

Syracuse University

## SURFACE at Syracuse University

---

Dissertations - ALL

SURFACE at Syracuse University

---

10-10-2022

### Teacher candidate and standardized student interactions following verbal threats of harm: Navigation of authority, displays of care, and solutions

Eryka Dever Murphey

Follow this and additional works at: <https://surface.syr.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Murphey, Eryka Dever, "Teacher candidate and standardized student interactions following verbal threats of harm: Navigation of authority, displays of care, and solutions" (2022). *Dissertations - ALL*. 1600.  
<https://surface.syr.edu/etd/1600>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the SURFACE at Syracuse University at SURFACE at Syracuse University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations - ALL by an authorized administrator of SURFACE at Syracuse University. For more information, please contact [surface@syr.edu](mailto:surface@syr.edu).

## Abstract

This exploratory qualitative study examines teacher candidate and student interactions in response to verbal threats of harm. This study uses existing data: a single set of 16 clinical simulations and four post-simulation debriefing sessions. Participants include eight female and eight male teacher candidates ( $n = 16$ ) who interact with one of six presumed male standardized students. This study explores teacher candidates' dispositions of authority and care and their solutions to threatening behavior in verbal interactions with the upset adolescent student, Casey Butler.

In this study, teacher candidates rely on coercive, legitimate, and personal authority more than competent authority and authority by inducement. In addition to Wrong's (2017) five types of authority, teacher candidates relinquish, share, and minimize their authority in interactions. They demonstrate elements of care by asking caring questions. Most teacher candidates vocalize compassion, offer time, sympathize, and practice receptive listening. Fewer teacher candidates praise and empathize with Casey. Participants rely on mild disciplinary solutions (e.g., referring to the counselor, reprimanding, conferencing) more than punitive or restorative approaches. Most teacher candidates propose the uncategorized solutions of giving responsibility to Casey, advising against violence, and discussing the possibility of Casey talking to someone else. Male and female participants responded similarly regarding authority, care, and solutions.

It is important to explore the ways teacher candidates interact with and respond to students who threaten because student threats are common and can result in violence. This study is relevant because teacher candidates have varied reactions, suggesting that candidates do not begin teaching knowing what to do when they observe threatening behavior. Recommendations are made for increased preservice and in-service learning.

**Teacher candidate and standardized student interactions following  
verbal threats of harm: Navigation of authority, displays of care, and solutions**

by

Eryka Dever Murphey

B.F.A. Colorado State University, 2001  
M.A.Ed. The University of New Mexico, 2007

Dissertation

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy in Teaching and Curriculum.

Syracuse University  
December 2022

Copyright © 2022 by Eryka Dever Murphey  
All Rights Reserved

## Acknowledgments

Thank you to Syracuse University for the opportunity to earn this degree. I am grateful for the support of many at Syracuse University. Thank you for the opportunities provided by the institution that helped make this possible—apprenticeships, benefits, tuition reimbursement, Maymester course options, and distance learning after coursework. Many people along the way—professors, staff, teaching assistants, and fellow students—have advanced and enriched my education. I acknowledge the individuals whose extra efforts helped me fulfill requirements and produce this work.

- To Dr. Ben Dotger, Working together through a pandemic with you as the department chair was not what we expected. I appreciate your efforts and commitment during these especially trying and stressful times. You graciously provided the data for this study and made time for countless meetings. You advised me in uncertain times to improve the direction, writing, organization, and clarity of this work. Thank you for supporting me through this process. This dissertation would not be what it is without you.
- To Drs. Mara Sapon-Shevin and George Theoharis, Thank you both for agreeing to serve on my committee and for caring about this work. I am incredibly grateful for the time you devoted during a pandemic and the thoughtful critiques you provided. All your efforts served to broaden and strengthen this work. Thank you!
- To the SOE administrative staff, Thank you for supporting this effort by keeping me on track, answering countless emails, and ensuring forms were accounted for and correct.
- To Tom, I began this journey when our first child was 19 months old, and our second child was three weeks old. I am forever grateful to you. Achieving his dream was not possible without your support. I am deeply grateful for your willingness to live in Syracuse, your work ethic to support our family, and your positive attitude in times of uncertainty. I always appreciated your counseling and mentorship when I felt lost and the thousand little things you did as a husband and father to help make this possible. Thank you for always encouraging me to follow my dreams. I love you.
- To my children, Thank you for constantly reminding me to be joyful, fully in each moment, and to prioritize what matters most. I love you.
- To Mom, I am forever grateful and feel incredibly lucky to have you as a mom. As a parent of a child with dyslexia, you supported my education—you advocated, researched, tutored, read to me, took me to experts, and found schools where I learned best. Thank you for teaching perseverance, grit, and unconditional love by example.
- To Christine, Meredith, and Theresa, Thank you, friends. Your support provided much-needed humor, comradery, and accountability on this journey. Thanks for sharing it with me. I am grateful for your friendship and wish you all the best in life.

- To my teachers, the commitment and care by countless teachers and mentors throughout my schooling helped make this a reality. Thank you for your efforts, big and small.

## Contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Figures</b> .....	<b>ix</b>
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	<b>x</b>
<b>List of Appendices</b> .....	<b>xi</b>
<b>Chapter One: Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
The Context of the Problem.....	1
Violence in schools.....	4
Statement of the Problem.....	6
Purpose of the Study .....	9
Clinical Simulations.....	10
Clinical Simulations Compared to Traditional Data Sources.....	11
Significance of the Research.....	12
Definition of Terms.....	13
Positionality .....	14
Chapter Summary .....	17
<b>Chapter Two: Review of the Literature</b> .....	<b>20</b>
Part I: Violence, Threats, and Unwanted Behaviors.....	21
Reported Violence .....	21
Youth Violence: Developmental Theory, Risk and Protective Factors.....	23
Threats of Violence in Schools.....	24
Violence Reduction and Prevention Strategies.....	28
‘Challenging Behaviors’ and Teacher-Student Relationships .....	42
Part II: Classroom Management .....	48
Historical Context.....	49
Current Classroom Management Models and Approaches .....	51
Evidence-Based Classroom Management Practices .....	55
Part III: Teacher Dispositions of Authority and Care.....	57
Theoretical Background of Authority in Educational Settings.....	58
Contemporary Research on Classroom Authority .....	62
Power and Authority in the Literature .....	67
Theoretical Background of Care in Educational Settings.....	68
Care and Authority in the Literature.....	72
Part IV: Teacher Preparation and Development .....	76
Teacher Preparation and School Violence.....	77
Teacher Preparation and Threatening Behavior .....	78
Teacher Development and School Violence.....	81
Teacher Preparation and Students Who Present Unwanted Behaviors .....	83
Teacher Development and Students Who Present Unwanted Behaviors .....	86
Teacher Preparation and Classroom Management .....	88
Teacher Development and Classroom Management .....	93
Teacher Preparation and Authority.....	97
Teacher Preparation and Care.....	102
Chapter Summary .....	105

<b>Chapter Three: Methodology (Simulation Design)</b> .....	<b>108</b>
Research Design.....	108
Clinical Simulations Pedagogy.....	109
Historical Context .....	110
Terminology.....	112
Theories and Conceptual Frameworks Relevant to Clinical Simulations .....	113
Clinical Simulation and Assessment.....	118
General Advantages and Disadvantages of This Pedagogy.....	121
A History of Clinical Simulations at Syracuse University .....	123
The Casey Butler Simulation .....	125
Topic Selection .....	125
The Standardized Student: Student Casey Butler .....	126
Triggers .....	127
Implementation Procedures .....	129
Research Sites .....	132
Participants.....	132
Data .....	133
Collection.....	133
Analysis and Interpretation .....	134
Analytic Lenses.....	137
Chapter Summary .....	141
<b>Chapter Four: Results</b> .....	<b>142</b>
Part I: Demographics, Simulation Details, and the Post-Simulation Debriefs .....	143
Demographics .....	143
Clinical Simulation Details.....	144
The Post-Simulation Debriefs: Teacher Candidates’ Initial Reactions .....	150
Part II: Question 1a Results – Evidence of Teacher Candidate Authority .....	152
Theoretical Perspectives .....	152
Authority Codes .....	153
Results: Evidence of Teacher Candidate Authority.....	154
Authority as a Hybridized Concept.....	169
Summary .....	170
Part III: Question 1b Results – Evidence of Teacher Candidate Care.....	171
Theoretical Perspectives .....	171
Care Codes .....	171
Results: Evidence of Teacher Candidate Care.....	173
Overt Expressions of Care .....	187
Encouragement Across Codes .....	188
Summary .....	189
Part IV: Question 1c Results – Evidence of Teacher Candidates’ Solutions .....	190
Solutions Codes .....	191
Results: Evidence of Teacher Candidates’ Solutions .....	192
Solution Frequency and Order .....	203
Solutions in Context.....	207
Posing Solutions.....	211
Summary .....	212



Part V: Gender and Teacher Candidate Authority, Care, and Solutions .....	213
Summary .....	215
Chapter Summary .....	216
<b>Chapter Five: Conclusions and Implications .....</b>	<b>218</b>
Purpose of the Study and Research Questions.....	218
Key Findings and Conclusions .....	219
Dispositions of Teacher Candidate Authority.....	219
Dispositions of Teacher Candidate Care.....	223
Teacher Candidates’ Solutions to Threatening Behavior .....	226
Authority, Care, and Solutions Together .....	230
Gender Similarities .....	232
Study Limitations.....	232
Implications, Why This Work Matters .....	236
Implications for Teacher Preparation.....	236
Implications for Practicing Teachers .....	239
Clinical Simulations Use in Social-Emotional Contexts .....	242
Recommendations for Future Research .....	244
Concluding Thoughts.....	247
<b>Appendix A .....</b>	<b>249</b>
<b>Appendix B .....</b>	<b>251</b>
<b>Appendix C .....</b>	<b>255</b>
<b>Appendix D .....</b>	<b>256</b>
<b>Appendix E .....</b>	<b>257</b>
<b>Appendix F .....</b>	<b>259</b>
<b>Appendix G .....</b>	<b>260</b>
<b>Appendix H.....</b>	<b>262</b>
<b>Appendix I .....</b>	<b>266</b>
<b>Appendix J.....</b>	<b>267</b>
<b>Appendix K.....</b>	<b>268</b>
<b>Appendix L .....</b>	<b>269</b>
<b>Appendix M.....</b>	<b>270</b>
<b>Appendix N.....</b>	<b>271</b>
<b>Appendix O.....</b>	<b>272</b>
<b>Appendix P .....</b>	<b>273</b>
<b>Appendix Q.....</b>	<b>274</b>
<b>Appendix R.....</b>	<b>276</b>
<b>Appendix S.....</b>	<b>278</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>280</b>

## List of Figures

*Figure 1.* Teacher candidate solutions – Order similarities

## List of Tables

- Table 1. *Triggers Within the Casey Butler Simulation*  
Table 2. *Participant Pseudonyms, Demographics, and Identifiers*  
Table 3. *Details Gathered by the Teacher Candidates During the Clinical Simulation*  
Table 4. *Teacher Candidate Behaviors During the Clinical Simulation*  
Table 5. *SI Consistency: Casey Butler Clinical Simulation Details and Triggers*  
Table 6. *Data: Clinical Simulation Duration*  
Table 7. *Teacher Candidate Evidence of Elements of Authority, Part 1 and 2*  
Table 8. *Legitimate authority: Examples of Teacher Candidates' Roles as Rule Enforcers*  
Table 9. *Teacher Candidate Evidence of Elements of Care*  
Table 10. *Examples of Teacher Candidates' Sympathizing with How Casey is Feeling*  
Table 11. *Examples of Teacher Candidates' Sympathizing with Casey's Experience*  
Table 12. *Examples of Teacher Candidates' Offering Time to Talk with Casey in the Future*  
Table 13. *Teacher Candidate Evidence of Mild Disciplinary Solution: Reprimand*  
Table 14. *Teacher Candidate Evidence of Mild Disciplinary Solution: Conferencing with Casey*  
Table 15. *Teacher Candidate Solutions Evidence, Parts 1 and 2*  
Table 16. *Teacher Candidates' Solutions in Context*  
Table 17. *Examples of Teacher Candidates' Solution Suggestions*

## **List of Appendices**

- Appendix A: Seven partially related studies
- Appendix B: Standardized student interaction protocol
- Appendix C: Teacher interaction protocol – Standardized student interaction
- Appendix D: Authority – Coding criteria
- Appendix E: Care – Coding criteria
- Appendix F: Solutions – Coding criteria
- Appendix G: Authority – Simultaneously coded excerpts
- Appendix H: Care – Simultaneously coded excerpts
- Appendix I: Solutions – Simultaneously coded excerpts
- Appendix J: Authority – Initial codes
- Appendix K: Authority – Updated codebook – Initial and emerging codes
- Appendix L: Authority – Complete codebook – Initial, emerging, and after-emerging codes
- Appendix M: Care – Initial codes
- Appendix N: Care – Updated codebook – Initial and emerging codes
- Appendix O: Care – Complete codebook – Initial, emerging, and after-emerging codes
- Appendix P: Solutions – Initial codes
- Appendix Q: Solutions – Updated codebook – Initial and emerging codes
- Appendix R: Solutions – Complete codebook – Initial, emerging, and after-emerging codes
- Appendix S: Gender comparison – Authority, care, and solutions frequency

## **Chapter One:**

### **Introduction**

#### **The Context of the Problem**

The social-emotional dimensions of teaching and learning are overarching concepts that include the individual constructs of threatening behavior, care, authority, punitive practices, and restorative practices. Schonert-Reichl et al. (2015) use the work of Osher et al. (2008), Payton et al. (2000), and Weissberg et al. (2007) to “define social-emotional learning as the process of acquiring the competencies to recognize and manage emotions, develop caring and concern for others, establish positive relationships, make responsible decisions, and handle challenging situations effectively” (p. 407).

There are many arguments for a social-emotional emphasis in teaching and learning. Some believe the social and emotional relationships between the teacher and the student are central to education (Shriver & Buffett, 2015). Others argue that children in middle and high schools report social-emotional incompetence. In a survey of about 148,000 middle and high school students, more than half felt they lacked social-emotional competence in conflict resolution, empathy, and decision-making. This survey also found that less than 30% of students felt their school provided a caring and encouraging environment (Darling-Hammond, 2015; Durlak et al., 2011). An additional argument is that social-emotional competence positively impacts students’ well-being. In a meta-analysis of 213 studies, Durlak et al. (2011) explored the effects of social-emotional programming on student outcomes and found that a focus on the social and emotional aspects of teaching and learning heightened academic performance; social-emotional competencies; student attitudes toward themselves, others, and school; and students’ overall social-emotional well-being (p. 417).

Teacher preparation programs nationwide do not afford the adequate time and opportunities for preservice teachers to build their knowledge, skills, and practice in the social-emotional facets of both teaching and learning, the social-emotional development of children, behavior management, and classroom management (Brophy, 2006; Flower et al., 2017; Greenberg et al., 2014; S. Jones & Bouffard, 2012; Schonert-Reichl et al., 2015). Thus, it is unsurprising that preservice and novice teachers report feeling ill-prepared to address certain aspects of classroom management, respond to student's behavioral needs, and advance students' social-emotional learning and development (Begeny & Martens, 2006; Chesley & Jordan, 2012; Goh & Matthews, 2011; Kaufman & Moss, 2010; Melnick & Meister, 2008; O'Neill & Stephenson, 2014; Paquette & Rieg, 2016; Reinke et al., 2011; Stoughton, 2007; Walter et al., 2006).

Educational policy at the time of this study strongly favored academic subjects like reading and mathematics at the exclusion of art, social, emotional, and moral education. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act was an influential educational policy established within the schools where preservice teachers worked during data collection (*No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, n.d.). NCLB focused on data on students' academic proficiency and growth. The legislation held schools accountable for adequate yearly progress (AYP) or specified numerical benchmarks along a continuum signifying gradual student proficiency improvements. This legislation focused resources on academic achievement and meeting standards as measured through standardized assessments. Schools unable to meet AYP over five consecutive years faced disruptive and often punitive consequences such as school restructuring and closure.

Gay (2007) describes NCLB as a force with enticing rhetoric and frightening realities, dangerous precedents, and numerous negative consequences. One negative consequence discussed in the literature is a narrowing or streamlining of the curriculum so that teachers

devote more time to the tested subjects and less time to the other subjects (Jennings & Rentner, 2006; H. Ladd, 2017). In a paper comparing NCLB rhetoric with reality, Gay (2007) states,

Equating high quality achievement with test scores narrows the range of knowledge taught to students. Important knowledge, attitudes, values and skills needed for learning how to be morally, ethically and emotionally healthy human beings, caring community members and worthy citizens in a culturally pluralistic society and world are being woefully neglected. (pp. 290-291)

A lineage of legislation focused on test-driven accountability pressured schools, teachers, and students to focus on specific academic facets of teaching and learning and not others. Reading and math skills are critical, and secondary teachers should be highly qualified in the subject areas they teach. However, scholars express concern when schools place little to no emphasis on the moral, social and emotional learning needs of their students (Gay, 2007; Shapiro, 2006; Sizer, 2006). Educational policies, with a focus on test-based accountability, shift attention away from the social and emotional aspects of teaching and learning and de-emphasize the emotional work of teachers and staff. These policies fail to acknowledge that both the academic and the social and emotional needs of students are significant.

Populous schools and tight schedules make it harder for teachers to connect with students through interpersonal interactions, mediate conflicts, and meet students' overall social and emotional needs. With the Industrial Revolution and the societal shift from an agrarian to an industrial society, schools transformed from small and multi-aged communities to large and bureaucratic institutions focused on producing educated adults (Darling-Hammond, 1994). As a result, public secondary schools in the United States are much larger than they used to be. In 2014-2015 average school enrollments were 488 students in regular elementary schools, with state averages ranging from 683 in Georgia to 191 in Montana. Average enrollments in typical

secondary schools were 701 students, with state averages ranging from 1,508 students in Florida to 156 students in Montana (Snyder et al., 2018). Populous schools contribute to student anonymity and make it challenging, if not impossible, for teachers to be aware of, care for, and be responsive to the needs of all students (Noddings, 2005b, p. 2). Tight schedules often demand that teachers make quick decisions about critical issues and hinder teachers' abilities to mediate and resolve student conflict. B. Hopkins (2002) explains that school size impacts conflict resolution because time is limited, and conflict resolution is time-consuming.

### ***Violence in schools***

School is a relatively safe place for children in the United States when considering extreme violent acts (Cornell, 2015). On school campuses nationwide, the risk of extremely violent acts (e.g., homicides) is relatively rare (see Burnette et al., 2018; Nekvasil, Cornell, & Huang, 2015). Between 1992 and 2016 “the percentage of youth homicides occurring at school each year remained less than 3 percent of the total number of youth homicides” (Musu et al., 2019, p. 28). In 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021, there were 24, 24, 10, and 34 school shootings (Decker et al., 2022). As of May 2022, there were 27 reported school shootings (Diaz, 2022). These events are catastrophic; even one violent act is too many because the devastation can be far-reaching and the trauma acute.

Extreme violence is relatively rare, but threatening behavior is more common in schools. In 2015-2016, public schools nationwide reported a total of 257,000 threats of physical harm without a weapon. Of these, middle schools reported 79,000, and high schools reported 76,500, with rates of eight per 1,000 students and six per 1,000 students respectively (Diliberti et al., 2017). Most students make threats without a weapon (Diliberti et al., 2017), threats are not carried out (Cornell et al., 2012; Nekvasil & Cornell, 2015), and they rarely result in catastrophic violence such as fatal school shootings. Instead, threats made by students remain as angry



outbursts or unrealized challenges to fight (Nekvasil & Cornell, 2015). Adolescent children are more likely to enact forms of violence. Developmental theorists accept that the peak onset of violent behavior for youth is between ages eight and 14, while the peaking enactment of violence over a lifetime is between the ages of 15 and 19 (Farrington, 2003).

Schools use varied approaches to address violent and threatening behavior. These reactions are often punitive. The Columbine High School shooting and other extreme acts of violence influenced policy and disciplinary procedures in schools nationwide. This school shooting motivated school authorities and policymakers to support zero tolerance disciplinary procedures. Zero tolerance disciplinary policies punish students severely with suspension or expulsion regardless of circumstance, threat type, or threat level (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008; Skiba & Knesting, 2001). Student threat assessments are another approach to student discipline for threatening behavior. With this approach, a team of professionals within a school community follows a specific procedure to understand the root cause and context in which the threat occurred. Professionals categorize threats by type and severity. School professionals support students who enact threatening behavior through counseling and parental involvement (Cornell et al., 2012). Restorative justice practices are another approach schools use to resolve and prevent conflict. Restorative justice approaches are relational. This approach moves away from the control-based and punitive nature of other disciplinary methods and empowers those affected by the conflict to collectively problem-solve without isolation or blame in small peer-mediated groups, thus encouraging healing and an increased sense of belonging for students (B. Hopkins, 2003; Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007; Morrison et al., 2005).

Conflict resolution can be difficult for both novice and experienced teachers. Varying experience levels and moral conflicts challenge teachers when conflict arises. Knowledge of

specific school resources and policies varies among novice and preservice teachers. There is also the potential for moral conflict, as the disciplinary policies enacted within an educational space may not align with what teachers believe is best practice (Fries & DeMitchell, 2007).

### **Statement of the Problem**

Teachers' roles are complex. Educators must be knowledgeable in multiple disciplines and hold many responsibilities. The schools where educators work are multidimensional spaces where simultaneous events occur with unpredictable outcomes (Doyle, 2006). Djigic and Stojiljkovic (2011) describe teachers' responsibilities as "general personal growth of students" and "acquisition of knowledge" by students (p. 820). The focus here is academic, but other descriptions of teachers' roles and responsibilities allow space to address and acknowledge the importance of students' social and emotional needs and development. For example, Hollins (2011) describes teaching as "a complex and multidimensional process that requires deep knowledge and understanding in a wide range of areas and the ability to synthesize, integrate, and apply this knowledge in different situations, under varying conditions, and with a wide diversity of groups and individuals" (p. 395). Further, Cochran-Smith and Villegas (2015) explain that teachers must "be knowledgeable and reflective professionals who work in the context of communities of professional educators and make reasoned decisions in the service of their students" (p. 10).

The literature addresses both the academic and social-emotional responsibilities teachers hold toward their students. Preservice teachers must meet both the academic and social-emotional needs of students while simultaneously supporting positive relationships through a balance of authority and care. Preservice teachers must address student behavior in constructive and positive ways that support youth and foster safe and productive learning environments.

Butler and Monda-Amaya (2016) assert that “preservice teachers [should be] be adequately prepared to manage challenging behavior” (p. 277). However, preservice and practicing teachers report feeling ill-prepared to effectively manage challenging behaviors (Alvarez, 2007; Freeman et al., 2014; Westling, 2010). Teacher preparation programs supply minimal practical experiences for preservice teachers to address student behavior before their field experience (Stough & Montague, 2015).

Students’ verbal threats of violence are common (Borum et al., 2010). Preservice teachers will encounter this behavior during their careers. However, they may not observe threatening behavior as preservice teachers due to multiple limitations within the field experience. One limitation is its variability; preservice teachers do not all have the same field experiences. Teacher preparation programs cannot standardize the field experiences of their students because school sites, cooperating teachers, and students vary. Thus, learning experiences vary. A second limitation of the preservice teacher field experience is time. Preservice teachers have limited opportunities to observe threatening behavior because field experiences are often short. A third limitation of preservice teacher field experience is restricted authority to discipline students. The authority and independence expected of preservice teachers vary by program, placement site, and individual cooperating teacher. In some cases, preservice teachers experience very limited opportunities to interact with students as the sole authority.

Another aspect of the problem is an emphasis on teaching as a cognitive practice instead of both a cognitive and emotional practice (A. Hargreaves, 1998). Historically, teacher preparation has focused on teachers’ knowledge of the subject matter (Shulman, 1986). Darling-Hammond et al. (2002) highlight that teacher preparation programs now require more “subject matter preparation, more intensive coursework on content pedagogy and strategies for meeting the needs of diverse learners, and more systematic and connected clinical experiences” (pp. 286-

287). Bartell et al. (2018) highlight that teacher preparation programs have specific but different goals and priorities for schools, including “student performance on measures aligned with national content standards” and the Common Core State Standards (p. 426). The idea of teaching as an emotional practice is absent when the sole focus of teacher preparation is on teachers’ knowledge of the academic subject matter. Teacher preparation programs overlook teaching as an emotional practice when they emphasize pedagogical content knowledge. The view of teaching as an emotional practice is possible when teacher preparation requirements emphasize meeting the needs of all learners.

Still, Fleming and Bay (2004) argue that “few colleges of education have incorporated SEL training into their teacher preparation programs” and “teacher candidates receive little to no instruction in social and emotional development” (p. 95). Subject matter knowledge, content pedagogy, and teaching strategies to meet students’ needs are important and reflect the responsibilities of preservice teachers on the job. However, as Fleming and Bay (2004) argue, “Teachers are *the* critical element in creating learning environments in which children’s understandings and skills in [the social and emotional] domain are advanced” (p. 95). Thus, teaching as an emotional practice should not be overlooked in teacher preparation.

The emotional responsibilities of teaching are de-emphasized in teacher preparation by minimal instruction and limited practical experiences (Begeny & Martens, 2006; Freeman et al., 2014; Grossman et al., 2009; Landau, 2001). Fleming and Bay (2004) argue that novice teachers are underprepared to teach social and emotional skills. Thus, it is not surprising that novice teachers report feeling underprepared and concerned to manage their classrooms (Chesley & Jordan, 2012; Kaufman & Moss, 2010); to address disruptive student behavior (Goh & Matthews, 2011; Melnick & Meister, 2008); and to manage occupational stress (Chesley & Jordan, 2012). E. Brown et al. (2014) argue that “little explicit evidence of the emotional

component of teaching exists to help educators learn how to express emotions, react to the emotions of students, and negotiate emotion-related interactions with parents, colleagues, and other school personnel” (p. 207).

Preservice teachers need professional preparation to support children in conflict productively. They need the background, skills, knowledge, and experience to discipline effectively and re-engage upset students in learning. Communicating effectively with upset students and resolving student conflict in productive ways takes practice. However, the extent to which preservice teachers handle student rule infractions during their field experiences varies. Preservice teachers must learn to use their authority to keep all students safe while meeting the social and emotional needs of struggling students. Social awareness, responsible decision-making abilities, and relationship management skills are necessary to do this well.

### **Purpose of the Study**

This study emphasizes the emotional work of teachers. It explores facets of teacher candidates’ emotional labor and closely examines interpersonal verbal interactions with a student in a social context. This research study addresses how preservice teachers interact with students who enact threatening behaviors in schools. This study is an exploratory qualitative examination of a single set of clinical simulations used as a research tool to investigate the interactions between teacher candidates and standardized individuals trained to portray upset adolescent students. This study explores how preservice teachers navigate the contexts of authority, care, and student discipline; specific attention is paid to types of authority, elements of care, and disciplinary practices, including punitive, mild disciplinary, and restorative approaches. The following research questions reflect these ideas:

1. How do teacher candidates engage in a clinical simulation focused on threatening behavior in schools?
  - a. Do elements of authority emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student?
  - b. Do elements of care emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student?
  - c. What solutions emerge within the simulations? And do teacher candidates' solutions have elements of punitive, mild disciplinary, or restorative practices?

### **Clinical Simulations**

Clinical simulations are one form of professional preparation simulation. Howard Barrows and Stephen Abrahamson developed clinical simulations as an assessment tool for the professional preparation of medical students in the early 1960s (Barrows, 1993; Barrows & Abrahamson, 1964). Today, professionals utilize clinical simulations as an assessment tool (Epstein & Hundert, 2002), a pedagogical tool (B. Dotger, 2015), and a research methodology (Cil & Dotger, 2015). Multiple professional communities use clinical simulations in professional preparation (e.g., medicine, nursing, counseling, and education). During a clinical simulation, students interact in real-time with an actor trained to portray a standardized individual. The actor or actress has been coached to portray a series of symptoms and respond with particular words or mannerisms before the clinical simulations. Instructors, the student, or a cohort of students view video-recorded clinical simulations in real-time or afterward. Students and teachers use the video-recordings for assessment, reflection, or as a basis for discussion. Clinical simulations are a way for students to engage in challenging interpersonal communications in a semi-controlled environment supportive of learning and reflection, with reduced risk of harm (B. Dotger, 2013).

The data set for this study includes 16 video-recorded clinical simulations in which teacher candidates interact with a standardized student coached as an upset adolescent student who recently threatened to harm his peer(s). It is an existing data set, created as part of a teacher preparation course and used as a pedagogical tool. I use the clinical simulations as a methodology to explore the ways teacher candidates navigate authority, care, and the types of solutions they propose.

### ***Clinical Simulations Compared to Traditional Data Sources***

There are many challenges to studying teachers' and teacher candidates' actual use of authority, care, and solutions in response to verbal threats. Verbal threats are common in schools (Borum et al., 2010). However, research suggests that “teachers may not be detecting a significant portion of children who are threatening others” (Liau et al., 2004, p. 245). Teacher and student initial conferences following verbal threats of harm are spontaneous events, meaning the researcher must be in the right place at the right time. The use of clinical simulations is advantageous and lends itself to studying teacher responses to verbal threats for multiple reasons. Clinical simulations are efficient and allow researchers to concentrate their efforts (i.e., it would be time-consuming and challenging to collect the amount of data within these 16 clinical simulations as a participant observer). As mentioned above, clinical simulations facilitate studying actual, not recollected, or hypothetical responses to students who threaten harm. In this study, the use of clinical simulations limits researcher bias. The use of clinical simulations supports the trustworthiness of this study's findings because I did not interact with the participants before, during, or after data collection.

Clinical simulations allow the researcher to study what the participant actually does in a situation. The use of clinical simulations supports back-and-forth interaction and highlights

nuances in communication. In contrast, interviews and surveys tell us what the participant thinks they did or will do.

### **Significance of the Research**

This dissertation addresses gaps in the current literature on (1) preservice teachers' interactions with students threatening harm in social spaces, (2) preservice teachers' use of authority and care, and (3) preservice teachers' disciplinary practices concerning restorative, mild disciplinary, and punitive solutions. It further adds to minimal research using clinical simulations to explore preservice teachers' and standardized students' interactions in a secondary context.

This study also adds to limited research on preservice teachers' interactions with students in social spaces concerning social-emotional topics. This study contributes to the growing body of literature related to the emotional work of teachers because it focuses on teacher candidates' care and authority in interpersonal interactions with a student; and teacher candidates' solutions to students' threatening behaviors. This study is the first to investigate how teacher preparation programs prepare general education teacher candidates to address the externalizing behavior of verbal threats.

This study is also among the first to help us understand the one-on-one preservice teacher and student interactions concerning authority, care, and threatening behavior. This study is set apart from more traditional insights into teacher thinking gathered through interviews, surveys, self-evaluation, and written responses where teacher candidates communicate hypotheticals. Teacher candidates in this study converse one on one, *in situ*, with a standardized student. Thus, participants do not talk about what they did or think they would do in this data set. Instead, this study closely examines what teacher candidates *do* in conversation with a student who threatens



harm. It gives valuable insight into how teacher candidates *practice* authority, care, and problem-solve in conversation with a student threatening harm.

### **Definition of Terms**

In this section, I define some of the terms used in this study. These definitions, supported by literature, serve as a reference to clarify relevant constructs in this document.

*Authority* – a hierarchical social relationship by which people in subordinate roles consent to follow and obey those in leadership roles to preserve the moral order (Metz, 1978; Weber, 1947).

*Care* – The verb *care* is defined in dictionaries as feeling troubled, anxious, interested, and concerned. Noddings (2013) connects the concept of care to moral education and actions “directed toward the welfare, protection, and enhancement of the cared-for” (p. 23). Noddings argues that ones-caring as teachers hold the primary responsibility to nurture “students’ ethical ideal” (p. 178). Teachers have a unique and powerful influence on the enhancement or destruction of this ideal through dialogue, practice, and confirmation.

*Clinical simulation* – a pedagogy and assessment technique developed by Howard Barrows and Stephen Abrahamson (Barrows, 1993; Barrows & Abrahamson, 1964) used in multiple professional preparation contexts where the interactions between a standardized patient (SP) or standardized individual (SI) with a student are video recorded for later summative assessment by an instructor or formative reflection and analysis by the student or a group of students.

*Emotional work of teaching* – the work of teachers that includes building and maintaining emotional understanding with others (Denzin, 1984); addressing the social-emotional needs of children; and the emotional labor required of teachers to remain professional (Hochschild, 1993).

*Mild disciplinary responses* – a term used by Payne and Welch (2010) that is separate from restorative practices but describes disciplinary responses that are “more restorative in nature” (p. 1031). They include holding conferences, reprimands, and referrals to the school counselor.

*Punitive disciplinary responses* – a term used by Payne and Welch (2010) that “pertain to harsher, more punitive school responses” in reaction to student behavior and include “suspension from school, in-school suspension, and after-school detention” (p. 1031).

*Restorative practices* – reactions to a conflict that focus on healing harm and repairing relationships. The goals of these practices are to reduce violence through improved behavior and strengthen connections between people through community, family, or peer involvement (Stutzman-Amstutz & Mullet, 2005).

*Standardized individual (SI)* – this term includes any person carefully coached to simulate the body language, emotions, and personality characteristics of a student, parent, administrator, teacher, etc., consistently over time during a clinical simulation (Barrows, 1987).

*Standardized student (SS)* – this term includes any person carefully coached to simulate the body language, emotions, and personality characteristics of a student, consistently over time during a clinical simulation (Barrows, 1987, p. 1).

*Teacher candidate or preservice teacher* – a student working toward a teaching credential in a structured and guided education program that includes coursework, experience teaching in collaboration with a licensed teacher, and experience teaching independently.

## **Positionality**

Here, I would like to describe my positionality as a researcher and how I approach this research. There are three themes, across a breadth of experiences, that influence my work as a researcher. First, my identity impacts my work. Second, learning and working with students in

underserved communities and teaching at a large elementary school with minimal support for student behavior affects my work. Third, my collective experiences, including teacher preparation, professional development, and continued learning in higher education, impact my perspective.

My identity as a white, middle-class, middle-aged mother with an art and elementary teaching background impacts this work. I am also a native English speaker, able-bodied, and a person with dyslexia. My grandmother, aunts, and mother worked as career teachers and/or administrators in underserved communities within Philadelphia and Albuquerque. I grew up in a rural multicultural community along the Rio Grande River on the outskirts of Albuquerque, New Mexico. My teacher preparation and a master's degree program focused on social justice. I later pursued an endorsement in teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students through additional coursework and co-teaching. The focus of some coursework at Syracuse University was on racial injustice, institutional racism, critical pedagogy, and the student experience in under-resourced schools.

I do not have experience teaching adolescents. However, the second collection of experiences that influence how I approach this study is my work teaching second grade. In my experience, younger students rarely threatened to hurt others. When students threatened their peers, it was the teacher's responsibility to talk with the child/children, decide the next steps, and support all involved. I taught second grade, for eight years, in the largest elementary school in New Mexico (1,100 children K-5). Student demographics were 50% Latinx, 30% White, 15% Indigenous, and 5% Black or Pacific Islander. Most students qualified for free or reduced lunch (85%-90%), and, generally, I had 100% parent participation during conferences. Teachers often solely addressed student behavior because the school was big with limited resources. For example, in most years, one school counselor primarily reacted to extreme student behavior as

policy dictated. The cluster psychologist worked off-site, and the school social worker worked to connect school personnel with outside resources in times of student crisis. My personal experiences (mistakes, struggles, and successes) as a white woman guiding learners with diverse backgrounds, languages, and heritages spark my interest in research related to student discipline and the social-emotional needs of all students, especially students in underserved and under-resourced school communities. My interest in this research topic stems from personal feelings of uncertainty about how, as a white woman, I can best meet students' needs and my doubt about some school systems' approaches to discipline. I am motivated by the hope that with training, awareness, and resources, teachers can learn how to successfully meet the social and emotional needs of students they discipline.

My teacher preparation, professional development, and continued learning through graduate coursework did not provide instruction and practice in interacting with upset students. In my professional career, I earned a master's of elementary education and a K-8 teaching license, completed two dossiers to advance my teaching license, fulfilled and led many hours of district-mandated professional development, took summer institutes, worked on committees to revise standards, completed National Board Certification, earned multiple license endorsements, and completed Ph.D. coursework. The focus of all these experiences was not generally on the social-emotional dimension of teaching and learning. Specific to this dissertation, the focus was never on the impacts of school, district, state, and federal discipline policies or school resources to support upset children or threatening behavior. Learning how to interact with an upset student in productive and supportive ways was not part of my education. I learned to talk with upset children on the job because structured instruction and practice relating to a student who threatens to hurt others were never part of my teacher preparation or professional development experiences.

My positionality influences the questions I ask and how I view and analyze the data of this study. As a white woman in a more privileged educational setting, I did not experience the issues that my students later encountered. Collectively, the juxtaposition of my personal experiences compared to those of my students became a pressing reminder of inequities that can translate into fewer resources, stricter discipline, and less attention to the social-emotional needs of children educated in under-resourced communities. They also reinforce that talking with upset students who threaten to harm others is part of the job, and that structured learning centered on productive interactions with upset students at any age is not always a focus of teacher preparation.

Based on my experiences, I believe preservice teachers should be prepared to enact disciplinary practices in supportive and productive ways. They will be more effective if they have the skillset and knowledge to productively engage with upset youth, glean critical information, and keep all students safe. As a teacher, it can be challenging to interact with upset children productively. Also, the teacher may not glean critical information to support a resolution and ensure safety. Teachers must use their authority in ways that support children socially, emotionally, and academically. They must learn how to balance professionalism and care. Teachers must understand the support systems and personnel available to children in need. Preservice teachers should understand the federal, state, district, and school policies on discipline to make informed choices and work toward policy changes if the current systems work against children.

## **Chapter Summary**

Preservice teachers enter school spaces where the social and emotional work of teaching is undervalued. Further, the social and emotional needs of children go unaddressed. Social and

emotional learning is not a priority in schools. Educational policies emphasizing test-based accountability and a narrow curricular focus push moral and social-emotional education to the sidelines.

Teaching is a challenging and complex profession. Ayers (2001) explains, “the challenge of teaching is to decide who you want to be as a teacher, what you care about and what you value, and how you will conduct yourself...with students” (p. 23). This exploratory qualitative study explores how preservice teachers conduct themselves with students who enact threatening behaviors in schools. The data set includes 16 previously recorded clinical simulations in which preservice teachers contend with many of the challenges Ayers (2001) mentions. The research questions focus on how preservice teachers navigate authority, communicate care, and discuss solutions in conversation. Answers to my research questions improve researchers’ and practitioners’ understanding of how preservice teachers respond to children who threaten others. Practitioners may adapt their preparation programs to better prepare preservice teachers for supportive conversations with struggling youth who threaten to harm others.

Threatening behaviors are common in schools. Practicing teachers address this behavior during their careers. However, preservice teachers may not learn about threatening behavior during their professional preparation. Preservice teachers must be prepared to speak directly to and support students who verbally threaten to hurt others in schools. Threats may signal disruptions or disequilibrium in the lives of youth, or they may foreshadow future violence. Preservice teachers must make sound judgments when they observe threatening behavior. Yet teacher preparation programs often do not directly address how to communicate with students who threaten their peers. Teacher preparation programs do not give preservice teachers adequate time and opportunities to build their knowledge, skills, and practice in the social and emotional facets of teaching and learning. This reality underprepares preservice teachers for the emotional

labor teaching requires and leaves novice teachers ill-equipped to meet the social and emotional needs of their students.

## **Chapter Two: Review of the Literature**

This dissertation examines how preservice teachers interact with an upset adolescent student who threatens physical harm. I am interested in preservice teachers' dispositions of authority and care—and their disciplinary solutions when engaging with an upset student.

Chapter Two has four parts. First, I review the literature on violence, threats, and students who present unwanted behaviors. Second, I discuss classroom management. Third, I review teacher dispositions of authority and care. Fourth, I review select elements of teacher preparation and development for each of these topics.

In Part I, I discuss school violence, threats, and unwanted student behavior. This section provides a context for my first research question: how do teacher candidates engage in a clinical simulation focused on threatening behavior in schools? It also provides context for the subsequent question: what solutions emerge within the simulations, and do teacher candidates' solutions have elements of punitive, mild disciplinary, or restorative practices? Because verbal threats are a form of violence, this section begins with a review of school violence. Next, I explore the literature on the prevalence and management of threatening behavior in schools. Then, I review the literature on unwanted student behaviors, including the externalizing behaviors of aggression and threats of violence.

In Part II, I explore classroom management in terms of historical context, current models and approaches, and practices. My research questions do not directly address classroom management; however, the literature on classroom management is applicable because it discusses the actions and decisions of teachers, conflict management, emotional support, behavior management, and student discipline. These are pertinent topics to explore when studying how preservice teachers engage with upset students.



In Part III, I explore the literature on classroom authority and care in educational settings and address the teacher dispositions of authority and care. I explore these two constructs in education because I am interested in preservice teachers' dispositions of authority and care as they converse with an upset student. Specifically, do elements of authority emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student? And do elements of care emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student?

Part IV discusses the current literature on teacher preparation and teacher development related to violence, students who present unwanted behaviors, and classroom management. It is important to discuss the constructs of violence, unwanted behaviors, and classroom management with preservice teachers because they are the participants in this study. Teacher development for violence, unwanted behaviors, and classroom management is pertinent because these topics are not exclusive to teacher preparation and extend as part of continual learning and support throughout teaching careers.

## **Part I: Violence, Threats, and Unwanted Behaviors**

### ***Reported Violence***

Schools today are safer than they used to be. Musu et al. (2019) report that “from 1992 to 2017, the total victimization rate and rates of specific crimes—thefts, violent victimizations, and serious violent victimizations—declined for students ages 12–18, both at school and away from school” (p. iv). The number of nonfatal violent incidents affecting students at school has decreased from 68 students per 1,000 students in 1992 to 21 per 1,000 students in 2015. However, in 2015, rates of nonfatal violent victimization defined as “serious violent victimization, rape, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault” and theft defined as “taking things valued at over \$10 without personal confrontation,” for students ages

12-18 were close to double when home risk and school risk are compared (p. 243). For example, reported rates of nonfatal student victimization in 2015 were 21 per 1,000 students at school (this includes traveling to and from school, during school, and on school property), and 11 per 1,000 students at home (Musu-Gillette et al., 2017, p. 36). In 2017, a total of 827,100 (33 per 1,000) students ages 12-18 experienced theft or nonfatal victimization at school. Fewer students reported victimizations at home, 503,800 (20 per 1,000) (Musu et al., 2019, p. iv). These survey results suggest children are safer at home than at school and that victimization rates increased from 2015 to 2017. According to data collected in 2009 through the National Youth Risk Behavior Survey, 31.5% of high school students reported physical fighting within the past year (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2010). The Federal Bureau of Investigation reports approximately 86,000 adolescent arrests for crimes classified as violent in 2009 (Puzzanchera & Adams, 2011).

There are numerous reported effects of violence on students, staff, and the community. For example, connections between school violence, school climate, and student achievement are evident in the literature. Professionals within education agree that school climate contributes significantly to school effectiveness (National School Climate Council, 2007). Lower levels of victimization and a positive school climate are associated with higher academic achievement within schools (Benbenishty et al., 2016; Berkowitz et al., 2015; Espelage et al., 2004; Lacey & Cornell, 2016; McCoy et al., 2013). The multidimensional concept of school climate has been studied extensively in connection with academic achievement and student behavior (Wang & Degol, 2016). Scholars debate how the constructs of student achievement, school climate, and victimization interact (Berkowitz et al., 2015). Benbenishty et al. (2016), in a recent, longitudinal study, found that “high levels of overall improvements in school academic performance predict better climate and much lower school victimization over time” (p. 203). This leads to the

conclusion that schools should invest means to improve overall academic achievement, thus improving school climate and decreasing violence. This recommendation contradicts the research of other scholars. For example, McEvoy and Welker (2000) recommend that schools invest resources to reduce violence and improve the school climate to foster and advance academic achievement.

### ***Youth Violence: Developmental Theory, Risk and Protective Factors***

Farrington (2003) asserts that there are many “widely accepted conclusions about the development of offending.” In this context, Farrington (2003) defines offending as “the most common crimes of theft, burglary, robbery, violence, vandalism, minor fraud and drug use, and to behavior that in principle might lead to a conviction in Western industrialized societies such as the United States and the United Kingdom” (p. 223). Scholars generally accept that the peak age of onset for children is between eight and 14 years old. Offending behaviors peak during adolescence between the ages of 15 and 19, and the peak age people desist from violence is between 20 and 29. Thus, individuals are less likely to engage in offending behaviors as they age (Farrington, 2003).

The literature also discusses developmental and environmental risk factors related to enacting offending behaviors such as violence and aggression. Ferguson et al. (2009) conducted a multivariate analysis, and the results indicate that predictors of youth violence and aggression include depressed mood, anti-social personality traits, associations with peers exhibiting delinquent behavior, and negative life events, such as negative relationships with adults (p. 907). Herrenkohl et al. (2000) also studied developmental risk factors. They concluded that “hyperactivity (parent rating), low academic performance, peer delinquency, and availability of drugs in the neighborhood predicted violence from ages 10, 14, and 16 years” (p. 176). This study found that risk factors had an additive effect, meaning that children who experience

multiple risk factors were at increased odds of violence compared to their peers who had fewer than two risk factors.

Protective factors, the opposite of risk factors, have been shown to reduce the risk for violence in late adolescence (Kim et al., 2016) and indicate “a dose–response relationship,” meaning that, as the number of protective factors increases, the likelihood of violence decreases (Lösel & Farrington, 2012, p. S16). Lösel and Farrington (2012) studied protective factors related to youth violence. They organized their review based on individual characteristics; parent-child relationships; neighborhood and community factors; parenting behavior; and biological, school, peer, and family factors (pp. S12-S15). Lösel and Farrington (2012) list 30 factors that post-analysis seem to support promising protective effects. Examples include intensive parental supervision, positive attitudes toward family and school, a close relationship with at least one parent, a positive school climate, and support and supervision by teachers (p. S18). In a more recent study on the interaction of risk and protective effects, results indicate the effects of “high nonverbal intelligence, high verbal intelligence, high school attainment, and high parental interest in education protected against poor child-rearing; good parental supervision protected against high dishonesty; and high family income protected against a convicted parent” (Farrington et al., 2016, p. 63).

Next, I will address threats of violence in schools because it is the specific externalizing behavior that precedes the interactions between the teacher candidates and the upset students in this study.

### ***Threats of Violence in Schools***

One definition of a threat is “a statement of an intention to inflict pain, injury, damage, or other hostile action on someone in retribution for something done or not done” (Oxford Languages, n.d., definition 1). Threats of violence are a concern for schools in the United States

(Borum et al., 2010). The 2015-2016 School Survey on Crime and Safety reports rates of violent incidents, as defined as physical attacks or fights without a weapon, threats of physical attack without a weapon, and serious violent incidents, in United States public schools. According to this data, the highest rates of reported violent incidents were in middle schools (reported rates of 27 per 1,000), followed by near equivalent rates at high schools (16 per 1,000 students) and elementary schools (15 per 1,000 students). Rates of “threats of physical attack (with or without a weapon” were also surveyed (p. 21). Results indicate that most students make threats without weapons. Nationally, 39% of public schools reported one or more student threats without a weapon compared with 9% of schools reporting student-initiated threats with a weapon. During the 2015-2016 school year, public schools nationwide reported a total of 257,000 threats of physical harm without a weapon. Of these, approximately 79,000 reports were by middle schools, and 76,500 were by high schools, with rates of eight per 1,000 students and six per 1,000 students, respectively (Diliberti et al., 2017).

Current research on threatening behavior in schools indicates the following: first, most students do not follow through with their threats (Burnette et al., 2018; Cornell et al., 2012; Nekvasil & Cornell, 2015). Second, threats are not of equal risk (Burnette et al., 2018). Third, threats most often manifest as angry outbursts or challenges to fight and do not result in catastrophic violence (Nekvasil & Cornell, 2015). Fourth, catastrophic violence is rare (Nekvasil et al., 2015). Fifth, a misinformed view that homicidal violence is likely “can skew the perception of risk in evaluating a potentially dangerous student” (Burnette et al., 2018, p. 5).

Research on threatening behaviors in schools addresses multiple topics, including but not limited to (1) connections between threats and violent behavior (M. Singer & Flannery, 2000), (2) prevalence of threatening behavior (Nekvasil & Cornell, 2012; Rowe et al., 2004), (3) teacher

awareness (Liau et al., 2004) and (4) student report of threatening behavior (Millspaugh et al., 2015; Unnever & Cornell, 2004).

Research documents preliminary connections between threatening behavior and violence. In a study of the relationship between threats of violence and violent behaviors, M. Singer and Flannery (2000) found, through multivariate regression analysis, that students who threatened either frequently or infrequently were significantly more likely to engage in five specific violent behaviors than students who did not threaten others. Specifically, students who threatened others infrequently were three to four times more likely to report engaging in violent behaviors than those who did not report threatening others. Further, students who threatened peers frequently were six to eight times more likely to report engagement in violent behavior, as compared to students who did not make threats (M. Singer & Flannery, 2000). This strong association between general aggression, such as fighting, and threats in schools supports the conclusion that teachers and school staff must take threats of harm seriously.

Students should feel comfortable reporting threats to adults, but this is not always the case. A few studies suggest that students threaten their peers more often than adults realize. Many threats go unreported by students to school personnel, and teachers are often unaware of peer threats happening within their classrooms. Nekvasil and Cornell (2012) studied the prevalence and outcomes of student reports of peer threats of violence. Of the 3,756 high school students in the sample, 12% reported being threatened at school in the past month; 23% of the 12% thought the threat was serious; but only 26% of those threatened by peers reported the incident to school staff. A second study by Liau et al. (2004) examined teacher awareness of peer threats and asked 3,201 third- to sixth-grade students how often they threatened a peer during the past school year. Then researchers asked teachers to name students who they believe threatened

others. This study concluded that teachers are often unaware of student threats because teachers only correctly named students who threatened their peers 23% of the time (Liau et al., 2004).

In a third study related to actual bullying experiences, Unnever and Cornell (2004) anonymously surveyed 2,437 middle school students and learned that 898 of the students were bullied over the past year. However, 40% did not inform an adult, and 25% did not tell anyone about their victimization. In an older study surveying the perception of children in grades three through eight regarding bullying and non-bullying children, Rowe et al. (2004) found that 70 out of the 192 (36%) students in their study self-identified as participating in one or more bullying behaviors provided in list form by the research team in the past three months. The list of bullying behaviors included threats, teasing, racist name-calling, spreading rumors, social exclusion, and physical assault. From a student perspective, 17 of the 70 students who self-identified as bullies said that a teacher had talked to them about their bullying behavior in the last three months (Rowe et al., 2004).

Eliot et al. (2010) studied the relations between a supportive school climate and 7,318 ninth-grade students' willingness to report bullying and threats. Students reported their willingness to seek help by completing an eight-item survey and rating levels of agreement to disagreement to relevant statements on a 4-point scale (Cornell & Sheras, 2003). Eliot et al. (2010) define a supportive school climate as "the extent to which students perceive that adults at school care about students, respect them, and want them to do well" (p. 539). School climate was measured using an eight-item survey and a 5-point scale to rate statements related to care, listening, fairness, responsibility, student success, attention, and respect. This study found correlational but not causal effects that students' perceptions of supportive school climates impact their reported willingness to seek help when witnessing or being victimized by bullying or threatening behavior (p. 546).

There is a call for more research on threatening behavior in schools. Cornell et al. (2012) made three recommendations, advising that there should be (1) more research related to “the nature and prevalence of student threats,” (2) more research investigating victims’ perspectives, and (3) more research investigating the “implementation of threat assessment procedures in schools” (p 113). Nekvasil and Cornell (2012) state, “There is a need for research on the frequency of students being threatened, risk factors for being threatened, and characteristics of threats that might indicate they were more likely to be carried out” (pp. 359-360).

### ***Violence Reduction and Prevention Strategies***

School safety and changing student behavior are central goals of violence reduction and prevention strategies. Schools use varied approaches, including zero tolerance school discipline, student threat assessments, restorative practices, and anti-bullying programs, to address school violence. Zero tolerance school discipline is a reactive and punitive violence prevention approach. According to Molina et al. (2004), schools with high rates of violence often implement multiple reactive and independent strategies in response to violence. A second approach is the use of systematic threat assessments to support children who threaten or enact violence in school {e.g., Virginia (Cornell et al., 2012) and Dallas, Texas (Van Dyke & Schroeder, 2006)}. A third approach to reducing violence in schools employs restorative practices (an alternative to zero tolerance and punitive disciplinary practices) which empower students to mediate conflict via communication (Gregory et al., 2016). A fourth approach is the use of anti-bullying programs to both prevent and react to bullying by working with students, teachers, and whole school communities (Baldry & Farrington, 2007). These programs range in philosophy from those that purport individual accountability based on criminal justice to those that support conflict resolution pedagogy rooted in restorative justice and social-emotional learning (Ferguson et al., 2007). Teachers address identified bullying behavior through varied approaches, which include a



traditional approach, restorative practices, mediation, strengthening the victim, providing support groups, or using a method of shared concern (Rigby, 2011). A fifth approach is anti-bullying and harassment policies. The following sections detail these violence reduction and prevention strategies and their impact.

**Zero tolerance school discipline.** The zero tolerance school discipline is a punitive discipline approach widely adopted in United States schools (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008; Skiba & Knesting, 2001) and supported by federal policies, such as the Gun Free Schools Act of 1994 (Skiba & Knesting, 2001; Skiba & Peterson, 2000). In the introduction to their investigation of the uses, effectiveness, and controversies of zero tolerance, Skiba and Knesting (2001) outline its history. In 1989, school districts in three states adopted a zero tolerance school discipline policy, mandating school expulsion for fighting, drugs, gang activity, and weapons. By 1993, zero tolerance school discipline policies were adopted nationwide and often included less severe infractions, like smoking and school disruption, and suspension as an additional consequence. This discipline approach focuses on quick and strict disciplinary consequences for both serious and minor infractions, regardless of the gravity of the behavior, the circumstances, and the context in which it occurs (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008; Skiba & Knesting, 2001). Zero tolerance is defined by Skiba and Peterson (1999) as “a disciplinary policy that is intended primarily as a method of sending a message that certain behaviors will not be tolerated, by punishing all offenses severely, no matter how minor” (p. 372). A key element of this philosophy is the premise that severe punishments, such as suspension or expulsion, will deter future disruptive behaviors, thus creating a safer environment for the remaining students (Kafka, 2011). In addition to expulsion and suspension, school security measures are relied upon (Skiba & Peterson, 2000). Security measures like metal detectors, random or scheduled locker

checks, increased lighting, police dogs, cameras, school uniforms, and security personnel can create a prison-like environment (Nolan, 2011) and are often ineffective (Molina et al., 2004; Skiba & Peterson, 2000).

Two goals of zero tolerance school discipline are improving school climate and keeping students safe. These aims are uncontested in the literature. However, this punitive and reactive strategy has faced a breadth of criticism over the past 20 years. In 2008 the American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force released an evidentiary review with recommendations. Through a rigorous review of the literature from the past 20 years, this task force concluded that zero tolerance practices in schools do not improve school climate or school safety. The use of expulsion and suspension does not improve student behavior and, in some studies, predicts increased rates of disruptive behaviors (Bowditch, 1993; Costenbader & Markson, 1998; Raffaele Mendez & Knoff, 2003; Tobin et al., 1996). Implementing zero tolerance policies in schools nationwide also contradicts published knowledge of child development (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008). Students suspended from school are at increased risk for subsequent anti-social behaviors (Hemphill et al., 2006). High suspension rates are associated with increased student dropout (Lee et al., 2011) and lost instructional time (Arcia, 2006).

The widespread use of zero tolerance school discipline unjustly targets students of color. Zero tolerance policies worsen the problem of overrepresentation in expulsion, suspension, and discipline referrals (termed the racial discipline gap) for African American, Latinx, and Indigenous students by subjecting them to harsher punishments for less-severe infractions as compared to their White peers (González, 2012; R. Gordon et al., 2000; KewalRamani et al., 2007; Losen & Skiba, 2010; Raffaele Mendez et al., 2002; Raffaele Mendez & Knoff, 2003; Skiba et al., 2002, 2011). For example, in 2006, African American students represented 17.1

percent of the population and "accounted for 37.4 percent of total suspensions and 37.9 percent of total expulsions nationwide" (NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, 2009, p. 43).

**Student threat assessment.** One violence prevention alternative to zero tolerance strategies is the use of systematic student threat assessments. In the late 1990s, education and law enforcement professionals collaborated to develop this approach following several devastating school shootings. This prevention strategy has a central goal of reducing serious violent incidents on school campuses, specifically school shootings (Nekvasil et al., 2015). Student threats are reviewed on a case-by-case basis to identify individuals who pose a serious threat of violence (Fein et al., 2004; Nekvasil & Cornell, 2015; O'Toole, 2013). This approach aims to keep students in school, as they work with adults to resolve conflicts at the root of their threatening behaviors (Cornell et al., 2012). School authorities want to react appropriately to student threats. They don't want to underreact to a serious threat, nor do they want to overreact to a non-serious threat (Cornell et al., 2012).

Both the Federal Bureau of Investigation (O'Toole, 2013) and the Secret Service (Fein et al., 2004) recommend that schools train threat assessment teams, but how schools do this varies (Cornell et al., 2012). One approach uses the Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines. This approach involves a school administrator whose role is to lead the team, ensure safety, and decide consequences, and a school officer (police or resource). The team should also include a school psychologist whose responsibilities include "(a) assisting in resolving less serious cases, (b) screening for mental health problems that demand immediate attention, (c) assessing why the student made the threat, and (d) making recommendations for dealing with the problem or conflict that stimulated the threatening behavior" (Cornell et al., 2012, p. 102). Family involvement is also encouraged with this approach, as student threats can reflect challenges students experience outside of school. After a report of a threat, an interview with a school

administrator commences, with the goal to understand the context of the threat. The school staff references a multi-step decision tree to categorize the severity of the threat during this interview. There are three types of threats: *transient*, *serious substantive*, and *very serious substantive*. This approach mobilizes psychological, social, emotional, and parental support to help students solve the underlying problems at the root of their threatening behaviors.

Cornell et al. (2012) conducted an experimental evaluation in which participating schools were randomly assigned to either: (1) receive a one-day training on the Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines, or (2) continue as usual and then receive the training the following school year (control group). They hypothesized that students who made threats at schools within the treatment group would be more likely to receive counseling services, more likely to have parent involvement in response to the threat, and less likely to be suspended for long periods or relocated to another school (p. 102). Within this study, 201 students made threats of violence within 40 schools, elementary through high school. This study did not highlight notable differences in the treatment and control groups. Researchers noted that the intervention and control groups were similar across many variables, including, but not limited to the number of reported threats (100 and 101 respectively), suspension rates for threats (75% and 73%, respectively), and support service referrals for threats (15% and 18%, respectively) (p. 105). The results confirmed the hypotheses. Study results measured rates per intervention and control group as follows: “long-term suspensions, 25% (intervention) versus 49% (control); parent conference, 75% versus 55%; victim’s parent notified, 79% versus 81%; alternative school placement, 4% versus 20%; and counseling provided, 56% versus 25%” (p. 110). Students in the intervention group were 3.8 times more likely to receive counseling services, 2.57 times more likely to receive a parent conference, and three and eight times less likely to receive long-term suspension or alternative school placement, respectively (p. 108).

**Restorative justice practices in schools.** Restorative practices (i.e., transformative practices, restorative justice practices, restorative discipline) are an alternative behavior management framework, philosophy, or mindset that shifts the focus from a punitive and control-based discipline system to a reparative one that values humanity (Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007; Latimer et al., 2005; Stutzman-Amstutz & Mullet, 2005; Winn, 2018). Restorative practices are conflict prevention and relational resolution approaches used to change how people, systems, and institutions respond to serious and minor problematic behavior in their communities (Blood & Thorsborne, 2005; Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007; McCluskey, Lloyd, Kane, et al., 2008). Winn (2018) discusses restorative justice in this way: “It is about equity, understanding context, and true accountability, in which everyone acknowledges their responsibility to humanity and makes a commitment to putting things right when they have caused harm” (p. 18). Winn (2018) argues that restorative justice practices are more than just a set of principles followed school-wide to shift how students and adults relate and communicate. Instead, restorative justice is a paradigm—a way of being which finds value in relationships between stakeholders, building community, and making things right (p. 18).

Zehr (2015) outlines and discusses three pillars of restorative justice: harms and needs, obligations, and engagement. The category of harms and needs addresses not only those who have caused harm but also those harmed, and often those who harm have experienced past harm(s) (Winn, 2018). With a restorative justice mindset, those harmed may include any stakeholder (e.g., student, teacher, administrator, staff, parent, community member). As part of the dialogue of circles, participants may voice past and present needs. The second pillar is obligations; this includes the obligations of all stakeholders. Adults and youth are obligated to take responsibility for their actions, mend harm, and cultivate self-discipline in their environment. Zehr (2015) defines the third pillar of engagement as “the involvement of an

enlarged circle of parties as compared to the traditional justice process” (p. 24). Winn (2018) frames the pillar of engagement as the practice of freedom and justice as stakeholders foster democratic engagement (p. 21).

Restorative approaches are adaptable to individual school contexts and student needs within schools (Stutzman-Amstutz & Mullet, 2005). They support ideas of inclusion, communication, respect for others, empowerment through student efficacy, responsibility and support for amends, efforts toward healing harm, conflict as a learning opportunity, and the importance of addressing power imbalances (Evans et al., 2013; D. Hopkins, 2003; Morrison et al., 2005). This focus on communication, community building, and affective statements and questions help students understand the impact their actions have on peers and their whole community (Costello et al., 2010; Mirsky, 2011). Restorative justice circles cultivate the types of engagement listed above.

In contrast to widely adopted school discipline structures, restorative programs empower students to build community and resolve conflict in peer-mediated small groups or circles. It is important to acknowledge that the practice of restorative justice circles is borrowed and adapted from Indigenous and Aboriginal peoples in Canada, the United States, and New Zealand (Winn, 2018). Pranis (2012) describes circles as a place where community members and all shareholders have “equal voice” to enact participatory democracy and support “non-domination.” Those affected by conflict collectively determine solutions within these circles. In this way, the wrongdoer does not experience blame or isolation (Morrison et al., 2005). Circles shift the focus away from blame for past behavior and instead center energy on support, community impact, and future solutions (Wearmouth et al., 2007b). Winn (2018) explains that circles are a place where people “are transformed through a participatory process that provides opportunities for them to learn more about the lives of others they have previously disregarded or even held in contempt”

(p. 47). Circles support a way of thinking that challenges binaries (offender and victim) and labels (p. 27). They “provide a forum for exploring histories, futures, tensions, and paths forward” (p. 26).

