DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 886 SP 017 315

AUTHOR Rohrkemper, Mary M.: Brophy, Jere E.
TITLE Teachers' General Strategies for Dealing with Problem Students. Research Series No. 87.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for Research on Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 80
CONTRACT 400-76-0073
NOTE 34p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April, 1980). For related documents, see SP 017 313-314.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University, 252 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824 ($2.50)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Failure: Aggression: Attention Span: Behavior Modification: *Behavior Problems: *Classroom Techniques: *Discipline: Elementary Education: Low Achievement: Maturity (Individuals): Peer Relationship: *Problem Solving: Student Behavior: Student Characteristics: *Teacher Behavior: Teacher Effectiveness: *Teacher Response

ABSTRACT

Elementary teachers' responses to vignettes depicting twelve types of student problem behavior (instructional concerns: failure syndrome, perfectionist, underachiever, and low achiever: aggression problems: hostile aggressive, passive aggressive, and defiant: activity issues: short attention span, hyperactive, and immature: and peer relation difficulties: shy/withdrawn and rejected by peers) were analyzed for points of agreement across the twelve types of problem behavior concerning problem-solving strategies that involved rewards, punishments, supportive behaviors, and threatening/pressuring behaviors. Subanalyses were conducted to identify distinctions between teachers who differed by school location, grade level, teacher role perception (primarily instructor vs. primarily socializer), and management expertise (outstanding vs. average). In general, teachers' responses to the vignettes involved more punishment than reward, and supportive behavior more than threatening or pressuring behavior. (Authors)

Research Series No. 87

TEACHERS' GENERAL STRATEGIES FOR DEALING WITH PROBLEM STUDENTS

Mary M. Rohrkemper and Jere E. Brophy

Published By

The Institute for Research on Teaching
252 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

September 1980

This work is sponsored in part by the Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University. The Institute for Research on Teaching is funded primarily by the Program for Teaching and Instruction of the National Institute of Education, United States Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education. (Contract No. 400-76-0073)

Institute for Research on Teaching

Teachers' thoughts and decisions are the focus of studies currently under way at Michigan State University's Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT). The IRT was founded in April 1976 with a $3.6 million grant from the National Institute of Education. That grant has since been renewed, extending IRT's work through September 1981. Funding is also received from other agencies and foundations. The Institute has major projects investigating teacher decision-making, including studies of reading diagnosis and remediation, classroom management strategies, instruction in the areas of language arts, reading, and mathematics, teacher education, teacher planning, effects of external pressures on teachers' decisions, socio-cultural factors, and teachers' perceptions of student affect. Researchers from many different disciplines cooperate in IRT research. In addition, public school teachers work at IRT as half-time collaborators in research, helping to design and plan studies, collect data, and analyze results. The Institute publishes research reports, conference proceedings, occasional papers, and a free quarterly newsletter for practitioners. For more information or to be placed on the IRT mailing list please write to : The IRT Editor, 252 Erickson, MSU, East Lansing, Michigan 48824.

Co-Directors: Judith E. Lanier and Lee S. Shulman

Associate Directors: Lawrence W. Lezotte and Andrew C. Porter

Editorial Staff:

Lawrence W. Lezotte, coordinator of Communications/Dissemination
Janet Flegg, IRT editor
Pat Nischan, assistant editor

Abstract

Elementary teachers' (N=98) responses to vignettes depicting 12 types of student problem behavior (instructional concerns: failure syndrome, perfectionist, underachiever, and low achiever; aggression problems: hostile aggressive, passive aggressive, and defiant; activity issues: short attention span, hyperactive, and immature; and peer relation difficulties: shy/withdrawn and rejected by peers) were analyzed for points of agreement across the 12 types of problem behavior concerning problem-solving strategies that involved rewards, punishments, supportive behaviors, and threatening/pressuring behaviors. Subanalyses were conducted to identify distinctions between teachers who differed by school location (Lansing vs. inner-city Detroit), grade level (K-3, 4-6), teacher role perception (primarily instructor vs. primarily socializer), and management expertise (outstanding vs. average). In general, teachers' responses to the vignettes involved punishment more than reward, and supportive behavior more than threatening or pressuring behavior.

TEACHERS' GENERAL STRATEGIES FOR DEALING WITH PROBLEM STUDENTS[1]

Mary M. Rohrkemper and Jere E. Brophy[2]

Brophy and Putnam (1979), in a review of elementary school classroom management, contrasted the literature on managing groups of students during instruction with the literature on coping with students who present serious and sustained problems. They concluded that recent research had produced a rich and largely consistent knowledge base identifying effective group management techniques and linking them to teacher success in maximizing student engagement in academic activities and achievement on standardized tests (cf. Anderson, Evertson, & Brophy, 1979; Brophy & Evertson, 1976; Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Good & Grouws, 1977; and Kounin, 1970). They also reported agreement across diverse sources (educational psychology, behavior modification, and psychotherapy/mental health texts) on principles for dealing with students who present serious problems.

