6-26-2024

Implementing Behavior Management Strategies to Manage Disruptive Student Behavior

MacKenzie Geyer
geyerm@csp.edu

Implementing Behavior Management Strategies to Manage Disruptive Student Behavior

MacKenzie Geyer

College of Education, Concordia University, St. Paul

Master of Arts in Education – Educational Leadership

ED590: Research and Completing the Capstone

Instructor: Dr. Brian Boothe

Second Reader: Michael Foster

June 15, 2024

DEDICATION

To my family: Thank you for always being my biggest supporter in everything I do!

To Madison Elementary, Steve, and Cam: The day I stepped into Madison, I never could have predicted the journey it would take me on as an educator. Thank you for believing in me and for seeing something in me I had not yet seen in myself.

Table of Contents

Abstract

This paper examined research considering how teachers and educational leaders may equitably lead and teach during a rise of disruptive student behavior. The research analyzed was qualitative, quantitative, quasi-experimental, or mixed-methods. These research studies delved into different school-wide interventions, classroom management systems, classroom interventions, and professional development. These models, systems, and strategies may work together to allow for positive student behavior and an overall conducive learning environment for all students. The studies recognized the challenges educators face with the rise of disruptive behaviors, and throughout each theme, solutions were given. With the given solutions through the research, fidelity and buy-in from teachers and administration became the most significant barriers to implementing the researched solutions. The research suggested the importance of data collection to make appropriate decisions regarding behavioral models, systems, and strategies. The research also demonstrated a need for training in managing challenging student behaviors and how to manage those behaviors through classroom management appropriately for preservice and veteran teachers. With the thoroughly analyzed research regarding disruptive student behavior, it is recognized in the research outcomes there is not a one-size-fits-all approach to this educational issue. Schools will need to address the educational issue for each specific district or site; nevertheless, the issue of disruptive student behavior can be managed appropriately through proper implementation of school-wide interventions, classroom interventions and management, and professional development around behavior management.

Keywords: disruptive student behavior, positive behavior intervention supports (PBIS), classroom management, interventions, professional development (PD)

Implementing Classroom and Behavior Management Strategies to Manage Disruptive Behavior

Chapter One: Introduction

Imagine walking into an elementary school building and being brought back in time by remembering your experience as an elementary student. You think about how much fun you had in your elementary school classroom: all the friends you made, and how you thoroughly had a positive school experience. Suddenly, you are distracted by screaming; you hear tables and chairs being thrown, and a classroom full of kindergarteners are being evacuated from their classroom by their classroom teacher. The students exit the classroom, walk down the hallway, and sit alongside the wall, ready and waiting for their teacher to give directions. Some students have an expression of panic written on their faces, while some students suddenly have a burst of nervous energy. The students also cannot understand the current situation is not a comical one. Other students are silently waiting on the floor alongside the wall in the hallway with stunned expressions on their faces. After witnessing what transpired, you quickly think about your elementary school experience and wonder if any classmates had explosive outbursts like the one just witnessed.

Unfortunately, disruptive, volatile behaviors in educational settings are becoming more common than ever before. According to *City Journal*, "44 percent of school-district leaders said they received more threats of violence from students now than in fall 2019, and that two out of three teachers, principals, and district leaders noted more misbehavior from students compared with 2019" (Beinen & Kennedy, 2023, para. 1). While trying to manage student behaviors, teachers are burnt out and are concerned about academic achievement simultaneously. With disruptive student behaviors, teachers are struggling to find adequate classroom management strategies and determine interventions to promote positive behavior change.

Importance of the Topic

Disruptive behavior from students has been rising, creating a significant problem in elementary schools. "More than 70% of teachers report a recent increase in disruptive behavior" (Whalen & Moore, n.d., p. 4). Some examples of disruptive student behavior consist of "bullying, tantrums, defiant behavior, elopement (running off), self-injury, aggression, unresponsiveness, emotional outburst, and non-compliance" (Whalen & Moore, n.d., p. 4). Many teachers cannot manage these behaviors while maintaining their primary responsibility – teaching. Teachers have reported due to the disruption of these behaviors; students are losing up to three weeks of instruction (Whalen & Moore, n.d.). Teachers are significantly underprepared for the rise of student behavior in the classroom, and only about a third of teachers are prepared to manage challenging behaviors effectively (Whalen & Moore, n.d.). "While Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) are known to help with behavior management, only 63% of teachers reported having any training in it, and only 57% of teachers reported they use it regularly" (Whalen & Moore, n.d., p. 6). Without proper implementation of models, systems, or strategies to manage behavior (also known as fidelity), districts, schools, and teachers will continue to struggle with disruptive student behaviors. Some teachers are used to the old methods of disciplinary actions. For example, writing a referral and sending the student to the principal's office; however, those methods no longer work in the contemporary educational setting. New models, systems, and strategies must be considered to manage disruptive behavior in the classroom.

Teachers and educational leaders endlessly develop innovative and unique strategies and systems to keep students engaged in the educational setting by utilizing positive behavior incentives and building positive relationships; however, is it enough to make the change

(Jenkins, 2023)? The following research analysis delves into how various school-wide interventions, classroom interventions, and classroom management can help reduce disruptive student behavior and will analyze if proper implementation and professional development can make a significant impact.

Scope of Research

The research examines qualitative, quantitative, mixed-methods, and quasi-experimental studies focusing on student behavior in the educational setting and different ways educators can better manage the behavior. The literature review follows three themes from the research regarding student behavior. The first theme discusses the importance of implementing positive behavior interventions school-wide, which includes support from teachers, administrators, other educational professionals, and parents. This theme reveals how PBIS, and other school-wide behavior interventions can support managing some student behaviors but not all. The second theme discusses behavior interventions and management in the classroom setting. This theme gives insight into how tracking behavior and analyzing the data are used to construct a specific intervention around the behavior. This theme also delves into the importance of structured classroom management systems and how these systems can result in a positive learning environment for all students. The third theme involves professional development around behavior management. This theme will help guide veteran and preservice teachers in implementing effective classroom and behavior management strategies to ensure students' needs are met, and academics can be taught. After researching, a few areas were not analyzed. Charter schools were not studied in the research found. The research was also analyzed only based on data from schools in the United States; schools from countries outside of the United States were not involved in the studies analyzed in this literature review.

Research Question

In light of what is known about pedagogy in the contemporary educational setting, how can educational leaders support the implementation of effective classroom management strategies or behavior management strategies during an increase of disruptive student behavior, so teachers and students are successful in the classroom? This research allowed for an understanding of how to manage student behaviors with school-wide interventions, how to implement purposeful classroom management strategies, and the importance of professional development for educators around this educational issue. The research also aimed to connect to Concordia University, St. Paul's Educational Leadership Program's Essential Question: "In light of what is known about pedagogy in the contemporary educational setting, how shall educators lead equitably and inclusively in order to positively impact student development and learning?" The research connects to the program's essential question due to leading equitably and inclusively around student behaviors. The research in this paper found there is not a one-size-fits-all approach to managing disruptive student behavior, and all students, classrooms, schools, or districts themselves may need something different when it comes to managing disruptive student behavior.

Definition of Terms

Fidelity is an educational term used when curriculum, interventions, or academic models are implemented and are to be carried out or taught as intended (Fefer et al., 2021).

Classroom Management is a system teachers implement to establish expectations regarding behavior and routines in a classroom setting, allowing for academics to be implemented and retained with fidelity (Menzies et al., 2017).

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is a framework used in educational settings to promote positive behavior and academic success (McDaniel et al., 2017).

Paraprofessionals are staff hired in educational settings to work one-on-one with students who need academic or behavioral support (Bronstein et al., 2021).

