 teachers and the other with 19. One was in a suburban community and the other a rural community.

Eight teachers agreed to participate in the VT training program and thus were identified as the Treatment Group (N=8). Five additional teachers were interested in participating but were unable to commit to the 8-10 sessions required. Consideration was given to alter the format of the VT sessions to accommodate these teachers but this idea was abandoned since it would introduce confounding variables that might produce uninterpretable results. The remaining teachers from both schools were combined to form the Comparison Group (N=24). They were given no in-service training during the 3 months the study was being conducted. Two teachers, one from each school, were lost to the study.

Voluntary participation in the Treatment Group (TG) meant that randomization procedures could not be followed. This condition may have skewed the results somewhat but the author felt this was a realistic limitation he had to accept given the nature of the project. The
### Table 1
Sample Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment Group N = 8</th>
<th>Comparison Group N = 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Exper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDO Exper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Qual.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spec. ed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The above biographical data asked the respondents to indicate the range that described their years of teaching experiences. Subsequently the mean and median scores are estimates and not exact numbers.
time commitment for the TG was significant and arbitrary assignment could result in sporadic attendance thereby further confounding the results. In addition, much of the viability of the treatment program was based on opportunities for extensive collaboration. Effective collaboration requires voluntary participation as a prerequisite for success (Stanovich, 1996).

A summary of the characteristics of the Treatment Group and the Comparison Group (CG) is available in Table 1. The respondents were asked to indicate the range that identified their years of teaching experience, experiences with CDO students and their academic and professional qualifications. Because of this non-numerical data standard deviations and significance tests could not be conducted on this biographical data. The TG consisted of eight female teachers. This group was a very experienced group of teachers with five of the eight having taught sixteen or more years in the elementary school system, one of the eight over nine years and two of the eight, between three and eight years. The TG group reported the following experiences with CDO students; five of the eight reported at least some experiences and two of the eight, many experiences. Only one suggested she had no CDO experience. The academic and professional training of the TG was varied. Half of the group had basic teacher training while one of the eight had a graduate degree and three of the eight had Special Education qualifications.

The CG consisted of sixteen female teachers and eight males. This group was also quite experienced with over one third of the group having sixteen or more years of teaching experience. One fifth had between nine and fifteen years teaching experience and another third between three and eight years. Only one teacher in this group was in his/her first year of teaching. The CG reported considerable exposure to behaviour disorders in their classrooms. Over half of the CG reported at least some CDO experiences while one quarter reported many experiences. As in the TG, the academic and professional training of the CG was varied with half reporting basic qualifications, one eighth having graduate degrees and over one third having Special Education qualifications. It is apparent that the TG is remarkably similar to the CG with respect to teaching experience, experiences with CDO students and teacher training.

Both groups were compared on their differences in their perceptions of their Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE). PTE measures were collected using the ten items that comprise that factor from the Gibson and Dembo (1984) Teaching Efficacy scale. The mean PTE score for the TG and CG was 35.0 (SD = 8.18) and 31.46 (SD = 7.059) respectively. A t-test was conducted
on the difference and it was found not to be significant ($p = .246$, $df = 30$). Subsequently both

groups were assumed to be quite similar on this particular characteristic.

The small sample size of the TG ($N=8$) is an obvious limitation. The author would have

prefered a larger group representation but when permission was being obtained the Board

administrators felt at the time their schools had been 'over-studied' and only the two schools were

assigned to the study.
CHAPTER THREE
Results

CDOPS - Test Development:

As indicated earlier, the 53 question items on the CDOPS were chosen a priori by the author from his reading of the literature and from his experiences in the field of education involving CDO students. The question items were hypothesized to cluster around 4 variables, namely perceptions of volitional control, responsibility for CDO students, CDO efficacy and CDO emotionality. ‘Perceptions of Volitional Control’ refer to the teacher’s judgement of the student’s motives for the disturbing behaviour as being either willfully directed at the teacher, or as being beyond the student’s capability to cope with the specific situation. ‘Responsibility for CDO Students’ question items reflect the teacher’s attitude toward teaching students like the ones depicted in the vignettes. ‘CDO Efficacy’ identifies the teacher’s assessment of their own competency with respect to these students to bring about behavioural change and to teach them skills. Finally, ‘CDO Emotionality’ question items are attempting to capture the negative feelings that build up in a teacher when they are dealing with an episode similar to the one in the vignette.

Because these variables represented constructs chosen a priori a Factor Analysis was applied to the pre-test data for the combined Treatment and Comparison groups as well as the reliability group for a total ‘N’ of 86. The purpose was to validate the subscales in the CDOPS and to eliminate unreliable factors. The process of test development and item validation is described below.

The Factor Analysis procedure was administered using SPSS release 6.1.2 for Windows. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) was applied to the data. The MSA value of .83 is considered sufficiently high to warrant an analysis of the factors (SPSS for Windows 6.1.2 manual). The Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was also applied to the data. The critical value (2793.56 @ p< .001) achieved on this test allowed the author to accept the alternative hypothesis that the correlations observed were most likely representative of the population. The assumptions of sampling adequacy and sphericity having been met, a varimax rotation of the factor matrix produced an eleven-factor solution that accounted for 71.6% of the variance.

The author considered the eleven-factor solution to be somewhat cumbersome. Ideally
Table 2  
Factor Analysis Summary  
Varimax Rotation

**Factor 1: CDO Efficacy (CDOEFF)**
Eigenvalue: 13.39689  
Pct. Var. 32.7%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>positive about challenge to motivate CDO students</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>optimistic about prognosis for behaviour improvement</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>confident of enough personal resources to counter-act unsettled climate caused by CDO student</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>comfortable about teaching CDO students</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>motivated about the challenge of working with such hostile students</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>current skills are effective with CDO students</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>preparation for teaching CDO students has been inadequate</td>
<td>-.442</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor 2: CDO Emotionality (CDOEMOT)
Eigenvalue: 3.111185
Pct. Var. 7.6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>apprehensive about level of support available</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>frustrated with the limitations of the school system to accommodate CDO students</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>frustrated about CDO student restricting effectiveness of teaching</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>self-doubt about ability to be effective with CDO student over long term</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>despondent about career choice because of CDO student's behaviour</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>resentment about time taken away from other students</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>resentment for having CDO student in classroom</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>worried about having to deal with CDO student</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor 3: Locus of Responsibility
Eigenvalue: 2.47193
Pct. Var. 6.0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 d</td>
<td>classroom teacher's responsibility to counsel CDO student</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 c</td>
<td>administration should assume the responsibility for improving CDO student's behaviour</td>
<td>-0.639</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 h</td>
<td>it is the classroom teacher's responsibility to have skills necessary to assist the CDO student in the behaviour-change process</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>determined to find a solution to deal with the CDO student more effectively</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>important for classroom teachers to have effective skills for teaching CDO students</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 g</td>
<td>classroom teacher's responsibility to modify curriculum to accommodate CDO students</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>determined to understand how background factors influence CDO behaviour</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Accumulated Variance = 46.3 %
fewer factors would have been preferred. An analysis of eight of the eleven factors of the solution revealed inherent weaknesses in their interpretability. Collectively, they only accounted for just over 20% of the total variance. Insufficient loading values and/or insufficient item representation contributed to this weakness. Stevens (1992) suggests that factor retention should be predicated on a combination of absolute loading values, the number of items comprising the factor and the sample size. The recommendation offered by Stevens (1992) is that factors with four or more loadings above .60 in absolute value are reliable regardless of sample size. Factors with ten or more items loading around .40 are only reliable when the sample size exceeds 150. Using this criteria, only the first two factors qualified as sufficiently reliable for interpretation. However, the third factor came close to meeting the criteria as 3 items were above .60 in absolute loading value and 2 additional items came close with values of .579 and .562 respectively. This third factor was included in the analysis whereas the final eight were culled. Almost half the variance (46.3%) in the CDOPS is explained in these first three factors.

An examination of these individual factors follows.

The reader should refer to Table 2 and Table 3 as a guide in this discussion. The first factor registered an eigenvalue of 13.40 and accounted for almost one third (32.7%) of the variance. This factor contained 7 question items and it loaded on these variables in a range of .75 to .44 in absolute value. Wording such as "I would feel positive about the challenge to motivate CDO students" and "I would feel that my current skills are effective with CDO students" indicate that the factor appeared to reflect the internal factor of Teaching Efficacy identified earlier by Guskey and Passaro (1994) and restated here as "...perceptions of personal influence, power and impact in teaching and learning situations (Guskey & Passaro, 1994, p. 639)". This first factor was felt to be congruent with both Guskey and Passaro's (1994) internal factor of teaching efficacy and Gibson and Dembo's (1984) Personal Teaching Efficacy. Because the responses to the CDOPS question items identified perceptions about the students depicted in the vignettes, the author named the factor CDO Efficacy.

The second factor extracted produced an Eigenvalue of 3.11 and accounted for 7.6% of the variance. This factor loaded on 8 variables as well ranging from .73 to .50. Here, words such as 'frustrated', 'apprehension' and 'resentment' seem to evoke negative emotions with respect to CDO students and is thus referred to as CDO EMOTIONALITY. The third factor generated
### Table 3

**Item Analysis Summary: Personal Teaching Efficacy**
with CDO Efficacy, CDO Emotionality and Locus of Responsibility
(listed in the order of factor loading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gibson &amp; Dembo Scale Items</th>
<th>CDO Efficacy (CDOPS)</th>
<th>CDO Emotionality (CDOPS)</th>
<th>Locus of Responsibility (CDOPS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gibson &amp; Dembo Scale Items</strong></td>
<td><strong>Personal Teaching Efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;...perceptions of personal influence, power and impact in teaching and learning situations.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Factor (Guskey &amp; Passaro, 1994, p. 639)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>15. When grades of students improve, it is usually because their teachers found more effective teaching approaches.</td>
<td>30. I would feel positive about the challenge of trying to motivate students like the one in the video.</td>
<td>16. I would feel apprehensive about the level of support available to me in developing a workable strategy for this student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>5. If a student masters a new concept quickly, this might be because the teacher knew the necessary steps in teaching that concept.</td>
<td>34. I would feel optimistic about prognosis this student has for achieving appropriate behaviour while in my class.</td>
<td>31. I would feel frustrated with the limitations of a school system to accommodate students like the one in the video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>3. When a student gets a better grade than he/she usually gets, it is usually because I found better ways of teaching that student.</td>
<td>33. I would feel confident that I have enough personal resources to counteract the unsettled climate in the classroom caused by this student.</td>
<td>8. I would feel frustrated about this student restricting the effectiveness of my teaching ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>17. If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his/her retention in the next lesson.</td>
<td>17. I would feel self-doubt about my ability to be effective with this kind of student of the long term.</td>
<td>26. I would feel determined to find a solution to deal with this student more effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1. When a student does better than usual, many times it is because I exerted a little extra effort.</td>
<td>5. I would feel motivated by the challenge of working with such a hostile student.</td>
<td>10. I would feel despondent about my career choice because of students like this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>12. When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students.</td>
<td>35. I would feel comfortable about teaching students like the one presented in the video.</td>
<td>19. I would feel resentment for having this student in my classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>21. If I try really hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.</td>
<td>36. I would feel that my current teaching skills are effective with students like the one presented in the video.</td>
<td>12. I would feel worried about having to deal with this student on a daily basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>9. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him/her quickly.</td>
<td>28R I feel that my preparation for teaching students like this has been inadequate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>19. The influence of a students' home experiences can be overcome by good teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>7. If a student couldn't do a class assignment, most teachers would be able to accurately assess whether the assignment was at the correct level of difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 'R' is a reverse score item
an Eigenvalue of 2.47 and accounted for 6.0% of the variance. Items loaded in the range of .40 to .77 in absolute value for this factor. An analysis of the content of these question items suggested attitudes about the issue of personal vs. systemic responsibility for CDO students. Other wording such as "determined to find a solution", "important for classroom teachers to have the skills" and "determined to understand background factors" confounded the clarity in this factor. Such wording would appear to relate more to efficacy. However, one's ability (ie. efficacy) to carry out teaching responsibilities with respect to CDO students and one's attitude toward assuming such responsibility might have a mutual dependency where both efficacy and attitude must coexist. This factor suggests a LOCUS OF RESPONSIBILITY dimension as a contributor to the overall attitude held by teachers toward CDO students and is named as such.

Post hoc discussions with colleagues affirmed the naming of the principal factors. Table 3 provides an item comparison for all the principal factors. It was distributed to two teachers for their comments. Factor names were excluded. They were shown a video vignette used in the CDOPS and asked to identify what each item cluster had in common. The first factor elicited the label of "empowerment". The word 'efficacy' was not a word the teachers used frequently but when Guskey and Passaro's (1994) definition of the construct was read to them, both felt 'efficacy' to be an appropriate label for the item cluster. There was universal agreement for the second factor. They felt the question items identified 'emotional' states experienced by the respondents. The third item cluster generated 'personal responsibility' as a possible label. Here again, the word 'locus' was less familiar to them, but once defined, there was agreement as to its appropriateness for the factor's name.

In summary then, the Factor Analysis was able to affirm 3 of the 4 hypothesized constructs contained in the CDOPS; CDO Efficacy, CDO Emotionality and Locus of Responsibility. Perceptions of Volitional Control was not affirmed as a viable factor in this analysis.

Reliability of the CDOPS

The three surviving subscales resulting from the factor analysis were assessed for their reliability using a Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha. Only the pre-test measures were used for this purpose. CDO Efficacy and CDO Emotionality were assessed to be very reliable, achieving $\alpha = .87$ and .86 respectively ($N = 86$). Locus of Responsibility achieved levels of $\alpha = .79$, and the
total of the subscales levels of $\alpha = .67$.

Correlation Among the Variables

The reader will recall that the first research question focused on the relationship among teachers’ perceptions of their Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) and the hypothesized variables isolated in the CDOPS. These variables are restated here as the teachers’ perceptions of a) their teaching efficacy while working with students displaying CDO behaviour, b) their emotionality while working with students displaying CDO behaviour, c) their own confidence while working with students displaying CDO behaviour, d) their sense of responsibility for students who display CDO behaviour and e) the student’s volitional control over their behaviour. PTE was measured using the ten-item subscale from the Gibson and Dembo (1984) scale of Teacher Efficacy. As mentioned previously, c) and e) above (CDO Confidence and Perception of Volitional Control) were removed from the CDOPS following the factor analysis and will be excluded from these results. Table 4 lists the items that represent the variables included in these results.

The purpose of including a measure of PTE (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) in the study was to provide evidence supporting the validity of the hypothesized constructs isolated by the CDOPS. PTE as a subscale of Teacher Efficacy has been used to establish concurrent validity in other studies (Jordan et al., 1993; Jordan, 1995; Stanovich, 1994) and it has a known internal reliability alpha coefficient of $.82-.86$ (Stanovich, 1994).

Two-tailed Pearson Correlation Coefficients were generated for these variables on the pretest data ($N = 86$) and are isolated in Table 4. PTE correlated significantly with CDO Efficacy ($r = .640, p < .001$). PTE registered a significant negative correlation with CDO Emotionality ($r = -.395, p < .001$). Since strong negative emotions are associated with diminished self-perception (Harter, 1986 & 1989; Kindsvatter & Levine, 1980; Pik, 1981; Sharp, 1984; Tavris, 1989) a negative correlation with CDO Emotionality and the other variables was anticipated. PTE also correlated significantly with Locus of Responsibility ($r = .506, p < .001$). With construct validation as the intent, the author views the above correlations as being very affirming lending considerable support for establishing CDO Efficacy and Locus of Responsibility as subconstructs of Personal Teaching Efficacy.

Significant correlations were observed among the variables identified by the CDOPS as well. As anticipated CDO Efficacy had a significant negative correlation with CDO Emotionality.
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(r = -.475, p < .001) and a significant positive correlation with Locus of Responsibility (r = .538, p < .001). A relatively strong negative correlation between CDO Efficacy and CDO Emotionality appears consistent with the information given above. Those reporting high levels on CDO Efficacy are less likely to feel strong negative emotions following a CDO episode. In addition, elevated levels of CDO Efficacy tend to coincide with elevated levels of Locus of Responsibility for teaching CDO students. CDO Emotionality correlated negatively with Locus of Responsibility (r = -.319, p < .01). This also appears to be consistent with the predictions presented above. Those teachers reporting elevated levels of CDO Emotionality are less likely to also report high degree of responsibility for accommodating CDO students in their classrooms.

Linear Pearson product-moment correlations assess both the nature and the strength of two variables. However, as Kirk (1990) cautions, there are two reciprocal components of this relationship; namely proportion of explained variance and unexplained variance in relation to the variable with which it is being correlated. Values of $r > |.71|$ explain more than 50% of one variable in terms of another variable, but with values or $r < |.70|$ most of the relationship between two variables is explained by factors other than the one it is being correlated with (Kirk, 1990). Thus PTE might predict CDO Efficacy since they correlate significantly ($r = .64$) but close to 60% of CDO Efficacy can be predicted by other undetermined factors (ie. teacher education, time of year, etc.). To some, this may suggest that the correlations observed in this current study do little to advance our understanding of the variables as they relate to one another. This may be true, but it is a realistic limitation that heuristic investigations of this nature must accept until all the factors that contribute to a full understanding are accounted for (Kirk, 1990). In relative terms then, the correlations observed in the current study are quite promising.