Various authors employed different concepts and addressed different problems, but when they did overlap in discussing dealing with problem students, they usually offered similar advice. This advice typically was not based on classroom research, however. With the exception of certain applications of behavior modification principles, there has been little research on methods of dealing with problem students, and, in particular,

---

[1]This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Boston, April, 1980. The authors wish to acknowledge and thank Jane Smith, Janis Elmore, Carolyn Rettke, Jean Medick, Lonnie McIntyre, Susan Rubenstein, Stephen Katz, and JoAnn Hite, who assisted in project planning and data collection; Sheba Dunlap, Pat Linton and Caroline Wainright, who coded the data; and June Smith, who assisted in manuscript preparation.

[2]Mary M. Rohrkemper is project manager for the Classroom Strategy Study and an IRT research intern. Jere E. Brophy is coordinator of the Classroom Strategy Study and a professor of educational psychology and teacher education.

very little research focusing on techniques that may be feasible and effective for the ordinary classroom teacher (i.e., not the school psychologist or other specialist).

These issues are addressed in the Classroom Strategy Study, an investigation of teachers' thinking about and strategies for coping with 12 types of "difficult" or "problem" students often observed at the elementary level (see Figure 1). The 12 problem behavior types shown in the figure were identified as the focus for study through the following process. First, a list of approximately 75 troublesome behaviors was developed from nominations by the project staff, which included professors and graduate students in educational psychology and related disciplines, along with several elementary school teachers. The list was first winnowed through elimination of duplications, and then sharpened and elaborated using concepts and terminology borrowed from previous studies of chronic childhood problem behavior syndromes as seen by clinicians or classroom teachers (Lambert & Nicoll, 1977; Miller, 1972, Peterson, 1961; Stott, Marston, & Neill, 1975; and Werry & Quay, 1971).

The result was a list of about 20 syndromes or patterns of problem behavior, later reduced to the 12 shown in Figure 1 by eliminating several that seemed less severe or widespread than the others. The 12 patterns are defined so as to be mutually exclusive, although several could coexist in the same student (for example, short attention span/distractibility and motoric hyperactivity involve different behaviors but are often seen in the same individuals, and either or both of these could be combined with underachievement, hostile aggressive behavior, or other patterns, as well). Even where multiple patterns exist in the same individual, however, the patterns are different enough to be

1. Failure Syndrome. These children are convinced that they cannot do the the work. They often avoid starting or give up easily. They expect to fail, even after succeeding. Signs: easily frustrated; gives up easily, says "I can't do it."

2. Perfectionist. These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so that they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of a "perfectinnist"; often anxious/fearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

3. Underachiever. These children do a minumum to just "get by." They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to school work; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

4. Low Achiever. These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

5. Hostile Aggressive. These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled. Signs: intimidates and threatens; hits and pushes; damages property; antagonizes; hostile; easily angered.

6. Passive Aggressive. These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs: subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

7. Defiant. These children resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do. Signs: (1) resists verbally (e.g., (a) "You can't make me..."; (b) "You can't tell me what to do..."; (c) makes derogatory statements about teacher to others); (2) resists non-verbally (e.g., (a) frowns, grimaces, mimics teacher; (b) arms folded, hands on hips, foot stomping; (c) looks away when being spoken to; (d) laughs at inappropriate times; (e) may be physically violent toward teacher; (f) deliberately does what teacher says not to do).

8. Hyperactive. These children show excessive and almost constant movement, even when sitting. Often their movements appear to be without purpose. Signs: squirms, wiggles, jiggles, scratches; easily excitable; blurts out answers and comments; often out of seat; bothers other children with noises, movements; energetic but poorly directed; excessively touches objects or people.

9. Short Attention Span/Distractible. These children have short attention spans. They seem unable to sustain attention and concentration. Easily distracted by sounds, sights, or speech. Signs: has difficulty adjusting to changes; rarely completes tasks; easily distracted.

10. Immature. These children are immature. They have poorly developed emotional stability, self control, self-care abilities, social skills, and/or responsibility. Signs: often exhibits behavior normal for younger children; may cry easily; loses belongings; frequently appears helpless, incompetent, and/or dependent.

11. Rejected by Peers. These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

12. Shy/Withdrawn. These children avoid personal interactions, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs; quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.

Figure 1. The 12 types of problem behavior addressed by the Classroom Strategy Study.

described separately without difficulty, and it seemed likely that teachers would use different strategies to try to cope with them. Consequently, procedures were designed to deal with each problem separately. It should be noted, however, that teachers deal with real students, not abstract behavioral syndromes. They may worry more about peer rejection of compliant students, for example, than about peer rejection of students whose behavior is marked by defiance and hostile aggression. These and other possible interaction effects among behavior patterns that coexist in the same individuals were not addressed in this study.

The Classroom Strategy Study is not an experiment but a large and systematic gathering of self-report data from experienced elementary teachers selected to provide variation in grade level and types of students taught and in skill dealing with problem students (Rohrkemper & Brophy, Note 1).