Intervention in schools is completed by a licensed educator. The task involves targeting a specific academic area or behavior a student is not effectively meeting. The goal is to support students in succeeding in academics or behavior without needing special education services (Anyon et al., 2016).

Disruptive Student Behavior is a behavior exhibited by a student(s) and the behavior disrupts the learning environment in the educational setting. This behavior may include refusal, blurting, throwing of materials, being off-task, or physical outbursts toward students or adults (Bronstein et al., 2020).

Summary

Teachers and educational leaders continue to report student behavior is causing educational turmoil. Disruptive student behavior prevents students from learning and prevents teachers from teaching academics. Teachers and educational leaders are also not equipped to manage behavioral disruptions successfully. Throughout the analyzed research, many strategies were found beneficial if implemented appropriately and carried out with fidelity to represent positive change in the rise of disruptive student behavior. The strategies include school-wide intervention, classroom intervention and management, and professional development around student behavior. This paper will aim to decipher different methods, interventions, and professional development schools can implement to support educators with disruptive student behavior.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

With the rise of disruptive student behavior, more studies and research are being completed on how teacher colleges, schools, administration, teachers, and parents can better support and reduce its effects on the education system. This literature review aimed to decipher potential behavioral management systems, strategies, models, processes, and professional development to be implemented in a school-wide or classroom setting to reduce the disruptive student behavior reported by teachers, schools, and districts. The research analyzed in this paper resulted in three major themes connecting to the research question of, how can educational leaders support the implementation of effective classroom management strategies or behavior management strategies during an increase of disruptive student behavior so teachers and students are successful in the classroom? The first theme considered the positive effects of implementing school-wide intervention systems. The second theme involved different means of observed behavior in the classroom, such as adequately using data and interventions to support teachers with students needing behavioral intervention. The third theme gave insight into how professional development around behavior management can benefit teachers' overall success in the classroom with challenging behaviors.

The first theme involved five studies by Anyon et al. (2016), Fefer et al. (2022), McDaniel et al. (2017), Menzies et al. (2021), and Pinkelman et al. (2015). These studies researched implementing school-wide interventions to benefit overall student behavior and target the challenging behaviors schools face. These studies all found implementing school-wide interventions can be a challenge to implement with fidelity and considered how teacher buy-in creates a significant challenge with implementation.

The second theme involved six studies by Bronstein et al. (2021), Caldarella et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2021), Harpin et al. (2016), Ratcliff et al. (2010), and Wills et al. (2022). The analyzed research discussed the importance of classroom management systems and classroom interventions that can be implemented to support overall behavior and aid disruptive student behavior. The studies found with teacher buy-in and follow-through with implementation student behavior changed in a positive direction. However, the researchers also found many teachers struggled to maintain the new systems and would revert backward at times with classroom management and interventions.

The third theme discovered from the research analyzed involved four studies by Butler and Monda-Amaya (2016), Conner et al. (2022), Oakes et al. (2020), and Morrison et al. (2014). These studies researched different professional development techniques regarding behavior management. The studies found teachers need a better understanding of how to manage and identify challenging behaviors. Preservice teachers should also be considered for receiving professional development support for better classroom management and preparedness regarding behavior management during the rise of disruptive student behavior.

School-Wide Interventions

School-wide interventions are an appropriate first step toward change when considering how to create positive changes in student behavior. A qualitative research study conducted by McDaniel et al. (2017) investigated how a high-risk school district in the Southeast region of the United States perceived a schoolwide implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). There are three different tiers of intervention included in the PBIS system, including schoolwide (Tier 1), individual or small group targeted interventions (Tier 2), and interventions for persistent disruptive behaviors (Tier 3) (McDaniel et al., 2017).

The study represented four educators across the district: one elementary teacher, one middle school assistant principal, one elementary counselor, and one school psychologist. The middle school represented in the study had a student population of 500, and 77% of the students qualified for free and reduced lunch. The elementary school represented in the study had a student population of 450, and 96% qualified for free and reduced lunch. This elementary school also planned to implement PBIS in its school turnaround plan, meaning it is underperforming in academic achievement, and a plan has been implemented to produce academic growth. The high school represented in this study had about 700 students, and 87% qualified for free and reduced lunch. The school district demographics included 95% to 100% African American students (McDaniel et al., 2017). After implementing PBIS, the study participants suggested the success of PBIS in high-need schools will vary based on fidelity, grade level, buy-in from teachers and support staff, and leadership support. The participants in the study found PBIS effective at lowering the rate of office referrals, suspensions, and special education referrals. The participants in the study also believed there needed to be alternatives for specific discipline needs. The study's focus group understood the need for professional development around PBIS. The researchers (2017) also found high behavioral needs, lack of parental involvement, and socioeconomic challenges will make implementation more complex. The study also determined PBIS can support academic achievement and is believed to be successful when implemented effectively (McDaniel et al., 2017).

Another qualitative study by Menzies et al. (2021) used a comprehensive, integrated, three-tiered model (Ci3T). According to Menzies et al. (2021), the Ci3T model "is designed to meet students' needs by using data-informed decision-making and ongoing professional learning and is the first to address academic, behavioral, and social-emotional domains in a single

comprehensive model" (p. 208). The researchers (2021) also note Ci3T is a flexible model created to adapt to the building or district's needs regarding behavior practices.

After two years of Ci3T implementation, 18 predominately White female teachers involved in the study were interviewed for one hour in four different interview sessions over a two-day process about implementing the Ci3T model. The focus groups represented elementary teachers, Title 1, special education, English language (EL), and Ci3T building leadership (Menzies et al., 2021). The focus groups included a group of teachers with high-fidelity implementation and a group with low-fidelity implementation. The study's interview results exhibited teachers struggled to implement the PBIS structure of the Ci3T model. The teachers also struggled with using proactive classroom management strategies, understanding the role of punishment in classroom management, and effectively using data to facilitate change (Menzies et al., 2021). The teachers in the study also felt they did not have sufficient time to learn the model. However, the teachers witnessed positive outcomes with students. Teachers grew comfortable with the new strategies, and positive changes in student behavior occurred. The Ci3T model ultimately permitted the teachers to revert to the new techniques to address the behavior. Some limitations of the study were opposing districts, especially districts with diverse demographics, may find a tiered support model not valuable, or perceptions of the model may be seen differently (Menzies et al., 2021).

Both studies conducted by McDaniel et al. (2017) and Menzies et al. (2021) found implementing behavior intervention strategies beneficial with some success rates; however, the limitations were different. McDaniel et al. (2017) found the implementation process cannot be successful without teacher, administration, and parent buy-in, while Menzies et al. (2021) found

teachers struggled with using a proactive approach (reinforcement) to classroom management rather than using the typical reactive approach (consequences).

A mixed-methods study by Anyon et al. (2016) used a school-wide Tier 1 intervention called Responsive Classroom (RC). The researchers define responsive classroom as it "improves social, emotional, literacy, and math outcomes for disadvantaged students with behavior problems by building on the assets of teachers to intervene with misbehaving students in the classroom setting or school environment" (Anyon et al., 2016, p. 81). Responsive Classroom is also a "...professional development intervention to strengthen teachers' abilities to manage problem behavior with student-centered and developmentally appropriate strategies" (Anyon et al., 2016, p. 82).

The study occurred at a primarily low-income urban K-8 school with a diverse student population. The school has 58% of students who qualify for free or reduced lunch, and 62% are students of color. In the study, the implementation of Responsive Classroom included 35 teachers within the K-8 setting at the school. This included 60% of elementary educators, three principals, three behavior specialists, and three social workers. The study occurred in two different focus groups. The first focus group completed round one in the fall of 2013, including 15 staff members. The second focus group completed round two in the spring of 2014, including 19 staff members. There were 24 other teachers who participated in classroom observations during both focus groups (Anyon et al., 2016).