In 1994, restorative justice practices originated in response to wrongdoings in criminal justice practices and were bridged into schools in Queensland, Australia (Cameron & Thorsborne, 2001). Today, many states (e.g., Florida, Colorado, California, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota) implement restorative practices (González, 2012; Henderson et al., 2010; International Institute of Restorative Practices, 2014; Karp & Breslin, 2001; Minnesota Department of Education, 2011; Suvall, 2009). Internationally, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, England, Hong Kong, Scotland, and Wales have adopted forms of restorative practices (Cameron & Thorsborne, 1999; Kane et al., 2008; Wearmouth, Mckinney, et al., 2007; D. Wong et al., 2011).

Restorative practices are used and misused in schools in the United States today (Karp & Breslin, 2001). Karp and Breslin (2001) describe the implementation of restorative practices to address discipline as uncommon. However, some scholarship notes that schools are using restorative practices more often (Winn, 2018). Most literature related to the impact of restorative practices in school communities is not in peer-reviewed journals. Instead, the information is in reports on project implementation (for example: (Henderson et al., 2010; International Institute of Restorative Practices, 2014; Minnesota Department of Education, 2011; Mirsky, 2007). Empirical research on the impact of restorative practices is slim (Evans et al., 2013), and more research is needed (Morrison & Vaandering, 2012).

The efficacy of restorative practices has been studied nationally (González, 2012; Gregory et al., 2016; Karp & Breslin, 2001; McCluskey, Lloyd, Kane, et al., 2008; McCluskey, Lloyd, Stead, et al., 2008) and internationally (Cameron & Thorsborne, 1999; Wearmouth,

McKinney, et al., 2007; Wearmouth, McKinney, et al., 2007). In a large study of restorative practices, 379 school personnel from 119 schools in Queensland, Australia learned to use community conferencing, a non-punitive intervention (Suvall, 2009). Researchers conducted two separate year-long pilot studies. Findings from the first Queensland Educational Department trial in 1996 included high participant satisfaction and low reoffending rates. Student offenders reported feeling accepted and belonging, and victims reported feeling safer in school. A second pilot study, conducted in 1997, confirmed that community conferencing was an effective strategy, but school-wide implementation lagged, as school staff handled many infractions using traditional discipline methods. Staff cited multiple reasons for not initiating community circles, including time limitations (Cameron & Thorsborne, 1999).

Unlike zero tolerance policies, the implementation of restorative practices reduces rates of suspensions and expulsions in schools (Karp & Breslin, 2001). Karp and Breslin (2001) conducted a series of exploratory case studies on how schools in Pennsylvania, Minnesota, and Colorado use restorative practices to address substance abuse. The school sites within each state used restorative justice practices in different ways, with varying adoption and implementation. Schools within Minnesota reported dramatic decreases in violent behavior, suspensions, detentions, and expulsions during the first year of the five-year project (p. 257).

McCluskey and colleagues studied the restorative practices in Scotland through a national pilot project (McCluskey, Lloyd, Kane, et al., 2008; McCluskey, Lloyd, Stead, et al., 2008). Their paper outlines preliminary findings based on a two-year evaluation of the pilot project and addresses both successes and challenges experienced in the 18 school sites. Data sources included interviews, surveys, participant and standard observation, policy and statistical data analysis, and focus groups. Findings show that implementation ranged from the whole school to more individual approaches. Evidence of cultural change included the language usage of staff



and students and the development of conflict resolution skills by the children. The primary schools exhibited evidence of more comprehensive and faster change, as compared to the secondary schools. This article concludes with findings that schools were most successful when teachers and administrators showed high levels of commitment, practiced and modeled principles, provided high levels of professional development, and viewed problematic student behavior as a community-wide learning experience. Many schools experienced improved student relationships and reductions in “playground incidents, discipline referrals, exclusion and need for external support” (McCluskey, Lloyd, Kane, et al., 2008, p. 415).

Wearmouth, McKinney and Glynn (2007b) discuss Māori cultural practices in collaboration with restorative conferencing in New Zealand. They discuss two applications of restorative practices. In one vignette, a “hui whakatika (hui: meeting; whakatika: to put things right)” is with a student, school staff, and members of his “whanau [wider family]” (p. 198). Using strategies rooted in Māori cultural practices that align with restorative practices, a 15-year-old boy was supported by his larger community. The effects of his actions were explained to him by those affected, he took responsibility for his actions, and all left with a sense of “wairua (sense of spiritual well-being)” (p. 198).

Gregory et al. (2016) surveyed the opinions of 419 high-school students in 29 classes in an exploratory, correlational study to learn more about the student experience in classrooms that use restorative practices on the East Coast of the United States. Through statistical analysis of student survey data, researchers found that diverse students had more positive relationships with their teachers who enacted high-level implementation of restorative practices. Students perceived teachers who frequently implemented restorative practices as more respectful. This study also addressed the racial discipline gap and showed promising results. Teachers with higher implementation referred fewer Latino and African American students for disciplinary action.

However, all classrooms with high levels of restorative practice implementation did not eliminate the racial discipline gap. Recommendations were made for replicated studies of an experimental nature to confirm this study's findings and draw stronger conclusions.

Like other discipline approaches, restorative practices aim to make schools safer. Restorative practices are different from zero tolerance policies in many respects. Restorative practices create support systems instead of inflicting punishment or increasing police presence (Winn, 2018, p. 83). They aim to resolve conflict and support academic achievement by keeping children in school (González, 2012). Restorative practices focus on the causes and contexts in which students' misbehavior occurs (Suvall, 2009), thus reducing disciplinary practices that sort, label, and isolate children (Winn, 2013). Restorative practices emphasize what is *just* and ethical, not only what is lawful. Restorative practices provide a transformative space for multigenerational dialogue centered on justice and race, humanity and healing (Winn, 2018).

**Anti-bullying programs.** Bullying is a form of aggressive behavior which can result in violence, aggression, or threats. However, not all bullying involves violence or aggression, and vice versa (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009b). Bullying is multi-faceted in the literature. It is a physical, verbal, or psychological attack rooted in intimidation, where an imbalance of power exists. The interactions occur repetitively, and there is intended physical or emotional harm to the victim (Farrington, 1993; Nansel et al., 2001; Olweus, 1993). Nansel et al. (2001) studied the frequency of self-reported bullying and victimization. According to their study, 29.9% of students "reported some type of involvement in moderate or frequent bullying" within the United States (p. 2096). Anti-bullying programs began with widespread implementation in Norway in 1983 (P. K. Smith, 2011). The multitude of anti-bullying programs implemented today varies widely in their type, quality, use of evidence-based interventions, and their level of implementation (Rigby, 2011, 2014; P. Smith et al., 2003, 2004). For example, Vreeman and Carroll (2007) conducted a

systematic review of anti-bullying programs and categorized interventions as “curriculum interventions, multidisciplinary or whole-school interventions, targeted social and behavioral skills groups, mentoring, and increased social work support” (p. 79). Many schools in the United States implement bully-prevention or moral education programs, but many programs are not systematically or empirically reviewed—and researchers suspect levels of publication bias in those that are (Ferguson et al., 2007; Sherman, 2000).

The effectiveness of anti-bullying programs is widely studied and debated (Baldry & Farrington, 2007; Farrington & Ttofi, 2009b, 2009a; Ferguson et al., 2007; Fox et al., 2012; Merrell et al., 2008; J. Smith et al., 2004; P. Smith et al., 2012; Ttofi & Farrington, 2009, 2011; Vreeman & Carroll, 2007). Ttofi and Farrington (2011) conducted a meta-analytic review after an extensive search yielding 622 reports specifically on bullying prevention. They systematically selected and reviewed 89 evaluations with 53 programs. Of these, 44 were analyzed. This review found that school-based bullying prevention programs are generally effective at reducing bullying by 20-23% as compared to control schools (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009a; Ttofi & Farrington, 2009, 2011). This study related effect size to a program element and found that the following program elements were associated with decreased bullying: “parent training/meetings, improved playground supervision, disciplinary methods, classroom management, teacher training, classroom rules, a whole school anti-bullying policy, school conferences, information for parents, and cooperative group work” (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011, p. 41). The total number of program elements, program duration, and program intensity were significantly associated with a decrease in bullying behaviors. Within this review, programs for older children were generally more effective (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009a). In concurrence with (Olweus, 2005), this review concludes bullying prevention programs must be intensive and long-lasting. Recommendations, exclusive of zero tolerance approaches, are made for increased parent communication, increased

supervision during recess, and firm disciplinary methods, such as “serious talks with bullies, sending them to the principal, making them stay close to the teacher during recess time, and depriving them of privileges” (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011, p. 45).

P. Smith et al. (2012), in a subsequent commentary, challenge the significant association between disciplinary methods and bullying and suggest larger effect sizes for older students in the Ttofi and Farrington (2011) meta-analysis. P. Smith et al. (2012) argue the work of Ttofi and Farrington (2011) should not influence policy, but instead should inform future studies, specifically those that evaluate the effectiveness of single programs on children of various ages, those that use intervention and control groups, and those that research moderating variables. Ttofi and Farrington (2012a) published their work in response to P. Smith et al. (2012).

In contrast to Ttofi and Farrington (2011), earlier meta-analyses find anti-bullying programs less effective (Ferguson et al., 2007; Merrell et al., 2008). In a meta-analysis, Ferguson et al. (2007) selected and categorized studies between 1995 and 2006, calculated effect size using Pearson's  $r$ , and then analyzed statistical and publication bias using fixed and random effects models (p. 406). Researchers in this study conclude that school-based anti-bullying programs are not “practically effective” (p. 410). This is because, when adjusting for observed publication bias, the adjusted effect size was close to  $r = .10$ , which is below both Cohen's (1992) and Lipsey's (1998) suggested cutoff for effect size and practical significance. Additionally, in an earlier analysis of school bullying interventions, Merrell et al. (2008) culled 16 international studies published between 1980 and 2004. Standard meta-analytic techniques were used to find averaged effect-sizes using *proportion difference* (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001). Results of this meta-analysis indicate that some elements of school bullying programs produce modest positive outcomes, as about 36% of the outcome variables showed significant effects. However, within this study, 4% of the outcome variables showed negative effects, and approximately 60% of

outcome variables did not exhibit sufficient power to be considered meaningful within this meta-analysis (p. 38).

**Anti-bullying policy.** It is important to address federal and state efforts to reduce acts of bullying and harassment in schools. Bullying is a prevalent problem, with mental health consequences for school-age children in the United States (Brunstein Klomek et al., 2007). Federal law does not prohibit bullying (McCallion & Feder, 2013). However, federal laws do prohibit discrimination based on disability, sex, race, color, or national origin. Between 1999 and 2017, all 50 states enacted anti-bullying legislation (McGeough, 2020; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2019). One state-level policy to address bullying and harassment in schools is the Dignity for All Students Act (DASA or the Dignity Act) in New York. This legislation “seeks to provide the State’s public elementary and secondary school students with a safe and supportive environment free from discrimination, intimidation, taunting, harassment, and bullying on school property, a school bus, and or at a school function” (New York State Education Department, n.d.). The primary focus of this policy is on prevention. When acts of bullying and harassment occur, the policy promotes progressive discipline and intervention, instead of zero tolerance approaches. This policy outlines prevention measures such as additional staff-training requirements, school climate expectations, adequate supervision in less structured areas (i.e., hallways and busses), and raising parental and community awareness. Appropriate intervention, reporting, discipline, and remediation measures are defined (The State Education Department, 2013).

This is one example of an anti-bullying and harassment policy. However, the definitions of bullying, the responsibilities of staff and students, and the consequences for involved parties vary between state policies (Kueny & Zirkel, 2012). Anti-bullying and harassment legislation also varies in levels of effectiveness at reducing bullying and harassment within schools

(McGeough, 2020). Furthermore, research has shown that school-level policies may be more effective at reducing bullying than state legislation (Greene, 2006; Kueny & Zirkel, 2012).

This dissertation explores the ways preservice teachers interact with a student who verbally threatens to harm peers whom they believe are talking about them. Verbal aggression is evident, but the student's behavior does not fit the commonly accepted behaviors and conditions that define bullying in the academic literature. However, guidance for state policies such as the Dignity for All Students Act (DASA) of New York broadly defines bullying. The Guidance for the Local Implementation of DASA states that verbal threats of physical harm and spreading rumors about someone with the potential to happen more than once are bullying (p. 5). Further, educational research and educational policies on peer victimization and aggression are often centered on bullying and harassment. For example, Troop-Gordon and Ladd (2015) connect peer aggression to bullying in the following statement: "Teachers hold a unique and prominent position within the school environment. Teachers' responses to students' peer victimization may contribute to a school climate that is conducive to, or dissuasive of, bullying" (p. 46). In this sense, bullying is a possible outcome of student aggression and peer victimization.

### ***'Challenging Behaviors' and Teacher-Student Relationships***

I include a section on students who present 'challenging behaviors' and teacher-student relationships because interactions between preservice teachers and an upset student who threatens physical harm toward their peers are the focus of this dissertation. In this section, I generally address unwanted student behaviors and specifically review 'challenging behavior' because it includes the externalizing behavior of verbal aggression, including threats (see Westling, 2010, p. 50). It is established that aggression is externalizing behavior and that threats of violence are considered a form of aggression (see Janssens et al., 2017; Liau et al., 2004; Millspaugh et al., 2015). For example, Janssens et al. (2017) use threatening behavior as an

example of aggressive behavior defined as “violent behaviour which directly victimizes others” (p. 421) under the larger category of externalizing behaviors.

It is important to acknowledge three points before moving on. First, many terms used to describe unwanted student behavior, such as ‘challenging behavior,’ are social constructs that promote deficit thinking about differences. Orsati and Causton-Theoharis (2013) assert that “challenging behaviour is a social construct that depends on the student’s context, especially the rules established for social environments and relationships in the classroom” and “that a behaviour problem is not an inherent deficit to the student” (p. 508). Second, verbal threats are a form of aggression and externalizing behavior, but verbal threats were not commonly listed as an example of student mis(behavior) in the educational research, when compared to other examples of aggression, like physical altercations and bullying. Third, some definitions of ‘challenging behavior’ mention frequency or repetition of the behavior, which does not fit this study. However, threatening behaviors may cause harm, interfere with learning or social relationships, cause concern for the teacher, and signify potential danger. In the following section, I discuss the literature on students who present ‘challenging behaviors’ and teacher-student relationships.

Chandler and Dahlquist (2006) define ‘challenging behaviors’ as those “that are harmful to other individuals or the student, or that interfere with learning and social relationships” (p. 5).

Westling (2010) expands upon this and defines ‘challenging behaviors’ as

...intense behaviors that present physical, instructional, or social concerns to the teacher.

These behaviors disrupt learning, are dangerous to the student or others, cause physical pain, cause property damage, or seriously disrupt the teaching-learning process.

Challenging behaviors are demonstrated frequently by a student and are difficult to manage. (p. 50)

B. Smith and Fox (2003) define ‘challenging behavior’ as “any repeated pattern of behavior, or perception of behavior, that interferes with or is at risk of interfering with optimal learning or engagement in pro-social interactions with peers and adults” (p. 5). Some studies suggest that ‘challenging behavior’ is relatively common in educational settings and that secondary and elementary teachers work with students exhibiting ‘challenging behaviors’ one or more times in a typical day (e.g., Clunies-Ross et al., 2008). Other studies classify ‘challenging behaviors’ like non-compliance as rare (Gunter & Coutinho, 1997).

The literature about students who present ‘challenging behaviors’ often discusses externalizing and internalizing behavior (e.g., J. Baker et al., 2008). Externalizing behaviors are rooted in low self-control and include aggression and hyperactivity (Murray & Murray, 2004). The literature acknowledges the need for more research centered on “the relation of externalizing behavior with social interactions within the school context, and more specifically with teacher-child interactions” (Doumen et al., 2008, p. 588). Internalizing behaviors are rooted in anxiety and can include depression and social withdrawal (J. Baker et al., 2008). Children perceived to show externalizing and or internalizing behaviors are vulnerable to poorer school adjustment (J. Baker et al., 2008), poorer school outcomes in higher risk samples (Hamre & Pianta, 2001), peer rejection (Rubin et al., 2006), and strained teacher-student relationships (Henricsson & Rydell, 2004).

Teacher-student interactions are an integral part of research with students considered to present ‘challenging behaviors.’ Researchers label the nature of the interactions between teachers and students as positive or negative; positive interactions strengthen relationships, and negative interactions degrade relationships. Positive and negative interactions between teachers and students influence student outcomes (Reinke et al., 2016). For example, positive interactions which contribute to positive relationships with teachers can serve as buffers, protecting children



from known risk factors (Hamre & Pianta, 2001; G. Ladd & Burgess, 2001). On the other hand, conflictual teacher-student relationships in kindergarten can predict some negative school outcomes through middle school (Hamre & Pianta, 2001).

Birch and Ladd (1997) report that most children in their study had close, nonconflictual, and nondependent relationships with their teachers (p. 68). Research supports the importance and influence of close teacher-student relationships for young children (J. Baker, 2006; Hamre & Pianta, 2001), elementary-aged children with internalizing and or externalizing behaviors (J. Baker et al., 2008), and middle-aged children (J. Baker, 2006). Hamre and Pianta (2001) conducted a longitudinal study (nine years) with 179 participants to ascertain how teachers' perceptions of relationship quality with kindergarten students correlate with both academic and behavioral outcomes through the eighth grade. Results indicated that close teacher-student relationships in kindergarten predicted academic achievement through fourth grade and general school adjustment through middle school. J. Baker (2006) studied the relationships between elementary students and their teachers in connection with school adjustment and found that children benefit from close relationships with their teachers. Children who experience behavioral or learning challenges are less likely than their peers to form close relationships with their teachers. However, having a close relationship with a teacher sheltered children with learning and behavioral challenges from the poorer learning outcomes experienced by children with learning and behavioral challenges who had distant or conflictual relationships with their teachers (p. 222).

Congruently, researchers acknowledge the harm of negative interactions with children. The interactions and resulting relationships between teachers and students with challenging behaviors are often more distant and adverse. Research by Gunter and Coutinho (1997) on the impacts of negative reinforcement suggests that teachers avoid students, through proximity and

interaction, with the greatest rate of (mis)behavior. This research also suggests that teachers' and students' behaviors are affected by a strong desire to avoid negative events. Gunter and colleagues found that teachers rarely praised students with challenging behaviors for appropriate behavior, and they experienced seven times the number of negative interactions, as compared to positive interactions with their teachers (Gunter et al., 1993, 1994). Also, teachers are more likely to develop negative, more conflictual relationships with students who demonstrate ongoing challenging behaviors (Doumen et al., 2008; G. Ladd & Burgess, 1999; Nurmi, 2012). Teachers report having closer relationships with students they perceive as having positive attitudes toward school, and they perceive "more negative school attitudes for children with whom they have conflictual relationships" (Birch & Ladd, 1997, p. 75). Spilt and Koomen (2009) found that teachers report both close and conflictual relationships with students who engage in challenging behavior. Students with more frequent problematic behaviors also experience harsher consequences for disruption than their peers (i.e., a reprimand instead of a redirect) (Nelson & Roberts, 2000).

Negative interactions between teachers and students affect students' school adjustment. Research shows that conflictual relationships are associated with negative school adjustment (Hamre & Pianta, 2001). A prospective study by Henricsson and Rydell (2004) found that when compared to their peers, first and later third-grade students with disruptive behaviors and externalizing problems had lower self-perceptions, more frequent conflict-centered interactions with their teachers, and lower peer acceptance due to increased aggressive behaviors. This study also found differences in teachers' relationships with children exerting externalizing versus internalizing behaviors. These findings align with past research and confirm that relationships between teachers and children with negative behaviors are conflictual, dependent, and distant simultaneously. Children with internalizing behaviors did not deviate from their peers labeled

“nonproblem children” over two years (p. 132). G. Ladd and Burgess (1999) studied relationship trajectories of children labeled withdrawn, aggressive, and withdrawn or aggressive from kindergarten through second grade. Researchers found that the relational trajectories of children with withdrawn behaviors resembled their peers, except for more dependent and less close relationships with their kindergarten teachers. Aggressive behavior was somewhat stable, and children experienced more conflictual relationships with their teachers and lower peer acceptance. As compared to their peers, children who showed both withdrawn and aggressive behaviors were most likely to have negative relationships with their teachers and peers.

Student demographics impact interactions between teachers and students. Boys, students of color, and students living in low-income circumstances experience more negative interactions with their teachers than their peers (J. Baker, 2006; Saft & Pianta, 2001). In addition, they are more likely than their peers to experience office discipline referrals, school suspension, and expulsion (Bradshaw et al., 2010; González, 2012; Losen & Skiba, 2010; Raffaele Mendez et al., 2002). Saft and Pianta (2001) investigated teachers’ perceptions of their relationships with children based on demographic variables and found that “teachers perceived more conflict in their relationships with children whose ethnicity differed from their own” (p. 135). Reinke et al. (2016) reiterate that negative interactions between teachers and students combined with zero tolerance practices partially contribute to the “educational debt” owed to students within underserved communities (Gregory et al., 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2006).

Schools are safer today than in the past (Musu et al., 2019). They have implemented various approaches to try and address school safety and change student behavior, including zero tolerance school discipline, student threat assessments, restorative practices, and anti-bullying programs. Threats are an externalizing behavior and type of verbal aggression (Janssens et al., 2017; Liau et al., 2004; Millspaugh et al., 2015). Threats of violence are common (Borum et al.,

2010), with the highest rates of reported violent incidents in middle schools (Diliberti et al., 2017). Most students make threats without weapons and do not follow through with their threats (Burnette et al., 2018; Cornell et al., 2012; Nekvasil & Cornell, 2015). Instead, most threats manifest as angry outbursts and do not result in catastrophic violence (Nekvasil & Cornell, 2015). However, threats are not of equal risk (Burnette et al., 2018). Thus, threats of violence are a concern for schools in the United States (Borum et al., 2010), and teachers and school staff must take threats of violence seriously (M. Singer & Flannery, 2000). Calls for more research include work on victims' perspectives, the nature and prevalence of student threats, and student threat assessment procedures and implementation in schools (Cornell et al., 2012, p. 113). In addition, Nekvasil and Cornell (2012) call for more research on student threat frequency, risk factors for being threatened, and the characteristics of the threats more likely to be carried out (pp. 359-360).

I will briefly explore the historical context of classroom management and current classroom management models, approaches, and practices in Part II.

## **Part II: Classroom Management**

Definitions of classroom management often center on teachers' actions and decisions. Schonert-Reichl et al. (2015) define classroom management as "the ways in which teachers establish order, routine, and limits in their classrooms, deliver lessons, manage multiple transitions that occur between activities, and create an atmosphere of safety and support for students" (p. 409). Levin and Nolan (2014) frame classroom management as strategies, techniques, or principles to guide teachers' decision-making. These decisions relate to the classroom environment, relationship building, teaching strategies, discipline, cultural responsiveness, routine, etc. Bru et al. (2002) categorize teachers' classroom management

responsibilities as (1) providing academic support, (2) providing emotional support, (3) classroom monitoring, and (4) conflict management. Some studies describe classroom management as one social classroom process critical to student achievement. For example, in an empirical investigation of pedagogical/psychological knowledge (PPK), Voss et al. (2011) list the three classroom processes of classroom management, teaching methods, and classroom assessment, combined with students' heterogeneity, as essential for instructional quality and student achievement. They categorize classroom management and teaching methods as "social aspects of school learning" and subdimensions of PPK (Voss et al., 2011, p. 953). Other studies connect classroom management directly to behavior management practices. Cooper et al. (2018) define classroom management as "specific directed activities by teachers that include maximizing time allocated for instruction, arranging instructional activities to maximize student engagement and academic achievement" (p. 13) in connection with the implementation of behavior management practices (Sugai & Horner, 2002). Together these definitions of classroom management center it as a teacher-directed and social process to facilitate an environment that fosters student achievement and academic engagement through social-emotional support.

### ***Historical Context***

Scarlett et al. (2009) provide a historical narrative of classroom and behavior management beginning with the authoritarian-coercive approaches to discipline, such as corporal punishment, used in the early 19th century. This narrative then shifts to the progressive education movement, led by John Dewey, which framed teaching, learning, and discipline differently. Dewey (1963) shifted thinking about control, proposing that the locus of control does not have to reside within the teacher, but rather control is supported through the facilitation of engaging student activities and a well-managed classroom. The teacher's role in this philosophy is the facilitator of a democratic classroom. The progressive movement helped re-frame concepts of

power and authority. Dewey (1963) asserts, “The teacher reduces to a minimum the occasions in which he or she has to exercise authority in a personal way. When it is necessary ... to speak and act firmly, it is done on behalf of the interest of the group, not as an exhibition of personal power” (p. 54, as cited in Scarlett et al., 2009, p. 32). Simultaneously at the end of the 19th century, the kindergarten movement emphasized teachers’ use of affection and care as a locus of control and motivation. Character education and attention to motives for obedience influenced classroom and behavior management. Scholars began to consider obedience as not rooted solely in fear of punishment but rather as part of students’ developing conscience (Scarlett et al., 2009, pp. 26–34).

Scarlett et al. (2009) highlight two main philosophies, the child study movement, and the mental hygiene movement, which shaped debates about classroom and behavior management in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The child study movement (Hall, 1883) used the scientific method to empirically research child development, schooling, and discipline. This philosophy emphasized the importance of supporting claims and arguments with scientifically-based evidence. The use of terms like best-practices, research-based practices, and evidence-based practices reflect the child study movement. The use of empirical studies to support arguments is also rooted in the child study movement of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The mental hygiene movement, based on psychobiological theory and the medical community, was led by Adolph Meyer. Meyer’s theory promoted guidance and prevention to limit negative emotions as a means of control. The mental hygiene movement emphasized the importance of children’s inner being and their feelings. Teachers took a more preventative approach and supported children through accommodation (Scarlett et al., 2009, pp. 35–39).

Weinstein (1999) discusses a classroom management paradigm shift beginning in the 1970s in a book chapter on classroom management best practices and promising programs.

Weinstein explains that the focus of classroom management shifted “from a paradigm that emphasizes the creation and application of rules to regulate student behavior to one that also attends to students’ needs for nurturing relationships and opportunities for self-regulation” (p. 151). This shift acknowledged the complexity of human behavior and moved away from classroom management as a simple set of rules, or “bag of tricks” that can be acquired over a short period with the central aim of child obedience. Instead, educators began to view classroom management as a “body of knowledge” and “practices” requiring decision-making, reflection, professional development, and collaboration (p. 153). With a new focus on preventing behavior, teachers were tasked with supporting students’ self-regulation skills and building caring and trusting relationships. Classroom environments began to center on learning where routinized spaces of teacher-directed work became “places for active, student-centered learning” (p. 152).

Eisenman et al. (2015) argue that classroom management deserves more attention within teaching and research communities. They assert that “there is comparatively little scholarship dedicated to classroom management issues, no graduate programs, professional organizations, national conferences, or journals focused on classroom management” and that “this lack of focus has put classroom management at the low end of priorities and pedagogical innovation” (p. 2). To address this deficit, they propose a pedagogical change in which educational professionals shift their view on classroom management away from “tools to control student behavior” to ways to improve student learning (p. 2).

### ***Current Classroom Management Models and Approaches***

Supporting students’ self-regulation is evident in some but not all classroom management models used today. The literature describes classroom management models that range from teacher-centered models using rewards and punishments to student-centered approaches that rely on intrinsic motivators. For example, Malmgren et al. (2005) discuss three established classroom

management methods used in secondary settings. They include Assertive Discipline (Canter & Canter, 1976), Logical Consequences (Dreikurs & Grey, 1968), and Teacher Effectiveness Training (T. Gordon, 1977). Assertive Discipline is a behaviorist approach using punishment and rewards designed to control children. Teachers using this approach establish fair rules and consistently enforce positive and negative consequences based on student compliance (Malmgren et al., 2005, p. 36).

Logical Consequences is a counseling approach designed to guide student behavior. This classroom management approach centers around Alfred Alder's idea that social recognition and acceptance are innate human needs. When these needs go unmet, children engage in a series of behaviors that may result in power struggles and disengagement. Using this approach, teachers and students address misbehavior through logical consequences (Dreikurs & Grey, 1968).

Logical consequences relate directly to the behavior and are agreed upon by the teacher(s) and student(s) beforehand. This model emphasizes preventing misbehaviors and power struggles but still seeks to control children in constructive ways.

Teacher Effectiveness Training (T. Gordon, 1977) is a student-centered approach that focuses on building positive student-teacher relationships. This approach encourages adults to help students manage their behavior through respect for the individual, trust in the individual's ability to problem solve and self-regulate, and unconditional acceptance. Teacher Effectiveness Training focuses on positive and constructive ways teachers can choose to communicate with students. Communication facilitators, such as active listening, I-messages, and encouragement rather than praise, are central. Active listening is a form of feedback that involves engaging with a student to understand their perspective and then verbally communicating what was heard to ensure accurate understanding. This communication facilitator helps children feel understood. I-messages are facts that do not pass judgment or evaluate the child's behavior. I-statements



focus the problem within the teacher, eliminate harmful judgments, and give children space and time to problem-solve (Scarlett et al., 2009, p. 62).

The school-wide behavior management model of Positive Behavior Support (PBS) or effective behavior support (T. Lewis et al., 1998; T. Lewis & Sugai, 1999) aims to prevent unwanted behaviors school-wide by teaching specific behavioral expectations; rewarding positive behavior; continually assessing the effectiveness of approaches; and supporting relationships among students, staff, administrators, and the larger school community (Warren et al., 2006, p. 187). This approach considers relationships, provides ample opportunity for student self-regulation, and incorporates thoughtfulness and reflection.

Emphasis on relationship building within classroom management has returned, with attention on community building and classroom management as moral work (Scarlett et al., 2009, p. 44). The prosocial classroom mediation model reflects this current attention on positive student-teacher relationships. Jennings and Greenberg (2009) propose the prosocial classroom mediation model and emphasize the importance of social-emotional learning and optimal classroom climate. In a prosocial classroom, the teacher supports student learning through their ability to create and sustain supportive teacher-student relationships through social and emotional competence (SEC), facilitation of a social-emotional program, and effective classroom management. This model emphasizes the teacher's responsibility to foster community, support a healthy classroom climate, and meet the social-emotional and academic needs of students. This model describes classroom management as one of three elements of "teacher functioning," along with teacher-student relationships and implementation of social-emotional programs (p. 514). This model emphasizes the importance of the teacher-student relationship. It is not presented as a classroom management model but is relevant if we consider classroom management to be a

teacher-directed and social process to facilitate an environment that fosters student achievement and academic engagement through social-emotional support.

The Responsive Classroom (RC) approach acknowledges relationships as central to student success and views classroom management as a moral practice. This model is rooted in elementary teaching. It is considered a research-based classroom management method, developed in the early 1980s by a group of teachers in Massachusetts. This approach supports the whole child by considering social, emotional, and academic needs. This democratic model of classroom management supports positive and caring relationships between teachers and students. Each child creates personal goals, and then classroom rules are co-created by students and teachers. To prevent misbehavior, teachers create and maintain an organized environment, actively teach and support social skills, and value individual voices. Misbehavior is not punished within this model. Instead, school staff considers misbehavior a teachable moment when an adult may support the child through reflection and discussion—helping the student think of other solutions or reactions to try next time (Allred, 2014, pp. 673–674).

Classroom and behavior management approaches during the 19<sup>th</sup> and much of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries tailored their theories for Euro-American children in two-parent, middle-class families. Varied experiences based on culture, language, and ability were rarely explored (Scarlett et al., 2009, p. 39). Still today, Weinstein et al., (2004) reiterate that “the literature on classroom management has paid scant attention to issues of cultural diversity” (p. 26). Culturally responsive classroom management addresses this troubling reality in part. Milner IV and Tenore (2010) study classroom management in diverse settings and provide a detailed explanation of culturally responsive classroom management. They explain that Hammond et al. (2004) theorized “culturally relevant classroom management strategies” (p. 3) and Weinstein et al. (2003) termed “culturally responsive classroom management” (p. 269). Culturally responsive classroom

management builds from Ladson-Billings' (2009) concept of culturally relevant teaching and Geneva Gay's (2000) concept of culturally responsive teaching. Culturally responsive classroom management focuses, in part, on building teachers' awareness of their ethnocentrism, diverse cultures, and the larger economic, social, and political systems influencing education. In this way, culturally responsive classroom management is a frame of mind (Weinstein et al., 2004, p. 27). This approach also focuses on setting behavioral expectations, using appropriate strategies, creating caring classroom communities in which all students feel welcome, and building strong partnerships with families (Weinstein et al., 2004).

### ***Evidence-Based Classroom Management Practices***

Evidence-based classroom management practices are specific strategies for educators to use that may or may not fit within a broader classroom management method or approach. Simonsen et al. (2008) identify and explore 20 evidence-based classroom management practices through an empirical literature review. The 20 identified practices address five critical features of classroom management. They are “(a) maximize structure; (b) post, teach, view, monitor, and reinforce expectations; (c) actively engage in observable ways; (d) use a continuum of strategies for responding to appropriate behaviors; and (e) use a continuum of strategies to respond to inappropriate behaviors” (p. 353). These six critical features address classroom environment, student expectations, student engagement, and teacher response to appropriate and inappropriate behavior. There is a list of specific evidence-based strategies under each feature. For example, strategies to address inappropriate behavior include error correction, performance feedback, differential reinforcement, planned ignoring, response cost, and time out from reinforcement. Simonsen et al. (2008) discuss gaps in the existing empirical literature on evidence-based classroom management practices. They encourage research on new practices and under-studied

strategies, optimization of existing practices, teacher training methods, and the best methods for increasing the adoption and durability of evidence-based strategies in practice (p. 370).

Scholars define classroom management in terms of teachers' actions and decisions. Definitions center it as a teacher-directed and social process to facilitate an environment that fosters student achievement and academic engagement through social-emotional support. Past classroom and behavior management approaches and philosophies range from authoritarian-coercive approaches aligned with corporal punishment to the progressive education movement, the child study movement, and the mental hygiene movements in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. A classroom management paradigm shift begins in the 1970s when, in addition to the creation and application of rules, there is a new emphasis on establishing nurturing relationships with children and self-regulation by children (Weinstein, 1999, p. 151). Learning communities also began to see classroom management as developing knowledge and following practices. This adoption of classroom management practices is evident in the use of evidence-based classroom management practices today (Simonsen et al., 2008). Classroom and behavior management required decision-making, reflection, professional development, and collaboration (p. 153). Current classroom management models and approaches range from teacher-centered models using rewards and punishments (e.g., Assertive Discipline) to student-centered approaches that rely on intrinsic motivators (e.g., Responsive Classroom). Today, Eisenman et al. (2015) argue that classroom management deserves more attention within teaching and research communities. They express a lack of focus on classroom management (comparatively little scholarship, no graduate programs, no professional organizations, no professional journals, or national conferences), which contributes to a lack of pedagogical innovation (p. 2).

In Part III, I explore teacher dispositions of authority and care and discuss the theoretical backgrounds of authority and care in teaching, contemporary research, and how care and authority converge in educational research.

### **Part III: Teacher Dispositions of Authority and Care**

This section is about authority and care in the context of education. I begin with a definition and a short discussion of teacher *dispositions*. Next, I define and discuss classroom authority through a review of theoretical approaches and contemporary research. I briefly discuss how the constructs of authority and power are differentiated, or not, in the literature. Then, I define and discuss the theoretical views about care in educational research, and I discuss the literature on care and authority.

In a study on beginning teachers' professional judgment and action, L. Johnson and Reiman (2007) use the work of Shulman (1998) to define teacher *dispositions* as:

...attributed characteristics of a teacher that represent a trend of a teacher's judgments and actions in ill-structured contexts (situations in which there is more than one way to solve a dilemma; even experts disagree on which way is best). Further, it is assumed that these dispositions, trends in teacher judgments and actions, develop over time when teachers participate in deliberate professional education programs. (p. 677)

L. Johnson and Reiman (2007) assert that quality teachers develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions. These skills and knowledge are clearly defined and explored within the literature. However, teacher dispositions are "elusive," with minimal development (p. 676). This study explores preservice teachers' dispositions of authority and care while interacting with an upset student. What follows is more about authority and care in education.

### ***Theoretical Background of Authority in Educational Settings***

In the context of the United States, Pace and Hemmings (2007) situate the concept of authority as a social relationship through the work and ideas of educational sociologist Mary Haywood Metz and social theorists Max Weber and Emile Durkheim, among others. Pace and Hemmings (2007) highlight a definition of authority composed by Metz (1978):

Authority is distinguished ... by the superordinate's *right* to command and the subordinate's *duty* to obey. This right and duty stem from the crucial fact that the interacting persons share a relationship that exists for the service of a *moral order to which both owe allegiance*. This moral order may be as diffuse as the way of life of a traditional society or as specific as the pragmatic goals of a manufacturing organization. But in any case, all participants have a duty to help realize the moral order through their actions. (p. 26)

Authority is a *social relationship* by which people in subordinate roles must consent to follow people in leadership roles. However, the social relationships between authority figures and those who follow depend on those in consenting roles believing in the *legitimacy* of those commanding (Metz, 1978; Weber, 1947). This hierarchical relationship serves to preserve the *moral order* (Metz, 1978) as all members are working toward a "shared purpose" (Pace & Hemmings, 2007, p. 6).

Authority is central to the teaching and learning process. It is one of many forms of classroom control and is highly interactive (Metz, in Pace and Hemmings, 2006). Teachers' roles and the broader purpose of the educational institution support teachers' authority (Pace, 2003c). Authority is rooted in interpersonal relationships and is based on complex teacher-student negotiations influenced by cultural and societal factors and educational settings (Metz, 1978). According to Pace and Hemmings (2007), authority is granted, not assumed, and is built,

deconstructed, and rebuilt through negotiation and social interactions between teachers and students (p. 21). Students do not always respect teachers' authority through compliance. The result is potential misunderstanding and conflict (Pace, 2003c; Pace & Hemmings, 2007).

Pace and Hemmings (2007) discuss types of authority used to study social interactions within classrooms. Three types of authority are from the work of Weber (1947) and include *traditional* authority, *charismatic* authority, and *legal-rational* (bureaucratic) authority. The literature identifies a fourth type of authority termed *professional* authority, distinct from *legal-rational* authority. Some scholars argue that *professional* authority is best suited for studying teachers because it supports their educational goal attainment (Metz, 1978; Pace, 2003a, 2006). Durkheim (1956) explores *moral* authority, a type of authority used to teach acceptable behavior, interpret moral ideas, and maintain the moral order of the institution and society. Authority types are not pure; they are often hybridized in teacher-student interactions within the classroom (Pace, 2003c; Pace & Hemmings, 2006b).

In a more recent article within the United Kingdom, Macleod et al. (2012) also problematize the concept of authority in educational policy, research, and literature. They argue that, within policy communications, the term is one-dimensional, often synonymous with control, and connected in context with the use of reasonable force (Department for Education, 2011). Also, according to Pace and Hemmings (2007), the term authority is often mistakenly associated with negativity and is coupled with power and control. Macleod et al. (2012) argue that, within the literature, the dominant narrative surrounding the notion of authority relates to solutions or strategies to control student misbehavior (p. 494). Macleod et al. (2012) partially attribute this narrow view of authority to a lack of adequate theory. To address this void, they bring together sociological and philosophical perspectives to tease out the nuances of authority within student and teacher relationships and provide a conceptual framework for educational

researchers interested in discipline. Importantly, they discuss the shift in pedagogical thinking resulting from neo-liberal influences.

Macleod et al. (2012) explore the work of Weber (1958) and Hearn (2012) in connection to authority and define it in terms of the “ability to give orders (or instructions) and to have them obeyed” (p. 498). Similar to the work of Pace and Hemmings (2007), Macleod et al. (2012) outline three modes of legitimized authority conceptualized by Weber (1958): *rational-legal*, *traditional*, and *charismatic*. Rational-legal authority relates to laws and rights, traditional authority relates to the sanctity of traditions, and charismatic authority relates to devotion based on personal characteristics and leadership skills (p. 489). Five types of authority conceptualized by Wrong (2017) are presented by Macleod et al. (2012) as part of a much-needed conceptual framework for studying and complicating the notion of authority in student-teacher relationships.

Wrong (2017) delineates authority as a form of power and distinguishes five types of authority based on varied motivations for obeying. The five types of authority described by Wrong (2017) are coercive, legitimate, competent, personal, and authority by inducement.

Coercive authority is most closely connected to authority through domination and motivates students to obey under the threat of force. Authority by inducement is a type of authority rooted in rewards. Students are motivated to obey, expecting teacher-provided rewards with the possibility of teacher denial or removal of rewards as punishment. Both coercive authority and authority by inducement are “allied” and supported by current policy and educational practice of classroom management—rooted in a sense of control over discipline (Macleod et al., 2012, p. 505).

A whole-group consensus of a person’s right to command based on their role supports Wrong’s (2017) concept of legitimate authority. Legitimate authority is enacted within a classroom context when students agree to obey based on a sense of duty rooted in social roles



and norms. The whole group knows about and respects the teacher's right to command; thus, the students obey. Macleod et al. (2012) assert that notions of teachers' competent and legitimate authority are threatened within the current educational climate. For example, policy, school cultures, and instruction that support students' rights to question authority through acts of independent thinking and resistance threaten legitimate authority.

Competent authority is rooted in the idea that those with authority are most competent to serve the common good of others. Within the context of competent authority, subjects obey because they believe that the person with authority possesses superior skills or knowledge. This type of authority aligns well with the context of the teaching profession. Students obey because they believe their teacher is the authority on a subject, meaning they have more education, skills, and knowledge within a specific area. This type of authority liquidates over time as teachers 'impart' knowledge to their students (Wrong, 2017).

Finally, personal authority relates to the individual qualities of teachers. Within schools, students are motivated to obey through a sense of admiration and wanting to please. This type of authority connects to the literature on specific personal traits students value in their teachers (e.g., kindness and humor) (Hutchings et al., 2008) and the importance of relationship-building (Galton, 2007; Sellman, 2009). This type of authority relates to Weber's (1947) charismatic authority. Macleod et al. (2012) comment that personal authority holds the most promise for practicing teachers because coercive authority and authority by inducement are tied to control instead of discipline—and current educational policy threatens both competent and legitimate authority (p. 505).

Additionally, the Relational Model of Authority (RMA), established by Tyler and Lind (1992), is used to study authority in the classroom context by scholars in Europe (Gouveia-Pereira et al., 2003; Graça et al., 2013; Sanches et al., 2012). RMA is rooted in the social

psychology of authority and the group-value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Tyler and Lind (1992) recognize the collective human drive to establish rules and empower authorities in the circumstance of social dilemma or political conflict, and authorities' value when they enhance group functioning. RMA focuses on *legitimate power* in which "obedience flows from judgments about the legitimacy of the authority" (Tyler & Lind, 1992, p. 118). In support of their model and through a review of the literature, Tyler and Lind (1992) conclude that "the key to authoritativeness and legitimacy lies not in judgments about the decisions of an authority, but rather in judgments about the procedure, the process, and the quality of interaction that characterize encounters with authority" (pp. 162-163). In other words, legitimate authority rests on the authority figure's perceived ability to treat people with respect and use fair procedures. In interactions, individuals make judgments based on perceived trust (concern and consideration), standing (dignity, politeness, and respect), and neutrality (honestly, absence of bias or prejudice) of the individual with authority. People are not simply concerned with the outcome of their encounters with authority figures. Instead, they have relational concerns—they worry about their social status in the group and seek to understand their position from the perspective of the authority through the actions of the person in charge (p. 160). In sum, when people view authority as legitimate, they are more likely to comply voluntarily. People view authority figures as legitimate when they are respectful and fair. In situations of conflict or dilemma, people comply because they are concerned with preserving their value in the group and maintaining positive relationships.

### ***Contemporary Research on Classroom Authority***

In the Foreword of *Classroom Authority: Theory, Research, and Practice* (Pace & Hemmings, 2006a), Mary Haywood Metz states that "in the last 30 years, the study of authority in schools has fallen out of favor, as has the very word" (p. viii). Controversy has surrounded the

topic and term since the 1960s. There is limited research on how teachers practice authority in educational spaces (Hurn, 1985; Macleod et al., 2017). In connection to past literature on authority in the classroom, Pace and Hemmings (2007) outline (1) groundbreaking ethnographies from the 1960s and 1970s, (2) a few studies on high schools in the 1980s, (3) research on the challenges of diversity (focused on student resistance, sociocultural experience, and inequality), and (4) contemporary research. I discuss contemporary research on classroom authority both nationally and internationally in the following section.

Publications by Judith Pace EdD, Professor in Teacher Education at San Francisco University, are the most prolific (Pace, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2006; Pace & Hemmings, 2006b, 2007). To revitalize the study of authority in school spaces, Pace and Hemmings extended beyond individual articles and co-edited the book *Classroom Authority: Theory, Research, and Practice*, in which they compiled multiple studies on classroom authority by several scholars (Bixby, 2006; Mulooly & Varenne, 2006; Pace, 2006; Pace & Hemmings, 2006b; Rosenblum, 2006; Wills, 2006). This book features qualitative research on classroom authority in the United States explored from sociological and anthropological perspectives. Educational contexts for these studies range from elementary to undergraduate classrooms. For example, Wills (2006) studies the relationships between classroom authority, elementary school culture, co-construction of historical knowledge, and the impact of standardized testing during a social studies lesson in a fifth-grade class. Rosenblum (2006) studies teacher authority negotiations associated with college teachers' response to student demands to adjust academic standards at an urban public college.

Research on student resistance and compliance, challenges of sociocultural diversity, and conflict in classrooms is prolific. However, within this critical body of work, Pace and Hemmings (2007) argue that “a lack of explicit attention to authority relations and links to social

theory and ideology points to missed opportunities and a need for new, more integrative inquiries” (p. 17). A few contemporary studies specifically examine authority within teacher-student interactions and relationships in connection to sociocultural background and/or ethnicity and student achievement or engagement (Bixby, 2006; Ford & Sassi, 2014; Hemmings, 2006; Pace, 2006). For example, Pace (2006) studied the arising tensions between a white female teacher and her students in a high-school English class. Tensions arose over completing assignments, class participation, and student success or failure with a challenging curriculum. Pace (2006) concludes that the teacher’s use of specific strategies created the appearance of a cooperative classroom but also “unintentionally perpetuated the construction of underachievement among Black students” (Pace & Hemmings, 2006b, p. xiv).

Like Pace (2006), Bixby (2006) studied authority, student achievement, and race in detracked classrooms. This study addresses the complexities that manifest when we eliminate tracking, but cultural, pedagogical, and curricular changes remain unaddressed. They discuss the tensions between teachers’ reliance on authority as content experts and their struggles to support the academic achievement of students of color. Hemmings (2006) investigates moral orders and paradoxical findings within two high schools. The general culture of one school supported the community, and teachers expressed an ethic of care. However, the teachers viewed themselves as authorities on the lived experience and challenges of the underserved Black youth in their classrooms, while simultaneously failing to see their students as capable learners and unintentionally supporting racial inequality. Teachers used their professional authority cautiously and were fearful of increased resistance which led to increased student drop-out and diminished perceptions of care, contributing to inequitable educational opportunities for Black students.

Alternately, Mullooly and Varenne (2006) study authority and humor. Their study focused on two moments of play and pedagogical authority during a reading lesson. Participants

include eighth-grade students from a Jesuit middle school established to prepare immigrant children from Mexico for elite high schools. Within this work, Mullooly and Varenne (2006) argue that students' play was an acknowledgment of teachers' authority and a means to confirm their position.

International research on classroom authority includes studies from the United Kingdom (Elliott, 2009; Macleod et al., 2017; Pirrie & Rafanell, 2017), Portugal, Italy, and Finland (Gouveia-Pereira et al., 2003; Graça et al., 2013; Harjunen, 2009; Sanches et al., 2012) and Egypt (E. Hargreaves et al., 2018). Using varied theoretical approaches, this body of work focuses on (1) the development of deeper theoretical understandings of teacher authority (Macleod et al., 2012; Pirrie & Rafanell, 2017), (2) student behavior in connection to qualities and actions (e.g., an ethos of care and commitment) (E. Hargreaves et al., 2018; Macleod et al., 2017), (3) autonomy support (Graça et al., 2013), (4) perceptions of justice (Gouveia-Pereira et al., 2003; Sanches et al., 2012), and (5) teachers' perceptions of their authority in teacher-student relationships (Harjunen, 2009).

Multiple researchers acknowledge the complex and dynamic teacher-student relationships within the classroom context and approach classroom authority from varied theoretical perspectives that commonly support authority as relational. For example, Sanches et al. (2012) use the Relational Model of Authority (RMA) (Tyler & Lind, 1992) in combination with Emler and Reicher's (1995, 2005) youth delinquency theory. Graça et al. (2013) use RMA in connection with the Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000) and the Theory of Psychological Reactance (Brehm, 1966). Harjunen (2009) references the work of Herbart (1835) in connection to a didactical relational view of pedagogical authority. Some scholars support a deeper theoretical understanding of authority. Like Macleod et al. (2012), Pirrie and Rafanell (2017) push to further develop theories around authority in classrooms. Pirrie and Rafanell

(2017) problematize current policy and educational scholarship that assumes teacher authority is instilled outside the classroom and enacted using strategies. They assert that “authority is continuously negotiated, challenged, accepted, defined and ultimately constituted in and through the dynamics of interaction between and amongst pupils (and, by extension, between pupils and teachers)” (p. 12). In conclusion, they push for further development of a theory that addresses authority within the context of classroom dynamics and the micro-interactions between people in these environments.

Some studies focus on student perception and behavior in connection to teacher authority. Two studies addressed student behavior and perceptions of justice (Gouveia-Pereira et al., 2003; Sanches et al., 2012). Sanches et al. (2012) studied the relationship between justice judgments about teachers, institutional authority evaluation, and adolescent deviant behavior. Within this study, justice perceptions were negatively associated with adolescent deviant behavior, suggesting that the more adolescent students feel they are treated fairly by school authorities, the less likely they are to participate in deviant behavior (p. 615). In a second study, Gouveia-Pereira et al. (2003) also investigate the justice judgments of teachers and the evaluation of institutional authority. They specifically look at relationships between school experience, evaluations of legal and judicial authorities, and legitimation of teacher or school authority (p. 314).

In Portugal, Graça et al. (2013) also studied student-perceived teacher legitimacy and authority, this time in connection to adolescents’ autonomy level and their perceived autonomy support. This study confirmed that higher student perception of teacher legitimacy is associated with higher perceived autonomy support (the interpersonal relationship strategies used by teachers during academic activities). The association between these constructs depends on individual levels of autonomy, as high autonomy support was associated with higher teacher legitimacy, and higher autonomy levels were associated with lower teacher legitimacy (p. 1071).

### *Power and Authority in the Literature*

Constructs of teacher power and teacher authority overlap minimally within national and international scholarship. Macleod et al. (2017) assert, “There are numerous ways of conceptualizing authority, and it is frequently elided with other forms of power relationship (such as force, persuasion and manipulation” (p. 2). Scholars sometimes mention teacher power in research on teacher authority (e.g., E. Hargreaves et al., 2018; Harjunen, 2009, 2011; Macleod et al., 2017). E. Hargreaves et al. (2018) use the word power to define teacher authority, referring to a teacher’s power to command pupils and to the legitimacy of a teacher’s power. In another instance, Harjunen (2009, 2011) distinguishes between “authoritarian use of power” and “pedagogical authority” (p. 110), and, in a discussion of positive or negative characterizations of authority, states that both shared power and teacher-imposed power are possible (p. 114). Also, teacher statements presented by Harjunen (2009) mention power struggles, positions of power, and jockeying for power (pp. 117, 121). Wrong (2017) categorizes authority as a form of power in their theoretical work.

In *Teacher Power*, a discussion related to the notable decline of teacher power and authority due to conservative forces, the author does not distinguish between power and authority in text or definition (Myers, 2007). Instead, they use the terms power, authority, and influence interchangeably. For example, the paper reads, “Four factors have contributed to the reduction of authority and power of teachers...” (p. 240). A few sentences later (Myers, 2007) states, “The recent decline in the power and influence of teachers can be traced to...” (p. 240). Unlike the literature reviewed previously, this paper does not discuss teacher authority concerning student and teacher relationship, but rather teacher power, authority, and influence related to professionalism, autonomy, and political influence.

### *Theoretical Background of Care in Educational Settings*

The verb care is defined in dictionaries as feeling troubled, anxious, interested, and concerned. The work of Noddings (2013) connects the concepts of care and moral education. Noddings (2013) asserts that “the primary aim of every educational institution and of every educational effort must be the maintenance and enhancement of caring” (p. 172). The act of caring has two roles—the one-caring and the one-cared-for. The teacher often assumes the role of the one-caring, and the student is the one-cared-for in a classroom setting. Care is connected to actions “directed toward the welfare, protection, and enhancement of the cared-for” (p. 23). A teacher has “one great aim: to preserve and enhance caring in herself and with those with whom she comes in contact” (p. 172). Noddings argues ones-caring as teachers hold the primary responsibility to nurture “students’ ethical ideal” (p. 178). Teachers have a unique and powerful influence on the enhancement or destruction of this ideal through dialogue, practice, and confirmation. This conception of care requires that the one-cared-for receives and acknowledges the caring by the one-caring. Care in relationships between teachers and students is reciprocated by students through responsiveness (questions, effort, comments, cooperation), and this is a teacher’s natural reward for teaching (p. 181).

Caring involves stepping out of one’s personal frame of reference into the other’s. When we care, we consider the other’s point of view, his objective needs, and what he expects of us. Our attention, our mental engrossment is on the cared-for, not on ourselves. Our reasons for acting, then, have to do both with the other’s wants and desires and with the objective elements of his problematic situation. (Noddings, 2013, p. 24)

This view of caring commands engrossment and motivational displacement for the cared-for by the one-caring. When the needs and goals of the cared-for are prioritized by the one-caring, motivational displacement occurs. Caring in this way requires that the one-caring acts freely to



support the cared-for in the problematic situation. In other words, the teacher must have flexibility in their response to a problematic situation to prioritize the student's well-being over solving an abstract problem using predefined guidelines (p. 25). Schools are institutions with rules, guidelines, and policies, which impact how teachers and students behave. This reality harbors challenges for caring in the ways Noddings describes (Gregory & Ripski, 2008).

A critique is the use of oversimplified conceptions of care in the literature. Lisa Goldstein addresses this in a paper presented at the 1998 AERA annual meeting (Goldstein, 1998). She argues that instead of conceptualizing caring as relational, some scholars have assumed an oversimplified definition of care—one that frames care as a feeling, group of feelings, or a personality trait. Goldstein urges scholars to frame care using Gilligan's (1993) ethics of care, and with this acknowledge feminist moral theory and "its deeply ethical, philosophical and experiential roots" (p. 3).

Scholars use the *Ethics of Care* theory across psychology, philosophy, politics, medicine, education, and more (Held, 2006, p. 9). Ethicist, psychologist, and feminist Carol Gilligan developed this normative ethical theory (Held, 2006). Gilligan's (1977, 1993) theory challenged Lawrence Kohlberg's work on the stages of moral development. Gilligan's (1993) work fought patriarchy and the idea that "men's experience stands for all human experience" (xiii). She argued that Kohlberg's stages of moral development, derived from research using an exclusively male sample (Colby et al., 1983), were androcentric and that his higher stages of development focused on traditionally masculine values, such as rationality, individuality, detachment and impersonality (L. Walker, 1984, p. 678). Gilligan expanded our understanding of human development, moral reasoning, and identity formation in psychology by listening to and including women's voices and experiences. Gilligan argued for an ethical theory rooted in

feminism that shifts the social order by including and acknowledging women's voices to reframe how we see, talk, and interpret our world.

Gilligan (2003) explores the basis of development for her theory in the following excerpt: Moral problems are problems of human relations, and in tracing the development of an ethic of care, I explore the psychological grounds for nonviolent human relations. This relational ethic transcends the age-old opposition between selfishness and selflessness, which have been the staples of moral discourse. The search on the part of many people for a voice which transcends these false dichotomies represents an attempt to turn the tide of moral discussion from questions of how to achieve objectivity and detachment to how to engage responsively and with care. (Gilligan, 1993, p. xix)

Later, Held (2006) writes, "The central focus of ethics of care is on the compelling moral salience of attending to and meeting the needs of the particular others for whom we take responsibility" (p. 10). This theory values emotions and views people as relational and interdependent. There is a focus on the interpersonal interactions between morally concerned individuals as they discern what is best (pp. 10-11).

Gilligan argued distinctly masculine and feminine approaches toward moral dilemmas from her research on adolescent moral reasoning. From a feminine perspective, some of the women in her study mediated moral dilemmas "personally, through communication in relationship" while very few men did (Gilligan, 1993, p. 29). From a masculine perspective, most men mediated moral dilemmas impersonally, applying logic and rules. Although her research delineates two distinct ways people talk about moral dilemmas and labels these perspectives masculine and feminine, she notes that her work "highlights a distinction between two modes of thought" which are not "characterized by gender" nor "absolute" (p. 2).

Gilligan's (1977) study and the *Ethics of Care* theory (1993) are not without critique. Walker (1984) argues that Gilligan's (1977) findings related to masculine and feminine differences in adolescent moral reasoning are less pronounced when considering education levels and occupation. More contemporary works acknowledge the importance of feminist progress in the development of this theory (Held, 2006, p. 22) but also recognize adaptations to the theory and its scope over time and through use (p. 9). Over decades, the use of this theory has shifted from applicability within the private spheres of family life to the public spheres of life within society (p. 18).

The *Ethics of Care* theory aligns with my study because of its focus on voice, care, human interconnectedness, and responsibility. Gilligan (1993) describes voice as

...composed of breath and sound, words, rhythm and language. And voice is a powerful psychological instrument and channel, connecting inner and outer worlds. Speaking and listening are a form of psychic breathing. This ongoing relational exchange among people is mediated through language and culture, diversity and plurality. (p. xvi)

This definition of voice fits my study because I wonder how preservice teachers care (i.e., voice interest and concern for the upset student). In addition to voice, the concept of care is central to both the *Ethics of Care* theory and my research question 1b. This theory fits this study because it emphasizes human interconnectedness and views humans as relational beings. Lastly, this theory's central focus of "attending to and meeting the needs of the particular others for whom we take responsibility" (Gilligan, 1993, p. 29) applies to the teaching and learning environment where teachers are responsible for meeting the needs of their students.

The work of Noddings (2013) and Gilligan (1993) provide a scholarly foundation for current research on care in teaching and learning (e.g., Noblit, 1993). However, there are other perspectives. In an ethnographic confessional, Noblit (1993) writes about the connections

between power and care in a second-grade classroom. He argues that most conceptions of care are relational and reciprocal without acknowledging the power of the teacher in a teacher-student relationship. He urges scholars to reconceptualize caring to include dynamics of power. Noblit (1993) constructs caring as a type of moral authority, “an authority not only legitimated by the usual mechanisms of our society but also by reciprocal negotiation between people, in this case people of unequal power and knowledge” (p. 37). His ethnographic work states, “Caring in classrooms is not about democracy—it is about the ethical use of power” (p. 24). Noblit (1993) reiterates Noddings’ (2013) conceptions of power, specifically, that teacher power should not objectify or oppress but should be used to confirm and promote the cared-for. Noddings (2013) asserts that teachers’ “awesome” power should be used to guide children’s decision-making so that it aligns with both their physical and ethical selves (p. 64).

### ***Care and Authority in the Literature***

In their work on theorizing student and teacher authority relationships, Macleod, MacAllister, and Pirrie (2012) also discuss authority connected to ideas related to more caring approaches to student behavior. They highlight how teachers’ responses to student behaviors have changed recently. They note shifts in the types of interventions teachers use to address and prevent student behavior, a focus on relationships and student rights, and a focus on the social and emotional needs of children. Macleod et al. (2012) discuss how teachers today are more likely to learn about positive discipline and restorative practices. Some argue that this shift has caused a breakdown in teacher authority (Arum, 2003). However, Macleod et al. (2012) argue that student and teacher authority relationships have been “inadequately theorised, and the possibility of teachers maintaining authority other than through exercising control has not been adequately explored” (p. 497).

The constructs of care and authority converge in select educational research studies (e.g., Ford & Sassi, 2014; E. Hargreaves et al., 2018; Hemmings, 2003; Macleod et al., 2012, 2017). Macleod et al. (2017) build upon Macleod et al. (2012) to explore why children comply in authority relationships. This research assesses the relevance of Wrong's (2017) typologies of authority in understanding student compliance across four educational settings (p. 5). Interviews with 21 adults and focus groups with 44 youth (aged 12-21) supported Wrong's five reasons children obey. Interestingly, Macleod et al. (2017) suggest authority of care and commitment as a sixth basis for authority and specifically connect feeling cared for to compliance (p. 10). They suggest that this extension of Wrong's (2017) typologies may be particularly important for students who experience cumulative negative interactions in schools. Macleod et al. (2017) use the work of Noddings (2010) to define the term and position the notion of care as a foundation of an ethical approach toward education (p. 12). Macleod et al. (2017) highlight potential tensions between care and control in school settings:

...the development of caring relationships has been seen as leading to challenges for teachers in negotiating the boundaries between teacher and pupil. For example, there may be cases where a policy advocates one course of action, but a caring approach suggests another (Aultman et al., 2009). Here caring is understood as tension with control: the reciprocity and openness of caring relationships undermining established traditional patterns of authority relationships. (p. 12)

In contrast to this idea, Macleod et al. (2017) found that care supported rather than undermined adult authority.

E. Hargreaves et al. (2018) studied student perspectives of teacher authority and the importance of an ethic of care in a series of government primary schools in Egypt. Researchers in this study "ask how the teacher's legitimation of authority affects her/his pedagogic

relationship with the pupils” and how their relationships impact feelings and learning from students’ perspectives (p. 3). The 393 students in this study completed sentence starters related to the qualities or actions taken by their English language teachers to help them learn. Students named “affective factors linked to the affective relationship between the teacher and the pupils, rather than on cognitive learning outcomes” (p. 7) most often. During 38 individual student interviews, themes related to the importance of care emerged, as students stressed mutual positive relations, kindness, humor, likeability in the learning process, and enjoying the class or content. Pupils admired the teacher’s authority rooted in an ability to effectively manage the classroom environment in ways that did not rush student learning, kept order, and allowed for an extensive explanation of content knowledge (pp. 11-12). The extent of the teacher’s content knowledge and experiences also strengthened their authority, according to students. Students in this study noted the influence of charisma and respected teachers they considered role models. Pupils in this study noted physical and psychological coercion as the most common authoritarian tactic while expressing a desire for more peaceful tactics. Teachers also expressed a desire to rely less on harsh punitive measures and “offer students more care than at present” (p. 13).