In summary it appears that the hypothesized variables have been affirmed by the results of this study. Teachers who hold high levels of PTE may also register corresponding levels of CDO Efficacy and Locus of Responsibility for students who display CDO behaviour. These teachers are less likely to experience strong negative emotions when experiencing a CDO episode as well.

---

1Kirk identifies the coefficient of determination as $r^2$ and the coefficient of nondetermination as $1 - r^2$. Thus with a value of $r = .64$, $1 - r^2 = 1 - .64^2 = 1 - .41 = .59$ or 59% of the relationship is explained by undetermined factors. (Kirk, 1990, p. 171)
Other factors may influence these variables but they have not been identified in this study.
Secondly, CDO behaviour has the potential for generating strong negative emotions in a proportion of the teachers registering lower levels of CDO Efficacy that could result in the these teachers abandoning their responsibility for accommodating these students in their classrooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PTE</th>
<th>CDO Efficacy</th>
<th>CDO Emotionality</th>
<th>Locus of Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTE</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CDO Efficacy</strong></td>
<td>.640*</td>
<td>.538*</td>
<td>-.319**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .001  
**p < .01
Means Comparison

The pre and post mean scores for both the Treatment (N = 8) and the Comparison groups (N = 24) on the subscales identified above follow. The reader may wish to refer to Table 5 for a summary of these results. Individual item scores could range from 0 to 4. The treatment group obtained a mean score of 2.23 (SD = .78, Var. = .61) on the pretest of CDO Efficacy and 3.00 (SD = .32, Var. = .10) on the post measure of this subscale. The Comparison group mean score was 2.20 (SD = .51, Var. = .26) on the pretest of this subscale and 2.16 (SD = .51, Var. = .26) on the post test. The Treatment group pretest mean score on CDO Emotionality was 2.22 (SD = .90, Var. = .80) and 1.80 (SD = .50, Var. = .25) on the posttest. It should be noted that this was a desirable effect since lower negative emotion is associated with higher levels of efficacy (see Correlation Among the Variables Section). The Comparison group pretest mean score was 2.12 (SD = .83, Var. = .68) on this subscale and 2.32 (SD = .86, Var. = .74) on the posttest. The treatment group pre test mean score on Locus of Responsibility was 2.88 (SD = .35, Var. = .11) and 3.48 (SD = .19, Var. = .03) on the posttest. The Comparison group pretest mean score on this same variable was 2.57 (SD = .50, Var. = .25) and 2.57 (SD = .53, Var. = .28) on the post measure.
### Table 5
Mean Scores on CDOPS (Pre & Post)
highest possible score = 4

**Treatment Group N = 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Pre Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Post Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CDO Efficacy</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CDO Emotionality</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.80*</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Locus of Responsibility</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison Group N = 24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Pre Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Post Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CDO Efficacy</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CDO Emotionality</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Locus of Responsibility</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lower levels of CDO Emotionality are a desired effect in VT training.*
Analysis of Variance of the CDOPS

The pre and post measures of the CDOPS for the Treatment Group (n=8) and the Comparison Group (n=24) were analyzed using a 2-way univariate Repeated Measure ANOVA with one grouping factor (treatment) and one repeated factor (phase as either pre or post). After conferring with a statistical consultant this method was chosen over a multivariate design for the following reasons. The proportion of sample size to the levels of repeated measures in this study places the advantages for increased power with the univariate approach (Stevens, 1992). This is because the variance due to the individual differences is removed from the error term. Secondly, the study can achieve significance with fewer subjects which is an especially important consideration given the small size of the Treatment Group (n=8). The SPSS for Windows, Release 6.1.2 was used to generate these data.

Separate analyses were conducted for the three subscales of the CDOPS retained from the original factor analysis. Mean scores of the subscales were calculated for the Treatment Group and the Comparison Group in both the pre and post phases of the study. Table 5 provides the mean scores for the two groups by phase (ie. pre/post). The Repeated Measures procedure was applied to this comparison to assess the significance of the observed variance. For summary purposes, ANOVA and Effect Size tables are provided (Table 6a and Table 6b respectively).

The Repeated Measures ANOVA procedure requires the variance in the dependent measures to be homogeneous. The assumption of homogeneity was met for all but Locus of Responsibility (post) at \( p > .05 \) level of significance. This reduces the tenability of the comparisons made for this variable.

The results of the Repeated Measures ANOVA are as follows. On the CDO Efficacy variable, there was a significant difference for the groups (F= 4.66, d.f. = 30,1 , \( p < .05 \)) and for the phase (F = 23.46, d.f. = 30,1 , \( p < .001 \)). A strong group by phase interaction was also noted (F = 28.41, d.f. = 30, 1,1 , \( p < .001 \)). This would appear to confirm that the two groups varied significantly under the 2 levels of treatment (ie. no treatment and VT training) on this variable. An examination of the Effect Size table (Table 7b) reveals a medium effect size for the two groups (Partial eta squared = .44) as well as for the group by phase interaction (Partial eta squared = .49). Stevens (1992) suggests small to medium effect sizes are more of the norm in social science research and large effect sizes (ie. > .80) are very rare. He also indicates that with
small sample sizes (n < 100) high power levels are less likely. For this particular variable however, very high power levels were achieved indicating that the probability of a treatment effect for CDO Efficacy is high when the subjects are provided with VT training. CDO Emotionality was not significant for either the group or phase comparisons but there was a significant group by phase interaction ($F = 11.86$, d.f. = 30,1,1 , $p < .002$). This would indicate that the teachers in the Treatment Group were less likely to display elevated levels of emotionality following a CDO episode after experiencing VT training than those of the Comparison Group. Here again, a modest effect size was noted for this interaction (Partial eta squared = .28) with a very high power level (.914) indicating that under the treatment condition for this variable the two groups do indeed vary.

The third variable, Locus of Responsibility registered significant differences between groups ($F = 11.45$, d.f. = 30,1 , $p < .002$) and phase ($F = 19.38$, d.f. = 30,1 $p < .001$). A significant group by phase interaction ($F = 20.16$, d.f. = 30,1,1 , $p < .001$) was also noted for this variable. A modest effect size for this interaction (Partial eta squared = .40) with a high power level (.991) indicate that although there were significant individual and group differences initially, these differences were more dramatic following the treatment. Thus, after experiencing VT training the Treatment Group was more likely to report higher levels of professional responsibility for teaching CDO students than the control group.
### Table 6a

**Analysis of Variance Between Pre and Posttest of CDOPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category of Test</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CDO Efficacy</td>
<td>Between - Subjects</td>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within - Subjects</td>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group by Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>28.41</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CDO Emotionality</td>
<td>Between - Subjects</td>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>39.98</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within - Subjects</td>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group by Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Locus of Responsibility</td>
<td>Between - Subjects</td>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within - Subjects</td>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group by Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It would appear then that VT training had a significant effect on the Treatment Group in enhancing their sense of teaching self-efficacy with students who display CDO behaviour and in lowering their levels of emotionality while working with these students. The heterogeneity of the variance (noted earlier) notwithstanding, VT training may have also increased their sense of responsibility for educating these students as well. This is all the more impressive given the small group size.

Before discussing these findings I will turn the reader’s attention to the qualitative phase of the study.

Chapter Three
CHAPTER FOUR
The Qualitative Research Phase

Introduction

The following qualitative account is submitted to add additional information for the reader in order to identify, and to assess the value the VT training held for the eight teachers who participated in the study. Are the significant differences reported in the previous statistical section the result of "halo effects" (Staretsky, 1975), or do they represent changes in beliefs and practice from the perspective of the teachers?

Qualitative ethnographic social research has come into recognition in the past 2 decades as a viable departure from statistics-based survey studies (Hamilton, 1994; Vidich & Lyman, 1994). The apparent 'freedom' afforded by qualitative ethnographic research as one departs from the statistical rigorousness of empirical methods is not without restriction. Qualitative methods are essentially narrative accounts of sociological phenomenon (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to trace the history of these methods, many paradigms of qualitative research have evolved that employ practices specific to the canons of these paradigms (Guba & Lincoln, 1994) and each have struggled with the ethical constraints inherent in the representation of observed phenomenon and interpretive writing (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). The debate differs from paradigm to paradigm but essentially it is the issue of 'subjectivity' and the opportunities for subsequent abuse that casts a shadow of suspicion on interpretive accounts using Qualitative methods. Obtaining 'valid' representations in non-objective ways is the mandate of the ethnographer (Altheide & Johnson, 1994). A reflexive accounting has been offered as the most probable solution for researchers engaged in ethnographic studies (Altheide & Johnson, 1994). This type of validity requires the ethnographer to account to the reader, all aspects of interpretive bias that may have influenced his/her perception of what was observed and the telling of it (Altheide & Johnson, 1994). It becomes essential that all breaches of objectivity be exposed and allow the reader the opportunity to ascertain their respective significance. This is accomplished without apology as the ethnographer celebrates the

---

1 For a complete account of qualitative ethnographic methods refer to an edited compilation by Denzin & Lincoln (1994), Handbook of qualitative research.
relationship between the observed and the observer (Altheide & Johnson, 1994; Fine, 1994; Fontana & Frey, 1994). It is what Fine (1994) describes as "working the hyphen" between self-other relationships (Fine, 1994, p. 72). It is this relationship that defines the context for the reader and the process itself becomes part of the culture being represented (Fontana & Frey, 1994).

To signify the transition from objectivity to subjectiveness the first person 'I' is used in accounting for the author's presence in the study. I have been a practicing teacher for over twenty five years. I have developed an expertise in working with students who exhibit interfering behaviour. This expertise has been acquired through many and varied experiences. Reflective contemplation, observations, reading and learning from others have influenced my beliefs and practices about working with these students. These beliefs and practices have been embodied in the VT approach. (For a more detailed account of these beliefs see Appendix ‘G’) I am in the study as both the investigator and the trainer. In another respect, I am also a participant; participating in my own professional development. I have shared these beliefs and practices with the other teachers involved in the study with the expressed intention of inculcating these same beliefs and practices into their particular orientation and practice. Some have been adopted and others have been challenged, indicating further the cycle of reflection. Through this qualitative account, I am letting the voices of the others testify as to the extent in which this intention has been realized. These voices will be interpreted for the reader only in the sense that they have been collected and grouped into specific categories. Other than that, they will stand alone for the reader to ascertain their respective significance.

Voice is a by-product in a qualitative account (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994). In a very practical sense, voice arises when the researcher moves from 'field texts' (ie. transcripts, notes, etc.) to 'research texts'. Many voices can emerge from these research texts as the researcher maps the experience for the reader. The investigator's interpretation of voice moves research texts from merely summaries of field texts to what is actually being 'said' by the research (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994).

"The search for...patterns, narrative threads, tensions and themes that constitutes the inquiry that shapes the field texts is created by the writer's experience. And the researcher's experience, like experience generally, has internal and existential
conditions." (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994, p. 423)
The extent that these conditions are understood by the researcher and communicated to the reader as possible sources of influence is a measure of ethnographic quality (Altheide & Johnson, 1994).

The representation of voice in qualitative methods is fraught with ethical tensions (Fine, 1994). Issues about question selection, subject-interviewer rapport, the decontextualization of narrative accounts and the influence of personal and cultural inhibitions abound in the representation of voice. Fine (1994) refers to this as the "imperialism of scholarship" (Fine, 1994, p.73). As researchers set upon their mission of asking elitist questions from positions of self-interest and decontextualizing 'what was said' they begin to 'colonize' the relationship between 'teller' and the 'asker' (Fine, 1994).

"Once out beyond the picket fence of illusory objectivity, we trespass all over the classed, raced and otherwise stratified lines that have demarcated our social legitimacy for publicly telling their stories. And it is then that the ethical questions boil. " (Fine, 1994, p. 80)

The description of the context of the study and the interview format that follows serves to identify the extent of the 'colonization' in this present study.

The Context of the Study

What follows is a chronology of events that account for my presence in the study. I entered the shared experience with the other teachers involved in this study as an 'expert' brought in from the 'outside'. Initially, I was not a guest in the sense that I was invited to their school. I arranged to be invited after self-promoting my area of expertise to the school administrators. To the best of my knowledge, this fact was unknown to the eventual participants. I was however, 'invited' back in the traditional sense; returning to their school to satisfy a request to conduct VT sessions for these teachers after delivering an overview of what they might expect to gain from VT training. The inference here is that 'the initial message' contained in the VT approach was sufficiently compelling to be invited back. This was an important principle for me as the researcher can be perceived to be in a position to benefit most from such experiences (Clark, Moss, Goering, Herter, Lamar, Leonard, Robbins, Russell, Templin, & Wascha, 1996). When participants in a study view themselves as simply 'subjects under consideration' the intended
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treatment benefit is seldom realized over the long term (Clark, et al., 1996). I believe that these teachers felt that they had as much to gain as I did and were thus motivated to participate.

The perception of 'expert' was a concern in this qualitative component of the study as it has the potential to exacerbate the 'colonization' process in narrative accounts (Fine, 1994). The relationship between the 'knower' and the 'learner' is a transitory one in this study. In being both the trainer and the investigator I had to switch roles from being the knower to the learner. This juxtaposition of roles has been observed recently in a study of collaborative relationships as a form of professional development for teachers (Clark et al., 1996). The transition from one role to the other was a very fluid process in the present study and this flow often defied arbitrary attempts to partition each of the respective positions. In general though, every effort was made to establish and maintain a peer-to-peer relationship with the participants as opposed to an expert-to-learner relationship. I felt it was important to legitimize and affirm the teachers' experiences and to steer away from the perils of being put in the position of passing judgement and risking the alienation of the subjects. This relationship developed over five months.

In all, there were nine sessions conducted before the initial interviews took place. The VT sessions ran from the end of February 96 to the middle of May 96. The sessions were held on consecutive weeks where possible. This cycle was interrupted on two occasions; a PD day and the March Break.

There was ample evidence that a rapport had developed between myself and this group of teachers. We were on a first name basis. We shared humourous and sometimes self-effacing anecdotes of classroom events indicating a high level of trust. On one occasion we even shared a pot-luck lunch. The participants were open and candid about their concerns and criticisms of the school system. I felt that my relationship with the subjects by the end of the VT sessions was ideal for capturing the narrative accounts of their experiences.

The VT sessions occurred at lunch times every Friday from 12:00 to 12:45. We began by meeting in the library but because of the confidential nature of our discussions a classroom that doubled as a computer room became our regular meeting place. We began each session with a review of the assignment from the previous week with each teacher sharing their experience of the VT skill. The other teachers and I provided feed-back to those reporting. This was done in a discussion format. Following the review, I introduced the next VT skill. An anecdotal situation
was provided to frame the skill in its appropriate context. After a VT approach was suggested and its corresponding rationale was explained the teachers were reminded of the importance of maintaining an ecological perspective when working with students who display CDO behaviour. The phrase, 'view them as victims rather than vandals' was used to prompt them to adopt an objective perspective and to keep non-volitional elements central to their attributional ascriptions about the motives behind the behaviours they were trying to remediate. A short discussion usually followed and the teachers retired to their classrooms to consider the assignment.

On occasion I asked for feed-back from the group as to the benefit these sessions were having. They provided their collective affirmation. On another occasion I met with the principal, who was not a participant in the sessions, to discuss the progress of the group. He confirmed that the teachers were quite positive about what they were receiving. The teachers' regular attendance and their active participation in the discussions reflected this assessment.

The interviews

The interviews that generated the narrative accounts took place at two distinct times; once during the week following the last VT session and an additional one, a full year later (May 97). The latter interviews were to assess the long-range benefit of the program for the teachers involved in the study.

The initial set of interviews were conducted individually and scheduled for 30-45 minutes. Each subject was asked to pick an appropriate time to be interviewed. Interviews took place in the same room that had been used for the VT sessions. This room was a computer lab that was 'off-limits' for students during the lunch time. Each respondent was asked if they objected to the interviews being recorded using a microcassette recorder. They were told that non-identifiable transcripts were going to be made following the interview and that the tapes would eventually be erased. Participants were also encouraged to view the resulting transcripts following the interview.

An agenda of open-ended questions were used as a guide for the interview but I was not compelled to follow them in script-like fashion if a more prudent line of questioning became evident or if the teacher wished to digress. Care was given to provide an unstructured experience for the teacher, ensuring opportunities for elaboration and unincumbered self-expression...allowing them to experience the full power of voice (Fontana & Frey, 1994). An
The interview of this nature is more than a static collection of quotable material. The intersection of two diverse individuals converging in a common place to discuss a common topic can have a dynamic affect on voice. The myth of the faceless subject and the invisible interviewer is untenable (Fontana & Frey, 1994) as the voice of the informant emerges, spawned by the interviewer's invitation to speak perhaps making what was once thought benign, enlightening and worthy of voice (Fine, 1994). If conditions of trust prevail, masks are set aside and free and open discourse emerges enhancing the quality of the ethnographic account (Fontana & Frey, 1994). However as open-ended as this might appear, the interviewer did set out to establish some fundamental information that would satisfy the requirements previously mentioned. This information is listed as follows. The narrators were encouraged to disclose their previous history with CDO students and the feelings those experiences generated. They were asked to comment on the benefit (if any) the VT program held for them.