During the implementation of Responsive Classroom, the educators involved in the study had three leading practices within the intervention. The first was implementing a morning meeting in each classroom, the second was implementing similar teacher language around positive behaviors, and the third was using logical consequences for misbehavior (Anyon et al.,

2016). After the implementation of Responsive Classroom, the educators who participated in the study noted there needed to be more consistency within grade levels of the implementation of the RC intervention. The results showed middle school teachers had less fidelity with the implementation of Responsive Classroom than elementary teachers. "Participants reported this was, in part, a reflection of inconsistent buy-in at the leadership level, with the lead principal for the elementary schools grades reporting greater investment and commitment to RC than the middle school leader" (Anyon et al., 2016, p. 86). The authors reported utilizing additional support with fidelity and additional resources might allow for improved implementation of the schoolwide intervention (Anyon et al., 2016).

Unlike the studies above, a quasi-experimental study by Fefer et al. (2022) tried a different approach involving a school-based family intervention with high success rates. The study focused on behavioral parent training (BPT) called Helping Our Toddlers, Developing Our Children's Skills (HOT DOCS). Behavioral parent training is typically available through clinics; however, it has shown a need for implementation in the school setting (Fefer et al., 2022). HOT DOCS will also align with PBIS implementation, like the previous study by McDaniel et al. (2017), as it can support students with or without disabilities.

This quasi-experimental study involved 25 caregivers with children ages two to six with challenging behaviors and older children with developmental disabilities. The objective was to guide the 25 caregivers with problem-solving techniques to effectively address disruptive or challenging behaviors (Fefer et al., 2022). The study was implemented in two diverse school districts in the Northeast United States. At the end of the seven-week training, results showed a decrease in the frequency and intensity of the challenging behaviors the caregivers were seeing (Fefer et al., 2022). Caregivers were also less stressed and felt they had better relationships with

their children. The study resulted in behavioral parent training being effective in a school setting. The authors did find a few limitations in the study. The study did not have a control group which cannot guarantee behavioral parent training leads to changes in the measured outcomes. The authors note future research should involve a single-case experimental design and a random control group with HOT DOCS to hopefully see the same results found with the 25 caregivers (Fefer et al., 2022). McDaniel et al. (2017) state PBIS implementation should heavily focus on parent involvement and representation, aligning with HOT DOCS' main focus – parent buy-in.

The studies conducted by Anyon et al. (2016), Fefer et al. (2022), McDaniel et al. (2017), and Menzies et al. (2021) all demonstrated possible implementations of school-wide interventions; however, all approaches demonstrated some implications around equitably leading teachers to implement with fidelity. The administration in a school building must be the change's driving force. This can support teacher buy-in and promote fidelity around implementation to see positive change in disruptive student behavior. An outlier of the research was noted in (Fefer et al., 2022). The research indicated parent buy-in is detrimental to improving disruptive student behavior in and out of school. To provide proper behavior intervention and classroom management techniques, many factors need to be weighed and focused on by implementing PBIS school-wide or a school-based family intervention like HOT DOCS.

The above researchers believe in the success of school-wide positive behavior interventions even though complications were found in each study with the fidelity of implementation. The following qualitative research by Pinkelman et al. (2015) examined the barriers and possible enablers of preventing the school-wide implementation of positive behavior support (SWPBIS) to ultimately lead to sustainability of implementation and intervention. To gather information about school-wide implementation of PBIS, the participants completed the

SUBSIST assessment during the first year of the longitudinal study. The SUBSIST assessment is "a research-validated measure assessing the presence of variables related to implementation and sustainability of universal behavior support interventions" (Pinkelman et al., 2015, p. 174).

The study had 860 participants and all participants were educators from schools across all regions of the United States, and only included 14 states. The educators in the study had many roles in the school. The participants included were 61% PBIS team leaders, 24% were school principals, 9% were on a PBIS team, and 5% were district coaches. The schools involved in the study were 68% elementary schools, 20% were middle schools, and 12% were high schools. The locations of the schools in the study were 33% suburban, 28% urban, 25% rural, and 14% in towns. Amongst all the schools, 25% were in year zero or year one of implementation of SWPBIS, 48% were between year two and year four, and 28% had been implementing for five years or longer (Pinkelman et al., 2015).

The results of the study displayed a noteworthy pattern regarding enablers and barriers. Staff buy-in and consistency resulted in the most identified barrier to the sustainability of SWPBIS and is also the most identified enabler from the given SUBSIST assessment. "Participants indicated that staff buy-in was one of the most important factors contributing to SWPBIS sustainability, and when staff buy-in was lacking, its absence was a significant barrier" (Pinkelman et al., 2015, p. 179). The second most identified enabler from the SUBSIST assessment was school administrator support. The results indicated schools with strong implementation or years of experience with the implementation would also fail if there were an adverse change in school administrator support. The second and third barriers to SWPBIS implementation found from the SUBSIST assessment were the lack of resources, specifically time and money. The researchers (2015) note SWPBIS implementation is typically cost-effective

after training. However, if staff have a creative mindset, it may allow for a positive implementation with the lack of resources.

In conclusion, the above studies by McDaniel et al. (2017), Menzies et al. (2021), Anyon et al. (2016), Fefer et al. (2022), and Pinkelman et al. (2015) all suggest promising school-wide interventions districts and schools can implement to foster positive behavior and hopefully manage disruptive student behaviors. Fidelity in school-wide intervention and buy-in from teachers, administrators, and parents are essential factors to lead to successful outcomes. While these studies suggest that school-wide interventions revealed positive results to help manage overall behaviors, the research above also exhibited a need for classroom interventions. Classroom management systems and strategies are imperative to help manage individual disruptive student behaviors. The following studies will explore the importance of strong classroom management and classroom interventions to support teachers with challenging student behaviors.

Classroom Interventions and Management

In the previous theme, school-wide intervention is a strategy used to help manage student behavior. The second theme will consider how classroom interventions and management can aid disruptive student behavior. The research below by Bronstein et al. (2021), Chen et al. (2021), Harpin et al. (2016), Ratcliff et al. (2010), and Wills et al. (2022) will delve into dissimilar interventions and classroom management strategies while supporting teachers with student behavior.

The study conducted by Menzies et al. (2021) around the Ci3T model believes in using collected behavioral data to help implement behavior intervention with fidelity. When thinking about the needs of individual children or classrooms, data should be collected to determine the

next steps. Teachers and support staff need to feel comfortable analyzing data and using it as a driving force to adapt to student needs, especially behavioral needs. Teachers must also thoroughly understand how classroom management is necessary when considering student behavior. "Classroom management is an important and necessary aspect of teaching and is a broad term comprised of strategies and techniques used to assist in engaging students as well as limiting disruptive behaviors" (Chen et al., 2021, p. 155). Overall, classroom management plays a role in how and why interventions may be implemented for individual students by consistently monitoring behavior.

A mixed methods study conducted by Bronstein et al. (2021) assessed paraprofessionals' perceptions of student behavior and whether paraprofessionals feel more equipped to implement behavior intervention with coaching versus those who have not had coaching. The study involved 86 paraprofessionals (81 females and five males, all representing different ethnicities) from 36 schools in urban and suburban areas in the Northeast United States (Bronstein et al., 2021). The paraprofessionals also worked with kindergarten through fifth graders and supported those with or exhibiting disruptive behavior disorders (DBD). The Behavior Observation of Students in School (BOSS) measures student classroom behavior, and it was modified and used in the study to guide paraprofessionals in tracking behavior. The behavior logs allowed paraprofessionals to log perceptions of student behavior, which were monitored and logged over several weeks (Bronstein et al., 2021).