Ford and Sassi (2014) studied the differences between Black and White teacher authority using discourse analysis and ethnographic research methods. The research team was specifically interested in how Black teachers ground their authority and use culturally specific practices when working with Black children. The discussion outlines effective approaches used by Black teachers, which when used by White teachers may assist in the establishment of caring and productive cross-racial relationships. The convergence of the concepts of authority and care is discussed in the literature review of this article through the lens of “the warm demander” (p. 43). In summary, the warm demander holds high expectations, takes no excuses, provides a structured learning environment, and is a person who “balances discipline and care” (p. 43) (See Ware,

2002). Care within this context is rooted in the ideas of an *ethic of care* and *other mothering*. The term *other mothering* comes from West African tradition where women of the community care collectively for children (Ware, 2002). Other mothering extends beyond the community circle to include care for the entire African American community (Irvine, 2002). Within this article, perspectives of authority based on race are briefly discussed.

Hemmings (2003) researches authority and respect in the classrooms and school corridors of two urban high schools. This work explores the experiences of six seniors, their peers, and teachers as they navigate a “crisis of respect for authority” (p. 418) in their schools. Hemmings attended school with each participant for 2-4+ weeks and conducted one-on-one and group interviews. Hemmings (2003) cites the work of Metz (1990) to support findings related to students’ and teachers’ levels of respect for the dominant educational regime and daily classroom regime (p. 421). However, this work does not specify authority typologies or theories of authority beyond the work of Metz (1990) and the crisis of authority. Hemmings (2003) discusses varied student experiences in corridors related to authority. Student experiences include lax adult supervision, intentional disregard of violent or disruptive student behavior by staff and administration, and unpredictable pat-downs and frisks by security guards. Students engage in fights to earn “personal authority in their relations with others” (p. 426) or maintain, gain, or defend one’s reputation (p. 428). Care is not a central theoretical construct of this study, but it is mentioned by teachers in connection to classroom practices and by students in discussions of teacher authority. Two teachers were described by participants as respected by their students. Students obeyed Ms. Hathaway because of her “instructional competence” and her appreciation and respect for her students (p. 432). One student respected and obeyed Mr. Cameron because he “really cares about kids” (p. 432) and navigates heated classroom debates in ways that help people see multiple perspectives and validate individual experiences.

In part, this dissertation explores preservice teachers' dispositions of authority and care (L. Johnson & Reiman, 2007, p. 677). Authority is a hierarchical, social relationship between people when individuals command and obey to preserve the moral order (Metz, 1978). The negotiation of authority through teacher and student interaction is a complex process influenced by culture and society (Metz, 1978). Authority is granted and built, deconstructed, and rebuilt between students and teachers (Pace & Hemmings, 2007, p. 21). Researchers consider many types of authority when studying social interactions between teachers and students in classrooms (see Durkheim, 1956; Metz, 1978; Pace, 2003a, 2006; Tyler & Lind, 1992; Weber, 1947; Wrong, 2017). However, there is limited research on how teachers practice authority (Hurn, 1985; Macleod et al., 2017). The work of Noddings (2013) and Gilligan (1993) provide a foundation for educational research on care (see Noblit, 1993). Care manifests as relational actions "directed toward the welfare, protection, and enhancement" of a student (Noddings, 2013, p. 23). The *Ethics of Care* theory (Gilligan, 1993) views people as relational and interdependent and focuses on a moral responsibility to meet people's needs (Held, 2006) and engage with care (Gilligan, 1993, p. xix). Teacher care and authority converge in a few studies, but more research is needed.

I will briefly discuss the current literature on violence, verbal aggression, and threatening behaviors related to teacher preparation and development in Part IV.

#### **Part IV: Teacher Preparation and Development**

In Part IV, I review the literature on violence and threats, students who present unwanted behaviors, classroom management in connection to preservice teachers and their teacher preparation experiences, and practicing teachers and their teacher development. Then, I discuss teacher dispositions of care and authority with preservice experiences.



### ***Teacher Preparation and School Violence***

Preservice teachers perceive peer victimization as important and concerning (Nicolaidis et al., 2002). However, research on preservice teachers and violence prevention training is limited (Kandakai & King, 2002b). A couple of older studies address the topic. In 1998-1999, 871 preservice teachers completed surveys; 94% thought violence prevention was important, and 89% thought teaching violence-prevention strategies to students was valuable. Preservice teachers were somewhat confident that they could teach their students the following skills: seeking help from the school staff (70%), using non-threatening language (67%), remaining calm (59%), using conflict-resolution skills (58%), refraining from fighting (57%), and using peer mediation (54%). However, most preservice teachers reported no violence prevention training as part of their teacher preparation programs. Further, few preservice teachers reported decision-making (31%), conflict resolution (27%), peer mediation (18%), and anger management training (16%) (Kandakai & King, 2002b).

The research focused on preservice teachers' beliefs about school violence is also scant (Kandakai & King, 2002a). In a separate publication using the same data set, Kandakai and King (2002a) asked preservice teachers if they perceived specific violence prevention strategies as effective or ineffective on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Respondents noted effective strategies by marking four or five. Effective strategies included training teachers and staff in violence prevention (700, 80%), teaching children conflict resolution strategies (618, 73%), and requesting a parent/teacher meeting (585, 65%). Less than half the participants marked referral to the school counselor (403, 48%) and a referral to the principal (369, 42%) as effective. Preservice teachers were least likely to believe that keeping students after school (173, 20%) and suspension (13, 1.5%) were effective violence prevention strategies (p. 353). Preservice teachers perceived school suspension (469, 55%) and keeping students after school (349, 40%) as

ineffective strategies. The results of this survey indicate that most preservice teachers perceive violence prevention training, teaching children conflict resolution, and meetings with parents and the parties involved as effective violence prevention strategies. Referrals to a counselor were not perceived as effective by most participants, and most preservice teachers in this study perceived principal referrals as ineffective at preventing violence.

The same survey asked preservice teachers, “If you encountered a violent situation with students at school, how comfortable would you be discussing the issue with the following individuals?” (p. 355). Most preservice teachers felt comfortable discussing violent situations with teachers (92%), university supervisors (88%), school counselors (87%), students (86%), principals (85%), and parents (68%) (p. 355). Preservice teachers without violence prevention training were “more likely to believe that such training would have positive effects on the school environment” (p. 355). Interestingly, preservice teachers with some level of violence prevention training reported less confidence in the effectiveness of violence prevention training to influence school violence outcomes than teachers with no violence prevention training (p. 355).

### ***Teacher Preparation and Threatening Behavior***

**Literature search.** Both exploratory and empirical research connecting constructs of preservice teachers and threatening behavior is limited—and research further connected to social spaces does not exist, to my knowledge. I did not find current, peer-reviewed research on preservice teacher and student interactions centered on threatening behavior within classroom management literature. For example, searching databases EBSCOhost, Education Full Text, Education Source, ERIC, PsycINFO, and Social Sciences Full Text, selecting for peer-reviewed, scholarly articles from 2000-2018 and using terms SU (pre-service OR preservice OR novice OR beginning teacher OR practicum) AND SU (classroom management) returned 94 articles. However, only three of the 94 articles contained the term *threat* in their full text. Upon review,

these articles reference threats in the context of “teachers’ use of threat” (Quek, 2013, p. 20), encouragement for novice teachers to take action in response to student misbehavior as opposed to using threats (D. Johnson et al., 2005), and student actions as threats to teachers’ identities and instructional control (Kanno & Stuart, 2011).

Second, I searched using the same databases and limiters but only used preservice descriptors and threat descriptors related to student behavior (student threat OR threatening behavior) together. This search returned eight articles unrelated to the topic of this dissertation.

Third, I searched for peer-reviewed journal articles from 2000-2020 using the terms preservice OR teacher candidate OR pre-service OR novice OR student teacher OR teacher trainee OR practicum AND threat OR threats in the subject terms AND hallway OR non-classroom OR cafeteria in all terms and retrieved three results. Two articles were not relevant because they discussed stereotype threat. The third article by Haselswerdt and Lenhardt (2003) discussed reframing school violence to emphasize emotional and psychological violence, not just physical violence. Within this article, a student expresses concerns about teachers’ lack of discipline in non-classroom spaces. A participant in this study explains, “If there is a fight in the hall, there’s no teacher there, and if there’s a classroom right next to it, ... it’s amazing how they don’t hear it. When they come out, they just, like, stand there.” (p. 329).

I did not find current, peer-reviewed literature directly related to preservice teacher and student interactions concerning threatening behavior within non-classroom spaces using clinical simulations. However, a couple of publications partially relate to this study. Butler and Monda-Amaya (2016) examine preservice teacher-student interactions associated with student misbehavior and discipline in a hallway. Further, Pankowski and Walker (2016) use mixed-reality simulations to explore preservice teachers’ classroom management skills (see Appendix A).

**Literature review.** Butler and Monda-Amaya (2016) conducted an empirical study to examine preservice teachers' perceptions of student behavior using the Challenging Behaviors Perception Scale (CBPS; Butler & Monda-Amaya, 2010). Participants ( $n = 255$ ) in this study viewed and responded to three video scenarios, rated challenging student behaviors, and provided their demographic information. One scenario addressed rule enforcement in an interaction between a teacher and a student in a hallway. Within this scenario, a student walks "down the hallway with a group of friends...wearing a t-shirt displaying inappropriate language on the front. The teacher stops the student and asks her to turn the shirt inside out; the student refuses...the student [walks] away and the teacher [grabs] the student's arm" (p. 280). Preservice teachers evaluated the teacher's role in either escalating or de-escalating the situation. The participants explored possible motives of student and teacher responses and conveyed how they would respond in each scenario. In response to this scenario, 99% of participants thought the teacher's actions had a negative effect on the outcome of the scenario, 42% of preservice teachers thought the teacher's response stemmed from negative emotions, and 97% of respondents said they would have responded differently. Results indicate that preservice teachers view physical aggression, physical altercations in the classroom, and bullying as harder to manage; they view whining, making noises, and tardiness as easier to manage. The list of student behaviors did not include verbal threats.

Pankowski and Walker (2016) designed two mixed reality simulations related to classroom management: one on non-compliance and the other on student motivation. The mixed reality simulations used five avatars embedded in a virtual classroom. Participants included 26 preservice teachers (12 in a traditional teacher preparation program and 14 in an alternative teacher preparation program). Pankowski and Walker (2016) gathered data to study changes in (1) preservice teachers' classroom management schemas, (2) the classroom management

strategies they used, and (3) their self-evaluation of learning through the simulation process. Initial definitions for both groups focused on control. Four weeks later, preservice teachers' definitions of classroom management balanced concepts of care and control. Both groups tended toward control-based strategies (e.g., pure control) to address non-compliance and care-based strategies to address student motivation (e.g., persuasion). Both groups in this study rated their performance "between developing and effective and they perceived improvement in their practice over time" (p. 14).

Like this study, the work of Pankowski and Walker (2016) explores broad concepts of preservice teacher and student interactions related to the classroom management concepts of non-compliance and unwanted student behaviors using simulations. However, there are differences worth discussing. Pankowski and Walker (2016) implemented a longitudinal cross-comparative study in which participants, divided by program type, interacted in two simulations three separate times over a multi-week timespan. They used mixed reality simulations as opposed to clinical simulations with the conceptual categories of control, care, and self-regulation to code. This study also explored the developmental fit of mixed reality simulations based on preservice teacher needs.

### ***Teacher Development and School Violence***

Both preservice and practicing teachers express a fear of failure to prevent violence and act appropriately in a potentially violent situation. Williams and Corvo (2005) compared preservice and in-service teachers' beliefs and fears about school violence using open-ended surveys. Preservice teachers' responses focused on a fear of harm to themselves and fear of making mistakes. In-service teachers' responses were student-centered compared to preservice teachers, as harm to students was their greatest fear. Both preservice and in-service teachers fear the consequences of their actions or inaction associated with school violence. In-service teachers

express “fear of failure to act appropriately to prevent violence” (p. 52). Preservice teachers fear making a mistake such as “missing warning signs, acting inappropriately and failing to stop a potentially violent situation” (p. 52).

Research on teachers’ reactions to victimization often focuses on the frequency in which teachers intervene instead of the nature of teachers’ responses to peer-to-peer aggression (Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015). Troop-Gordon and Ladd (2015) looked for correlations between teachers’ peer victimization-related beliefs and aggression reduction strategies. Teachers’ beliefs were not strongly related to the strategies teachers use. However, “teachers who held more normative views of peer victimization were less likely to report reprimanding aggressive students and were more likely to utilize passive response strategies” (p. 45). Teacher responses to student behavior influence levels of peer aggression and peer victimization in classrooms. For example, “separating students was associated with lower levels of aggression in the spring, declines in classroom-levels of peer victimization, and declines in aggressive behavior among girls high in aggression in the fall” (p. 55). In classrooms where teachers supported peer-assertiveness toward aggressive peers, aggression and peer victimization increased overall and especially among “highly aggressive girls” (p. 56). However, “highly aggressive boys became less aggressive during the school year when teachers advocated assertion and highly victimized children evidenced declines in harassment” (p. 55).

Sela-Shayovitz (2009) studied the effects of school violence prevention training on preservice teachers’ perceived self-efficacy. The study considers three types of efficacy, including personal teaching efficacy, teachers’ efficacy in the school as an organization, and teachers’ outcome efficacy. Outcome efficacy is the “teachers’ perceptions of their self-efficacy in dealing with actual violent events” as measured by Likert-type survey responses (p. 1063). A significant correlation was found between violence prevention training and total outcome

efficacy only. When working with students who exhibit violent behaviors, high school teachers reported the lowest levels of outcome efficacy compared to elementary and middle school teachers. Additionally, teachers with higher levels of school support reported higher levels of outcome efficacy. The statistical analyses did not find significant correlations between violence prevention training and teachers' reported levels of personal teaching efficacy or teachers' efficacy in the school as an organization.

### ***Teacher Preparation and Students Who Present Unwanted Behaviors***

**Literature search.** I explored the literature on preservice teachers and student behavior. A search of peer-reviewed journal articles from 2010-2020 using terms preservice OR pre-service OR novice OR student teacher OR teacher trainee OR practicum OR teacher preparation AND challenging behavior OR discipline problem OR disruptive behavior OR problem behavior OR misbehavior OR (mis)behavior OR externalizing OR aggression OR threat OR threat of violence in the subject terms AND hallway OR nonclassroom OR cafeteria in all fields yielded 148 articles in education. A preliminary review of titles and or abstracts revealed a lack of concentrated research on preservice teachers and students who make verbal threats, and minimal research on unwanted student behaviors and preservice teachers.

**Literature review.** Researchers call for more research centered on constructs of preservice teacher and student interaction concerning unwanted student behavior. In the introduction to their brief literature review, Butler and Monda-Amaya (2016) state, "Few studies have examined preservice teacher perceptions of challenging behavior and the role teachers may play in incidents of behavior" (p. 278). They add, "Although researchers recognize that all teachers need a solid foundation in behavior management strategies, few empirical studies have examined specific escalating interactions or exchanges between teachers and students" (p. 278). Freeman et al. (2014) note lacking attention on how to address 'challenging behavior.'

Mikulec and Hamann (2020) state that “currently, there is limited research that focuses specifically on preparing pre-service secondary teachers for the challenges of student behavior in adolescent settings” (p. 103).

In a study of teachers’ knowledge and views of ‘challenging behaviors,’ Westling (2010) highlights that in “general education, there does not appear to be an explicit expectation that preservice preparation addresses effective ways for teachers to work with children with challenging behavior” (p. 61). Mikulec and Hamann (2020) argue that secondary preservice teachers may learn about student behavior (one element of classroom management) as part of another course or through reading a textbook chapter (Emmer & Stough, 2001; Hammerness, 2011). Mikulec and Hamann (2020) explain that typical “secondary methods textbooks discuss the history of classroom management, as well as provide guidelines and steps for preservice teachers to take to establish their classroom routines, rules and procedures...but they lack practical applications and can present classroom management and student behavior as less complex facets of teaching than they are” (pp. 102-103).

Stoughton (2007) investigated the disconnect between preservice teachers’ beliefs, what they learn through preservice teacher preparation coursework, and their observations of behavior management strategies. This research explores how best to challenge and support future teachers to think critically about “taken for granted practices”—and instead use the lens of critical inquiry to consider multiple perspectives, as well as moral and ethical matters (p. 1024). Stoughton (2007) believes that “preparing teachers who are sensitive and reflective decision makers able to work against the technicalization and reductionism of the current educational climate depends to a great extent on teacher education that develops a stance of thoughtful inquiry concerning dominant practices” (p. 1024).



It is not surprising that preservice and novice teachers currently and historically report concerns about discipline. Veenman (1984) reviewed 83 studies on the perceived problems of novice teachers in their first three years. The number one difficulty reported by novice teachers in their review was classroom discipline. Today, preservice teachers report feeling underprepared to address student behaviors such as disruption and non-compliance, even after completing their classroom management coursework (O'Neill & Stephenson, 2014). Multiple studies report student discipline as an area of preservice teacher concern (Goh & Matthews, 2011). Novice teachers report anxiety about addressing student behavior in the classroom (Kaufman & Moss, 2010; Stoughton, 2007) and stress associated with communication and discipline (Paquette & Rieg, 2016).

Preservice teacher preparation can address preservice teacher confidence, concerns, and insecurities related to unwanted student behaviors. Research has shown that both confidence levels and implementation rates of effective classroom and behavior management strategies increase as the amount of preparation in challenging behavior that preservice teachers receive increases (P. Baker, 2005; Westling, 2010). In a study discussed earlier by O'Neill and Stephenson (2012), teacher candidates reported increased preparedness, confidence, and familiarity with classroom management concerns. However, they also reported feeling only "somewhat prepared to manage student misbehaviour and were confident using only half of the strategies they were familiar with" (p. 1131). These findings are echoed in recent studies by Begeny and Martens (2006) and Chesley and Jordan (2012). Additionally, school sites globally often lack clear centralized policies to guide teachers in intervention and their responses to student aggression and bullying (Kepenekci & Çinkir, 2006).

Teacher preparation programs rarely provide preservice teachers opportunities to explore and use concrete management strategies under realistic conditions. Stough and Montague (2015)

argue that preservice teachers do not have ample opportunity, support, and feedback to develop a complete understanding of classroom dynamics and practice classroom management skills during their teacher preparation. There is a need for realistic, specific, interactive, and reflective experiences for preservice teachers. Butler and Monda-Amaya (2016) state, “Instruction on developing behavior management strategies ... must extend beyond typical instruction in the university classroom and be incorporated throughout student teaching or clinical experiences ... preservice teachers need specific instruction in realistic situations connected to challenging behavior rather than a general set of behavior management strategies” (p. 288). Grossman et al. (2009) argue that professional preparation programs should provide novice professionals the freedom to learn by doing in supportive and low-risk settings. They highlight numerous professional preparation goals. One is to help “novices attend to the complexities of interaction ... and to respond in the moment under conditions of uncertainty” (p. 2060). Grossman et al. (2009) discuss the value of “approximations of practice” (p. 2056) and provide clinical simulation in the medical community as one example (p. 2091). The use of clinical simulations as a core pedagogy provides preservice teachers with specific, interactive, and reflective experiences that extend beyond typical behavior management teacher preparation practices. This pedagogy facilitates preservice teachers to hone communication skills and learn to address student behavior in respectful, productive, and responsive ways.

### ***Teacher Development and Students Who Present Unwanted Behaviors***

Westling (2010) surveyed practicing special and general education teachers to learn more about their knowledge, views, and practices in addressing challenging behaviors. Practicing general education teachers in this study reported that 24% of their students enact some form of challenging behavior. Practicing special education teachers report that 43% of their students enact some form of challenging behavior. Special education teachers manage challenging

behavior more often than general education teachers. All teachers reported “defiance and noncompliance, disruption, and socially inappropriate behavior” as commonly occurring (p. 59). Both general and special education teachers reported inadequate pre- and in-service teacher preparation to address challenging behaviors. More specifically, in no area of training occurring during either preservice or in-service preparation did more than about 50% to 70% of the participants report that their preparation was adequate or extensive, and more often, this figure was between 30% and 40%” (p. 59). Most general education teachers surveyed reported adequate or extensive preservice (57%) and in-service (70%) classroom management preparation. In the other six training areas, teacher reports of adequate or extensive preservice and in-service preparation were lower, ranging from 32% to 39% in preservice preparation and 26% to 52% in in-service preparation. Approximately 25% of the teachers in this study did not feel “they had ‘sufficient knowledge and skills to deal with most challenging behavior’” (p. 59). Almost all teachers (97%) reported that they learned to address challenging behaviors through teaching experience. Nearly all teachers reported a belief that behavior can improve (96.5%). Although not generalizable ( $n = 69$ ), results indicate that teachers feel underprepared to address challenging behaviors in their classrooms.

**In-service professional development and unwanted behavior.** Research suggests that professional development provides practicing teachers with additional ways to support children with aggression. Alvarez (2007) conducted an initial investigation and addressed a gap in the literature on how teacher training impacts practicing teachers’ intervention decisions and practices, such as affective reactions to behavior problems. Alvarez (2007) used four vignettes within classroom settings to study practicing teachers’ hypothetical reactions to student aggression. The 121 teachers in their study completed phrase completion scales (Hodge & Gillespie, 2003) related to causal locus, controllability, stability, and intentionality. Through

statistical analyses, Alvarez found that previous training in behavior management impacted teachers' affective responses and behavioral reactions to aggressive behavior. Teachers with previous training reported fewer negative emotions and lower levels of negative affect than teachers without training (p. 1120). This empirical study concludes that teacher training impacts how teachers respond to student aggression and "suggests the need to further develop and compare different methods of teacher training and technical assistance focused on non-academic topics such as classroom management for aggressive students. Training programs differ widely in terms of content, procedures, and duration" (pp. 1123, 1124).

Westling (2010) emphasizes the need for more in-service preparation for practicing teachers to support children with challenging behavior. He argues that practicing teachers need continual access to research-based knowledge, tools, and training in emerging and developing areas of study such as Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) and Positive Behavior Support (PBS). Westling (2010) suggests that teachers' confidence in supporting students with challenging behaviors might increase through interactions with consultants and professionals who specialize in behavior management of children with challenging behavior (Westling et al., 2006).

### ***Teacher Preparation and Classroom Management***

Background information about preservice teachers' classroom management experiences is relevant because classroom management includes student behavior and behavior management in coursework, practice, and the literature.

**Literature search.** I searched for literature on preservice teachers and classroom management using the terms preservice OR pre-service OR novice OR student teacher OR teacher trainee OR practicum AND classroom management in the abstract, title, or keywords and returned 495 articles. A review of titles and or abstracts from this search revealed a lack of concentrated research on the topics of this dissertation. Instead, research from this search focused

on topics of teacher preparation effectiveness (Flower et al., 2017; O'Neill & Stephenson, 2012; Woodcock & Reupert, 2013), efficacy (Gold et al., 2017; Prichard, 2017; Sak, 2015; Siwatu et al., 2017; Swanson, 2013), self-report and development of classroom management practices (Balli, 2011; Cooper et al., 2018; Kwok, 2018; Liu & Babchuk, 2018; Woodcock & Reupert, 2017), pedagogical knowledge and skills (Choy et al., 2013; Hudson, 2013; Voss et al., 2011), technology (Kale & Akcaoglu, 2018; Koc, 2011; Kurt, 2017), teacher well-being (Dicke et al., 2018; Oral, 2012; Paquette & Rieg, 2016), and social-emotional connections (Goegan et al., 2017; Stillman et al., 2018), among other topics. From this search, I gleaned information on teacher preparation for classroom and behavior management to provide a general context for classroom management and the preservice teacher experience.

**Literature review.** There are multiple philosophies and approaches toward classroom management instruction in teacher preparation (see Landau, 2001; Wubbels, 2011), which allows for a wide breadth of experiences for preservice teachers. Teacher training requirements for classroom management vary by state and program. Freeman et al., (2014) found that most states require classroom management training for preservice teachers, and most teacher preparation programs offer a course or content associated with classroom management. State policy connected to classroom management for special education programs is more explicit than general education program policy. Policies for alternative teacher licensure programs are the least comprehensive. A review of policy and curriculum documents highlighted that alternative teacher licensure programs generally do not require a course in classroom management. In their review, Freeman et al. (2014) concluded that only 60% of the programs had research-based content, and the research team found evidence of specific research-based classroom management practices in less than half of the programs (p. 116). Even more concerning, this research team

expressed apprehension that their data may overrepresent actual classroom management content within teacher preparation programs due to voluntary sampling methods.

Educator preparation programs address classroom management with varying implementation and consistency (Freeman et al., 2014; Stough & Montague, 2015). Teacher educators acknowledge both the importance of classroom management and the limited classroom management training preservice teachers receive (Brophy, 2006). Studies suggest that special education programs often supply more classroom management instruction and experiences than general education programs. Alternative general education teacher preparation programs offer the fewest learning opportunities in classroom management for their teacher candidates, compared to other program types.

Classroom and behavior management content also vary depending on program type (Hammerness, 2011). Flower et al. (2017) surveyed general and special education teachers to learn more about the behavior management content of their college/university-based or alternative preparation programs. This study organized behavior management into four categories: universal strategies, increasing appropriate behavior, behavior reduction, and assessment. Survey results showed most teacher preparation programs address routines, rules, and environmental elements, like classroom arrangement. On average, 87%, 58%, 52%, and 54% of teacher preparation programs cover universal behavior management methods, increasing appropriate behavior, behavior reduction, and assessment, respectively. College and university-based special education programs showed the highest and most consistent percentages across all four categories with a range of 82%-89%. Alternative general education teacher preparation programs had some of the lowest percentages across the four measured constructs, with 39% and 40% of programs covering behavior reduction and behavior assessment strategies. Across program types, 58% to 89% of teacher preparation programs reported a course offering or

specific experience related to classroom management. Most teacher candidates are likely to explore universal methods. However, teacher candidates in programs other than college or university-based special education programs are far less likely to learn about preventative strategies, behavior reduction, and behavior assessment.

Research also suggests that training and the use of evidence-based classroom management practices are lacking. Cooper et al. (2018) surveyed 248 educators for their opinions on the training, use, and effectiveness of evidence-based classroom management practices. In this study, 30% of respondents reported no formal training in the four categories of evidence-based classroom management practices named. Also, only 70% of the participants reported using these practices in their classrooms (p. 21). Teachers in this study were more likely to experience preservice and in-service training related to antecedent-based practices (rules/expectations/room arrangement) than they were self-management practices and consequence-based practices. Like Flower et al. (2017), this study found that special education programs provide significantly more formal training in evidence-based classroom management strategies related to self-management practices and consequence-based practices. Researchers recommend a classroom management course with evidence-based classroom management practices for general education teacher candidates and added professional development for practicing teachers.

Some practicing teachers report feeling underprepared by their teacher preparation programs in classroom management (Chesley & Jordan, 2012; Stough, 2006). Stough et al. (2015) studied the opinions of practicing special education teachers regarding their preservice classroom management experiences in which all participants took coursework described as “relatively extensive” (p. 43). Survey answers revealed that 52% of teachers felt their classroom management coursework prepared them well or extremely well, 35% felt “somewhat” prepared,

and 13% felt underprepared or could not recall a classroom management course (p. 41). Overall, 83.9% would have liked more classroom management training. Teachers learned the most about classroom management or behavior intervention by teaching in their classrooms (61%), participating in preservice fieldwork (25.8%), taking coursework (24.4%), and substitute teaching (3.2%).

Preservice teachers also report insufficient classroom management training and feelings of under-preparedness to manage student behavior (Begeny & Martens, 2006; Chesley & Jordan, 2012; Freeman et al., 2014). Paquette and Rieg (2016) stress a need for more preservice teacher support in communication, classroom management, and discipline, as these three topics were named by early childhood preservice teachers as the main stressors within classroom settings. Eisenman et al. (2015) call for more “reality-based pedagogy” in classroom management preservice education (p. 2).

Classroom management coursework can improve teacher candidates’ feelings of preparedness, confidence, and familiarity. O’Neill and Stephenson (2012) studied the effects of classroom management coursework on preservice teachers’ preparedness, familiarity, and confidence using behavior management strategies in Australia. They found that teacher candidates who completed classroom management units reported feeling significantly more confident and prepared to address certain student behaviors than teacher candidates who did not finish the classroom management unit.

How do preservice teachers use classroom management strategies when they interact with students? Reupert and Woodcock (2010) surveyed 336 preservice teachers in Canada to understand the levels of use, confidence, and perceived effectiveness of classroom management strategies. Preservice teachers in this study reported using “initial corrective strategies” (close proximity, mentioning the student by name) most often even though they “reported that



preventative strategies were the most successful” (p. 1265). Preservice teachers were least likely to use “later corrective strategies,” which include exclusion from the classroom space and referral to professionals (p. 1265). Overall, preservice teachers were confident in using a wide range of strategies. However, high confidence correlated with high frequency, as they used the strategies they were most confident in more often. Preservice teachers closer to graduation were more likely to use preventative strategies than those in the beginning stages of their programs.

Thus, years of teaching experience seem to impact classroom management decisions after graduation, too. Glock and Kleen (2019) investigated differences between in-service teacher and preservice teacher responses to minor student misbehavior. They found that in-service teachers are more likely to choose lenient interventions, such as ignoring the behavior or nonverbal responses. In contrast, preservice teachers are more likely to choose suspension for student misbehavior. In the following section, I will briefly discuss teacher development and classroom management.

### ***Teacher Development and Classroom Management***

Emmer and Stough (2001) argue that teacher development of classroom management expertise is like Berliner’s (1988) theory of skill learning. Teachers develop classroom management expertise in a staged process through years of experience. Based on the work of M. Jones and Vesilind (1996), Emmer and Stough (2001) describe novice teachers’ perspectives during student teaching as incomplete and idiosyncratic. They note that novice teachers experience a discontinuity when encountering new teaching contexts (Bullough & Baughman, 1995; Cambone, 1994). Emmer and Stough (2001) argue that “knowledge of effective classroom management should, therefore, include adequate conceptualization (Brophy, 1999; Doyle, 1990), rather than being learned as discrete concepts and skills, and should give developing teachers a research-based heuristic for examining and formulating their views on management” (p. 109).

They argue that effective classroom management skill acquisition must be pragmatic—novice or preservice teachers must apply new knowledge in practical applications. They emphasize the importance of reflective-practitioner methods, which work “to situate classroom management within real-world contexts and events” (p. 110). Consequently, Emmer and Stough (2001) discuss methods to promote the reflective-practitioner approach (e.g., videos, case-based instruction, and the Professional Development School Model).

Novice teachers express concerns with classroom management. Many novice teachers report feeling underprepared to manage their classroom and student behavior as they begin their careers (Balli, 2009; Begeny & Martens, 2006; Chesley & Jordan, 2012; Melnick & Meister, 2008). Novice teachers report frustration due to a lack of support (Hung & Smith, 2012). They report occupational stress connected to classroom management and student discipline concerns (R. Lewis et al., 2005). Beginning teachers report lower confidence levels to address behavior and foster a disciplined learning environment than experienced teachers do (Melnick & Meister, 2008). Research lists student discipline and classroom management as contributing factors toward novice teacher attrition (Ingersoll, 2001; Watson, 2006).

Teachers, especially first-year teachers, want more professional development focused on classroom management. The American Psychological Association published results from a teacher needs survey in 2006. This survey focused on teachers’ needs in the four areas of instructional strategies, classroom management, classroom diversity, and parent or caregiver outreach. The convenience sample included 2,334 teachers, Pre-K through high school, from 49 states and the District of Columbia. When asked to prioritize options for professional development, 52% of the first-year teachers ranked classroom management as their number one choice over instructional skills, classroom diversity, and communication with families and caregivers. Teachers with more experience also expressed a need for support with classroom

management. About a quarter of teachers with 2-5 years of teaching experience and 6-10 years of teaching experience ranked professional development in classroom management as their first preference, 28%, and 26% respectively (Coalition for Psychology in Schools and Education, 2006).

Experienced teachers also want to learn more about classroom management. In a study of experienced teachers' preservice and in-service experiences related to classroom management, Stough et al. (2015) state that "teachers in this study overwhelmingly expressed their desire for more training in classroom management, not only as part of their university preparation but as part of their ongoing professional development" (p. 43). Experienced teachers believe that additional training in classroom and behavior management benefits both special and general education teachers (Stough et al., 2015). Thus, preservice, practicing, and experienced teachers think it is beneficial to learn more about classroom and behavior management (Stough et al., 2015). It is important to consider what professional development learning looks like after graduation.

**In-service professional development and classroom management.** Darling-Hammond et al. (2009) describe traditional professional development in the United States as "episodic, myopic, and often meaningless" (p. 2). It often consists of short-term conferences or workshops, university courses that lack a specific school-site or teacher challenge context, and visits to other schools for observation. In contrast, they describe effective professional development as sustained, intensive, and connected to practice. It should be context-specific, it should align with school initiatives, and it should foster collaboration between teachers (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009).

There are many approaches to classroom management professional development. For example, Thompson et al. (2012) describe three professional development strategies to support

teachers with classroom management. The first approach is meetings and workshops—a typical strategy that involves “passive listening to didactic instruction” (p. 522). The second approach is self-monitoring—a strategy where teachers self-monitor their behavior by collecting and analyzing data, reflecting on video recordings of their teaching, or listening to more anonymous voice recordings. The third approach is instructional coaching—an intensive strategy where the classroom teacher and a competent peer (coach) foster an ongoing collaborative relationship to address specific individual concerns (Guskey & Yoon, 2009). Approaches toward classroom management professional development vary in levels of implementation and effectiveness.

Further, Mitchell et al. (2017) propose a systems-based approach for in-service professional development using evidence-based classroom management practices and enhancements to teachers’ classroom and behavior management. Some of the suggested improvements include “clear expectations about a continuum of behavior management practices identified for use in every classroom, a commitment to and supports for ensuring implementation fidelity, and the use of teacher teams as a mechanism for acquiring and sustaining evidence-based management practices” (p. 152). They also recommended that in-service approaches for classroom and behavior management include a longer time frame, goal setting, a collaborative team process, data collection and feedback, collaboration with a peer or group of peers, and utilization of trainers and instructional coaches over time. The authors also stressed the need for a “continuum of evidence-based practices”; a staff committed to implementation; and a supportive staff, willing to collaborate (p. 150). Next, we look at what additional training teachers want.

Stough et al. (2015) asked experienced teachers about additional training, and 40% of the sample wanted additional training in “interactionalist whole-classroom management strategies,” meaning how “teachers create behavior systems in the classroom and how to involve students in

creating classroom rules and regulating their personal behavior” (p. 38). In this study, 25%, 25%, and 10% of teachers, respectively, wanted to learn more about “managing behaviors associated with particular disabilities,” wanted additional training in “other management or behavior-related training,” or they did not want additional training (p. 42). In this same study, teachers wrote about their participation in in-service professional development in classroom and behavior management. To further their classroom and behavior management knowledge, teachers attended workshops (87%), completed university coursework (21.7%), and worked with behavioral consultants (6.5%). They participated in a variety of programs, including “*Boys Town, Nonviolent Crisis Intervention, Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA), Capturing Kids’ Hearts, Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline, Building Better Boys, and Love and Logic* (p. 42).

Multiple approaches for ongoing teacher education on classroom management and student behavior exist. However, “the unfortunate reality is that the majority of educators receive very limited to no training in behavior and classroom management but are expected to meet the social/emotional needs of students who present daily challenges in the classroom” (Begeny & Martens, 2006) as cited in (Mitchell et al., 2017, p. 140). Next, I will discuss preservice teachers and authority.

### ***Teacher Preparation and Authority***

**Literature search.** A search of APA PsycArticles, eBook Collection (EBSCOhost), Education Source, ERIC, and APA PsycInfo for full text, peer-reviewed articles using (authority) AND (pre-service OR preservice OR novice OR student-teacher OR beginning teacher OR teacher candidate) in the subject terms resulted in 11 peer-reviewed articles published between 2000 and 2021. Most articles related to principals’ authority. Lai et al. (2015) and Pellegrino (2010) partially relate to this study (see Appendix A).

**Literature review.** Pellegrino (2010) qualitatively studied five (four male, one female) preservice teachers' classroom practices and authority. The participants completed surveys, classroom observations, personal journal entries, and focus group interview transcripts. The study utilized Weber's (1947) models of authority (*traditional*, *legal-rational*, and *charismatic*) as a conceptual framework to code data and organize and discuss preservice teacher authority. The preservice teachers in this study co- and solo- taught social studies for 14 weeks within a high school in the southeastern United States. The research notes variables of experience, including years of experience and authority style of mentor teachers, school demographics, and school enrollments of 600 to 2,700 students. Preservice teachers in this study relied on *charismatic* authority more than *traditional* authority, and there was minimal evidence of *legal-rational* authority. Concerning *traditional* authority, 80% of participants believed the teacher was the "supreme authority figure" (Pellegrino, 2010, p. 71). Lauren thought students obey because they feel a sense of duty based on her role and because of the social norms and expectations within school settings. Her mentor teacher relied on and modeled a traditional approach to authority that worked due to his status. In practice, she also relied on traditional authority, expecting students not to question rules and curriculum. Conflict ensued when students did not comply with the narrative that it was her class and her rules.

Preservice teachers' reliance on *charismatic* authority was often ineffectual. The three preservice teachers who relied heavily on *charismatic* authority exhibited challenges keeping students on task and engaged in learning, and they were often frustrated by disrespectful behavior. In relation to classroom management coursework in connection to classroom practice, no preservice teachers claimed to use classroom management skills from coursework, and four of the five preservice teachers stated in interviews and surveys that the classroom management content from coursework was not useful in practice. Classroom observations confirmed these

preservice teacher responses, as plans developed in classroom management courses were not observed in practice (p. 74). In conclusion, (Pellegrino, 2010) states, “In fact, practical experiences and critical self-reflection examining the dynamic nature of how one experiences classroom situations is perhaps more crucial to acknowledging the significance of establishing classroom authority based on legal and rational means, rather than relying on traditional authority paradigms or simply one’s charisma as a means to an effective classroom” (p. 75).

In a second article related to authority and preservice teacher experience, Lai et al. (2015) discuss how Chinese teachers navigate legitimate teacher authority (pedagogical and interpersonal) in cross-cultural preservice teaching contexts. Specifically, researchers asked, “How do the pre-service Chinese language teachers from mainland China perceive legitimate teacher authority during teaching practicum at international schools in Hong Kong?” (p. 421). Individual semi-structured interviews were conducted, at three intervals, among those participating in the same one-year teacher training program. Participants included 18 female preservice Chinese language teachers. Preservice teachers’ perceptions of legitimate teacher authority changed throughout their year-long experience. In initial interviews, before their school experience, participants emphasized pedagogical authority and mentioned strengthening disciplinary knowledge and improved teaching techniques as means to legitimate authority. They perceived interpersonal relationships as important but not critical to their success as teachers. After working with mentor teachers and students, preservice teachers began to realize that authority could not be assumed, as students were disrespectful and disengaged within their mentors’ classes. In subsequent interviews, after their practical experience, preservice teachers stressed the importance and interconnected nature of building positive relationships, so students are motivated and engaged. Of the participants, 16 preservice teachers viewed student-centered learning as an ideal way of asserting legitimate authority, but in practice they faced student and

time management challenges. Initial reflections on legitimate interpersonal authority show that preservice teachers foresaw befriending students and gaining admiration and respect through good intentions and knowledge they possessed. By observing the mentors at the international school, preservice teachers quickly learned that when they supported students' self-discipline in respectful and caring interactions, their legitimate authority was upheld. In practice, preservice teachers found that treating students as equals did not bode well, and, instead, they needed to enact a more balanced approach. Preservice teachers in this study faced cross-cultural challenges in establishing legitimate authority due to limited cultural knowledge and skills.

In a third publication, Elliott and Stemler (2008) emphasize the importance of professional authority in the teaching profession. They position traditional or bureaucratic authority as decreasingly relevant. Instead, they voice a need for preservice teachers to demonstrate expertise in the professional modes of "subject knowledge, pedagogical ability, and skill in managing complex interpersonal dynamics" to increase their professional authority (p. 86). Elliott and Stemler (2008) frame interpersonal skills as tacit and contextualized, making them more challenging to teach. They also maintain that behavior is teachable and tacit knowledge related to managing the complex personal interactions within classrooms does not have to come solely from years of experience and self-reflection after teachers are professionals.

Elliott and Stemler (2008) cite the work of Kounin (1970) and Kounin and Doyle (1975) in connection to professional authority and the skills of *withitness* and *overlapping*. *Withitness* relates to a teacher's ability to read the room. It is an awareness of all dynamics within the classroom environment. It involves the skills to read subtle environmental cues, the skills to differentiate between and address cues, and the ability to communicate awareness to students. *Overlapping* is a second skill involving teachers' ability to manage multiple events simultaneously. A third skill is non-verbal communication. Elliott and Stemler (2008) use



non-verbal behavior channels of space, body, face, visual behavior, and voice (Harper et al., 1978) to discuss how skilled teachers keep professional authority, and how non-verbal behaviors common to novice teachers undermine their authority and increase student misbehavior. Elliott and Stemler (2008) argue that preservice teachers with increased awareness, instruction, modeling, and practice with these skills convey expertise—and thus maintain professional authority—which helps them keep an orderly and productive classroom environment through decreased student misbehavior.

More research centered on both teacher and preservice teacher authority in school spaces is needed. In their review of theory, ideology, and educational research related to authority in classrooms, discussed earlier, Pace and Hemmings (2007) frame the topic of authority as “fundamental, problematic, and poorly understood” (p. 4). The authors state the “need for more interpretive studies that shed light on the construction of classroom authority in a variety of locations and that investigate the influence of current reforms and debates” (p. 6). Pace and Hemmings (2007) argue that classroom authority is complex, confusing, and contradictory. In educational research on classroom dynamics and teacher-student interactions, Pace and Hemmings (2007) highlight that “these studies have not included explicit and theoretically grounded analysis of teacher-student authority relations” (p. 5). Also, Macleod et al. (2012) confirm “a gap in empirical research on the topic of teachers’ authority” (p. 505). Further, Graça et al. (2013) assert that “the majority of existing studies on authority in an academic context are essentially focused on the effects of social inequalities and cultural domination in student resistance” (p. 1066). In effect, research often disregards the multifaceted and mutable relationships between individual students and authority figures, which results in an insufficient understanding of authority in the educational context (Pace & Hemmings, 2007). Pellegrino (2010) encourages studies related to preservice teachers and authority with more participants,

specializing in content areas other than social studies. The work of Pace and Hemmings (2006a) highlights the “importance of attending to authority in teacher education and professional development in ways that foster new strategies of action based on better understandings of students, racial issues and authority” (p. xiv). In the following section, I will revisit care in the context of teacher preparation.

### ***Teacher Preparation and Care***

Research and policy related to personal qualities within education are slim (Korthagen, 2004; Tickle, 1999). Korthagen (2004) explores a holistic model of teaching and teacher preparation. This theoretical model addresses the essential qualities of a good teacher and how to help people become good teachers. Korthagen (2004) proposes “the onion: a model of levels of change” (p. 80) and uses this model to discuss core qualities (Ofman, 2000) of good teachers and interventions to help teachers improve. Concentric circles or layers in the model include constructs capable of influencing each other. Each layer is of equal importance. The outermost layers are given the most attention by student teachers, research, and policy. These include the environment, teacher behaviors, and competencies. Korthagen (2004) focuses on the innermost levels of teacher beliefs, identity, and mission “because they have received far less attention in the literature on teaching and teacher education than the outer levels” (p. 93). The innermost layers are associated with personal qualities such as empathy, care, and trust. Korthagen (2004) recommends that practicing and preservice teachers “learn how they can get (back) in touch with their core qualities, and how they can stimulate these qualities in their students” (p. 93).

The research on preservice teachers and the construct of care is limited. However, Goldstein and colleagues published a series of studies on caring and preservice teaching in the late 1990s and early 2000s (Goldstein & Freedman, 2003; Goldstein & Lake, 2000, 2003). Goldstein and Lake (2000) found that preservice teachers’ “conceptions of the relationship

between teaching and caring were underdeveloped and limited” (p. 862). Goldstein and Lake (2003) studied how field placements impacted preservice teachers’ conceptions of caring and questioned the stability of preservice teachers’ beliefs over time. Like this study, their participants came from one class, and every student could participate. Preservice teachers in the small sample ( $n = 17$ ) identified as a range of ethnicities and one participant identified as male. Both researchers independently analyzed 170 electronic dialogue journal entries and used a cross-comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1994) to explore common themes. The results of Goldstein and Lake (2003) align with previous work (Goldstein & Lake, 2000) that “preservice teachers’ preconceptions about caring teaching were characterized by essentialism, oversimplification, and idealism” (Goldstein & Freedman, 2003; Goldstein & Lake, 2003, p. 121). Novice teachers in this study expressed confusion and uncertainty in connection to care and authority. Some preservice teachers wrote about authority and care as if they were mutually exclusive—an either/or choice. Others acknowledged the complexity and fluidity needed to balance roles as caring teachers and as professionals with authority. Preservice teachers’ opinions on caring did not change dramatically over time; their conceptions slowly progressed in complexity with experience (p. 128). Goldstein and Lake (2003) “contend that we need to develop an orientation toward teacher education in which preservice teachers’ pre-existing beliefs about caring and teaching are called into question, scrutinized critically, and then thoughtfully reintegrated into their evolving practices” (p. 129).

Like the work of Goldstein and colleagues, McBee (2007) sought to understand educators’ conceptualization of care. Most participants in this study were preservice teachers (124 preservice teachers, 13 classroom teachers, and seven college faculty). Collectively the 144 participants identified 78 characteristics of caring teachers. The six most common responses in order of frequency were to offer help, show interest in students, show compassion, give their

time, listen, and care about the individual. McBee highlights two themes evident in the data. First is the intentionality with which teachers get to know their students. Second is the varied and extensive methods and approaches teachers use to teach and model care. In conclusion, this study encourages teacher educators to model a list of actions (e.g., attentive listening, maintaining good eye contact, learning names, smiling, courteous interactions, greetings, send-offs, and respecting privacy) and modify their curriculum to include planned conversations, readings, case studies, and libraries addressing caring in schools (p. 41).

The work of Tickle (1999) argues that the current view of teaching is limited and limiting due to (1) the highly technical view of practice related to defined competencies, (2) a focus on classroom control and management, and (3) instruction based on the transmission of externally defined context knowledge (p. 121). Tickle (1999) argues a great need for consideration of the self in teacher preparation. He asserts that “in policy and practice the identification and development of personal qualities, at the interface between aspects of one’s personal virtues and one’s professional life, between personhood and teacherhood, if you will, has had scant attention” (p. 123). Tickle (1991, 1994, 1999) argues that the highly technical view of education fails to acknowledge and support the development of “the emotions associated with being a teacher and with the intense social interaction of teaching” (1999, p. 123). Tickle (1999) endorses an extension of teacher preparation content and methods to include attention to teacher qualities such as empathy, compassion, and understanding of social situations (p. 123).

The existing research on preservice teachers and care is limited and does not provide a clear picture of preservice teacher behavior related to caring, as I hope to frame it in my dissertation (see Appendix A). Studies use the work of Noddings (2013) and Gilligan (1993) to describe the theoretical origins of care in education, and they discuss preservice teachers’

oversimplified and limited conceptions of care. The current research studies preservice teachers' conceptions, not acts of care.

### **Chapter Summary**

We know that schools are generally safe (Musu et al., 2019), but violence (including threats) is problematic because it negatively impacts students, staff, and the community. Middle-school-aged students without weapons make the most threats (see Diliberti et al., 2017). Most students do not follow through with their threats (Burnette et al., 2018; Cornell et al., 2012; Nekvasil & Cornell, 2015)—meaning that threats of violence are often angry outbursts or challenges that do not result in violence (Nekvasil & Cornell, 2015). Importantly, threats may cause harm, interfere with learning or social relationships, cause concern for the teacher, and signify potential danger.

Teacher-student interactions are an integral part of research with students who present 'challenging behaviors.' Positive and negative interactions influence student outcomes (Reinke et al., 2016). Research supports the importance and influence of close teacher-student relationships for children and adolescents (J. Baker, 2006; J. Baker et al., 2008; Hamre & Pianta, 2001). Negative interactions with children are harmful, and the resulting relationships between teachers and students with 'challenging behaviors' are often more distant and adverse (Doumen et al., 2008; Henricsson & Rydell, 2004; G. Ladd & Burgess, 1999; Nurmi, 2012). Conflictual relationships are associated with negative school adjustment (Hamre & Pianta, 2001). Student demographics also impact interactions between teachers and students. Boys, students of color, and students living in low-income circumstances experience more negative interactions with their teachers than their peers (J. Baker, 2006; Saft & Pianta, 2001) and more office discipline

referrals, school suspension, and expulsion (Bradshaw et al., 2010; González, 2012; Losen & Skiba, 2010; Raffaele Mendez et al., 2002).

Effective classroom management strategies are well documented (Wubbels, 2011), and there is extensive research connecting classroom management practices and quality instruction (Brophy, 2006). However, a documented gap between research-based classroom management practices and current teacher preparation practices persists (Freeman et al., 2014). Present research reiterates preservice and practicing teachers' need for classroom management training in the form of dedicated courses and professional development from experts (Cooper et al., 2018; Flower et al., 2017). Stough and Montague (2015) argue for teacher preparation programs to provide intensive and integrated classroom management instruction. Work by Emmer and Stough (2001) argues for classroom management instruction that uses a "reflective-practitioner approach," is "pragmatic," and is situated "within real-world contexts and events" (p. 110).

We know that preservice and in-service teachers respond differently to student (mis)behavior (Glock & Kleen, 2019), and classroom management knowledge increases with classroom management experience (Voss et al., 2011). However, novice teachers feel underprepared to manage their classrooms (Balli, 2009; Begeny & Martens, 2006; Chesley & Jordan, 2012; Melnick & Meister, 2008). Also, policy reviews and survey research suggest that teachers do not receive adequate classroom management training (Beran, 2005; Oliver & Reschly, 2010). Preservice teachers are underprepared to effectively manage students' behaviors after graduation (Freeman et al., 2014). Also, most teacher preparation programs address classroom management strategies that work for most students and fail to specifically address skills and evidence-based practices to support children with more challenging behaviors (Flower et al., 2017, p. 167). We know that teachers want additional training in classroom and behavior management (Stough et al., 2015). However, many teachers receive inadequate behavior and

classroom management training and struggle to meet the social and emotional needs of their students (Begeny & Martens, 2006).

Tickle (1999) endorses an extension of teacher preparation content and methods to include attention to teacher qualities such as empathy, compassion, and understanding of social situations (p. 123). Goldstein and Lake (2003) call for teacher preparation experiences where teacher candidates can question, critique, and change their pre-existing conceptions of care in their practice (p. 129). McBee (2007) encourages teacher educators to model a list of caring actions and to include planned conversations, readings, case studies, and children's libraries addressing caring (p. 41).

Teacher preparation programs do not adequately prepare teachers to meet the social and emotional needs of students, the discipline demands, and the classroom management challenges. Research focused on preservice teachers' use of authority and care is limited. Existing research does not address how teacher candidates use dispositions of authority and care in interactions with students who threaten harm. Current research does not tell us how teacher candidates problem-solve with a student threatening harm (see Appendix A).

## **Chapter Three:**

### **Methodology (Simulation Design)**

A goal of qualitative research is to understand complex and nuanced human experiences and behavior (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). According to Bogdan and Biklen (1982), Qualitative researchers “seek to grasp the processes by which people construct meaning and to describe what those meanings are” (p, 43). The purpose of this study was to explore teacher candidates’ dispositions of authority, care, and disciplinary solutions to threatening behavior. This exploratory qualitative study used convenience sampling. The participants were teacher candidates in the middle stages of their preparation as primary and secondary teachers. My relationship with participants was virtual and one-sided, as I never interacted with participants. This reality contributed to a more detached and distant perspective, atypical of qualitative research.

### **Research Design**

This exploratory qualitative study was designed to investigate the interactions between teacher candidates and an upset adolescent student. I used 16 video-recorded clinical simulation sessions and four small-group debriefing sessions. This research study explored how teacher candidates communicated with an upset student who enacted threatening behaviors in schools.

My research questions were:

1. How do teacher candidates engage in a clinical simulation focused on threatening behavior in schools?
  - a. Do elements of authority emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student?



- b. Do elements of care emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student?
- c. What solutions emerge within the simulations? And do teacher candidates' solutions have elements of punitive, mild disciplinary, or restorative practices?

These questions addressed teacher candidates' use of authority, evidence of caring, and the solutions they proposed in a conversation with an upset student threatening to harm their peers. Answers to these questions are significant because they help researchers and practitioners understand how teacher candidates respond to children who threaten harm in school spaces. Improved understanding of teacher candidates' behavior during clinical simulations with standardized students has practical applications for teacher preparation programs (e.g., better preservice teacher preparation in disciplinary policy and practices, school resources, conflict resolutions, threatening behavior, etc.) (Booth et al., 2008).

This research project used clinical simulations as a methodology to investigate and explore my research questions. Thus, I begin this chapter with an extensive review of the literature on clinical simulation pedagogy. Then, I discuss the *Casey Butler* simulation specifically as the basis for this study by outlining topic selection, the standardized student, triggers, and implementation procedures. Next, I shift to a description of the research sites and participants. Finally, I discuss data collection, analysis, and interpretation using the analytical lenses of authority, care, and teacher candidate solutions.

### **Clinical Simulations Pedagogy**

This section discusses the past and current utilization of clinical simulation pedagogy in multiple professional preparation contexts. To begin, I outline a historical context and discuss terminology specific to clinical simulations. Next is a section on clinical simulations as

assessments. Then, I discuss the general advantages and disadvantages documented in the literature. A short section on relevant theories within this pedagogy follows. Last is a section on clinical simulations in teacher and administrator preparation.

Clinical simulations advance student learning through practice, feedback, and reflection in many professional preparation contexts. Students in medicine, therapy, and education interact with standardized patients and standardized individuals to advance their diagnostic, recording, and communication skills. These experiences let students grapple with challenging scenarios related to their professional trajectories in environments that protect patients and individuals. Participation in a clinical simulation means that students must be physically present and communicate in real-time with SIs. This process develops students' knowledge and skills in an applied setting. Clinical simulations allow students to make mistakes with limited risk. Instructors and organizations continue to use clinical simulations to assess, teach, and qualify their students. Medical professionals and instructors use clinical simulations in multiple summative assessments. Educational professionals and instructors use clinical simulations as a formative assessment and teaching tool. Clinical simulations are a platform for preservice teachers, practicing teachers, and administrators to practice and advance skills in specific situations critical to their professional success. In all clinical simulations, instructors are instrumental in attending to the details of the learning environment. They design the simulation and coach the SIs. In some medical cases, but not in teacher education, they pause the simulation and address concerns or answer questions. Instructors guide students' learning through debriefing and reflection in some medical cases and all teacher education cases.

### ***Historical Context***

Clinical simulations began in the early 1960s as a form of assessment for medical students. Howard Barrows and Stephen Abrahamson used programmed patients to rate students'

diagnostic and interpersonal performance in clinical neurology at the Los Angeles County Hospital (Barrows, 1993; Barrows & Abrahamson, 1964). Simulations in this context gave medical students access to SPs—individuals trained to communicate and portray specific medical conditions that they may or may not have, through both spoken and body language, consistently to more than one medical student over time (Barrows, 1993). Barrows and Abrahamson (1964) referred to the use of programmed patients as an “evaluative tool,” an “assessment technique,” and a “technique of measurement of clinical performance” (p. 805). Initially, the larger medical community did not universally nor quickly use SPs to assess clinical competence (Barrows, 1993). However, the use of clinical simulations as a summative assessment in medical-professional preparation has increased. Today, clinical simulations with SPs are a widely used, hands-on, and practice-based pedagogy within the medical community (Bolstad et al., 2012). In 2008, 95% of medical schools used clinical simulation in medical school training and assessment (Coplan et al., 2008).

Multiple professions use clinical simulations to prepare professional workers. The use of standardized or simulated patients is most common in medicine (Nestel et al., 2017), but extends to nursing (Bolstad et al., 2012; Ebbert & Connors, 2004; MacLean et al., 2017; Ryan et al., 2010; Shin et al., 2015), pharmacy (Blom et al., 2011; Dobson et al., 2007; Rickles et al., 2009; Schultz & Marks, 2007; Vyas et al., 2013; Westberg et al., 2006), athletic training (Armstrong & Jarriel, 2015, 2016; Edler et al., 2017; S. Walker et al., 2015), counseling (Baer et al., 2004, 2009; Haeseler et al., 2011; Hartzler et al., 2010), and preservice teacher and administrator education (B. Dotger, 2009, 2010, 2011a, 2011b; B. Dotger et al., 2008, 2011, 2015; B. Dotger & Ashby, 2010; S. Dotger et al., 2009).

## ***Terminology***

Clinical simulations are one form of professional preparation simulation. The term *simulation* defines multiple and varied experiences in professional preparation contexts. Ziv, Small, and Wolpe (2000) described the breadth of medical simulation as using simple models or manikins, animal models, human cadavers, simulated patients, SPs, screen-based simulators, realistic high-tech procedural simulators, virtual reality, and realistic high-tech interactive patient-simulators. This study used *clinical simulations*, a type of human simulation with standardized patients, standardized individuals, standardized parents, or standardized students. Within clinical simulations, the person trained or coached to interact with the professional or student in a standardized way is termed a programmed patient (Barrows & Abrahamson, 1964), simulated patient (Barrows, 1987), standardized patient (Barrows, 1993), standardized parent (Cil & Dotger, 2017; B. Dotger, 2009, 2010, 2011b, 2015; B. Dotger et al., 2008, 2011; S. Dotger et al., 2009), standardized student (B. Dotger, 2011b, 2015), standardized teacher (B. Dotger, 2011b), standardized individual (Cil & Dotger, 2015; B. Dotger, 2011a; B. Dotger et al., 2015; B. Dotger & Ashby, 2010), or simulated client (Baer et al., 2009). Terminology changes by professional field, by year, and based on the geographic location of the research. I differentiated the terms programmed, simulated, or standardized because the roles they describe are fundamentally different from actors, pseudo-patients, practical instructors, and patient instructors. Barrows (1987, 1993) differentiated and defined these terms for clarity, but I will not elaborate.

The work of Barrows and Abrahamson (1964) used the term programmed patients. This term evolved to simulated patients (Barrows, 1987). Following this, Geoff Norman defined and used the term standardized patients (Barrows, 1993). This change in terminology reflected the critical aspect of standardization, meaning SIs portrayed an illness or condition in the same way,

multiple times to individual students, whether or not the condition was real. Barrows (1993) encouraged the description standardized patients as an umbrella term for patients with both actual and simulated illnesses. Recent medical, nursing, and athletic training research from the United States used the term standardized patients. Similarly, current scholarship in the professional field of education used standardized parents and standardized individuals to describe those interacting with students during clinical simulations (Cil & Dotger, 2015, 2017; B. Dotger, 2009, 2010, 2011a, 2011b, 2015; B. Dotger & Ashby, 2010). Within the context of this dissertation, I used Geoff Norman's term, standardized patient, and B. Dotger's terms standardized parent, standardized individual, and standardized student.

### ***Theories and Conceptual Frameworks Relevant to Clinical Simulations***

The theoretical and conceptual foundations of clinical simulations guide decisions of process and procedure and support the pedagogical decisions guiding student learning (B. Dotger, 2013). On a foundational level, theories can help us better understand the inner workings of broad phenomena around us (e.g., learning, communication, identity, community, and interaction). Theory increases understanding by examining complex phenomena in more detail. This section summarizes the theories relevant to clinical simulations and explores novice teacher learning, communication, identity development, community, and interactions.

**Barrows design tenets.** Instructors carefully select the topics of clinical simulations. Barrows' (1987) four design tenets (prevalence, clinical importance/impact, social impact, and instructional importance) help instructors design clinical simulations across professional disciplines (p. 45-46). The prevalence tenet underpins clinical simulations on frequent experiences of practicing professionals (B. Dotger, 2015). The tenet of clinical importance/impact supports topics of high importance or impact and potentially rare occurrences. Social impact relates to simulation topics that strongly influence individuals or communities. The

focus of clinical simulations supported by the tenet of instructional importance is on specific skills or learning issues significant to student professional development and understanding (Barrows, 1987). Typically, clinical simulation topics are selected based on actual cases or situations reported by professionals, and they align with one or more of Barrows' tenets (Barrows & Tamblyn, 1980). However, the use of fictional cases also exists (Barrows, 1993).

**Situated cognition.** The theoretical framework of situated cognition suggests that knowledge imparted to students without a relevant social and physical context and professional culture is limiting and contradictory to current research on cognition. Brown et al. (1989) assert that to learn, not learn about, the teaching profession, “students need much more than abstract concepts and self-contained examples. They need exposure to the use of a domain’s conceptual tools in authentic activity—teachers acting as practitioners and using these tools in wrestling with problems of the world” (p. 34). It is critical to actively engage preservice teachers in authentic activities or “ordinary practices of the culture” so they can apply their knowledge using cognitive tools (J. Brown et al., 1989, p. 34). Brown et al. (1989) assert that knowing and doing during learning are not separate. People gain conceptual understanding within a context and culture of use through the process of teaching and learning.

The concept of cultures of use is an important idea to clarify within the theory of situated cognition. Brown et al. (1989) argue that knowledge is context- and culture-specific. Learning is an act of enculturation. People enculturate as they learn the nuances (social norms, jargon, and the expected and accepted behaviors) of a specific professional culture when they participate *in situ* (p. 34). People gain conceptual understanding when they use knowledge in practical and purposeful ways within the context of the actual professional culture. In sum, situated cognition emphasizes the importance of gaining conceptual understanding using knowledge actively through social negotiation in authentic activities within specific professional cultures of use.

One goal of schools is to prepare preservice teachers for professional success. Brown et al. (1989) argue that this can be a challenge because the cultures of school and the cultures of use are different in school. Schools often teach students in the absence of the authentic contexts provided within professional cultures of use. The classroom assignments students complete do not align with the actual activities of professionals for multiple reasons. The current structure of schools makes it challenging for students to engage in authentic ways. Schools and professional workspaces have separate and distinct cultures. When teachers bring authentic activities into classrooms, they automatically become classroom activities influenced by school culture (p. 34).