Long range follow-up data was also collected in May, 1997, approximately one year later. I contacted the school in the February 97 and found that the participants in the VT sessions were still convening regularly. Five of the original 8 teachers had continued to meet once a week to discuss classroom management issues using the VT concepts. Two additional inexperienced teachers had joined the group. The school had a new principal and she was supportive of the continuation of the sessions. I arranged to attend once-per-month to offer additional input and to do some individual counselling. During one of those visits, the principal took a particular interest in one of the VT topics and requested that I do a 'refresher' workshop on reinforcement strategies for the whole staff in June 1997. The 'one year later' follow-up interview data was gathered in general discussions (as opposed to formal interviews) during May and June 1997.

The Narratives

The voices of the teachers who experienced VT training will report on the following themes: the experience of victimization following a CDO episode, the sense of professional isolation when working with students who exhibit interfering behaviours, changes experienced by them in their beliefs and practices, and the overall benefit of establishing collaborative networks while working with students who exhibit CDO behaviour, and their experience with the process of objectifying their attributions.

Initially these themes emerged from the author's reading of the narratives. The possibility
of personal bias influencing the allocation of narrative pieces into arbitrary categories was guarded against through a subsequent review. The author arranged for two colleagues to read the accounts in the ungrouped format. After being given some background for the study, they were asked to codify a piece of text into either of the following categories; victimization, isolation, personal/professional growth, collaboration and a non-specific category referred to as 'other'. These categories were defined as follows.

*Victimization*: evidence that the narrator was describing an event that she felt emotionally violated about and relatively powerless to do anything about it.

*Isolation*: evidence that the narrator was describing a situation where she did not feel that she had an opportunity to get support either directly or indirectly to help remediate her difficulty.

*Personal/professional growth*: evidence that the narrator was describing a benefit experienced in either a pragmatic sense or in a general sense that contributed to her ability to perform more confidently in situations involving CDO students.

*Collaboration*: evidence that the narrator was describing a benefit from the opportunity to communicate with her colleagues about a situation of mutual concern.

*Other*: evidence that the narrator was describing an account of something unrelated to any of the above definitions.

We met to compare our individual groupings. Discrepancies in our categorizations were infrequent and those identified were subsequently resolved by a clarification of semantics. A minor discrepancy resulted in a recoding of some narrative pieces into a category named ‘Objectifying’. My colleagues felt that a few of the narrators spoke of the process of objectifying their experience through reflective contemplation. Expressed empathy toward the students they were recalling characterized this category and was thus renamed.

The reader is reminded that interviews were conducted in both May/June of 1996 and once again in June of 1997. To avoid confusion while reading these accounts, the interviews taken in June of 1997 will be specifically identified as such and the font will change to this: *example of changed font*. All other accounts not so identified took place in May/June 1996.

The narratives will be removed from the pattern of the original context to address the
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themes that surfaced from the discussions. The reader is drawn into a reflexive process at this stage and must evaluate this account's ability to avoid the vulnerabilities inherent in the mission by giving consideration to several questions. First, do these responses serve as valid indications of the CDO experience as problematic for teachers generally and secondly, how effective was the VT program to affect change in skills and attitude in those who participated in it? Finally, in lifting the words from each of the narrative transcripts and having them stand alone as representations of others' thoughts, have I, perhaps by omission, altered the context to the extent where misrepresentation may be a factor? In this reflexive accounting it is incumbent upon the inquirer to pay homage to the blotch of whiteness left behind on the page, outlined by the text 'not chosen' for representation. This image symbolizes the risks involved in the process and begs the question, 'Do these words truly speak for the 'others'?

The 'others': By way of introduction, the school and the eight teachers who participated in the VT training are described individually in the following section. To preserve their anonymity, their actual names have been replaced by pseudonyms.

The school where the study took place was in an average-sized K-8 school of about 350 students. The school principal at that time was male and he had been there for eight years. He was serving his final year before his retirement. There was no vice principal for the school. Special education services were provided either in class or on a resource withdrawal basis. The school was situated in an established suburban neighbourhood.

We begin by introducing the reader to the group of teachers.

Bonnie: Bonnie is at the beginning stages of her career as a teacher. After several years in other forms of employment she decided to risk going back to school to become a teacher. She is now in her 3rd year after having served as a supply teacher and as a regular classroom teacher in several short-term contract positions in junior and senior kindergarten. She reports that in her brief time as a qualified teacher she has experienced some CDO behaviour. Her supply teaching experience is where she encountered most of this type of student behaviour.

"...being a supply teacher in the higher grades is no fun. It is very very challenging, especially when they look at my height and they say 'Oh wow! we got it made..."
with this one.”

**Marguerite**: Marguerite is an itinerant French teacher for the junior and intermediate students. She is very experienced teacher and has taught at the school for five years. She reports having experienced some CDO behaviour over the years of teaching. She partially attributes it to her teaching subject, French.

"My role is that I see 180 students a day...the fact that I don't have my own room, the fact that it is once a day...40 minute sessions, and I have to consider the subject that I teach and the attitudes that come with it...so there is a few strikes against me from the beginning."

Marguerite describes her approach to discipline in her French classes.

"I began setting up systems of consequencing students so the system that worked, if I could speak to that, ...it is a negative one...they lose their gym time...there is a specific set of expectations...if they don't meet that expectation their name goes on the board, if it is repeated they get a tick and a 3rd time, it's like strike 3 they miss their gym. Sometimes it is immediate...sometimes it's the following day if they've already had their gym...they show up the following day with their materials and they come to class with me. They know why they are there and they hate it. I've been here for 5 years, that's the way it is and they know it. It works. So that's the set of consequences that works for me...something that hurts."

**Q** How do you feel about that approach? You've mentioned that it is effective...does it make you feel that you are accomplishing something with those offending students?

**Does it make you feel good about your teaching?**

**Marguerite** "...if I were to think globally it doesn't bother me because I know for the majority of the
classes it is restoring order and I am getting some teaching done. But if I were to think individually...I've had the same kid for 5 years and I've been nailing him every year...have I done anything for him?...have I made a difference in his life...No. He's just learned to deal with my class. Now I'll open the door and it's bedlam and I'll quiet them all down, do my lesson and then leave and then it's bedlam all over again when the teacher returns."

Ann Marie: Ann Marie began teaching in the early eighties but took some years off to raise her family. In total she has taught seven years in the primary grades. Her current assignment is grade one. She also reports experiencing some CDO behaviour over the years.

Ann Marie: "I've had a few experiences for sure ...it's not an area I feel comfortable with...you know...knowing what to say and how to say it. You don't want them (the students) to think that you're backing down but you also don't want to inflame the situation either...confrontation is not my specialty."

Mary: Mary has taught for 6 years in the primary division. She too has come to teaching after experiencing other careers. She reports experiencing a high degree of CDO behaviour since beginning her career. She mentioned this one particular student she was having difficulty managing early in her career that required her to call in a behaviour consultant. She describes this situation below.

Mary "... here was me on him every day because I had to keep him in line so he wouldn't... his behaviour was so bizarre at times that he would cause himself injury or cause other children injury."

Jennifer: Jennifer is a half-time junior kindergarten teacher. She is a very experienced teacher. She reports experiencing some CDO behaviour over her career but it was usually in other areas of the school.

"In terms of CDO behaviour...it's not as much a problem
in the primary grades...perhaps in other areas of the school like the school yard...I’ve experienced these kinds of students there but there I’m not totally responsible.”

**Patty:** Patty has also been in and out of the field of education having taken time to raise her family. She is experienced in the junior and intermediate grades as well as in the primary division where her current assignment is. She reports some CDO experiences over her career and she suggests that she had some affinity with those type of students.

“After I graduated I found myself drawn to a certain type of kid, the type other teachers had difficulty with and for some, not all of them, I found I could make a connection with...Other teachers would say ‘God, I can’t stand that kid!’ and I would say ‘He’s not so bad’ you know.”

Patty has some special training in conflict mediation.

**Kim:** Kim has taught for nine years in the junior division. Her current assignment is a five-six split. She recalls having many CDO students over her career.

“I’ve had them since my first year. My first year I had a class from hell. I had nineteen boys and ten girls. The boys were just horrendous...the year before, the teacher they had let them be wild...let them do whatever they wanted. Like I had a kid say to me, "We walked all over so-and-so, so we're going to walk all over you." And my principal, he was a nice guy, but not a disciplinarian at all. I went into him sometime about May and I said, "Either you do something about them or they are not allowed in my class" because I had had it with them. “

**Valerie:** Valarie is a very experienced itinerant French teacher in the Primary grades. Valerie reports that she has had some experience with CDO behaviours over her career.

“There is always some...I go to different classes therefore I have to establish my routines and my
classroom discipline to each class I go to...It's a little harder than having the same kids all the time but there is always some and it's always difficult to know what to do and how to handle some and so on. Last year I had to enlist the help of the principal. He would come to assist with this one child who would do nothing that you would want him to do...I would buzz down and he (the principal) would come down and get him because the whole class would be in an uproar."

From my lengthy career as a teacher and through my long-term relationship with this particular group of teachers, I believe these teachers are representative of many others found in schools today. They are a dedicated group generally but significantly worn from the mounting responsibility an under-resourced system has subjected them to. As a group they are protective of what they believe to be in the best interests of their students and they are fearful that pedagogical change and adverse systemic influences will erode their ability to respond to the needs of their students in meaningful ways. They approach their practice with guarded optimism and they keep a sceptical eye on initiatives that may alter it.

*The Theme of Victimization*

The feeling of being personally victimized resulting from a CDO episode is a theme that surfaces in the narratives. Many of the subjects were able to recall either a past experience or a current one that left them feeling personally attacked which often depleted them of personal resources to cope with the situation.

Bonnie was asked to identify a CDO experience she had that stood out as being particularly troublesome for her. She was quick to offer one of her supply-teacher experiences. She uses the word "challenging" as a descriptor for this class. She lamented,

Bonnie "...when I went home I said, 'I don't care what they pay me. I'm never going back there again...I just felt mentally drained.'"

Marguerite reported a more generalized feeling;

Marguerite"...it is a feeling of being over-
powered...overwhelmed. The feeling that the tide's against you. Whether you are dealing with just one student in a class or a group of them you just get that sinking feeling that you're not gaining...you're not winning. And, "Why are you in this business" and so that type of feeling...your emotions are so close to the surface."

I reminded **Marguerite** of a student she referred to in the VT sessions. She had mentioned him on several occasions as a student that she was having difficulty managing. I asked her why she had brought him up in the sessions.

**Q** You talked about C... in a couple of our VT sessions. Why did you bring him up?

**Marguerite** "Well because he was literally one of these 'in your face' type persons...this was the 2nd year I've had C... so...I have a routine in the class...so he's the type that will not have his materials out...just listening to his own drummer, doing his own thing, being out of his seat, enticing other people to listen to him... meanwhile I'm talking...doing my routines to get the kids focused on French and he's totally undermining that and not paying any attention. He'd be physically right up to my face...I mean physically nose-to-nose trying to tell me something."

**Q** And the feelings you had when that was happening?

**Marguerite** "I'd like him out of my room...I'd like him out of the way...Why do I have to teach him? Ya, those feelings were definitely there."

**Ann Marie** reported on her experiences with a particular student that we had discussed in a couple of the sessions and some of the feelings she associated with that youngster.

**Ann Marie** "...initially you felt as if you were walking on egg shells...wondering would this be the time when I asked him to sit in his seat...would this be the time when he would kick the chair over..."

I asked her what effect this had on her emotionally.
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**Q** What was this doing to you as you were waiting for this event to take place...your emotions...your sense of confidence?

**Ann Marie** "You know when you (the author) talk about being the victim...you do initially feel that you are the victim...that this child is venting at you and, maybe you caused it...maybe you looked at him the wrong way...maybe you went 'public' on something when you should have whispered in his ear...maybe you used your voice too loudly. You see you start to over-analyze yourself."

Feeling victimized as an initial reaction and then, possibly with elapsed time, this is replaced by a different kind of emotion. **Ann Marie** related this story.

**Q** Did you find yourself having to struggle with your emotions while you were dealing with R...?

**Ann Marie** "...one day when we were restraining him he said that he was going to sneak into my house when I was sleeping and he was going to rip my heart right out. I said to my aid, "He's already doing it!" In his own little way. I'm up at night worrying about him. Wondering about the lifestyle he has had...what's created such anger in this child."

**Jennifer**, while reporting an incident with a particular child in her room, was asked about her approach.

**Q** Why do you think you didn't separate her from the group?

**Jennifer** "I suppose I wanted to avoid getting into that struggle. I'm aware that I was getting angry...I'm thinking "Why am I feeling this way? She's just a little girl." I'm wondering why she is doing this to me...I guess that's what I'm trying to get my finger on...I'm getting angry inside but that's not what I want to feel...I'm kind of mad at myself..."

Both **Ann Marie** and **Jennifer** show evidence of personalizing their experiences with difficult to manage children in the descriptions above. It is difficult to remain objective when vindictive
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behaviours appear directed at you personally (Frieze, et al. 1983; Weiner, 1983; Rohrkemper & Brophy, 1983). **Mary** uses the term 'victimized' in her account of a particular student.

*Mary*"One of the students mentioned in our sharing sessions...I had him in grade 2 ...and he is another child that makes you feel so victimized. I thought oh boy...I think of every piece of advice you (the author) have been giving us and I think of trying to use it with him and I haven't had him for 3 years. I mean he is like a text book case. That's the kind of effect these kids can have on you."

**Patty,** recalling an incident where she observed a student who had a reputation for displaying CDO behaviour doing something wrong, confronted the student. He denied it even though she observed him doing it. She tells about how it affected her.

**Q** *How was your emotional level during the incident?*

**Patty** "...you get frustrated...I guess this is this way with everybody. You know you are right...you know you saw him and you know that he is bald faced lying to you. And you just keep working at it and working at it and short of shaking the kid and yelling, "TELL ME THE TRUTH". You get very frustrated."

Frustration is also a feeling that **Valerie** reported during our conversation when she was describing a child that she had difficulty managing in a classroom context.

**Q** *You mentioned you tried to stay calm and you would yell from time to time. Did you find that you would be experiencing any other kinds of feelings?*

**Valerie** "I would feel frustrated, if that's what you mean. Sometimes you're thinking, "What am I doing here? This is not pleasant!". That's not what you want it to be. You want to walk away feeling confident that you had an impact on the kids."

Managing subsequent, post-event feelings is an issue that **Patty** raised.

**Q** *Do you find that when you are getting around to consequencing kids you have additional feelings that you have to manage?*
Patty  "I've thought things like 'make the kid pay' type of thing. You know, "Boy, if that kid moved or boy it would do that kid a lot of good if someone got him out in the playground, maybe nail him to a wall." It doesn't last long. You know, you start thinking about the kid...that he's been through hell. You start thinking "the kid's been ripped from that home and living in this home, and back and forth". It doesn't last long but, oh yeah that feeling is there."

Recalling a separate episode when she had to physically restrain a student, Patty recalls the following.

Patty"I can remember bringing him up to the office, restrained. By the time I got him to the office I could not breathe. I was so upset I couldn't breathe. I thought, "How could a child who's 7 years old have this kind of effect on me? I'm a mother of 3, I should be able to handle these kinds of things. And I can remember being physically sick. And I was saying things like, why did they move here? Why is this kid at the school?"

Strong lingering negative emotions resulting from recalled CDO episodes have been felt by most of the participants in their experiences as classroom teachers. These emotions were so strong as to cause a few to question their career choices, others to seek sanctuary away from these students and still others to even conjure schemes of vengeance. A few could not escape the feeling of being victimized by these students. Some alluded to experiencing physical effects while others reported reduced self-efficacy and powerlessness...drawn away from what they would prefer to be like. In the presence of persistent negative emotions such as those described above there is a tendency for reduced self-worth and diminished capacity in workplace environments (Harter, 1989).

Theme of Objectifying Attributions:

A few of the subjects identified a gradual return to empathy (a positive emotion) when they considered the student in the full context of their social/emotional development. Ann Marie
for example reports the importance of recognizing that the cause of the misbehaviour may be due to many components that are not necessarily directly attributable to mismanagement.

Commenting on her attitudinal shift she states...

**Ann Marie** "It was gradual ...it was also observing him (a student we discussed in VT training) to see that this attitude just didn't carry on just for me. It happened for the aid also (the teaching assistant) ...He used to behave when the principal came in...very under control, but gradually that wore off and he would just go crazy and he would have to be physically restrained. So you could see "No, it wasn't us." This child had severe emotional problems...no, now we had to look at what was causing those problems and how we could prevent them...So gradually as we kind of got past that it's us and started thinking that it was the child, let's help the child..."