There were two conditions involved in this study. One group was coached and given professional development (PD) while the other was not. Participants attended a five-hour PD around behavior and the importance of using data to identify functionality and classroom interventions with 45-minute coaching sessions immediately following the PD (Bronstein et al.,

2021). The other participants did not receive PD or coaching guidance. Both groups were asked to complete a minimum of 10 behavior logs and were encouraged to complete as many logs as possible based on the needs of student behaviors (Bronstein et al., 2021). The results of the study displayed paraprofessionals could identify DBD behaviors, although the paraprofessionals struggled with definitions of the behavior presented by the student. Bronstein et al. (2021) found paraprofessionals who received PD and coaching were more equipped to log behaviors and define the behavior accurately which helped to identify adequate behavior interventions for the students involved in the behavior logs.

Similar to the Bronstein et al. (2021) study around collecting data on behavior, a one-year quantitative study was conducted in 2008-2009 by Ratcliff et al. (2010) around classroom management and student behavioral struggles. In the Ratcliff et al. (2010) study, data were collected to identify the difference between teachers who have been identified as "strong" or "needs improvement" by the principals and to understand what behaviors or instructional needs are being met between the two different categories of the rated teachers.

The study involved 34 second and fourth-grade teachers with a total of 558 students, and the teachers were all observed six times (unannounced) for 40 minutes (Ratcliff et al., 2010). The teachers and students involved in the study were either Caucasian, African American, or Hispanic. All teachers were rated during the classroom observations on whether the interactions with the students were instructional or management-focused. Ratcliff et al. (2010) found drastic differences in the observations with the teachers who were rated as "strong" or as "needs improvement." Teachers who were rated as "strong" had better classroom management techniques, intentional interactions with students, better delivery of instruction, and used verbal praise when addressing desired behaviors (Ratcliff et al., 2010). Teachers rated as "needs

improvement" in the study had many instances of misbehavior or disruptions in the classroom (Ratcliff et al., 2010). These teachers were found to spend more time managing behavior than delivering instruction, and the management techniques would result in the teachers pleading and bribing students to do as asked. Teachers rated as "needs improvement" would retreat 50% of the time, while teachers rated as "strong" only retreated two percent of the time (Ratcliff et al., 2010). This means teachers who retreat more create a vague classroom environment, and students spend more time off task, which can ultimately lead to more disruptive behaviors.

The researchers (2010) concluded from the qualitative data some essential classroom management techniques all teachers, including preservice teachers, should strive for. Examples of the suggested classroom management techniques include being alert and quickly redirecting off-task behavior, avoiding retreating, appropriately using praise and rewards, and being aware of pacing and keeping children engaged (Ratcliff et al., 2010). Ratcliff et al. believe if teachers genuinely want to have better success with behavior in the classroom, all teachers need to have the opportunity to self-reflect. The authors (2010) in this study believe teachers can then engage in collaborative reflection about individual classroom management techniques. The researchers also note teachers must be open to feedback to make and see positive behavior changes (Ratcliff et al., 2010).

The research by Bronstein et al. (2021) and Ratcliff et al. (2010) contrast each other when considering the adults or school staff involved in behavior management; however, these similarities between the two could be considered. Paraprofessionals and classroom teachers work closely together throughout the school day. When both paraprofessionals and classroom teachers are trained in classroom management techniques and how to track behavior data, positive changes in behavior may be seen due to both school staff using the same management systems

and delivering the same set of expectations. On the contrary, if paraprofessionals and classroom teachers are not given the appropriate support to track behavioral data or implement classroom management techniques through observation feedback, the change in disruptive behavior may not be seen or may be inconsistent.

As suggested above in the research by Bronstein et al. (2021) and Ratcliff et al. (2010), classroom management is essential to limiting disruptive behaviors in the classroom. A qualitative study by Chen et al. (2021) explored teachers' perceptions of classroom management strategies, classroom climate, teacher-child relationships, students' social-emotional behavior, and academic engagement through interview questions. The study was conducted at an early learning academy in the southern United States and involved 18 different pre-kindergarten through fourth-grade classrooms and one special education classroom. There were 264 students involved in the study, including 3.8% Asian students, 9.8% Black or African American students, 20.8% White students, 65.2% Hispanic students, and 0.4% Native American students (Chen et al., 2021). The participants in the study were 18 teachers, including 17 women and one male. All teachers had a wide range of teaching experience and educational experience (Chen et al., 2021).

After completion of the interviews, three common themes were found: teacher-child relationships, teachers' perceptions of students' behaviors, and teachers' behaviors (Chen et al., 2021). "The findings revealed a need to provide relationship-focused training opportunities for teachers to learn ways to better connect with children, understanding children's behavioral and social-emotional needs, and ultimately decrease teaching stress and enhance classroom management" (Chen et al., 2021, p. 163). A few limitations were listed in the research: generalizability and possible participant bias. The study also lacked diversity and was only completed in one geographical area. The authors also suggested future research could involve

preservice teachers' experience of learning teacher-student relationships and the success of play-based learning within classroom management (Chen et al., 2021).

In addition to Chen et al. (2021) finding crucial needs to better understand children's behavioral and social-emotional needs, a qualitative study by Harpin et al. (2016) was conducted through a mindfulness pilot intervention to determine the behavioral implications of students. "Mindfulness has been used in classroom settings, particularly with older children and adolescents, to help with behavioral and academic outcomes in school" (Harpin et al., 2016, p. 149).

This pilot mindfulness program was implemented in two fourth-grade classrooms in a public elementary school in Denver, Colorado. The school had a diverse student population, including 53% Hispanic, 19.5% Black or African American, 17% White, 4% Asian, and 5% two or more races, along with 85% of the student population qualified for free and reduced lunch (Harpin et al., 2016). The principal selected the two fourth-grade classes to participate in the study. Concurrently, one group implemented the Mindfulness intervention as the first-morning activity each school day, and the other group continued with the regular morning routine each school day. The Mindfulness intervention classroom used a blend of *MindUp* and *Mindful Schools* curriculum and spent 20 to 30 minutes on Mindfulness twice a week. The intervention was delivered by a qualified Mindfulness professional (Harpin et al., 2016). Teachers and students in the study also completed three different surveys as pre- and post-intervention assessments to gather more information about mindfulness. The teachers completed the first survey, *FasttrackTeacher Social Competence*, for each student; this survey measured social-emotional behavior and academic achievement. The second survey, the *Child Assent Mindfulness Measurement Survey* (CAMM), measured students' social awareness and ability to accept

situations. The third survey, the *Mindful Schools Survey*, measured how effective the mindfulness curriculum was for each student and teacher (Harpin et al., 2016).

The results of the surveys were positive, as both students and teachers reported the Mindfulness curriculum was beneficial. "Both students and teachers in the treatment group reported increases in positive classroom behaviors, emotional regulation, and academic achievement" (Harpin et al., 2016, p. 154). The authors found three limitations in the study. The first limitation of the study was how the Mindfulness pilot, was only completed in one elementary school. The second limitation of the study included a small sample size and similar results during both methods. The third limitation was the CAMM survey had not yet been tested on children, and students may not have understood the meaning of Mindfulness pre-intervention, which resulted in exaggerated answers on the survey (Harpin et al., 2016). The researchers believed, "Mindfulness among youth can be an important component of a healthy youth development framework and contribute to resiliency among vulnerable youth who may be exposed to trauma" (Harpin et al., 2016, p. 155). Mindfulness could be a healthy behavioral intervention to implement in schools and may help decrease challenging or disruptive behaviors in the educational setting.