**Cognitive apprenticeship.** Cognitive apprenticeship, initially discussed by Collins et al. (1988), is included in situated cognition (J. Brown et al., 1989). Cognitive apprenticeship (J. Brown et al., 1989) is “the development of concepts out of and through continuing authentic activity” (p. 39). It is an idea in the ideas above—learning and cognition develop within physical and social contexts, and knowledge is the product of situations and activities involving people and tools (J. Brown et al., 1989; Putnam & Borko, 2000). People progressively develop skills over time in environments where they can make mistakes and receive feedback while engaged in action (J. Brown et al., 1989, pp. 32–33). Again, it is a focus on *authentic activities* (Putnam & Borko, 2000) that are coherent, meaningful, purposeful, and “ordinary practices of the culture” (J. Brown et al., 1989, p. 34). Learning through cognitive apprenticeships rejects the idea that teaching and learning are neutral and happen in isolation from culture, social interaction, and physical location. These apprenticeships involve enculturating “students into authentic practices through activity and social interaction” (p. 37). Cognitive apprenticeship supplies learners with opportunities to gain, hone, and practice cognitive tools through authentic learning experiences that involve apprenticeship, collaboration, and reflection. Student learning happens through conversation, narrative, coaching, and repetition (J. Brown et al., 1989).

**Situated learning theory.** Anthropologist Jean Lave and educational theorist Étienne Wenger developed a general theory of learning termed situated learning theory in the late 1980s (Lave & Wenger, 1991). This theory stems from their ethnographic work on apprenticeship (Wenger, 1998) and explores how people develop professional skills. This theory emphasizes the importance of engaging the whole person in and with the world to advance conceptual understanding. Situated learning theory claims that all learning is situated, meaning “learning is an integral and inseparable aspect of social practice” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 31). Situated learning theory acknowledges that (a) there is a complex relationship between knowledge and learning, (b) people negotiate meaning, and (c) learning stems from active engagement and problem-solving in social and cultural contexts (p. 33). This theory rejects the assumptions that (a) learning takes place solely within an individual, (b) learning is the result of direct instruction by a teacher, and (c) learning happens in isolation from other activities (Wenger, 1998).

Situated learning theory is not without critique. In response to criticism, Lave and Wenger further defined their theoretical work by connecting their theory to a specific analytical approach to learning, the concept of legitimate peripheral participation in connection to communities of practice. According to Lave and Wenger (1991), legitimate peripheral participation is “a descriptor of engagement in social practice that entails learning as an integral constituent” (p. 35). Specifically, Lave and Wenger (1991) defined legitimate peripheral participation as a specific analytical approach to learning within the broader situated learning theory and explained how legitimate peripheral participation results in membership within communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 31).

**Communities of practice.** Etienne Wenger’s (1998) concept of *communities of practice* encompasses the idea that humans pursue joint enterprises through mutual engagement with a shared repertoire (p. 73). Communities of practice are cultures with specific uses of



knowledge and tools. Members learn through social interaction with each other and the world. These communities weave together individual social roles, habits, customs, and responsibilities into a collective learning experience. Members engage in individual and social activity as they create meaning through action—actions of perception and interpretation or physically making something tangible, like an object or piece of writing. Communities of practice are all around us and are integral to our daily lives. Individuals may belong to multiple communities of practice at any one time.

In schools, communities of practice form in the classroom or on the playground. They can be formal or informal. Communities of practice are communities of people created over time and sustained through shared enterprises (Wenger, 1998). Communities of practice are powerful places of learning. Wenger (1998) argues that “in spite of curriculum, discipline, and exhortation, the learning that is most personally transformative turns out to be the learning that involves membership in these communities of practice” (p. 6). The work of engagement is central to the formation of communities of practice. However, imagination, alignment, and engagement transform a community of practice into a community of learning (p. 187).

The ideas of Lave and Wenger (1991) have influenced teachers and researchers since their publication in the early 1990s (Korthagen, 2010). However, their work is not without critique. Anderson, Reder, and Simon (1996) critiqued four claims of situated learning (Originally published in a 1994 report by The National Research Council). First, they argue that it is inaccurate to presume that *all* knowledge connects to context (p. 6). Second, they argue that the claim that *all* knowledge is non-transferable to real-world applications is false, based on a large body of psychology research. Instead, knowledge transfer varies on a continuum by amount and type (positive or negative). The third claim they argue is that “training by abstraction is of little use” (p. 8). The fourth claim Anderson et al. (1996) dispute is that (a) learning is a social

phenomenon and (b) learning should center on complex problems. In response to their critique, Anderson et al. (1996) propose that (a) cognition is both context-dependent and context-independent, (b) that knowledge is transferable in some instances and non-transferable in others, (c) that a combination of abstract instruction and concrete examples is more powerful than either one independently, and (d) that not *all* skills needed for successful job performance should be taught in a social context because “some performances benefit from training in a social context, others do not” (p. 10).

### ***Clinical Simulation and Assessment***

Professionals use clinical simulations as summative and formative assessments in the medical profession (Epstein & Hundert, 2002). A literature review on assessment and professional competence in medicine concluded that standardized patient assessments are one of the top three assessments used in medical professional preparation (Epstein & Hundert, 2002). Hauer et al. (2005) conducted a survey-based study on clinical skills assessment implementation in the United States and found that “the majority of medical schools nationally have implemented comprehensive clinical skills assessments using standardized patients during the third and fourth years of medical school” (p. S28).

Multiple summative assessments use SPs for professional preparation in medicine. Medical professionals initially used SPs in clinical simulations to assess clinical competence in what Barrows (1993) describes as “multi-station examinations” (p. 443). Multi-station examinations to assess clinical competence and add to the traditional written and oral examination data would exclusively note clinical competence without considering actual clinical behavior. The Clinical Practice Examination (CPX) is a summative multi-station assessment during which senior medical students might spend over two days interacting in 17-18 clinical simulations lasting about 20 minutes each. This exam allows medical students to experience

“an entire encounter with a patient from beginning to end” and supplies valid and comprehensive assessment data for instructors (Barrows, 1993, p. 447).

The second form of summative assessment using SPs is the Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE). The OSCE is a timed examination to assess the competence of future medical professionals in varied clinical skills (Epstein, 2007; Epstein & Hundert, 2002; Sando et al., 2013) and covers “problem solving, communication skills, decision-making and patient management abilities” (Zayyan, 2011, p. 222). As of 1996, most OSCEs use SPs (Martin et al., 1996; Zayyan, 2011), and since 2004 this examination is part of the U.S. Medical Licensing Examination needed by all senior medical students (Epstein, 2007).

A third summative assessment using SPs is the Clinical Skills Assessment (CSA) (Boulet et al., 2002). A passing grade on this performance-based assessment is essential for graduates of international medical schools who wish to enter postgraduate medical training programs in the United States. The purpose of the CSA is to prove proficiency in English language skills comparable to those graduating from United States medical schools.

Instructors use clinical simulations as a formative assessment to evaluate students’ skills, attitudes, and knowledge in professional preparation contexts. Formative assessments are informal evaluation tools to assess student knowledge at specific points in time so teachers can change future instruction or learning opportunities. In other words, these assessments inform teaching and help teachers adapt instruction to meet learners’ needs (Black et al., 2003). When the design of clinical simulations supplies feedback and addresses misconceptions and errors in practice, they serve as formative assessments.

Methods of formative assessment in medical clinical simulations include checklists, verbal feedback, and the “time in-time out” technique. Barrows developed the “time in-time out” technique at McMaster University (Barrows, 1987, 1993). While using this technique, instructors

or facilitators can call “time out” as a group of medical students works with an SP. The SP freezes and avoids interaction with those in the room during the time out. The instructor(s) and medical student(s) then engage in conversation centered on feedback to the learner(s) (Barrows, 1987). After a feedback session, the instructor(s) call(s) a “time in” and the simulation resumes. One cited advantage of the “time in-time out” technique is access and timeliness—this technique allows instructors to address student behavior or communication in real-time.

One frequent form of written feedback during medical clinical simulations is case-specific binary checklists. Medical professionals, instructors, or the SPs complete checklists to assess medical and nursing students’ clinical competence and interpersonal skills during the clinical simulation (Barrows, 1993; Boulet et al., 2002). Participants often receive verbal or written feedback after the simulation is complete. Instructors use clinical simulations as an instructional tool when committed to formative assessment. In the medical community, the clinical simulations used as formative assessments are untimed (Sando et al., 2013). Formative feedback informs the participant and improves their practice over time.

Clinical simulations and the use of SPs for assessment purposes have many cited advantages within the literature. The use of SPs in assessments supports versatility and is adaptable (Vu & Barrows, 1994; Zayyan, 2011). Simulated patient interactions supply flexibility to challenge students across a broad range of issues and necessary skills (Barrows, 1987). The use of SPs also decreases measurement errors by increasing uniformity through standardization (Martin et al., 1996). Experiences and scores derived from interactions likely differ during an assessment when students interact with real patients. There is a reduced variability of experience in clinical simulations because SPs portray their illness or condition in a manner consistent with their training (Barrows, 1987), and they show high consistency of portrayals (Tamblyn et al.,

1991; Vu et al., 1992). Lastly, using SPs in assessments supplies objectivity and reduces bias (Barrows & Tamblyn, 1980; Islam & Zyphur, 2007).

***General Advantages and Disadvantages of This Pedagogy.***

There are many advantages of this pedagogy. The use of simulations and SPs solves access, timing, and space challenges (Barrows, 1987, 1993). SPs are more accessible than actual patients for training and examination purposes. They can come to locations other than hospitals, such as classrooms and non-traditional spaces, at times that work for students and facilitators (Barrows, 1993). This pedagogy provides space, time, and structure for medical students to practice communication and diagnostic skills face-to-face with other human beings (Barrows, 1993).

This pedagogy has the advantage of control. Clinical simulations allow facilitators increased control over student learning goals, the physical environment, and the clinical experiences students experience. Within residency programs and patient rounds, students engage in many medical situations that may differ from their peers. Clinical simulations let educators create uniform and collective experiences for their students (Armstrong & Jarriel, 2016; Arthur, 1999; Barrows, 1993; Islam & Zyphur, 2007). The use of SPs gives instructors the ability to provide students with clinical experiences they may not otherwise experience (Armstrong & Jarriel, 2016) and provides opportunities for all learners to work with challenging patients and difficult scenarios (Barrows, 1987). There is a level of risk when medical students interact with real patients. Within simulations, medical students or professionals interact with trained individuals and learn with a decreased risk to human life and wellness (Barrows, 1993; Galloway, 2009; Gibbons et al., 2002; Ziv et al., 2000).

Clinical simulations provide a physical environment supportive of learning and reflection. They are a space for students to connect theory with practice (Cil & Dotger, 2017; Ziv

et al., 2000). This pedagogy works well for novice learners because it provides practice and builds confidence (Barrows, 1987). Clinical simulations with SPs also offer insight into students' clinical behavior (Barrows, 1993).

Beullens et al. (1997) discuss the advantages and disadvantages of using SPs in an analysis of 31 sources in medical and general practice literature (p. 59). The disadvantages include 1) limited physical conditions and symptoms that SPs can portray, 2) a limited number of physicians or students that can participate simultaneously, and 3) limits to how much one can learn about medical decision-making over time because most clinical simulations within the general practice literature are a first time encounter, meaning that it is the first time a physician or medical student meets with the standardized patient (Gerritsma & Smal, 1988).

SPs have limitations. For example, SPs must match the demographics of the patient they portray, and they must allow for examinations that are consistent with their symptoms. The literature cites levels of commitment by SPs as a limitation. Instructors expect SPs to learn the case, the details of specific professions, and rater responsibilities (Beullens et al., 1997).

Psychological problems and stress SPs may experience are disadvantages. Stressors range from the emotional impact of real patients presenting their cases repetitively to the embarrassment simulated patients experience when asked for details about their condition (Beullens et al., 1997). Some SPs express deficits in emotional energy when a real-life experience like death or divorce coincides with their work as a standardized patient (Woodward & Gliva-McConvey, 1995).

Time and cost are two other limitations (Epstein, 2007; Hauer et al., 2005). However, Barrows (1993) rebuts the time argument and states, "A good simulation can be produced, with someone who has never been a standardized patient before, in approximately two to three hours" (p. 445). B. Dotger (2013) argues that clinical simulations are not cost-prohibitive (p. 53-54).

### *A History of Clinical Simulations at Syracuse University*

Clinical simulations in the context of teacher preparation are “close approximations of daily practices that support teacher learning and development” (B. Dotger, 2013, p. xi). Clinical simulations in teacher preparation have a general objective “to challenge a PST [preservice teacher] to engage, make decisions, and communicate as the licensed teacher she or he is preparing to become, working directly with the (standardized) student or parent sitting at the table to address her or his scholastic and sociocultural contexts, questions, and concerns” (B. Dotger, 2015, p. 216). All clinical simulations share one concept: the preservice teachers engage one-to-one and face-to-face with SIs and the interactions are recorded for later video analysis (B. Dotger, 2015, p. 217).

In early 2007 Professor B. Dotger, in collaboration with SUNY Upstate Medical University and Steve Harris, began using clinical simulation pedagogy as an instructional tool in teacher preparation at Syracuse University. B. Dotger taught a class to undergraduate education majors using six clinical simulations with a general focus on preservice teacher engagement with standardized parents (B. Dotger et al., 2010). The six clinical simulations were designed as a teaching tool to help practicing and preservice teachers develop communication and listening skills (Bolstad et al., 2012), bridge theory and practice (B. Dotger, 2015; B. Dotger et al., 2010; B. Dotger & Ashby, 2010), actively address parental concerns (B. Dotger, 2015), and increase multicultural and moral/ethical awareness and sensitivity (B. Dotger, 2010).

In 2008-2009, this pedagogy quickly broadened to include a learner and a standardized individual (e.g., teacher, parent, student) in the form of 12 school leadership clinical simulations. B. Dotger aimed to create simulations grounded in Barrow’s tenet of prevalence and named the most common situations licensed school leaders or teachers encounter on the job. By late 2017, there were 57 clinical simulations in teacher education, administrator education and counseling

education. A current focus is on elementary math classrooms and the Next Generation Science Standards and the experiences of veterans new to college campuses.

Syracuse University was the first university to use clinical simulation pedagogy in teacher preparation. However, over time more schools adopted and adapted this pedagogy. According to B. Dotger (2015), in 2015 four other teacher preparation programs used clinical simulations, designed at Syracuse University, as part of their teacher preparation programs.

Each clinical simulation in teacher and administrator preparation at Syracuse University follows a consistent pattern of events. Clinical simulation design is rooted in the literature and considers Barrows' tenets. The instructor writes SI protocols to support live simulations and meets in training sessions with local actors. A space for the clinical simulations is prepared to ensure working technology, privacy, and separation between student participants and SIs. The instructor creates a schedule to organize the multiple simultaneous simulations. The student participants receive a two-page Interaction Protocol a few days before the clinical simulation. This document ensures that the student participants enter the clinical simulation prepared with background information and context. Before entering the clinical simulation room, preservice teachers answer three questions. After entering the simulation room, they wait for a knock on the door by the SI. Preservice teachers actively and independently take part in the clinical simulation with the SI. No one interrupts the clinical simulation once it begins (except when the clinical simulations extend beyond a time limit). After the simulation, the student participants have multiple modes of reflection: raw reflection and data-based reflection (Cil & Dotger, 2017; B. Dotger, 2010, 2015; S. Dotger et al., 2009).



## **The Casey Butler Simulation**

In 2011-2012 as part of a grant from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations, Professor B. Dotger and colleagues developed a series of clinical simulations connected to specific secondary education content areas. The *Casey Butler* simulation was one of these simulations and was the first simulation specifically designed for a secondary education context that involved a standardized student. Undergraduate education majors in either the secondary or PreK-12 education programs at a private university in the northeastern United States participate in six clinical simulations as part of a teacher preparation foundations course. The use of this clinical simulation has increased over time. It has been implemented every semester since the spring of 2019. When integrated into the teacher preparation course, the *Casey Butler* simulation is always the third of six clinical simulation experiences.

### ***Topic Selection***

Barrows' design tenets are a theoretical framework common to clinical simulations in medicine. When instructors select and design clinical simulations for teachers and teacher leaders, they also consider Barrows' four tenets of prevalence, clinical importance/impact, social impact, and instructional importance (Barrows, 1987). Many clinical simulations address the tenet of prevalence (B. Dotger, 2011b). Another tenet is clinical impact which refers to a topic of high importance or impact that may or may not, rarely happen in the lives of practicing professionals. B. Dotger designed the *Casey Butler* simulation based on Barrows' tenet of clinical impact (B. Dotger, 2015) as explained in the following statement:

Directly engaging with a student who threatens physical violence may be a more or less prevalent situation for licensed teachers. Mishandling the situation—not giving Casey's words appropriate consideration or grossly overreacting to her outburst—holds

potentially high consequences for Casey and the health/safety of other students. (B. Dotger, 2015, p. 219)

This statement supplies the rationale behind the simulation design. It highlights the importance of teacher candidates' responses—connecting teacher candidates' actions or inactions with possible consequences for those involved.

### ***The Standardized Student: Student Casey Butler***

This clinical simulation is unique because it uses a standardized student. In preparation for this clinical simulation, Professor B. Dotger and colleagues recruited six actors from the theatre department at Stratus University. The director of the clinical skill center selected college-age actors who could reasonably portray 15, 16, or 17-year-old students. The Principal Investigator (PI) trained both male and female actors as SIs for the *Casey Butler* simulation during a single 2-hour session held approximately 3-5 days before the clinical simulation (B. Dotger, 2013, p. 22). The PI used a detailed Standardized Student Interaction Protocol (see Appendix B) to coach the SIs. This document is about 1,900 words and provides the actors with the following information:

- 1) demographic details
- 2) conference type
- 3) a page of text outlining the family background and dynamics
- 4) specific characteristics and background knowledge
- 5) triggers (specific verbal statements and non-verbal mannerisms described as information and questions to present to each teacher candidate during each simulation).

Standardized students were encouraged to review and practice their character outside of the training session using the Standardized Student Interaction Protocol for reference.

The standardized students in this clinical simulation portray a student named Casey Butler. Casey is described as a 15-year-old adolescent, who is experiencing taunting by two peers on the bus rides to and from school. Casey believes this taunting may be related to their mother, who has a history of substance abuse and is currently incarcerated; Casey overheard two boys on the bus say, ‘drugs’ and ‘mom.’ In the hallway before the start of school, Casey mentions to two friends a desire to retaliate against the two boys believed to be taunting. While on hall duty that morning, the teacher candidate overhears Casey stating, “He pisses me off so much. I may just have to kick his ass to shut him up!” In direct response, the teacher candidate requests a short one-on-one conference with Casey before the start of the school day. Within the clinical simulation that follows, each teacher candidate converses with Casey. The teacher candidate does not know Casey and is unaware of the events leading up to Casey’s veiled threat and use of obscenities.

### ***Triggers***

The Principal Investigator trains the standardized students to adhere to the triggers. When triggers present, they are coached to behave and speak consistently—they respond to verbalizations and body language that the teacher candidate may or may not exhibit. For example, the standardized students only communicate their mother’s struggles with substance abuse *if* the teacher candidate asks directly about her/his parents or home life (see Appendix B). If asked directly about their mother, they are to provide limited information defensively and abruptly. Teacher candidates will learn more if they actively question because the standardized students are coached not to pour out a detailed and complete story after a single question. A series of questions by the teacher candidates should guide the standardized student’s responses. Finally, if the teacher candidate assigns the consequence of reporting the threat to the principal’s office, the standardized student is instructed to respond “whatever” in a snide tone and look at

the floor for the rest of the conference.

Teacher candidate responses to verbal and non-verbal triggers vary, influencing the conference outcome. The data-based reflections are organized based on teacher candidates' responses to the triggers. The video clips students choose to present are organized by trigger during data-based reflections. This way the class can view, discuss, and reflect on multiple approaches to the same trigger. Table 1 notes the triggers associated with the *Casey Butler* simulation.

**Table 1**

*Triggers within the Casey Butler Simulation*

Trigger	Standardized student response	Notes
When you step into the teacher's classroom...	Shake hands if he/she offers a handshake. If not, don't shake hands. You should appear sullen and defensive, but not scared.	
Initial question from the teacher candidate...	"I know they were talking about me, and I'm gonna take care of it!"	You are not using the same language with the teacher as you used with the boys on the bus or that you used in recounting the story to your friends in the hallway. However, if the teacher asks for exactly what happened on the bus, use the exact language.
If the teacher begins asking you questions about <i>why</i> the boys would have been talking about you or <i>why</i> you verbally lashed out at them, use the following triggers...	"People need to mind their own business and stay out of my life!" "There's stuff going on at home, that's all." "My dad works hard and we're doing ok; it's just a rough time."	
If the teacher asks about your mom...	Tell him/her your home situation in a very abrupt, defensive, matter-of-fact tone of voice: "Look, my mom's in jail, ok. She has a drug problem and she's in jail!" You can and should say more to the teacher if prompted – using your	You should not mention your mom unless the teacher asks you directly. Do not just pour out all the details – let the teacher's questions – if they are

	notes from this document – but let the teacher guide you through this.	asked – draw the answers out of you.
After you've given all the info you've been prompted for by the teacher...	Resort to being sullen, defensive, and quiet for the rest of the conference.	Let the teacher guide/facilitate this conference from this point forward.
If the teacher indicates that your use of language and threats in the hallway will mean that you have to go down to the principal's office...	Reply by simply saying, "Whatever" in a snide voice and then look at the floor until the conference is over.	

---

*Note.* Reference Appendix B for more detail.

### ***Implementation Procedures***

The *Casey Butler* simulation is one of six clinical simulations facilitated during a semester-long course taught by B. Dotger and colleagues. IRB granted permission to use the *Casey Butler* simulation video recordings for research in 2011-2012. All students enrolled in a semester-long course instructed by Professor B. Dotger were given consent forms in January 2016. On April 21, 2016, the 16 teacher candidates who consented and were present were video recorded during their simulations and debriefing sessions. In October of 2021, Professor B. Dotger filed an amendment to the original IRB, adding me as research staff. Quickly thereafter, it was approved, and the process of video transcription and data analysis began.

All data was securely stored and, in compliance with the original IRB document, on a closed-loop server located on the university campus that hosted the clinical simulations. Upon IRB approval, the video data became accessible to me in a password-protected shared space. Professor B. Dotger stores the consent forms in a locked file cabinet in his office. I coordinated efforts with Professor B. Dotger to verify participants based on signed consent forms during the IRB amendment process. Documents, such as the course syllabus and protocols, transcripts of the clinical simulations and debriefing sessions, as well as video-recorded interviews with

Professor B. Dotger, are stored on a password-protected computer. I use pseudonyms for all participants and have taken reasonable actions not to identify specific places.

The general routines related to the teacher candidate experience during the *Casey Butler* simulation are relevant. These routines provide a contextual understanding of this pedagogy. Before the simulation, each teacher candidate reads the Teacher Interaction Protocol—Standardized Student Interaction (see Appendix C). This document is approximately 600 words in length and provides contextual details such as (1) who initiated the conference; (2) where the teacher candidate works; (3) their responsibilities within the school; (4) details of the observed interaction between the three students and their communication (i.e., Casey and their two friends); and (5) intervention and request for a conference in the hall at the start of the school day. The teacher candidate should read this document carefully before the simulation.

The teacher candidate is prepared but *not* coached or scripted in any way before the clinical simulation (B. Dotger, 2013). Three simulations typically run simultaneously. Teacher candidates answer three questions on computers outside the entrance just before entering the simulation rooms. The purpose of these questions is to gather the teacher candidates' feelings and thoughts about the simulation and to provide a snapshot of what their approach may be in the minutes before they enter their respective simulation rooms to wait briefly. It is not typical for the clinical simulation to be interrupted. However, the facilitator will knock and say that the teacher candidate is needed for another meeting if a simulation extends beyond a certain time. Participants in this simulation have limited time because it is situated just before the start of the academic school day.

Teacher candidates participate in “raw reflections” and “data-based reflections” (B. Dotger, 2013, p. 59). These reflections serve as debriefing experiences following the completion of the clinical simulation. After their clinical simulation, teacher candidates enter a room to

collectively debrief their experience in the form of raw reflection guided by a facilitator. Teacher candidates can talk about their experience while it is still fresh during this initial small group debrief. It serves “to capture the immediate, visceral reactions the teacher exhibits in response to the problem-of-practice s/he just experienced in the simulation” (B. Dotger, 2013, p. 59). The clinical simulation facilitator asks a series of planned questions focused on how the teacher candidate feels and their first thoughts about the simulation. These more general questions are followed-up with specific questions like, in the case of the *Casey Butler* simulation, “Did you find out about mom?” Teacher candidates may reflect upon things they forgot to do, or they may talk about the things they did well.

Following the clinical simulation and a small group debrief, each teacher candidate has time to review a recording of their clinical simulation. The teacher candidates identify things they did well and things they feel need improvement. They choose two video clips to share with their peers during a whole-group data-based reflection session (B. Dotger, 2013, p. 60). These sessions occur a few days to a week later and typically last 2.5 hours. The discussion format within these larger debrief sessions is more prescribed than the initial post-simulation debriefs/raw reflections. Teacher candidates introduce their scene selection with a sentence or two—setting the stage by explaining *what* the audience will see and *why* they chose the clip. The teacher candidate may ask for feedback from peers or to “have the last word” (B. Dotger, 2013, p. 61) after the video clip plays. Teacher candidates often ask for peer feedback. A three-page deconstruction of the simulation is due three weeks after the clinical simulation. Teacher candidates have access to their video and a response template consistent across all six simulations in the course.

## Research Sites

This study uses two sites. In the first, participants attended Central University and walked to the clinical simulation facility within Stratus Medical University for class. Central University is a private university in the Northeastern United States. This institution works to meet pressing global needs through research. Enrollment is 22,850, and 52% of the students identify as white. The university welcomes and supports minority and international students who represent close to 25% and 20% of the student population. Participants in this study are students in the school of education, one of 13 of the University's schools and colleges. The second site is Stratus Medical University. Stratus Medical University is within walking distance from Central University. It has a comprehensive clinical simulation facility where participants in this study engaged in clinical simulations and debrief sessions as part of a course at Central University.

## Participants

Participants in this study are teacher candidates in the second year of a four-year teacher preparation program at Central University. The undergraduate students in this study are students in either secondary or PreK-12 education programs. Participants in this study took a semester-long course including six clinical simulations, of which the interaction with Casey Butler was third. The introductory course supports the practice of critical examination and reflection in multiple teaching areas (for example, standards, assessment, interpersonal and professional relationships, the use of technology, and leadership roles). To make informed and just choices as current students, and future teacher leaders, teacher candidates define relevant and important questions to ask themselves, their instructors, and their coursework during this course.

Hundreds of teacher candidates have participated in the *Casey Butler* simulation. However, limited permissions to analyze the video reduces the data set. Professor B. Dotger



collected data for this study in the spring of 2016. There are 16 participants. Most teacher candidates, 17 of 19, signed consent forms agreeing to engage fully in the *Casey Butler* simulation and permitted video analysis for research purposes. However, one teacher candidate was absent on the day of the simulation, April 21, 2016. Data includes videos of 16 one-on-one clinical simulations with teacher candidates and Casey Butler, and videos of four small group debriefing sessions. There is video footage featuring two camera angles for 15 participants and one camera angle for one participant.

Demographic information for this study is presumed because I do not have access to student rosters. At the date of this simulation, it is presumed that eight teacher candidates identified as female, and eight teacher candidates identified as male. All teacher candidates in this sample were in the beginning to the middle stages of their teacher preparation (the second year of a four-year teacher preparation program). Most participants ranged in age from 19 to 22 years of age, with two non-traditional teacher candidates closer to age 30. Most teacher candidates completed a course on educational psychology before data collection.

## **Data**

### ***Collection***

Professor B. Dotger and colleagues collected data for this study in 2016. It consists of video-recorded clinical simulations and small group debriefing sessions. I conducted two interviews with Professor B. Dotger and reviewed the EDU304: The Study of Teaching syllabus to understand more about the development and implementation of clinical simulations in general. I read the Standardized Student Interaction Protocol and the Teacher Interaction Protocol—Standardized Student Interaction (Appendices B and C) to learn more about the *Casey Butler* simulation. We discussed data protection and ethics.

Clinical simulations began and are common practice in medical schools nationwide. Architects design the spaces to support clinical simulation teaching and assessment practices. As a result, facilities are often built specifically for clinical simulation use. Teacher candidates participated in the clinical simulations for this study at a clinical simulation facility within a nearby medical school. The building hosts a series of clinical simulation rooms—separate spaces for teacher candidates and standardized students—as well as a computer lab to view clinical simulation videos, and a large classroom equipped with technology to debrief clinical simulations. Specifically, the building has concentric and separate spaces, so teacher candidates or medical students do not see or interact with SIs outside the clinical simulation. In each clinical simulation room, the SI and teacher candidates sit at a table facing each other. Each room has two doors, cameras, and microphones. Two microphones clustered with two cameras directly behind and slightly overhead the teacher candidate and the SI pick up audio and video. As a result, one camera angle is slightly above and looking at the teacher candidate. One camera angle is slightly above and behind the teacher candidate—with an angle that includes the back of the teacher candidate and the front of the SI. The frame of one recording shows the teacher candidate, and the frame of the second recording includes both people in the room.

### *Analysis and Interpretation*

The data for this study consists of video-recordings of clinical simulations and debriefing sessions. All videos (16 clinical simulations and four debriefing sessions) were transcribed using Rev.com. The videos and transcripts were then uploaded to a shared drive for password-protected remote access. Once granted access to the data, I created pseudonyms and edited file names to protect participants' privacy. I familiarized myself with this data set by briefly opening all the videos to make sure they played and by noting specific details. I noted the start and end times of each video to calculate conversation lengths. I noted the presumed gender of each

teacher candidate and the presumed gender of the standardized student they interacted with. I assigned a number and a clothing descriptor to each standardized student. I then created a series of memos with tables and notes. One table included pseudonyms, presumed demographic information, and standardized student identifiers. The second table included the presumed gender of the participants, conversation starting and ending time stamps, and a total conversation length for each participant. From this data, and using Excel, I was able to outline the longest, shortest, median, and average conversation lengths for all 16 participants, for the eight male participants, and for the eight female participants separately.

After this, I began to systematically code the data. I used deductive coding and relied on an initial set of predetermined codes organized in a codebook (Appendices I, L and O). The predetermined codes were based on theoretical frameworks and constructs within my predetermined research questions, e.g., types of authority, acts of care, restorative, mild disciplinary and punitive practices, etc. (Cil & Dotger, 2015). Like the work of Cil and Dotger (2017), I used codes based on theoretical frameworks to increase external reliability (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). Using the coding method of Lincoln and Guba (1985), I first coded a subset of the transcripts using the predetermined codes within my initial code book to ensure fit. I expected the predetermined codes in my codebooks to change. I added to and modified existing codes as the coding of the data proceeded. I analyzed the coded material for patterns and themes evident in the collective data set.

As I began coding transcripts for authority, I created coding criteria reference sheets to support coding consistency (Appendices D, E and F). If there are two or fewer lines of dialogue between similarly coded excerpts, I count them as one code example. I count the similarly coded text as one example when there are multiple codes present in one paragraph but like codes repeat. I count the similarly coded text as two examples if there is one code example, then Casey

speaks, then there is a different code, then there is a repeat of the first code. Subcode excerpts also follow these guidelines. For example, when coding for evidence of authority, there are numerous subcodes under each authority type. Different subcodes in the same paragraph but under the main code of legitimate authority are coded separately. There are exceptions when I analyze coded material for patterns after the coding process. For example, in my analysis of individual codes, I sometimes subdivide a single code example into two or three subcode categories (e.g., responsibility to Casey and advise against violence).

I simultaneously coded select excerpts in this study. Simultaneous coding occurs 10 times for authority, 41 times for care, and three times for solutions (Appendices G, H and I). It is important to note that all simultaneous coding for care occurs due to the code *All Questions*, as I coded all the questions teacher candidates asked. Teacher candidates ask questions 41 times within an additional care code example. The simultaneous codes for care exclude the *Caring Questions* and the *Receptive Listening* codes. The *All Questions* code and the *Caring Questions* code overlap intentionally, as caring questions were pulled from the list of total questions. Excerpts of *Receptive Listening* comprised large swaths of transcript and thus are excluded from identification for simultaneous coding.

To make meaning, I analyzed the data thematically with each research question (Bergman, 2010; Lieber & Weisner, 2015). I coded data sets line by line for evidence of interactions involving teacher candidates' dispositions of authority and care. I identified solutions in order of proposal for each participant to address my final research questions. Each teacher candidate suggests multiple solutions during their clinical simulation. Proposed solutions were then analyzed collectively based on frequency and order to learn more about teacher candidates' thinking in response to student behavior.

## Analytic Lenses

I am interested in which elements of authority and care emerge during teacher candidate and adolescent student interactions and which solutions teacher candidates propose during interactions stemming from threatening behavior. This study adds to our understanding of the types of authority teacher candidates use and how they care during a disciplinary interaction with an upset student. I am also interested in the solutions teacher candidates propose to address threatening behavior during clinical simulations. This study examines teacher candidates' solutions for elements of punitive, mild disciplinary and/or restorative practices to understand how they may conceptualize and enact student discipline. My research questions are:

1. How do teacher candidates engage in a clinical simulation focused on threatening behavior in schools?
  - a. Do elements of authority emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student?
  - b. Do elements of care emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student?
  - c. What solutions emerge within the simulations? And do teacher candidates' solutions have elements of punitive, mild disciplinary, or restorative practices?

I approach this data informed by my literature review and with the constructs of authority, care, and teacher candidates' solutions in mind. I use the concepts of authority, care, and solutions as analytic lenses to code, analyze, and interpret the data of this study.

**Authority as an analytic lens.** The first analytic lens is authority. This study frames authority as a social relationship in which the teacher candidates have a *right* to command and the student, Casey Butler, has a *duty* to obey (Metz, 1978). Authority is granted, not assumed,

and is built, deconstructed, and rebuilt through negotiation and social interactions between teachers and students (Pace & Hemmings, 2007, p. 21). The teacher candidates in this clinical simulation hold the assumed authority and a leadership position. They may or may not use their authority to work toward a shared purpose and preserve moral order.

Like Macleod et al. (2012) and using authority as an analytic lens, initial codes include the five types of authority conceptualized by Wrong (2017). They are coercive, legitimate, competent, personal, and authority by inducement. I work with the assumption that types of authority are not pure but are hybridized in teacher-student interactions (Pace, 2003c; Pace & Hemmings, 2006b). For example, a teacher candidate may use some form of coercive authority, in which case they would threaten the student with the use of force. They may rely on their personal authority, using personal qualities such as kindness or humor to engage with Casey. Those with competent authority are most competent to serve the common good of others. The teacher candidates may rely on competent authority and mention their superior skills or knowledge.

**Care as an analytic lens.** I approach the study of the interactions between the teacher candidates and Casey Butler by referencing Noddings's (2013) conceptions of care and Gilligan's (1993) *Ethics of Care* theory. In this section, I focus on the interpersonal interactions between morally concerned individuals as they discern what is best. I also frame care in part as actions and energy directed toward the welfare, protection, and enhancement of the cared-for (Noddings, 2013, p. 23). This simulation offers teacher candidates opportunities to care and harbors multiple ethical dilemmas for teacher candidates to negotiate. However, I cannot use the data set to gauge teacher candidate engrossment. Nor does this simulation allow for a complete caring interaction (Noddings, 2013) because, (1) Casey Butler, as the one-cared for, is not

receptive to the care, and (2) there is a possibility that the teacher candidate, as the one-caring, leaves the interaction feeling conflicted rather than fulfilled.

I am curious about the ways teacher candidates interact when challenged to care in a discipline scenario. Like McBee (2007), the teacher candidates in this study may interact in ways that align with how other preservice teachers conceptualize care. They may offer help or time. They may show interest in Casey Butler through questioning. They may listen, show compassion, or empathize. Teacher candidates in this study may actualize caring by listening attentively, using eye contact, and smiling.

Understanding that care is elusive and hard to study (Goldstein & Lake, 2000), I coded, analyzed, and interpreted the data through an analytic lens of care. Codes created through this lens included questioning, offering time, compassion, receptive listening, empathy, etc. Through the analytic lens of care, I was most interested in how teacher candidates talked to Casey Butler.

**Teacher candidate solutions as an analytic lens.** My last two research questions focused on the types of solutions teacher candidates proposed during the simulation. First, I coded for problem-solving dialogue and proposed solutions. Codes of specific solutions included the involvement of a school resource officer, a referral to the principal, talk of suspension, a call to parents, a verbal reprimand, a referral to a counselor or social worker, and a follow-up meeting with Casey, the other student(s), and support staff, individually or in combination.

My previous exploration of the literature on punitive, mild disciplinary, and restorative practices influenced how I categorized, labeled, and analyzed the teacher candidates' solutions as having punitive elements, mild disciplinary elements, restorative elements, or none. For example, a reference to suspension is more punitive than a meeting between Casey and their peers to resolve the conflict and mend harm. The work of González (2012) helped define punitive practices in this study. The research of Payne and Welsh furthered my understanding of how to

organize disciplinary solutions as punitive, mild, or restorative (Payne & Welch, 2010; Welch & Payne, 2010).

After systematically and carefully reading through and coding each transcript, I created a separate document for care, authority, and solutions. The documents contained the code books and a table for each code. Each table included: (1) the code number, (2) code name, (3) code description, and (4) code type. I copied and pasted each code example from the transcripts into the appropriate table. The tables listed the participant, the code example, and a page number. I added comments to indicate simultaneous coding when necessary. I then carefully examined each set of code examples to ensure that the excerpts fit the descriptions of the codes. If they did not belong, I omitted them. I then looked for themes within each set of code examples.

Sometimes there were few coded examples, making themes within the codes easily identifiable. If the code examples were extensive, I printed out the table, manually numbered each excerpt, cut out each code example, and physically manipulated them into common categories based on themes. For example, within the Competent Authority: Advice code, there were 35 code excerpts. In this case, I manually grouped common types of advising; advising against violence, advising to manage gossip, and advice on alternative solutions. I then ordered the cut-out excerpts alphabetically by each participant. From these, I created a table of code examples for each theme.

I met with my advisor regularly and wrote memos consistently throughout this process. I kept a memo for each participant, outlining their demographics, simulation details, trigger details, and notes on their use of authority, care, and solutions. I also wrote memos on emerging themes in the process of coding. Themes across codes but within the separate constructs of authority, care, and solutions emerged at different times through coding, analyzing, memo writing, and discussing the data with my advisor. For example, posing solutions was evident in



the language the teacher candidates consistently used and became more concrete when I specifically looked for the solutions teacher candidates committed to as part of my analysis. Encouragement across codes as a theme emerged in conversations with my advisor about a code name, encouragement, that did not quite exemplify the code examples beneath it. Authority as a hybridized concept was visually evident when I color-coded the code examples in the transcripts.

### **Chapter Summary**

This is an exploratory qualitative study to research teacher candidates' dispositions of authority, care, and disciplinary solutions to threatening behavior. Participants in this study include 16 teacher candidates in the second year of a four-year teacher preparation program at a private university in the Northeastern United States. The existing data set from the Spring of 2016 includes video recordings of 16 individual *Casey Butler* clinical simulations and four small group debriefing sessions. The standardized student for this simulation is a 15-year-old disgruntled adolescent, Casey Butler. Before the clinical simulation, the teacher candidate on hall duty overhears Casey verbally threatening to physically harm a peer whom they believe verbally taunted them on the bus. During this clinical simulation, teacher candidates must grapple with a challenging scenario related to threatening behavior and school violence; they have an opportunity to explore their dispositions of authority and care and hone their professional judgment of disciplinary solutions.

## Chapter Four:

### Results

This qualitative study investigates the interactions between teacher candidates and an upset adolescent student who enacts threatening behaviors. In the previous chapter, I described the *Casey Butler* clinical simulation in which a teacher candidate interacts with a student who threatens harm. I used this clinical simulation to view interactions and explore how teacher candidates engage in a clinical simulation focused on threatening behavior in schools. I discuss the results of my study from two sources of data: clinical simulation videos and small-group, post-simulation debriefing sessions.

I specifically explore elements of teacher candidate authority, teacher candidate care, and teacher candidate solutions. Based on my literature review, I analyze and interpret the data using the analytical lenses of authority, care, and teacher candidate solutions. Separately for each sub-question, I discuss initial codes based on my literature review a priori, emerging codes, and the main themes from the data. My research questions are:

1. How do teacher candidates engage in a clinical simulation focused on threatening behavior in schools?
  - a. Do elements of authority emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student?
  - b. Do elements of care emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student?
  - c. What solutions emerge within the simulations? And do teacher candidates' solutions have elements of punitive, mild disciplinary, or restorative practices?

In this chapter, I discuss evidence related to elements of teacher candidate authority and care in response to questions 1a and 1b. I explore teacher candidate solutions and the evidence of elements of punitive, mild disciplinary, and restorative practices in response to question 1c.

## **Part I: Demographics, Simulation Details, and the Post-Simulation Debriefs**

### *Demographics*

I assigned each participant a pseudonym and then renamed all the files, replacing identifiers with pseudonyms to protect participants' privacy. The demographics of the teacher candidates in this study were presumed because I did not have access to class rosters. Eight participants were presumed female, and eight participants were presumed, male. I based my presumptions on the self-identifiers nine teacher candidates used (Ms., Mr.) and appearances in the video footage when the teacher candidates did not self-identify. This data came as is, without access to student rosters. Although I acknowledge the importance and impact of race and ethnicity in teacher-student interactions, I did not assume the race and ethnicity of teacher candidates in this study. Refer to Table 2 for more detail.

**Table 2**

#### *Participant Pseudonyms, Demographics, and Identifiers*

Video no.	Name	Self-identified gender	Presumed gender of participant	Presumed gender of Casey Butler	Standardized student descriptor	SS no.
1	Adelyn	Yes	Female	Male	Black outfit	4
2	Arthur		Male	Male	Striped sweater	2
3	Clayton	Yes	Male	Male	Argyle sweater	1
4	Elise		Female	Male	Blue sweatshirt	3
5	Elizabeth		Female	Male	Grey sweater	5
6	Jasper	Yes	Male	Male	Black outfit	4
7	John		Male	Male	Argyle sweater	1
8	Justin		Male	Male	Blue sweatshirt	3

9	Kenneth		Male	Male	Striped sweater	2
10	Kyle	Yes	Male	Male	Grey sweater	5
11	Marcia		Female	Male	Black outfit	4
12	Marissa	Yes	Female	Male	Plaid shirt	6
13	Natalya	Yes	Female	Male	Striped sweater	2
14	Rebecca	Yes	Female	Male	Argyle sweater	1
15	Samara	Yes	Female	Male	Grey sweater	5
16	Thomas	Yes	Male	Male	Blue sweatshirt	3

Note. no. = number; SS = standardized student.

### ***Clinical Simulation Details***

In this clinical simulation, the teacher candidates learn about Casey and his situation. In the process of coding for authority, I noted if the teacher candidates learned Casey's name and grade level, if they gathered the names and grade levels of the boys on the bus, and whether they learned about dad and mom. Table 3 shows the nine teacher candidates who learned about dad and the four candidates who learned about mom. All but one teacher candidate learned Casey's first name, and six asked for his last name. Four teacher candidates asked for Casey's age or grade. Seven teacher candidates ascertained the first name of the first boy, and two teacher candidates learned the last name of the first boy on the bus. Five teacher candidates out of 14 gathered the first name of the second boy on the bus. No one learned of the last name of the second boy on the bus.

Table 4 shows that 11 teacher candidates introduced themselves. Six teacher candidates called the language a threat or threatening. One teacher candidate mentioned school policy on fighting, and four candidates discussed confidentiality with Casey.

I assigned each standardized student portraying Casey Butler a clothing descriptor and presumed gender identity based on appearance (see Table 2). Six actors portrayed Casey Butler and were all presumed male. Five standardized students interacted with three teacher candidates

each. One standardized student interacted with a single teacher candidate. Simulations are approximations of reality. Thus, I expected some inconsistency between actors, sometimes by the same actors, as they interacted for the first, second, and third times.

**Table 3**

*Details Gathered by the Teacher Candidates During the Clinical Simulation*

Name	Gender	Learns about dad	Learns about mom	Information about Casey			Information about boys				SS no.	
				First name	Last name	Grade/age	Boy 1		Boy 2			Grade/age
							Fir	L	Fir	L		
Adelyn	F			Yes	Yes							4
Arthur	M	Yes	Yes	Yes							Yes	2
Clayton	M	Yes					Yes	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	1
Elise	F			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes			3
Elizabeth	F	Yes	Yes	Yes								5
Jasper	M	Yes		Yes								4
John	M	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—		1
Justin	M			Yes			Yes		Yes			3
Kenneth	M			Yes								2
Kyle	M	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							5
Marcia	F	Yes		Yes		Yes						4
Marissa	F	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes			6
Natalya	F			Yes								2
Rebecca	F	Yes		Yes			Yes		—	—		1
Samara	F			Yes	Yes							5
Thomas	M			Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes			3
Total TCs		9	4	15	6	4	7	2	5	0	2	

*Note.* — = not applicable because the standardized student mentions one boy, not two; no. = number;

SS = standardized student; TC = teacher candidate; Fir = first name; L= last name; M = male; F = female.

**Table 4***Teacher Candidate Behaviors During the Clinical Simulation*

Name	Introduces themselves	Calls language a threat or threatening	Mention policy	Discusses confidentiality	SS no.
Adelyn	Yes				4
Arthur		Yes			2
Clayton	Yes			Yes	1
Elise					3
Elizabeth		Yes	Yes	Yes	5
Jasper	Yes				4
John	Yes	Yes		Yes	1
Justin	Yes	Yes			3
Kenneth					2
Kyle	Yes			Yes	5
Marcia					4
Marissa	Yes				6
Natalya	Yes				2
Rebecca	Yes				1
Samara	Yes	Yes			5
Thomas	Yes	Yes			3
Total TCs	11	6	1	4	

*Note.* no. = number; SS = standardized student; TC = teacher candidate.

I created Table 5: SI Consistency: Casey Butler Clinical Simulation Details and Triggers to understand the consistencies and inconsistencies across simulations in this data set. This table explored whether each standardized student correctly expressed the demeanors, statements, and triggers outlined in the Standardized Student Interaction Protocol (see Appendix B, p. 4-5).

**Table 5***SI Consistency: Casey Butler Clinical Simulation Details and Triggers*

Name	Meeting demeanor and behavior	TC asks why? Or what's going on?	"I know they were talking about me, and I'm gonna take care of it!"	TC asks why? Or What angers Casey	Trigger a: "People need to mind their own business and stay out of my life!"	TC asks why?	Trigger b: "There is stuff going on at home, that's all."	TC asks about what stuff?	Trigger c: "My dad works hard and we're doing ok; it's just a rough time."	SI opens up about Mom	TC mentions the principal	"Whatever"	SS no.
Adelyn	Yes	Yes	Yes										4
Arthur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>2</sup>	Yes	2
Clayton	Yes <sup>4</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	—	Yes		Yes	Yes	1
Elise	Yes	Yes	Yes								Yes	Yes <sup>1</sup>	3
Elizabeth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes		Yes	Yes			5
Jasper	Yes <sup>4</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	Yes				4
John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	Yes				1
Justin	Yes	Yes	Yes										3
Kenneth	Yes	Yes	Yes								Yes <sup>2</sup>		2
Kyle	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			5
Marcia	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes				4
Marissa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			6
Natalya	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						Yes <sup>2</sup>	Yes	2
Rebecca	Yes <sup>4</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	—	Yes				1
Samara	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								5
Thomas	Yes <sup>4</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes				Yes <sup>3</sup>	3
Totals	16	16	16	11	10	2	10	7	9	4	5	5	

*Note.* Yes = The standardized student correctly expressed the demeanor, statement, or trigger outlined in the Standardized Student Interaction Protocol; TC = teacher candidate; no. = number; SS = standardized student; — = SI combined statements or triggers, skipping ahead.

---

<sup>1</sup> In response to a suggestion of talking to the bus driver

<sup>2</sup> TC mentioned the principal as a resource or asked if Casey wants to go

<sup>3</sup> In response to a suggestion of talking to the guidance counselor, another teacher, Mike, or Sam

<sup>4</sup> TC offered to shake hands

From Table 5, we learn that all the standardized students acted consistently upon entering the room and meeting the teacher candidates. Four teacher candidates offered to shake hands. The standardized students reciprocated according to the protocol. All teacher candidates asked a “why” or “what’s going on” type of question. Additionally, all standardized students responded consistently with a verbatim or approximation of the words “I know they were talking about me, and I’m gonna take care of it!” The standardized student interacting with Marcia was inconsistent when they combined the previous statement with trigger b and omitted trigger a. In all, 11 teacher candidates questioned Casey about why he is angry or what angers him. In these clinical simulations, 10 of 11 standardized students followed the protocol and responded, “People need to mind their own business and stay out of my life!” Inconsistencies in the standardized students’ language emerged after this. In four clinical simulations, four different standardized students combined triggers a and b. In two clinical simulations, one standardized student combined triggers a, b, and c, without probing by the teacher candidates. For example, in a conversation with Clayton, the standardized student stated, “I mean, people just need to learn to mind their own business. There’s some stuff going on at home, you know? Dad’s working hard and it’s, you know? It’s all right, but it’s, it’s what it is.” The standardized students did not mention mom unless prompted by the teacher candidates. Four of five standardized students responded “whatever” when the teacher candidates mentioned the principal. Standardized student #1’s recall of the names and the number of boys on the bus was inconsistent. In one simulation Standardized student #1 referred to the boys as Sam and Keith. In two other



simulations standardized student #1 talked as if only one boy was talking about Casey on the bus. In addition, one standardized student referred to himself as Daniel instead of Casey. This analysis tells us that all the standardized students were relatively consistent across each of their three simulations. All but one standardized student was consistent in their application of the protocol.

The data set for this study consisted of 16 video-recorded clinical simulations and four small-group post-simulation debrief sessions. Before coding, I viewed the start and end of each clinical simulation video. I checked the audio and visual quality of the digital recordings and time-stamped the beginning and end of each conversation to determine the total interaction time (see Table 6). The clinical simulation videos ranged in length from two minutes 20 seconds to 13 minutes and 49 seconds. In three cases, shorter than average length simulations resulted because the teacher candidates did not ask why Casey was upset or what angered him (e.g., Adelyn, Justin, Kenneth). The average length of the clinical simulation videos was six minutes and 53 seconds, and the median length was five minutes and 38 seconds. In total, there was one hour, 50 minutes, and 13 seconds of clinical simulation video footage for coding and analysis.

**Table 6**

*Data: Clinical Simulation Duration*

Name	Gender	Start	End	Duration	SS no.
Adelyn	Female	0:03:28	0:08:53	0:05:25	4
Arthur	Male	0:03:24	0:16:37	0:13:13	2
Clayton	Male	0:03:26	0:17:15	0:13:49	1
Elise	Female	0:03:49	0:11:34	0:07:45	3
Elizabeth	Female	0:03:49	0:17:11	0:13:22	5
Jasper	Male	0:03:18	0:08:40	0:05:22	4
John	Male	0:03:25	0:11:12	0:07:47	1
Justin	Male	0:03:24	0:06:42	0:03:18	3

Kenneth	Male	0:03:49	0:07:33	0:03:44	2
Kyle	Male	0:03:27	0:10:50	0:07:23	5
Marcia	Female	0:03:25	0:05:45	0:02:20	4
Marissa	Female	0:03:50	0:11:08	0:07:18	6
Natalya	Female	0:03:19	0:07:38	0:04:19	2
Rebecca	Female	0:03:29	0:07:23	0:03:54	1
Samara	Female	0:03:19	0:08:42	0:05:23	5
Thomas	Male	0:03:18	0:09:09	0:05:51	3

*Note.* no. = number; SS = standardized student.

### ***The Post-Simulation Debriefs: Teacher Candidates' Initial Reactions***

This data set included 16 clinical simulations and four small group post-simulation debriefing sessions. Teacher candidates gathered to the debriefing sessions, in succession, immediately after conversing with Casey (B. Dotger & Chandler-Olcott, 2022). In these sessions, the teacher candidates generally reflected on their reactions, expressed their visceral feeling, and discussed their performance (i.e., how they thought they did). They talked about the standardized student's appearance, demeanor, and reactions. Teacher candidates' rarely addressed the specifics of what they did or how they interacted with Casey. This lack of code examples for authority, care, and teacher candidate solutions within the post-simulation debriefs limited triangulation opportunities for this study.

This dissertation centers on the interactions between teacher candidates and an angry adolescent student threatening harm. It may seem counterintuitive to discuss the post-simulation debriefs before exploring the evidence related to my research questions and the data. However, in this section, I use data from the post-simulation debriefs—not to answer my research questions, but rather to help understand how the teacher candidates feel as they converse with Casey. Understanding how the teacher candidates feel in interactions with Casey is important

to discuss first because it contextualizes the evidence related to my research questions discussed later.

The teacher candidates participated in small group post-simulation debriefing sessions after leaving the clinical simulation rooms. Four or five teacher candidates participated. They entered the room as they finished, and Professor B. Dotger joined the group once all the clinical simulations were complete. The debriefs ranged in length from approximately 13 to 22 minutes. They lasted about 18 minutes, on average. In the debriefs, the teacher candidates discussed their initial reactions to their experiences in the clinical simulation.

In the first debrief, Rebecca, Kenneth, and Marissa discussed their recent experiences talking with Casey. Rebecca discussed general feelings of uncertainty. She asked Kenneth if it was an awkward encounter for him. She agreed with Kenneth that the experience was rough, and she expressed that she didn't know what else to say. Kenneth described his experience as "horrible," "rough," and "the hardest one by far." Marissa did not share these sentiments and expressed that "it was fine" and that "she just talked to him like he was a friend."

Jasper, Natalya, and Samara talked about their experiences in the second debriefing. Samara said, "I feel like I didn't accomplish anything...I literally didn't." And Jasper agreed. Samara described not knowing what to do. Jasper expressed that Casey did not take any of his "options for solutions," leading to feelings of helplessness. When describing his interactions with Casey in the debrief, Jasper stated, "I don't know how to help you then, kid. I don't know."

Kyle, Adelyn, and Clayton talked about their uncertainties in the third debriefing. Like Jasper, Adelyn felt like she had no solution. She described her experience in the simulation as interesting. In dialogue with Professor B. Dotger, Clayton articulated that he was trying to help Casey, that he did not know "which way to turn" the conversation, and that "it was just too much. It was too much." Clayton also stated feelings of uncertainty by stating, "I just didn't

know how to end it.” Kyle was the most vocal about his experience with Casey. He expressed feeling tired, angry, and mad. He described the experience as “crazy” and “bad,” and said he did horribly. Like Samara, Kyle does not know what to do.

Justin, Marcia, and Arthur talked in the fourth debrief. Justin discussed feelings of unpreparedness and regret with Marcia. Justin said, “I have no way actually to follow up with him because I didn’t get his information.” He told Marcia, “I didn’t even find out that his dad was working. I should have probably found out more about his other stuff.” Arthur told Professor B. Dotger, “This one seemed like a lot.” Overall, there was evidence that some teacher candidates found this simulation challenging, perplexing, and emotionally taxing.

## **Part II: Question 1a Results – Evidence of Teacher Candidate Authority**

This study explores how teacher candidates engage in a clinical simulation focused on threatening behaviors in schools. The focus of this study is on: (1) elements of teacher candidate authority, (2) elements of teacher candidate care, and (3) teacher candidates’ solutions and elements of punitive, mild disciplinary, or restorative practices. To begin, I look at the elements of authority that emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student. In this section, I discuss evidence related to elements of teacher candidate authority to address my first sub-question 1a. Do elements of authority emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student?

### ***Theoretical Perspectives***

This study defines authority as a hierarchical social relationship by which people in subordinate roles consent to follow and obey those in leadership roles to preserve the moral order (Metz, 1978; Weber, 1947). Authority is a social relationship in which the teacher candidates have a right to command, and the student has a duty to obey (Metz, 1978). Authority is granted,

not assumed, and is built, deconstructed, and rebuilt through negotiation and social interactions between teachers and students (Pace & Hemmings, 2007, p. 21). This study uses authority as one analytical lens. The teacher candidates in this clinical simulation hold the assumed authority and a leadership position. I work with the assumption that types of authority are not pure but are hybridized in teacher-student interactions (Pace, 2003c; Pace & Hemmings, 2006b).

### ***Authority Codes***

**Initial codes.** This study used deductive coding. I developed an initial set of codes for each of my research sub-questions based on my literature review a priori. The first sub-question was: Do elements of authority emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student? I based my initial set of codes for the construct of authority on the work of Wrong (2017). The initial codes included the five types of authority defined by Wrong: coercive authority, authority by inducement, legitimate authority, competent authority, and personal authority (Wrong, 2017). With *coercive authority*, a threat of force motivates people to obey. For example, a teacher candidate would threaten the student with the use of force (p. 41). *Authority by inducement* is a type of authority rooted in rewards. Students are motivated to obey because they expect teacher-provided rewards. However, there is the possibility of teacher denial or removal of rewards as punishment (p. 44). *Legitimate authority* is enacted within a classroom context when students agree to obey based on a sense of duty rooted in social roles and norms—the whole group knows about and respects the teacher’s right to command. Thus, the student obeys (p. 49). Those with *competent authority* are most competent to serve the common good of others. For example, the teacher candidates may rely on competent authority and mention their superior skills or knowledge (p. 52). *Personal authority* relates to the ways teacher candidates use individual qualities, such as kindness or humor, to establish their right to command and promote student obedience (p. 60).

My initial codebook for authority included Wrong's (2017) five types of authority as main codes with subcodes based on specific representations described in the literature as examples of each authority type (see Appendix J). For example, initial code four was competent authority, 4a was competent authority: knowledge, and 4b was competent authority: skills. The specific subcode terms were pulled directly from the literature on authority, as Wrong (2017) described competent authority as an “authority based on specialized knowledge or skill” (p. 52).

**Emerging and after-emerging codes.** As mentioned previously, I coded 19% of the data (three simulations) using my initial codebook. A total of 10 additional codes emerged in this process. The emerging codes included: four additional subcodes under coercive authority (threaten action, consequences, reprimand, and open-ended); one additional subcode under authority by inducement (offer or denial of help); one additional subcode for competent authority (advice); and one additional subcode of personal authority (trustworthiness). Three codes emerged that I could not categorize within my framework based on Wrong's (2017) work. The teacher candidates relinquished authority, shared authority, and minimized their authority.

I then coded the remaining 13 transcripts and four post-simulation debriefs using an updated codebook with initial and emerging codes (see Appendix K). The additional roles of rule enforcer and protector, as subcodes of legitimate authority, emerged as two after-emerging codes. Appendix L was my complete codebook for authority.

### ***Results: Evidence of Teacher Candidate Authority***

Teacher candidates in this study relied on coercive, legitimate, and personal authority. There was less evidence of competent authority and authority by inducement. In addition to Wrong's (2017) five types of authority, teacher candidates relinquished their authority, shared authority with Casey, and minimized their authority in interactions. Part 1 of Table 7 details evidence of coercive authority, authority by inducement, and legitimate authority.

**Table 7***Teacher Candidate Evidence of Elements of Authority, Part 1*

Name	Coercive: threat	Coercive: action	Coercive: consequences	Coercive: reprimand	Coercive: open-ended	Inducement: rewards	Inducement: help	Legitimate: role	Legitimate: role, rule enforcer	Legitimate: role, protector
Adelyn				1	3			2	2	3
Arthur				4	1					
Clayton		1	1				1	1		1
Elise			2							1
Elizabeth		3		1				1	3	3
Jasper			1				1	1	1	
John		2			1			1		
Justin				1				1		2
Kenneth				3						
Kyle								1	1	
Marcia				2					1	
Marissa		1						1	1	
Natalya		1		1				1		1
Rebecca			1					1	1	
Samara			1	1				1		3
Thomas			1	1	1			1	2	3
Total	0	5	6	9	4	0	2	12	8	8
%	0%	31%	38%	56%	25%	0%	12%	75%	50%	50%

**Coercive authority: action, consequences, reprimands, and open-ended.** Teacher candidates did not use coercive authority as Wrong (2017) describes; they did not threaten the use of force. Teacher candidates in this study did not express wanting to harm Casey. However, teacher candidates used their authority to try and persuade Casey to speak more, to choose non-

violence to solve his problems, and to reach a resolution. A few teacher candidates spoke of consequences to try and persuade Casey to make appropriate choices. A few teacher candidates made open-ended threats. More teacher candidates reprimanded Casey.

Five teacher candidates used language meant to instill fear to persuade Casey to comply. Compliance differs in the context of the conversation; across the examples, direct statements of potential action meant to instill fear, not harm, were evident. In the following excerpt, Clayton wants Casey to talk to him. One tactic he used was to threaten the involvement of the administration:

Because right now, I'm in a position where I have to speak to the principal and the school security because I don't know what you're planning on doing. If you don't talk to me, that's all I'm going to have to... that's all I'm going to have to go on. It's pretty much can I step in, intervene and get [the] administration involved? When we can just talk to each other about this right now. So, would you like to talk to me about it? Or would you like to talk to [the] administration about it?

Based on Clayton's language in this quote, Casey may view involvement by the school's administration as more punitive and less supportive than only speaking to Clayton. In this quote, engagement by the administration has a more negative association. Clayton implied that if they resolved the conflict in real-time, the administration would less likely be involved. Marissa talked to Casey about what could happen if he were to get in a fight. She said, "But you know damn well if you get into a fight, you're getting suspended, simply because you punched them or you said something more on them. So why would you get yourself into trouble?" Marissa wanted Casey to choose a non-violent solution and tried to convince him of the benefits of not fighting by reminding him of potentially serious consequences. The consequence of "getting suspended" may instill fear in Casey and deter him from fighting. Marissa was not threatening Casey with



suspension, but she did discuss suspension, potentially scaring Casey enough to prevent a physical fight. John was going to report what Casey said.

Six teacher candidates discussed potential or implied consequences with Casey in ways that may instill fear. Clayton wanted to help Casey and he wanted Casey to talk freely, so he said, “I want to help you. But I need you to help me, help you. I need you to... Because the, the road you’re headed down right now, it’s not good. It’s not good at all.” Elise wanted Casey to choose non-violence and thus reminded him that he could get kicked off the basketball team and that she did not “want to see you, all the hard work that you’ve done with basketball and school. I don’t want to see it go away all because of just a couple of words that get thrown around.” Jasper did not want violence to ensue and implied negative consequences when he told Casey, “I just don’t think you want that in the long haul and I don’t think they want to be there.” Rebecca explained,

I don’t want to...be something like some fight to go on so that you might end up kicked out of school.... I feel like your dad might be a little worried if you got suspended or something for getting kicked out of school.

Rebecca and Thomas implied that Casey should choose non-violence because people at home would be disappointed.