Method

Teachers

Interviews were obtained from 98 elementary school teachers distributed about evenly across grades K - 6. Of these, 54 taught in Lansing and 44 in inner-city Detroit. No more than four teachers in any given school were included. All teachers had at least three years of experience and had been nominated by their principals as either outstanding or average in ability to deal with difficult students. These 98 teachers represented about 75% of those originally nominated; the others declined to participate. Teachers were paid for the time they spent responding to our interviews.

Data Collection

Each teacher was observed and interviewed by a project staff member, who did not know how the principal had rated the teacher. Teachers were observed for two half-days, during which the interviewers gathered general

impressions of the teacher's style and level of success in managing the classroom and dealing with problem students, the nature of the students in the class, the general classroom atmosphere, and the availability and use of other adults in the classroom. Following this, teachers were interviewed individually for an average of over four hours (range = 2 to 10 hours), spread over two or more sessions.

Interviews began with the vignettes, which were presented one at a time in the order given in Figure 2. Following the vignettes, teachers were asked to discuss their general strategies for dealing with each of the 12 problem-student types described in Figure 1. They also were asked to rate their abilities to cope with each of these student types, to state the frequency with which they had encountered each type in the past three years, and to answer several questions about the schools in which they taught. The present report focuses on analyses of teachers' responses to the vignettes. Readers interested in more details about the larger study as a whole should consult Rohrkemper and Brophy (Note 1).

There were two vignettes for each of the 12 problem behavior types shown in Figure 1. During development, the vignettes were revised several times to insure that they depicted incidents that would be familiar to elementary school teachers and perceived as typical of the kinds of problems presented by each of the 12 types of problem students under study. To make it easy for each teacher to visualize the events depicted in the vignette as occurring in his or her own classroom, we eliminated specific references to facilities, equipment, or individuals (school psychologists, social workers) that might be familiar to some teachers but not others.

In order to avoid confounding the behavior depicted in the vignettes with various status characteristics of students, we avoided mention of

age, race, ethnicity, or social class, and eliminated clues (direct quotes or other language data, pictures or drawings, and so on) that might suggest these characteristics. Students were identified by sex through names, because we felt that this was necessary for realism. Only male names were assigned to behavior patterns identified primarily with males (hyperactivity, hostile-aggressive behavior), but both male and female names were assigned to behavior patterns that are less sex typed (failure syndrome, passive aggressive). The incident depicted in each vignette is presented as only the latest in a series of similar incidents involving the same student. Thus, the incident is placed in a context of chronic problem behavior as defined by the patterns given in Figure 1. The vignettes are given in Figure 2.

Teachers were asked to read each vignette and respond as if the situation had occurred in their classroom. Specifically, they were asked to state what they would say and do, to tell why they would say and do this, and to describe the student in the vignette in their own words. These data simulate teachers' responses to actual classroom incidents in which there are real consequences for themselves, for the student engaging in the problem behavior, and for the student's classmates, who witness the event and experience its effects vicariously.

Coding

Interviews were tape recorded and transcribed, and then coded with a variety of instruments which included categories drawn from both empirical content analysis and theoretical sources. In this analysis, the focus was on the amounts and types of reward, punishment, support, and threatening or pressuring behavior which teachers report using for dealing with difficult students. (A copy of the Rewards and Punishment Coding System is available from the authors on request.)

1. Joe could be a capable student, but his self concept is so poor that he actually describes himself as stupid. He makes no serious effort to learn, shrugging off responsibility by saying that "that stuff" is too hard for him. Right now he is dawdling instead of getting started on an assignment that you know he can do. You know that if you approach him he will begin to complain that the assignment is too hard and that he can't do it.

2. This morning, several students excitedly tell you that on the way to school they saw Tom beating up Sam and taking his lunch money. Tom is the class bully and has done things like this many times.

3. Bill is an extremely active child. He seems to burst with energy, and today he is barely "keeping the lid on." This morning, the class is working on their art projects and Bill has been in and out of his seat frequently. Suddenly, Roger lets out a yell and you look up to see that Bill has knocked Roger's sculpture off his desk. Bill says he didn't mean to do it, he was just returning to his seat.

4. Mark is not well accepted by his classmates. Today he has been trying to get some of the other boys to play a particular game with him. After much pleading the boys decide to play the game, but exclude Mark. Mark argues, saying that he should get to play because it was his idea in the first place, but the boys start without him. Finally, Mark gives up and slinks off, rejected again.

5. Beth has average ability for school work, but she is so anxious about the quality of her work, that she seldom finishes an assignment because of all her "start-overs." This morning you have asked the children to make pictures to decorate the room. The time allocated to art has almost run out and Beth is far from finished with her picture. You ask her about it and find out she has "made mistakes" on the other ones and this is her third attempt at a "good picture."

6. The class is about to begin a test. The room is quiet. Just as you are about to begin speaking, Audrey opens her desk. Her notebook slides off the desk, spilling loose papers on the floor. Audrey begins gathering up the papers, slowly and deliberately. All eyes are upon her. Audrey stops, grins, and then slowly resumes gathering papers. Someone laughs. Others start talking.

7. George's attention wanders easily. Today it has been divided between the discussion and various distractions. You ask him a question, but he is distracted and doesn't hear you.