**Patty** distinguishes between the 'during' and the 'after' episode times as being important in examining the full spectrum of information that may influence a teacher's attitude toward an offending student and a possible return to objectivity. Perceiving the student as being 'victimized' is also important in restoring objectivity. **Patty** states...

**Patty**"By the next day I'd see something else in him and I'd think "That poor kid. He's been through so much." My heart just goes out to him. When he's calmed down, the situation isn't as physical or as dangerous...you look at him and think, "Look at what he has had to put up with,"... That's when things start to calm down."

VT training promotes reflecting on student background factors as a possible explanation for misbehaviour. Viewing the aberrant behaviour as a symptom of more fundamental problems in the child's life is helpful in maintaining objectivity and fostering empathetic emotions during and following CDO episodes (Frieze et al., 1983; Weiner, 1983). As **Ann Marie** and **Patty** report, elapsed time appears to assist them in this process. They are using it as a kind of brake pedal for their own emotions. Understanding the phases of an altercation can be useful in mediating...
intense emotionality (Sharp, 1984).

Kim was able to reflect on a particular topic that dealt with the advantages of having as much student information as you can.

Q *What ways specifically do you think it helped...how did it change what you did?*

Kim "... We did talk about some kids... I know in the staff room it gets pretty bad... you know and that's not good... because these kids have problems that make them act like they do.... and we tend to forget that and I must admit, I was too. As adults we can control it *(domestic difficulties)* but they can't. I mean it's like you said... keeping the reasons behind the actions of particular students front and center in your mind.... as information.... helps you to keep objective... helps you to keep calm."

Mary had been discussing a particular student she had difficulty with in the past who was diagnosed with Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. I asked her about her current comfort level with this student after experiencing VT training.

Q *Let's suppose you were to experience the same student you have been talking about right now...how would you feel about your level of preparedness for him right now in your career?*

Mary "To a certain extent I would feel more fortified."

Q *What has helped you feel more fortified do you think?*

Mary "Knowledge of the condition *(ADHD)* has helped. I've done a fair amount of reading on the condition. Certainly empathy for them and what they are going through. What goes on in their heads."

The above accounts seem to suggest that specific kinds of processes assist the teacher in maintaining an objective perspective. Knowledge of the negative elements in a child's domestic life is part of an ecological perspective promoted in VT training and serves as a method of managing intense emotionality during a CDO episode. Patty was able to achieve this following an episode with the student she was describing. Ann Marie was able to determine that her troubled
student was not directing his rage specifically at her. She took comfort in this and this allowed her to assuage her emotions and focus on the child’s difficulties. Kim reports that understanding the student’s motives helped to keep her calm. Mary mentioned that knowledge of specific symptom clusters like Attention Deficit Disorder is helpful in maintaining an empathetic approach. These examples appear to confirm the efficacy of adopting an ecological perspective as a method of managing strong negative emotions when dealing with CDO students.

*Theme of Professional Isolation*

It would appear that CDO episodes have the potential for arousing strong negative affect in these teachers as well as others (Kindsvatter & Levine, 1980; Pik, 1981; Sharp, 1984). How is this negative affect dissipated? What 'professionalizing' processes are in place to assist teachers who become entrenched in this negativity? Here we explore the theme of professional isolation.

When discussing one of her earliest CDO experiences as a graduated teacher, Bonnie recalls the dilemma of not knowing what to do about her situation.

**Q** *Did you try to turn things around with these kids?*

**Bonnie** "Well I tried. I'd tell them that we weren't going on until it was quieter. I went on with the lesson but I wasn't getting the type of behaviour I would have wanted. I don't know what I could have done differently except maybe call the principal earlier. I think they needed that. But as a supply, you never want to do that, especially when you don't have a contract or a lot of years to fall back on."

Bonnie was asked how she felt after this experience.

**Q** *So, at the end of the day, how did you feel?*

**Bonnie** "I didn't feel that I knew where I could have gone...to come at it in a different stance..."

Bonnie was asked if the past 3 months of VT sessions would have helped her in this situation.

**Q** *If you were assigned to that class you supplied in, the one you described initially, and I was running the VT sessions in that school at the same time, do you think that would have helped you?*

**Bonnie** "Oh. Well for sure. Yes that would be an ideal
situation. I would get a lot of benefit from the sessions. Just knowing that there was someone out there who could get you to think about things a little differently. Just knowing that there was someone who had experiences with these kinds of situations. Yes. That would be ideal."

Jennifer speaks of not feeling supported when she was coping with a difficult school-yard incident.

Q *How did you feel about the way you handled it?*

Jennifer "I was satisfied yes but when I came back into the school and reported it to the principal, it just wasn't handled the way I would have liked it to have been handled. It was like... you know...(the principal speaking to Jennifer) you've dealt with it...that's enough...just get on with it. But you know....I would have liked it to be dealt with further the next day. "Will you talk to them?" (a question posed to the principal) "No. You've handled it. That's enough. Just cool off." So it's hard. Sometimes you need that extra support and you don't always get that. I think we've been crying out for that for a long time. You know...just that little bit more...you can handle it to a point...you shouldn't have to always send every problem to someone else to handle but....you know you've handled it up to here and you know you've reached your...final line...it's there for them to handle now. So sometimes you stand back and say..."Now where did that get me?"

I questioned Jennifer about the possible benefits of having support similar to our VT sessions during the time she was experiencing that incident. She commented briefly about the importance of having this kind of support in a school and then returned to the isolation issue.

Jennifer "But there we were alone on this (referring to 2 boys that Jennifer reports ruled the school) and we were saying, "Why us?" And we did...we did say that very often because we were so angry."

Chapter Four
Later in the interview...

Jennifer "You go through different stages... with principals and their different styles. I think we've been drifting for too long."

Jennifer has identified the 'take over my problem' kind of support when she has reached her "final line". But what of in-class support? Mary speaks of an experience she had with a student in one of her classes.

Q Did you feel well supported while you were going through this?

Mary "We had a wonderful principal in here who had had a lot of experience in special education. We ...I immediately started the review process so we could get him identified..."

Q You mentioned you were supported in the review process... did you feel you got adequate support directly in your class?

Mary "I had the consultant come in... she was more like a support for him (the student) rather than for me... So I was the drill sargent with him and the behaviour consultant that came in... she was kind of like his 'pal' and that's the role she would assume with him and that was good.... he needed someone like that. But... in terms of really helping me in the classroom? Uhmm no I don't think so."

Q Now this drill sargent approach you mentioned... was this the persona you were comfortable with?

Mary "No... not at all... but I didn't... I had 32 kids in my class and I had other kids in there that were having problems... there were about 3 boys in there too that were difficult to handle and .... I really didn't have a lot to fall back on. I didn't have a wealth of techniques that I could use."

Q Did you feel any extra pressure... any expectation on you to 'manage' the situation so that it wouldn't get out of control?
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Mary "There is always that expectation in this profession."

Q By whom?

Mary "By everyone. People will say no but underneath it...there's that expectation. We deal with that all the time. We deal with that every day. People, parents, principals and administrators, they expect us to control behaviours in our classrooms. I think it's a bit unfair sometimes because they don't always know who's in the class causing the problems. They don't know the history behind the kids who are acting up."

A few interesting perspectives surfaced in the above reports. Certainly abandonment seems to appear in the commentary. Words like 'alone' and 'drifting' and references to a general lack of guidance are suggestive of a kind of professional isolation where the teachers were expected to 'cope' as best they could without the benefit of any viable support. Bonnie's comments inferred that requesting assistance was actually detrimental to an inexperienced teacher's career. Are graduating teachers just expected to have these skills? The implied expectation that Mary mentions draws the additional inference that somehow good teachers prevent misbehaviour and less competent ones don't, regardless of the social/emotional diversity in the student population in the classroom and/or the training of the teacher. Mary views this as inherently unfair.

"I think we can be responsible for doing something about the behaviour maybe but we can't always prevent the behaviour."

Do administrators, parents and other teachers judge a teacher's competency on the frequency and/or magnitude of misbehaviour in the classroom rather than the teacher's plan of action to remediate such misbehaviour?

The above two sections have established that CDO behaviour has the potential for generating a significant amount of emotional tension in teachers. In addition, there appeared to be little guidance or in-class support provided for the teachers who experience CDO behaviour in their classrooms. This combination is a significant contributor to occupational stress for teachers (Frank & McKensie, 1993; Kindsvatter & Levine, 1980; Pik, 1981; Sharp, 1984; Hiebert &
The Theme. VT Program as an Agent of Change

Whether or not the VT program was effective in bringing about desired changes in the participants must be examined in the context of self-report data since no pre and post in-class observation took place. Because of this the reader is left to consider predictors of change rather than examples of substantive change. References to different techniques that held some appeal for the subjects will be heard. The reader is to consider the following: if a specific technique is appealing, can we attach the inference that it will probably be used. If these techniques, once tried, produce the desired outcome is it reasonable that their use will be continued? Some subjects stated that they tried VT techniques while others mentioned that they intended to try them. Forming the intention to change has been viewed as a reliable predictor of change especially when the individual feels they have the ability to change (Ajzen, 1988; Pajares, 1992; Stanovich, 1994).

Bonnie was asked to comment on any changes she observed in herself with respect to CDO students.

Q Now, after experiencing the Victimless Teaching sessions, and you reflect on your own experiences with CDO students, do you regard these types of students any differently?

Bonnie "...You said that you should try to praise the kids for doing something good. I mean that certainly works with the younger kids. You seemed to suggest that it worked with the older kids too. So that was good to hear. I might be more willing to try that with older kids. What I really liked too was your examples of how you would handle certain CDO students or a CDO situation. One for instance was for the bully. You said take his hat as collateral if he is making a commitment to stop bullying. I would have never thought to do that. I thought that was excellent... It's nice to have something in the hat that you can pull out from time to time because there is no way in a year of teacher's college that you can get all that. You can study years and still not have enough knowledge to work with children. It's nice to have different strategies to fall back on. That was
one thing. There were a few others that I liked. I liked the one about having the bubble gum machine in class with the 'student of the moment award' and I liked the invisible student idea. I'll tuck those away and...I'll use them...”

Q Did you find any changes in your attitude over the course of our sessions? Did you find your feelings toward these type of students being challenged? Was there any growth or movement here?

Bonnie "I felt comfort in finding out that older students do want to be praised...they do want to be noticed. I guess I really didn't either recognize this or didn't believe it. It's nice to know something ...some approach you're good at works at different levels. It gives me the self-confidence to take some risks with the older kids. I mean I guess you have to modify the approach a little bit, but really its based on the same principle. I thought that was really good. That's where I feel my biggest growth occurred."

Marguerite had brought up a student named C... in several of the sessions. The other teachers were quite familiar with him. We had formulated a few VT procedures Marguerite could use with this student during the VT sessions to counter-act some of the behaviours this student was displaying.

Q How is it going with C... now?

Marguerite "... when we talked about him (in the VT sessions)...we talked about specific steps where I could place myself in a different part of the room and kind of ignore him until I saw the behaviour that I wanted. So I've been working on that and...it's a very slow process...it could take half a period before...but meanwhile...I've learned to be teaching on such different levels that I could be ignoring him and still be sensitive to everybody else and we're on task. OK. So that was a really good technique..."

Marguerite expressed some regret for not having some in-class observation as part of the VT
program. I was concerned that she didn't find the sessions helpful.

Q  *Were the sessions helpful to you?*

_**Marguerite**_ "Oh yes. They were helpful... look from nothing (no previous inservice) to that was great. It was very helpful... now I was rereading my notes (VT session notes) this morning and you talk about a particular situation... I like to mull it over... I need to go out and try it out and come back for your insightful comments and then go back and retry it... you know what I mean?... I benefit from that..."

She returned to the topic of in-class observation as being of greater benefit to her.

"... I mean if someone could be there to observe... right in the classroom... that would be more helpful."

She reflected on this for a moment as if she had something else to add.

"Well it's like... I hate to use this buzz word... it's like empowerment. It's like you said... we have to feel empowered to act. I remember you said, oh what was that... something controversial... oh yeah "consistency in consequencing can be the instrument of your own demise." I had to stop and think of that twice... it's kind of like giving permission to... well yeah, to fit the circumstances, why not... you know what I mean? Let's say about my system for gym. What if they have 2 ticks beside their name, 2 minutes into my 40 minute period. You pointed out that they have nothing to gain by behaving at that point... so I tell them that they can reverse the tick... what you have given me (in VT training) is permission to not be so lock-step in my consequencing you see...."

Q  *Would it be fair then to say that you feel more 'empowered' now?*

She mentioned she felt "less rigid in her thinking." Later in our discussion, the

---

2 I agreed to come into her class to observe a French class in progress at a later date.

---
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Q Do you think we were able to do anything about this intimidation factor in our VT sessions?

Marguerite "Well it is ...in lines like you (the author) said...you said you don't have to explain 'why' to these kids...as a professional you have a choice and if the kid is being irrational you don't owe him a rational explanation for your approach...that's very freeing isn't it...no, I don't have to do that...I don't have to explain...the image you asked us to consider...the benevolent dictator...that's a good feeling...I mean you're (referring to teachers) the professional, you're the competent, you know what you're doing and sometimes...you said (referring to the author) you take away the nice-guy part and you become autocratic, and you're allowed to because circumstances dictate that you see...so what you have taught me (in VT training) is flexibility as well...to allow the circumstances dictate your response. You know sometimes I laugh...you notice something that maybe requires your attention but you think, "what purpose is it going to serve to make an issue of it?" so you laugh...and your colleagues say "wow! How'd you let that one go?"...So I think ...what we need to hear...and you've confirmed this...that's O.K. (being selective about issues)...that's O.K."

Approximately one week later I was able to go into Marguerite's French class to observe her teaching. During this 40 minute period I made notes about the procedures she used with the class. Immediately following the class, we met to discuss what I had observed. I felt that it would be inhibiting to make a tape recording of this interview because I was going to focus on the specifics of her teaching behaviour and I didn't want to intimidate her. I did however, make some field notes immediately following the meeting. A paraphrased account of our discussion follows.

The class was very well run and I commented on that. I focused in on the positive
components isolating 2 observable events. I mentioned that I was unable to discern who C... (C... had been the student she had mentioned during our VT sessions) was until she called his name. I told her that this had to be a good sign since he didn't stand out the way she had described him earlier during our VT training (She had reported earlier in the interview that the procedures she adopted for C... were effective). She laughed and joked that at least she was doing something right. Then she elaborated that she thought C... had come a long way since she had been doing 'the planned ignoring' that we had discussed in the VT sessions. The second positive comment I offered had to do with her reinforcement of group behaviours. I mentioned that her praise was delivered quickly and was specific to the behaviours she was looking for.

Marguerite smiled and said with a slight tone of embarrassment, "You're going to mention M... aren't you." I asked her why she felt that and she began to describe a notable (but fairly minor) confrontation she had with M... while I was in the room. I asked her if she felt she handled it well and she said no. I asked her why she felt that way. She began retracing the events that led up to the incident. She mentioned that she became annoyed when he wouldn't begin the seat-work assignment. I heard her admonishing him for this but I wasn't able to hear his response. Marguerite admitted that she wasn't able to either but she felt she heard him say something sarcastic under his breath. She confronted him about this. Marguerite reflected on this during our conversation and she suggested that she gave him too much attention. She stated that she let her annoyance interfere with her concentration and she ended up making him the focus of attention. I explained that recognizing this is probably a good sign because one of the principles of the VT approach is to pay attention to your practice. We talked about what she might have done. She was quick to suggest that she should have continued to distribute praise about the room for those students she found to be on task (a VT technique) and wait to observe M... begin before giving him her attention.

In June of 1997, approximately one year later, Marguerite was asked about the long-range impact the VT training she received had on her.

Q How do you think the Victimless Teaching has affected you as a teacher?

Marguerite "For me it's like nothing gets blown-up any more. Just being able to have a plan that you feel
confident in and using it makes your fears dissolve. So if 'A' happens you do 'B' and it works...you can relax."

Q  Is that a different feeling for you from before?

Marguerite  "Oh I think so. I used to worry about losing control. I don't anymore...I mean it's there...you want predictability and order...but if it doesn't happen the way you want...you can change it."

Q  Losing control...losing control of your emotions?

Marguerite  "No, no. Losing control of the class."

Q  Can you give me an example?

Marguerite  "...dismissals were a problem for me and coming back in...the transition times. I remembered about what you (the author) said about 'shrinking' the environment when we were discussing Mth... at mass that day ... (Mth... was a student we discussed in one of the VT sessions who misbehaved during a mass celebration that the whole school took part in) so I decided to do something about it and I did it (shrinking the environment) with my grade sixes (Marguerite's teaching assignment has changed this year. She is a grade 6 teacher and is no longer teaching French). I thought that a lot of kids could benefit from that approach...so I tried it and it worked...I don't seem to have dismissal problems any more."