I coded the statements of four teacher candidates as coercive: open-ended. Three teacher candidates made “if” statements and did not complete their thought to clarify the “then this.” Adelyn began her sentence with, “if anybody does get hurt, just know that I...”. However, she did not finish her thought. Thomas told Casey, “If something goes too far, if you seriously hurt someone...or what I heard today could have been an empty threat.” Thomas failed to finish his thought and assumed an empty threat instead. John says, “if I could get...If I could put in the report that you had some alternative toward your previous plan of kicking his ass.”

Reprimands were a subcode of coercive authority and a mild disciplinary code within solutions; the excerpts were the same for both codes. Nine teacher candidates reprimanded Casey. Examples of the reprimands made by teacher candidates are discussed further in the mild disciplinary practices section within the solutions section of this chapter.

**Authority by inducement: offering help.** Teacher candidates did not use authority by inducement, a form of authority coupled with expectations of rewards and the possibility of revocation of such rewards. However, two teacher candidates told Casey that if he gives them more information, they will be better able to help him. Clayton stated, “We’re here to help you, but you have to be willing to bend with us a little, okay? We’re going to try to do everything that we can to help you. Everything. But you have to let us know something.” Jasper said,

And if you want to let me know who those guys were, next time you might see them or point, maybe you catch their name, and you want to tell me if you’re willing to do that, I can also just keep an eye out for them to make sure, they’re not doing anything that they shouldn’t be doing.

In both cases, the teacher candidates offered to help.

**Legitimate authority: teacher or hall monitor, rule enforcer, and protector roles.** A total of 14 teacher candidates used legitimate authority, either tied to their role as a teacher or hall monitor, or tied to their role as a rule enforcer and/or tied to their role as a protector. Three-quarters of the participants in this study used legitimate authority associated with their role as teachers or hall monitors. Nine teacher candidates used prefix titles when introducing themselves to Casey (e.g., Ms., Mr.). John was the least formal and introduced himself by first name only. Justin gave Casey his first and last names and said he was the health teacher. Four additional teacher candidates informed Casey of their specific teaching roles in their introductions (e.g., health teacher, English teacher, physical education teacher, math teacher). Not all coded

examples for this section were introductions or role confirmations. Elizabeth did not introduce herself, but she did reference a responsibility of her job; when Casey confirmed that Elizabeth was going to tell the counselor, she responded that yes, it was her job. Adelyn referred to her job as hall monitor and reminded Casey that she was “here regulating the halls.” In the role of teachers or hall monitors, teacher candidates emphasized their responsibilities as rule enforcers. In this case, Casey obeyed due to legitimate authority and out of respect for the teachers’ role as rule enforcers. Eight teacher candidates (five female and three male) referenced rules or mentioned responsibilities related to enforcing the expectations. Quote examples are listed by the participant in Table 8.

**Table 8**

*Legitimate Authority: Examples of Teacher Candidates’ Roles as Rule Enforcers*

Name	Example quote
Adelyn	“Anything I hear, anything I see, I have to take the initiative to take care of the situation.”
Adelyn	“...and I was just concerned about this colorful language that you did apply outside...it’s definitely something I have to address, and I don’t want this to progress.”
Elizabeth	“You know, our policy about fighting?”
Elizabeth	“You understand? We’re not allowed. I can’t just overlook the fact that you threatened to fight someone, right?”
Elizabeth	“Not the way you said in the hallway, you said you’re going to take care of it, but I can’t let you do that. You understand that, right?...I can’t just let you go fight anyone that makes fun of you.”
Jasper	“...you said in the hall that you just might have to kick their ass. And when I hear that, it’s just something that I obviously have to step in and get involved with.”
Kyle	“How are you going to take care of it, Casey? What’s your way? I want you to explain to me what’s your way of taking care of it and I’ll explain to you what’s my way of taking care of it.”
Marcia	“I would have to report if I thought it was serious, you know that...”
Marissa	“I will tell you what’s going to happen straight up. You get into a fight? Yeah, they may ... then you tell the principal, “Oh my god, they were making fun of me,” all of this, it doesn’t matter. You already threw the first punch. And I’m sorry, I’ll take care of that.”

- Rebecca "I just want to make sure nothing goes on."
- Thomas "But what I heard was a physical threat on someone else. I don't know who that is. I don't know if it's another student at school and I heard some vulgar language, but most of the time I just dismissed that but, the threat is something that I kind of have to take seriously."
- Thomas "All right. No, like I said, a threat, I kind of need to take that seriously... Violence is something that I have to take seriously."
- 

In these examples, the teacher candidates told Casey they must address the situation, take it seriously, intervene, report it, take care of it, and not overlook it.

Eight teacher candidates used legitimate authority connected to their role as protectors. Casey obeyed out of respect for the teacher candidates' role as protectors and a voiced responsibility to keep everyone safe. For example, Clayton stated, "And it's my job as a teacher to ensure the safety of everyone in the school, not just theirs, but your own...". Natalya told Casey, "I want this school to be a safe place for everyone. And if you don't feel like you are safe or you're uncomfortable because of other students, then that's definitely not something we tolerate here." Like Natalya, Samara stated, "And as a teacher in this building, I'm here to make sure that everyone's safe and that everyone's okay."

Part 2 of Table 7, on the next page, notes evidence of competent and personal authority, and the relinquishing, sharing, and minimizing of authority by teacher candidates.

**Competent authority: advice.** Teacher candidates did not rely heavily on competent authority. They did not talk about their superior professional skills or knowledge, but most teacher candidates gave Casey advice. Teacher candidates advised Casey on social and emotional topics, not academic, content-knowledge-related matters. There was a personal angle to the advice teacher candidates gave. Teacher candidates advised against violence; they advised on how to manage gossip and give alternative solutions. A total of 14 teacher candidates generated 31 examples of competent authority related to advice in the transcripts. Together, 11

teacher candidates advised more than once, and eight teacher candidates advised on two or three matters. Marissa is the only teacher candidate to advise on all three topics. Kyle was the only teacher candidate whose advice did not fit within these themes. He advised Casey to choose himself and to do right by himself, not to make assumptions about people.

**Table 7 Cont.**

*Teacher Candidate Evidence of Elements of Authority, Part 2*

Name	Competent: knowledge	Competent: skills	Competent: advice	Personal: humor	Personal: kindness	Personal: trustworthiness	Relinquish authority	Shared authority	Minimize authority	Elements of authority	Authority frequency
Adelyn			2		1		3	2	1	10	20
Arthur			4		3	1	1	1		7	15
Clayton			2		6	2	1	3		10	19
Elise			2		3	1		3	1	7	13
Elizabeth			4		4	4	4	8	1	11	36
Jasper			2		3			1	1	8	11
John					1	1		3		5	9
Justin			2		3			1		6	10
Kenneth			2					1		3	6
Kyle			3		1	2	1	1	1	8	11
Marcia			1		2			3		5	9
Marissa			5		1		3			6	12
Natalya					1	1		2		7	8
Rebecca			1		1			1	1	7	7
Samara			1		1		5	1		8	14
Thomas			3		2			2	3	10	19
Total	0	0	14	0	15	7	7	15	7		
%	0%	0%	88%	0%	94%	44%	44%	94%	44%		

Nine teacher candidates used competent authority and advised against violence. For example, Marissa told Casey, “I’ve always felt like it’s better to talk things out than to take physical action, personally.” Advise against violence was also a code for solutions. The competent authority: advice examples and the advise against violence, opinions excerpts contain the same text. However, the competent authority: advice examples are often longer excerpts.

Five teacher candidates advised Casey about gossip. Arthur and Marissa advised three times each. Clayton, Elise, and Thomas each advised once. Examples of advice range from brief to more detailed. For example, Marissa reminded Casey that “people don’t mind their business.” Arthur elaborates to Casey stating:

Well, it’s a small school, right? Not a ton of kids here, your lives might be more public than you’d like, right? But these are the things you got to learn to deal with. You know, people are going to, people are always going to have an opinion on your life at home. What kind of area you’re growing up in, what you’re saying, what you’re doing. You know, people are always going to be talking, especially in a community like this. Right?

But you can’t just hold it in and lash out. ... that’s just not the healthy way to go about it. Similarly, seven teacher candidates used competent authority and advised Casey of alternative solutions. The teacher candidates were not overbearing as they proposed solutions. Elizabeth said, “Maybe tell them to stop...” and Elise suggested what Casey might say, “maybe even just saying like, ‘Guys really, this isn’t the way to go about it.’ You got to be better than this.” Kenneth said, “Well maybe I think you should confront them about it.” Rebecca advised Casey to think about his actions so that a peaceful resolution is more likely. She stated, “Maybe that’s something that you should probably think through, of why you’re approaching this person and what you’re going to do when you do approach this person, so it doesn’t necessarily get out of hand.” These are not forceful commands; they are suggestions.

**Personal authority: kindness and trustworthiness.** Personal authority relates to the teacher candidate's use of individual qualities to establish their right to command and promote student obedience (Wrong, 2017, p. 60). Macleod et al. (2012) state, "The pupil's compliance arises from a desire to please the teacher, rather than the fact the teacher is perceived to have powers, expertise or status endorsed by the school community" (pp. 502-503). Important personal qualities are humor, kindness, and trustworthiness, among others (Macleod et al., 2012, p. 503). Teacher candidates did not rely on humor in this study. Teacher candidates did practice personal authority when they expressed kindness and tried to build trust with Casey. In her debrief, Marissa stated that "she just talked to him like he was a friend." Eight female and seven male teacher candidates expressed kindness through polite greetings and closings, supportive comments (including offering time), reassurance, and friendly banter. Justin used both polite greetings and closings when he told Casey, "Come in. How's it going? Have a seat please.... Well, it's nice to meet you, Casey" and, "So, thanks for coming in. I appreciate it. ... Have a nice day." Teacher candidates also made supportive comments. For example, Arthur said, "You've got friends, teachers, counselors, principals, vice-principals, that are going to support you." And Clayton reassured Casey with the comment, "You don't have to be ashamed of what's going on. Are you ashamed of what's going on?" Code examples of evidence of kindness include single phrases and pages of dialogue. For example, Elise engaged in friendly banter for much of her conversation with Casey, talking about basketball, his talent as a player, his first-period class and teacher, assignments due, and his friends.

Trustworthiness is a character trait mentioned by Macleod et al.'s (2012) discussion of Wrong's (2017) personal authority. The personal quality of trustworthiness emerged in the conversations of seven teacher candidates. Teacher candidates hinted at their trustworthiness, and sometimes to their loyalty to Casey to try and convince Casey to do what they wanted. Many

times, the teacher candidates wanted Casey to talk more about his situation. Teacher candidates spoke of confidentiality; they offered reassurance and loyalty.

Teacher candidates also used the personal quality of trustworthiness when they encouraged Casey to talk to them. Kyle told Casey “You can tell me anything. Don’t worry about it. Whatever you say, don’t worry. Just talk to me.” Elizabeth said, “You’re allowed to talk to me.” Arthur wanted Casey to talk about his situation. Using a personal characteristic of trustworthiness, he told Casey,

I was trying to figure out what’s going on. I’m not trying to get you in trouble. If you want to talk to me about it. I mean, I’ve never had you in class before, but I mean, feel free to open up. Family stuff?

In this statement, Arthur reassured Casey that he was not trying to get him in trouble. Like Arthur, other teacher candidates talked about “trouble” with Casey. I discuss more examples of teacher candidates’ language around trouble within the care section under the code well-being.

Four teacher candidates in this study offered Casey levels of confidentiality. Confidentiality alludes to the idea that the teacher candidate will not inform select individuals. Elizabeth told Casey she would not inform the counselor or the principal of anything without Casey’s permission. Clayton told Casey, “Everything that you tell me right now is in confidentiality,” and Kyle reassured Casey that the conversation is just between them. John offered confidentiality with exceptions. He stated, “I just want to say to start with that, whatever we talk about will be confidential, unless it involves any kind of abuse or any instance where you might hurt yourself or somebody else, that I have to report.” In this example, John relied on both personal and legitimate authority. John wanted Casey to talk to him, so he offered confidentiality (a way of communicating he is trustworthy), but he was the only teacher candidate to limit his statement with exceptions based on his perceived job-related responsibilities.



**Relinquished authority.** Seven teacher candidates relinquished their authority in this study. The relinquish authority code includes excerpts when the teacher candidate gave authority to Casey, either by placing the responsibility on Casey, giving authority to Casey, or asking Casey's permission. Four female teacher candidates and three male teacher candidates relinquished authority. However, it was more common behavior for females. Female participants spoke 15 of the 18 code examples. Adelyn gave authority to Casey by relinquishing her own. For example,

So, I'm telling you first and foremost, you have to advise somebody about it because if this does become continuous, that is a form of bullying and obviously you're saying something that's not nice to you. So, I want you to look into other sources and have a conversation with somebody about it and address this because this can escalate to an extreme, and you saying you can handle it can potentially harm somebody else and your well-being.

In this statement, Adelyn told Casey to advise someone else, as if she is not in a position to handle the situation herself. She eliminated herself as a person with the responsibility or authority to support Casey. Adelyn also placed the responsibility on Casey when she asked, "So what will be your course of action in regards to this situation?" and "So how will you go about this right now?" Marissa and Samara asked similar questions. Marissa asked, "And how are you going to face this?" And Samara asked, "So, what are you going to do to solve the problem?" Two teacher candidates asked for Casey's permission. Marissa asked, "Do you mind if I take care of it?" and Elizabeth asked, "Can you let me or someone else handle it?" Samara also asked, "And the person that's talking about you, should I be involved in this? Should I get other teachers involved in this?" These questions ask for Casey's opinions. I coded opinion questions as a shared authority, and these questions have elements of shared authority. However, I coded

these excerpts as relinquishing authority because, in them, the teacher candidate talks to Casey as one might a mentor. She asks Casey generally, what should I do?

Elizabeth and Casey created a unique dynamic when Casey consistently commanded Elizabeth not to inform other adults, and she complied. For example, Casey said, “You’re not going to tell anybody.” And Elizabeth responded, “Absolutely not.” This dynamic is evident in other sections of the dialogue. Here is an example.

Elizabeth: Okay. And then we can maybe go to the counselor.

Casey: No, just don’t, just don’t tell anybody.

Elizabeth: No.

Casey: No counselor, no principal, no one else.

Elizabeth: Never without your permission.

Casey: You’re not lying, are you?

Elizabeth: Absolutely not.

Casey: Because usually you go and tell. I don’t want the principal, I don’t want any counselors, any teachers just to find out or look at me differently.

Elizabeth: No. Okay. I would never tell any of the teachers. I’m going to tell the counselor that I’m talking to you, but not what about, just so that he’s aware.

Okay? Is that okay?

Casey: Yes.

When Elizabeth complied with Casey’s wishes by saying “never without your permission,” she relinquished her authority and must negotiate for permission to inform another adult.

**Shared authority.** In all, 15 teacher candidates shared authority with Casey. The shared authority code includes excerpts that position Casey as teamed with the teacher candidate in the process of problem-solving. The teacher candidate may ask how they can help. They may use the

terms *we*, *me and you*, and *with you* to denote teamwork. They may overtly ask for Casey's opinion about the solutions they propose. Casey's level of authority in these interactions varied. In some cases, shared authority is a teacher candidate genuinely asking for Casey's opinion. For example, Arthur asked Casey, "What can we do? How can we calm you down a bit." Kenneth and Justin both asked Casey if he thinks it would be a good idea to talk to the boys on the bus. In other cases, the teacher candidates prompted Casey's opinion in ways that communicate a correct answer aligned with school rules and teacher expectations. Casey had less autonomy to answer honestly. For example, Clayton asked if Casey would mind speaking to him again. Elise's question begins, "Do you think there's any other way that we can resolve this problem with the boys besides..." Teacher candidates also shared authority with Casey when problem-solving. Clayton asked,

Do you think that would be an effective type of intervention for me to speak to them or for the school principal to speak to them about easing up on you so that you can have some room to breathe? Do you think that'll work?

Clayton, Elizabeth, Elise, John, and Marcia shared authority with Casey three or more times, and Elizabeth had eight examples of shared authority in her conversation with Casey. She asked:

- 1) If there is someone he feels more comfortable talking to
- 2) If he wants her to talk to the students
- 3) If he wants her to get someone else to talk to the students
- 4) If he wants to talk to the principal or vice-principal
- 5) If he wants to continue to talk to her

Elizabeth reiterated that she and Casey need to find a solution, that they will talk to people, and that they can figure it out together.

**Minimized authority.** Seven teacher candidates (four female and three male) minimized their authority in conversation with Casey. Adelyn told Casey, “And I know it’s early in the morning and I didn’t want to bug you about it...” Adelyn’s words may undermine her authority if Casey is less willing to obey her because she gave the impression that his behavior is acceptable and not concerning. Casey may interpret the phrase “it is early in the morning” as it is okay to threaten people before and after school, but not during school. Or he may think that his behavior is not a big deal because it does not warrant an immediate discussion. Elizabeth minimized her authority by downplaying her abilities compared to the counselor. She stated, “Also, have you ever met the counselor? Because I’m just a teacher. I could just listen, but the counselor might have better advice.” Indeed, the counselor would probably have more specialized skills. However, when Elizabeth said she is “just” a teacher it may undermine her legitimate authority and give Casey fewer reasons to obey. Elise used the words “Not only with, nevermind me, because I’m not even your teacher, but your other teachers and your coach for basketball. I mean, could you imagine any situation like that, that would pull you right off the team right away?” She spoke to Casey about the consequences of an actual fight and hinted at possible actions and disappointment her coach and other teachers might take. In another example, Thomas explained,

I’m not going to bring up like any of the language. Like I said, I usually dismiss that anyways. Just look at people. And, but you guys just walked right by. I couldn’t tell you not to talk or not to swear or anything.

In this excerpt, Thomas explained to Casey that he usually overlooks language, i.e., obscenities, and he will not mention it. The meaning of Thomas’ last sentence is a bit hard to decipher. But he said that he cannot tell Casey not to talk or swear. This statement may minimize his legitimate

authority, and at the same time, it may increase his personal authority. Rebecca expressed ill confidence and uneasiness in her closing conversation with Casey:

Rebecca: If you need anybody to talk to you, my doors open. I don't know.

Casey: Okay.

Rebecca: Okay. Yeah. Cool. Nice chat, I suppose. I guess you can go back to first period.

Casey: Okay.

Rebecca: Thank you for indulging me and having a talk.

In this conversation segment, Rebecca openly stated her uncertainty with the statement, "I don't know." She further implied insecurity with the words, "Yeah. Cool," "I suppose," and "I guess."

### *Authority as a Hybridized Concept*

Types of authority are not pure—they are hybridized in teacher-student interactions (Pace, 2003b). Pace and Hemmings (2006b) state, "Types of authority in classrooms are inevitably blended or "hybridized" as teachers interact with students." (p. 7). All teacher candidates in this study relied on multiple types of authority. They sometimes used multiple types of authority in single statements to Casey. This is one of Adelyn's last statements to Casey:

Casey Butler. Okay, Casey, I'm just writing your name down, just in case anything were to happen. I know this is our first encounter together. Like I said, I'm here regulating the halls and I was just concerned about this colorful language that you did apply outside. And I know it's early in the morning and I didn't want to bug you about it, but it's definitely something I have to address and I don't want this to progress. So, if anything like this were to happen again, I advise you [to] seek help and thank you for coming. Thank you for telling me what you had in mind. But definitely don't try to resolve something by hurting somebody else. Okay?

In this paragraph, Adelyn relied on coercive authority when she said she will write his name down just in case. She used legitimate authority when she talked about regulating the halls, her concern, and her need to address the situation. Adelyn minimized her authority when she talked about it being morning and not wanting to bother Casey. At the end of the paragraph, Adelyn used personal authority, specifically kindness. She gave Casey advice, arguably a form of competent authority. As evident in the paragraph above, the teacher candidates in this study leveraged more than one type of authority simultaneously when talking with Casey.

### ***Summary***

Teacher candidates in this study relied on coercive, legitimate, and personal authority, with less reliance on competent authority and authority by inducement. Teacher candidates did not rely on coercive authority as Wrong (2017) describes; they did not make threats of harm. However, over half of the participants reprimanded Casey; over a third spoke to Casey of consequences in ways that some may interpret as meant to instill fear. In this study, every participant except Kyle used some form of coercive authority. Fourteen teacher candidates used some form of legitimate authority, with three-quarters mentioning their role as teachers or hall monitors and a half talking about their roles as rule enforcers and protectors. All but one teacher candidate showed evidence of using personal authority most through kindness, less through trust-building dialogue, and not at all through humor. When using competent authority, 14 of the 16 teacher candidates offered advice, but none touted their superior skills or knowledge. In the rare instance that teacher candidates used authority by inducement, they offered to help Casey and not by discussing rewards. Importantly, in addition to Wrong's (2017) five types of authority, all but one teacher candidate shared authority with Casey. A little under half of the participants relinquished and minimized their authority in their interactions with Casey.

### **Part III: Question 1b Results – Evidence of Teacher Candidate Care**

In the earlier section and in response to my first research sub-question, we looked at elements of teacher candidate authority in interactions with an upset student who threatens harm. In this section, I report evidence related to elements of teacher candidate care to address my second sub-question: Do elements of care emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student?

#### ***Theoretical Perspectives***

I analyze my data through a conceptual lens of care as relational using the ideas of Noddings (2013) and Gilligan's (1993) ethic of care. This study defines care as "actions and energy directed toward the welfare, protection, and enhancement of the cared-for" (Noddings, 2013, p. 23). Noddings (2013) argues ones caring as teachers hold the primary responsibility to nurture "students' ethical ideal" (p. 178). Teachers have a unique and powerful influence on the enhancement or destruction of this ideal through dialogue, practice, and confirmation. Based on Gilligan's (1993) ethic of care, I will focus on the interpersonal interactions between morally concerned individuals as they discern what is best (Held, 2006, pp. 10-11). I will value emotions and view people as relational and interdependent. Care in this study relates to teacher candidates "attending to and meeting the needs of the particular others for whom we take responsibility" (p. 10). Goldstein (1998) writes that care is often treated as a "feeling, group of feelings, or a personality trait" in the literature (p. 3). This study does not conceptualize care as such.

#### ***Care Codes***

**Initial codes.** My second sub-question asks, do elements of care emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student? The initial set of codes (see Appendix M) a priori for care are based on the works of (Noddings, 2005a, 2012a, 2012b, 2013) and McBee (2007).

The teacher candidates in this study may interact in ways that align with how other teacher candidates have conceptualized care. They may offer help or time (McBee, 2007). They may listen attentively (McBee, 2007; Noddings, 2005a, p. 16, 2012b) or demonstrate compassion (McBee, 2007). Teacher candidates in this study may actualize caring in non-verbal ways by using eye contact (McBee, 2007) or smiling (Noddings, 2005a, p. 17). Teacher candidates may have an empathetic (Noddings, 2012a) or sympathetic response (Noddings, 2005a, p. 19) within this clinical simulation. Through the analytic lens of care, I am interested in the questions teacher candidates ask Casey. An important code under the construct of care is teacher candidate questions, especially the questions teacher candidates ask to learn more, ask to understand what Casey is going through, and ask based on Casey's responses (McBee, 2007, p. 40; Noddings, 2012b, pp. 774–775).

**Emerging and after-emerging codes.** I coded the first three transcripts (19% of the simulations) using my initial codebook for care. Three codes emerged in this process: general care, best interests, and encouragement. I coded the remaining transcripts, and the four post-simulation debriefs using an updated codebook with initial and emerging codes (see Appendix N). One code, caring questions, emerged in this process. I also thoroughly defined my listening code and termed it receptive listening and changed my encouragement code to praise.

One initial code for care is questioning. In my coding process, it was challenging to differentiate a caring question from a non-caring question. I created an all questions code and listed every question the teacher candidates asked. Then, before coding for caring questions, I revisited the literature to understand what scholars who study care mean by a caring question. I discuss these definitions with the data in evidence of elements of care.

During the coding process, I was not content with my listening code. Determined to re-code specifically for evidence of listening, I went back to the literature on care and pulled a more



complete and accurate understanding of listening with care, described as receptive listening. In the words of Noddings (2012b), receptive listening (attention) means to “hear and understand the needs expressed” and to “address the expressed need of the student for emotional support, moral direction, or shared human interest” (p. 772). With this new knowledge, I re-coded the transcripts for receptive listening and omitted the data from my original listening code.

I coded for attention as an example of care initially. Receptive listening overlaps with the attention code. Noddings (2012b) co-terms receptive listening as attention, writing, “Receptive listening (attention) is at the heart of caring for human others” (p. 775). I deleted attention as a code because the receptive listening text includes the originally coded examples.

One emerging code descriptor was encouragement. I changed this code label to praise through the coding process. Praise is more specific, accurately defines the examples, and is not as general and thus evident across codes as encouragement. During the analysis of coded excerpts, I also changed the code label of best interests to well-being. Appendix O is my complete codebook for care.

### ***Results: Evidence of Teacher Candidate Care***

Teacher candidates demonstrated elements of care. In this section, I discuss evidence of elements of care apparent in conversations between Casey and the teacher candidates. Generally, all participants asked caring questions (100%), and most vocalized compassion (88%), offered time (67%), sympathized (63%), acknowledged what is in Casey’s best interest or thought of his well-being (63%), and practiced receptive listening (56%). Fewer teacher candidates praised Casey (32%) and expressed empathy (25%). Table 9 provides more details.

**Table 9***Teacher Candidate Evidence of Elements of Care*

Name	Compassion	Empathy	Sympathy	Offers time	All questions	Caring questions	Receptive listening	General care	Well-being	Praise	Elements of care use	Care frequency
Adelyn					24	8		1			2	9
Arthur	8	2	1	2	70	44	yes	1	1		8	60
Clayton	8		1	3	70	53	yes	1	1	1	8	69
Elise	5		2		37	19			4	1	5	31
Elizabeth	8	1	5	2	38	20	yes	1	4		8	42
Jasper	2		1	1	14	12	yes	1	1	1	8	20
John			1	1	32	26					3	28
Justin	2		2	1	12	7					4	12
Kenneth	4				12	10		1			3	15
Kyle	1	2	4		43	41	yes		3	1	7	52
Marcia	2		1	1	11	10			1		5	15
Marissa	2		5	1	32	19	yes				5	28
Natalya	2			1	9	8			1		4	21
Rebecca	1			1	10	10	yes				4	13
Samara	3				23	8	yes	2	2	1	6	17
Thomas	3	1		1	15	13	yes	1	2		7	22
Total	14	4	10	11	16	16	9	8	10	5		
%	88%	25%	63%	67%	100	100	56%	50%	63%	32%		

*Note.* All questions column not included in totals; Receptive listening counted as one element and one frequency when present.

**Compassion: offering help, teamwork, and future support.** Stevens and Bush (2018) cite the work of Baston (2009), Goetz et al. (2010) and T. Singer & Lamm (2009) to define compassion as a sensitivity to the suffering of another and a desire to alleviate that suffering. Compassion has a motivational component of wanting to help others (p. 55).

Compassion is a frequent example of care in this study. Kyle stated that he was just trying to help Casey in a debrief session with his peers (p. 6). This willingness to help is evident in the interactions of others as well. A total of 14 teacher candidates demonstrated compassion by offering to help Casey in 49 excerpts. Three-quarters of the candidates (12) showed compassion more than once, and one-quarter or four teacher candidates demonstrated compassion four or more times in conversation. Themes within compassion include unspecified offerings of help, specific ways teacher candidates propose to help, teamwork, and telling Casey to approach them for support in the future.

In the sub-category of unspecified offerings of help, six teacher candidates spoke of helping Casey. Arthur, Clayton, Natalya, and Samara stated that they were trying to help. Clayton reminded Casey that he wants to help four separate times. Elizabeth stated this twice, and Samara once. Clayton also said that he is there to help. Clayton and Marica asked what they can do to help. When Casey said, “Then, I don’t think you can help me at all,” Elizabeth answered, “I can. I can do something.” Clayton reminded Casey that there are people in the school, besides himself, who can help Casey. He explained, “You haven’t talked to like, the guidance counselor or anything like that, have you? No? You know, they’re always available though, right? I mean, do you know that people are there to help you if needed? Teachers, other than myself.”

Four teacher candidates expressed compassion in terms of teamwork. Kyle stated, “I want to figure this out with you.” And Clayton supported Casey by telling him, “We’re going to try to do everything that we can to help you. Everything...I would like to speak to you again.” Elise and Arthur asked Casey what else they can do to help.

Another way teacher candidates show compassion is by offering to help in specific ways. These code excerpts align with specific and separate solutions in the solutions section, but I

discuss some of them collectively here through the lens of compassion within care. All 12 teacher candidates offered help in specific but different ways. Arthur, Clayton, Elizabeth, Jasper, Kenneth, Natalya, and Thomas specifically discussed, or suggested, talking with the two students, in some cases with Casey. Clayton offered to mediate Casey's frustrations, and Marissa took a similar approach when she asked, "Do you want to tell me what's going on at home? Maybe talking about it could help you through it?" Three teacher candidates helped by suggesting the guidance counselor. Arthur said, "I can recommend a guidance counselor for you. If that's helpful. These are pretty heavy issues, right?" Elise said she would talk to the bus driver and Casey's homeroom teacher. Marcia asked, "Is there anyone you'd like to talk to about this? You think that would help you at all?" Similarly, Rebecca asked, "Do you need anybody to talk to about whatever's going on?" Elizabeth and Marissa asked Casey if they could help. Elizabeth asked, "Can you let me or someone else handle it?" And Marissa asked, "Do you mind if I take care of it?"

Elizabeth, Jasper, and Justin told Casey to come to them for help if the boys' behaviors continue. Jasper extended his invitation for Casey to talk to him if the boys on the bus or other students upset him, stating,

If this happens again with the same group of guys or another group of students and they say or do anything to upset you or harm you or get you mad like you were before, you can come to me and let me know.

Justin and Elizabeth talked in more general terms. Adelyn and John did not offer to help Casey. John asked Casey caring questions but focused on what he would put in an incident report. Adelyn also asked caring questions and focused on understanding how Casey planned to handle the situation. In both cases, helping Casey was not part of the conversation.

**Empathy: shared experiences.** Stevens and Bush (2018) define empathy as “the general vicarious experiencing or sharing of another person’s emotional state, not just their suffering” (p. 55). It is impossible to know if the teacher candidates in this study are feeling the same as Casey based on existing data. I only know what teacher candidates say and how they say it in the clinical simulation. I coded statements as having evidence of empathy when the teacher candidates try to relate by talking about personal experiences or feelings like Casey’s.

Four teacher candidates demonstrated elements of empathy in conversation with Casey. Two of Kyle’s statements contained evidence of empathy associated with his home life. He stated, “Cause, trust me, Casey, I know, I know what it’s like to have a lot of stuff going on at home. When I was at high school my senior year, I couldn’t even tell you from-” and, “Hold on Casey. Hold on quick, because I’m not going to just let you leave like that on me. I know what it’s like.” In both cases, Casey cut him off mid-sentence. An action by Casey that Kyle recounted is upsetting in the debrief. No other teacher candidates related to Casey’s home life. However, one statement by Thomas contained evidence of empathy connected to Casey’s behavior. Thomas told Casey, “It could be you, you’re venting. You’re hanging in with your friends. I know growing up, I did that. When I was mad, I’d just say stuff I didn’t mean.” Elizabeth told Casey that she does not like being made fun of either. I chose to code her statement as empathy because she implies that she understands as she has also experienced being made fun of in the past. Two of Arthur’s statements suggested feelings of empathy. He spoke with Casey about also having a younger sister in school that you feel you must protect and about his experience with upperclassmen who gossip.

**Sympathy: expressions of understanding and sorrow.** Noddings (2010b) describes sympathy as “an attitude of ‘feeling with’ another ... There is also an element of understanding in sympathy” (pp. 6-7). Stevens and Bush (2018) define sympathy as “feelings of sorrow for the

other” (p. 55). Coded excerpts under sympathy encompass statements that show understanding or sorrow by teacher candidates.

In total, 10 teacher candidates made sympathetic statements in conversation with Casey. They sympathized with Casey’s feelings, with his experience, and with the inappropriateness of the boys’ behaviors on the bus. Additionally, one teacher candidate (Kyle) dialogued with Casey to encourage feelings of sympathy.

Casey: Man, you don’t understand what I’m going through.

Kyle: So then explain it to me. Explain it to me-

Casey: I explained it already-

Kyle: All right then tell me how you feel. Tell me-

Seven teacher candidates spoke about understanding how Casey is feeling (see Table 10). Arthur and Elise understood why Casey was upset. Justin and Kyle commented on how stressful this must be for Casey. Marica and Marissa sympathized with feelings of frustration. Clayton wanted to understand why Casey is angry.

**Table 10**

*Examples of Teacher Candidates’ Sympathizing with How Casey is Feeling*

Name	Example quote
Arthur	“Right. Listen, I get why, you know, this is upsetting you and I’m intentionally not trying to pry into your life. All right? Hopefully, you see that. But I mean, these kids, obviously, are not doing a very nice thing.”
Clayton	“I just want to understand why you’re angry, more than anything.”
Elise	“Yeah, I can suit. I mean, I definitely understand why that would make you really upset that they were talking about you. I mean, there’s no need for it at all.”
Elise	“I get it. I mean, I can see why you’re upset, completely.”
Justin	“It’s stressful. There’s a lot of kids and a lot of different situations.”
Kyle	“It is a stressful time for you. I could see that’s really hard.”
Marcia	“I understand you’re angry. Things can be frustrating, but you sure you’re okay?”

Marissa “Okay. So, this is why you’re pissed off because they know nothing about your home life and for them to come and talk to you about things. It’s frustrating, I bet.”

---

Four teacher candidates expressed sympathy concerning Casey’s experience and what he was going through (see Table 11). Elizabeth and Kyle understood that Casey is struggling, and that life is hard for him right now. Jasper agreed that kids can be insensitive about what goes on at home, and Justin commiserated with Casey’s experience on the bus.

Three teacher candidates sympathized with Casey by agreeing with him. Elizabeth agreed with Casey that the boys on the bus are at fault when she said, “I’m very sorry. I’m not, I’m not trying to say that what they did was okay.” John and Marissa agreed with Casey that people need to mind their own business. John stated, “I agree, people do need to mind their own business and especially about people’s personal lives.” And Marissa agreed, “Yeah, you’re right on that. But people don’t mind their business. Obviously, I hear you.”

**Table 11**

*Examples of Teacher Candidates’ Sympathizing with Casey’s Experience*

Name	Example quote
Elizabeth	“I promise you. I do not like when other people make fun of you.”
Elizabeth	“I understand that... I’ve never I’ve never gone through that, but I can’t even imagine how hard that is for you. And I’m so sorry...That’s not fair to you. And no one should be made fun of.”
Elizabeth	“Cause what you’re going through is really hard.”
Jasper	“Mm-hm. Yeah no, kids can be pretty insensitive especially about stuff happening outside of school.”
Justin	“That’s terrible. I would never want somebody to be picked out or someone to be talked about behind each other’s back, especially on the bus.”
Kyle	“Cause I know, I know like the school got more crowded. A lot of things got more, more intense in the school. I could see how you could have a problem with other people.”
Kyle	“The same way I couldn’t assume when you came in my room that you was just angry at somebody. Nah, you’re going through things at home. You’re going through things right now. Life is a little hard for you. I understand that. And whether or not other people understand that is...It is what it is.”

Most teacher candidates either sympathize with Casey's feelings, sympathize with his experience, or sympathize through agreement. However, four teacher candidates sympathize across two categories. Justin and Kyle sympathize with both Casey's experience and his feelings. Elizabeth sympathizes with Casey's experience and agrees with Casey that the boys' behavior on the bus was inappropriate. Marissa sympathizes with Casey's feelings through agreement. No teacher candidates show sympathy across all three categories. Six teacher candidates do not sympathize with Casey.

**Offering time: future conversations.** The code offering time includes invitations to and/or voicing availability for conferencing with Casey in the future.

A total of 11 teacher candidates in this study offered their time in this way (see Table 12). Teacher candidates extended invitations with direct questions. For example, Elizabeth asked, "Well, why don't we start talking on a daily basis? Why don't you come here? We can talk about it." Jasper did not request that Casey come back to talk with him. He did tell Casey he is welcome to come back and talk. "Good luck with everything at home. And if there's anything else you need with that regard, just want to come to a place to talk, you know my door's always open so there's always a place." Marcia and Marissa extended open-ended invitations to talk. Elizabeth, Justin, and Rebecca used a version of the phrase "my door is always open." Arthur told Casey when he is available in the statement, "But if you ever need a teacher to talk to, I'm available before the bell, like now, but otherwise after school, during a study hall." Most teacher candidates offered their time once at the end of the conversation. Five teacher candidates did not extend Casey an invitation to talk in the future.

The definition of offering time is narrow in this study. I want to clarify that teacher candidates also offer their time in other ways within the compassion code. I did not simultaneously code these excerpts because my definition of offering time was narrow.



**Table 12***Examples of Teacher Candidates' Offering Time to Talk with Casey in the Future*

Name	Example quote
Arthur	"You can always stop by here, after school with me. If you want to keep talking about it, try to deal with it verbally."
Arthur	"But if you ever need a teacher to talk to, I'm available before the bell, like now, but otherwise after school, during a study hall or something..."
Clayton	"And if you ever feel the need that you want to talk to me"
Clayton	"I am here to help you and you can come talk to me at any time that you feel frustrated, okay? Would you come talk to me?"
Clayton	"Would you mind speaking to me again?"
Elizabeth	"Well, why don't we start talking on a daily basis? Why don't you come here? We can talk about it."
Elizabeth	"You can come to me. I know I'm not your teacher. You can come to me for anything. My door's always open. Do you want to, after school today..."
Jasper	"Good luck with everything at home. And if there's anything else you need with that regard, just want to come to a place to talk, you know my door's always open so there's always a place."
John	"Casey, if you want to talk about anything, you can come back and talk to me at any time, Okay?"
Justin	"So again, I'm Justin. My door's always, always open."
Marcia	"I'm always here if you'd like to talk."
Marissa	"Just know, anytime you need to talk, I know I don't have you as a student. I'm here."
Natalya	"You know where my classroom is, this is my classroom. So, if you feel that they're bothering you or anything like that, you can most definitely come and talk to me."
Rebecca	"If you need anybody to talk to you, my door's open."
Thomas	"And if you ever want to come back and talk to me or anything, feel free and I hope to see you around."

However, I will talk about three teacher candidates who did not offer time within the offering time code but do offer time more generally within the compassion code when trying to help Casey. Kenneth offered to schedule meetings with Casey after school, to conference later, to sit down with the boys, and to go to the counselor. Elise indirectly offered her time within the compassion code when she asked Casey if there is anything else she could do to help. Samara did

not overtly offer her time, but she did ask Casey if “she should be involved in this? Should I get other teachers involved in this?” Adelyn and Kyle did not offer their time within the compassion or offering time codes.

**Caring questions.** Noddings (2012b) states, “We have to ask questions and reflect on the answers. Dialogue is fundamental in building relations of care and trust.” (p. 775). Noddings (2012b), citing the work of (Weil, 1977, p. 51), defines caring questions as those aligned with the question, “What are you going through?” (p. 724). McBee (2007) defines a caring question as one that shows interest or helps the teacher learn more about a student (p. 40). Thus, I coded a question as caring if it reflects on Casey’s answers, relates to understanding what Casey was going through, or shows interest or helps the teacher candidate learn more about Casey.

This study organizes teacher candidates’ total queries into caring and non-caring questions. Teacher candidates questioned Casey, asking nine to 70 total questions in conversation. They inquired an average of 28 times. Natalya asked the fewest total questions (9). Arthur and Clayton asked the most (70 each).

Questions asking for Casey’s opinion are harder to categorize as caring or non-caring. As I discussed earlier, teacher candidates have authority in interactions with Casey. Not all questions are true questions. Some teacher candidates ask questions that resemble commands with a question mark. They are prompts with correct answers—answers that align with school norms and obedience (i.e., agreeing not to resort to physical violence). Here, Adelyn prompted, “Do you want to speak about it, speak about what happened, and maybe another solution to the situation? Can you think of anything in regards to the situation that does not involve harming somebody else?” In a second example, Elise said, “Do you think there’s any other way that we can resolve this problem with the boys besides...” In both cases, there are correct and expected answers. Sometimes Casey gave the expected answer and sometimes he did not. For example,

when Clayton asked, “Would you mind speaking to me again?” His response was “okay.”

However, in the following excerpt, he refused to comply:

Clayton: Would you mind me speaking to Sam and Keith? Alone. You don’t have to be there.

Casey: I mean, whatever.

Clayton: No, no, no. It’s, it’s not whatever. It’s not whatever. It’s... Seriously. What you... Do you think that would be an effective type of intervention for me to speak to them or for the school principal to speak to them about easing up on you so that you can have some room to breathe? Do you think that’ll work?

Casey: No.

Clayton: You don’t? Has it... has someone tried that before?

Casey: No.

Clayton: No? Are you not willing to try?

The question, would you mind me speaking to Sam and Keith, is a prompt. Readers may interpret this prompt as a caring question because the teacher candidate problem-solves based on Casey’s previous responses and tries to learn more. Clayton is interested in Casey’s answer. All questions asking for Casey’s opinion could be coded as caring if the teacher candidate listened to his opinions to learn more. Most questions were coded as caring when teacher candidates asked for Casey’s opinion. I excluded a few questions based on the language used, tone of voice, and a perceived lack of investment in Casey’s answer. For example, I coded Adelyn’s question, “Can you think of anything in regards to the situation that does not involve harming somebody else?” as a non-caring question.

All teacher candidates ask caring questions while interacting with Casey. The teacher candidates in this study asked from seven to 53 caring questions, with an average of 19 caring

questions in conversation. Justin asked the fewest caring questions (7), and Clayton asked the most (53). Rebecca asked the highest percentage of caring questions (100%), and Adelyn asked the lowest (33%). There are 14 teacher candidates who asked more caring questions than non-caring questions. Nine teacher candidates asked caring questions more than 75% of the time.

Teacher candidates asked caring questions reflective of Casey's answers. These caring questions include, but are not limited to, queries that repeat Casey's responses, reference help or helping, clarify Casey's responses, or are what I should do and what have you done type questions. For example, Samara asked, "What don't you care about?" And Kenneth asked, "Can you explain who they are? They friends of yours or what are they saying?" Questions that reflect on Casey's answers can intersect with caring questions that show interest or help the teacher candidate learn more. For example, when Jasper asked, "What's the situation if you don't mind me asking? And how do you plan on taking care of it?" his question was in response to Casey saying he will take care of it, and it also showed interest and helped Jasper learn more about Casey. I did not simultaneously code within the code of caring questions.

Teacher candidates also asked caring questions to learn more about what Casey is experiencing or going through. Elizabeth asked, "Why, why do you want to start fighting?" Kyle asked, "What's going on? Heard you... Heard you scuffling around here. Heard you say you were really upset with somebody. What's going on? Talk to me. What you upset about?" And John asked if Casey felt threatened, if he felt like he might get attacked, and if he felt like attacking a peer. Teacher candidates asked caring questions that show interest or help them learn more. Teacher candidates asked for Casey's name. They wanted to know details about Casey's family members, whom Casey is close to at school, and details about his bus rides. They asked about dad, and a few teacher candidates asked about mom.

**Receptive listening: hearing expressed needs, moral direction, emotional support, and connection.** According to Noddings (2012b), receptive listening (attention) is to “hear and understand the needs expressed” and to “address the expressed need of the student for emotional support, moral direction, or shared human interest” (p. 772). Nine teacher candidates used receptive listening in conversation with Casey (five male and four female). The teacher candidates exhibited receptive listening by hearing and understanding Casey’s needs. They provided emotional support. They gave moral direction and connected with Casey on common ground. Evidence of receptive listening encompassed long swaths of dialogue, not short phrases or single sentences. Although there were multiple examples of receptive listening evident in the transcripts, I will share one example of this code. In the following excerpt, Clayton used the term “attention” to directly communicate his awareness of Casey’s needs and his investment in Casey’s well-being:

I don’t want you to just go off and do something physical to try to prove a point because it doesn’t solve anything. Physical action doesn’t solve anything. Like trying to hit somebody just to get him to talk to you, you’re trying to fight the whole world, because people are going to do that. There’s going to be plenty of people talking about you. And I know it’s been going on for a long time, and I know it’s hard because you feel like no one’s listening, but I paid attention to it this morning. So, you have someone in your corner.

And if you ever feel the need that you want to talk to me, and I’m going to notify the principal about Sam and Keith. I’m also going to notify school security about Sam and Keith. And I’m also going to notify the counselor so that you can possibly have a chance to speak to them. So, you can get those, those pent-up emotions out of you. So,

you can have some type of way to just speak about what you're feeling. And I'm also going talk to notify the bus driver as well.

Clayton gave Casey moral direction by telling him not to use physical violence to solve his problem. Then he connected with Casey on common ground by telling him he “paid attention” and “is in his corner.” Clayton then provided solutions. One solution, an opportunity for Casey to speak with the counselor, is a form of emotional support. Clayton further voiced emotional support and showed an awareness of Casey's needs when he spoke to Casey about releasing pent-up emotions and talking through his feelings with the counselor.

**Casey's well-being: reassurance and concern.** Ten teacher candidates used language aligned with keeping Casey's well-being in mind. For example, Natalya overtly stated, “We can definitely try and handle that the best way possible for you.” Teacher candidates also expressed an awareness of Casey's well-being or best interests in their discussions of trouble, safety, and by giving advice.

Five other teacher candidates mentioned trouble. They either reassured Casey that he was not in trouble and/or expressed a desire to keep Casey out of trouble. For example, Arthur told Casey that he is not trying to get him into trouble. Clayton said, “You're not in trouble. Don't feel like you're in trouble. You're not in trouble at all.” Elise was concerned with Casey getting into trouble and getting hurt—she suggested ways he can stay out of trouble and stay safe. Thomas mentioned trouble in a different context. He stated his concern for Casey's safety but also used authority when he said, “And I don't want any hard feelings between you where I can see, because I just want to make sure that you're safe. I want to make sure that you're all good. I don't want to see any sort of trouble.”

Excerpts coded as well-being also include examples of teacher candidates advising against violence and advising to persuade. For example, Marcia stated, “I just think it'd be good

for you to learn, to channel your anger in different ways. You know, there's always other methods." Similarly, Samara said, "I know it seems like the best solution because that seems like a quick solution. And it'll get your problems over with quickly, but that'll probably just lead to more problems, and we don't want that." And Kyle told Casey, "I just want you to understand that you got to handle this for you. Making sure that you safe and you good." Advising against violence and advising to persuade are specific solutions codes discussed more in the uncategorized solutions section of teacher candidate solutions.

**Praise: positive messages.** J. Wong et al. (2019) define praise as a positive message with an emphasis on positive feedback given to a person, product, or performance (p. 820).

Five teacher candidates praised Casey during their interactions. Praise takes many forms. Clayton praised Casey for talking openly with him. He told Casey, "And the amount of information that you gave me now is, is a really good start. I appreciate that. I really do. I really do appreciate that because it takes guts." Jasper stated,

Well, I hope you use good judgment. I know all of you just met, but the fact that you came in when I asked you to in the hallway just a moment ago shows me initially that you can make you make good decisions. And I honestly believe that. So, the next time you run into these guys, I hope you can just, like I said, use good judgment.

Like telling Casey they believe he can make good decisions, Samara and Kyle told Casey, "I trust you." And Elise complimented Casey by saying, "You seem like a great kid to me."

### ***Overt Expressions of Care***

Three teacher candidates in this study overtly expressed care. Thomas said, "I care about you. I care about your well-being." Jasper explained, "But just for my sake, just for your well-being as a student, even though I don't have you in my class or anything like that, but as a student of the school, I care about your well-being." And twice, Samara clearly stated, "I care. I

don't want anyone getting hurt. Okay. I work in this building, and I see all of you from time to time and I don't want anyone getting hurt." And later, when Casey said he does not care, Samara responded, "I know I can tell, but I care...I care."

### *Encouragement Across Codes*

Teacher candidates offered help, expressed compassion, made sympathetic statements, and praised Casey. They proposed solutions and talked with Casey about how best to solve this problem. In addition, eight teacher candidates encouraged Casey when they acknowledged difficult aspects of his situation and or fostered "courage, perseverance, confidence, inspiration, or hope" with their words (J. Wong, 2015). J. Wong (2015) defines encouragement as "the expression of affirmation through language or other symbolic representations to instill courage, perseverance, confidence, inspiration, or hope in a person" (p. 182). It is a mode of interpersonal communication with a focus on "enhancing the recipient's motivation" (J. Wong et al., 2019, p. 820).

Six teacher candidates in this study acknowledged difficult aspects of Casey's situation. For example, Clayton said, "I know it's hard because you feel like no one's listening, but I paid attention to it this morning. So, you have someone in your corner." And Elizabeth stated, "I've never I've never gone through that, but I can't even imagine how hard that is for you. And I'm so sorry." And "what you're going through is really hard." Justin described Casey's situation as "stressful" and Kyle said, "I want to figure this out with you. It is a stressful time for you. I could see that's really hard." Marcia, Clayton, and Marissa specifically acknowledged his situation as frustrating. Marissa sympathized, "I'm sorry you had to deal with that." Teacher candidates affirmed Casey's experience as difficult, stressful, and frustrating.

Teacher candidates did not specifically tell Casey that he could do hard things. Seven teacher candidates made statements that may inspire "courage, perseverance, confidence,



inspiration, or hope” within Casey. In a statement that may give Casey hope Elizabeth said, “We’re going to stop them, I promise. Me and you will talk to people. We’re going to get them to stop.” And Elise told Casey, “You seem like a great kid to me.” Arthur stated, “You’ve got friends, teachers, counselors, principals, vice-principals, that are going to support you.” Clayton encouraged Casey and praised his courage when he said, “And the amount of information that you gave me now is, is a really good start. I appreciate that. I really do. I really do appreciate that because it takes guts.” Rebecca talked to Casey about her trust in him, which may instill confidence: “I trust that you’re going to handle the situation rationally. I trust in you.” In a longer statement, Jasper may have instilled confidence in Casey when he said,

Okay. Well, I hope you use good judgment. I know all of you just met, but the fact that you came in when I asked you to in the hallway just a moment ago shows me initially that you can make you make good decisions. And I honestly believe that. So, the next time you run into these guys, I hope you can just, like I said, use good judgment. If you want to call them out on what... Just ask them what they were saying, I think that’s fine as long as you’re respectful and non-confrontational and hopefully it doesn’t escalate into something more.

These excerpts have elements of sympathy, praise, and general care, and they exemplify the teacher candidates’ desire to look out for Casey’s best interests in some cases. The teacher candidates encourage Casey to handle the situation appropriately, and a couple of teacher candidates voice faith and trust in Casey’s ability to choose non-violent resolution strategies.

### ***Summary***

Teacher candidates communicated care across many codes in their interactions with Casey. All participants asked caring questions: reflecting on answers, understanding the experience of another, showing an interest, or learning more. Most participants vocalized

compassion, offered time, sympathized, acknowledged what was in Casey's best interest, and were receptive listeners. Teacher candidates showed compassion for Casey by offering him help and future support and through expressions of teamwork. Most teacher candidates offered to talk with Casey in the future. Teacher candidates were sympathetic toward Casey's feelings and lived experiences; some expressed sorrow. Most teacher candidates used language aligned with keeping Casey's well-being in mind. Teacher candidates used receptive listening in conversation with Casey by hearing and understanding Casey's needs, providing emotional support, giving moral direction, or connecting with Casey on common ground. Fewer teacher candidates praised and empathized. Teacher candidates encouraged Casey across care codes. Next, I discuss the teacher candidates' solutions to Casey's threatening behavior.

#### **Part IV: Question 1c Results – Evidence of Teacher Candidates' Solutions**

In the previous section, I reported evidence related to elements of teacher candidate care to address my second sub-question, investigating if elements of care emerge in conversations between the teacher candidates and standardized students. In this section, I discuss teacher candidates' solutions in response to my third sub-question (1c): What solutions emerge within the simulations? And do teacher candidates' solutions have elements of punitive, mild disciplinary, or restorative practices?

The teacher candidates in this clinical simulation must decide on an appropriate course of action while talking with Casey Butler. I coded for evidence of solutions broadly because my study frames solutions as the ways teacher candidates problem-solve or handle a situation. In this section, I discuss initial, emerging, and after-emerging codes. I explore teacher candidates and the principal, as well as evidence of punitive, mild disciplinary, and restorative solutions. Then, I

write about a few uncategorized solutions, the frequency and order of solutions, solutions in context, and patterns of teacher candidates' suggesting and not stating solutions.

### *Solutions Codes*

**Initial codes.** Prior to receiving the data for this study, I thought teacher candidates may suggest dissimilar and varied solutions to support Casey Butler and address threatening behavior. Additionally, I thought they may suggest multiple solutions within the same simulation. I didn't create codes, a priori, for all possible solutions the teacher candidate may or may not propose. However, I composed a list of codes (see Appendix P) a priori related to some punitive disciplinary practices, some mild disciplinary practices, some restorative practices, and two solution codes about the principal. Initial codes included the punitive disciplinary practices of suspension, expulsion, and involvement of the school resource officer (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43). Welch and Payne (2010) describe involving the school counselor and meeting with or calling Casey's parents as a "mild disciplinary response" (p. 43). I included these two solutions in my initial codebook. Additional initial codes included solutions with elements of restorative practices. These initial codes included restorative circles (Stutzman-Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 52) and a mention of healing harm (p. 61). I also added two codes connected to conferencing: (1) a meeting between Casey and his peers, or victim/offender conferencing (p. 61), and (2) a meeting with Casey, his peers, and the counselor. In this case, the counselor may have served as an "authority figure" (p. 60) described by Stutzman-Amstutz & Mullet (2005). I also included two codes about the principal. The first was a direct referral to the principal's office, and the second was a mention of a meeting with the principal or administration.

**Emerging and after-emerging codes.** When coding the first three transcripts for solutions, 10 codes emerged. Welch and Payne (2010) note reprimanding and conferencing as examples of mild disciplinary responses (p. 43). Thus, I categorized the emerging codes related

to the teacher candidates' reprimands of Casey as MILDReprimand. I termed language about teacher candidates' availability for a future conference, encouragement to meet in the future, and/or encouragement to talk during the clinical simulation as a conference, as

MILDConferencing: Talk with Casey. I coded the teacher candidates' language around conferencing with Mike/Keith and/or Sam as MILDConferencing: Meet with Mike and Sam. Seven uncategorized codes emerged. The codes include (1) giving responsibility to Casey, (2) working together, (3) advising against violence, (4) documenting the incident, (5) checking in with Casey to see if he had talked to someone else and or encouraging him to talk to someone else, (6) contacting the bus driver, and (7) monitoring and/or following-up with Casey. Appendix Q is my updated codebook for solutions after coding 19% of the simulation transcripts.

Four after-emerging codes emerged within uncategorized solutions while coding the remaining 13 transcripts. One after-emerging code was TC Advises to persuade. This code arose due to one teacher candidate's heavy reliance on talking to Casey to persuade him to handle people talking about him in productive ways with positive outcomes. Teacher candidates proposed meeting with another teacher (Inform another teacher), and they offered vague solutions (Vague solution). I also decided to code for the actions teacher candidates said they would not do (Not going to do). Appendix R is my complete codebook for solutions.

### ***Results: Evidence of Teacher Candidates' Solutions***

**The principal.** I began with the two initial codes related to the principal: Principal1 and Principal2. The Principal1 code was a direct referral to the principal's office. The Principal2 code was a mention of the principal or another administrator. I chose not to classify referral to or mention of the principal as punitive, mild disciplinary, or restorative because it is unknown if the actions of an administrator will be punitive, mild disciplinary, or restorative. No additional principal codes emerged.

Teacher candidates in this clinical simulation did not refer Casey directly to the principal's office as there was no evidence of the Principal1 code in the transcripts.

However, seven teacher candidates mentioned the principal, vice-principal, and/or administration (code: Principal2). Arthur asked if Casey had spoken to the principal already and later mentioned the principal and vice-principal in a list of multiple school personnel available for support. Like Arthur, Natalya referred to the principal as someone in a supportive role. However, Elizabeth stated, "So, I wanted to try and find a solution that didn't involve me sending you to someone up higher. I don't want to send you to the principal." Then, Elizabeth asked if Casey wanted to talk to the principal or vice-principal, then argued with Casey when he said not to tell the principal. Like Elizabeth, Clayton mentioned the administration or the principal multiple times. In the example below, he gave Casey a choice of talking to him or talking with the administration:

Because right now I'm in a position where I have to speak to the principal and the school security because I don't know what you're planning on doing. If you don't talk to me, that's all I'm going to have to... that's all I'm going to have to go on. It's pretty much can I step in, intervene and get administration involved? When we can just talk to each other about this right now. So, would you like to talk to me about it? Or would you like to talk to administration about it?

He also asked Casey if he thought asking the principal to talk with Mike and Sam would be effective, and twice said he would inform the principal. Elise casually mentioned that she thinks the vice-principal takes care of this. Kenneth asked Casey if he would like him to schedule a meeting with the principal and his peers. Marissa mentioned the principal when she described what may happen to Casey if he engaged in a physical fight.

**Punitive disciplinary practices: suspension, expulsion, and resource officers.** I began with the three initial punitive disciplinary codes of PUNsuspension, PUNexpulsion, and PUNofficer. Welch and Payne (2010) term expulsion as an extreme punitive disciplinary practice. They note suspension and the involvement of a school resource officer as punitive disciplinary practices (p. 43). No additional punitive disciplinary practice codes emerged.

Evidence of punitive disciplinary practices is slim. No teacher candidates said they planned to suspend or expel Casey, and only one teacher candidate involved the school resource officer. However, two teacher candidates mentioned suspension (PUNsuspension). Marissa told Casey that suspension was a potential consequence if he fights with his peers. Then she asked Casey, knowing this, why would he want to get himself into trouble. Rebecca discussed suspension by suggesting that Casey did not want to cause worry for his already busy father by getting kicked out of school or suspended. There is no direct evidence of expulsion (PUNexpulsion). Rebecca referred to Casey getting “kicked out of school” twice in her conversation. She could mean suspension or expulsion. I coded these statements as suspension because Rebecca used the term suspension once in her clinical simulation and twice in the debriefing session. Clayton was the only teacher candidate to mention school security. This code came up twice in his conversation. He mentioned his obligation to speak with the principal and school security and that he “will notify school security about Sam and Keith.”

**Mild disciplinary practices: counselors, parents, reprimands, and conferences.** There is more evidence of mild disciplinary responses than restorative and punitive responses. In this section, I discuss results related to the five solutions categorized as mild disciplinary responses by Welch and Payne (2010): (1) meeting with the counselor, (2) meeting with or calling Casey’s parents, (3) reprimanding Casey, (4) conferencing with Mike/Keith and or Sam, and (5) conferencing with Casey.

Eight teacher candidates mentioned meeting with a counselor or guidance. Three of these teacher candidates brought up the counselor once in their conversation with Casey. Adelyn asked Casey if there is anything she can do for him and then suggested a counselor. Justin told Casey that if the situation was more serious, he may want to talk to guidance. Natalya reminded Casey that there are counselors available. The remaining five teacher candidates mentioned the counselor twice or more. Arthur mentioned the counselor five times. He asked if Casey had talked to a guidance counselor. He reminded Casey that the counselors are available and here to help multiple times. At one point, Arthur stated, “I mean, do you want me to reach out to this kid? Sit him down get a guidance counselor, something? I can recommend a guidance counselor for you. If that’s helpful. These are pretty heavy issues, right?” Casey responded, “Whatever, whatever you want. Whatever.” Arthur did not confirm that he *will* recommend a counselor in the dialogue that followed. In one instance, Elizabeth suggested that “maybe” we can go to the counselor. She later told Casey, “I’m going to tell the counselor that I’m talking to you, but not what about, just so that he’s aware. Okay? Is that okay?” Elizabeth later touted the counselor as having better advice than she had. Clayton, Kenneth, and Thomas were decisive and clear in their statements about informing the counselor. For example, Kenneth told Casey, “You can schedule a meeting with me at the end of the day with the counselors,” and then informed Casey twice that he would notify the counselor. Thomas told Casey that he would communicate with the guidance counselor, so they came to talk to him four separate times during his clinical simulation.

Meeting with Casey’s parents as a solution is not evident. However, a few teacher candidates mentioned Casey’s parents or father in other ways. Arthur wondered if Casey had talked to his father about this situation and encouraged Casey to talk to his dad. Arthur advised, “Talk to your dad about it. Let him know what’s going on. What’s giving you trouble. If

anything, he'll be the one to understand. Right? He's the one living with you." Thomas also asked Casey if he had talked to his parents. Rebecca explained that if Casey got into a fight his actions may worry or disappoint his dad, especially if he were suspended for fighting.

Nine teacher candidates reprimanded Casey (see Table 13). Teacher candidates used the phrases: *can't*, *not okay*, *shouldn't*, *not tolerated*, and *not acceptable*. In addition, Justin stated, "...I want to make sure that this threat is just words because whatever's happening with this other student, I want to see it stop here." Most teacher candidates who reprimanded did so once or twice in the simulation. However, Kenneth and Arthur reprimanded three and four times respectively. Five teacher candidates used the terms *can't* or *cannot* in reprimands. The teacher candidates reprimanded threatening language and potential for violence independently and simultaneously.

**Table 13**

*Teacher Candidate Evidence of Mild Disciplinary Solution: Reprimand*

Name	Reprimand for language / threat	Reprimand for potential violence	Reprimand for both language / threat and violence
Adelyn		"...cannot address it by trying to harm someone else..."	
Arthur	"...can't go around yelling that..."	"...can't go get in fights..."	"...can't hold it in and lash out... "can't go around in the hallway, screaming I'm going to kick someone's ass..."  "...can't go around threatening, about getting in a fight or actually getting in a fight..."
Elizabeth		"...can't do it with your fists."	
Justin		"Cause I want to make sure that this threat is just words because	



		whatever's happening with this other student, I want to see it stop here."	
Kenneth		"...you can't get physical with this, there's no need for that.."	"I heard you bring up violence and you said you wanted to beat somebody up, which is not okay..."
		"...you shouldn't get physical with it."	
Marcia	"It's not okay to talk about hurting somebody else in the school."		"I don't want you doing what you say you're going to do in the hall talking about hurting someone else. It's not acceptable in school."
Natalya	"Well, I overheard you in the hallway saying that you may just have to kick another student's ass. That's obviously not behavior that's tolerated here in school."		
Samara	"...but when you're threatening to hurt someone, then that's not okay..."		
Thomas			"But you can't go around threatening people. Like I've said, if you do anything, it's going to bring more trouble to you. And I'm sure people at home, aren't going to be too happy about that. And it's just something that, I mean, as we grow up, as you get older, you learn that physical violence isn't the answer. It really never is. And it's not acceptable."