8. Linda is bright enough, but she is shy and withdrawn. She doesn't volunteer to participate in class, and when you call on her directly, she often does not respond. When she does, she usually whispers. Today, you are checking seatwork progress. When you question her, Linda keeps her eyes lowered and says nothing.

9. Carl can do good work, but he seldom does. He will try to get out of work. When you speak to him about this, he makes a show of looking serious and pledging reform, but his behavior doesn't change. Just now, you see a typical scene: Carl is making paper airplanes when he is supposed to be working.

10. Roger has been fooling around instead of working on his seatwork for several days now. Finally, you tell him that he has to finish or stay in during recess and work on it then. He says, "I won't stay in!" and spends the rest of the period sulking. As the class begins to line up for recess, he quickly jumps up and heads for the door. You tell him that he has to stay inside and finish his assignment, but he just says "No, I don't!" and continues out the door to recess.

11. Betty seems younger than the other students in your class. She has difficulty getting along with them and is quick to tattle. She has just told you that she heard some of the boys use "bad words" during recess today.

12. Jeff tries hard but is the lowest achiever in the class. This week you taught an important sequence of lessons. You spent a lot of extra time with Jeff and thought he understood the material. Today you are reviewing. All the other students answer your questions with ease, but when you call on Jeff he is obviously lost.

11 (Continued on next page)

Figure 2. The 24 vignettes used in the Classroom Strategy Study.

(Figure 2 continued)

13. Mary has the intelligence to succeed, if she applied herself, but she is convinced that she can't handle it. She gets frustrated and disgusted very easily, and then she gives up. Instead of trying to solve the problem another way, or coming to you for help, she skips the problem and moves on. Today she brings you her assignment, claiming to be finished, but you see that she has skipped many items.

14. Class is disrupted by a scuffle. You look up to see that Ron has left his seat and gone to Phil's desk, where he is punching and shouting at Phil. Phil is not so much fighting back as trying to protect himself. You don't know how this started, but you do know that Phil gets along well with the other students but Ron often starts fights and argues without provocation.

15. Paul can't seem to keep his hands off of the things and people in the room. He also seems to want to inspect or play with whatever is at hand. When he is not physically manipulating someone or something else, he hums, whistles, grimaces, drums his fingers, taps his feet, or makes other noises through physical activity. Just now he has discovered that one of the screws holding the back of his chair to its frame is loose, and he is pushing and pulling at the loose piece. In the process, he is further loosening the connection and at the same time distracting the class with the noise he is making.

16. Kathy is a loner in the classroom and an onlooker on the playground. No one willingly sits with her or plays with her. You divided the class into groups to work on projects, and those in Kathy's group are making unkind remarks about her, loud enough for all to hear.

17. Chris is a capable student who is exceptionally anxious about making mistakes. He doesn't contribute to class discussions or recitation unless he is absolutely sure he is right. You recognize his anxiety and try to call on him only when you are reasonably sure he can handle it. When you do this today, he blanches and stumbles through an incorrect answer. He is clearly upset.

18. The class has just been given instructions to line up quickly. The students comply, with the exception of Jack, who is always the last to follow directions. Jack remains at his desk, working on a drawing. He looks up, in the direction of the line, then resumes work on his drawing.

19. Sarah never seems to finish an assignment. She is easily distracted, and then isn't able to recapture what she had been thinking about before the interruption. You distribute a work sheet to the class, and the students, including Sarah, begin their work. After a couple of minutes you see that Sarah is looking out the window, distracted again.

20. John often seems to be off in his own world, but today he is watching you as you lead a discussion. Pleased to see him attentive, you ask him what he thinks. However, you have to repeat his name and he looks startled when he realizes that you have called on him. Meanwhile, you realize that he has been immersed in daydreams and only appeared to be paying attention.

21. Nancy is oriented toward peers and social relationships, not school work. She could be doing top grade work, but instead she does just enough to get by. She is often chatting or writing notes when she is supposed to be paying attention or working. During today's lesson, she has repeatedly turned to students on each side of her to make remarks, and now she has a conversation going with several friends.

22. Squirt guns are not permitted in school. Scott has been squirting other students with his squirt gun. You tell him to bring the squirt gun to you. He refuses, saying that it is his and you have no right to it. You insist, but he remains defiant and starts to become upset. Judging from his past and present behavior, he is not going to surrender the squirt gun voluntarily.

23. Greg often loses his belongings, becomes upset, whines, and badgers you to help him. Now he has misplaced his hat, and he is pestering you again. Other students smirk and make remarks about this, and Greg becomes upset.

24. Tim is a poor student. He has a low potential for school work and also lacks the basic experiences that help a child function in the classroom. You have just presented a new lesson to the class and have assigned related seatwork. You look over the class and see that Tim is upset. When you ask him if something is wrong, he tells you that he can't do it -- it's too hard.

Briefly, the reward category included anything offered to the student which was intended to be either an incentive or a reinforcement. Included in this category were several types of reward: symbolic, material, special privileges, and teacher reward (i.e., special attention, hugs, and so on, but not praise) along with one method of reward delivery (specifically, the use of contracts).