Q  Do you still have other kinds of behaviour problems?

Marguerite  (after a pause) "You know ...I still do. The same kids who misbehaved at the start of the year still misbehave now...maybe not as much...they've been like that since the primaries. What's different is I have more energy in the class because I am working with the 'allies' you (the author) talk about...the ones that don't
mess up. Because I'm WITH (with emphasis) them...they know I'm not going to abandon them to deal with a distraction or something like that...I can stay positive and focused. I end up doing a better job. I end up feeling better. It's a good feeling."

Following the workshop presentation on reinforcement strategies (approximately a year and 5 months since the initial VT session), Marguerite approached me about a technique she had tried to reduce the amount of 'shouting-out' behaviour exhibited by some of her students. I asked her permission to record the conversation. Marguerite began...

"I wanted to tell you something...I don't know where I got the idea. It must have been something you (the author) said. You know...I couldn't get them to stop shouting out. They think if they put their hand up it's a licence to speak. I decided to give them these cards. I said, "If you feel the impulse to shout-out and you are able to resist the temptation, put a check mark on the card." It worked. You know, it's like you (the author) said, "Put the responsibility back on them." You have no idea how that little thing has made the class."

I congratulated her on the success she experienced and probed for more details.

Q So, how do you reward the accumulation of check marks?
Marguerite "I use the treat box."

Q Have you given any thought to when the 'treats' might start losing their effect?
Marguerite "Well that's something that is always a problem I suppose...but it's given me a way in. Now I can reinforce them for waiting their turn. There is fewer of the impatient ones now...it's more manageable...they're more manageable. The fact that we discuss their card before the treat is given...it gives them time to reflect on impulse control. I believe
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that's a good thing, you know...to think about what it means in the big picture."

Q The 'big picture'? Can you elaborate on that?

Marguerite "Well...to get them to think about managing themselves as opposed to 'being managed'. That's important."

Returning to the first interview block in the spring of 1996 Ann Marie elaborates on how she manages her own emotionality in CDO episodes.

Q Where do you think you learned to separate yourself like that?

Ann Marie "I've learned a lot of things over the years...Just staying calm. That's something that takes a while to learn...I am now beginning to realize the power that calmness has. Now the louder R... gets the calmer I get. ...it's amazing the effects you have on children when you're calm."

Q Do you find that it is easier to 'stay calm' now as a result of our VT discussions than it was before?

Ann Marie "Yes...oh I think so...I think it helped a lot. Because again, what you (the author) were saying about the feeling of being a victim. You feel that it's an affront to you (the CDO behaviour) so it's even more difficult. Now I realize that some children are different and that it's not me. That allows you to divorce yourself from it and stay calmer. Before I would get so wrapped up in the lives of these children. But you have to stand back and remain calm by divorcing yourself from their personal situations...I think everyone can benefit from that kind of training. I mean I still need to improve because there are times when I try desperately not to go crazy. But there is the odd time...it'll be this thing that will push me over the edge. But it'll take a lot to push me now but before it wouldn't
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take much to push me over."

Q Moving back a bit now...I am interested in your reaction to the VT experience. How did you find that experience in terms of how it has influenced you in the classroom?

Ann Marie "Well, it was very confirming for one thing. I am so pleased to hear you mention that you don't...I mean consequences have a place but to hear you (the author) speak of consequencing becoming more intrinsic...and I liked your concept of...even with those students that were struggling through your exam (an example the author used in the VT sessions)...and you identified that self-esteem was the real issue rather than their academic abilities. We get caught up in issues and try to make them black or white. We say things like "You have to stay in at recess. This is the consequence." ...rather than looking at it more closely and being careful not to over-consequence kids. I don't want children behaving appropriately just because I am in the classroom and then behave totally differently when I am out of the room. It's like the cat's gone and now the mice can play. I want them to develop their own sense of the reason why we behave this way. The reason that we don't hit someone isn't just because we are going to stay in for recess. The reason is because you hurt that person. You have to see beyond that. So I liked your section on more logical consequencing. So if a student snuck outside and neglected to put his coat on when going out for recess, I'm not going to consequence him the weather will do that. A lot of teachers still have the philosophy, if you break this rule then this is the consequence. It's black or white...there is no grey."

Q So when someone, who is perceived to be an 'expert', affirms something that you have thought about...you believe in... and he does it in a collegial setting such as in our group, does that affirmation help you in your dealings with children? Does it help you reconcile
your actions with your colleagues?

Ann Marie "I do. Yes... very much so. It allows me to be more creative and not feel that I have to stick to the status quo. I think of more creative ways of consequencing children rather than just staying in for recess because that's what you do."

Q Before we end, is there anything in the VT experience that stands out as being particularly beneficial to you in your practice?

Ann Marie "I think I felt more... empowered... that these kids didn't seem as much of a burden for me anymore... yes I felt positive about things that once made me feel like I wasn't doing such a good job. I liked the term 'victimless'... you do as you (the author) say... you do as a teacher feel like a victim sometimes and it is nice to know that you don't have to be."

In June 1997, I was able to follow-up on some of the things Ann Marie spoke about a year earlier with respect to the impact the VT program had on her.

Q Can you identify how you may have benefited from the VT program after having been a participant in it for over a year now?

Ann Marie "Probably it was the flexibility... knowing that there were many ways you could choose to approach a problem and that sometimes it was more effective when you did things privately."

Q Can you think of ways you are different... in your teaching?

Ann Marie "I suppose... I am more confident... knowing more things I can do... that kind of thing."

Q Can you think of any examples of this?

Ann Marie "A few weeks ago I was supervising the hallway and J... came out of the washroom and told me that E... was swearing in the washroom. I thought
about the things you (the author) said, about perceptions
about different agendas and motives...I thought about
what I knew E... to be like and so I thanked J... and
told him I was sorry he had to hear that kind of
language and I just headed down the hallway. I didn't
want a confrontation with E... about something that was
reported to me that way. That might have put J... in a
bad spot or maybe J... was trying to get E... in
trouble. I decided that was an issue I wouldn't
follow-up on right then and there. Now that I think of
it, it would have gone the wrong way if I had
confronted E.... I mean the next day when I saw the
boys going into the washroom again I reviewed the kinds
of behaviour that was expected...but in a group...there
was no finger pointing...no accusing...no victims. I
felt I dealt with it in a creative way and that's nice
to know that every situation doesn't have to be dealt
with in the same way. So in the end, the message got
across and everything was on an even keel."

Q And you wouldn't have handled the incident like that before?

Ann Marie "No...not with as much thought...I would have
probably confronted E......and...it would have become
a big thing. This way I get to feel good about the way
it ended..."

Returning to the first interview time period in the spring of 1996 Jennifer comments on the VT
sessions as being beneficial as a reminder to use certain techniques that you have not been using.

Q What aspect of the VT sessions did you find the most beneficial in terms of your
practice?

Jennifer "... I think the one thing...I liked that idea about
you finding the child that is really doing it the right way
and you praise them instead of reprimanding the one's who aren't. It's an easy habit to fall into. I had been doing this for a couple of years. That really works. It doesn't even matter what ages they are...whether they are 4 or 14...if you say, "I really like the way Joe or Mary is sitting" and somebody else will say, "I am too" ...it's the ripple effect and then you eventually get the guy you wanted to sit nicely anyway. I thought that was a good thing to pay attention to...and it works."

Q If your teaching situation were to change next year let say and you found yourself teaching maybe...grade 8...is there anything from our VT sessions that perhaps would have provided you with a greater sense of confidence in preparing for that experience?

Jennifer "...I was interested in your technique for ignoring misbehaving kids. I would need to practice that a bit. But I know I tried some of your techniques when I went into my 20 minute lunch duty with the kids from the different grades and I practice there...and they do work but I'd feel better with more experience with the older ones doing that. It's hard...like it's not just going to happen in one day. I'm trying. I see progress."

Bridging from the same question, Jennifer began to report changes she noticed with one of her colleague's practice.

"With Kim (teacher who had been using VT techniques)...you know it's working for her room...I see progress...it's getting better..."

Q In what ways do you see progress?

Jennifer "It's just getting better for all of us...working as a team...they're (the students) all looking for attention...we look for ways of keeping them calm and we're getting there. I'm kind of proud, you know I was in there today (lunch room) and they were actually sitting...they're talking
normal...ignoring...it's hard...just blocking them out as if they weren't even there and focusing in on the quiet ones...it works...but it's hard to do."

Q Did you notice anything about your attitude when things started to work right?  

Jennifer "Yeah. You feel better about coming to work. You feel good...the child is kind of a reflection of you then...you know...oh, I did that...you know it's not always what the children learn in the books which I try to tell the kindergarten parents, it's their attitude. If their attitude is good, if they're happy you are. So your day is not so rough. When you're having a bad day like Kim does sometimes...it's not easy. You know...you're in their face and you think "I'm not getting through to them...maybe I'm not a good teacher" and you start getting down and down and you think teaching is not for me. But, if you get one doing it right you think "Wow, maybe this is OK."

Q Do you credit VT training for any of that? 

Jennifer "Oh I would think so...just the way we are working as a team and seeing the problem from the same perspective...that's good. I used to dread lunch-room duty but now ...well I see the way its working...it's good."

In June of 1997, approximately a year later, Jennifer was questioned again about ways in which her practice may have changed as a result of the VT program. She mentioned the support aspect again as being particularly beneficial and then added...

Jennifer "Well...I make sure I notice the positive things in the class first...I didn't always do that but I do now and I do it in other areas of the school as well. I think I am more confident...not as afraid to be involved with the others (the other students)."

Returning to the first interview session in the spring of 1996 Kim felt positive about this aspect of the VT program.
Q You've participated in the VT sessions from the beginning. What motivated you to continue coming to the groups?

Kim "Well I think you (the author) made really good points that I needed reinforced. I found after March break I went away...and I found that I had forgotten some of the stuff you said and when I came back and then we had our first session and ...it brought it all back to me. It gave me something to think about weekly instead of being my same old self trudging along ...I could change something and I knew the change....by taking some of your ideas and putting them back into practice...you know, reshuffling the deck, whatever...that I could use those ideas to help improve the situation instead of it being so confrontational because it was getting to the point where other kids in my class were becoming confrontational...you know...telling the kids to shut up...and I don't allow that in my class. It just gave me more options that could work out to be more positive. Just saying "Thank you" (Reference to the acknowledging your allies technique) to kids has worked really well. I'd have other kids sticking up there books and saying "I'm ready too"...Just fresher ideas and I think ..."

Q So you got a lot out of the group?

Kim "Oh for sure. I thought they (the topics) were about common things that everybody deals with...and your points (in the VT program) were really well received...I mean I made notes and I've kept them stapled to my day book...if I need something to think about...another idea to try, I go to them"

Q Did you find that you felt differently about the kids who were giving you problems?

Kim "I was thinking the other day and...about that question and you know, I think I actually do. What I thought was that by ignoring something a kid did you are actually doing
something for the kid...I mean by ignoring it. It's like you say, it frees you up to work with the kids who are not screwing up. I guess I felt that by doing that I'm doing something for everybody. That's a good thing I think in terms of what you said about responsibility. You end up being more responsible ...

In June of 1997, approximately 1 year later, Kim reported the following.

**Q Can you tell me how things are different for you now because of the VT program?**

**Kim** "For me it was probably the issue management (a VT topic). I mean the whole idea that you don't have to control everything...I was always in their face...it was getting to me. Now, I am more relaxed with it. I know I can teach them how to handle a lot of their own situations rather than me having to do it for them. I feel better ...they feel better. That and focusing on the positive. I think of C... and how it (the VT training) helped me with him. Just a simple thing like moving away...that was so effective. I think you taught me how to be objective. I was too down to be objective before. Now, I don't have a problem with it. And this year, with Cr...it was so much easier...I realized that he was being sent to P's (the principal) too much...I wanted to fix that...I wanted him back in the room...I was able to be objective about it and wanted the best for him."

**Q And you didn't think you could be like that?**

**Kim** "Well no...you just thought if you're (referring to the student) going to be like that then I don't want you here...now it's like, how can I get him back in? You know, I started chunking the work in smaller units and
I made the chart up with the assignments to be checked off and I arranged for his mom to sign it...all of that so he could be back in. And you know, I got a little note from him...can you believe it...it said "Thanks for helping me" and that I was the best teacher he ever had. I just about dropped dead."

Returning to the first block of interviews in the spring of 1996, Mary identifies some changes in her practice.

Q Do you feel you've experienced any changes in your practice since we've been working together?

Mary "It (the VT program) reinforced many of the things I was already doing but maybe I wasn't doing them with the finesse that you (the author) would do it or maybe I didn't have quite the right language...changing the way I say things...just the idea that you're not a victim that was so liberating...because you don't have to be a victim ...there is a more positive way to go about it."

Q Liberating? How so? In what ways did it liberate you?

Mary "It freed you up to think about the whole kid and not just what he was doing to you. In fact, it was no longer what he was doing to you...no, it became "What can I do for him?" That was liberating."

We began discussing some of the topics and the format of the VT sessions. I asked Mary if she had noticed any changes in her perception of her responsibility for behaviour problems since beginning the sessions.

Q In terms of your perception of your responsibility for working with CDO students, do you feel you have changed with respect to that perception since we've been working together?

Mary" Definitely. Now I feel I have more tools to deal with these kids...and of course they're your responsibility...if
you don't deal with them today they're going to be in your face tomorrow so why not deal with them today."

Q  *Is that how you've always felt or is that something new?*

Mary "No. That's basically how I've always felt but I never felt that I had all the tools that I needed."

Q  *Do you think having the tools empowers you take on the responsibility for CDO students with greater commitment?*

Mary "Yes. I think so. Just knowing that there is something you can do and you have the skill to do it...that's empowering isn't it."

We began discussing the legitimization of the social curriculum as a viable entity in schooling children.

Q  *Do you think the VT sessions were helpful in terms of legitimizing the social curriculum for CDO students?*

Mary "Oh. For sure. It reinforced that idea that we teach the whole kid, not just the academic side of the kid."

Patty reported positive results from trying some of the VT techniques.

Q  *Did you feel that you really consciously tried to apply some of the techniques to specific situations?*

Patty "I remember doing the 'reentry to the classroom' as the consequence. I can remember trying that one out and it worked. And there was the one where you're out in the hall problem solving with a student and I was out with R... and I stuck my head in the classroom and told G... to get out the dinosaurs and that one worked real good. It got him bouncing off the wall to get the problem solved. Those ones were definite ones where I consciously put into practice because it was an area I was having difficulty with."

Q  *Were you aware of any attitudinal shifts that you can directly relate to the VT sessions?*
Patty "Yes I can honestly say there was but it wasn't just the sessions though. My most problematic student, R... he started on medication about half way through your sessions. He responded to the medication so that probably helped too. I did start to treat him differently because he was reacting to me differently then too. I guess there was respect that was evident that I hadn't seen before. It was like that type of thing where before I would say something to him and he would say, "Shut up you idiot!" and that was replaced with a more appropriate response or maybe it would be inappropriate but he wouldn't be shouting at me. I think I began to see that as positive where as before, it would still be a negative. Its a little thing but it really helped...the attitude I mean."

Finally, we hear from Valerie and the benefit she derived from the program.

Q Did the Victimless Teaching sessions have any impact on you...either attitudinally or in the ways you interacted with students?

Valerie "Oh yes. I really appreciated all the ideas you (the author) gave us. I really tried put into practice...what you told us about the non-consequences...like praising the students who are behaving and and thanking them for behaving while ignoring the ones that are not. That has worked very well with a lot of the children especially just before lunch when they are all hungry and a little tired or after lunch when they come in from playing and they are all hyper. That has made a big difference in the one class that I go to after lunch. I feel better when I go in there. Before I was saying, you know, "Oh, these guys are such a tough bunch." But since we have been praising them for being quiet, sitting nicely, being ready ....things go much better. Now they are more polite and more willing to be quiet and things settle down more quickly whereas before
they weren't willing to settle down."

Q You mentioned you felt better. Could you elaborate?

Valerie "It feels better going into that classroom now. I feel more confident that if I point out the other children that are doing well, the others will pick up on that and follow suit. So when I have a chance to praise the other students who I never praised because they were so awful, they get some praise now too. They seem to be at the age where they soak that up."

Q Do you feel better because it works?

Valerie "Well it makes me feel good because I can like the children better when they're behaving...it's more pleasant to go in there ... the children are normal...polite...lovely little children instead of being confrontational and it allows you to operate on much nicer scale. It's wonderful."

Approximately one year later, in June of 1997, I spoke to Valerie again about her progress with her teaching.

Q Can you tell me ways that you think the VT program has had an effect on you?

Valerie "I got a lot out of all the sessions, especially the last one (the whole staff workshop on 'reinforcement strategies')."

Q Can you tell me ways in which things are different for you? It's been over a year now. Have things changed for you?