---

In this clinical simulation, some teacher candidates learned there is one peer, and some teacher candidates learned there are two peers. Teacher candidates were told the peers' names are Mike and Sam and, in Clayton's case, Keith and Sam. Eight teacher candidates offered to meet with one or both of Casey's peers, depending on their understanding of the situation. They never offered to meet with one peer if they know of two, nor did they offer to meet with each student individually. Seven teacher candidates proposed the solution to Casey as a question. They asked for permission (Clayton). They asked if Casey wanted them to talk to his peers (Arthur, Justin, Elizabeth, Thomas), if he thought it would be an effective intervention (Clayton), a good idea (Kenneth), or helpful (Natalya). Thomas was the only teacher candidate who was definitive and stated, "I'll definitely pull who'd you say it was again? Mike and Sam, I'll pull Mike and Sam aside. I'll talk to them and try to settle that out." Jasper was vague as he offered to maybe "facilitate a conversation" if Casey and his peers cannot work it out on their own.

Three-quarters of the teacher candidates in this study encouraged Casey to talk with them (during the simulation, in the future, or both, see Table 14). A total of 11 teacher candidates offered to conference with Casey in the future. These invitations ranged from general to specific. Jasper, more generally, stated, "And if there's anything else you need with that regard, just want to come to a place to talk, you know my door's always open so there's always a place." Arthur gave times he is available, "But if you ever need, a teacher to talk to I'm available before the bell, like now, but otherwise after school, during a study hall or something, I can always arrange something." Three teacher candidates also extended invitations to conference with Casey directly. For example, Elizabeth proposed,

Well, why don't we start talking on a daily basis? Why don't you come here? We can talk about it. I know you think, I know you think that might not help, but maybe talking about it will help. Have you ever tried it?

**Table 14***Teacher Candidate Evidence of Mild Disciplinary Solution: Conferencing with Casey*

Name	The teacher candidate offers Casey time/space to talk about it	Availability to conference in the future (general)	Encouragement to conference in the future (as a solution or if something similar happens again)	Encouragement to talk during the clinical simulation				
Adelyn	Yes (1x)			1				
Arthur	Yes (4x)	2	1	1				
Clayton	Yes (5x)	2	1	2				
Elise								
Elizabeth	Yes (3x)	1	2					
Jasper	Yes (3x)	1	1	1				
John	Yes (1x)	1						
Justin	Yes (2x)		2					
Kenneth								
Kyle								
Marcia	Yes (1x)	1						
Marissa	Yes (2x)	1		1				
Natalya	Yes (2x)		1	1				
Rebecca	Yes (1x)	1						
Samara								
Thomas	Yes (2x)	1		1				
Total	TCs 12	Instances 27	TCs 9	Instances 11	TCs 6	Instances 8	TCs 7	Instances 8

11 TCs offer to conference in future

*Note.* TC = teacher candidate; Number in parentheses = code example frequency by each participant.

Three different teacher candidates extended Casey an invitation to conference if he was bothered or felt threatened again. For example, Natalya said, “You know where my classroom is, this is my classroom. So, if you feel that they’re bothering you or anything like that, you can most definitely come and talk to me.” Seven teacher candidates explicitly encouraged Casey to converse during the clinical simulation. Arthur said, “If you want to talk to me about it. I mean,

I've never had you in class before, but I mean, feel free to open up. Family stuff?" Marissa asked, "Do you want to tell me what's going on at home? Maybe talking about it could help you through it?" Natalya asked a why question to encourage dialogue: "Why do you feel that violence would be the only solution to this problem?"

**Restorative practices: meetings with Casey and his peers.** Evidence of restorative practices is slim. Initial codes include the four restorative practices: (1) restorative circles (Stutzman-Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 52), (2) victim/offender conferencing: a meeting between Casey and his peers (p. 61), (3) a meeting with Casey, his peers, and the counselor (p. 60), and (4) mention of healing harm (p. 61). There is no evidence of restorative circles, healing harm, or a meeting with Casey, his peers, and the counselor. Teacher candidates did not use the term conferencing. However, five teacher candidates discussed arranging a meeting between Casey and his peers. Four teacher candidates were direct in their wording, and one teacher candidate (Justin) implied a meeting by stating, "And I want to see if we can do something about it to make this a better outcome and see if you guys can work it out." Clayton, Kenneth, and Natalya included themselves in this meeting. Arthur and Justin did not specify. Natalya and Clayton proposed this solution as a question to Casey. For example, Natalya asked, "Do you think it would be possible for me to have a meeting with you and whoever this other student is, and try and see if you could hash things out verbally instead of resulting to physical violence?"

**Uncategorized solutions: responsibility to Casey, advise against violence, and talking to someone else.** The teacher candidates posed many solutions that do not fit within punitive, mild disciplinary, and restorative responses (see Table 15, parts 1 and 2). In this section, I discuss the three important and common uncategorized solutions: (1) giving responsibility to Casey, (2) advising against violence, and (3) talking to someone else.

Of the participants, 14 teacher candidates included Casey in finding or defining a solution through questions, statements, or both. When giving responsibility to Casey, 11 teacher candidates asked questions (nine teacher candidates asked questions aligned with, *what will you do?* and eight teacher candidates asked questions aligned with, *what can I do?*). Three of the nine teacher candidates only asked questions aligned with, *what will you do?* Two of the eight teacher candidates only asked questions aligned with, *what can I do?* Six teacher candidates asked both types of questions.

Six of the nine teacher candidates that asked *what you will do?* questions wanted to understand more about how Casey planned to “take care of it.” For example, “How are you going to take care of it, Casey? What’s your way?” Three teacher candidates asked Casey directly what he was going to do. For example, Adelyn asked, “So, what will be your course of action in regard to this situation?” Six of the eight teacher candidates who asked *what I can do?* questions asked Casey how else they could help or if there is anything else they could do. Two teacher candidates asked Casey if there is anyone he wanted to talk to or if he wanted anyone else involved.

Ten teacher candidates gave Casey responsibility through their statements regarding how to behave or speak when talking to Mike and Sam in the future. Three teacher candidates gave specific statements. For example, Arthur suggested Casey say, “Hey, that’s not cool. You know, you don’t get it. Life’s hard at my house.” Adelyn gave Casey a general recommendation to remain calm. Elizabeth advised Casey to tell the boys to stop, to stand up for themselves, and to be the bigger person. Kenneth said he thought Casey should confront the boys.

Ten teacher candidates advised against violence, using opinions and/or discussing consequences. Within these examples, the teacher candidates discussed not using violence as a solution. The MILDreprimand code is similar to the Advise against violence code. However,

they do not overlap. This code explores what Casey should not do, and MILDreprimands explores what Casey cannot do. Four teacher candidates advised by only giving their opinions. For example, Adelyn stated, “But definitely don’t try to resolve something by hurting somebody else.” Elise talked about consequences,

I just don’t want to see you get hurt at all. I don’t want to see you, all the hard work that you’ve done with basketball and school. I don’t want to see it go away all because of just a couple of words that get thrown around.

Five teacher candidates (Arthur, Jasper, Marissa, Samara, and Thomas) advised against violence with both opinions and a mention of consequences. Jasper stated, “I just think violence is never the answer... I just don’t want any violence to ensue for obvious reasons, because I just don’t think you want that in the long haul and I don’t think they want to be there.”

A total of 11 teacher candidates encouraged Casey to or inquired if Casey had talked to someone other than themselves. Others include his parent(s), his sister, his friend(s), the counselor, and the teacher(s) at the school. Sometimes the teacher candidates’ references were vague. They said *someone*, *anyone*, or *anybody* instead of referencing a particular person. For example, Adelyn made two general references for Casey to “advise somebody about it because if this does become continuous, that is a form of bullying” and to “seek help” if this happens again. Arthur made six references to Casey talking to someone else. He encouraged Casey to speak with specific people in the following quote: “Talk to your friends. Talk to me if you need to. Otherwise. You know, the guidance counselor, like I said, your sister, your dad. Talk to your dad about it.”

Examples of this code include the teacher candidates asking Casey if he has already talked to someone else and advising Casey to talk with someone else. Five teacher candidates advised Casey to speak to someone other than the principal, vice-principal, counselor, or Mike

and Sam (these are independent codes). Two of these five excerpts are general, and three are specific statements. Eight teacher candidates inquired if Casey talked to someone else. Three teacher candidates asked if Casey had talked to teachers, his parents, etc., and five teacher candidates were general. Two teacher candidates advised Casey to and asked if Casey had spoken to someone else. Five teacher candidates did not ask or advise Casey to talk to someone else.

### ***Solution Frequency and Order***

The teacher candidates in this study discuss multiple solutions. Table 15 is a two-part table. This table shows the solution type, solution frequency, and the order of the solutions proposed or stated by each teacher candidate. In Adelyn's transcript, I coded 16 excerpts as solutions in seven total solution categories. Adelyn's first and second solutions were to document the incident, and her third solution was a reprimand, etc. She gave Casey responsibility for six of her 16 code examples. This table shows that teacher candidates differed in their problem-solving approaches. Some, like Rebecca, were direct, relying on only a few solutions and not repeating them. Others, like Clayton, used a scattershot approach, relying on a broad array of solutions, often more than once.

Table 15 also displays the total solution categories and the total solution excerpts for each participant (on the right-hand side of Table 15, part 2). The solution categories are the solution codes of this study. Total solution categories are the number of solutions indicated by specific solution codes each teacher candidate uses. Total solution excerpts are the number of excerpts coded as solutions using the codebook. First, I will review data for total solution excerpts. Following my coding criteria (see Appendices C, D, and E), this is how many times the teacher candidate mentions or proposes any type of solution within the codebook. Arthur and Clayton have the highest total solution frequency of 28 each, and Rebecca has the lowest total solution

**Table 15***Teacher Candidate Solutions Evidence, Part 1*

Name	Principal2	PUNsuspension	PUNofficer	MILDcounselor	MILDreprimand	MILDconferencing Mike and Sam	MILDconferencing: Casey	RESmeet Casey & peers	Responsibility to Casey	Work together
Adelyn				8	3		5		4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12	
Arthur	8, 14			4, 13, 19, 22, 27	2, 6, 12, 23	16, 18	3, 21, 26, 28	10	24	5
Clayton	7, 23, 16, 26		8, 17	11, 18		21, 23	1, 9, 15, 25, 28	3, 19	4, 10, 13, 22	
Elise	9								2, 10 <sup>1</sup>	6, 10 <sup>1</sup>
Elizabeth	3, 18, 19			22, 24, 25	12	5	9, 17, 20		11, 13	1, 4, 6, 15, 26
Jasper						5	9, 11, 12		1, 4, 6, 8	
John							10		3, 5, 7, 9	
Justin				3	4	7	2, 9	6		5
Kenneth	7			9, 11	1, 2, 6	8, 10		5	4	
Kyle									1	3, 4
Marcia					2, 6		8		1, 4	
Marissa	9	3					7, 11		1, 4, 5	
Natalya	7			6	1	4	2, 5	3		
Rebecca		1					3		2 <sup>1</sup>	
Samara					2				1, 5, 6, 8,	
Thomas				7, 9, 12, 15	5	4, 15	11, 17		14	10 <sup>1</sup>
TCs	7	2	1	8	9	8	12	5	14	6
%	43%	13%	6%	50%	56%	50%	75%	31%	88%	38%
Frequency	13	2	2	19	15	12	27	6	36	12



**Table 15 Cont.***Teacher Candidate Solutions Evidence, Part 2*

Name	Advise against violence	Advises to persuade	Document incident	Talk to someone else	Bus driver	Monitor or follow-up	Inform another teacher	Vague solution	Not going to do	Total solution categories	Total solution excerpts
Adelyn	10, 16		1, 2, 14	13, 15						7	16
Arthur	7	11, 15		1, 9, 17, 20, 25						11	28
Clayton	14	5, 12		6	20	27			2	13	28
Elise	1, 3			4	5, 7, 8		11			7	11
Elizabeth				2, 21				7, 8, 10, 14, 16	23	10	26
Jasper	3	7				10		2		7	12
John			2, 4, 8	6					1	5	10
Justin				1		8				8	9
Kenneth	3					12				8	12
Kyle		5, 6, 7, 8							2	4	8
Marcia	5		7	3						6	8
Marissa	6, 10	2						8		7	11
Natalya			8							7	8
Rebecca				2 <sup>1</sup>						4	3
Samara	3, 4,	10		9		12	11	7		8	12
Thomas	2, 6, 10 <sup>1</sup>	3		1, 8, 13						9	16
TCs	10	7	4	11	2	5	2	4	4		
%	63%	43%	25%	69%	13%	31%	13%	25%	25%		
Frequency	15	12	8	19	4	5	2	8	4		

<sup>1</sup>Simultaneous coding - Same excerpt coded as two solutions (three excerpts, three teacher candidates) (e.g., “talk to someone else” and “responsibility to Casey”)

frequency of three. Teacher candidates propose an average of 13.6 total solutions within all categories and across all codes. The total average solution frequency for males is 15.4, and it is 11.9 for females. Males in this study propose 123 total solutions and females propose 95.

Next, I will review the total solution categories. This is how many of the solutions in this study teacher candidates use, but not how many times they use them. Clayton uses 13 total solution categories. Rebecca and Kyle use four. The average number of solution categories for all teacher candidates is 7.6. The average number of solution categories male participants use is 8.2, and the average number of solution categories female participants use is seven.

The most frequently proposed solution is responsibility to Casey, with 36 instances. Conferencing with Casey has 27 excerpts (including requests to conference with Casey in the future and encouragement for Casey to conference during the simulation). Teacher candidates discuss talking to someone else and the counselor 19 times each. Nine of the 19 solutions have a frequency count of eight or below.

To discern patterns, I put the data from Table 15 into Excel to chart how many times a single solution was proposed first, second, third, etc., by the teacher candidates (see Figure 1). Every teacher candidate, except Rebecca, proposes at least one solution more than once. A number one in the chart may indicate one candidate mentioning the same solution at different times in a single clinical simulation. A quantity of more than one indicates that two or more teacher candidates propose or state the same solution in a similar order, but not at a similar time. For example, four teacher candidates reprimand as their second solution; advise against violence as their third solution; and conference with Casey as their ninth solution. Five teacher candidates

give responsibility to Casey as a first solution. Six teacher candidates give responsibility to Casey as a fourth solution. In this case, the same teacher candidate may give responsibility to Casey as a first and fourth solution.

As time progresses, teacher candidates propose fewer solutions in the same order. Figure 1 shows that teacher candidates suggest or state the same solution in the same position (first, second, third, etc.) more often between the first and thirteenth solutions than they do between the fourteenth and twenty-eighth solutions. Figure 1 also illustrates that teacher candidates pose solutions in different orders. A solution matched the position of no other teacher candidate's same solution 99 times (indicated by a one). A solution matched the position of only one other teacher candidate's same solution 38 times (indicated by a two). These account for 137 out of 149 total proposed or stated solutions.

### ***Solutions in Context***

As discussed in the previous section, teacher candidates in this study propose many solutions. In this section, I explore teacher candidates' most frequently proposed solutions, their last solution(s), and what teacher candidates say they *will* do at any point within the clinical simulation. Table 16 organizes teacher candidate solutions by these categories.

Six teacher candidates most frequently give responsibility to Casey. Three teacher candidates' most frequent solution is conferencing: talk with Casey (a code that includes expressing availability for a future conference, encouragement to meet in the future, and/or encouragement to talk during the clinical simulation). Two teacher candidates reprimand most frequently. Two teacher candidates mention the counselor most frequently. Teacher candidates also propose a final or last solution, or group their final solutions in a statement. Eight teacher candidates propose conferencing: talk with Casey as a final solution, and two teacher candidates mention monitoring or following up. The final solutions mentioned by the six remaining teacher

**Figure 1**

*Teacher Candidate Solutions — Order Similarities*

Principal2		1				3	1	2			1		1	1	1	1			1		1							
PUNsuspension	1	1																										
PUNofficer							1						1															
MILDcounselor			1	1		1	1	1	2		2	1	1	1		1	1		2		1	1	1					
MILDreprimand	2	4	1	1	1	3					2										1							
MILDcon. Peers				2	2		1	1		1			1	1	1		1		1		1							
MILDcon. Casey	1	2	2		2		1	1	4	1	3	1		1	2			1	1			1	1	2				
RESmeet			2		1	1				1						1												
Responsibility to C.	5	2	1		3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1					1									
Work together	1	1	2	2	2					2				1										1				
Advise against vio	1	1	4	1	1	2	1			3			1	1														
Advises to persuade		1	1		2	1	2	1		1	1	1			1													
Document incident	1	2		1			1	2						1														
Talk someone else	3	2	1	1		2		1	2				2	1	1			1	1				1					
Bus driver					1		1	1											1									
Monitor or follow up								1		1		2												1				
Inform another teacher											2																	
Vague solution		1					2	2		1			1	1														
Not going to do	1	2																						1				
Solution no.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28

Note: no. = number.

candidates are different from the two solutions above and from each other. Six teacher candidates mention multiple solutions in their final solutions statements.

I also examine what the teacher candidates say they *will do* in their conversations with Casey. Five teacher candidates do not specify an action. However, one of the five participants does not have an equal opportunity to pose solutions because the standardized student walks out. A total of 11 teacher candidates specify actions. Four teacher candidates state one action (three say they will document the incident, and one will monitor or follow-up). Five teacher candidates specify two deeds. Elise specifies three actions. In total, 11 of the 16 participants say they will take 22 actions, and one participant commits to 23% of these deeds. Clayton is thorough in his response and defines five actions. They include informing the principal, the school security, the counselor, and the bus driver. He also says he will follow up with Casey. The most common action specified is monitoring or following up with Casey ( $n = 5$ ).

**Table 16**

*Teacher Candidates' Solutions in Context*

Name	Most frequent solution(s)	Last solution	Solutions in the last paragraph of solutions	What TCs say they will do
Adelyn	Responsibility to Casey	Advise against violence	Document the incident / tell someone else / advise against violence	TC will document the incident
Arthur	Talk to someone else / counselor	Conferencing - talk with Casey	Conferencing: talk with Casey	Action not specified
Clayton	Conferencing: talk with Casey	Monitor or follow-up	Conferencing: talk with Casey / monitor or follow-up	TC will tell the principal / school security / counselor / bus driver / follow-up with Casey

Elise	Talk to the bus driver	Talk to another teacher	Talk to another teacher	TC will talk to the bus driver / vice principal / talk to another teacher
Elizabeth	Work together / vague solution	Work together	Work together	TC will talk to the counselor / conferencing: talk with Casey
Jasper	Responsibility to Casey	Conferencing: talk with Casey	Conferencing: talk with Casey	TC will monitor or follow-up
John	Responsibility to Casey	Conferencing: talk with Casey	Conferencing: talk with Casey	TC will document the incident
Justin	Conferencing: talk with Casey	Conferencing: talk with Casey	Talk with Mike and Sam / monitor or follow-up / conferencing - talk with Casey	TC will talk with Mike and Sam / monitor or follow-up
Kenneth	Reprimand	Counselor	Monitor or follow-up / counselor	TC will talk with the counselor / monitor or follow-up
Kyle	Advises to persuade	Advises to persuade	Advises to persuade	Action not specified (Casey walks out)
Marcia	Responsibility to Casey / reprimand	Conferencing: talk with Casey	Conferencing: talk with Casey	Action not specified
Marissa	Responsibility to Casey	Conferencing: talk with Casey	Conferencing: talk with Casey	Action not specified
Natalya	Conferencing - talk with Casey	Document the incident	Conferencing: talk with Casey / counselor / principal / document the incident	TC will document the incident
Rebecca	NA (each once)	Conferencing: talk with Casey	Conferencing: talk with Casey	Action not specified
Samara	Responsibility to Casey	Monitor or follow-up	Monitor or follow-up	TC will talk to the gym teacher / monitor or follow-up
Thomas	Counselor	Conferencing: talk with Casey	Counselor / conferencing: talk with Casey	TC will talk with Mike and Sam / counselor

---

*Note.* TC = teacher candidate.

### *Posing Solutions*

Teacher candidates in this study spend more time discussing solutions with Casey than they do telling Casey what they plan to do. Table 17 is a selection of excerpts and does not include all examples from the transcripts.

**Table 17**

#### *Examples of Teacher Candidates' Solution Suggestions*

Name	Example quote
Adelyn	"Is there anything I can do for you? Like there are support resources in school that you can go to counseling maybe, talk about it, and if it does continue on, it can be some form of bullying."
Arthur	"You've got friends, teachers, counselors, principals, vice principals, that are going to support you."
Arthur	"I mean, do you want me to reach out to this kid? Sit him down."
Clayton	"Do you think that would be an effective type of intervention for me to speak to them or for the school principal to speak to them about easing up on you so that you can have some room to breathe? Do you think that'll work?"
Elizabeth	"Do you want to, after school today, do you want to go talk to the principal? Vice principal?"
Elizabeth	"And then we can maybe go to the counselor."
Jasper	"I think talking it out and addressing your problem, whether it's to them straight up, just the two of you guys respectfully, and if you don't think that can happen maybe I can facilitate a conversation."
Justin	"Mike and Sam? Would you like me to talk to him?"
Kenneth	"Well, do you want to schedule a meeting? We could schedule a meeting with the principal about this with those kids as well."
Kenneth	"You can schedule a meeting with me at the end of the day with the counselors."
Natalya	"We have the counselors downstairs..."
Natalya	"Yeah. So, do you think it would be helpful for me to pull them aside? Maybe not necessarily mention your name, but just kind of see where their head is at?"
Natalya	"Do you think it would be possible for me to have a meeting with you and whoever this other student is, and try and see if you could hash things out verbally instead of resulting to physical violence?"
Thomas	"Or do you want me to talk to Mike and Sam?"

There is evidence of teacher candidates asking Casey for his approval and opinions. Clayton asks Casey's opinion regarding solutions, posing questions with, "Do you think..." Justin asks, "Would you like me to talk to him?" Teacher candidates remind Casey of supportive individuals within his school community, including counselors, administration, teachers, and friends. Adelyn is less direct in posing solutions to Casey; she asks if there is anything she can do, and she reminds Casey of supportive resources. Arthur also reminds Casey of support resources and poses specific solutions to Casey. There are ample solution suggestions. Natalya suggests counselors. She offers to talk with Mike and Sam, and she offers to speak with the boys and Casey together. Kenneth offers to schedule meetings, too; he asks Casey if he wants him to schedule a meeting with the kids and principal or schedule a meeting with the counselors. In contrast, teacher candidates state solutions less often than they propose them. This is apparent in the last column of Table 16, which lists the solutions the teacher candidates commit to enacting in the clinical simulation.

### ***Summary***

The teacher candidates must decide what to do while talking with Casey Butler. Seven teacher candidates mentioned the principal, vice-principal, and or administration in varied contexts; no one immediately directed Casey to the principal. Evidence of punitive disciplinary practices was slim to none: no teacher candidates said they planned to suspend or expel Casey, and only one teacher candidate involved the school resource officer. Evidence of restorative practices was also slim. There was no evidence of restorative circles, healing harm, or a meeting with Casey, his peers, and the counselor. Five teacher candidates discussed arranging a meeting between Casey and his peers (without using the restorative term "conferencing"). Mild disciplinary practices included the counselors, Casey's parents, reprimands, and conferencing. Half of the participants mentioned meeting with the counselor or guidance. Teacher candidates'



did not discuss formally involving Casey's parents. More than half of the teacher candidates reprimanded Casey, and three-quarters encouraged Casey to talk with them.

Teacher candidates in this study relied heavily on solutions outside my coding framework. The three most used uncategorized solutions were: responsibility to Casey, advising against violence, and talking to someone else. Teacher candidates included Casey in finding or defining a solution through questions, statements, or both. They advised Casey against violence and encouraged Casey to or inquired if Casey had talked to someone other than themselves. Teacher candidates proposed multiple solutions multiple times, in individualized orders making patterns hard to discern. Importantly, teacher candidates spent more time discussing solutions than telling Casey what they planned to do. Of the teacher candidates, four stated one action, five stated two actions, Elise stated three actions, Clayton stated five actions, and five teacher candidates did not specify any actions. Next, I discuss gender and teacher candidate authority, care, and solutions in response to Casey's threatening behavior.

### **Part V: Gender and Teacher Candidate Authority, Care, and Solutions**

Appendix S compares evidence of male and female authority, care, and solutions. This gender comparison table lists all authority, care, and solution codes. It is organized by column: the first and second columns show the number of male and female participants with evidence of specific codes, and the third and fourth columns note the frequency of examples within each code by male and female participants. The table shows the difference in code usage between female and male participants and who used codes most. It also shows the difference in *total* code examples between male and female participants and which gender used the code examples most frequently.

Within the construct of authority, the same number of males and females used the codes coercive: consequences, legitimate: role, and competent: advice. One additional female relied on coercive: action and reprimand, personal: kindness, and relinquishing and minimizing authority. Two more females than males used legitimate authority, both in their role of protector and rule enforcer. One more male than female used personal: trustworthiness and shared authority. Two more males than females used open-ended coercive authority and authority by inducement. I also looked at the frequency of use within each authority code by gender. The frequency of use within two authority codes was evenly split. The range of frequency of use within all 14 authority codes was 0-12 (with 12 codes differing by one to five examples). Although more male than female participants shared authority in this study, female participants shared authority with Casey more often than males (with a difference of seven code examples). Four female and three male participants relinquished authority in this study. However, the data suggest that female teacher candidates relinquished their authority more often than male participants in their conversations with Casey, as female teacher candidates accounted for 13 of the 18 total relinquishing authority code examples.

Within care, the same number of men and women offered compassion, asked caring questions, and acknowledged Casey's well-being in conversation. One more male participant than female participant offered time, was a receptive listener, and praised Casey. Two more men than women offered sympathy, empathy, and general care. Interestingly, more men than women displayed elements of care for all care codes, so this was not evenly split. However, when looking at the frequency of use within each care code (e.g., how many times a participant sympathized, not just if they sympathize) by gender, women sympathized three more times than men, and they referred to or supported Casey's well-being four more times. In male with male

interactions, male teacher candidates asked more than twice the number of caring questions as compared to female participants in this study.

Four solution codes had an equal number of female and male participants (MILDconferencing: Casey, Responsibility to Casey, Advise against violence, and Bus driver). Four solution codes had a difference of one participant (Principal2, PUNofficer, MILDreprimand, and Talk to someone else), and seven codes had a difference of two male or female teacher candidates. Three more male than female participants offered to meet with Casey and his peers, advised to persuade, and discussed monitoring or following up. Out of eight participants, four more males than females offered to meet with Mike and Sam.

Teacher candidates' use of authority and care differed minimally by gender, with at most a two-participant change, across all care and authority codes. The range of difference between males and females within solution codes was larger (from zero to four). However, it is important to consider that the range of difference between female and male teacher candidates for 15 out of 19 solution codes was similar to care and authority, with a difference of zero to two. Only four solution codes had a difference of three or four male participants.

### ***Summary***

Male and female teacher candidates used similar authority, care, and solutions in interactions with Casey. When looking at the frequency of examples within codes, female teacher candidates relinquished their authority more often than male participants. More men than women displayed elements of care for all the care codes, which were not evenly split. However, females sympathized and referred to or supported Casey's well-being three and four times more than males, respectively. Male and female teacher candidates used similar solutions. However, female teacher candidates were more likely to give vague solutions. Male teacher candidates were most likely to mention the counselor, discuss conferencing, and advise to persuade.

## Chapter Summary

This qualitative study explores the interactions between 16 teacher candidates and an upset adolescent student who threatens his peer(s) and asks, how do teacher candidates engage in a clinical simulation focused on threatening behavior in schools? This chapter specifically explores elements of teacher candidate authority, teacher candidate care, and teacher candidate solutions. My first sub-question is: do elements of authority emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student? Teacher candidates do not use coercive authority with threats of force. Teacher candidates do make potentially fear-inducing statements when talking with Casey about a plan of action and possible consequences in response to Casey's behavior. They use competent authority when advising Casey about violence, gossip, and suitable solutions. They enact personal authority: specifically, kindness and trustworthiness. They rely on legitimate authority, especially their role as teacher or hall monitor, and the associated responsibilities of rule enforcer and protector in these roles. Teacher candidates do not rely heavily on authority by inducement.

I also explore elements of care expressed by teacher candidates to address my second sub-question: do elements of care emerge as teacher candidates engage with a standardized student? Teacher candidates show some elements of care more than others. Teacher candidates in this study speak with evidence of compassion and sympathy and express an awareness of Casey's well-being or best interests in their discussions with him. They offer their time and ask caring questions. Nine participants use receptive listening, five participants praise Casey, and four participants make empathetic statements.

This chapter also explores teacher candidates' solutions and the evidence of elements of punitive, mild disciplinary, and restorative practices in response to my third sub-question, which

has two parts: what solutions emerge within the simulations? And do teacher candidates' solutions have elements of punitive, mild disciplinary, or restorative practices? All teacher candidates propose multiple solutions in their conversations with Casey—and all teacher candidates suggest more solutions than they commit to enacting. The solutions, order, and context of the solutions vary by individual. Generally, the teacher candidates in this study did not rely heavily on punitive solutions or restorative practices. They propose the mild disciplinary strategies of meeting with the counselor, conferencing with either Casey or the boys on the bus and reprimanding more often than they propose punitive or restorative responses. Most teacher candidates give responsibility to Casey, offer some form of advice, and encourage Casey to or inquire if Casey has talked to someone other than themselves.

## **Chapter Five:**

### **Conclusions and Implications**

This chapter offers a discussion and the implications of my dissertation study, informed by my literature review and exemplified by my results. In this chapter, I summarize the purpose of my study, including my research questions. I then discuss key findings and conclusions organized by the coding constructs of authority, care, and solutions. Within authority, I explore the relationships between authority and care and the importance of context and tone in this study. Related to care, I discuss the elements of care teacher candidates use to attend to and meet the needs of Casey, an individual for whom I assume they take responsibility (Gilligan, 1993, p. 29). I focus on a few interpersonal interactions between teacher candidates and Casey as they discern what is best (Held, 2006). I also provide examples of relational actions toward Casey's welfare, protection, and enhancement (Noddings, 2005a). Next, I explore teacher candidates' solutions and patterns of passivity, collaboration, and trust. I explain how authority, care, and solutions overlap in the data and conclusions on gender within codes and across constructs. I discuss the limitations of this study. Then, I explore implications for teacher preparation, professional development, and clinical simulation use in teacher education and research. Finally, I make recommendations for future research organized by construct.

### **Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

The purpose of this exploratory qualitative study was to investigate how teacher candidates interact one-on-one with an angry student threatening physical harm. This study explores how preservice teachers navigate authority, show care, and problem-solve with specific attention to punitive, mild disciplinary, and restorative approaches within a clinical simulation with a standardized student. This study specifically examined if elements of authority and

elements of care emerge as teacher candidates talk with an upset adolescent, what solutions emerge within the simulations, and if the solutions have elements of punitive, mild disciplinary, or restorative practices.

In this study, I used the concepts of authority, care, and solutions as analytic lenses to code, analyze, and interpret the data set. The resulting data from this study provide insights to my research questions, asking if elements of authority and elements of care emerge as teacher candidates interact with an angry adolescent. This study's results suggest answers to which teacher candidate solutions emerge within the simulations and if these solutions have elements of punitive, mild disciplinary, or restorative practices. Teacher candidates in this study used types of coercive, legitimate, competent, and personal authority. They showed care through compassion, sympathy, offering their time, and asking caring questions. Participants in this study discussed many solutions, few of which aligned with punitive and restorative practices. Instead, teacher candidates relied more on mild-disciplinary approaches and uncategorized solutions.

## **Key Findings and Conclusions**

### ***Dispositions of Teacher Candidate Authority***

In this section, I discuss teacher candidates' use of many types of authority in layers, conglomerates, and isolation. I consider authority in a social and emotional context, and I explore how the constructs of care and authority merge, creating interesting grey areas worthy of further exploration.

#### **Teacher candidate authority: layers, conglomerates, and isolated examples.**

Preservice teachers rely on different types of authority in other studies (e.g., Pellegrino, 2010). However, my study adds to the literature by exploring and highlighting teacher candidates' different approaches to expressions of authority in one-on-one conversations with a student in a

similar scenario. I also use Wrong's (2017) conceptual framework—a framework touted by Macleod et al. (2012) as a “neutral conceptual framework to assist understanding of the forms of authority that are being enacted [by teachers]” (p. 495). Teacher candidates in this study express authority differently. Some teacher candidates layer multiple authority types when talking with Casey. Adelyn, Marissa, and Thomas mix authority types in conglomerate statements—relying on three to six different categories of authority in a single statement. Rebecca does not repeat authority types and uses them each once and in isolation. There was variation in how teacher candidates voiced types of authority in conversation, including layers, conglomerates, and isolated examples.

**Authority in a social and emotional context.** It is important to consider that the participants of this study are teacher candidates at the beginning stages of their teaching careers. As teacher candidates and novices, it is logical to expect a low reliance on competent authority, a form of authority rooted in competence, including superior knowledge, skills, and education. In this study, an emerging subcode for competent authority is knowledge voiced in advice. Teacher candidates in this study rely on their social, emotional, and school norms knowledge gained through lived experience to advise Casey on violence, gossip, and alternative solutions. Wrong (2017) states, “Competent authority is a power relation in which the subject obeys the directives of the authority out of belief in the authority’s superior competence or expertise to decide which actions will best serve the subject’s interests and goals” (p. 53). When teacher candidates give advice, they use their experience of school structures—both social and disciplinary—and their knowledge of teen angst. They show evidence of having Casey’s best interests at heart. Wrong (2017) bases competent knowledge on “social power derived from knowledge or skill” and the “authority of the expert” (p. 53). According to Wrong (2017), those within competent authority interactions do not persuade others to follow their advice. Instead, subjects obey because they



assume competence, but not because those in authority demonstrate competence (p. 54). This study broadens our understanding of competent authority to include teachers' knowledge of social structures and human emotional needs, expressed through advice. It is important to recognize that teacher candidates are more likely to use certain authority types in disciplinary interactions with students because this knowledge informs teacher preparation and practice.

**Grey areas and blurred lines: confluences of care and authority.** In a study by Goldstein and Lake (2003), teacher candidates express confusion and uncertainty with care and authority. Some conceptualize care and authority as mutually exclusive, an either-or choice, and others acknowledge the complexity and fluidity required to balance roles as caring teachers and professionals with authority. The constructs of care and authority come together in this study, too. Like the work of Goldstein and Lake (2003), the results of this study suggest complexity, fluidity, and blurring of teacher candidates' use of authority and care in interpersonal interactions with Casey. Here are some examples.

Personal authority, expressed by kindness, and care, expressed by offering time, converge when teacher candidates support Casey's welfare, protection, and enhancement. Jasper tells Casey at the end of their meeting, "All right. Good luck with everything at home. And if there's anything else you need with that regard, just want to come to a place to talk, you know my door's always open, so there's always a place ... all right, nice meeting you, man." In this interpersonal interaction, Jasper offers his time (an expression of care) and simultaneously uses personal authority expressed as kindness. Kindness and care are distinct but related constructs with a logical connection. How they exist together in teacher candidates' verbal interpersonal communication is worth further exploration. I am curious how students who threaten harm interpret statements like Jasper's. How important or impactful are kind expressions of care extended to students in crisis? How often do students in crisis revisit a teacher who extends an

open invitation? How do teacher candidates contextualize kind expressions of care as part of their work?

This second example does not involve the overlap of distinct codes—one authority and one care. Instead, I explore the grey area created with advising and care. Teacher candidates use competent authority in the form of advice-giving: they advise against violence, advise on how best to handle gossip, and advise on alternative solutions. I did not code advice-giving as a care code. However, advice-giving is sporadically evident within other care codes (e.g., compassion and receptive listening), suggesting that advising can sometimes have elements of care. I find the relationship between care and advising intriguing and worth investigating further. It would be interesting to ask teacher candidates how they feel when they advise Casey and further how they feel when they reprimand.

Teacher candidates in this study share authority with Casey, asking for his opinion and approval and urging him to tell them how best to help. Care and shared authority blur some examples of this code. Elements of interest and concern are evident in teacher candidates' statements. For example, Elise says, "Does it sounds good to you?... Is there anything else you want me to do to help you, something that we can work together? Anything else that you want to get resolved at all?" However, sometimes care is less evident when you consider the tone of voice and the context. Adelyn has two types of care and nine code examples in her dialogue, fewer than her peers. In this shared authority example, she states, "Can you think of anything in regards to the situation that does not involve harming somebody else?" In this statement, Adelyn asks for Casey's opinion in a curt tone. She seems to ask a leading question with a definite correct answer, suggesting less care in her example than in Elise's. We don't know Adelyn's level of care in these interactions, but it is important to consider tone and context because they can influence perceptions.

Like the work of Macleod et al. (2012), the constructs of authority and care merge in this study. These scholars theorize student and teacher authority relationships and care. They note that the types of interventions teachers use to address and prevent student behavior may focus on relationships, student rights, and the social and emotional needs of the children. There is evidence that the teacher candidates in my study also focus on relationships, student independence, and social and emotional needs in interaction with Casey. Perhaps, like the participants in Lai et al. (2015), they see value in supporting students' self-discipline in respectful and caring interactions as a way to uphold their authority. Perhaps they are right to do so. As Graça et al. (2013) found, in academic contexts, students' perceptions of teacher legitimacy increased with higher perceived autonomy support (the interpersonal relationship strategies used by teachers during activities).

### ***Dispositions of Teacher Candidate Care***

In this section, I discuss teacher candidates' use of many elements of care in verbal interaction with Casey. I use the theoretical work of Noddings (2013) and Gilligan (1993) as a framework to discuss key findings and conclusions about care, beginning with the ways teacher candidates attend to and meet Casey's needs.

**Attending to and meeting Casey's needs.** One focus of the *Ethics of Care* theory is “attending to and meeting the needs of the particular others for whom we take responsibility” (Gilligan, 1993, p. 29). Looking at the data, I consider some of the ways teacher candidates attend to and meet the needs of Casey, a person for whom they feel a sense of responsibility. Like the results of McBee (2007), teacher candidates in this study conceptualize caring through compassion and offering their time. However, in this study, teacher candidates actualize rather than conceptualize care toward a student through compassion and offering time—expanding on the work of McBee. Compassion has a motivational component of wanting to help others

(Stevens & Bush, 2018, p. 55), and helping others is one way to meet a need. As discussed in Chapter Four, 14 teacher candidates demonstrate compassion by offering to help Casey in 49 coded examples. Teacher candidates in this study tell Casey they want to help him, are trying to help him, and encourage him to come to them for help. They negotiate and discuss ways to help, including possible solutions. Their expressed compassion is important because it shows that the novice teachers in this study enter the profession with caring attitudes, eager and willing to help students in need. However, teacher candidates' solutions and voiced actions or inactions show that even with strong desires to help, teacher candidates conceptualized help in different ways, and they were sometimes unsure of how best to help Casey.

Teacher candidates also aim to meet Casey's needs by offering future support. Almost 70% of teacher candidates, a total of 11, offer their time in statements like, "Good luck with everything at home. And if there's anything else you need with that regard, just want to come to a place to talk, you know my door's always open so there's always a place." The constructs of care and solutions come together when we look at additional ways teacher candidates help Casey. Although not differentiated as independent care codes, teacher candidates advise within the well-being care code and propose solutions within the compassion code to meet Casey's needs. So, it is possible that elements of care are evident when teacher candidates offer counsel and negotiate solutions in their conversations with Casey. These results hint that teacher candidates counsel with care. They care about their students enough to offer time outside of school hours. Novice teachers' flexibility and willingness to speak with struggling students outside the constraints of their tight schedules is noteworthy because it shows their eagerness to help, but wanting and knowing how to support students are two different things.

Teacher candidates strive to meet Casey's needs through questioning. All teacher candidates voice interest and concern for Casey by asking caring questions. Questions were

coded as caring if the teacher candidates' questions reflected on Casey's answers, related to understanding what Casey was going through, showed interest, or helped the teacher candidate learn more about Casey (McBee, 2007; Noddings, 2012b).

**Interpersonal interactions between teacher candidates and Casey as they discern what is best.** Held (2006), describing the work of (Gilligan, 1993), writes that care is expressed in interpersonal interactions between two people as they discern what is best (p. 10-11). In consideration of Held and Gilligan, it is important to consider evidence of interpersonal interactions between the teacher candidates and Casey in this study. Nine teacher candidates in this study show evidence of receptive listening. Some teacher candidates hear and understand Casey's needs and respond with emotional support; they give moral direction and connect with Casey on common ground. Three teacher candidates directly express care for Casey, and four teacher candidates empathize. A total of 10 teacher candidates use language aligned with caring about Casey's best interests and well-being, and some hint at loyalty. A total of 14 teacher candidates express care in one or more ways, across the codes of receptive listening, empathy, well-being, and general care; this suggests that most teacher candidates in this study care in ways that fit Gilligan's (1993) *Ethics of Care* theory.

**Relational actions toward Casey's welfare, protection, and enhancement.** Noddings (2013) writes that care manifests as relational actions "directed toward the welfare, protection, and enhancement" of a student (p. 23). Arguably, all the care codes (excluding *all questions*) in this study are relational actions directed toward Casey's welfare, protection, or enhancement. Teacher candidates in this study express compassion and sympathy. They use language concerning Casey's best interests and well-being, and some focus on keeping Casey out of trouble. They show concern for his welfare through caring questions. They explicitly state that they care about him. Teacher candidates praise Casey, perhaps to enhance his self-esteem.

### ***Teacher Candidates' Solutions to Threatening Behavior***

To my knowledge, there is no literature directly concerned with teacher candidates' responses to students' threatening behavior. My study addresses this gap in part by exploring what solutions emerge in interpersonal interactions between teacher candidates and an angry adolescent student, and if the solutions have elements of punitive, mild disciplinary, or restorative practices. The data in this study suggests that teacher candidates do not rely heavily on punitive or restorative practices. Instead, they frequently use mild disciplinary approaches and uncategorized solutions. I was interested in possible patterns in the order of teacher candidates' varied and frequent solutions. However, the breadth and the frequency of solutions proposed by teacher candidates added a layer of complexity. Few similarities emerged in solution order. Perhaps this is due to the number of solutions, frequency of solutions, and/or the range differences between participants. Higher than expected solution counts led me to explore teacher candidates' solutions and Casey's main takeaway from the conversation. Although patterns in the order of solutions were minimal, patterns in how teacher candidates problem-solve with Casey emerged. In the following pages, I discuss teacher candidates' solutions and some problem-solving patterns in interactions with Casey.

**Teacher candidates' solutions: contrasting approaches and risk tolerance.** The teacher candidates discuss numerous solutions, leaving Casey with many possibilities for interpretation. It is unclear what Casey will walk away thinking when we consider the conversation from his perspective. There are many ways to think about the solution(s) Casey may remember. It could be the solution teacher candidates propose most frequently, or the last solution or group of solutions Casey hears, or it may be what the teacher candidates say they *will* do anytime during the conversation. Generally, teacher candidates propose and discuss solutions with varied frequency, and teacher candidates state many solutions in common.

However, clear patterns in the solutions that Casey may remember, as defined by frequency, last solution(s), or what the teacher candidates say they *will* do, are less evident. Teacher candidates in this study state dissimilar solutions when considering only the solution categories above. For example, Adelyn's most frequent solution is to give the responsibility to Casey by asking how he will solve the problem and what support he wants. However, in her final statement to Casey, she tells him she will write his name down and that he should seek help by talking to someone else. Then she advises him against using violence. In the conversation, Casey learns of one thing the teacher will do and three things he should do. A person observing the interaction between Casey and Adelyn might wonder if Adelyn's approach is effective and adequate. Adelyn's solution of writing Casey's name down, just in case anything were to happen to him, may or may not be enough to curb his anger and prevent harm to others. Casey may not decide to take her advice, and he may not talk to someone else. One might wonder if telling Casey to talk to someone else because of the seriousness of the situation is dismissive and a way to skirt the responsibility. It is logical to conclude that Casey *is* talking to someone who can help, Adelyn. Adelyn accepts more risk by taking these approaches because it is unknown what may happen when Casey encounters the boys on the bus after school. Unlike six of her peers who did not define an action or whose action was to follow up, Adelyn said she would write his name down. One may argue that this plan is passive because Adelyn documents the incident in a way that results in the notification of no school personnel. Adelyn's interaction is one example of the complexity of solutions in this study.

Clayton takes a different approach in his conversation with Casey. Like Adelyn, his most frequent solution is to give responsibility to Casey. Clayton tells Casey he wants to speak with him again and asks if Casey is willing to do as the final solution. Unlike Adelyn, Clayton is more comprehensive with what he says he *will* do. His conversation with Casey is the longest and lasts

13 minutes and 49 seconds. Toward the end of the conversation, he tells Casey what he will do; the list of solutions he commits to is longer than other participants' lists. Clayton says he will notify the principal, the school security, the counselor, and the bus driver; and that he will follow-up with Casey. In this instance, Clayton is direct in his communication and does not ask for Casey's permission or approval. He is not negotiating. Casey's response to Clayton is, "Okay."

These are two contrasting examples that offer the possibility of very different outcomes and opposing levels of risk. Like the six other teacher candidates who did not designate an action or only mention following up, Adelyn takes a moderate or even a hands-off approach. Beyond the current conversation, she is minimally involved. She gives the responsibility to Casey in hopes that he will reach out to someone else for help and will choose non-violence if angry in the future. Arguably, her approach is risky because her conclusive action is to trust Casey, an upset adolescent she does not know well.

Clayton's approach is less risky. Clayton's decisive plan to inform four additional school personnel (the principal, school security, counselor, and bus driver) provides Casey with the possibility of support but also punishment. Clayton's solution to the problem reflects a level of seriousness that Adelyn's does not. Clayton appears to take Casey's threat seriously, and he seems to consider the safety of Casey and his peers throughout the day, on the bus, and in the future. To some degree, informing the administration and school security lessens his responsibility: talking to the counselor supports Casey, and telling the bus driver may keep Casey and his peers safer until resolution. The outcome and effectiveness of Clayton's answers are unknown, but the breadth and decisive delivery of his solutions are unmatched by other teacher candidates.



**Teacher candidate passivity.** Most teacher candidates in this study do not provide comprehensive solutions for Casey. Definitive plans of action are rare, as few teacher candidates take Clayton's approach and solve the problem for Casey by taking the reins and telling Casey what he must do and what they are going to do. Only three participants commit to more than two actions, when looking at what teacher candidates say they *will* do. Five teacher candidates do not define a single action in conversation with Casey. Four additional participants say they will either follow up, monitor the situation, or document the incident, meaning nine teacher candidates commit to zero or one action. Of these nine teacher candidates, eight take a passive approach by either not committing to a solution ( $n = 5$ ), committing to following up ( $n = 1$ ), or indirectly mentioning being written up ( $n = 2$ ). Adelyn's passive approach is exemplified above. Natalya is another student who mentions writing Casey up. However, she presents this with qualifiers and is indirect. Natalya says, "Okay, but just for future reference, don't go around the hallways saying things like you're going to beat other students up or things like that because we do have to write you up for that." Here it is unclear to the reader if she plans to write Casey up and inform others because, in this reprimand, Natalya does not say that she *will* write Casey up, but she does not say that she will not. It is the only time she implies an action, a moderate approach. John is much more repetitive and direct with his intention to document the incident and write Casey up than both Adelyn and Natalya. Even though writing Casey up is the only action John commits to, what to write in the report is the basis of his conversation with Casey.

Speaking to this, it is important to consider the potential for harm when teacher candidates choose a passive approach to problem-solving. I would argue that the goal of the conversation is to assess if Casey is a real threat to himself or others, to ensure the safety of all children, including Casey, and to provide Casey support. If the teacher candidate chooses inaction, a wait-and-see approach, or semi-commits to writing Casey up, as over half the

participants do, it leaves the door open. Risk increases when the school's personnel are not informed. Inaction does not support students or safety.

**Collaborative problem-solving and trust.** The data also hint that teacher candidates strive to involve Casey in the problem-solving process, evidence that they may not see themselves as the sole problem solver in the meeting. The teacher candidates in this study include Casey through negotiation, collaboration, and trust. For example, teacher candidates negotiate when asking for Casey's opinion and approval. They support collaboration through their language, using the terms *we* and *together*. A few teacher candidates directly state that they trust Casey. Others indirectly express trust when they advise against violence and advise Casey to choose himself. Importantly, teacher candidates also entrust Casey when they do not define an action as a solution in conversation. When teacher candidates do not tell Casey what they are going to do, the message Casey may receive is that the teacher candidates plan to do nothing. They indirectly communicate that they trust Casey to follow school rules and avoid physical altercations.

### ***Authority, Care, and Solutions Together***

The constructs of care and authority overlap in discussions about solutions between teacher candidates and Casey. Teacher candidates and Casey negotiate in collaborative solution-finding interpersonal interactions. Care is evident in solution-finding in teacher candidates' statements. For example, Arthur says, "You haven't talked to like, the guidance counselor or anything like that, have you? No? You know, they're always available though, right? I mean, do you know that people are there to help you if needed? Teachers, other than myself." In this compassion code example, Arthur mentions the counselor, he mentions someone other than himself, and he assures Casey that the school staff is available for support. In another example, Elizabeth says, "Do you want me to talk to the students? Do you want me to get someone to talk

to students?” In this example, Elizabeth wants to help. Through questioning, she shows compassion and shares authority while negotiating solutions with Casey.

The teacher candidates’ voiced experiences in this clinical simulation also hint at tensions between participants and Casey as they do the emotional work of caring in a professional space. Successfully navigating caring conversations with students about threatening behavior seemed to challenge some teacher candidates. This sense of challenge aligns with research where teachers report close and conflictual relationships with students who engage in challenging behavior (Spilt & Koomen, 2009). It also suggests that the teacher candidates want to avoid negative interactions with Casey. Avoiding negative interactions could decrease total interactions and lead to fewer positive interactions. Teacher candidates rarely praise Casey, aligning with the research that teachers rarely praise students with challenging behaviors for appropriate behavior (Gunter et al., 1993, 1994). Additionally, teacher candidates reprimand Casey, in support of research by Nelson and Roberts (2000) that found that students with more frequent problematic behaviors also experience harsher consequences for disruption than their peers (i.e., a reprimand instead of a redirect). Harsher punishments, like reprimands, by teacher candidates, are problematic because conflictual relationships are associated with students’ negative school adjustment (Hamre & Pianta, 2001). Many teacher candidates’ lack of praise and some teacher candidates’ reliance on punishment are important to consider because conflict impacts relationships, peer acceptance, and student well-being (Henricsson & Rydell, 2004). One challenging aspect of this scenario may be the tension of navigating a sometimes deeply personal space with professionalism while also needing a student to obey. It would be interesting to investigate this tension further; how do teacher candidates conceptualize their roles in the emotional work of teaching while disciplining?

### ***Gender Similarities***

The *Casey Butler* simulation has been used intermittently since 2011. Both female and male actors assume the role of Casey. However, six presumed male actors portray Casey Butler in this data set. Eight of the participants for this study are presumed female, and eight are presumed male. Comparisons of code usage and code example frequency between genders suggest a few differences in how female and male teacher candidates use authority, show care, and address threatening behavior. Across the constructs of authority, care, and solutions, the data suggests more similarities than differences in the ways female and male teacher candidates interact with a male Casey Butler. Male and female teacher candidates use similar elements of authority and care, and propose similar solutions in discussions with Casey.

### **Study Limitations**

There are several limitations of this study to consider. This study uses a small sample from one class of preservice teachers at a single private university in the Northeastern United States. The findings of this study are not generalizable due to the small sample size of 16. The data set for this study is pre-existing, and the participants no longer attend the university. An existing data set prohibits me from conducting interviews or focus groups based on my specific research questions. Triangulation through additional data sources would increase the validity of my findings. However, the circumstances of my data set limit triangulation and the validity of my findings.

A lack of interrater reliability is also a methodological limitation of this dissertation. I was a single coder, so the similarities and differences between two individuals' coded transcripts are unknown. I acknowledge that interrater reliability would strengthen this study. However, professors and graduate students are busy, and I did not have a qualified collaborator willing to

code this data set. As the single coder, I tried to guard against inconsistency and ensure the most reliability possible by using a strict code list, meeting with my advisor consistently, memo writing, color coding, organization, etc. Still, it is important to acknowledge that one individual completed the coding, analysis, and interpretation as part of this study.

My analysis method is also a limitation. In this study, I used an initial set of predetermined codes based on theoretical frameworks and constructs within my research questions to improve external reliability (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). Using the coding method of Lincoln and Guba (1985), I first coded a subset of the transcripts using the predetermined codes within my initial codebook to ensure fit. I used deductive coding, I was systematic, and I added to and modified existing codes as the coding of the data proceeded. Then, I analyzed the entire data set for patterns and themes. I could have used other approaches. For example, I could have used grounded theory without initial codes and an extensive prior literature review. Discourse analysis could have strengthened this study, especially when analyzing receptive listening. Although I considered the context in conversations and the teacher candidates' tone of voice, discourse analysis was not part of this study. This method seems particularly relevant to the study of care and authority, as care is relational and authority is built, constructed, and deconstructed in interactions over time. I did not examine non-verbal interactions between the teacher candidates and the standardized students in this study. Non-verbal communication is a dimension of relating worth considering in the study of authority and care. However, technology and the fixed data set were limiting. For example, I wanted to study eye contact and smiling as potential evidence of care (McBee, 2007), yet the steep camera angles and poor video resolution inhibited me from collecting data on teacher candidates' non-verbal representations of eye contact and smiling within care.

Clinical simulation methodology also has limitations. Simulations are not fully authentic; they are simulated environments. The interactions between the SI and the preservice teachers are “close approximations of daily practices” to support teacher development and learning (B. Dotger, 2013, p. xi). The preservice teachers in this study did not meet with an actual student whom they, minutes before, witnessed threatening to harm others in the hallway in a school where they worked as novice teachers. Instead, they were students enrolled in a class and instructed to participate in their third clinical simulation. It is important to acknowledge that preservice teachers might act and communicate differently when they witness a threat in an actual school environment.

Across the constructs of authority, care, and solutions, inconsistencies within the clinical simulations are a possible limitation. I outlined some consistencies and inconsistencies of the six standardized students who acted as Casey Butler in the clinical simulations in the previous chapter. However, there are countless variables to consider, and I did not examine them all. For example, I did not look at inconsistencies across race, LGTBQ status, stature, personality, age, etc. It is important to acknowledge that, when using clinical simulations, a shift in one variable (gender of the SS, the race of the SS or the teacher candidate, LGTBQ status, etc.) can dramatically alter the clinical simulation dialogue and outcome.

Emotional responses and the varied comfort levels of the teacher candidates while participating in this clinical simulation are other possible limitations. Feelings of nervousness, uncertainty, and intimidation could have contributed to inconsistencies and outcomes. Based on the course syllabi, the date of the video recordings, and communications with the course designer, I have determined this was the teacher candidates’ third experience in a clinical simulation. B. Dotger (2013) writes that at first, nervousness and uncertainty are common when teacher candidates begin to participate in clinical simulations and that these feelings can lessen

over time. Even in their third simulation, levels of nervousness and uncertainty may have influenced teacher candidates' behaviors.

Additionally, the varied experience levels of the standardized students are a limitation. Although my analysis in Chapter Four shows that most SIs consistently followed the protocol, the familiarity and experience of the SIs, both within this simulation and within other simulations, may have influenced their comfort levels, behaviors, and thus outcomes in interactions with Casey.

Although there were efforts to recruit younger-looking students, another possible limitation was the age difference between the teacher candidate and the SI. Actors attending local universities portrayed someone younger than themselves, a ninth-grade student. A perceived or real lack of age difference between the teacher candidate and the actors could influence this study's results. The teacher candidates' perceptions of Casey's age surfaced in the post-simulation debriefs. In one conversation between four teacher candidates, Natalya said, "He had facial hair." And Jasper responded, "Yeah. I hear you." Thomas said, "Very mature for a ninth-grader." And Samara answered, "Word." Jasper responded, "Literally, I'm pretty sure that kid was older than me."

Casey's ascribed character traits within the clinical simulation limit the study of care. I use the term *elements of care* intentionally because a complete caring interaction is challenging to achieve based on the limits and parameters of Casey's character. Noddings (2005a) describes caring as "a way of being in relation, not a set of specific behaviors" (p. 17). Care is about connection and relationships. She describes the consciousness of the one-cared-for: "Reception, recognition, and response seem to be primary. The cared for receives the caring and shows that it has been received" (p. 16). These actions by the one-cared-for are significant because they

complete the caring relationship. In her words, “A caring relation is completed when he receives my efforts as caring” (p. 16). Reciprocity is essential to the relation (p. 17). Appendix B describes Casey as sullen, defensive, and angry. The prescribed demeanor as an upset teen poses challenges to connection as Noddings (2005a) describes. Casey, as the one-cared-for, is not always receptive to the one-caring, which creates an incomplete caring interaction.

### **Implications, Why This Work Matters**

In this section, I discuss implications for teacher preparation, teacher professional development, and using clinical simulations as a tool for teaching and research.

#### ***Implications for Teacher Preparation***

The *Casey Butler* simulation gave novice teachers a space to practice interpersonal skills, care, and authority—all parts of the social and emotional work that teaching demands. The use of the *Casey Butler* simulation and clinical simulation pedagogy is one way to address scholars’ argument that teacher preparation programs nationwide do not afford the adequate time and opportunities for preservice teachers to build their knowledge, skills, and practice in the social-emotional facets of both teaching and learning (Brophy, 2006; Flower et al., 2017; Greenberg et al., 2014; S. Jones & Bouffard, 2012; Schonert-Reichl et al., 2015). The use of clinical simulations as pedagogy is a solution to this shortfall.

Scholars advise on the importance of both authority and care, and they advocate for increased awareness of teacher authority and care in teacher preparation and teacher development. Pace and Hemmings (2006a) highlight the “importance of attending to authority in teacher education and professional development in ways that foster new strategies of action based on better understandings of students, racial issues and authority” (p. xiv). Additionally, Goldstein and Lake (2003) “contend that we need to develop an orientation toward teacher



education in which preservice teachers' pre-existing beliefs about caring and teaching are called into question, scrutinized critically, and then thoughtfully reintegrated into their evolving practices" (p. 129). The *Casey Butler* clinical simulation addresses the arguments above as a forum for teacher candidates to further understand their dispositions of authority and care and to explore their use of authority and care in interactions with their students—supporting introspection, reflection, new strategies, and evolving practices. The *Casey Butler* clinical simulation is one of many simulations that potentially support teacher candidate development in dispositions of authority and care.

Teacher candidates need to recognize, be able to name, and reflect on the types of authority they use. This can help in challenging situations. I acknowledge that there is limited research on how teachers practice authority in educational spaces (Hurn, 1985; Macleod et al., 2017). However, like the work of Pellegrino (2010), the teacher candidates in this study relied on certain types of authority more than others. The teacher candidates in this study relied on legitimate authority, mentioning their roles and responsibilities. They expressed personal authority through kindness, and competent authority through advice. They often shared authority with Casey. Teacher candidates are often young, with limited professional experience. Logically, they would not rely heavily on competent authority related to the wealth of professional knowledge or experience, but they do have life experience. In conversations with Casey, the teacher candidates relied on their life experiences, as expressed through advice. In light of these results, teacher preparation programs should acknowledge that teacher candidates use authority, and that authority is a critical, flexible, and useful tool in teaching. Programs should explicitly teach the many types of authority. Preservice teachers should be asked to pay attention to the types of authority they use and reflect on their use of authority when interacting with children. This is imperative because authority is central in the classroom context. Macleod et al. (2012)

explore the work of Weber (1958) and Hearn (2012) in connection to authority and define it in terms of the “ability [of teachers] to give orders (or instructions) and to have them obeyed” (p. 498). Children must do what the teacher says in the current educational context because obedience impacts classroom function (Pace, 2003c; Pace & Hemmings, 2007).

Balancing care, responsibility, and instruction is different for all people. The number of ways and frequency in which teacher candidates expressed care varied among participants. All teacher candidates showed care multiple times and in various ways. A few teacher candidates in this study expressed minimal care, took nominal responsibility, and did not discuss a plan with Casey. Teacher candidates' care for their students is important for numerous reasons (e.g., it helps sustain relationships through connection and support keeps students safer, etc.). Children spend much of their childhood and adolescence in school; it should be a safe place with adults who care. To increase teacher candidates' capacity to care, emphasize the importance of caring by teachers in schools, and recognize the many ways teachers already care, I recommend more explicit training on: (1) what it means to care, (2) what caring looks like in specific scenarios, (3) the benefits of providing adequate emotional support to students, and (4) practice with interpersonal communication. These actions will better prepare teachers to engage thoughtfully and carefully in conversations with youth.

Teacher candidates in this study were passive in their solution negotiations with Casey, and some expressed uncertainty in the small-group debriefing sessions. Results from this study indicate that teacher candidates are unsure of what to do when students threaten harm. Many teacher candidates in this study did not outline a clear path forward. Their solutions were numerous. They were not assertive. In other cases, they did not commit to acting. These findings have practical applications for teacher preparation programs, specifically increased knowledge,

training, and opportunity to practice. It is important for teacher candidates to learn what to do as the first responder to a threat. To respond more effectively, novice and practicing teachers need:

- Knowledge of the support resources available to help students in crisis
- Training on threat assessment
- Training on what to do when students make threats
- Opportunities to practice responding and improve

From this additional training, novice teachers can gain a more comprehensive understanding of disciplinary policy and practices, school resources, conflict resolution strategies, and options for supporting children in crisis who enact unwanted behaviors, including threatening behavior.

Arguably, teachers highly trained in how to support children in crisis will always respond in clear, fair, productive, and supportive ways, keeping students safer and improving the school and classroom climate for all learners.

### ***Implications for Practicing Teachers***

This study explores preservice teachers' interactions with upset students. Still, this study may have implications for practicing teachers concerning how they enact authority, care, and discipline in their daily practice.

Arguably, increased awareness of one's authority, as an integral construct and educational tool, could benefit practicing teachers and students in reflexive and practical ways. Authority is fundamental and often misunderstood (Pace and Hemmings, 2007), and Pace and Hemmings (2006a) call for more professional development centered on teacher authority.

Explicitly teaching teachers about the existing theories related to authority and authority types might increase teachers' influence and improve their management skills and relationships with their students. This could potentially minimize or eliminate conflict. It is valuable to name the types of authority one uses and doesn't use because the types of authority we use can change

based on whom we interact with, our physical environment, emotional or intellectual state of being, years of experience, etc. This can help in challenging situations and potentially alleviate some.