When considering the above research, a quantitative study was completed and focused on an opposite strategy of classroom management: group contingency. The study conducted by Wills et al. (2022) used a system called Class-Wide Function-Related Intervention Teams (CW-FIT). "CW-FIT is a classroom management system using a group contingency involving direct teaching of classroom rules/skills, differential reinforcement of appropriate behaviors, and minimized social attention to inappropriate behaviors" (Wills et al., 2022, p. 149). The CW-FIT

study was completed in three different states, Kansas, Utah, and Tennessee, in nine teachers' classrooms.

The first school had a student population of 377, and 35.5% were White, while 55.1% qualified for free and reduced lunch (Wills et al., 2022). The study was completed in two first-grade classrooms and one third-grade classroom. A female school psychologist and a female school counselor took on coaching responsibilities for CW-FIT (Wills et al., 2022). The second school had a student population of 534, and 34% were not White, while 64% qualified for free and reduced lunch (Wills et al., 2022). This school completed the study in a first-, second-, and fourth-grade classroom. A male school facilitator who handled behavior referrals and supported new teachers, the male principal, and the Title I coordinator helped the participating teachers with CW-FIT implementation (Wills et al., 2022). The third school had a student population of 425 and 91% were not White, while 87% qualified for free and reduced lunch and completed the study in a second-, third-, and fourth-grade classroom (Will et al., 2022).

The teachers who participated in the study were all female and had a wide range of teaching experience. Students identified as at-risk for emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD) were individually monitored during the intervention, and six total students were tracked throughout the study. The female school counselor was appointed the CW-FIT implementation coach (Wills et al., 2022). The results from the study concluded from the baseline data and the completed intervention data saw significant improvement in disruptive behaviors and on-task behaviors, and students deemed at-risk for EBD were overall improving (Wills et al., 2022). The researchers (2022) found the CW-FIT implementation was successful with minimal researcher or school coaching support. A few limitations were considered post-research: only nine classrooms and teachers were involved and were selected by principals instead of a random selection. This

could have tampered with teacher buy-in as teachers may have felt obligated and not truly wanted to improve classroom management (Wills et al., 2022). However, the researchers believed it increased validity by having three states involved. The researchers also noted there needed to be better planning regarding data collection from CW-FIT coaching, and data should have been collected to determine better results on the coaching model (Wills et al., 2022).

The research conducted by Menzies et al. (2021), Bronstein et al. (2021), Ratcliff et al. (2010), Chen et al. (2021), Harpin et al. (2016), and Wills et al. (2022) all include means to better classroom management systems and provide potential intervention strategies, in contrast, this following cross-lag analysis (quantitative) study conducted by Caldarella et al. (2020) provides insight on how teachers are using reprimands and how it is negatively affecting the classroom management system, especially for students who exhibit emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD). The researchers examined "the effects of teacher reprimands on future student behavior while controlling for teacher praise, given the potential association between teacher praise and student behavior" (Caldarella et al., 2020, p. 164). Similar to the Wills et al. (2022) quantitative study, this study was completed using the CW-FIT system; however, the focus of the study was primarily on EBD students.

This study occurred during a four-year randomized control trial (RCT); 19 Missouri, Tennessee, and Utah elementary schools participated in a proactive classroom management program called Class-Wide Function-related Intervention Team (CW-FIT). There were 149 teachers randomly selected to participate, and the students involved were 311 at-risk EBD students. "The study found that teacher reprimands did not appear to decrease future disruptive behavior or increase future engagement for students at risk for EBD or vice versa" (Caldarella et al., 2020, p. 170.). This could be possible due to the reprimands used to teach students the

desired behavior; otherwise, it only continues to encourage the negative or unwanted behavior (Caldarella et al., 2020).

In contrast, the researchers (2020) were surprised there were minor associations between teacher reprimands and student disruptions, and the researchers stated it was expected to see a more significant connection between the two behaviors. Caldarella et al. (2020) noted there were inconsistent findings from the Utah and Missouri settings and are unsure why the results differed. The Utah setting "had significantly fewer teacher reprimands, student disruptions, and great student engagement than the other sites" (Caldarella et al., 2020, p.170). The Missouri setting had less student engagement than the other settings involved in the study.

A few limitations were also found in this study. One limitation is the data collected was only around students who were at risk for EBD, and future research could be based on all students in each classroom. Another limitation was the study did not control for teacher behaviors which may encourage or provoke future disruptive behaviors. In addition, the data may be inconsistent as the observations were not completed daily, and the observations were not evenly split between the two-to-three-week timeframe of completed observations (Caldarella et al., 2020). Lastly, the study only collected data in elementary schools, and future research could be conducted in secondary settings.

Overall, the research conducted by Bronstein et al. (2020), Ratcliff et al. (2010), Chen et al. (2021), Harpin et al. (2016), Wills et al. (2022), and Caldarella et al. (2020) concerning classroom interventions and classroom management systems and strategies are vital in managing disruptive student behaviors to allow for academics to be taught. The research suggested effective classroom management systems generally included teacher actions that reinforced positive behaviors, did not retreat from intervening, and did not use reprimands as a primary

intervention strategy. The above studies provided appropriate strategies for implementing the systems and strategies in a classroom setting. The studies also discussed the importance of behavioral data collection and the importance of using the data to drive decision-making regarding intervention and management systems. Professional development is imperative to implementing these systems and strategies with fidelity. The following research explored professional development to support veteran and preservice teachers in better managing disruptive student behaviors.

Professional Development Around Behavior Management

Professional development (PD) around behavior management is researched in the studies by Conner et al. (2022), Morrison et al. (2014), Oakes et al. (2020), and Butler and Monda-Amaya (2016). These studies delve into how professional development can support educational leaders, teachers, and preservice teachers with the rise of disruptive student behavior and how to improve classroom management overall.

A quantitative correlation study by Conner et al. (2022) involved a survey to determine whether there was a relationship between the amount of PD the teachers received around student engagement, instructional strategies, and behavior management and the teacher's sense of self-efficacy in those areas. The study involved teachers from eight elementary schools in the same school district. Ninety-nine teachers completed the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) via SurveyMonkey, and the responses included 85 women and 15 men (Conner et al., 2022). After collecting the data, high self-efficacy and classroom management scores were reported. The authors (2022) noted a few reasons the data was higher than expected. Not all teachers dealing with challenging behaviors in the classroom took the survey or did not rate themselves on the TSES appropriately. Another hypothesis is "a number of teachers are unaware of the extent of the

behavior management issues in their classrooms until such issues are fully brought to their attention" (Conner et al., 2022, p. 11). Another survey result found teachers in the school district had only attended one PD around behavior management in the last five years, so research suggested more PD and resources should be offered to teachers who work with challenging student behavior (Conner et al., 2022). The authors used the data from the TSES, and a manual was created for teachers to help with classroom management strategies and guidance on managing challenging student behaviors (Conner et al., 2022).

Another quantitative research study was conducted to decipher preservice teachers' perceptions of challenging behavior in elementary and secondary settings. The study was completed by Butler and Monda-Amaya (2016) to gain better knowledge of how preservice teachers perceive challenging behaviors and how the behaviors affect their role as classroom teachers by either escalating or de-escalating a behavior. The study included elementary and secondary teacher preservice teachers from a Midwestern university, 114 elementary education majors, and 141 secondary majors. The participants in the study were either at the junior, senior, or graduate level, and the majority were White (80.8%) and females (76.9%). The preservice teachers were enrolled in a special education course which taught specifics regarding special education students, as well as how to address and manage challenging student behaviors (Butler & Monda-Amaya, 2016).