Valerie "Very much. I pay attention more to the difficult children. I don't mean I give them more attention. I don't. In fact I give them less. I just pay attention to what I am doing when they are doing what they're doing when they misbehave. I make sure I reinforce the positive ones first."

Q And that's helped?

Valerie "Oh yes. It's helped a great deal. Some classes
I never enjoyed (Valerie is an itinerant French teacher) because of some of the children...they can be quite a handful. There were some well behaved children in those classes too. I just wasn't recognizing that I guess. I was too worried about the other ones to notice. That's made the difference. I can enjoy them. When I do that, things seem to go better...I teach better."

In summary, individual teachers reported evidence of increased confidence, a willingness to try some of the techniques, more flexibility in their approach, adapting VT principles to other situations, greater acceptance of diversity in the classroom, increased comfort, more empowerment to act. They observed the successes of peers, and reported a more positive outlook, increased sense of responsibility for the student behaviour, less victimization, having more tools to work with these students and more of a tendency to reflect on their own practice. Many of these positive effects were reported more than a full year after the VT sessions ended.

Theme of Collaboration and Affirmation

Opportunities to share and reflect on one's practice are excellent mediums for professional development in general (Clark, et al., 1996; Jordan, 1994) and quite necessary when dealing with diversity in the classroom in inclusionary settings (Stanovich, 1996; Udvari-Solner, 1996). Many of the subjects in this current study testify as to the intrinsic benefit of meeting as a group and sharing perceptions and strategies. The VT sessions were not by definition true collaborative efforts because they lacked a decision-making focus and a collective accountability. However the weekly sessions did have other qualities that shared essential elements for effective collaboration (Stanovich, 1996). Firstly, attendance was voluntary. Secondly, there was parity amongst the members of the group. The fact that the author, acting as the facilitator, had no attachments to the administration either philosophically or procedurally, assured each member an equitable voice unencumbered by systemic taboos. Thirdly, the group sought the common goal of improved efficacy with the management of aberrant behaviour in the classroom and in the school. Finally, there was a sharing of resources which for the most part entailed knowledge and strategies. Many of the VT subjects reported benefits from the general discourse that occurred during the sessions.
The reader will hear four specific themes relating to this discourse: the value of opportunities to hear others, the value of being heard, the value of feedback and the intrinsic value of peer-affirmation.

**Bonnie** while outlining the specific strategies she felt were viable in her own practice added the following.

**Bonnie**"You know, sometimes just teachers sharing what works and what doesn't work gives you something to draw on."

When asked about the helpfulness of the sessions, **Marguerite** commented on the opportunity for feedback.

**Marguerite**"It was very helpful...now I was rereading my notes (VT session notes) this morning and you talk about a particular situation...I like to mull it over...I need to go out and try it out and come back for your insightful comments and then go back and retry it...you know what I mean?...I benefit from that."

**Ann Marie** recalled her own particular experience with affirmation.

**Ann Marie**"I think it (the VT experience) was wonderful. It got us to sit down and talk about our own students in our classrooms. It helped you arrive at the notion that each child is an individual...I mean we all feel the same way about a confrontational child. It's very frustrating for all of us and we are all looking for different ways of dealing with the situation. The brainstorming approach was excellent. Dealing with these problems as a group gave us a sense that we didn't have to bear the responsibility for these youngsters in isolation. We could share the burden. It gave us a real group sense of dealing with the problem rather than saying, "This is my problem."

I asked her to discriminate the message from the way the message was delivered in the VT sessions.

**Q** Do you feel that what we discussed was more important than the way we discussed it
or vice versa?

Ann Marie "I think it was both. We needed the content. We needed to have you (the author) to give us some of the strategies that you have developed. We needed you to steer the discussions in the right direction. Then it was nice afterwards to talk about, "Have we used any of these ideas in our classrooms, have they worked, have there been problems?" I like that idea. I liked your idea about the imaginary student. "Has anyone tried that? What happened? When did you use it?" I liked that idea. It just opened us up to brainstorming more creative ways of dealing with these kids."

Jennifer reflected on the affirmation she received in the sessions...

Jennifer" We need to be told we are doing the right thing or we are doing a good job. I felt good...I felt smart for a change (laughing)."

and later in the interview she added...

Jennifer" I think the people that were here (in the VT sessions) were representative of the teachers who were really down about our work and we needed to be affirmed. We wanted someone else to say we're doing OK. Find me something on that sheet (the VT hand-outs) that I did or am doing...I'm OK. I can go back for another day. I think we were at a stage where we needed this program... Somebody was finally taking us under their wing and listening."

and again in June of 1997, approximately a year later when asked how she benefited from the VT training she replied...

Jennifer "I probably got more out of the support...just listening to the others and seeing...oh...that's how this kid is and that kid is...listening to the ideas and the solutions...that was good."

Chapter Four
Returning to the first interview session in the spring of 1996 Mary also felt the affirmation she received benefited her.

Mary" ...you sit there and you (the author) give advice about different strategies and I sit there and I think I filter it through every class I have ever taught and say OK...yeah that worked...and you're (the author) supporting some of the things I've already done. I may have either forgotten about them or I forget to use them sometimes. In that way you are really reinforcing the good things that I have already learned... It complements the principles of adult learning. You're reinforcing what we're doing...and we're reinforcing what we're learning because we are taking it back into our classrooms, in a real life situation and then sharing it with our peers and that's where the best learning occurs. The best courses I've taken since teachers college is when I've been able to take it back to my class and then share it with my peers. That's the way adults learn...so the way you set it up makes sense. Other PD days are a waste of time...a shot in the dark."

Mary spoke briefly on the value of having this kind of instruction from a peer as opposed to a different type of professional.

Mary "...we know that you (the author) are aware of exactly what we face when we walk into our class. We accept you as a peer. I couldn't accept advice from someone who I felt didn't know what I was up against."

Kim commenting on the power of voice provided in the VT sessions.

Kim " I think coming in like you (the author) did ...with you being a separate person from the group...it was obvious you knew a lot more than we did...and you had much more experience with the more severe cases....and by you being ...people talked...people talked freely....but with you
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being new to the group people were less likely to get right out and bitchy...about kids....because I didn't want that to happen."

Later in the interview in response to a question about what benefit she felt she derived from the VT sessions, Kim commented.

Kim "I would say the ideas that came up from the sessions were...thinking that....I mean I know that we're not alone in all this and we tend to think that sometimes...we get alienated...it was good that we could share and not feel so alone on this... This way we can begin to think of how we can deal with these kids collectively instead of going into the staff room and just complaining."

Patty felt that the VT sessions provided her with an adjunct to her mediation training. She reflected...

Patty "That's (the VT sessions) good too because you feel more supported. Like someone will say something (in the VT sessions) and I say "Yeah, yeah! That's how I feel." But sometimes you don't say anything because you think you might be the only one. I don't want to feel dumb. You think, "I took such and such a course. I should know how to deal with that...People are sharing information (in the VT sessions) but they are relating it to you in the context of their own experience. They are saying, "Yes, this particular approach does work". I mean, if you read it in a book let's say, it does not have the same credibility as someone who has come in and reported that they have tried such and such and it does work. I think it was practical because you (the author) are dealing with situations on a day to day basis where there are a lot of problems. The fact that we are a small school helps too because most of the teachers who were around this table have had most of the kids who are now in grade 8 so having to deal with problems that have gotten
worse or better throughout the years. I think having you as a facilitator helped us get through things or to bring up things that we may never of thought of before. And, even if you were to read these techniques in a manual it wouldn't have been as good because you were able to bring in some life-experiences that we could relate to as teachers. And we were able to go back to our classrooms and try the techniques out and come back every week to see how successful these techniques were. This was good. You'd hear so and so say "I tried this and it worked" or "I tried this and I had some problems with it". This is how we should be supported."

Later Patty commented on the value of opportunities for follow-up discussion in the VT sessions.

Patty "I think the weekly review sessions were the most beneficial for me. We had some in-service by Board personnel. The suggestions would maybe work, but if you ran into difficulty or they stopped working after awhile...then what? I would have to try something new. It would drive me nuts. With these sessions (the VT program) there was enough follow-up to make the suggestions more workable. I could go back to the classroom and try a few things confident that if I ran into a problem, I could bring it up next session. I could stay more committed to the changes that I was trying to accomplish."

Valerie commenting on the format of the sessions states...

Valerie "I liked the format because it was more personal because you could ask questions or you could say what you had done or express how you felt about a certain thing...I found it helpful because I teach in some of the classes, you know we share the same kids (Valerie is an itinerant French teacher) ...It's good to see if they (the other teachers) have problems with the same ones that I have problems with. It's good to see
how they handle it."

In summary then, the VT sessions, among other things, appeared to provide some respite for the subjects as they grappled with their various classroom difficulties. Coming together as peers for mutual support and problem solving seemed to be a catharsis for many of them. It appeared to wash away much of their sense of alienation in having to cope with these problem behaviours alone. The fact that the group continued to meet regularly a full year following the last formal VT session is a testament to the value that experience held for these teachers.
CHAPTER FIVE
Discussion

Facilitating positive change in teachers' attitudes and in their perceptions of their own practice has been the impetus driving this study. Through an iterative, inductive process the author has collected many observations about teachers and their practice while working with students who display CDO behaviours. Many of these observations have accumulated through the author's own experience as a teacher of many years, working in schools where such behaviours were evident, and having to formulate principles to guide his own practice with these students. Other observations were acquired in the process of compiling this document. The two strands of 'evidence' created some epistemological tensions between the lure of subjective musings and the rigors of objective accounting. As much as these musings may have inadvertently competed with the process of writing this paper, it is the opinion of the author that his historical link to the content gives the paper added strength. The author's background helped him to understand the conditions of practice encountered by the teachers and to be guided by this understanding. It is these conditions that often inhibit the adoption of viable educational innovation (Malouf & Schiller, 1995). Research that respects the 'realities' of the classroom experience achieves pragmatic advantages over other forms of research (Malouf & Schiller, 1995).

The interaction of teachers' beliefs about CDO students' motives, teachers' attitude toward these students and teachers' practice as they address the needs of these students in their classrooms has been the central thread that has bound these bits of epistemological tapestry together. It is this thread that will guide the following discussion.

The study reported here has helped to clarify the complex construct of teachers' perception of their own teaching efficacy in terms of our understanding of it, and in terms of how it can be improved in teachers. Authors have noted that within-teacher variances on measures of teacher efficacy can be explained as functions of situational, or domain-specific factors (Guskey & Passaro, 1994; Pajares, 1996a & 1996b; Ross et al., 1995). This perspective is consistent with the quantitative and qualitative data presented in this thesis. The relatively strong linear relationship (r = .640) CDO Efficacy held with Personal Teaching Efficacy (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) has affirmed it as a viable factor in the general measure of teaching efficacy.
provides a contextual component of efficacy not included in other measures. The teachers in this study were able to isolate a sense of their own efficacy with this specific population of students when they responded to the video vignettes in the recalled context of their own experiences. In the qualitative account, the expression of the teachers’ frustration as a reduced sense of their own effectiveness with the CDO episodes they were recalling and the alienation they experienced as they attempted to overcome this frustration highlights the power of the contextual elements to adversely influence efficacy expectations.

Assessing the predictive value of the measure of CDO Efficacy is not possible in the present study because actual teaching methods were not analyzed. Only the teachers’ perceptions were assessed. Do the benefits inherent in increasing teachers’ perceptions of their self-efficacy with students displaying CDO behaviour approximate the virtue inherent in improving their actual practice? It probably does. The reader will recall that when teachers have a high perception of their own teaching efficacy they adopt challenging goals, try harder to achieve them, persist when they encounter obstacles (Allinder, 1994; Landrum & Kauffman, 1992; Ross et al., 1995) and develop coping mechanisms to manage their emotional states (Ross, et al., 1995). It would follow then that elevated levels of perceived CDO Efficacy would predict similar teaching characteristics with students displaying CDO behaviour. If these same teachers also perceive ‘improved’ conduct in their students, this would tend to reinforce their efforts and the pattern of positive change would be sustained. Some examples of this were evident in the qualitative phase of this study. Marguerite’s account of her method for getting her students to wait for permission to respond, Ann Marie’s method for handling the washroom incident and Jennifer noticing her colleague Kim’s effective classroom management techniques are all examples of the reinforcing potential improved student outcomes have on teachers’ sense of their own efficacy.

Another question raised by this study concerns the function of beliefs and actions in the field of human agency. To what extent do our beliefs predict our actions? Bandura (1986) and Pajares (1992) feel, as do others (Ajzen, 1988; Allinder, 1994; Landrum & Kauffman, 1992) that beliefs generally guide our actions. However, there is sufficient evidence in the current study to suggest the possibility of a reciprocal relationship between actions and beliefs. Bandura (1986) has identified the power of disconfirming experiences to alter entrenched beliefs and attitudes. In the qualitative phase of the study, there was evidence of this. For Marguerite, acknowledging
that she got into an otherwise avoidable confrontation with M..., and her ability to generalize VT techniques for her dismissal problems and for her students who shout out in class and then, reflecting on the relative success of these techniques, all helped to shape her attitude about her improved sense of competency. She remarked that students continue to misbehave as they have always done but what is different is her analysis of her own attitude. In her own words: “I can stay positive and focused. I end up doing a better job. I end up feeling better. It’s a good feeling.” She is evaluating her role in avoiding reinforcing undesirable behaviour, as unintentional as it may be. We can infer from this that she is viewing student behaviours with more of an ecological perspective based on her perception of the students’ needs and motives, and this was reinforced with the success she was experiencing. Ann Marie had a similar experience. While describing how she handled a washroom incident with a student she reflected, “now that I think of it, it would have gone the wrong way if I had confronted E...”. Her after-the-fact appraisal of this altercation was that it was the best way to handle it. This reflection affirmed for her some developing beliefs about E...’s behaviour, the motives that drive it and her role in avoiding to reinforce it. Similarly, Jennifer’s assessment of her lunchroom supervision, Kim’s analysis that ‘ignoring’ is a type of action, and Valerie’s appraisal of her ability to manage her own classroom practice are all examples of actions being affirmed.

CDO Emotionality surfaced as a viable component in the general measure of teaching efficacy. As a subscale in the CDOPS it accounted for 7.6% of the variance. Its mild to medium negative linear correlation with Personal Teaching Efficacy \( r = -0.395 \) and CDO Efficacy \( r = -0.475 \) suggests that strong negative emotions are a significant part of the efficacy equation when deconstructing a CDO episode. It is difficult to feel empowered to teach these students when you are consumed by anxiety and apprehension. This negativity was also confirmed in the qualitative phase of the study where the teachers reported that their feelings of victimization caused them to seek retribution and relief from these students. Career choices were questioned, physical effects were experienced and a kind of professional impotence gripped them. These were powerful moments in their lives. They could be recalled vividly even after an elapsed time of several years. The impact strong aversive experiences have on beliefs is an important consideration in this factor (Bandura, 1986).

The ability to manage negative emotions surfaced as a benefit subsequent to VT training.
In the qualitative phase, we heard Ann Marie speak of how important it is to step back and see the child as a victim. She mentioned that she was able to do this. Marguerite explains that her sense of confidence in her approach has helped keep things from getting ‘blown-up’. Kim reports being more ‘relaxed’ because she has learned to hand over the responsibility for many behaviours to the students themselves. Patty was able to view student progress in smaller increments and that helped her feel less victimized by the student she was describing. Valerie found that she was able to ‘like’ the children more when she was successful in getting them to behave. It appears then that teachers’ attributions about student motives, the context in which they are derived and a sense of their own teaching efficacy effects the valence of emotionality one holds as being either positive or negative.

Locus of Responsibility also was affirmed as a viable factor in the measure of teaching efficacy. It accounted for 6% of the variance in the CDOPS. It held a moderate linear correlation with Personal Teaching Efficacy ($r = .506$) and CDO Efficacy ($r = .538$) and a mild negative one with CDO Emotionality ($r = -.319$). This suggests that the issue of ownership for students’ behavioural remediation in many cases is directly related to how effective the teacher feels about his/her ability to perform the necessary techniques. The direct relationship between teaching-efficacy beliefs and the orientation one holds for assuming the primary responsibility for teaching at-risk students has been identified previously (Jordan et al., 1991, 1993, 1997; Stanovich et al., 1994, 1998; Wolfolk & Hoy, 1990) and the data in the current study appear to be consistent with the findings of these authors.

The qualitative phase of the study provided evidence that this responsibility did not have to be an isolated one. Support from peers was an integral theme that surfaced in these accounts. The teachers were able to identify this as a contributing variable in their over-all development. Ann Marie puts it, “Dealing with these problems as a group gave us a sense that we didn’t have to bear the responsibility for these youngsters in isolation. We could share the burden.” The accounts testify as to the importance of affirmation that comes from peers. It legitimized their beliefs, it provided emotional support for their feelings and it assisted them to develop effective strategies.