A punishment was defined as anything threatened as a sanction against undesirable conduct. Any punishment threatened or actually invoked was coded. Included were loss of privileges, punitive isolation, extra time (i.e. stay after school), extra requirements, demands for restitution, involvement of another adult to punish, and physical punishment.

Supportive behavior, including praise and encouragement, consisted of anything the teacher does in the belief that it will help the student feel better. Types of teacher encouragement included specific behavioral praise; global personal praise; encouragement; comfort; defense of the student; kid-gloves treatment; supportive isolation; peer, parental, or other adult involvement in supportive roles; instruction; and modeling of support for the student.

The final category, threatening or pressuring behavior, was defined as anything the teacher says or does to pressure the student (short of punishment). Strategies coded here involved elements of rejection or attack on the student's sense of well being; specific behavioral criticism; global personal criticism; sarcasm/ridicule; "diagnosing" (that is, the teacher tells the student that his/her behavior stems from evil intentions or immature motives); third degree; and peer, parent, or other adult involvement (to provide pressure, rather than encouragement or support).

Teachers' responses to each of the 24 vignettes were coded for 40 subcategories within these four major categories of reward, punishment,

supportive behavior, and threatening/pressuring behavior. Each vignette was coded independently by two coders who were unaware of the identities or status characteristics of the teachers. Coding reliability was computed as percent exact agreement. (Percent exact agreement equals number of codes made and agreed upon by both coders divided by itself, plus number of disagreements, plus number of codes made by one coder but not the other.) This figure was 72% for the Rewards and Punishments system. Disagreements were resolved by discussion between the two coders, with arbitration involving a third coder when necessary.

Each of these 40 subcategories was scored as present or absent in each teacher's response to each vignette. In addition, four sum scores and six combination scores were computed from the subcategory data. Scores reflecting the frequency of use of these 50 variables across the 24 vignettes were computed for each teacher and correlated with 11 classifying variables. The 11 classifying variables are as follows:

1. Grade level (K - 3 vs. 4 - 6).
2. Teacher sex.
3. Location (Lansing vs. inner-city Detroit).
4. Role Perception (teacher's preferred emphasis is on instruction vs. socialization).
5. Principal's Classification (nomination of teacher as either average or outstanding at dealing with problem students).
6. Observer's Classification (5-point rating of teacher's ability to deal with problem students).
7. Ability Type Score (1 = classified average by principal and rated low by observer; 2 = classified high by principal but rated low by observer; 3 = rated average by observer; 4 = classified as average by principal but rated high by observer; 5 = classified as high by principal and rated high by observer).
8. Instruction and Management Factor (factor score developed from several ratings of teachers' instructional and classroom management skills).

9. Warmth Factor (factor score developed from several ratings of teacher's warmth and likeability).

10. Noise and Activity Tolerance Factor (factor score derived from observer's ratings of individualization of instruction and tolerance for noise and activity).

11. Teacher Self-Ratings Factor (factor score derived from teacher's self-ratings of ability to deal with problem students).

Only correlations significant at or below the .05 level will be reported. For 50 variables, 2.5 significant correlations would be expected at the .05 level by chance alone. The numbers of significant correlations observed for each of the classifying variables were above chance for all but the factor score based on teachers' self-ratings.

Findings will be reported concerning differences within teachers by grade level, location, ability ratings, and role perception.

Results

In general, teachers' responses to the 24 vignettes involved punishment more than reward, and supportive behavior more than threatening or pressuring behavior (Tables 1 and 2). The most frequent teacher behavior was supportive behavior ($\bar{X}$=31.46), followed by punishments ($\bar{X}$=11.99), threatening or pressuring behavior ($\bar{X}$=5.99), and finally rewards ($\bar{X}$=2.75).

Examination of the significant correlations for each source of teacher ability classifications--from the principal, our staff observers, and the teacher self-ratings--indicates that the observers' classifications of the teachers by their ability to deal with problem students are more clearly related to teachers' use of rewards, punishments, supportive behaviors and threatening/pressuring behaviors than are the principals' or teachers' ratings. While observer classifications yielded 11 significant correlations, principal classifications only yielded four, and teacher self-ratings only two, not above chance expectation.

Table 1.

Teachers' Use of Reward, Punishment, Supportive Behavior, and Threatening/Pressuring Behavior Categories in Responding to the 24 Vignettes