Increased in-service instruction in authority may impact the types of authority teachers utilize. Teachers may advance student autonomy in our current education system with an increased understanding of authority. Practicing teachers' further understanding of authority may encourage a critical examination of our educational system—one that is oppressive to some students and controlling to most. Knowledge and awareness of authority may help teachers confront their racial and gender biases. It may inspire them to give students more choice and voice in their classroom environments, potentially improving the schooling experiences of our youth.

Noddings (2013) asserts that “the primary aim of every educational institution and of every educational effort must be the maintenance and enhancement of caring” (p. 172). The teachers in this study showed numerous and varied expressions of care; they showed a responsibility toward Casey’s well-being and tried to meet his needs. It is important that we provide practicing teachers additional opportunities to develop their understandings and enactments of care toward all students, especially struggling students, so they may improve interpersonal interactions, build trust and confidence, and keep students safer. Teachers hold responsibility toward their students, and how teachers care impacts daily practice and students’ lives. It is powerful to name one’s actions and inactions and understand our interactions with children. It is logical to think that teachers’ actions and inactions associated with care influence student outcomes, academic achievement, and feelings of belonging, safety, and social-emotional well-being.

The teacher candidates in this study relied more on mild disciplinary solutions (the counselor, reprimands, and conferencing) than restorative solutions. One implication of this finding is a need for more training on relational resolution discipline approaches like restorative practices for practicing teachers. Training would give teachers a framework and enable partnerships with students to increase equity, contextualize behaviors, and support true accountability. It would also help support a work environment that de-stigmatizes and prioritizes mental health for students and teachers.

Student threats are events that fit within Barrows' (1987) design tenet of clinical importance or impact—they occur less frequently but are of high importance or impact. This study highlights gaps in teacher candidates' understanding of student threats and how best to handle them. Teacher candidates discuss varied and numerous solutions, yet only a few teacher candidates support Casey with a comprehensive solution. The results of this study suggest that teacher candidates do not begin teaching knowing what to do when they observe threatening behavior. With or without adequate training on how best to support children in crisis, novice professionals may interact with children who threaten others in their first few years of teaching. In either situation, the results of this study demonstrate a need for specific in-service professional development opportunities for novice teachers—experiences that better prepare new teachers to discipline children in crisis with supportive solutions that keep all students safe. One recommendation is training in threat assessment. Increased awareness through threat assessment training may give teachers the skills to quickly assess the likelihood and severity of a threat, so they can respond appropriately and react to and interact with the students effectively. Additionally, it is critical that teachers have some experience assessing the gravity and severity of student threats in the current political climate, where assault-type weapons are easily obtained.

We know of “the unfortunate reality that the majority of educators receive very limited to no training in behavior and classroom management but are expected to meet the social/emotional needs of students who present daily challenges in the classroom” (Begeny & Martens, 2006) as cited in (Mitchell et al., 2017, p. 140). The results of this study do not directly address if the teacher candidates feel they met Casey’s needs, but some teacher candidates in this study expressed feeling uncertain in their post-simulation debriefs. Their feelings of unease may support a need for more training in how to discipline children with aggression. Teacher training impacts teachers’ affective responses and behavioral reactions to student aggression and reduces teachers’ self-reported negative emotions and negative affect in response to aggression (Alvarez, 2007, p. 1120). Like Westling (2010), the results of this study emphasize the need for more in-service preparation for practicing teachers to support children with challenging behavior.

We know that preservice and practicing teachers fear failure to prevent violence and act appropriately in a potentially violent situation (Williams & Corvo, 2005). Increased training to assess threats and responses to student aggression may alleviate some of this fear.

The conversations between Casey and the teacher candidates were short. Some teachers discussed their intent to speak with additional school personnel. In school environments, tight schedules challenge teachers to meet students' social and emotional needs. Results of this study highlight a need for more flex time in the school day for practicing teachers. Teachers need more time in the day to consult with and inform other staff, the administration, bus drivers, etc., so they can respond appropriately and address student threats adequately.

### ***Clinical Simulations Use in Social-Emotional Contexts***

Professor B. Dotger and colleagues designed a series of clinical simulations connected to specific secondary education content areas in 2011-2012; the *Casey Butler* simulation is one of those simulations. Unlike other simulations that use standardized individuals to portray adults

(e.g., parents or colleagues), this simulation is the first to involve a standardized student in a secondary education context. It is the first clinical simulation to look at secondary teacher candidates' behaviors in response to threatening behavior, highlighting the emotional work of teachers and the social and emotional needs of students.

I used clinical simulations as a methodology to study the ways teacher candidates engaged in a clinical simulation focused on threatening behavior in schools. This study suggests that clinical simulations are a useful tool to study teacher candidates' interpersonal interactions with upset students in the context of threatening behavior, a social-emotional scenario. This study has implications for how we use approximations in research. The use of standardized students in this simulation lets researchers look at real-time interactions between teacher candidates and students in discussions about unwanted student behavior. Clinical simulations are approximations, but they afford researchers many conveniences and benefits. Clinical simulations allow researchers access to a repeated scenario. They ensure safety, require fewer and more easily-obtained permissions, and can save time. These conveniences and benefits are valuable to researchers who study teacher and student interpersonal interactions in social-emotional contexts because some obstacles and challenges are minimized or eliminated.

This study has implications for how we use approximations in teacher education. As an extension of this research, teacher preparation programs should use standardized students to explore other valuable teacher-student interactions. For example, clinical simulations could facilitate discussions with a student who is the perpetrator or victim of micro-aggressions or racism. They could center students who are suspected victims of neglect or abuse, or they could help teacher candidates discuss underachievement or truancy, connect with a student who appears depressed or withdrawn, etc. Approximations in teacher education should facilitate the study, teaching, and learning of many additional social-emotional topics. Clinical simulations

afford schools of education several options and considerations in training and ongoing professional development of teachers.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

Scholars assert that more research on teacher and preservice teacher authority in school spaces is needed (Pace & Hemmings, 2007). This study strives to partially address “a gap in empirical research on the topic of teachers’ authority” using clinical simulations (Macleod et al., 2012, p. 505). This dissertation answers Pellegrino’s (2010) call for more studies related to preservice teachers’ authority in subject areas other than social studies. This work and my use of theory address Pace and Hemmings’ (2007) assertion that current studies on teacher authority do not theoretically ground their analysis of teacher-student interactions. Graça et al. (2013) assert that “the majority of existing studies on authority in an academic context are essentially focused on the effects of social inequalities and cultural domination in student resistance” (p. 1066). This study expands the current research base on teacher authority focused on teacher candidates’ use of authority types in response to students’ threatening behavior—not the effects of social inequities and domination in student resistance.

Future studies could explore how teacher candidates’ dispositions of authority in scenarios of threatening behavior change over time, at different experience levels, and with students of different races, genders, or personalities. Researchers could look at how teacher candidates’ dispositions of authority change with threat seriousness (i.e., a student who is not going to fight vs. a student who remains elevated and does not calm down in ways that Casey sometimes does).

The research on preservice teachers and the construct of care is limited. The few existing studies do not provide a clear picture of the ways preservice teachers care for students in crisis.



This study adds to the current literature on care and preservice teachers using the work of Noddings (2013) and Gilligan (1993). Current studies discuss preservice teachers' oversimplified, limited, and idealistic conceptions of care and examine teacher candidates' beliefs (e.g., Goldstein & Freedman, 2003; Goldstein & Lake, 2003), but few look at specific ways teacher candidates care (McBee, 2007). McBee (2007) is most like this study because it looks at specific behaviors that teacher candidates ( $n = 124$ ), practicing teachers ( $n = 13$ ), and education faculty members ( $n = 7$ ) consider caring. The work of McBee (2007) provides possible ways the teacher candidates in my study exhibit care (e.g., defined as specific codes like compassion, offering time, etc.). However, it is important to note that these conceptions of care, expressed by a sample of mostly teacher candidates, were gleaned from surveys asking for examples of caring responses teacher candidates observed *and* exhibited to others in educational contexts (p. 35). My study adds to the literature by using clinical simulations to study actual, not conceptualized, caring responses of teacher candidates toward students, something other studies have not done. In this study, I analyze evidence of elements of care that teacher candidates voice while talking to a student. I am interested in learning more about how teacher candidates conceptualize care and how they view care with authority. Additional exploration of how teacher candidates use authority and care together within teaching and learning would add to the work of Goldstein and Lake (2003) by further defining how teacher candidates conceptualize relationships between care and authority as novices. My future work might explore how teacher candidates define care and how care fits within teacher candidates' schema of responsibilities as professional educators.

Searching the literature, I did not find current peer-reviewed research on teacher candidates' responses to threatening behavior in schools. This study begins to address the need for more research related to novice teachers' responses to student threats. This dissertation

also adds to a slim research base on teacher-student interactions in social spaces and using simulations.

A fellow teacher and I recently discussed a local school district's professional development opportunity centered on restorative discipline. This teacher mentioned that her student teacher attended the training. The data from this study is from 2016, and there is little evidence of restorative practices as solutions. Karp and Breslin (2001) describe restorative practices implementation to address discipline as uncommon. However, some scholars note schools' increased use of restorative practices (González, 2012; Winn, 2018). Another future research study might examine how teacher candidates engage and the solutions they discuss with Casey after specific or increased training in restorative discipline.

Goldstein and Lake (2003) conclude that preservice teachers' opinions on caring did not change dramatically over time, and conceptions slowly progressed in complexity with experience (p. 128). In a study of teacher candidates' reactions to students' non-compliance, using mixed reality simulations, Pankowski and Walker (2016) found that participants "perceived improvement in their practice over time" (p. 14). As an extension of this research, it would be useful to explore further how teachers' responses in this clinical simulation change with experience. Researchers could recruit experienced teachers to participate in the clinical simulation and compare novice and experienced teachers' responses. It would be interesting to see how the types of authority teachers use, how they care, and the solutions they discuss to address threatening behaviors shift with experience.

Communication with the participants of this study was impossible. Interviews or surveys would allow opportunities to learn more about teacher candidate thinking and could support triangulation, strengthening the reliability of my findings. Future studies could use interviews and surveys with clinical simulations to gain a deeper understanding of teacher candidate

authority, care, and problem-solving after students' threatening behavior. For example, it would be interesting to investigate why some teacher candidates did not commit to solutions within their conversations. Perhaps they see threatening behavior as common, not a big deal. Casey tells the teacher candidate that he will not follow through with violence a few times. Perhaps this influences their decisions. Or maybe the teacher candidates feel that talking to Casey in real-time is adequate, and further action is unnecessary. Through interviews, I could learn more about how confident teacher candidates are in addressing threatening behavior at school and what they wish they knew to better address the situation. I am also curious about how race, gender, and cultural identities impact authority usage, care, and problem-solving in similar simulations with participants who self-identify, using both female and male standardized students. Although not analyzed as part of this study, one extension of this research could be to look carefully at differences in language and tone by gender. In the future, I could extensively analyze and discuss the relationships, patterns, and overlap between the constructs of authority, care, and solutions.

### **Concluding Thoughts**

Pace and Hemmings (2007) frame the topic of authority as fundamental and poorly understood (p. 4). This study helps us better understand how teacher candidates use care and authority in their interactions with students. McBee (2007) asserts, "Discussions of caring remain largely general and vague regarding what a caring teacher's behaviors actually look like" (p. 33). This study helps clarify the caring behaviors teacher candidates display toward a student in real-time interpersonal interactions. From this study, we learn that a class of future teachers strives to connect with struggling students through caring interpersonal interaction. They use many types of authority, together and separate, to negotiate solutions with evidence of collaboration and Casey's shared best interest. Teacher candidates do not rely heavily on punitive discipline or

specific restorative practices; instead, they choose a middle ground and rely most on mild disciplinary and uncategorized solutions.

Novice teachers have much to learn on the job, and teacher preparation programs cannot teach it all. However, teacher preparation programs can and should adapt to consider and cover more social and emotional work of teachers. Emmer and Stough (2001) argue for classroom management instruction using a “reflective-practitioner approach” that is “pragmatic” and is situated “within real-world contexts and events” (p. 110). The *Casey Butler* clinical simulation is a focused learning opportunity that highlights the social and emotional work required of teachers and the social and emotional needs of students. It is pragmatic and considers a real-world scenario. Clinical simulation experience helps better prepare teachers for challenging interpersonal interactions about threatening behavior through real-time interaction, followed by discussion and reflection, supporting more informed decision-making and promoting professional growth.

The issue of educators’ and schools’ responses to threatening behaviors is complex. Data suggests that student threats are common but that most threats do not materialize. However, when students follow through with threats, violence ensues, with the risk of bodily harm and rarely death. How teachers respond to threatening behavior is critical because their actions influence outcomes. This study shows that teacher candidates’ approaches differ, and that they accept varying levels of risk. There is value in training teachers for a more thorough understanding of individual, school, political, and cultural responses to threatening behavior. Further, there is a need for teacher preparation programs and ongoing professional development to better prepare teachers to meet the social and emotional needs of struggling students in their care.

## Appendix A

### Seven Partially Related Studies

Details	Study 1	Study 2	Study 3	Study 4
Study	Lai et al. (2015)	Pellegrino (2010)	Goldstein and Lake (2003)	Goldstein and Lake (2000)
Description	Researchers studied how preservice Chinese language teachers perceived legitimate teacher authority during their teaching practicum.	The researcher studied preservice teachers' reliance on traditional, legal-rational, and charismatic authority.	Researchers studied the impacts of field placements on preservice elementary teachers' conceptions of caring and the stability of their beliefs over time.	Researchers studied preservice elementary teachers' preconceived conceptions of caring.
Methods and data	Qualitatively analyzed transcripts of individual semi-structured interviews, at three intervals, over one year.	Qualitatively analyzed participant surveys, class observations, personal journal entries, and focus group interview transcripts using Weber's (1947) models of authority	Qualitatively analyzed 170 electronic dialogue journal entries using a cross-comparative method to explore common themes.	Qualitatively analyzed electronic dialogue journal entries using a cross-comparative method to explore common themes.
Sample	18 female preservice Chinese language teachers	5 preservice teachers (1 female, 4 male)	17 preservice teachers (16 female, 1 male)	17 preservice teachers (16 female, 1 male)
Primary findings	Teachers' perceptions of pedagogical and interpersonal components of legitimate authority changed over time, becoming more nuanced and balanced.	Preservice teachers in this study relied on charismatic authority more than traditional authority. There was minimal evidence of legal-rational authority.	Opinions on caring did not change dramatically over time. Participants expressed confusion and uncertainty in connection to care and authority.	Caring and teaching are linked. Preconceptions of caring were oversimplified and idealized. Teacher candidates considered caring an essentialist trait.
Construct(s)	Authority	Authority	Care and authority	Care

Details	Study 5	Study 6	Study 7
Study	McBee (2007)	Butler and Monda-Amaya (2016)	Pankowski and Walker (2016)
Description	Researchers studied how educators conceptualize care.	Researchers studied preservice teachers' perceptions of other teachers' responses to unwanted student behavior.	Researchers studied changes in preservice teachers' classroom management schemas, their classroom management strategies, and their learning in mixed-reality simulations over time.
Methods and data	Qualitatively identified 78 characteristics of caring teachers from voluntary, anonymous open-ended surveys.	Participants viewed and responded to three video-recorded scenarios. They rated challenging student behaviors using the Challenging Behaviors Perception Scale (CBPS; Butler & Monda-Amaya, 2010).	Qualitatively analyzed preservice teachers' pre and post-assessments, qualitative comments, answers to self-evaluation prompts, and self-rated effectiveness.
Sample	124 preservice teachers, 13 classroom teachers, and 7 college faculty	255 preservice teachers	26 preservice teachers (18 female, 8 male)
Primary findings	The six most common responses in order of frequency were offering help, showing interest in students, showing compassion, giving their time, listening, and caring about the individual.	Preservice teachers viewed physical aggression, physical altercations in the classroom, and bullying as harder to manage. They viewed whining, making noises, and tardiness as easier to manage.	Initial definitions of classroom management focused on control and progressed toward a balance of care and control. Participants relied on control-based strategies to address non-compliance and care-based strategies to address student motivation. Participants rated their performance between effective and developing and noted improvement over time.
Construct(s)	Care	Unwanted student behavior	Student non-compliance, motivation

## Appendix B

### Standardized Student Interaction Protocol

STANDARDIZED STUDENT:

CASEY BUTLER

15 years old, Generally Disgruntled, Poorly Dressed, Older sister to Shannon Butler (11 years old), Defensive Attitude and Posture

CONFERENCE TYPE:

TEACHER-INITIATED

You are Casey Butler, a 15-year-old ninth grade fe/male at Smithfield School. This school is a small community school, and has students from all grades in it (Kindergarten through Grade 12). You are a generally disgruntled teenager, who clearly conveys a general dislike of all authority figures (i.e. all adults) and most of your peers as well.

You live with your father, Dave Butler, and your younger sister, Shannon Butler. Your father is technically married to your mother, but their marriage is not strong. Your mother has struggled with drugs for several years – you’ve known about it since you were in fourth grade. She was arrested when you were in 7<sup>th</sup> grade, and charged with Possession of Heroin with Intent to Sell and two counts of Endangering a Minor. She has been incarcerated in Jamesville Correctional Facility for the past 14 months and you’ve visited her twice with your father and sister. The last time you saw her was six months ago. What you’ve come to understand is that her drug problem escalated into her distribution (selling of drugs) out of the home, thus endangering the welfare of you and your sister. Your father – a delivery man for UPS – works very long hours (12 hours shifts, five days a week) and is not home until later in the evening (7:00 p.m. onward). Thus, your mother was often home alone and her drug use and drug selling habits went unnoticed for quite a while. Your father has told you that he is in the process of filing for divorce from your mother and filing for sole custody of you and your sister.

Your father has risen to the challenge of raising two teenagers, and has done pretty well given the circumstances. Because the three of you (your father, yourself, and Shannon) rely solely on his income, he picks up extra 12-hour shifts on the weekends, leaving you and Shannon at home. You and Shannon do fight at times, but you both tend to keep to your own territories (i.e. your own rooms). When your father is at home, he cooks sometimes, but also relies on you and your sister to “fend for yourselves” based on what is in the refrigerator/cupboard. Your father works hard, is very tired most of the time, and you hear him on the phone pretty often late at night. You know he’s not talking to your mom, and you’re a bit suspicious that he might be talking with some other woman.

### **CHARACTERISTICS/BACKGROUND INFO FOR STANDARDIZED STUDENT**

1. You are really not sure what to think of your mother being in jail. At times, you miss her and wish she were home. More often, though, you’re very embarrassed by having a mother in jail and find yourself angry with her and the world in general. You, your father, and your sister don’t talk about your mother much. The two times you visited her in prison were awkward, painful, and surreal – seeing her within a prison setting was just weird and she seemed like a stranger to you in many ways.
2. You and your father get along fairly well. You see him as a pretty good guy who is working hard just to keep the family going. At times, you feel sorry for him because he’s

so tired all the time from work.

3. You have a few friends at school, but you've grown apart from most of them in the last couple of years. Some of your peers at school know that your mom is in jail, and you know that some folks talk about you and your mom behind your back. You've seen enough whispered conversations and snickers out of the corner of your eye to confirm this.
4. Your grades are not great. You're generally a "C" student, with the occasional "B" in a class that you like. You're quite capable, but just don't try all that hard.
5. You generally steer clear of teachers and sit fairly passively in the back of the class. Your father is not in touch with the schools that often, as he's simply too busy/too overwhelmed with work and keeping the family fed, clothed, and housed. You generally don't like teachers and authority figures at school, but they haven't really given you much reason to truly dislike them. You've just got a healthy dose of anti-authority teenage angst.
6. Last year (in eighth grade) you amassed too many tardies getting to school in the morning. You and your sister are responsible for getting on the bus by yourselves. You slept in too often – your dad was already at work and didn't know. On the days you woke up and actually decided to go into school, you simply walked the short distance to school. The 19 tardies you accumulated resulted in two different days of "In School Suspension." You think notes were sent home to your father, but he never said anything to you, so you haven't given it much thought since then. This has been your only infraction as a student.
7. Yesterday afternoon, you got into a verbal altercation on the bus ride home. Two boys sitting in the seat just behind you were whispering and laughing. You turned around at one point and they laughed much more. You scowled at them, but didn't think much of it. Later, when you were much more attuned to what they were saying, you thought you heard them say your name quietly to each other. Other snippets of the conversation included the words, "drugs" and "mom." Importantly, you didn't hear any one segment of their conversation clearly, but you think they were talking about you.

Knowing that your bus stop was approaching, you stood up and turned around about 30 seconds before the bus came to a stop. You looked at both boys, and said quite loudly, "If you don't stop talking about me, I will beat both of your fucking asses!" Then, you stomped off the bus. As you passed the front of the bus, the bus driver was just shaking her head. As you stepped off the bus, you could hear what sounded like the entire bus roaring with laughter and amusement at your loud use of profanity. You felt your neck and cheeks darken with embarrassment, but you were as angry as you were embarrassed.

8. This morning, you got back on the bus, knowing that you'd see those same two boys again. You flipped through the Smithfield K-12 Yearbook last night, finally discovering they were both 10<sup>th</sup> graders named Sam and Mike. When you got on the bus this morning, you were determined not to avoid them. You sat in your usual seat, and they



got on the bus later and sat right behind you. You didn't initiate anything, but you were especially attuned to anything they might be saying. On the bus ride to school this morning, they didn't say anything about you that you could hear. However, they were laughing a lot, which only made you angry all over again.

9. When you got to school, you found your two best friends (Aaron and Ty). You re-explained to them what had happened on the bus yesterday afternoon. You remained angry at the two boys on the bus, as you and your two friends walked down the halls before 1<sup>st</sup> period began.
10. As you continued to recount your story to your friends, you focused your story on one of the boys on the bus (Sam) in particular. This is the one who was looking at you with a particularly snide look on his face after you threatened them on the bus. In speaking aloud to your friends as you walked down the hall, you said "He (Sam) pisses me off so much. I may just have to kick his ass to shut him up!"
11. Very soon after you uttered these words, Mr./Ms. (INSERT TEACHER'S NAME) appeared in front of you, Aaron, and Ty. The teacher said good morning, and encouraged Aaron and Ty to head to 1<sup>st</sup> period. But, the teacher said directly to you, "Let's you and I chat for a moment before school starts. Step into my classroom for a minute." You groaned (inwardly), not really wanting to chat with a teacher about what you'd just said to your friends.

#### **QUESTIONS/INFORMATION TO PRESENT TO THE TEACHER**

1. When you step into the teacher's classroom, shake hands if he/she offers a handshake. If not, don't shake hands. You should appear sullen and defensive, but NOT SCARED. You're still angry at what happened on the bus yesterday afternoon.
2. The teacher will hopefully provide you a door-opener (i.e. "Tell me what's going on" OR "I heard you in the hallway. Is something wrong?"). Your response to any type of initial question from the teacher should be: *"I know they were talking about me, and I'm gonna take care of it!"*

**NOTE: You are not using the same language with the teacher as you used with the boys on the bus or that you used in recounting the story to your friends in the hallway. HOWEVER, if the teacher asks for exactly what happened on the bus, USE THE EXACT LANGUAGE.**

3. At the heart of this situation is the fact that you are very sensitive and very embarrassed by your family situation (i.e. mom in jail). The teacher may or may not try to get to the heart of the matter. If the teacher begins asking you questions about WHY the boys would have been talking about you or WHY you verbally lashed out at them, use the following triggers:
  - a. "People need to mind their own business and stay out of my life!"
  - b. "There's stuff going on at home, that's all."
  - c. "My dad works hard and we're doing ok; it's just a rough time."

4. **YOU SHOULD NOT MENTION YOUR MOM UNLESS THE TEACHER ASKS YOU DIRECTLY!!** If the teacher asks about your mom (i.e. “You haven’t mentioned your mom, what can you tell me about her?”), then you need to tell him/her your home situation in a very abrupt, defensive, matter-of-fact tone of voice: “Look, my mom’s in jail, ok. She has a drug problem and she’s in jail!” You can and should say more to the teacher if prompted – using your notes from this document – but let the teacher guide you through this. **DO NOT JUST POUR OUT ALL OF THE DETAILS – LET THE TEACHER’S QUESTIONS – IF THEY ARE ASKED – DRAW THE ANSWERS OUT OF YOU.**
5. The teacher may or may not have a consequence to assign you for you loud obscenities in the hallway. After you’ve given all the info you’ve been prompted for by the teacher, you should resort to being sullen, defensive, and quiet for the rest of the conference. Let the teacher guide/facilitate this conference from this point forward.

***IF THE TEACHER INDICATES THAT YOUR USE OF LANGUAGE AND THREATS IN THE HALLWAY WILL MEAN THAT YOU HAVE TO GO DOWN TO THE PRINCIPAL’S OFFICE,*** you should reply by simply saying, “Whatever” in a snide voice and then look at the floor until the conference is over.

## Appendix C

### Teacher Interaction Protocol—Standardized Student Interaction

STUDENT: CASEY BUTLER  
CONFERENCE TYPE: Teacher-Initiated

You are a high school teacher within a small, but growing K-12 community school. The Smithfield School serves 650 students (from Kindergarten through grade 12) within the Smithfield community. This is a tiny community with a small K-12 school. However, as industry from a city one hour away has encroached on your small community, the number of neighborhoods have increased, the tax base has increased, and the Smithfield School has become increasingly crowded.

Like all teachers in this small school, you have responsibilities beyond teaching your (INSERT SUBJECT AREA) courses. The school is generally divided into two wings, one that houses K-6 students and one that houses students in grades 7-12. Many of your responsibilities (hall monitoring, cafeteria duty, and club sponsorships) have you working with students in the secondary grades (7-12) in the secondary wing of the school, though you do have some whole school responsibilities during assemblies, pep rallies, bus/parking lot duties, etc.

Each morning, you complete your hall duty responsibilities by standing outside of your classroom door for the fifteen minutes that lead up to the first school bell of the day. The hall is always full of students, some lounging on the floor, some busy in their lockers, some simply roaming around and laughing with friends. This is typically a noisy and busy time of day, as everyone prepares for the start of school. You've learned that this is an important time of day, though, that allows you to connect with students outside of class. You get the chance to catch up with former students, check in with others you know, and chat informally with current students outside your daily classroom structures. In essence, this is an important time for you and students to communicate. Just a few minutes ago, an older kid you don't know walked down the hall toward you, demonstrating to his friends (and anyone within earshot) that he was very angry. As the boy and his two friends approached and then passed you in the hall, you heard the visibly angry one exclaim, "He pisses me off so much. I may just have to kick his ass to shut him up!" As you monitor halls each morning, you routinely hear colorful language from middle and high school students. At times, you address students' use of expletives with a simple, disapproving look. On other occasions, you have to intervene. When this student and his two friends passed you, and you overheard a conversation that not only indicated a poor choice in language, but also a potential physical altercation, you decided you needed to intervene.

You left your doorway and followed the three boys a few feet down the hall, walking quickly to catch up with them. They were lost in their own conversation, and didn't see you approach them until you stepped around and in front of them. They all stopped right away. The angry student at the center of small group stood there with a visible scowl; his two friends looked back at you with mouths agape, looking a bit scared about possibly being in trouble. You said, "Good morning!" to all three of them, but then looked directly at the student who had uttered the obscenities and veiled threats. To him, you said, "Let's you and I chat for a moment before school starts. Step into my classroom for a minute." He quickly glanced at his two peers, but then stepped into your classroom. You closed the door most of the way and sat down to speak with him. At this point, you are not aware of his name.

## Appendix D

### Authority – Coding Criteria

If there are two or fewer lines of dialogue between similarly coded excerpts they are counted as one code example. For example, the yellow text below was coded as one example of *legitimate - role – teacher / hall monitor*.

Adelyn: **My name is Ms. Jones. I am the health teacher here.**

Casey: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Adelyn: **And first I would like to address, I am a hall monitor in the mornings and I do regulate you guys, you guys coming in and out.** And for those 15 minutes, my job is to take care of you guys. Anything I hear, anything I see, I have to take the initiative to take care of the situation. So, I did call you in here today for a reason. Do you know why, maybe?

If there are multiple codes present in one paragraph and the codes repeat, the similarly coded text is counted as one example. For example, the green text (*competent – advice*) is counted as one code example.

Casey Butler. Okay, Casey, **I'm just writing your name down, just in case anything were to happen.** I know this is our first encounter together. **Like I said, I'm here regulating the halls and I was just concerned about this colorful language that you did apply outside. And I know it's early in the morning and I didn't want to bug you about it, but it's definitely something I have to address and I don't want this to progress.** So if anything like this were to happen again, I advise you seek help and thank you for coming. **Thank you for telling me what you had in mind. But definitely don't try to resolve something by hurting somebody else. Okay?**

If there is one code example, then Casey speaks, then a different code, then a repeat of the first code the first and last codes are counted separately. For example, the first red sentence is one code example, and the following red statement is the start of another code example.

Thomas: All Right. Like I said, I'm going to talk to a guidance counselor. **We're going to have to get by this without resorting to physical violence. That's like I said, never a solution.** And if there's anything you ever want to talk about, if there's something you want to say, now I'm listening. I care about you. I care about your well-being.

Casey: I'm good.

Thomas: You're good. All right. So, I'll have the guidance counselor, come get you. Maybe you're more comfortable talking to them. **Is there, if there's a guidance counselor here that's willing that you're close to... any teacher, anything?**

All authority codes follow these rules.

## Appendix E

### Care – Coding Criteria

#### Care – Coding Criteria

If there are two or fewer lines of dialogue between similarly coded excerpts they are counted as one code example. For example,

Elise: Yeah. And it definitely was, but also you see my concern is, you getting in trouble?

Casey: Yeah.

Elise: Not only with, nevermind me, because I'm not even your teacher, but your other teachers and your coach for basketball. I mean, could you imagine any situation like that, that would pull you right off the team right away.

If there are multiple codes present in one paragraph and the codes repeat, the similarly coded text is counted as one example. For example, the rust colored text noted as *compassion* is counted as one code example.

Clayton: You're not in trouble. Don't feel like you're in trouble. You're not trouble at all. We want to help you. Okay? We're here to help you, but you have to be willing to bend with us a little, okay? We're going to try to do everything that we can to help you. Everything. But you have to let us know something. And the amount of information that you gave me now is, is a really good start. I appreciate that. I really do. I really do appreciate that because it takes guts. I'm going to let you get back to your class because it's about, the bells about to ring. I would like to speak to you again. Would you mind speaking to me again?

If there is one code example, then Casey speaks, then a different code, then a repeat of the first code the first and last codes are counted separately. For example,

Elise: Is there anything else you want me to do to help you something that we can work together? Anything else that you want to get resolved at all?

Casey: No, I think that sounds like a good plan.

Elise: All right. That sounds good. I will let your homeroom teacher know that you're going to go back this way. You finish home room and get the second period on time and everything.

All codes for care, except *all questions*, *caring questions*, and *receptive listening* follow these rules.

*All questions* – When coding for *all questions* I counted each question as one example of the code unless the TC asked multiple questions in the same breath that were very similar. I counted the questions individually when they differed if the TC asked a series of questions without letting Casey answer.

For example, I counted this as four separate questions.

Arthur	1	Okay. So, you told your friends about it, right? Can I ask you what they said about you? They're talking about you, right? Not to you?
--------	---	--

I counted this as one example of the code.

Arthur	5	So, what are they talking about? You said they're saying something. And then you said, you mentioned your dad. About how he's doing the best he can. So, what are they talking about?
--------	---	---

## Appendix F

### Solutions – Coding Criteria

If there are two or fewer lines of dialogue between similarly coded excerpts they are counted as one code example. For example,

Arthur: I mean, not whatever, you know, you got to work on it. Not going to be an overnight thing.

Casey: It's like, it's not, I didn't start this.

Arthur: Right. I get that. And that, I mean, just like this, so you don't have to start something for there to be a problem. Problems are going to come on you. Right? And you still have to learn to deal with them. You can't just deal with the problems that you create. Right? I mean, everyone does that. Everyone has challenges. People are going to be talking, and if that's going to upset you, then you got to deal with it.

If there are multiple codes present in one paragraph and the codes repeat, the similarly coded text is counted as one example. For example, the navy underlined text below is counted as one *MILDreprimand* code example.

Arthur: Yeah. Well, it's a small school, right? Not a ton of kids here, your lives might be more public than you'd like, right? But these are the things you got to learn to deal with. You know, people are going to, people are always going to have an opinion on your life at home. What kind of area you're growing up in, what you're saying, what you're doing. You know, people are always going to be talking, especially in a community like this. Right? But you can't just hold it in and lash out. You've got friends, teachers, counselors, principals, vice principals, that are going to support you. But you know, you can't go around in the hallway, screaming. I'm going to kick someone's ass, that's just not the healthy way to go about it.

If there is one code example, then Casey speaks, then a different code, then a repeat of the first code the first and last codes are counted separately. For example,

Adelyn: So, what will be your course of action in regards to this situation?

Casey: I don't know.

Adelyn: Do you want to speak about it, speak about what happened and maybe another solution to the situation? Can you think of anything in regards to the situation that does not involve harming somebody else?

All codes follow these rules. In the case of the code *responsibility to Casey* and *advise against violence* I subdivided originally coded material to fit the appropriate subcode categories.

## Appendix G

## Authority – Simultaneously Coded Excerpts

Adelyn *coded as <i>legitimate - role</i> and <i>coercive - open ended</i>	2	My job is to address the situation that if anybody does get hurt, just know that I ...
Elise *coded as <i>minimizes authority</i> and <i>coercive - consequences</i>	3	Not only with, nevermind me, because I'm not even your teacher, but your other teachers and your coach for basketball. I mean, could you imagine any situation like that, that would pull you right off the team right away.
Elizabeth *coded as <i>competent - advice</i> and <i>coercive - reprimand</i>	4	Maybe tell them to stop, but you can't do it with your fists.
Jasper *coded as <i>personal - kindness</i> and <i>legitimate - role - teacher</i>	1	Thanks for coming in, I'm Jasper, by the way. Or Mr. Fieldstone. I don't think I've gotten the chance to meet you.
Jasper *coded as <i>personal - kindness</i> and <i>minimizes authority</i>	2	I'll be looking out if you don't mind, just before class starts like I was today. Just for you and your buddies to make sure you guys are doing all right
Justin *coded as <i>legitimate - role - protector</i> and <i>competent authority - advice</i>	2	All right. I can do that, and I'll follow up with you, but really if there's ever a time where you feel threatened yourself or if someone is not doing something you like just come to us. Cause honestly, we're here to help you.
Kenneth *coded as <i>competent authority - advice</i> and <i>coercive - reprimand</i>	1	Well, it's one thing to deal with that, which is, it's a good thing to deal with this because you don't want this going on, but you can't get physical with this, there's no need for that. Do you understand that? There is definitely better ways to handle this.
Samara *coded as <i>personal - trustworthiness</i> and <i>relinquish authority</i>	3	I'm talking to you, you'll be done soon. I promise, I understand the first period is very soon, but can you please make sure not to use that kind of language in the hallways? That's all I'm asking. I trust that you're going to handle the situation rationally. I trust in you. I just want to make sure that you're not using that kind of language in the hallways anymore. That's all I'm asking. Can you do that for me?
Thomas *coded as <i>personal - kindness</i> and <i>legitimate - role - teacher</i>	1	I don't think we ever had the pleasure meeting. I'm Mr. Drakos. I'm an English teacher, nice to meet you.



Thomas *coded as <i>coercive - open ended</i> and <i>personal - trustworthiness</i>	2	If something goes too far, if you seriously hurt someone or what I heard this morning could have been an empty threat. It could be you, you're venting. You're hanging in with your friends
---	---	---

## Appendix H

### Care – Simultaneously Coded Excerpts

Specific simultaneous codes (excluding the *receptive listening* coded material because *receptive listening* comprises large swaths of transcripts / and excluded the *all questions* code examples coded as *caring questions*)

41 questions were simultaneously coded as *all questions* and another care code (other than *caring questions* and *receptive listening*).

Simultaneously coded excerpts for care below:

Arthur * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	2	You haven't talked to like, the guidance counselor or anything like that, have you? No? You know, they're always available though, right? I mean, do you know that people are there to help you, if needed? Teachers, other than myself.
Arthur * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	2	So, I mean, what can we, what can we do? How can we calm you down a little bit?
Arthur * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	2	You're still upset, right?
Arthur * coded as <i>empathy</i> and <i>all questions</i>	4	Yeah? So, you got her, right? You're older. You got to protect her. You got to ... right?
Arthur * coded as <i>sympathy</i> and <i>all questions</i>	5	Right. Listen, I get why, you know, this is upsetting you and I'm intentionally not trying to pry into your life. All right? Hopefully you see that. But I mean, these kids, obviously, are not doing a very nice thing.
Arthur * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	5	I'm trying to see if we can work something out where I can sit them down, maybe?
Arthur * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	5	I mean, do you want me to reach out to this kid? Sit him down, get a guidance counselor, something? I can recommend a guidance counselor for you. If that's helpful. These are pretty heavy issues, right?
Clayton * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	3	Would you pretty much like to have a sit down with me and them and just try to ease the tension between you two?
Clayton * coded as <i>general care</i> and <i>all questions</i>	3	So, I'm just concerned because when you say you're going to take care of it on your own, I'm pretty sure that doesn't mean you're just going to talk to them. So, what are your intentions of taking care of them?
Clayton * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	4	What can I do to help you?

Clayton * coded as <i>offers time</i> and <i>all questions</i>	7	I am here to help you and you can come talk to me at any time that you feel frustrated, okay? Would you come talk to me?
Clayton * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	7-8	We're here to help you, but you have to be willing to bend with us a little, okay?
Clayton * coded as <i>offers time</i> and <i>all questions</i>	8	Would you mind speaking to me again?
Elise * coded as <i>well-being</i> and <i>all questions</i>	3	And it definitely was, but also you see my concern is, you getting in trouble?
Elise * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	4	So why don't we work together to take care of this? How about that?
Elise * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	4	Why not the both of us work together?
Elise * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	6	Is there anything else you want me to do to help you something that we can work together?
Elizabeth * coded as <i>general care</i> and <i>all questions</i>	1	But you don't, you don't seem all right?
Elizabeth * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	2	Do you want me to talk to the students? Do you want me to get someone to talk to students?
Elizabeth * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	2	Can you let me or someone else handle it?
Elizabeth * coded as <i>offers time</i> and <i>all questions</i>	3	Well, why don't we start talking on a daily basis? Why don't you come here?
Elizabeth * coded as <i>attention</i> and <i>all questions</i>	8	Also, have you ever met the counselor?
Elizabeth * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	8	And if they do you come right back to me and I'll do it all over again. Okay?
Jasper * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	2	.... arm you or get you mad like you were before, you can come to me and let me know. All right?
John * coded as <i>offers time</i> and <i>all questions</i>	5	Casey, if you want to talk about anything, you can come back and talk to me at anytime, Okay?
Kenneth	2	Well, do you want to schedule a meeting?

* coded as <i>offers time</i> and <i>all questions</i> ”		
Kyle * coded as <i>attention</i> and <i>all questions</i>	2	I’m still here. I want to know what’s going on. What’s going on at home that’s bothering you so much? Is people talking about what’s going on at home? Is that what’s happening?
Kyle * coded as <i>well-being</i> and <i>all questions</i>	4	Is that right for you or is that right for how you’re feeling right now?
Kyle * coded as <i>well-being</i> and <i>all questions</i>	4	Who cares if someone’s talking about you?
Kyle * coded as <i>well-being</i> and <i>all questions</i>	4	Who cares if this kid over here is talking about you, or that girl got a problem with you?
Marcia * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	1	Is there anything you think we could do to help you with the situation?
Marcia * coded as <i>sympathy</i> and <i>all questions</i>	1	...you sure your okay?
Marcia * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	2	Is there anyone you’d like to talk to about this? You think that would help you at all?
Marissa * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	3	Do you want to tell me what’s going on at home? Maybe talking about it could help you through it?
Marissa * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	3	Do you mind if I take care of it?
Natalya * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	1	So, do you think it would be helpful for me to pull them aside?
Rebecca * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	2	Do you need anybody to talk to about whatever’s going on?
Samara * coded as <i>attention</i> and <i>all questions</i>	2	And I don’t want this to go unnoticed, obviously, because if someone is talking about you and if someone’s making you feel uncomfortable, I don’t want that to just be left alone.
Samara * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	3	And the person that’s talking about you, should I be involved in this? Should I get other teachers involved in this?
Thomas * coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>	3	Is there, if there’s a guidance counselor here that’s willing that you’re close to... any teacher, anything?
Thomas	3	Are you sure? There’s nothing I can do. Or do you want me to talk to Mike and Sam? See if...

* coded as <i>compassion</i> and <i>all questions</i>		
--	--	--

## Appendix I

### Solutions – Simultaneously Coded Excerpts

I simultaneously coded the three excerpts below:

Elise *coded as <i>work together</i> and <i>responsibility to Casey</i>	6	Is there anything else you want me to do to help you something that we can work together? Anything else that you want to get resolved at all?
Rebecca *coded as <i>responsibility to Casey</i> and <i>talk to someone else</i>	2	Do you need anybody to talk to about whatever's going on?
Thomas *coded as <i>work together</i> and <i>advise against violence</i>	3	We're going to have to get by this without resorting to physical violence. That's like I said, never a solution

## Appendix J

### Authority – Initial Codes

#	Code	Descriptions	Type
1	Coercive	Coercive authority (Wrong, 2017, p. 41)	I
1a	Coercive: Threat	Coercive authority: threaten use of force	I
2	Inducement	Authority by inducement (Wrong, 2017, p. 44)	I
2a	Inducement: Rewards	Authority by inducement: offer or denial of rewards	I
3	Legitimate	Legitimate authority (Wrong, 2017, p. 49)	I
3a	Legitimate: Role	Legitimate authority: role of teacher	I
4	Competent	Competent authority (Wrong, 2017, p. 52)	I
4a	Competent: Knowledge	Competent authority: knowledge	I
4b	Competent: Skills	Competent authority: skills	I
5	Personal: General	Personal authority (Wrong, 2017, p. 60)	I
5a	Personal: Humor	Personal authority: humor	I
5b	Personal: Kindness	Personal authority: kindness	I

## Appendix K

### Authority – Updated Codebook – Initial and Emerging Codes (After Coding 19% of the Sim Transcripts)

#	Code	Descriptions	Type
1	Coercive	Coercive authority (Wrong, 2017, p. 41)	I
1a	Coercive: Threat	Coercive authority: threaten use of force	I
1b	Coercive: Action	Coercive authority: threaten action	E
1c	Coercive: Consequences	Coercive authority: consequences	E
1d	Coercive: Reprimand	Coercive authority: reprimand	E
1e	Coercive: Open Ended	Coercive authority: open-ended	E
2	Inducement	Authority by inducement (Wrong, 2017, p. 44)	I
2a	Inducement: Rewards	Authority by inducement: offer or denial of rewards	I
2b	Inducement: Help	Authority by inducement: offer or denial of help	E
3	Legitimate	Legitimate authority (Wrong, 2017, p. 49)	I
3a	Legitimate: Role	Legitimate authority: role of teacher	I
4	Competent	Competent authority (Wrong, 2017, p. 52)	I
4a	Competent: Knowledge	Competent authority: knowledge	I
4b	Competent: Skills	Competent authority: skills	I
4c	Competent: Advice	Competent authority: advice	E
5	Personal: General	Personal authority (Wrong, 2017, p. 60)	I
5a	Personal: Humor	Personal authority: humor	I
5b	Personal: Kindness	Personal authority: kindness	I
5c	Personal: Trust	Personal authority: trustworthiness	E
6	Relinquish Authority	Gives authority to Casey	E
7	Shared Authority	Expresses shared authority	E
8	Minimizes Authority	Minimizes own authority	E



## Appendix L

### Authority – Complete Codebook – Initial, Emerging, and After-Emerging Codes (After Coding Remaining 81% of the Sim Transcripts)

#	Code	Descriptions	Type
1	Coercive	Coercive authority (Wrong, 2017, p. 41)	I
1a	Coercive: Threat	Coercive authority: threaten use of force	I
1b	Coercive: Action	Coercive authority: threaten action	E
1c	Coercive: Consequences	Coercive authority: consequences	E
1d	Coercive: Reprimand	Coercive authority: reprimand	E
1e	Coercive: Open Ended	Coercive authority: open-ended	E
2	Inducement	Authority by inducement (Wrong, 2017, p. 44)	I
2a	Inducement: Rewards	Authority by inducement: offer or denial of rewards	I
2b	Inducement: Help	Authority by inducement: offer or denial of help	E
3	Legitimate	Legitimate authority (Wrong, 2017, p. 49)	I
3a	Legitimate: Role	Legitimate authority: role of teacher	I
3b	Legitimate: Role, Rule Enforcer	Legitimate authority: role of rule enforcer	AE
3c	Legitimate: Role, Protector	Legitimate authority: role of a protector	AE
4	Competent	Competent authority (Wrong, 2017, p. 52)	I
4a	Competent: Knowledge	Competent authority: knowledge	I
4b	Competent: Skills	Competent authority: skills	I
4c	Competent: Advice	Competent authority: advice	E
5	Personal	Personal authority (Wrong, 2017, p. 60)	I
5a	Personal: Humor	Personal authority: humor	I
5b	Personal: Kindness	Personal authority: kindness	I
5c	Personal: Trust	Personal authority: trustworthiness	E
6	Relinquish Authority	Gives authority to Casey	E
7	Shared Authority	Expresses shared authority	E
8	Minimizes Authority	Minimizes own authority	E

## Appendix M

### Care – Initial Codes

#	Code	Descriptions	Type
1	Compassion	Teacher candidate demonstrates compassion (McBee, 2007)	I
2	Empathy	Teacher candidate demonstrates empathy (Noddings, 2012)	I
3	Sympathy	Teacher candidate sympathy (Noddings, 2005, p. 19)	I
4	Offers Time	Teacher candidate offers their time (McBee, 2007)	I
5	Questioning	Teacher candidate questions to learn more (McBee, 2007, Noddings, 2013)	I
6	Listening	Teacher candidate listens (McBee, 2007, Noddings, 2005 p. 16, Noddings 2012)	I
7	Attention	Teacher candidate attention (Noddings, 2005, p. 17)	I
8	Eye Contact	Teacher candidate uses eye contact (McBee, 2007)	I
9	Smiles	Teacher candidate smiles (Noddings, 2005, p. 17)	I

## Appendix N

### Care – Updated Codebook – Initial and Emerging Codes (After Coding 19% of the Sim Transcripts)

#	Code	Descriptions	Type
1	Compassion	Teacher candidate demonstrates compassion (McBee, 2007)	I
2	Empathy	Teacher candidate demonstrates empathy (Noddings, 2012)	I
3	Sympathy	Teacher candidate sympathy (Noddings, 2005, p. 19)	I
4	Offers Time	Teacher candidate offers their time (McBee, 2007)	I
5	Questioning	Teacher candidate questions to learn more (McBee, 2007, Noddings, 2013)	I
6	Listening	Teacher candidate listens (McBee, 2007, Noddings, 2005 p. 16, Noddings 2012)	I
7	Attention	Teacher candidate attention (Noddings, 2005, p. 17)	I
8	Eye Contact	Teacher candidate uses eye contact (McBee, 2007)	I
9	Smiles	Teacher candidate smiles (Noddings, 2005, p. 17)	I
10	General Care	General Evidence of care	E
11	Best Interests	Teacher Candidate talks about what is in Casey's best interest	E
12	Encouragement	Teacher Candidate encourages Casey	E

## Appendix O

### Care – Complete Codebook – Initial, Emerging, and After-Emerging Codes (After Coding Remaining 81% of the Sim Transcripts)

#	Code	Descriptions	Type
1	Compassion	Teacher candidate demonstrates compassion (McBee, 2007)	I
2	Empathy	Teacher candidate demonstrates empathy (Noddings, 2012)	I
3	Sympathy	Teacher candidate sympathy (Noddings, 2005, p. 19)	I
4	Offers Time	Teacher candidate offers their time (McBee, 2007)	I
5	All Questions	All questions	I
5a	Caring Questions	Evidence of TCs reflecting on the answers (Noddings, 2012, p. 775) Questions like “what are you going through?” (Weil, 1977, p. 51, in (Noddings, 2012, p. 774). Questions that show interest or help the TC learn more about a student (McBee, 2007, p. 40)	AE
6	Receptive Listening	Receptive Listening (attention) Noddings (2012) “hear and understand the needs expressed” and “address the expressed need of the student for emotional support, moral direction, or shared human interest” (Noddings, 2012, p. 772).	I
7	Eye Contact	Teacher candidate uses eye contact (McBee, 2007)	I
8	Smiles	Teacher candidate smiles (Noddings, 2005, p. 17)	I
9	General Care	General Evidence of care	E
10	Well-being	Teacher Candidate talks about what is in Casey’s best interests	E
11	Praise	Teacher Candidate praises Casey	E

## Appendix P

### Solutions – Initial Codes

#	Code	Descriptions	Type
1	Prinicpal1	Direct referral to the principal's office	I
2	Principal2	Mention of the principal / administration	I
3	PUNsuspension	Punitive: suspension (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
4	PUNexplulsion	Extreme Punitive: expulsion (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
5	PUNofficer	Punitive: involvement of the school resource officer (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
6	MILDcounselor	Mild disciplinary response: mention of the counselor (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
7	MILDparents	Mild disciplinary response: meeting with or calling Casey's parents (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
8	REScircles	Restorative: circles (Stutzman Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 52)	I
9	RESmeet Casey and peers	Restorative: a meeting between Casey and his peers, victim/offender conferencing (Stutzman Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 61)	I
10	RESmeet Casey peers counselor	Restorative: a meeting with Casey, his peers, and the counselor (Stutzman Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 60)	I
11	REShealing harm	Restorative: mention of healing harm (Stutzman Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 61)	I

## Appendix Q

### Solutions – Updated Codebook – Initial and Emerging Codes (After Coding 19% of the Sim Transcripts)

#	Code	Descriptions	Type
1	Prinicpal1	Direct referral to the principal's office	I
2	Principal2	Mention of the principal / administration	I
3	PUNsuspension	Punitive: suspension (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
4	PUNexplulsion	Extreme Punitive: expulsion (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
5	PUNofficer	Punitive: involvement of the school resource officer (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
6	MILDcounselor	Mild disciplinary response: mention of the counselor (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
7	MILDparents	Mild disciplinary response: meeting with or calling Casey's parents (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
8	MILDRprimand	Teacher candidate reprimands Casey (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	E
9	MILDConferencing: Meet with Mike and Sam	Teacher candidate offers to conference with Mike/Keith and or Sam (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	E
10	MILDConferencing: Talk with Casey	Teacher candidate conferences with Casey (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	E
11	REScircles	Restorative: circles (Stutzman Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 52)	I
12	RESmeet: Casey and peers	Restorative: a meeting between Casey and his peers, victim/offender conferencing (Stutzman Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 61)	I
13	RESmeet: Casey peers counselor	Restorative: a meeting with Casey, his peers, and the counselor (Stutzman Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 60)	I
14	REShealing harm	Restorative: mention of healing harm (Stutzman Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 61)	I
15	Responsibility to Casey	Teacher candidate gives responsibility to Casey	E
16	Work together	Teacher candidate and Casey work together	E
17	Advise against violence	Teacher candidate advises against violence	E
18	Document incident	Teacher candidate reference documenting, writing up, or recording the behavior	E
19	Talk to someone else	Teacher candidate encourages Casey to talk to someone else and or asks if he has talked to someone else	E

20	Bus driver	Teacher candidate offers to or will talk to the bus driver	E
21	Monitor or follow-up	Teacher candidate offers to, or will monitor the situation or follow-up	E

---

## Appendix R

### Solutions – Complete Codebook – Initial, Emerging, and After-Emerging Codes (After Coding Remaining 81% of the Sim Transcripts)

#	Code	Descriptions	Type
1	Prinicpal1	Direct referral to the principal's office	I
2	Principal2	Mention of the principal / administration	I
3	PUNsuspension	Punitive: suspension (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
4	PUNexpulsion	Extreme Punitive: expulsion (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
5	PUNofficer	Punitive: involvement of the school resource officer (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
6	MILDcounselor	Mild disciplinary response: mention of the counselor (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
7	MILDparents	Mild disciplinary response: meeting with or calling Casey's parents (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	I
8	MILDRprimand	Teacher candidate reprimands Casey (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	E
9	MILDConferencing: Meet with Mike and Sam	Teacher candidate offers to conference with Mike/Keith and or Sam (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	E
10	MILDConferencing: Talk with Casey	Teacher candidate conferences with Casey (Welch & Payne, 2010, p. 43)	E
11	REScircles	Restorative: circles (Stutzman Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 52)	I
12	RESmeet Casey and peers	Restorative: a meeting between Casey and his peers, victim/offender conferencing (Stutzman Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 61)	I
13	RESmeet Casey peers counselor	Restorative: a meeting with Casey, his peers, and the counselor (Stutzman Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 60)	I
14	REShealing harm	Restorative: mention of healing harm (Stutzman Amstutz & Mullet, 2005, p. 61)	I
15	Responsibility to Casey	Teacher candidate gives responsibility to Casey	E
16	Work together	Teacher candidate and Casey work together	E
17	Advise against violence	Teacher candidate advises against violence	E
18	Document incident	Teacher candidate reference documenting, writing up, or recording the behavior	E



19	Talk to someone else	Teacher candidate encourages Casey to talk to someone else and or asks if he has talked to someone else	E
20	Bus driver	Teacher candidate offers to or will talk to the bus driver	E
21	Monitor / Follow-up	Teacher candidate offers to, or will monitor the situation or follow-up	E
22	Advises to persuade	Teacher candidate advises to persuade Casey to address people talking productively	AE
23	Inform another teacher	Teacher candidate will inform another teacher	AE
24	Vague solution	Teacher candidate offers a vague solution	AE
25	Not going to do	Actions the teacher candidate says they won't do or solutions they did not think of	AE

---



Principal2	3	4	1	F	7	6	1	M
PUNsuspension	0	2	2	F	0	2	2	F
PUNexplusion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PUNofficer	1	0	1	M	2	0	2	M
MILDcounselor	5	3	2	M	14	5	9	M
MILDparents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MILDReprimand	4	5	1	F	9	6	3	M
MILDConferencing: Meet with Mike and Sam	6	2	4	M	10	2	8	M
MILDConferencing: Talk with Casey	6	6	0	-	17	10	7	M
REScircles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RESmeet Casey and peers	4	1	3	M	5	1	4	M
RESmeet Casey peers counselor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
REShealing harm	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Responsibility to Casey	7	7	0	-	16	20	4	F
Work together	4	2	2	M	5	7	2	F
Advise against violence	5	5	0	-	7	9	2	F
Advises to persuade	5	2	3	M	10	2	8	M
Document incident	1	3	2	F	3	5	2	F
Talk to someone else	5	6	1	F	11	8	3	M
Bus driver	1	1	0	-	1	3	2	F
Monitor / Follow-up	4	1	3	M	4	1	3	M
Inform another teacher	0	2	2	F	0	2	2	F
Vague solution	1	3	2	F	1	7	6	F
Not going to do	3	1	2	M	3	2	1	M

## References

- Allred, S. (2014). Responsive classroom approach. In W. G. Scarlett (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of classroom management* (pp. 673–674). SAGE Publications, Inc.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483346243>
- Alvarez, H. K. (2007). The impact of teacher preparation on responses to student aggression in the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(7), 1113–1126.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.10.001>
- American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools?: An evidentiary review and recommendations. *American Psychologist, 63*(9), 852–862. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.9.852>
- Anderson, J. R., Reder, L. M., & Simon, H. A. (1996). Situated learning and education. *Educational Researcher, 25*(4), 5–11. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1176775>
- Arcia, E. (2006). Achievement and enrollment status of suspended students: Outcomes in a large, multicultural school district. *Education and Urban Society, 38*(3), 359–369.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124506286947>
- Armstrong, K. J., & Jarriel, A. J. (2015). Standardized patient encounters improved athletic training students' confidence in clinical evaluations. *Athletic Training Education Journal, 10*(2), 113–121. <https://doi.org/10.4085/1002113>
- Armstrong, K. J., & Jarriel, A. J. (2016). Standardized patients provide a reliable assessment of athletic training students' clinical skills. *Athletic Training Education Journal, 11*(2), 88–94.  
<https://doi.org/10.4085/110288>
- Arthur, D. (1999). Assessing nursing students' basic communication and interviewing skills: The development and testing of a rating scale. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 29*(3), 658–665.  
<https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.1999.00934.x>

- Arum, R. (2003). *Judging school discipline: The crisis of moral authority*. Harvard University Press.
- Aultman, L. P., Williams-Johnson, M. R., & Schutz, P. A. (2009). Boundary dilemmas in teacher-student relationships: Struggling with “the line.” *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 636–646. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.10.002>
- Ayers, W. (2001). *To teach: The journey of a teacher* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Baer, J. S., Rosengren, D. B., Dunn, C. W., Wells, E. A., Ogle, R. L., & Hartzler, B. (2004). An evaluation of workshop training in motivational interviewing for addiction and mental health clinicians. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 73(1), 99–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2003.10.001>
- Baer, J. S., Wells, E. A., Rosengren, D. B., Hartzler, B., Beadnell, B., & Dunn, C. (2009). Agency context and tailored training in technology transfer: A pilot evaluation of motivational interviewing training for community counselors. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 37(2), 191–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2009.01.003>
- Baker, J. (2006). Contributions of teacher-child relationships to positive school adjustment during elementary school. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(3), 211–229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.02.002>
- Baker, J., Grant, S., & Morlock, L. (2008). The teacher-student relationship as a developmental context for children with internalizing or externalizing behavior problems. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1045-3830.23.1.3>
- Baker, P. (2005). Managing student behavior: How ready are teachers to meet the challenge? *American Secondary Education*, 33(3), 51–65. <https://doi.org/https://www.jstor.org/stable/41064554>
- Baldry, A. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2007). Effectiveness of programs to prevent school bullying.

- Victims and Offenders*, 2(2), 183–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564880701263155>
- Balli, S. J. (2009). *Making a difference in the classroom*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Balli, S. J. (2011). Pre-service teachers' episodic memories of classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(2), 245–251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.004>
- Barrows, H. (1987). *Simulated (standardized) patients and other human simulations*. Health Sciences Consortium.
- Barrows, H. (1993). An overview of the uses of standardized patients for teaching and evaluating clinical skills. *Academic Medicine*, 68(6), 443–451. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-199306000-00002>
- Barrows, H., & Abrahamson, S. (1964). The programmed patient: A technique for appraising student performance in clinical neurology. *Journal of Medical Education*, 39, 802–805.
- Barrows, H., & Tamblyn, R. M. (1980). *Problem-based learning: An approach to medical education*. Springer Publishing Company.
- Bartell, T., Floden, R., & Richmond, G. (2018). What Data and Measures Should Inform Teacher Preparation? Reclaiming Accountability. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 69(5), 426–428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118797326>
- Baston, C. D. (2009). These things called empathy: Eight related but distinct phenomena. In J. Decety & W. Ickes (Eds.), *The social neuroscience of empathy* (1st ed., pp. 3–15). MIT Press.
- Begeny, J. C., & Martens, B. K. (2006). Assessing pre-service teachers' training in empirically-validated behavioral instruction practices. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 21(3), 262–285. <https://doi.org/10.1521/scpq.2006.21.3.262>
- Benbenishty, R., Astor, R. A., Roziner, I., & Wrabel, S. L. (2016). Testing the causal links between school climate, school violence, and school academic performance: A cross-lagged

- panel autoregressive model. *Educational Researcher*, 45(3), 197–206.  
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16644603>
- Beran, T. (2005). A new perspective on managing school bullying: Pre-service teachers' attitudes. *Journal of Social Science*, 8(3), 43–49.
- Bergman, M. M. (2010). On concepts and paradigms in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 4(3), 171–175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689810376950>
- Berkowitz, R., Glickman, H., Benbenishty, R., Ben-Artzi, E., Raz, T., Lipshtat, N., & Astor, R. A. (2015). Compensating, mediating, and moderating effects of school climate on academic achievement gaps in Israel. *Teachers College Record*, 117(7), 1–34.
- Berliner, D. (1988). The development of expertise in pedagogy. *Charles W. Hunt Memorial Lecture*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Beullens, J., Rethans, J. J., Goedhuys, J., & Buntinx, F. (1997). The use of standardized patients in research in general practice. *Family Practice*, 14(1), 58–62.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/14.1.58>
- Birch, S. H., & Ladd, G. (1997). The teacher-child relationship and children's early school adjustment. *Journal of School Psychology*, 35(1), 61–79. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4405\(96\)00029-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4405(96)00029-5)
- Bixby, J. (2006). Authority in detracked high school classrooms: Tensions among individualism, equity, and legitimacy. In J. L. Pace & A. Hemmings (Eds.), *Classroom authority: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 113–134). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003). *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*. Open University Press.
- Blom, L., Wolters, M., ten Hoor-Suykerbuyk, M., van Paassen, J., & van Oyen, A. (2011). Pharmaceutical education in patient counseling: 20h spread over 6 years? *Patient Education*

- and Counseling*, 83(3), 465–471. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2011.05.018>
- Blood, P., & Thorsborne, M. (2005). The challenge of culture change: Embedding restorative practice in schools. *6th International Conference on Conferencing, Circles and Other Restorative Practices, 'Building a Global Alliance for Restorative Practices and Family Empowerment*, 3–5.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Bolstad, A. L., Xu, Y., Shen, J. J., Covelli, M., & Torpey, M. (2012). Reliability of standardized patients used in a communication study on international nurses in the United States of America. *Nursing and Health Sciences*, 14(1), 67–73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-2018.2011.00667.x>
- Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2008). *The craft of research* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226062648.001.0001>
- Borum, R., Cornell, D. G., Modzeleski, W., & Jimerson, S. R. (2010). What can be done about school shootings? a review of the evidence. *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 27–37. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09357620>
- Boulet, J. R., McKinley, D. W., Norcini, J. J., & Whelan, G. P. (2002). Assessing the comparability of standardized patient and physician evaluations of clinical skills. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 7(2), 85–97.
- Bowditch, C. (1993). Getting rid of troublemakers: High school disciplinary procedures and the production of propouts. *Social Problems*, 40(4), 493–509. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3096864>
- Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., O'Brennan, L. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Multilevel exploration of factors contributing to the overrepresentation of black students in office disciplinary referrals. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(2), 508–520.