The ability of the Victimless Teaching program to affect change in these teachers was affirmed in this study. Significant Group by Phase interactions with substantial effect sizes were
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achieved in all three of the variables measured in the CDOPS. The teachers in the Treatment Group registered significant improvement over the Comparison Group teachers in CDO Efficacy, Locus of Responsibility and CDO Emotionality. Based on this instrument it appears that attributional training was effective in altering these teachers’ perceptions of their own efficacy, decreasing their perceptions of their own emotional reactivity and reporting feeling more responsible for the remediation of their students’ inappropriate behaviour.

The theoretical cornerstone of the VT program is attributional training. Unfortunately, the variable hypothesized to measure teachers’ attributions, Perception of Volitional Control, was not substantiated in the current form of the CDOPS. Should a revised CDOPS be developed, complete with a valid measure of teachers’ attributions about students’ motives for their misbehaviour, a more complete assessment of this as a dependent variable could be obtained. Alternatively, the theme of Objectifying in the qualitative account tapped a representation of the Treatment Group’s attributional ascriptions. In this section Ann Marie, Patty, Kim and Mary reported attributions that reflect the perception of reduced volitional control on the part of the student when offering explanations for the student’s misbehaviour. The students have been described as victims of some other factor that places them as only indirectly responsible for their actions. This is the intent of VT training but it is not clear whether this notion occurred subsequent to it specifically. Pre-VT Program interviews that addressed this question would have to be conducted to ascertain this.

Benefits from VT training appear to have a self-sustaining quality. The teachers continued to meet more than a full year after the last VT session. The teachers were able to identify specific benefits they felt they received as a result of the program even after 14 months. That in itself is significant. After that prolonged time, Marguerite and Ann Marie provided examples of when they invoked VT approaches and applied them to some problems they were experiencing; and Jennifer, Kim and Valerie were able to isolate attitudinal types of change. So there appears to have been a lasting effect to the program.

The qualitative research phase revealed some unanticipated benefits for the teachers from the VT training as well. The teachers reported that the process of meeting regularly as a group to discuss common problems was beneficial. The affirmation they received from one another and the collaborative method of problem solving with the guidance of an ‘expert’ appeared to have a
positive influence on the teachers. Bonnie's comments about the importance of sharing, and Ann Marie indicating the value of developing "a group sense of dealing with problems" are indications of the benefit of collaborating when dealing with problem behaviour. This particular benefit addressed the professional isolation felt among the teachers as well. Jennifer stated, "someone was finally listening to us" and Kim, "it was good that we could share and not feel alone on this" account for this effect. The fact that the teachers continued to meet a full year after is a significant indication of this benefit. Other authors have observed similar benefits (Cooley & Yovanoff, 1995; Gersten, Morvant & Brengleman, 1995; Gersten et al, 1997; Pugach & Johnson, 1995). Pugach and Johnson (1995) report that peer collaboration through dialogue resulted in changes in attitude and a decrease in referral rates. Cooley and Yovanoff (1995) found stress management along with peer collaboration to be effective agents of change in their study as well.

Implications for Research and Teacher Training

The correspondence of CDO Efficacy with actual teaching practice was not assessed here, except through the teachers' reports. Only the perception of CDO Efficacy was measured. Linking it to measures of effective practice with students who display CDO behaviour is quite compelling as a predictive tool although such measures would be extremely complex. 'Best' practices for students displaying an array of interfering behaviours would have to be identified. These practices would have to evolve from a concentric perspective about what methods 'best' address the emotional health and psychological well-being of these students. Extremes from militaristic approaches to psychological counselling could conceivably be considered in the discussion. Consensus on this topic would be unlikely. Also, the outcome indicators for these students would be equally confounding. Would frequency of disturbing behaviour be the measure, or would a measure of the student's psychological acquiescence be more appropriate? Assuming there was consensus in the field and viable measures did exist, in-class observations would have to be collected in the context of a CDO episode. Given the emotionally charged nature of these situations, such episodes might be distorted, possibly through emotional constraints of the teacher, or excessive bravado on the part of the student. CDO episodes are uniquely personal experiences for both the student and the teacher where vulnerabilities are exposed and emotions are raw. Efficacy may cease to be a relevant variable beyond a certain point in these situations. What is probably more important is the residual effect these episodes
have for the teacher and the student, and the opportunities they each have for future positive change. The extent to which perceptions influence these opportunities is key. This makes it especially important to include an assessment of teachers’ perceptions in inservice initiatives involving the management of behaviour.

The inference that these teachers’ beliefs were adjusted due to affirming experiences is a probable one subsequent to this study, but we are unclear as to the nature of these beliefs and the extent to which they have been altered. Composite studies that involve both qualitative and quantitative methods are needed to clarify this. Interviews, similar to those conceived by Jordan et al. (1991), designed to extract dimensional teacher-held perspectives of students displaying CDO behaviours might be able to detect attitudinal shifts following affirming experiences with VT techniques. With such a condition, we might be able to proceed more confidently, augmenting our understanding of the reciprocal nature of beliefs and practice. The quantitative measure might be supplied by an improved CDOPS. CDO Efficacy has been substantiated in this study as a principal factor in the construct (accounting for 32.7% of the variance), and to a lesser extent, so has CDO Emotionality and Locus of Responsibility. Unfortunately though, Perception of Volitional Control was not demonstrated as a viable factor in this study. It has been hypothesized in this paper that Perception of Volitional Control reveals aspects of teachers’ belief structure which might predict the level of help-giving the teacher is willing to provide. It is also felt that such a variable would reflect the respondent’s beliefs about the legitimacy of more obscure etiologies (ie. family background, attention deficit disorders, the byproduct of unintentional reinforcement or exacerbation by the teacher, etc.) that tend to compete with the student’s ability to exercise volitional control. If this hypothesized variable could be empirically refined to warrant inclusion into a revised CDOPS, this instrument could serve to benefit future studies that share this intent.

If teachers are to adopt preferential ecological perspectives when serving at-risk populations of students they are more likely to do so when they are unencumbered with emotional trauma. It is the memory of these times of high emotion that contribute so significantly to sustained dysfunctional beliefs (Bandura, 1986). It is these dysfunctional beliefs that increase the probability of committing an errant judgement (Bandura, 1986; Pajares, 1992). Misjudging a CDO episode can only serve to exacerbate a situation and thus contribute to the cycle of negative
belief entrenchment. Here again, a viable measure of Perception of Volitional Control might help us to understand how strong negative emotions can be better managed. If it could be shown that there is a strong linear relationship between the way teachers interpret student motives for misbehaviour and their subsequent emotionality following such episodes, then teacher education programs would most likely benefit from attributional training that would attempt to alter this perception. Until then we can only speculate as to how emotionality interacts with efficacy beliefs.

Other implications of this study suggest that if teachers acquire competencies in managing classroom behaviour their professional acceptance of diverse populations of students might improve. However, the issue is probably more complex. Other situation-specific factors like class size and the learning characteristics of the students in the class have been shown to influence the teachers’ perspective (Ross, et al., 1995). Some very effective teachers resist the placement of at-risk students in their classes simply because these students’ compete with the instructional time for the others students (Gersten, Walker & Darch, 1988). This would be an understandable concern for a lot of good teachers; however, when all is said and done, and the class rosters have been set, it appears that the most probable positive outcome would result when the teacher feels competent.

The implications of this study in the broader context of REI are significant. The apparent effectiveness of the VT approach to assist teachers to adopt professional orientations to the challenges presented by students who display disturbing behaviours suggests a possible benefit to other teachers. This is especially important when governments consider closing segregated facilities serving students who display extremes of CDO behaviour, and subsequently integrate them into mainstreamed schools. Potentially all teachers could have several students of this type in their classrooms and would need skills and attitudes that adequately prepare them for the challenge these students present. If long term change is required, then administrations charged with the responsibility of implementation of REI should take into account the type, frequency and intensity of the professional development required for a long term effect.

**Limitations**

The apparent success of the study must be defended in the context of its design limitations. There were many factors that mitigated against a more refined design. Firstly, the
author was acting from within the limitations of his own financial and personal resources. Because of this, attempts to obtain objective purity were strained. By necessity the author became the designer of the VT program, the program facilitator and the evaluator of its impact.

The demarcation line that separates the objective from the subjective was significantly smudged because of this. Although these were seen to be practical limitations, this transgression somewhat reduces the power of the study to supply substantive information that may direct future professional development for teachers.

The design of the study would be strengthened if the sample selection procedures were improved. The reader will recall that attempts were made to run two VT programs, one in each of the two schools. Unfortunately, the author was not able to procure sufficient commitment from teachers in the second school to form the additional Treatment Group. A reliance on the teachers’ generosity with their time and energy was an unavoidable precondition for group selection. The inference that this committed group would be predisposed to ‘change’ is not unreasonable thus contributing to a biased result. Ideally, if the support of the schools’ administration could have been obtained, arbitrary group assignment might have contributed to a more balanced sample. The Board administrator explained that the schools had participated in other studies just prior to this study and because of that, participation in the groups would have to be voluntary. This was accepted as a realistic limitation that was beyond the control of the author.

With the assumption that a balanced sample could be obtained, group assignment could have been based on relevant independent variables. PTE scores, years of teaching experience, types of teaching experiences, and professional training backgrounds could have been used for this purpose. Teaching efficacy is a mitigating variable in attitude and skill change (Jordan, et al., 1991, 1993, 1994, 1997; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Guskey & Passaro, 1994; Pajares, 1992; Stanovich, 1994). Conducting VT training with groups of teachers including ones with lower PTE and CDOPS scores would be ideal if similar results could be achieved. Relatively equal proportions of these variables would make potential differences on the dependent measures more valid. A multivariate analysis of the data might be used then to reveal the influence of these other independent measures.

Unanticipated treatment effects were not controlled for in this study. Significant
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differences on the subscales of the CDOPS could have been attained for reasons that went beyond the content of the VT program. For example, the teachers could have derived sufficient benefit from just meeting together in discussion groups without a prescribed agenda. To guard against that, the Comparison Group could have been given an alternative intervention program that did not include attributional training. With this condition in place, a more accurate appraisal of the VT program's content could be made. Then, if gains on the dependent measures were significantly different for the Treatment group it would strengthen the case for attributional training in subsequent programs.

The dependent measures require some refinement as well. The author has already alluded to the absence of a viable measure of Perception of Volitional Control. This was an important component for the study. Earlier, it was established that attributions of volitional control mediated intentions of help-giving (Frieze, et al., 1983; Weiner, 1983). The author hypothesized that if misbehaviour was perceived to be deliberate and therefore within the volitional control of the student, help-giving would be withheld. It would have been interesting to assess the relationship this component had with other constructs involving teaching efficacy. The structure of the question format that was designed to tap this particular component (#1 a - h) was awkward and proved difficult for the teachers to respond to. Subsequent revisions of the CDOPS would benefit from a reworking of this cluster of questions.

Sample size for the validation of the CDOPS was an obvious short-coming in this study. With such a small sample (N = 86) it is difficult to substantiate the validity of the factors in the CDOPS. A sample size that is consistent with that which was obtained by Gibson and Dembo (1984), N > 300, should be used for an instrument of this nature especially if the two instruments are being compared. In spite of this, the CDOPS measure in its current form is a place to start. Additional data can be collected to further substantiate its usefulness as a domain-specific measure of teaching efficacy. The sample size of both the Comparison (N = 24) and Treatment Groups (N = 8) is also a limitation in this study. A much larger Treatment Group is needed to enhance the validity of the results. With greater numerical representation, the viability of using a multivariate approach in the analysis improves as well (Stevens, 1992).

Another limitation of the CDOPS had to do with the recalled context of CDO episodes. For some subjects, conjuring an event that may have occurred in the distant past could have been
a difficult rendering. For others, recalling the full emotional impact of those events was likely a perplexing process. Forcing the respondent to identify his/her own particular vulnerabilities after the emotional dust has settled, and having to penetrate the psychological defenses that may have been put in place to 'rationalize' the extremes of those recalled reactions might have been troubling for some. The qualitative accounts however, affirmed feelings of victimization in the teachers as they recalled CDO episodes in their past experiences. The fact that these memories were vivid months and sometimes years later is significant in itself.

A possible follow-up study that would target teachers who are working directly with CDO students would add some additional validity to the techniques employed in the VT approach. Teachers could be selected for the study on the basis of having students that meet a specific behavioural criteria. This might require that these teachers receive one-on-one coaching in addition to the collaborative approach used in the current study. A study of this nature might supply additional validity of the VT techniques in a CDO context.

The biographical data sheet that accompanied the CDOPS (Appendix ‘A’) proved to be inadequate. The reader will recall that t-tests could not be used to substantiate the differences between the Comparison and the Treatment Groups on years of experience, teaching assignments, and experiences with special populations of students because respondents indicated a category-range rather than a specific value. Exact numerical data is required to calculate these means. Also, the reliability of individuals responding to adjectives like ‘none’, ‘some’ and ‘many’ is suspect. Obtaining consistent interpretations from one teacher to the next is difficult to establish using this approach. Secondly, the terms are relative to the number of years of experience a teacher has. A beginning teacher may have had four experiences with behaviour disordered students and indicate ‘many’ whereas an experienced teacher with over sixteen years in teaching might have had twenty students of this type but indicate ‘some’. This aspect of the instrument requires refinement.

The interviews employed in the qualitative phase could be improved upon as well. A preinterview could obtain some valuable information about the teachers’ formative experiences, an understanding of their attributional ascriptions about students’ motives and their methods of coping with students who display CDO behaviour. This would be useful for comparison purposes when the follow-up interviews were completed. Secondly, a thorough attempt at coding the
transcripts using trained examiners would certainly help to reduce the bias and possibly reveal new information that would be otherwise hidden from the author's view. Thirdly, participants in the Groups could have been encouraged to keep field journals about their experiences. This would be an obvious benefit to their memory and it would encourage them to capture their feelings during the different phases of an altercation should there be one. These journals could be used for reference in the follow-up interviews. This modification would be especially important if long term follow-up is being considered.

Finally, attempts to avoid affirmative response bias must be considered for future studies involving this design. Ideally, a trained impartial interviewer would conduct the follow-up interviews using a prescribed format. Perhaps having the author of the VT program conduct the interviews put excessive strains on the level of candor the teachers felt comfortable with. There were many 'soft' signs that the teachers and the author had developed a friendly relationship and the teachers could have couched their language in consideration of this relationship when expressing their thoughts.

Whether teachers who received the VT training are able to continue to respond to the needs of CDO students by viewing them more as victims than vandals is a question for further research. Five of the original eight teachers continued for over a year making use of the principles involved in VT training in their daily practice. Given this, there is a likelihood these skills and attitudes are still being shared with other colleagues. Successes may be observed and practices may be emulated as these principles infiltrate the culture of their school. Staff and students will flow in and out of that culture and perhaps some of these principles will be transported with them for others to benefit.
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Biographical Information

- Female  
- Male

Teaching Experiences

- Total number of years teaching

  recent graduate  1-2 yrs  3-8 yrs  9-15 yrs  16+ yrs

- Elementary Experiences

  Primary (k-3)  none  some  most  all
  Junior (4-6)  none  some  most  all
  Senior (7-8)  none  some  most  all

- Secondary School Experiences

  Transition years (9-10)  none  some  most  all
  Senior years (11 - OAC)  none  some  most  all

- Special Education Experiences

  Segregated classroom experience  none  some  most  all
  Resource support (withdrawl)  none  some  most  all

Please indicate you experiences with special student classifications below.

- Learning disabled  none  some  most  all
- Developmentally challenged  none  some  most  all
- Physically disabled  none  some  most  all
- Behaviour disordered  none  some  most  all
- Hearing impaired  none  some  most  all
- Attention deficit/hyperactivity disordered  none  some  most  all
- Other
Academic background and professional training.


Special Qualifications:
Teacher Efficacy Questionnaire

Directions: Please read the following statements and indicate how strongly you agree or disagree using the rating scale provided. Remember, all results are confidential, with only group responses reported.

1= strongly disagree
2= moderately disagree
3= disagree slightly more than agree
4= agree slightly more than disagree
5= moderately agree
6= strongly agree

1. When a student does better than usual, many times it is because I exerted a little extra effort. 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. The ours in my class have little influence on students compared to the influence of their home environment. 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. When a student gets a better grade that he/she usually gets it is usually that I found better ways of teaching that student. 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. The amount that a student can learn is primarily related to family background. 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. If a student masters a new concept quickly, this might be because the teacher knew the necessary steps in teaching that concept. 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. If students aren’t disciplined at home, they aren’t likely to accept any discipline. 1 2 3 4 5 6

7. If a student couldn’t do a class assignment, most teachers would be able to accurately assess whether the assignment was at the correct level of difficulty. 1 2 3 4 5 6

8. I have not been trained to deal with many of the learning problems my students have. 1 2 3 4 5 6

9. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him/her quickly. 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. My teacher training program and/or experience did not give me the necessary skills to be an effective teacher.

11. When a student is having difficulty with an assignment, I often have trouble adjusting it to his/her level.

12. When I really try, I can get through to the most difficult students.

13. I am very limited in what I can achieve because a student’s home environment is a large influence on his/her achievement.