		Mean Number of vignettes to which the category was applied	Percentage of teachers using the category at least once
A.	**Rewards**		
A0	No rewards	21.74	100
A1	Symbolic Reward	0.74	31
A2	Material Reward	0.35	17
A3	Special Privilege	0.95	45
A4	Teacher Reward	0.20	16
A5	Other	0.17	8
A6	Contracts	0.34	17
B.	**Punishments**		
B0	No punishment	16.10	100
B1	Loss of Privilege	2.12	74
B2	Punitive Isolation	1.98	67
B3	Extra Time	1.00	41
B4	Extra Requirements	0.41	19
B5	Restitution	1.01	66
B6	Physical Punishment	0.48	20
B7	Other Adult	3.37	86
B8	Other	1.62	61
C.	**Supportive Behaviors**		
C0	No Supportive Behavior	6.56	94
C1	Specific Behavioral Praise	1.42	61
C2	Global Personal Praise	0.39	20
C3	Encouragement	2.34	84
C4	Comfort/Reassurance	0.72	40
C5	Defending the Student	0.82	40
C6	Kid Gloves Treatment	4.05	89
C7	Supportive Isolation	0.90	42
C8	Involves Peers	4.31	98
C9	Involves Parents	1.70	57
C10	Involves other Adults	1.77	54
C11	Instruction	8.70	99
C12	Modeling Acceptance	0.70	41
C13	Other	3.64	90
D.	**Threatening/Pressuring Behaviors**		
D0	No Threatening/Pressuring Behaviors	19.19	100
D1	Specific Behavioral Criticism	2.25	63
D2	Global Personal Criticism	1.06	35
D3	Sarcasm/Ridicule	0.55	23
D4	"Diagnosing"	0.15	9
D5	Third Degree	0.28	14
D6	Involves Peers	0.14	8
D7	Involves Parents	0.32	16
D8	Involves Other Adults	0.17	9
D9	Other	1.07	38

Table 2.

Means and Standard Deviations for the Summary and Combination Scores

Score			Mean	SD
Sum	A	Total Rewards	2.75	3.34
Sum	B	Total Punishments	11.99	5.32
Sum	C	Total Supportive Behavior	31.46	9.51
Sum	D	Total Threatening/Pressuring Behavior	5.99	6.73
Comb.	E	Rewards/ Rewards + Punishments	0.17	0.18
Comb.	F	Support/Support + Threat or Pressure	0.85	0.15
Comb.	G	Rewards + Punishments/Rewards + Punishments + Support + Threat or Pressure	0.28	0.09
Comb.	H	Specific Praise/Specific + Global Praise	0.55	0.47
Comb.	I	Praise/Total Supportive Behavior	0.06	0.05
Comb.	J	Specific/Specific + Global Criticism	0.51	0.44

Of interest in the principal and teacher self-rating data, however, are the correlations regarding use of another adult. Principals apparently used teacher self-reliance (B7) in punishing students as a criterion in ability classification. Similarly, teachers who viewed themselves as high in ability were less likely to involve others to either support (C10) or threaten or pressure (D8) students. Taken together, these correlations indicate that principals' ability classifications were influenced by how seldom the teachers called upon the administration for help in handling difficult students, and less so by what the teachers actually did in their classrooms with these students.

Combining the principal and observer classifications yielded five levels of ability type, ranging from agreed high ability through agreed average ability. These ability type scores yielded 13 significant correlations (Table 3). Teachers with greater ability to handle difficult students used more total rewards (Sum A), including more symbolic rewards (A1) and contracts (A6); more total supportive behavior (Sum C), including more comforting and reassuring of students (C4), and more unique supportive methods (C13). In addition, high-ability teachers used punishment less (B0) than the other teachers. Punishments that the less effective teachers were more likely to use were loss of privileges (B1) and involvement of other adults to punish (B7). Recall that the use of other adults was also a factor in the principals' classifications and teachers' self-ratings. Not only did less effective teachers invoke punishments more, they also failed to provide support and encouragement (C0) as often as teachers rated higher. When they did engage in supportive behavior, however, they used proportionately more praise than did the outstanding teachers (Comb. I).

These data indicate that teachers whom the principals and observers

Table 3.

Teachers' Use of Reward, Punishment, Supportive Behavior, and Threatening/Pressuring Behavior Categories by Classifying Variables*

Category	Grade Level	Teachet Sex	Principal's Classification	Obgerver's Classifi-cation	Teacher Role Perception	School Location	Ability Type Score	Instructional Management	Warmth Factor	Noise and Activity Tolerance	Self-Ratings Factot
A. Rewards											
A0 No Rewards											
A1 Symholic Rewatd				.28			.17	.26			
A2 Material Reward											
A3 Special Privilege						.20			.16		
A4 Teacher Reward	-.20	.19			.26	-.17					
A5 Other											
A6 Contracts				.29			.23	.24	.25		
B. Punishments											
B0 No Punishment				.32	-.26	-.26	.32	.23	.28	.24	
B1 Loss of Privilege							-.18		-.32	-.23	
B2 Punitive Isolation											
B3 Extra Time					-.18	-.36					
B4 Extra Requirements						-.17			-.23		
B5 Restitution					-.18				-.22	-.17	

(Table continued on next page)

(Table 3 continued)