After an in-depth understanding of the course literature, the participants were administered a survey created for the research. "The Challenging Behaviors Perception Scale (CBPS) contained three sections: responses to video scenarios, ratings of challenging behavior, and participant demographics" (Butler & Monda-Amaya, 2016, p. 4). The CBPS was administered to all students after class lectures regarding behavior management and challenging

behavior (Buter & Monda-Amaya, 2016). The instruction delivered involved watching three behavior-related scenarios via pre-recorded videos between a teacher and a student. The preservice teachers then rated their perceptions of how the behavior scenario was managed and whether the preservice teacher could appropriately manage the presented scenario independently (Butler & Monda-Amaya, 2016). The survey results found the preservice elementary and secondary teachers rated themselves differently in a few areas. However, the preservice teachers all demonstrated their ability to identify the problem and whether the teacher was able to de-escalate the behavior or resulted in escalating the behavior. In the category of managing challenging behavior, the overall rating of confidence was low. Only 19% of elementary and 23.4% of secondary preservice teachers rated themselves as confident or expert in managing challenging behavior (Butler & Monda-Amaya, 2016). There were also substantial variances in elementary preservice teachers' rating themselves as confident in classroom management and managing challenging behavior (Butler & Monda-Amaya, 2016). The researchers noted, "It is important to consider that when classroom teachers felt more confident in behavior management, they were more likely to implement specific strategies in the classroom and reportedly more comfortable addressing challenging behavior" (Butler & Monda-Amaya, 2016, p. 13).

The approach used in the study by Conner et al. (2022) is similar to the study by Butler and Monda-Amaya (2016) by having preservice and veteran teachers complete a survey or assessment to identify their ability to manage challenging student behaviors and the strength of their classroom management abilities. The studies' similarities are within the purpose of the research, regarding how teachers perceive challenging student behaviors, and within the results of both studies. Both studies indicated PD around challenging behaviors and classroom

management is critical in helping preservice and veteran teachers become equipped to manage and identify behavioral issues with the rise of disruptive student behavior.

Unlike the above research, a qualitative study by Morrison et al. (2014) was conducted around technical assistance in education and whether the multi-tiered system of support, PBIS, and Response to Intervention (RTI) model is truly integrated with fidelity. There were 10 White participants involved in this study during the first year, while only nine participated during the second year. The participants in this study were Technical Assistance Providers (TAPs) through Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi). The participants included nine females, while one was male, which dropped to eight females and one male in year two (Morrison et al., 2014). All participants had previous education experience as a school psychologist, a special education teacher, or a reading specialist (Morrison et al., 2014). During year one of the study, interviews were held via telephone with all participants to gather information about the structure of their work and their role in helping implement new innovative models. Focus groups were created using data collected from the phone interviews. During year two of the study, the interviews focused on how well technical assistance units functioned and what improvements could be made within the system. "The results of the study indicated the need for structures and processes for communication and problem solving, greater clarity regarding the roles of the TAP within the organization, and additional guidance in balancing implementation fidelity and customization" (Morrison et al., 2014, p. 134). The research also suggests TAPs must work with a school district's implementation stage and must drive the district toward fidelity during early implementation to ensure positive results (Morrison et al., 2014).

This study by Morrison et al. (2014) supports the authors McDaniel et al. (2017) and Menzies et al. (2021) through implementing PBIS and behavior intervention with fidelity. For example, school districts will implement new models based on individual behavioral needs, which creates inconsistency for each TAP involved in the implementation process. The TAP will also encounter teacher and administration buy-in, which has been shown through the research to be only somewhat successful.

Similar to Menzies et al. (2021) study of a Ci3T implementation in the elementary setting, another Ci3T model was implemented in the quantitative study by Oakes et al. (2020) in one middle school serving sixth through eighth grade in a small Midwestern city in the Spring of 2014. While the Menzies et al. (2021) qualitative study focused on implementing the Ci3T model in the classroom, the Oakes et al. (2020) quantitative study focused on a book study similar to the Ci3T model. The book study involving the Ci3T model helped prepare teachers for future implementation through professional development. "The participating school was part of a district installing Ci3T models of prevention across all schools for supporting goals of excellence, equity, and engagement" (Oakes et al., 2020, p. 9).

The book study participants were 61 middle school educators: teachers, administrators, related service providers, and other staff. Many of the educators involved were White, females and all educators had a range of educational experience (Oakes et al., 2020). The student population in the middle school had a mix of diversity, including 77.01% White, 7.56% Hispanic, and 7.24% Asian/Pacific Islander, while less than five percent of students were Black, mixed races, or American Indian/Alaskan Native (Oakes et al., 2022). Lastly, 22.57% of middle school students qualified for free and reduced lunch (Oakes et al., 2022).

The book study was led by the middle school principal and an English language arts teacher. "Results showed that educators reported high levels of knowledge for classroom management practices, with the vast majority (80%) reporting average or above average knowledge for all items in the category" (Oakes et al., 2020, p. 9). By implementing a book study, the researchers (2020) felt the professional development was achievable through allowing the educators to work together, practice individual findings, and were given more autonomy compared to other professional development practices.

Four limitations were noted in this study, the first being only one middle school was involved. The second limitation was relying on the educators' self-reported scores, which may not have been completed with fidelity in fear of not being adequate in the areas surveyed. The third limitation "did not allow for analyses to detect differences between teachers and staff or between special and general educator" (Oakes et al., 2020, p. 10). The final limitation was how the professional development was presented as a book study; however, this method did promote a healthy outlook on the importance of professional development (Oakes et al., 2020).

The above research by Buter and Monda-Amaya (2016), Conner et al. (2022), Oakes et al. (2014, and Morrison et al. (2014) regarding professional development for veteran and preservice educators discussed the importance of preparing and thoroughly understanding disruptive behaviors seen in educational settings. The studies suggested professional development is fundamental to allow for strong classroom management and ensure educational leaders, teachers, and preservice teachers feel confident with the implementation of interventions, models, and strategies.

Overall, the three themes discovered through the research provide educational leaders and teachers with models, systems, and strategies that can be implemented to optimistically manage

the rise of disruptive student behavior in the contemporary educational setting. As previously noted, there is not a one-size-fits-all approach to this educational issue of disruptive student behavior, and educational leaders will need to use research methods to decipher which model, system, or strategy best fits the needs of their district or school.

Review of the Proposed Problem

In light of what is known about pedagogy in the contemporary educational setting, how can educational leaders support the implementation of effective classroom management strategies or behavior management strategies during an increase of disruptive student behavior, so teachers and students are successful in the classroom? The above research highlighted three themes to help manage disruptive student behavior in the contemporary education setting. The first theme involved school-wide intervention systems and models schools and districts can implement to support overall student behavior and to control fewer behavioral disruptions. The second theme involved classroom intervention and management, giving teachers tools and strategies to implement and help manage behaviors while using behavioral data to make informed decisions to guide behavioral interventions in the classroom. The third theme involved providing professional development around behavior management to all teachers, including preservice teachers. This will allow all teachers to feel successful and ensure students' needs are met and academics can be taught.

Review of the Importance of the Topic

Disruptive student behavior is rising in the contemporary educational setting, and teachers are unequipped with ways to manage this educational issue. Districts, schools, and teachers are endlessly creating new and unique ways to manage disruptive behavior; however, implementing these models, systems, and strategies has been found not to be followed through

with fidelity. The need for professional development opportunities can support teachers with their students' needs through interventions and classroom management systems and will help with the overall fidelity of implementation (Whalen & Moore, n.d.). While teachers are trying to manage disruptive student behaviors students are not receiving the accurate amount of instruction. Teachers have reported due to the disruption of these behaviors, students are losing up to three weeks of instruction (Whalen & Moore, n.d.). Teachers and schools need support managing challenging behaviors to maintain their primary responsibility – teaching.