14. Teachers are not a very powerful influence on student achievement when all factors are considered.

15. When the grades of students improve, it is usually because their teachers found more effective teaching approaches.

16. If parents would do more with their children, teachers could do more.

17. If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his/her retention in the lesson.

18. Even a teacher with good teaching abilities may not reach many students.

19. The influence of a student’s home experiences can be overcome by good teaching.

20. When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can’t do much because most of a student’s motivation and performance depends on his/her home environment.

21. If I try really hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.
Confrontational, Defiant, Oppositional Behaviour Perception Scale

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project. The preceding video presentation depicts a confrontational, defiant, oppositional (CDO) episode. The questionnaire taps your initial reactions to this particular student assuming this CDO episode happened to you. Consider the situation in the context of your current comfort level with CDO students. Please be as candid as possible when responding to the question items. All responses will remain anonymous. Please use the following scale to record your responses.

0 = not a feeling I would have
1 = a weak feeling I would have
2 = a moderate feeling
3 = a strong feeling
4 = a very strong feeling
This first section contains 8 items that deal with your perception of the student’s motives for behaving this way. The questionnaire is designed to identify you immediate thoughts about these motives, assuming the CDO episode depicted in the video happened to you and you had no background information that might explain the episode. Please review each of the 8 items before responding.

1(a) I would feel suspicious that he/she was manipulating the situation to get out of doing the assignment.

(b) I would feel that he/she was disturbed about a problem with another student just prior to the class.

(c) I would feel that the student was trying to get even with me over a prior incident.

(d) I would feel that the student was acting-out because of frustrations he/she was experiencing at home.

(e) I would feel that the student was in control and acting quite willfully.

(f) I would feel that the student was irritable because he/she was not feeling well.

(g) I would feel that this student’s desire for attention motivated him/her to act this way.

(h) I would feel that frustrations with academic achievement were causing this student to act out.

Other possible causes:

__________________________________________________________________________
Arranging for change in this student's behaviour may involve several factors. In the next section please respond to each of the items giving your opinion as to who bears the responsibility for improving this student's behaviour to acceptable levels. Please review each of the 8 items before responding.

2 (a) I feel that this student should assume the responsibility for changing his/her attitude toward authority figures.

(b) I feel the responsibility for improving this student's behaviour should be the classroom teacher's.

(c) I feel the responsibility for improving this student's behaviour should be the administration's.

(d) I feel it should be the classroom teacher's responsibility to personally counsel this student about his/her behaviour.

(e) I feel the student's family should assume the responsibility for changing the student's behaviour.

(f) I feel it should be the responsibility of support personnel like social workers and behaviour counsellors to improve this student's behaviour.

(g) I feel it should be the classroom teacher's responsibility to modify the curriculum to accommodate this student.

(h) I feel it should be the classroom teacher's responsibility to have the skills necessary to support the student in the behaviour-change process.

Other possible change-agents:

Items 3 to 39 are interested in your emotional response to the CDO episode and your opinions on your capacity to respond to the student. Please complete the remaining items as if the CDO episode depicted in the video presentation happened to you given your current comfort level and professional preparation for CDO students. Assume you are aware of this student's reputation but have no other pertinent background information.
|   |   |   |   |   |   
|---|---|---|---|---|---
<p>| 3. | I would feel shocked at the insolence shown by the student. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. | I would feel determined to understand how background factors may have precipitated the student’s behaviour. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. | I would feel motivated by the challenge of working with such a hostile student. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. | I would feel annoyed about the disruption to the classroom activity. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. | I would feel confident about my ability to develop an approach that would assist this student with his/her conduct. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. | I would feel frustrated about this student restricting the effectiveness of my own teaching. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. | I would feel positive that I would be able to maintain my composure. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. | I would feel despondent about my career choice because of students like this. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. | I would feel embarrassed by the misbehaviour of the student as it would reflect negatively on my classroom management. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. | I would feel worried about having to deal with this student on a daily basis. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. | I would feel gratified because such behaviours are a sign of a healthy climate for the natural expression of frustration. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. | I would feel constrained by the demands of the curriculum as it conflicts with the social/emotional needs of this student. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15. | I would feel angry at the disrespect shown by the student. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16. | I would feel apprehensive about the level support available to me in developing a workable strategy | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I would feel self-doubt about my ability to be effective with this kind of student over the long term.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I would feel positive about my capacity to plan effective strategies for working with this pupil.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I would feel resentment for having this student in my classroom.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I would feel the student deserves a lot of empathy.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I would feel my attitude toward this student would be such that I would find it difficult to help him/her.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I would feel unempathetic toward this student because he/she was in control of his/her actions.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I would feel positive about the effectiveness of the resources of the school system to offer support while this student was in my classroom.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I would feel my current approach to discipline would not work with this student.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I would feel doubtful about my ability to contain my emotions for the remainder of the day.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I would feel determined to find a solution to deal with this student more effectively.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I would feel resentment about the time this student takes away from the other students in my class.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I would feel my preparation for teaching students like this has been inadequate.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I would feel victimized by the personal attack.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I would feel positive about the challenge of trying to motivate students like the one in the video.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I would feel frustrated with the limitations of the school system to accommodate students like the one in the video.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. I would feel doubtful about my ability to restore order to the classroom immediately following the incident. 0 1 2 3 4

33. I would feel confident that I have enough personal resources to counter-act the unsettled climate in the classroom caused by this student. 0 1 2 3 4

34. I would feel optimistic about the prognosis this student has for achieving appropriate behaviour while in my class. 0 1 2 3 4

35. I would feel comfortable about teaching students like the one presented in the video. 0 1 2 3 4

36. I would feel my current teaching skills are effective with students like the one presented in the video. 0 1 2 3 4

37. I feel it is important for regular classroom teachers to have effective skills for teaching students like the one in the video. 0 1 2 3 4

38. I would feel personally responsible for controlling this student’s outburst. 0 1 2 3 4

39. I would feel a general expectation from others (ie. other teachers, parents, administrators, society) to control this student’s outburst. 0 1 2 3 4

Please feel free to comment on any aspect of the questionnaire:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for participating in this research project. Your contribution to teacher education is a valued one.
Dysfunctional Ascriptions Anecdote

Sean was an affable average looking 17 year old boy who, at age 7 was stricken with meningitis. The disease left him with significantly impaired vision and brain damage. He was legally blind although he could get around quite nicely without the aid of any kind of device. He had no peripheral vision and his central vision was cloudy and imprecise. His brain damage affected his memory and his cognitive functioning. In spite of this his appearance and general conduct betrayed none of the disabilities he was afflicted with.

I was his teacher in a Special Education class in a community high school. I was also the coach of the Cross Country Team. I tried to get Sean involved in extra curricular events like Cross Country by having him attend the odd Meet with me. Sean would stay by my side and assist me with the runner’s warm-up clothing and water bottles and such. The Team accepted Sean as a team mate and were very encouraging. Sean was allowed to wear the school’s warm-up suit to make him feel more a part of things. On one occasion, Sean and I went on one of the trails to follow our runners. I stopped to talk to a coach that I hadn’t seen in a while and Sean failed to detect that he was no longer at my side. He was about thirty meters ahead before I realized that he didn’t see me stop. Just then a group of runners emerged from the woods only to find Sean in the middle of the narrow trail. Because of Sean’s vision problem he had no concept of what a trail was and perhaps even what the concept of a Cross Country race was. Subsequently he did not move from the middle of the trail and he remained in the runner’s way. They did their best to avoid him but judging from the invective they were directing at him, they assessed Sean’s actions to be deliberate. Shortly after, another coach who I know to be an excellent human being, came toward the commotion and saw Sean and he too began yelling at him. I on the other hand, was only worried about Sean’s well being because I had the benefit of knowing about his disabilities. The other coach did not though and he assumed Sean’s actions to be deliberate. This is a case where this coach was controlled by dysfunctional ascriptions even though this is not a characteristic he displayed often.
Appendix 'E'

VT Skill 1:

Correcting behaviour without consequencing students

| Situation: When you are trying to conduct a lesson you may find that you are encountering frequent interruptions from misbehaving students, knocks at the door or fire trucks racing by. Getting students to get back on track is often more difficult than simply telling them to do so, especially CDO students. |

The VT approach:

Always be vigilant about keeping your allies responsive and loyal to you. You may not recognize it but there are many student behaviours in the midst of 'classroom chaos' that are worthy of your praise. Reinforce these behaviours with your class. When Zeek is talking when he should be listening, heap praise on Bill for continuing to pay attention while ignoring Zeek. In essence, catch the kids doing something good instead of something bad. Teachers often misinterpret the effect they are having when they correct a misbehaving student by cease and desist commands. The student may momentarily comply which reinforces the teacher's strategy. However, if these corrections are happening too frequently with the same student then the strategy is actually reinforcing the behaviour the teacher is trying to eliminate.

Rationale:

1. CDO students pupils thrive on attention even negative attention.

2. When CDO students are getting attention, even negative attention, then none of the other students are. This is reinforcing to the CDO student.

3. Directing attention away from a misbehaving student notifies your allies that you are not going to abandon them to admonish a less deserving student. It also serves as a cue to the misbehaving student that the teacher's attention can only be gained by exhibiting appropriate behaviour.

Assignment:

Begin your lessons by asking the students for your attention once. Look about the room for students who may be responding to your request. Acknowledge them because they are your allies. "Thank you Lily for paying attention right away. Good students need to pay attention." Wait to catch others paying attention and reinforce them. If your
more rambunctious students begin to catch on make sure that the appropriate amount of praise goes their way as well.

If your situation requires a more 'obvious' redirection initiate a Student of the Moment Award program. This is a light hearted way of drawing the attention of the class back to you. You can have a material reward or you can make it a bit silly. You can issue a voucher for a free drink of water or 2 tickets to Hawaii and turn the event into a mini mock quiz show. For younger students I use Icabod. Icabod is an imaginary character who exhibits perfect student behaviour. He has a place in the room where he resides and when the classroom gets chaotic, Icabod gets all the praise.

Try these techniques for next week. Good luck.
Follow-up Interview

This interview was given to subjects who have completed the Victimless Teaching (VT) workshops within one month following the last VT session.

The interview is a semi-structured type, lasting approximately 30–40 minutes. Each subject in the follow-up group was interviewed separately and in a private room.

Interview Questions:

1. Previous history with CDO students
   a. When you think back over the years that you have been teaching, can you recall any experiences you have had with CDO pupils?
   b. Can you elaborate on any of these experiences?
   c. Can you tell me how you handled the situation?
   d. Why did you deal with it in that particular way?
   e. How did you feel about your approach?
   f. How was the student affected by your approach?
   g. How did the experience make you feel?

2. Post-intervention techniques
   a. After participating in the VT workshops for several weeks now, if you were to experience the same or a similar situation to the one you described, would you handle it any differently?
   b. What do you attribute the different approach to?
   c. Did you have an opportunity to try some of the techniques we talked about during the sessions?
      (1) Could you elaborate on any?
      (2) Were they effective?

3. General questions
   a. What kept you coming to the sessions?
   b. What did you think of the format of the sessions?
   c. Is there any topic that stood out in your mind as being particularly beneficial to you as a teacher?
   d. Is there any topic that you would have included that we did not discuss?
   e. How is this approach different from others you may have experienced in the past?
f. Do you feel that these workshops should be continued or have the served their purpose?

g. Do you feel that there are teachers who would not benefit from this approach?
The Author's Belief Orientation

Since much of the VT approach is based on my own personal experience interacting with students who display CDO behaviour and observing other teachers interacting with these students, I felt it necessary to trace the evolution of this perspective. Biographical aspects of my own practice and specific conceptualizations that are pertinent to the development of the VT approach follow. The text is written in the form of a narrative and for this reason I have chosen to use the same font used in the other narrative accounts.

I am in my 27th year of teaching. I have split my teaching experiences between the elementary and high school panels. During my career I have had many varied experiences teaching in regular-education and special-education classrooms. I have taught in resource-withdrawl settings as well as in segregated settings. More than half of my career has been devoted to providing education to students with social/emotional difficulties. I identify my four year appointment at a residential treatment centre for emotionally disturbed students as being very significant in shaping my current beliefs about education and students with CDO behaviour. There I discovered just how wounded kids could be. For most of those students, there were very understandable reasons why they were so disturbed. Abuse, neglect, family dysfunction, environmental and social trauma were very often in their backgrounds. For others though, the mitigating factors were less obvious. It was for those particular students, the ones whose maladaptive behaviour was less understood, that I became interested in. Those students seemed to evoke less empathetic emotions and less prudent reactions in myself and my colleagues. Far too often, and I say this with some degree of shame, teacher responses to these students' behaviour was retributionally motivated.

It was during this time that I began to observe my own and other teachers' interactions with CDO students. I paid particular attention to teachers' perceptions of the motives that prompted the students to behave in contrary ways. I felt that if you could see the misbehaving student as a victim rather than as a vandal it would assist you in many different ways. Firstly it would remove you from the 'personalization' of the invective that might be directed at you. Secondly it would allow you to retain your objectivity and thereby assist the teacher in seeking solutions that went beyond the retributional objectives of many so called 'consequences'.

I knew it was not quite as simple as deciding to view the student in a different light. There were many skill components that had to accompany the process of changing the perspective of the
teacher. The teacher has to develop some self-knowledge about his or her own emotional triggers. These emotional triggers have the potential for launching teachers into subjectiveness. A lot of this can be avoided when we 'professionalize' our responses to these kids. The skills for acquiring student-knowledge, the background factors that give the misbehaviour some element of causation, is the first step in the process. Secondly, in order to be continuously effective, teachers have to learn to go through a kind of metacognitive process while engaging with a CDO student to probe for the motives behind the behaviour. Thirdly, learning to recognize the stages of a CDO episode and how to manage each of these stages differently is also important. Fourthly, learning the language of conciliation to pry the student loose from his/her own subjectiveness is an essential skill. Finally, learning to orchestrate this in a group context is the most difficult skill to master.

Far too often I have seen these situations go ‘bad’. I have seen teachers become ‘victims’ themselves. I have seen very competent teachers become completely consumed by a CDO episode to the point where their own judgement is impaired. They become over-wrought emotionally and seek consequences that are strictly punitive and have nothing to do with the long-term needs of the student. In fact some of these consequences are so excessive that they result in the offending student setting up alternative agendas that virtually ensure the episode will reoccur. What is particularly troubling for me is that when this cycle begins, the teacher’s attitude toward the student sours to the point where nothing can be salvaged. Alternatively, I have seen teachers engage in very significant CDO episodes and with considerable skill are able to defuse these episodes and continue to work with the students again, seemingly unencumbered with the emotional residue that often accompanies such situations. There are no ‘victims’ in these situations.

I learned that these skills can be acquired through experience and reflective practice. It's not just a matter of having the right personality for the job. Consider the phrase, ‘You must have a lot of patience to work with those kids.’ I’ve been told that, but I take exception to it. I don't believe that it has much to do with patience at all. It is a matter of attitude ...viewing yourself as a teacher of students and not just a teacher of academic subjects is important...and it is a matter of confidence acquired through the successful orchestration of specific skills. I believe attitude and skill have a reciprocal relationship. Fortunately I suppose, most teachers don't get enough exposure to CDO episodes to hone the skills that are needed to be effective with this kind of
student unless they are working in treatment centers where CDO episodes are more frequent. Teachers tend to rely on methods they experienced as children themselves. Cease and desist commands, loud-voiced reprimands, and heated threats often characterize these tactics. ‘They worked for us so they’ll work for them’ is the logic. But it is an overly simplistic logic that does not address the reality that contributed to these student’s social and emotional difficulties.

The central question with respect to teaching students like this especially in mainstream settings is, what is our mandate for them? Are we simply expected to ‘control’ their behaviour by structuring their environment so misbehaviour is prevented, or is it our mission to act on misbehaviour in ways that arrange for the social/emotional growth of these youngsters? Stopping a misbehaviour is often just the first step in raising the social consciousness of students. There are many more steps to follow if the instruction of civility is our intent. Do principals and other teachers acknowledge this? Is it part of the culture of the school? These two perspectives can compete with one another in mainstream settings. Social/emotional needs require time and understanding that develops in an environment that allows for and encourages open and supported communication. In some schools this atmosphere may be difficult to achieve.

I am also concerned about the kinds of support that is available to teachers when they are experiencing disruptive classrooms. Controlling misbehaviour is an implicit requisite for assessing the performance of a teacher. The other skills, the more explicit ones that define teaching competency in terms of academic growth for children are usually measured against the backdrop of classroom management. If you have the potential for being a 'competent' teacher but are apparently unable to manage disruptive behaviour, your skills are not likely to be as evident and may go unrecognized, even by yourself. This contributes little to your sense of self-efficacy. Help may be available in such cases but if this help is either inadequate or ineffective frustration will set in fueled by the anxiety of knowing you will ultimately be held responsible for turning the situation around. It is for this reason that many teachers are reticent about admitting they need professional growth in this area.