Category	Grade Level	Teacher Sex	Principal's Classification	Observer's Classification	Teacher Role Perception	School Location	Ability Type Score	Instructional Management	Warmth Factor	Noise and Activity Tolerance	Self-Ratings Factor
B6 Physical Punishment											
B7 Other Adult			-.19		-.18	.40	-.17		-.16	-.18	
B8 Other											
C Supportive Behaviors											
C0 No supportive behavior				-.17	-.21		-.20				
C1 Specific Behavioral Praise											
C2 Global Personal Praise	-.20		.17								
C3 Encouragement	-.18										
C4 Comfort/Reassurance				.21			.25	.20	.21		
C5 Defending the student						-.41				.17	
C6 Kid Gloves Treatment					.19	-.35				.38	
C7 Supportive Isolation											
C8 Involves Peers											
C9 Involves Parents				.22		.31					
C10 Involves Other Adults		.19				.36		-.21		-.21	-.19
C11 Instruction	-.17		.19								

(Table continued on next page)

(Table 3 continued)

Category	Grade Level	Teacher Sex	Principal's Classification	Observer's Classification	Teacher Role Perception	School Location	Ability Type Score	Instructional Management	Warmth Factor	Noise and Activity Tolerance	Self-Ratings Factor
C12 Modeling Acceptance	-.19										
C13 Other				.30			.33		.20		
D. Threatening/Pressuring Behaviors											
D0 No Threatening/Pressuring Behaviors											
D1 Specific Behavioral Criticism											
D2 Global Personal Criticism					-.19						
D3 Sarcasm/Ridicule											
D4 "Diagnosing"					.29					-.16	
D5 Third Degree			.22								
D6 Involves Peers	-.26				.20			-.17		-.18	
D7 Involves parents				.18					.18		
D8 Involves Other Adults											-.22
D9 Other	.22	-.32									

(Table continued on next page)

(Table 3 continued)

Category	Grade Level	Teacher Sex	Principal's Classification	Observer's Classification	Teacher Role Perception	School Location	Ability Type Score	Instructional Management	Warmth Factor	Noise and Activity Tolerance	Self-Ratings Factor
Sum Scores											
Sum A Total Rewards	-.19			.27			.18	.24	.21		
Sum B Total Punishments							-.22		-.32	-.25	
Sum C Total Supportive Behavior	-.24			.17	.21		.20				
Sum D Total Threatening Behavior											
Combination Scores											
Comb. E. Rewards/Rewards + Punishments				.26					.23		
Comb. F. Support/Support + Threat or Pressure	-.19	.19									
Comb. G. Rewards + Punishments/Rewards + Punishments + Support + Threat or Pressure					-.20		-.24		-.19	-.22	
Comb. H Specific Praise/ Specific + Global Praise											

(Table continued on next page)

(Table 3 continued)

Category	Grade Level	Teacher Sex	Principal's Classification	Observer's Classification	Teacher Role Perception	School Location	Ability Type Score	Instructional Management	Warmth Factor	Noise and Activity Tolerance	Self-Ratings Factor
Comb. I Praise/ Total Supportive Behavior							-.17				
Comb. J Specific/Specific + Global Criticism											
Number of Significant Correlations	10	4	4	11	11	10	13	7	14	11	2

* All reported correlations are significant at the .05 level or below.

judged as outstanding in their ability to deal with problem students were proactive in their dealings with these students. They punished less, were more supportive and reassuring, used more symbolic rewards, and were more likely to use contracts, thus involving the student in his/her own behavior change.

In contrast, less effective teachers were more punitive and less supportive of students. They seemed to be more distanced from the students, more action oriented and less verbal. While high ability teachers appeared more subtle in their interactions with students, less effective teachers appeared more reactive.

Correlations involving the factor scores (instructional management; warmth; noise and activity tolerance) from the observers' ratings based on classroom observations are shown in Table 3. These correlations generally confirm and elaborate what has already been said about teachers who differ in ability classification.

Examination of the data by school location, Lansing versus inner-city Detroit, yielded 10 significant correlations. Differences within the reward category indicate that Detroit teachers used more special privileges (A3), while Lansing teachers used more teacher rewards (A4). Within the punishment category, Detroit teachers were more referral oriented in their discipline (B7). Lansing teachers punished less (B0), but when they did punish, they were more likely to administer the punishment themselves. They demanded extra time (after school) (B3) and imposed extra requirements (B4) on misbehaving students more than the Detroit teachers.

Differences in teacher supportive behavior parallel the differences in the use of punishment. Detroit teachers were more likely to look to the parent(s) (C9) or to other adults (C10) to provide support for the

student. In contrast, Lansing teachers were more likely to defend the student (C5) and treat the student with "kid gloves" (C6), thus providing support personally.

The pattern which emerges from these differences indicates that Lansing teachers take a more personal role with their students, and tend to handle personally the situations which arise within their classrooms. In contrast, Detroit teachers appear more distanced from their students and tend to rely on external agents for both control and support of their students.

Analysis of the data by grade level yielded 10 significant correlations. Teachers in grades K - 3, as compared to teachers in grades 4 - 6, used more rewards overall (Sum A), and within that, more teacher rewards (A4). The lower grade teachers also used more supportive behavior overall (Sum C); proportionately more supportive relative to threatening behavior (Comb. F); more global, personal praise of students (C2); student encouragement (C3); individual instruction and special help (C11); and acceptance of isolated children (C12). Lower grade level teachers also invoked peer pressure to change student behavior (D6), a category never used by the upper grade teachers. Upper level teachers did use more threatening/pressuring behaviors that were not codable with the present system (D9).