Summary of Findings

In the research studies completed by McDaniel et al. (2017), Menzies et al. (2021), Anyon et al. (2016), Fefer et al. (2022), and Pinkelman et al. (2015), many reoccurring findings were noted in the research. The researchers believed in the need for school-wide intervention implementation and saw positive outcomes when school leadership, teacher, and parent buy-in were strong. However, the limitations were similar. If teacher buy-in and school leadership were not strong, the implementation of school-wide intervention would be inconsistent, and the outcome for positive behavior changes may not be seen. One positive discovery from Fefer et al. (2022) research is implementing behavioral parent training in a school setting to allow for focus on behavior in the school and home settings for overall better behavior.

In the studies conducted by Bronstein et al. (2021), Ratcliff et al. (2010), Chen et al. (2021), Harpin et al. (2016), Wills et al. (2022), and Caldarella et al. (2020) strategies, intervention, and observations and data collection regarding behavior management were found in the classroom setting. The authors had a common outlook on supporting teachers within their classroom management styles, using specific language when reprimanding behaviors, implementing mental health strategies, and involving support staff with behavioral needs.

Overall, most of the research found when teachers and paraprofessionals are supported through professional development or received support from the administration and collected data appropriately to create interventions, ultimately, the outcome of disruptive student behavior can be managed.

In the research studies by Conner et al. (2022), Morrison et al. (2014), Oakes et al. (2020), and Butler and Monda-Amaya (2016), the authors considered the benefits of how professional development around behavior management is crucial in managing disruptive student behavior. The research suggested when professional development is implemented with fidelity, it allows for overall positive behavior changes and academic achievement. Whether the research involved veteran or preservice teachers, providing teachers with new classroom or behavior management strategies is critical to a thriving learning environment for all students.

Conclusion

The above research delved into the three potential systems teachers, school leaders, paraprofessionals, and preservice teachers may implement to help manage disruptive student behavior. School-wide interventions, classroom interventions and management, and professional development around behavior management are instrumental in managing the rise of disruptive student behavior. All three themes coincide to positively create a process for teachers and school leaders to manage student behavior effectively. The following chapter will discuss the insights gained from the research and how the insights can be applied in a contemporary educational setting to support school leaders, teachers, paraprofessionals, and preservice teachers with the rise of disruptive student behavior. The following chapter will also discuss possible future studies to delve further into managing the rise of disruptive student behavior to guide school leaders, teachers, and students to success.

Chapter Three: Discussion, Application, and Future Studies

In this chapter, the research analyzed in the literature review will delve into the insights gained from the research on managing disruptive student behavior in a contemporary educational setting. The analyzed research's insights do not provide a one-size-fits-all approach, meaning schools and districts must implement behavior management strategies, systems, and models to fit their behavioral needs appropriately. This chapter will also discuss how schools and districts could apply school-wide intervention, classroom intervention and management, and professional development around behavior management. Future studies regarding how to equitably manage and lead during an increase in disruptive student behavior will also be discussed.

Insights Gained from the Research

Within the research analyzed, there were commonalities between implementing school-wide interventions, classroom intervention and management, and professional development around behavior management. The first insight gained from the research is the implementation of the researched behavior interventions and professional development regarding managing student behavior. Many schools and teachers found the implementation of the researched models, systems, and strategies challenging for a few reasons. If the administration was not involved or did not have effective follow-through with implementation, it became challenging with staff buy-in regarding the different interventions or professional development implementations. This also created a discrepancy in the fidelity of the implementation. Some teachers and schools had effective fidelity to the implementation processes, while others struggled with the fidelity of implementation. Many schools and districts would not see positive results or receive mixed results regarding behavior changes due to the lack of follow-through. With the findings from the

research, it is imperative educational leaders are the driving force to allow for teacher buy-in with implementation.

Another insight gained from the research is incorporating professional development around behavior management in all districts and schools. With the rise of student behavior, many teachers are ill-prepared to manage this educational issue. Including preservice teachers in this professional development strategy may allow for enhanced classroom management when these teachers enter the teaching force. This could help with a decrease in behaviors, or it may prevent disruptive student behaviors. Also, including paraprofessionals who support EBD or special education students with behavioral needs allows for enhanced behavior management within the classroom setting. Within a better understanding of strong classroom management systems comes a better understanding of identifying behaviors and how to manage the challenging behaviors best. Professional development around behavior management can ensure teachers are prepared for the rise of disruptive student behavior and are appropriately prepared to manage this educational issue.

The last insight gained from the research is the ability to collect behavioral data to create an intervention, whether it is implemented school-wide or in the classroom. The Ci3T, PBIS, or Responsive Classroom models allowed teachers and paraprofessionals to understand the importance of data collection to drive instruction or to adapt to specific student needs. Within the data collection, schools and teachers saw positive behavioral changes school-wide and within the classroom.

The research analyzed regarding disruptive student behavior gave insights into means to manage and support educational leaders, teachers, paraprofessionals, and preservice teachers. The research does not suggest a one-size-fits-all approach, which therefore enables districts or

schools to adjust the systems or models to individual behavioral needs as they see fit. The insights show there can be positive results. The underlying issue truly determines the selection of school-wide interventions, classroom interventions and management, professional development, and the overall fidelity of the selection.

Application of Research

Implementing school-wide interventions like PBIS, Responsive Classroom, HOT DOCS, or a Ci3T model may result in changes in behavior. When administration and teachers implement these models and systems with fidelity, the research reveals a positive change in student behavior can occur. The key to seeing positive changes in behavior through these systems and models is ensuring consistency within the implementation among administration, teachers, and parents. This may look like creating school-wide behavioral expectations for all students and a behavior plan for typical behaviors seen within a building while encouraging behavioral parent training to support students in and out of the educational setting.

When considering classroom interventions and management regarding disruptive student behavior, guiding teachers with proper data collection will allow teachers to make appropriate decisions regarding managing specific disruptive behaviors by creating interventions or behavior plans. The classroom management techniques found or suggested in the research should also be consistent throughout a school building to maintain positive behavior as students move through grade levels, which ultimately sets the same expectation for every student.

As schools implement professional development, guidance around disruptive student behavior should be considered by school leaders and teachers. Whether this is professional development around school-wide interventions, data collection, or classroom management techniques, teachers need support and new strategies to manage the rise of disruptive student

behavior. When professional development is implemented throughout a school year, teachers should have the opportunity to practice the skills, strategies, systems, and models. This will help with buy-in from all school staff as they can practice new systems and strategies and feel comfortable with individual implementation.

Future Studies

A few possibilities could be researched when considering future studies regarding disruptive student behavior. With the rise of disruptive student behavior, schools should take behavioral data in a longitudinal sense and analyze the changes in behavior from year to year. The study could partner with a school-wide intervention like PBIS, Responsive Classroom, or Ci3T, for example. This will allow schools to identify the behavioral needs being witnessed and how to appropriately address the behavior within the school or classroom setting, along with deciphering which school-wide intervention fits the school's needs best.

Another future study would be identifying student behavior needs and how well schools adhere to the Child Find laws and processes during a school's Tier 2 process. In education, "School districts have an affirmative duty to locate, evaluate and potentially serve any infant, toddler, or school-aged student impacted by disability under the Child Find Mandate – part of the special education law" (Walsh, 2020, para. 1). Many students may not be receiving the adequate intervention support or are continually being overlooked for behavioral needs without any solutions for the teachers on how to manage the behavior effectively. A year-long study on collecting data around a student or student behavior presented to a school's Tier 2 team could give insight into how well districts and schools understand the intervention process and will guide teachers on tracking behavioral data appropriately. This may set teachers up for success in managing disruptive student behaviors and will ultimately have more time to teach academics.

Lastly, a future study should involve intentional professional development around behavior management. Many districts have moved to provide coaching around literacy and mathematics academic areas; something similar could be done around behavior management. With the rise of disruptive behavior, teachers do not feel prepared to manage the disruptions it causes in the classroom. Behavioral coaches could be utilized for probationary teachers or teachers who struggle with classroom management. Behavioral coaches could be implemented in districts to support teachers within these areas with the goal of decreasing disruptive student behaviors.

These future studies may help decrease disruptive student behaviors by addressing teachers' ability to collect behavioral data and how to apply the findings within their classroom management strategies and interventions. Tier 2 systems are also imperative in helping teachers appropriately manage student behaviors and allowing teachers to understand the process better, ultimately enhancing classroom management. Behavioral coaches for teachers may also be a key factor in helping see a decrease in student behavior, as teachers will feel supported and solution-oriented.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this literature review examined the rise of disruptive student behavior through various research methods. The research deciphered models, systems, and strategies districts and schools may implement to decrease disruptive student behavior. The research revealed three themes: school-wide interventions, classroom interventions and management, and professional development around behavior management. The themes suggest this educational issue of disruptive student behavior will require a collaborative effort from educational leaders, teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents to address the need for support. The research also

revealed managing student behaviors is complex. Districts and schools will need strong leadership for appropriate implementation and fidelity within the three themes. Without strong leadership from administration or district leaders, teacher buy-in and fidelity to implementation will become challenging, ultimately not promoting academic success for all students.

When considering the experience of a contemporary elementary-aged student, one may not realize the exposure students have to volatile behaviors. Witnessing these behaviors is more common now than ever. However, the research provides models, systems, and strategies to allow educational leaders and teachers to lead equitably through this educational issue. The research provides optimism for educators to ensure all students receive an equitable educational experience within this educational issue while acknowledging the vital work teachers, paraprofessionals, and preservice teachers will need to do through interventions and professional development. With collaboration, support, and determination, disruptive student behavior can be effectively managed through interventions, strategies, and professional development, which creates an overall conducive learning environment for all students.

References

Anyon Y., Nicotera, N., & Veeh, C. A. (2016). Contextual Influences on the Implementation of a Schoolwide Intervention to Promote Students' Social, Emotional, and Academic Learning. *Children & Schools,* 38(2), 81-88. https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cdw008

Beinen, L., & Kennedy, C. (2023, May 30). *Confronting the student behavior crisis*. City Journal. https://www.city-journal.org/article/confronting-the-student-behavior-crisis

Bronstein, B., Breeden, N., Glover, T. A., & Reddy, L. A. (2021). Paraprofessionals' Perceptions of Behavior Problems in Elementary School Classrooms. *Journal of Special Education*, 55(3), 153–162. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466920961085

Butler, A., & Monda-Amaya, L. (2016). Preservice Teachers' Perceptions of Challenging Behavior. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 39(4), 276-292. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406416654212

Caldarella, P., Larsen, R. A. A., Williams, L., Wills, H. P., & Wehby, J. H. (2021). "Stop Doing That!": Effects of Teacher Reprimands on Student Disruptive Behavior and Engagement. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *23*(3), 163–173. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300720935101

Chen, S.-Y., Lindo, N.A., Blalock, S., Yousef, D., Smith, L., & Hurt-Avila, K. (2021). Teachers' Perceptions of Teacher-Child Relationships, Student Behavior, and Classroom Management. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 11*(1), 153–167.

Conner, N., Jones, D., & Garza, K. (2022). Classroom Management Strategies as a Cornerstone of Elementary Teachers' Self-Efficacy. *Research in Higher Education Journal, 41.*

Fefer, S. A., Donnelly, M., & Santana, Z. A. (2022). Pilot Implementation of School-Based Behavioral Parent Training: Outcomes and Acceptability. *Journal of Child & Family Studies*, 31(1), 260–275. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-021-02117-9

Harpin, S. B., Rossi, A., Kim, A. K., & Swanson, L. M. (2016). Behavioral Impacts of a Mindfulness Pilot Intervention for Elementary School Students. *Education*, *137*(2), 149–156. https://doi.org/https://www.projectinnovation.com/education.html

Jenkins, R. (2023, December 5). *Elementary School student behavior issues escalating*. The Famuan. https://www.thefamuanonline.com/2023/12/05/elementary-school-student-behavior-issues-escalating/

McDaniel, S. C., Kim, S., & Guyotte, K. W. (2017). Perceptions of Implementing Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports in High-Need School Contexts through the Voice of Local Stakeholders. *Journal of At-Risk Issues*, *20*(2), 35–44.

Menzies, H. M., Oakes, W. P., Lane, K. L., Royer, D. J., Cantwell, E. D., Common, E. A., & Buckman, M. (2021). Elementary Teachers' Perceptions of a Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention. Remedial & Special Education, 42(4), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932519896860

Morrison, J. Q., Russell, C., Dyer, S., Metcalf, T., & Rahschulte, R. L. (2014). Organizational Structures and Processes to Support and Sustain Effective Technical Assistance in a State-Wide Multi-Tiered System of Support Initiative. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, *2*(3), 129–137.

Oakes, W. P., Cantwell, E. D., Lane, K. L., Royer, D. J., & Common, E. A. (2020). Examining Educators' Views of Classroom Management and Instructional Strategies: School-Site

Capacity for Supporting Students' Behavioral Needs. *Preventing School Failure*, *64*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2018.1523125

Pinkelman, S. E., McIntosh, K., Rasplica, C. K., Berg, T., & Strickland-Cohen, M. K. (2015). Perceived Enablers and Barriers Related to Sustainability of School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. Behavioral Disorders, 40(3), 171-183. https://doi.org/https://www.ccbd.net/publications/behavioraldisorders

Ratcliff, N. J., Jones, C. R., Costner, R. H., Savage-Davis, E., & Hunt, G. H. (2010). The Elephant in the Classroom: The Impact of Misbehavior on Classroom Climate. *Education*, *131*(2), 306–314.

Whalen, C., & Moore, A. (n.d.). Preparing Educators to Address the Rising Problem of Behavior Problems. RethinkED.

Walsh, N. (2020, December 23). *Child find: Schools have a legal duty to evaluate children impacted by disability*. PAVE. https://wapave.org/child-find-schools-have-a-legal-duty-to-evaluate-children-impacted-by-disability/

Wills, H. P., Wehby, J. H., Caldarella, P., & Williams, L. (2022). Supporting elementary school classroom management: an implementation study of the CW-FIT program. *Preventing School Failure*, 66(3), 195-205. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2021.2013150

Appendix

Article Tracking Matrix

Articles	Method	School Wide Interventions	Classroom Interventions and Management	Professional Development Around Behavior Management
Anyon et al., 2016	Mixed-Methods	X		X
Bronstein et al., 2021	Mixed-Methods		X	X
Butler & Monda-Amaya, 2016	Quantitative			X
Caldarella et al., 2021	Quantitative		X	
Chen et al., 2021	Qualitative		X	
Conner et al., 2022	Quantitative			X
Fefer et al., 2021	Quasi-Experimental	X		X
Harpin et al., 2016	Qualitative		X	
McDaniel et al., 2017	Qualitative	X		
Menzies et al., 2021	Qualitative	X		
Morrison et al., 2014	Qualitative			X
Oakes et al., 2020	Quantitative			X
Pinkelman et al. 2015	Qualitative	X		
Ratcliff et al., 2010	Quantitative		X	
Wills et al., 2022	Quantitative		X	X