While the level of punishment and threatening/pressuring behavior appears constant across the grades, the amounts of rewards and supportive behaviors used by teachers decreased significantly. Overall, these data support the notion of a transformation of the warm and nurturant classroom in the early grades into the less personalized and more businesslike classroom of the upper grades. This evolution of the teacher role from one of nurturance in the early grades to one of impersonal authority figure in the upper grades seems an important consideration for those entering the teaching profession.

Examination of the data by teacher role perception yielded 11 significant correlations. The pattern of these correlations lends support to the desirability of matching role preference with grade level. Like lower grade level teachers, teachers who described themselves as emphasizing socialization over instruction used more total supportive behavior (Sum C), teacher reward (A4), and "kid-glove" treatment (C6), and more often involved peers to pressure students to change (D6). Teachers with a socialization emphasis also diagnosed the students' behavior more (D4). Thus, teachers who emphasized socialization labeled the student's underlying motives or needs, apparently with the belief that such labeling would provide the student with insight into his/her own behavior. It is noteworthy that this technique was never used by teachers who placed a heavy emphasis on instruction.

In contrast to the teachers who emphasized socialization, those teachers who viewed their role as primarily instructional were not as nurturant and did not use supportive behavior as often as socializers (CO). Instructors also used different types of punishments. These included extra time requirements (B3), demands for restitution (B5), and involvement of other adults to punish (B7). Teachers who emphasized instruction were also more likely to criticize students in global, personal ways (D2). Finally, instructors' attempts to influence students consisted of proportionately more rewards and punishments (Comb. G) relative to support or threatening or pressuring behaviors.

Thus, teachers with a socialization emphasis appeared to be more verbal, personal, supportive, and psychologically interested in their students, while teachers who emphasized instruction appeared more like impersonal authority figures who were concerned with the control and direction of student behavior, but less interested in underlying student

needs or motives. As mentioned previously, these distinctions due to differences in role emphasis parallel the previously discussed grade-level differences and appear to be a matter of style and preference.

These separate profiles of teachers who differ by ability classifications, school location, grade level, and role perception provide few surprises. Rather, they tend to support ideas and beliefs present in the literature regarding the routinizing and depersonalization of large school systems; the evolution of the teacher role from the lower to the upper grades, and the feasibility of matching role preference with grade level taught.

The differences in reported problem-solving strategies between teachers classified as outstanding at dealing with problem students and teachers classified as merely average in this regard were in the directions expected. However, teachers' reported problem-solving strategies also were related to location: there were systematic differences between teachers in Lansing and teachers in inner-city Detroit. Possible reasons for and implications of these differences will be addressed in our continuing analyses of data from the Classroom Strategy Study (see also Brophy & Rohrkemper, Note 2, Note 3).

Pending completion of these analyses, the present data should not be taken to imply that the Lansing teachers were in any general sense "better" than the inner-city Detroit teachers at dealing with problem students. It often happens that common practice which is contrary to theory or even (apparent) common sense turns out to be appropriate or effective upon closer analysis, and this may be true here. That is, the methods favored by the inner-city Detroit teachers may be adaptive, at least with respect to what reasonably can be accomplished given the constraints within which they work.

Reference Notes

1. Rohrkemper, M., & Brophy, J. Classroom Strategy Study: Investigating teachers' strategies with problem students (Research Series No. 50). East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1979.

2. Brophy, J., Rohrkemper, M. Teachers' specific strategies for dealing with hostile, aggressive students (Research Series No. 86). East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1980.

3. Brophy, J. & Rohrkemper, M. The influence of problem ownership on teachers' perceptions of and strategies for coping with problem students (Research Series No. 84). East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1980.

References

Anderson, L. J., Evertson, C. M., & Brophy, J. E. An experimental study of effective teaching in first-grade reading groups. Elementary School Journal, 1979, 79, 193-223.

Brophy, J. E., & Evertson, C. M. Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976.

Brophy, J. E., & Putnam, J. G. Classroom management in the elementary grades. In Duke, D. L. (Ed.), Classroom management: The 78th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979. (Also available as IRT Research Series No. 32. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1978.)

Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C. M., & Anderson, L. M. Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. Elementary School Journal, 1980, 80, 219-231.

Good, T. L., & Grouws, D. Teaching effects: A process-product study in fourth-grade mathematics classrooms. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 49-54.

Kounin, J. S. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.

Lambert, N. M., & Nicoll, R. C. Conceptual model for nonintellectual behavior and its relationship to early reading achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1977, 69, 481-490.

Miller, L. C. School behavior check list: An inventory of deviant behavior for elementary school children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 38, 134-144.

Peterson, D. R. Behavior problems of middle childhood. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1961, 25, 205-209.

Stott, D. H., Marston, N. C., & Neill, S. J. Taxonomy of behaviour disturbance. London: University of London Press, 1975.

Werry, J., & Quay, H. The prevalence of behavior symptoms in younger elementary school children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1971, 41, 136-143.