<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018450>

- Brehm, J. (1966). *A theory of psychological reactance*. Academic.
- Brophy, J. (1999). Perspectives of classroom management. In H. J. Freiberg (Ed.), *Beyond behaviorism: Changing the classroom management paradigm* (pp. 43–56). Allyn & Bacon.
- Brophy, J. (2006). History of research on classroom management. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 17–43). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brown, E., Horner, C. G., Kerr, M. M., & Scanlon, C. L. (2014). United states teachers' emotional labor and professional identities. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, *11*(2), 205–225.
- Brown, J., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, *18*(1), 32–42.
- Bru, E., Stephens, P., & Torsheim, T. (2002). Students' perceptions of class management and reports of their own misbehavior. *Journal of School Psychology*, *40*(4), 287–307.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4405\(02\)00104-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4405(02)00104-8)
- Brunstein Klomek, A., Marrocco, F., Kleinman, M., Schonfeld, I. S., & Gould, M. S. (2007). Bullying, depression, and suicidality in adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *46*(1), 40–49.  
<https://doi.org/10.1097/01.chi.0000242237.84925.18>
- Bullough, R. V., & Baughman, K. (1995). Contexts and expertise in teaching: First-year teacher after seven years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *11*(5), 461–477.
- Burnette, A. G., Datta, P., & Cornell, D. (2018). The distinction between transient and substantive student threats. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management*, *5*(1), 4–20.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/tam0000092>

- Butler, A. M., & 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>
- Butler, A. M., & Monda-Amaya, L. M. (2010). *Pre-service teachers' perceptions of challenging behaviors*.
- Cambone, J. (1994). *Teaching troubled children*. Teachers College Press.
- Cameron, L., & Thorsborne, M. (1999). *Restorative justice and school discipline: Mutually exclusive?*
- Cameron, L., & Thorsborne, M. (2001). Restorative justice and school discipline: mutually exclusive? In H. Strang & J. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Restorative justice and civil society*. Cambridge University Press.
- Canter, L., & Canter, M. (1976). *Assertive discipline: A take charge approach for today's educator*. Canter and Associates.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2010). *Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance - United States, 2009. Surveillance Summaries, June 4, 2010. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report 59, SS-5*.
- Chandler, L. K., & Dahlquist, C. M. (2006). *Functional assessment: Strategies to prevent and remediate challenging behavior in school settings*. Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Chesley, G., & Jordan, J. (2012). What's missing from teacher prep. *Educational Leadership, 69*(8), 41–45.
- Choy, D., Wong, A. F., Lim, K. M., & Chong, S. (2013). Beginning teachers' perceptions of their pedagogical knowledge and skills in teaching: A three year study. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 38*(5), 68–79. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n5.6>
- Cil, O., & Dotger, B. (2015). Pre-service teachers' identity characteristics: An investigation of

- pre-service teachers' decision-making and facilitation processes within a clinical simulation. *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences*, 6(19), 50–75.
- Cil, O., & Dotger, B. (2017). The emergence of moral, professional, and political geographies in a clinically simulated parent-teacher interaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 237–245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.05.018>
- Clunies-Ross, P., Little, E., & Kienhuis, M. (2008). Self-reported and actual use of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and their relationship with teacher stress and student behaviour. *Educational Psychology*, 28(6), 693–710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410802206700>
- Coalition for Psychology in Schools and Education. (2006). *Report on the Teacher Needs Survey*.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Villegas, A. M. (2015). Framing Teacher Preparation Research: An Overview of the Field, Part 1. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(1), 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114549072>
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155–159. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155>
- Colby, A., Kohlberg, L., Gibbs, J., Lieberman, M., & Fischer, K. (1983). A longitudinal study of moral judgment. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 48(1/2), 1–124.
- Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Newman, S. E. (1988). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the craft of reading, writing and mathematics. *Thinking: The Journal of Philosophy for Children*, 8(1), 2–10.
- Cooper, J. T., Gage, N. A., Alter, P. J., LaPolla, S., MacSuga-Gage, A. S., & Scott, T. M. (2018). Educators' self-reported training, use, and perceived effectiveness of evidence-based

- classroom management practices. *Preventing School Failure*, 62(1), 13–24.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2017.1298562>
- Coplan, B., Essary, A. C., Lohenry, K., & Stoehr, J. D. (2008). An Update on the utilization of standardized patients in physician assistant education. *The Journal of Physician Assistant Education*, 19(4), 14–19. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01367895-200819040-00002>
- Cornell, D. (2015). Our schools are safe: Challenging the misperception that schools are dangerous places. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 85(3), 217–220.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000064>
- Cornell, D., Allen, K., & Fan, X. (2012). A randomized controlled study of the Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines in kindergarten through grade 12. *School Psychology Review*, 41(1), 100–115.
- Cornell, D., & Sheras, P. (2003). *School Climate Bullying Survey*.
- Costello, B., Wachtel, J., & Wachtel, T. (2010). *Restorative circles in schools: Building community and enhancing learning*. International Institute for Restorative Practices.
- Costenbader, V., & Markson, S. (1998). School suspension. *Journal of School Psychology*, 36(1), 59–82. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-4405\(97\)00050-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-4405(97)00050-2)
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). The current status of teaching and teacher development in the United States. In *Background paper prepared for the National Commission of Teaching in America's Future* (p. November).
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2015). Social and emotional learning: Critical skills for building healthy schools. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice* (pp. xi–xiii). Guilford Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Chung, R., & Frelow, F. (2002). Variation in teacher preparation: How

- well do different pathways prepare teachers to teach? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(4), 286–302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053004002>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession. *National Staff Development Council, February*, 1–32.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01)
- Decker, S., Kim, H.-Y., & Peele, H. (2022). *School Shootings in 2021: 4 Takeaways, in Charts*. Education Week. <https://www.edweek.org/leadership/school-shootings-in-2021-4-takeaways-in-charts/2021/12>
- Denzin, N. K. (1984). *On understanding emotion*. Jossey-Bass.
- Department for Education. (2011). *New guidance for teachers to help improve discipline in schools*.
- Dewey, J. (1963). *Experience and education*. Collier MacMillan.
- Diaz, J. (2022). *27 school shootings have taken place so far in 2022: NPR*. Npr.Org. <https://www.npr.org/2022/05/24/1101050970/2022-school-shootings-so-far>
- Dicke, T., Stebner, F., Linninger, C., Kunter, M., & Leutner, D. (2018). Supplemental material for a longitudinal study of teachers’ occupational well-being: Applying the job demands-resources model. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(2), 262–277. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000070.supp>
- Diliberti, M., Jackson, M., & Kemp, J. (2017). *Crime, violence, discipline, and safety in U.S.*

- public schools: Findings from the School Survey on Crime and Safety: 2015-16. (NCES 2017-122).*  
<https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED574956&site=ehost-live>
- Djigic, G., & Stojiljkovic, S. (2011). Classroom management styles, classroom climate and school achievement. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29(December), 819–828.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.310>
- Dobson, R., Taylor, J., Cassidy, J., Walker, D., Proctor, P., & Perepelkin, J. (2007). Interprofessional and intraprofessional teams in a standardized patient assessment lab. *Pharmacy Education*, 7(2), 159–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15602210701406618>
- Dotger, B. (2009). From a medicinal to educational context: Implementing a signature pedagogy for enhanced parent-teacher communication. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 35(1), 93–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607470802587186>
- Dotger, B. (2010). “I had no idea”: Developing dispositional awareness and sensitivity through a cross-professional pedagogy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 805–812.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.10.017>
- Dotger, B. (2011a). From know how to do now: Instructional applications of simulated interactions within teacher education. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 24(2), 132–148.
- Dotger, B. (2011b). The school leader communication model. An emerging method for bridging. *Journal of School Leadership*, 21(6), 871–892.
- Dotger, B. (2013). “I had no idea!”: *Clinical simulations for teacher development*. Information Age Publishing.
- Dotger, B. (2015). Core pedagogy: Individual uncertainty, shared practice, formative ethos. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(3), 215–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115570093>

- Dotger, B., & Ashby, C. (2010). Exposing conditional inclusive ideologies through simulated interactions. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 33(2), 114–130.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406409357541>
- Dotger, B., & Chandler-Olcott, K. (2022). Clinical simulations in educator preparation. In B. Dotger & K. Chandler-Olcott (Eds.), *Clinical Simulations as Signature Pedagogy: Educator Preparation Across the Disciplines* (pp. 1–13). Harvard Education Press.
- Dotger, B., Dotger, S. C., & Maher, M. J. (2010). From medicine to teaching: The evolution of the simulated interaction model. *Innovative Higher Education*, 35(3), 129–141.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-009-9128-x>
- Dotger, B., Harris, S., & Hansel, A. (2008). Emerging authenticity: The crafting of simulated parent-teacher candidate conferences. *Teaching Education*, 19(4), 337–349.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210802438324>
- Dotger, B., Harris, S., Maher, M., & Hansel, A. (2011). Exploring the emotional geographies of parent-teacher candidate interactions: An emerging signature pedagogy. *The Teacher Educator*, 46(3), 208–230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2011.581882>
- Dotger, B., Masingila, J., Bearkland, M., & Dotger, S. (2015). Exploring iconic interpretation and mathematics teacher development through clinical simulations. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 18(6), 577–601. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10857-014-9290-7>
- Dotger, S., Dotger, B., & Tillotson, J. (2009). Examining how preservice science teachers navigate simulated parent-teacher conversations on evolution and intelligent design. *Science Education*, 94(3), 552–570. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20375>
- Doumen, S., Verschueren, K., Buyse, E., Germeijs, V., Luyckx, K., & Soenens, B. (2008). Reciprocal relations between teacher-child conflict and aggressive behavior in kindergarten:

- A three-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 37(3), 588–599. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15374410802148079>
- Doyle, W. (1990). Classroom knowledge as a foundation for teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 91, 347–360.
- Doyle, W. (2006). Ecological approaches to classroom management. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 97–125). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dreikurs, R., & Grey, L. (1968). *A new approach to discipline: Logical consequences*. Plume.
- Durkheim, E. (1956). *Education and sociology*. The Free Press.
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82(1), 405–432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x>
- Ebbert, D. W., & Connors, H. (2004). Standardized patient experiences: evaluation of clinical performance and nurse practitioner student satisfaction. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 25(1), 12–15.
- Edler, J. R., Eberman, L. E., & Walker, S. (2017). Clinical education in athletic training. *Athletic Training Education Journal*, 12(1), 46–50. <https://doi.org/10.4085/120146>
- Eisenman, G., Carey, S. E., & Cushman, A. (2015). *Bringing Reality to Classroom Management in Teacher Education*. 39(1), 1–12.
- Eliot, M., Cornell, D., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2010). Supportive school climate and student willingness to seek help for bullying and threats of violence. *Journal of School Psychology*, 48(6), 533–553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2010.07.001>
- Elliott, J. G. (2009). The nature of teacher authority and teacher expertise. *Support for Learning*,



- 24(4), 197–203. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9604.2009.01429.x>
- Elliott, J. G., & Stemler, S. E. (2008). Teacher authority, tacit knowledge, and the training of teachers. In *Advances in learning and behavioral disabilities* (Vol. 21, Issue 08, pp. 75–88). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0735-004X\(08\)00003-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0735-004X(08)00003-7)
- Emler, N., & Reicher, S. (1995). *Adolescence and delinquency—The collective management of reputation*. Blackwell.
- Emler, N., & Reicher, S. (2005). Delinquency: Cause or consequence of social exclusion? In D. Abrams, M. A. Hogg, & J. M. Marques (Eds.), *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion* (pp. 211–241). Psychology Press.
- Emmer, E., & Stough, L. M. (2001). Classroom management: A critical part of educational psychology, with implications for teacher education. *Educational Psychologist*, 36(2), 103–112. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3602\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3602_5)
- Epstein, R. M. (2007). Assessment in medical education. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 356(4), 387–396. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra054784>
- Epstein, R. M., & Hundert, E. M. (2002). Defining and assessing professional competence. *Jama*, 287(2), 226–235.
- Espelage, D. L., Gutsell, E. W., & Swearer, S. M. (Eds.). (2004). *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention*. Routledge.
- Evans, K. R., Lester, J. N., & Anfara, Jr., V. A. (2013). Restorative justice in education: What we know so far. *Middle School Journal*, 44(5), 57–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00940771.2013.11461873>
- Farrington, D. P. (1993). Understanding and preventing bullying. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice* (p. vol. 17, pp. 381–458). University of Chicago Press.
- Farrington, D. P. (2003). Developmental and life-course criminology: Key theoretical and

- empirical issues-the 2002 Sutherland Award Address\*. *Criminology*, 41(2), 221–225.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2003.tb00987.x>
- Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2009a). How to reduce school bullying. *Victims and Offenders*, 4(4), 321–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564880903227255>
- Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2009b). Reducing school bullying: Evidence-based implications for policy. *Crime and Justice*, 38(1), 281–345. <https://doi.org/10.1086/599198>
- Farrington, D. P., Ttofi, M. M., & Piquero, A. R. (2016). Risk, promotive, and protective factors in youth offending: Results from the Cambridge study in delinquent development. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 45, 63–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.02.014>
- Fein, R. A., Vossekuil, B., Pollack, W. S., Borum, R., Modzeleski, W., & Reddy, M. (2004). Threat assessment in schools: A guide to managing threatening situations and to creating safe schools. In *U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Department of Education* (Issue May).
- Ferguson, C. J., Miguel, C. S., Kilburn, J. C., & Sanchez, P. (2007). The effectiveness of school-based anti-bullying programs: A meta-analytic review. *Criminal Justice Review*, 32(4), 401–414. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016807311712>
- Ferguson, C. J., San Miguel, C., & Hartley, R. D. (2009). A multivariate analysis of youth violence and aggression: The influence of family, peers, depression, and media violence. *Journal of Pediatrics*, 155(6), 904-908.e3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2009.06.021>
- Fleming, J., & Bay, M. (2004). Social and emotional learning in teacher preparation. In J. Zins, R. Weissberg, M. Wang, & H. Walberg (Eds.), *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* (pp. 94–110). Teachers College Press.
- Flower, A., McKenna, J. W., & Haring, C. D. (2017). Behavior and classroom management: Are teacher preparation programs really preparing our teachers? *Preventing School Failure*, 61(2), 163–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2016.1231109>

- Ford, A. C., & Sassi, K. (2014). Authority in cross-racial teaching and learning (re)considering the transferability of warm demander approaches. *Urban Education, 49*(1), 39–74.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085912464790>
- Fox, B. H., Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2012). Successful bullying prevention programs: Influence of research design, implementation features, and program components. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence, 6*(2), 273–282.  
<https://doi.org/10.4119/UNIBI/ijcv.245>
- Freeman, J., Simonsen, B., Briere, D. E., & MacSuga-Gage, A. S. (2014). Pre-service teacher training in classroom management. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, 37*(2), 106–120.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406413507002>
- Fries, K., & DeMitchell, T. A. (2007). Zero tolerance and the paradox of fairness: viewpoints from the classroom. *Journal of Law & Education, 36*(2), 211–229.  
<http://flagship.luc.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eh&AN=24821757&site=ehost-live>
- Galloway, S. (2009). Simulation techniques to bridge the gap between novice and competent healthcare professionals. *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing, 14*(2), 1–11.
- Galton, M. (2007). *Learning and teaching in the primary school*. SAGE Publishing.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. Teachers College Press.
- Gay, G. (2007). The rhetoric and reality of NCLB. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 10*(3), 279–293. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320701503256>
- Gerritsma, J. G. M., & Smal, J. A. (1988). An interactive patient simulation for the study of medical decision-making. *Medical Education, 22*(2), 118–123.

- Gibbons, S. W., Adamo, G., Padden, D., Ricciardi, R., Graziano, M., Levine, E., & Hawkins, R. (2002). Clinical evaluation in advanced practice nursing education: using standardized patients in health assessment. *The Journal of Nursing Education, 41*(5), 215–221. <https://doi.org/10.3928/0148-4834-20020501-07>
- Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and morality. *Harvard Educational Review, 47*(4), 481–517.
- Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Harvard University Press.
- Glock, S., & Kleen, H. (2019). Teachers' responses to student misbehavior: the role of expertise. *Teaching Education, 30*(1), 52–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2018.1444023>
- Goegan, L. D., Wagner, A. K., & Daniels, L. M. (2017). Pre-service and practicing teachers' commitment to and comfort with social emotional learning. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 63*(3), 267–285.
- Goetz, J. L., Keltner, D., & Simon-Thomas, E. (2010). Compassion: An Evolutionary Analysis and Empirical Review. *Psychological Bulletin, 136*(3), 351–374. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018807>
- Goh, P. S., & Matthews, B. (2011). Listening to the concerns of student teachers In Malaysia during teaching practice. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(3). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2011v36n3.2>
- Gold, B., Hellermann, C., & Holodynski, M. (2017). Effects of video-based trainings for promoting self-efficacy in elementary classroom management. *Zeitschrift Fur Erziehungswissenschaft, 20*, 115–136. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11618-017-0727-5>
- Goldstein, L. (1998). Taking caring seriously: The ethic of care in classroom life. *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*.

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED419801.pdf>

- Goldstein, L., & Freedman, D. (2003). Challenges enacting caring teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(5), 441–454. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487103259114>
- Goldstein, L., & Lake, V. (2000). “Love, love, and more love for children”: Exploring preservice teachers’ understandings of caring. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(8), 861–872. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(00\)00031-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(00)00031-7)
- Goldstein, L., & Lake, V. E. (2003). The Impact of field experience on preservice teachers’ understandings of caring. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 30(3), 115–132.
- González, T. (2012). Keeping kids in schools : Restorative justice , punitive discipline, and the school to prison pipeline. *Journal of Law and Education*, 41(April), 281–335.
- Gordon, R., Piana, L. D., & Keleher, T. (2000). *Facing the consequences: An examination of racial discrimination in US public schools*.
- Gordon, T. (1977). *T.E.T.: Teacher effectiveness training*. David McCay.
- Gouveia-Pereira, M., Vala, J., Palmonari, A., & Rubini, M. (2003). School experience, relational justice and legitimation of institutional. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 18(3), 309–325.
- Graça, J., Calheiros, M. M., & Barata, M. C. (2013). Authority in the classroom: adolescent autonomy, autonomy support, and teachers’ legitimacy. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 28(3), 1065–1076. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-012-0154-1>
- Greenberg, J., Putman, H., & Walsh, K. (2014). Training Our Future Teachers: Classroom Management. In *National Council on Teacher Quality* (Issue January). [http://www.nctq.org/dmsStage/Future\\_Teachers\\_Classroom\\_Management\\_CNTQ\\_Report](http://www.nctq.org/dmsStage/Future_Teachers_Classroom_Management_CNTQ_Report)
- Greene, M. B. (2006). Bullying in schools: A plea for measure of human rights. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62(1), 63–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00439.x>

- Gregory, A., Clawson, K., Davis, A., & Gerewitz, J. (2016). The Promise of Restorative Practices to Transform Teacher-Student Relationships and Achieve Equity in School Discipline. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 26*(4), 325–353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2014.929950>
- Gregory, A., & Ripski, M. B. (2008). Adolescent trust in teachers: Implications for behavior in the high school classroom. *School Psychology Review, 37*(3), 337–353.
- Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher, 39*(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09357621>
- Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. W. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record, 111*(9), 2025–2100.
- Gunter, P. L., & Coutinho, M. J. (1997). Negative reinforcement in classrooms: What we're beginning to learn. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, 20*(3), 249–264. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088840649702000306>
- Gunter, P. L., Denny, R. K., Jack, S. L., Shores, R. E., & Nelson, C. M. (1993). Aversive stimuli in academic interactions between students with serious emotional disturbance and their teachers. *Behavioral Disorders, 18*(4), 265–274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019874299301800405>
- Gunter, P. L., Kenton Denny, R., Shores, R. E., Reed, T. M., Jack, S. L., & Nelson, M. (1994). Teacher escape, avoidance, and countercontrol behaviors: Potential responses to disruptive and aggressive behaviors of students with severe behavior disorders. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 3*(2), 211–223. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02234068>

- Guskey, T. R., & Yoon, K. S. (2009). What works in professional development? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(7), 495–500.
- Haeseler, F., Fortin, A. H., Pfeiffer, C., Walters, C., & Martino, S. (2011). Assessment of a motivational interviewing curriculum for year 3 medical students using a standardized patient case. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 84(1), 27–30.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2010.10.029>
- Hall, G. S. (1883). The contents of children's minds. *Princeton Review*, 2(May), 249–272.
- Hammerness, K. (2011). Classroom management in the United States: A view from New York City. *Teaching Education*, 22(2), 151–167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2011.567844>
- Hammond, H., Dupoux, E., & Ingalls, L. (2004). Culturally relevant classroom management strategies for American Indian students. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 23(4), 3–9.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/875687050402300402>
- Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development*, 72(2), 625–638.
- Hargreaves, A. (1998). The emotional practice of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(8), 835–854. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(98\)00025-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(98)00025-0)
- Hargreaves, E., Elhawary, D., & Mahgoub, M. (2018). 'The teacher who helps children learn best': affect and authority in the traditional primary classroom. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 26(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2017.1314318>
- Harjunen, E. (2009). How do teachers view their own pedagogical authority? *Teachers and Teaching*, 15(1), 109–129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600802661345>
- Harjunen, E. (2011). Students' consent to a teacher's pedagogical authority. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 55(4), 403–424.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2011.587325>

- Harper, R. G., Wiens, A. N., & Matarazzo, J. D. (1978). *Nonverbal communication: The state of the art*. Wiley.
- Hartzler, B., Beadnell, B., Rosengren, D. B., Dunn, C., & Baer, J. S. (2010). Deconstructing proficiency in motivational interviewing: Mechanics of skilful practitioner delivery during brief simulated encounters. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy, 38*(5), 611–628. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1352465810000329>
- Haselswerdt, M. V., & Lenhardt, A. M. C. (2003). Reframing school violence: Listening to voices of students. *Educational Forum, 67*(4), 326–336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131720308984581>
- Hauer, K. E., Hodgson, C. S., Kerr, K. M., Teherani, A., & Irby, D. M. (2005). A national study of medical student clinical skills assessment. *Academic Medicine, 80*(10 SUPPL.), 25–29. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-200510001-00010>
- Hearn, J. (2012). *Theorizing power*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Held, V. (2006). *The ethics of care: Personal, political, and global*. Oxford University Press.
- Hemmings, A. (2003). Fighting for respect in urban high schools. *Teachers College Record, 105*(3), 416–437. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9620.00245>
- Hemmings, A. (2006). Moral order in high school authority: Dis/enabling care and (un)scrupulous achievement. In *Classroom authority: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 135–150). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hemphill, S. A., Toumbourou, J. W., Herrenkohl, T. I., McMorris, B. J., & Catalano, R. F. (2006). The effect of school suspensions and arrests on subsequent adolescent antisocial behavior in Australia and the United States. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 39*(5), 736–744. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.05.010>
- Henderson, T. E., Sumner, M. D., Silverman, C. J., & Frampton, M. L. (2010). *School-based*



*restorative justice as an alternative to zero-tolerance policies: Lessons from West Oakland.*

[www.law.berkeley.edu/HendersonCenter.htm](http://www.law.berkeley.edu/HendersonCenter.htm)

Henricsson, L., & Rydell, A. M. (2004). Elementary School Children with Behavior Problems:

Teacher-Child Relations and Self-Perception. A Prospective Study. *Merrill-Palmer*

*Quarterly*, 50(2), 111–138. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mpq.2004.0012>

Herbart, J. F. (1835). *Pädagogische vorlesungen*. Hermann Wendt.

Herrenkohl, T. I., Maguin, E., Hill, K. G., Hawkins, J. D., Abbott, R. D., & Catalano, R. F.

(2000). Developmental risk factors for youth violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 26(7),

176–186.

Hochschild, A. R. (1993). *The managed heart: The commercialization of human feeling*.

University of California Press.

Hodge, D. R., & Gillespie, D. (2003). Phrase completions: An alternative to Likert scales. *Social*

*Work Research*, 27(1), 45–55. <https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/27.1.45>

Hollins, E. R. (2011). Teacher preparation for quality teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*,

62(4), 395–407. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487111409415>

Hopkins, B. (2002). Restorative justice in schools. *Support for Learning*, 17(3), 144–149.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9604.00254>

Hopkins, B. (2003). *Just schools: A whole school approach to restorative justice* (Jessica Ki).

Hopkins, D. (2003). School Improvement for Real. *School Improvement for Real*, May.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203165799>

Hudson, P. (2013). Strategies for mentoring pedagogical knowledge. *Teachers and Teaching:*

*Theory and Practice*, 19(4), 363–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.770226>

Hung, L.-C., & Smith, C. S. (2012). Common problems experienced by first year alternatively

certified teachers: A qualitative study. *Journal of the National Association for Alternative*

*Certification*, 7(2), 3–17. <http://jnaac.com/index.php/test/article/view/89/63>

Hurn, C. (1985). Changes in authority relationships in schools: 1960-1980. *Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization*, 5(1), 31–57.

Hutchings, M., Carrington, B., Francis, B., Skelton, C., Read, B., & Hall, I. (2008). Nice and kind, smart and funny: What children like and want to emulate in their teachers. *Oxford Review of Education*, 34(2), 135–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980701663959>

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499–534.

<https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038003499>

International Institute of Restorative Practices. (2014). *Improving school climate: Findings from schools implementing restorative practices*. <http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRP-Improving-School-Climate.pdf>

Irvine, J. J. (2002). African American teachers' culturally specific pedagogy: The collective stories. In J. J. Irvine (Ed.), *In search of wholeness: African American teachers and their culturally specific classroom practices* (pp. 139–146). Palgrave MacMillan.

Islam, G., & Zyphur, M. (2007). Ways of interacting: The standardization of communication in medical training. *Human Relations*, 60(5), 769–792.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726707079201>

Janssens, A., Van Den Noortgate, W., Goossens, L., Verschueren, K., Colpin, H., Claes, S., Van Heel, M., & Van Leeuwen, K. (2017). Adolescent externalizing behaviour, psychological control, and peer rejection: Transactional links and dopaminergic moderation. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 35(3), 420–438. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjdp.12184>

Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of*

- Educational Research*, 79(1), 491–525. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325693>
- Jennings, & Rentner. (2006). *Ten big effects of the No Child Left Behind Act on public schools*.  
www.cep-dc.org
- Johnson, D., Rice, M. P., Edgington, W. D., & Williams, P. (2005). For the uninitiated: How to succeed in classroom management. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 42(1), 28–32.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2005.10532082>
- Johnson, L., & Reiman, A. (2007). Beginning teacher disposition: Examining the moral/ethical domain. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(5), 676–687.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.12.006>
- Johnstone, G., & Van Ness, D. W. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook of restorative justice*. Willan Publishing.
- Jones, M., & Vesilind, E. M. (1996). Putting practice into theory: Changes in the organization of preservice teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(1), 91–117. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312033001091>
- Jones, S., & Bouffard, S. M. (2012). Social and emotional learning in schools: From programs to strategies and commentaries. *Social Policy Report*, 26(4), 1–33.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2379-3988.2012.tb00073.x>
- Kafka, J. (2011). *The history of “zero tolerance” in American public schooling*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Kale, U., & Akcaoglu, M. (2018). The role of relevance in future teachers' utility value and interest toward technology. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 66(2), 283–311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-017-9547-9>
- Kandakai, T. L., & King, K. A. (2002a). Preservice teachers' beliefs regarding school violence prevention training. *American Journal of Health Education*, 33(6), 350–356.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/19325037.2002.10604759>

Kandakai, T. L., & King, K. A. (2002b). Preservice Teachers' Perceived Confidence in Teaching School Violence Prevention. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 26*(5), 342–353.

<https://doi.org/10.5993/AJHB.26.5.3>

Kane, J., Lloyd, G., McCluskey, G., Riddell, S., Stead, J., & Weedon, E. (2008). Collaborative evaluation: Balancing rigour and relevance in a research study of restorative approaches in schools in Scotland. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education, 31*(2), 99–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17437270802124343>

Kanno, Y., & Stuart, C. (2011). Learning to become a second language teacher: Identities-in-practice. *Modern Language Journal, 95*(2), 236–252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01178.x>

Karp, D. R., & Breslin, B. (2001). Restorative justice in school communities. *Youth and Society, 33*(2), 249–272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X01033002006>

Kaufman, D., & Moss, D. M. (2010). A new look at preservice teachers' conceptions of classroom management and organization: Uncovering complexity and dissonance. *Teacher Educator, 45*(2), 118–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878731003623669>

Kepenekci, Y. K., & Çinkir, Ş. (2006). Bullying among Turkish high school students. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 30*(2), 193–204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2005.10.005>

KewalRamani, A., Gilbertson, L., Fox, M. A., & Provasnik, S. (2007). Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic minorities (NCES 2007-039). In *National Center for Education Statistics*. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2007/2007039.pdf>

Kim, B. K. E., Gilman, A. B., Hill, K. G., & Hawkins, J. D. (2016). Examining protective factors against violence among high-risk youth: Findings from the Seattle Social Development Project. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 45*, 19–25.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.02.015>

Koc, M. (2011). Let's make a movie: Investigating pre-service teachers' reflections on using video-recorded role playing cases in Turkey. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(1), 95–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.07.006>

Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: Towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(1), 77–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.10.002>

Korthagen, F. A. J. (2010). Situated learning theory and the pedagogy of teacher education: Towards an integrative view of teacher behavior and teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(1), 98–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.05.001>

Kounin, J. S. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kounin, J. S., & Doyle, P. H. (1975). Degree of continuity of a lesson's signal system and the task involvement of children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 67(2), 159–164. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076999>

Kueny, M. T., & Zirkel, P. A. (2012). An Analysis of School Anti-Bullying Laws in the United States. *Middle School Journal*, 43(4), 22–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00940771.2012.11461817>

Kurt, G. (2017). Implementing the flipped classroom in teacher education: Evidence from Turkey. *Educational Technology and Society*, 20(1), 211–221.

Kwok, A. (2018). Promoting “quality” feedback: First-year teachers' self-reports on their development as classroom managers. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 53(1), 22–36.

Lacey, A., & Cornell, D. G. (2016). School administrator assessments of bullying and state-mandated testing. *Journal of School Violence*, 15(2), 189–212.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2014.971362>

- Ladd, G., & Burgess, K. B. (1999). Charting the relationship trajectories of aggressive, withdrawn, and aggressive/withdrawn children during early grade school. *Child Development, 70*(4), 910–929.
- Ladd, G., & Burgess, K. B. (2001). Do relational risks and protective factors moderate the linkages between childhood aggression and early psychological and school adjustment? *Child Development, 72*(5), 1579–1601. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00366>
- Ladd, H. (2017). No Child Left Behind: A deeply flawed federal policy. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 36*(2), 461–469. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7), 3–12.  
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x035007003>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Lai, C., Gu, M., & Hu, J. (2015). Understanding legitimate teacher authority in a cross-cultural teaching context: pre-service Chinese language teachers undertaking teaching practicum in international schools in Hong Kong. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 41*(4), 417–434.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2015.1081717>
- Landau, B. (2001). Teaching classroom management: A stand-alone necessity for preparing new teachers. *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.*
- Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2005). The effectiveness of restorative justice practices: A meta-analysis. *The Prison Journal, 85*(2), 127–144.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885505276969>

- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- LeCompte, M. D., & Goetz, J. P. (1982). Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research. *Review of Educational Research*, 52(1), 31–60.  
<https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543052001031>
- Lee, T., Cornell, D., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2011). High suspension schools and dropout rates for black and white students. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 34(2), 167–192.  
<https://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2011.0014>
- Levin, J., & Nolan, J. F. (2014). *Principles of classroom management: A professional decision-making model* (Seventh Ed). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Lewis, R., Romi, S., Qui, X., & Katz, Y. J. (2005). Teachers' classroom discipline in Australia, China and Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(6), 729–741.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.05.008>
- Lewis, T., & Sugai, G. (1999). Effective behavior support: A systems approach to proactive school-wide management. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 31(6), 1–24.
- Lewis, T., Sugai, G., & Colvin, G. (1998). Reducing problem behavior through a school-wide system of effective behavioral support: Investigation of a school-wide social skills training program and contextual interventions. *School Psychology Review*, 27(3), 446–459.
- Liau, A. K., Flannery, D. J., & Quinn-Leering, K. (2004). A comparison of teacher-rated and self-reported threats of interpersonal violence. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 24(3), 231–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431604265669>
- Lieber, E., & Weisner, T. S. (2015). Meeting the practical challenges of mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 559–580). SAGE Publications, Inc.

<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506335193.n22>

- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Lipsey, M. W. (1998). Design sensitivity: Statistical power for applied experimental research. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.), *Handbook of applied social research methods* (pp. 39–68). SAGE Publishing.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (2001). *Practical meta-analysis* (applied so). SAGE Publishing.
- Liu, X., & Babchuk, W. (2018). Developing classroom management strategies in non-native culture: A single case study. *Qualitative Report*, 23(4), 799–800.
- Lösel, F., & Farrington, D. P. (2012). Direct protective and buffering protective factors in the development of youth violence. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 43(2 SUPPL. 1), S8–S23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2012.04.029>
- Losen, D. J., & Skiba, R. J. (2010). UCLA K-12 Racial Disparities in School Discipline Title Permalink. *U.s. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights Compliance Survey Data*. <https://cloudfront.escholarship.org/dist/prd/content/qt8fh0s5dv/qt8fh0s5dv.pdf>
- MacLean, S., Kelly, M., Geddes, F., & Della, P. (2017). Use of simulated patients to develop communication skills in nursing education: An integrative review. *Nurse Education Today*, 48, 90–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2016.09.018>
- Macleod, G., Fyfe, I., Nicol, R., Sangster, P., & Obeng, H. (2017). Compliance through care and commitment: why young people do as adults ask. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 48(5), 607–623. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2017.1386160>
- Macleod, G., MacAllister, J., & Pirrie, A. (2012). Towards a broader understanding of authority in student-teacher relationships. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(4), 493–508.



<https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2012.716006>

- Malmgren, K. W., Trezek, B. J., & Paul, P. V. (2005). Models of classroom management as applied to the secondary classroom. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 79(1), 36–39. <https://doi.org/10.3200/tchs.79.1.36-39>
- Martin, J. A., Reznick, R. K., Rothman, A., Tamblyn, R. M., & Regehr, G. (1996). Who should rate candidates in an objective structured clinical examination? *Academic Medicine*, 71(2), 170–175.
- McBee, R. H. (2007). What it means to care: How educators conceptualize and actualize caring. *Action in Teacher Education*, 29(3), 33–42.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2007.10463458>
- McCluskey, G., Lloyd, G., Kane, J., Riddell, S., Stead, J., & Weedon, E. (2008). Can restorative practices in schools make a difference? *Educational Review*, 60(4), 405–417.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910802393456>
- McCluskey, G., Lloyd, G., Stead, J., Kane, J., Riddell, S., & Weedon, E. (2008). “I was dead restorative today”: From restorative justice to restorative approaches in school. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 38(2), 199–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057640802063262>
- McCoy, D. C., Roy, A. L., & Sirkman, G. M. (2013). Neighborhood crime and school climate as predictors of elementary school academic quality: A cross-lagged panel analysis. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 52(1–2), 128–140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-013-9583-5>
- McEvoy, A., & Welker, R. (2000). Antisocial behavior, academic failure, and school climate: A critical review. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 8(3), 130–140.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/106342660000800301>
- McGeough, B. (2020). An Analysis of Statewide Anti-bullying Laws Employing the Iowa Safe

- Schools Law as a Case Study. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 0123456789.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-020-00700-5>
- Melnick, S. A., & Meister, D. G. (2008). A Comparison of Beginning and Experienced Teachers' Concerns. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 31(3), 40–56.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Merrell, K. W., Gueldner, B. A., Ross, S. W., & Isava, D. M. (2008). How effective are school bullying intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23(1), 26–42. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1045-3830.23.1.26>
- Metz, M. H. (1978). *Classrooms and corridors: The crisis of authority in desegregated secondary schools*. University of California Press.
- Metz, M. H. (1990). Real school: A universal drama amid disparate experience. In D. Mitchell & M. Goertz (Eds.), *Politics of education association yearbook* (pp. 75–91). Taylor & Francis.
- Mikulec, E., & Hamann, K. (2020). “My Eyes Have Been Opened”: Pre-Service Secondary Teachers Exploring Behavior Management through a Microteaching Project. *Action in Teacher Education*, 42(2), 102–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2019.1612297>
- Millspaugh, S. B., Cornell, D. G., Huang, F. L., & Datta, P. (2015). Prevalence of aggressive attitudes and willingness to report threats in middle school. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management*, 2(1), 11–22. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tam0000031>
- Milner IV, H. R., & Tenore, F. B. (2010). Classroom management in diverse classrooms. *Urban Education*, 45(5), 560–603. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085910377290>
- Minnesota Department of Education. (2011). *Restorative measures in schools survey, 2011 executive summary*.
- Mirsky, L. (2007). SaferSanerSchools: Transforming school Cultures with restorative practices. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 16(2), 5–12.

- Mirsky, L. (2011). Building safer, saner schools. *Educational Leadership*, 69(1), 45–50.
- Mitchell, B. S., Hirn, R. G., & Lewis, T. (2017). Enhancing effective classroom management in schools: Structures for changing teacher behavior. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 40(2), 140–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406417700961>
- Molina, I., Bowie, S. L., Dulmus, C. N., & Sowers, K. M. (2004). School-based violence prevention programs. *Journal of Evidence - Based Social Work*, 1(2–3), 175–188. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J394v01n02\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1300/J394v01n02_12)
- Morrison, B., Blood, P., & Thorsborne, M. (2005). Practicing restorative justice in school communities: The challenge of culture change. *Public Organization Review*, 5(4), 335–357. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-005-5095-6>
- Morrison, B., & Vaandering, D. (2012). Restorative justice: Pedagogy, praxis, and discipline. *Journal of School Violence*, 11(2), 138–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2011.653322>
- Mullooly, J., & Varenne, H. (2006). Playing with pedagogical authority. In J. L. Pace & A. Hemmings (Eds.), *Classroom authority: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 63–86). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Murray, C., & Murray, K. M. (2004). Child level correlates of teacher-student relationships: An examination of demographic characteristics, academic orientations, and behavioral orientations. *Psychology in the Schools*, 41(7), 751–762. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20015>
- Musu-Gillette, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., & Oudekerk, B. A. (2017). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2016*. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2017064>
- Musu, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., & Oudekerk, B. A. (2019). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2018*.
- Myers, D. A. (2007). Teacher power—Revisited. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 80(5), 239–242. <https://doi.org/10.3200/tchs.80.5.239-242>

- NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, I. (2009). *Annual report of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (2007-2009)*.  
[http://www.naacpldf.org/files/publications/NAACPLDF\\_2007-2009\\_Annual\\_Report.pdf](http://www.naacpldf.org/files/publications/NAACPLDF_2007-2009_Annual_Report.pdf)
- Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth. *Jama*, *285*(16), 2094–2100.  
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.285.16.2094>
- National School Climate Council. (2007). *The school climate challenge: Narrowing the gap between school climate research and school climate policy, practice guidelines and teacher education policy*. <http://www.ecs.org/html/projectsPartners/nclc/docs/school-climate-challenge-web.pdf>
- Nekvasil, E. K., & Cornell, D. G. (2012). Student reports of peer threats of violence: Prevalence and outcomes. *Journal of School Violence*, *11*(4), 357–375.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2012.706764>
- Nekvasil, E. K., & Cornell, D. G. (2015). Student threat assessment associated with safety in middle schools. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management*, *2*(2), 98–113.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/tam0000038>
- Nekvasil, E. K., Cornell, D. G., & Huang, F. L. (2015). Prevalence and offense characteristics of multiple casualty homicides: Are schools at higher risk than other locations? *Psychology of Violence*, *5*(3), 236–245. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038967>
- Nelson, J. R., & Roberts, M. L. (2000). Ongoing reciprocal teacher-student interactions involving disruptive behaviors in general education classrooms. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *8*(1), 27–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/106342660000800104>
- Nestel, D., Kelly, M., Jolly, B., & Watson, M. (2017). *Healthcare simulation education: Evidence, theory and practice*. Wiley-Blackwell.

- New York State Education Department. (n.d.). *The Dignity Act*. The Dignity for All Students Act. Retrieved February 4, 2021, from <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/dignityact/>
- Nicolaides, S., Toda, Y., & Smith, P. K. (2002). Knowledge and attitudes about school bullying in trainee teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72(1), 105–118.  
<https://doi.org/10.1348/000709902158793>
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, Pub. L. No. 107.
- Noblit, G. W. (1993). Power and caring. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30(1), 23–38.
- Noddings, N. (2005a). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education* (Second). Teachers College Press.
- Noddings, N. (2005b). What does it mean to educate the whole child? *Educational Leadership*, 63(1), 8–13.
- Noddings, N. (2010a). Complexity in caring and empathy. *Abstracta, Special Issue V*, 6–12.
- Noddings, N. (2010b). Complexity in caring and empathy. *Abstracta, Special Issue V*, 6–12.
- Noddings, N. (2012a). Language of Care Ethics. *Knowledge Quest*, 40(4), 52–56.
- Noddings, N. (2012b). The caring relation in teaching. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(6), 771–781. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2012.745047>
- Noddings, N. (2013). *Caring: A relational approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed. Up). University of California Press.
- Nolan, K. (2011). *Police in the hallways: Discipline in an urban high school*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Nurmi, J. E. (2012). Students' characteristics and teacher-child relationships in instruction: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 7(3), 177–197.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2012.03.001>
- O'Neill, S., & Stephenson, J. (2012). Does classroom management coursework influence pre-

- service teachers' perceived preparedness or confidence? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(8), 1131–1143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.06.008>
- O'Neill, S., & Stephenson, J. (2014). Evidence-based classroom and behaviour management content in Australian pre-service primary teachers' coursework: Wherefore art thou? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(4), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n4.4>
- O'Toole, M. E. (2013). *The school shooter: A threat assessment perspective*. Critical Incident Response Group, National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime, Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- Ofman, D. (2000). *Core qualities: A gateway to human resources*. Scriptum.
- Oliver, R. M., & Reschly, D. J. (2010). Special education teacher preparation in classroom management: Implications for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*, 35(3), 188–199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019874291003500301>
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Blackwell.
- Olweus, D. (2005). A useful evaluation design, and effects of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 11(4), 389–402. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160500255471>
- Oral, B. (2012). Student Teachers' Classroom Management Anxiety: A Study on Behavior Management and Teaching Management. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(12), 2901–2916. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00966.x>
- Orsati, F. T., & Causton-Theoharis, J. (2013). Challenging control: Inclusive teachers and teaching assistants discourse on students with challenging behaviour. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(5), 507–525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2012.689016>
- Osher, D., Sprague, J., Weissberg, R. P., Axelrod, J., Keenan, S., Kendziora, K., J. E. Z. (2008).

A comprehensive approach to promoting social, emotional, and academic growth in contemporary schools. *Best Practices in School Psychology V*.

Oxford Languages. (n.d.). Threat. In Google.com. (n.d.). Retrieved January 7, 2020, from

[https://www.google.com/search?q=threat&spell=1&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwj91P624\\_DsAhXUB80KHaXCCr4QBSgAegQICBAq&biw=1633&bih=916](https://www.google.com/search?q=threat&spell=1&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwj91P624_DsAhXUB80KHaXCCr4QBSgAegQICBAq&biw=1633&bih=916)

Pace, J. L. (2003a). Managing the dilemmas of professional and bureaucratic authority in a high school English class. *Sociology of Education*, 76(1), 37–52.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/3090260>

Pace, J. L. (2003b). Using ambiguity and entertainment to win compliance in a lower-level US history class. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35(1), 83–110.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270210157597>

Pace, J. L. (2003c). Revisiting classroom authority: Theory and ideology meet practice. *Teachers College Record*, 105(8), 1559–1585. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9620.00300>

Pace, J. L. (2006). Saving (and losing) face, race, and authority: Strategies of action in a 9th grade English class. In J. L. Pace & A. Hemmings (Eds.), *Classroom authority: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 87–112). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pace, J. L., & Hemmings, A. (Eds.). (2006a). *Classroom authority: Theory, research, and practice*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pace, J. L., & Hemmings, A. (2006b). Understanding classroom authority as a social construction. In J. L. Pace & A. Hemmings (Eds.), *Classroom authority: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 1–32). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pace, J. L., & Hemmings, A. (2007). Understanding authority in classrooms: A review of theory, ideology, and research. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 4–27.

<https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298489>

- Pankowski, J., & Walker, J. T. (2016). Using simulation to support novice teachers' classroom management skills: Comparing traditional and alternative certification groups. *Journal of the National Association for Alternative Certification, 11*(1), 3–20.
- Paquette, K. R., & Rieg, S. A. (2016). Stressors and coping strategies through the lens of early childhood/special education pre-service teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 57*, 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.03.009>
- Payne, A., & Welch, K. (2010). Modeling The Effects Of Racial Threat On Punitive And Restorative School Discipline Practices. *Criminology, 48*(4), 1019–1062. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2010.00211.x>
- Payton, J. W., Wardlaw, D. M., Graczyk, P. A., Bloodworth, M. R., Tompsett, C. J., & Weissberg, R. P. (2000). Social and emotional learning: A framework for promoting mental health and reducing risk behavior in children and youth. *Journal Of School Health, 70*(No.5), 179–185.
- Pellegrino, A. M. (2010). Pre-Service teachers and classroom authority. *American Secondary Education, 38*(3), 62–78.
- Pirrie, A., & Rafanell, I. (2017). Re-conceptualising authority relations in education: a micro-situational approach. *Critical Studies in Education, 1*–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2017.1343198>
- Pranis, K. (2012). The Restorative Impulse. *Tikkun, 27*(1), 33–34. <https://doi.org/10.1215/08879982-2012-1015>
- Prichard, S. (2017). A Mixed-Methods Investigation of Preservice Music Teaching Efficacy Beliefs and Commitment to Music Teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 65*(2), 237–257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429417710387>
- Putnam, R. T., & Borko, H. (2000). What Do New Views of Knowledge and Thinking Have to



Say About Research on Teacher Learning? *Educational Researcher*, 29(1), 4–15.

<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X029001004>

Puzzanchera, C., & Adams, B. (2011). Juvenile arrests 2009. In *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: National Report Series Bulletin*.

<https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh176/files/pubs/236477.pdf>

Quek, C. L. (2013). Exploring beginning teachers' attitudes and beliefs on classroom management. *New Horizons in Education*, 61(2), 13.

Raffaele Mendez, L. M., & Knoff, H. M. (2003). Who Gets Suspended from School and Why: A Demographic Analysis of Schools and Disciplinary Infractions in a Large School District. *Source: Education and Treatment of Children EDUCATION AND TREATMENT OF CHILDREN*, 26(1), 30–51. <https://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2012.0008>

Raffaele Mendez, L. M., Knoff, H. M., & Ferron, J. M. (2002). School demographic variables and out-of-school suspension rates: A quantitative and qualitative analysis of a large, ethnically diverse school district. *Psychology in the Schools*, 39(3), 259–277.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.10020>

Reinke, W. M., Herman, K. C., & Newcomer, L. (2016). The Brief Student-Teacher Classroom Interaction Observation. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 42(1), 32–42.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1534508416641605>

Reinke, W. M., Stormont, M., Herman, K. C., Puri, R., & Goel, N. (2011). Supporting Children's Mental Health in Schools: Teacher Perceptions of Needs, Roles, and Barriers. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 26(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022714>

Reupert, A., & Woodcock, S. (2010). Success and near misses: Pre-service teachers' use, confidence and success in various classroom management strategies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(6), 1261–1268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.03.003>

- Rickles, N. M., Tieu, P., Myers, L., Galal, S., & Chung, V. (2009). The impact of a standardized patient program on student learning of communication skills. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 73(1). <https://doi.org/10.5688/aj730104>
- Rigby, K. (2011). What can schools do about cases of bullying? *Pastoral Care in Education*, 29(4), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643944.2011.626068>
- Rigby, K. (2014). How teachers address cases of bullying in schools: a comparison of five reactive approaches. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 30(4), 409–419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2014.949629>
- Rosenblum, R. (2006). Standards and sob stories: Negotiating authority at an urban public college. In J. L. Pace & A. Hemmings (Eds.), *Classroom authority: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 151–174). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rowe, W. S., Theriot, M. T., Sowers, K. M., & Dulmus, C. N. (2004). Perceptions of Bullying and Non-Bullying Children. *Journal of Evidence - Based Social Work*, 1(2–3), 159–174. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J394v01n02\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1300/J394v01n02_11)
- Rubin, K. H., Bukowski, W. M., & Parker, J. G. (2006). Peer interactions, relationships, and groups. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (6th edn, V, pp. 571–645). Wiley.
- Ryan, C. A., Walshe, N., Gaffney, R., Shanks, A., Burgoyne, L., & Wiskin, C. M. (2010). Using standardized patients to assess communication skills in medical and nursing Students. *BMC Medical Education*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-10-24>
- Saft, E. W., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Teachers' perceptions of their relationships with students: Effects of child age, gender, and ethnicity of teachers and children. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 16(2), 125–141. <https://doi.org/10.1521/scpq.16.2.125.18698>
- Sak, R. (2015). Comparison of self-efficacy between male and female pre-service early

childhood teachers. *Early Child Development and Care*, 185(10), 1629–1640.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2015.1014353>

Sanches, C., Gouveia-Pereira, M., & Carugati, F. (2012). Justice judgements, school failure, and adolescent deviant behaviour. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(4), 606–621.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.2011.02048.x>

Sando, C. R., Coggins, R. M., Meakim, C., Franklin, A. E., Gloe, D., Boese, T., Decker, S., Lioce, L., & Borum, J. C. (2013). Standards of Best Practice: Simulation Standard VII: Participant Assessment and Evaluation. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*, 9(6 SUPPL), S30–S32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecns.2013.04.007>

Scarlett, W. G., Ponte, I. C., & Singh, J. P. (2009). *Approaches to Behavior and Classroom Management : Integrating Discipline and Care*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Hanson-Peterson, J. L., & Hymel, S. (2015). SEL and preservice teacher education. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice* (pp. 406–421). Guilford Press.

Schultz, K. K., & Marks, A. (2007). Community-based collaboration with high school theater students as standardized patients. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 71(2).

<https://doi.org/10.5688/aj710229>

Sela-Shayovitz, R. (2009). Dealing with school violence: The effect of school violence prevention training on teachers' perceived self-efficacy in dealing with violent events. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(8), 1061–1066.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.04.010>

Sellman, E. (2009). Lessons learned: Student voice at a school for pupils experiencing social, emotional and behavioural difficulties. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 14(1), 33–

48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632750802655687>

Shapiro, H. S. (2006). *Losing heart: the moral and spiritual miseducation of America's children*.

Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sherman, L. W. (2000). The Safe and Drug-Free Schools Programs. *Brookings Papers on*

*Education Policy*, 2000(1), 125–156. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pep.2000.0020>

Shin, S., Park, J. H., & Kim, J. H. (2015). Effectiveness of patient simulation in nursing

education: Meta-analysis. *Nurse Education Today*, 35(1), 176–182.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2014.09.009>

Shriver, T. P., & Buffett, J. (2015). The uncommon core. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R.

P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning:*

*Research and practice* (pp. xv–xvi). Guilford Press.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *American*

*Educational Research Association*, 15(2), 4–14.

Shulman, L. S. (1998). Theory, Practice, and the Education of Professionals. *Elementary School*

*Journal*, 98(5), 511–526. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461912>

Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., Myers, D., & Sugai, G. (2008). Evidence-based

practices in classroom management: Considerations for research to practice. *Education and*

*Treatment of Children*, 31(3), 351–380.

Singer, M., & Flannery, D. J. (2000). The relationship between children's threats of violence and

violent behaviors. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 154(8), 785–790.

<https://doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.154.8.785>

Singer, T., & Lamm, C. (2009). The social neuroscience of empathy. *Annals of the New York*

*Academy of Sciences*, 1156, 81–96. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04418.x>

Siwatu, K. O., Putman, S. M., Starker-Glass, T. V., & Lewis, C. W. (2017). The culturally

- responsive classroom Management Self-Efficacy Scale: Development and initial validation. *Urban Education*, 52(7), 862–888. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915602534>
- Sizer, T. R. (2006). What we all want for each of our children. In C. Glickman (Ed.), *Letters to the next president: what we can do about the real crisis in public education* (pp. 2017–2210). Teachers College Press.
- Skiba, R., Horner, R. H., Chung, C. G., Rausch, M. K., May, S. L., & Tobin, T. (2011). Race is not neutral: A national investigation of African American and Latino disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Review*, 40(1), 85–107.
- Skiba, R., & Knesting, K. (2001). Zero tolerance, zero evidence: an analysis of school disciplinary practice. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 92, 17–43.
- Skiba, R., Michael, R., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *Urban Review*, 34(4), 317–342. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021320817372>
- Skiba, R., & Peterson, R. (1999). The dark side of Zero Tolerance: Can punishment lead to safe schools? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(5), 372–X.
- Skiba, R., & Peterson, R. (2000). School discipline at a crossroads: From zero tolerance to early response. *Exceptional Children*, 66(3), 335–346.
- Smith, B., & Fox, L. (2003). *Systems of service delivery: A synthesis of evidence relevant to young children at risk of or who have challenging behavior*.
- Smith, J. D., Schneider, B. H., Smith, P. K., & Ananiadou, K. (2004). The effectiveness of whole-school antibullying programs: A synthesis of evaluation research. *School Psychology Review*, 33(4), 547–560.
- Smith, P. K. (2011). Why interventions to reduce bullying and violence in schools may (or may not) succeed: Comments on this special section. *International Journal of Behavioral*

- Development*, 35(5), 419–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025411407459>
- Smith, P. K., Ananiadou, K., & Cowie, H. (2003). Interventions to reduce school bullying. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 48(9), 591–599. <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674370304800905>
- Smith, P. K., Pepler, D., & Rigby, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, P. K., Salmivalli, C., & Cowie, H. (2012). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A commentary. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 8(4), 433–441. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-012-9142-3>
- Snyder, T. D., de Brey, C., & Dillow, S. A. (2018). *Digest of Education Statistics 2016 52nd Edition. (NCES 2017-094)*. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2017/2017094.pdf>
- Spilt, J. L., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2009). Widening the view on teacher-child relationships: Teachers' narratives concerning disruptive versus nondisruptive children. *School Psychology Review*, 38(1), 86–101.
- Stevens, L., & Bush, B. (2018). The brain that longs to care for itself: The current neuroscience of self-compassion. In L. Stevens & C. Woodruff (Eds.), *The Neuroscience of Empathy, Compassion, and Self-Compassion* (pp. 53–89). Elsevier Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-809837-0.00004-0>
- Stillman, S. B., Stillman, P., Martinez, L., Freedman, J., Jensen, A. L., & Leet, C. (2018). Strengthening social emotional learning with student, teacher, and schoolwide assessments. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 55, 71–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2017.07.010>
- Stough, L. M. (2006). The place of classroom management and standards in teacher education. In C. M. Everston & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management:*

- Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 909–923). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Stough, L. M., & Montague, M. L. (2015). How teachers learn to be classroom managers. In E. Emmer (Ed.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 446–458). Erlbaum.
- Stough, L. M., Montague, M. L., Landmark, L. J., & Williams-Diehm, K. (2015). Persistent Classroom Management Training Needs of Experienced Teachers. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 15(5), 36–48.  
<https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v15i5.13784>
- Stoughton, E. H. (2007). “How will I get them to behave?”: Pre service teachers reflect on classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(7), 1024–1037.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.001>
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. SAGE Publishing.
- Stutzman-Amstutz, L., & Mullet, J. H. (2005). *The little book of restorative discipline for schools: teaching responsibility; creating caring climates*. Good Books.
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (2002). The evolution of discipline practices: School-wide positive behavior supports. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy*, 24(1–2), 23–50.  
[https://doi.org/10.1300/J019v24n01\\_03](https://doi.org/10.1300/J019v24n01_03)
- Suvall, C. (2009). Restorative justice in schools: Learning from jena high school. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, 44(2), 547–569.
- Swanson, P. B. (2013). From teacher training through the first year on the job: Changes in foreign language teacher efficacy. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 10(1), 5–16.
- Tamblyn, R. M., Klass, D. J., Schnabl, G. K., & Kopelow, M. L. (1991). The accuracy of

- standardized patient presentation. *Medical Education*, 25(2), 100–109.
- The State Education Department. (2013). *Dignity for All Students Act, Student Discrimination, Harassment and Bullying Prevention and Intervention*.  
<http://p1232.nysed.gov/dignityact/documents/DASAGuidanceLocalImplementation.pdf>
- Thompson, M. T., Marchant, M., Anderson, D., Prater, M. A., & Gibb, G. (2012). Effects of tiered training on general educators' use of specific praise. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 35(4), 521–546. <https://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2012.0032>
- Tickle, L. (1991). New teachers and the emotions of learning teaching. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 21(3), 319–329.
- Tickle, L. (1994). *The induction of new teachers: Reflective professional practice*. Cassell.
- Tickle, L. (1999). Teacher self-appraisal and appraisal of self. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), *The role of self in teacher development* (pp. 121–141). State University of New York Press.
- Tobin, T., Sugai, G., & Colvin, G. (1996). Patterns in middle school discipline records. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 4(2), 82–94.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/106342669600400203>
- Troop-Gordon, W., & Ladd, G. W. (2015). Teachers' Victimization-Related Beliefs and Strategies: Associations with Students' Aggressive Behavior and Peer Victimization. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 43(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-013-9840-y>
- Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2009). What works in preventing bullying: effective elements of anti-bullying programmes. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 1(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17596599200900003>
- Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce



- bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 7(1), 27–56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-010-9109-1>
- Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2012). Bullying prevention programs: The importance of peer intervention, disciplinary methods and age variations. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 8(4), 443–462. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-012-9161-0>
- Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25(C), 115–191. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60283-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60283-X)
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2019). *Facts about bullying*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Unnever, J. D., & Cornell, D. G. (2004). Middle school victims of bullying: Who reports being bullied? *Aggressive Behavior*, 30(5), 373–388. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20030>
- Van Dyke, R., & Schroeder, J. (2006). Implementation of the Dallas Threat of Violence Risk Assessment. In S. R. Jimerson & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *The handbook of school violence and school safety* (pp. 603–616). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2), 143–178. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543054002143>
- Voss, T., Kunter, M., & Baumert, J. (2011). Assessing teacher candidates' general pedagogical/psychological knowledge: Test construction and validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(4), 952–969. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025125>
- Vreeman, R. C., & Carroll, A. E. (2007). A systematic review of school-based interventions to prevent bullying. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 161(1), 78–88. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.161.1.78>
- Vu, N. V., & Barrows, H. (1994). Use of standardized patients in clinical assessments: Recent

- developments and measurement findings. *Educational Researcher*, 23(3), 23–30.  
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X023003023>
- Vu, N. V., Barrows, H., Marcy, M. L., Verhulst, S. J., Colliver, J. A., & Travis, T. (1992). Six years of comprehensive, clinical, performance-based assessment using standardized patients at the Southern Illinois University School of Medicine. *Academic Medicine*, 67(1), 42–50.
- Vyas, D., Bray, B. S., & Wilson, M. N. (2013). Use of simulation-based teaching methodologies in US colleges and schools of pharmacy. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 77(3), 53. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe77353>
- Walker, L. (1984). Sex differences in the development of moral reasoning: A critical review. *Child Development*, 55(3), 677–691. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1130121>
- Walker, S., Weidner, T., & Armstrong, K. J. (2015). Standardized patient encounters and individual case-based simulations improve students' confidence and promote reflection: A preliminary study. *Athletic Training Education Journal*, 10(2), 130–137.  
<https://doi.org/10.4085/1002130>
- Walter, H. J., Gouze, K., & Lim, K. G. (2006). Teachers' beliefs about mental health needs in inner city elementary schools. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 45(1), 61–68. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.chi.0000187243.17824.6c>
- Wang, M. Te, & Degol, J. L. (2016). School climate: a review of the construct, measurement, and impact on student outcomes. In *Educational Psychology Review* (Vol. 28, Issue 2).  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9319-1>
- Ware, F. (2002). Black teachers' perceptions of their professional roles and practices. In J. J. Irvine (Ed.), *In search of wholeness: African American teachers and their culturally specific classroom practices* (pp. 33–46). Palgrave MacMillan.
- Warren, J. S., Bohanon-Edmonson, H. M., Turnbull, A. P., Sailor, W., Wickham, D., Griggs, P.,

- & Beech, S. E. (2006). School-wide positive behavior support: Addressing behavior problems that impede student learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, *18*(2), 187–198.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/23363906>
- Watson, S. B. (2006). Novice science teachers: Expectations and experiences. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, *17*(3), 279–290. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-006-9010-y>
- Wearmouth, J., Mckinney, R., & Glynn, T. (2007). Restorative justice and New Zealand. *British Journal of Special Education*, *34*(4), 196–203.
- Wearmouth, J., McKinney, R., & Glynn, T. (2007). Restorative justice in schools: A New Zealand example. *Educational Research*, *49*(1), 37–49.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131880701200740>
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. Free Press.
- Weber, M. (1958). The three types of legitimate rule. *Berkeley Publications in Society and Institutions*, *4*(1), 1–11.
- Weinstein, C. S. (1999). Reflections on best practices and promising programs. In H. J. Freiberg (Ed.), *Beyond behaviorism: Changing the classroom management paradigm* (pp. 145–163). Allyn & Bacon.
- Weinstein, C. S., Curran, M., & Tomlinson-Clarke, S. (2003). Culturally responsive classroom management: Awareness Into action. *Theory Into Practice*, *42*(4), 269–276.
- Weinstein, C. S., Tomlinson-Clarke, S., & Curran, M. (2004). Toward a conception of culturally responsive classroom management. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *55*(1), 25–38.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487103259812>
- Weissberg, R. P., Payton, J. W., O'Brien, M. U., & Munro, S. (2007). Social and emotional learning. In F. C. Power, R. J. Nuzzi, D. Narvaez, D. K. Lapsley, & T. C. Hunt (Eds.), *Moral education: A handbook* (Vol. 2, pp. 417–418). Greenwood Press.

- Welch, K., & Payne, A. (2010). Racial threat and punitive school discipline. *Social Problems*, 57(1), 25–48. <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2010.57.1.25>
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Westberg, S. M., Adams, J., Thiede, K., Stratton, T. P., & Bumgardner, M. A. (2006). An interprofessional activity using standardized patients. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 70(2). <https://doi.org/10.5688/aj700234>
- Westling, D. L. (2010). Teachers and challenging behavior: Knowledge, views, and practices. *Remedial and Special Education*, 31(1), 48–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932508327466>
- Westling, D. L., Herzog, M. J., Cooper-Duffy, K., Prohn, K., & Ray, M. (2006). The teacher support program: A proposed resource for the special education profession and an initial validation. *Remedial and Special Education*, 27(3), 136–147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325060270030201>
- Williams, K., & Corvo, K. (2005). That I'll be killed: Pre-service and in-service teachers' greatest fears and beliefs about school violence. *Journal of School Violence*, 4(1), 47–69. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J202v04n01\\_04](https://doi.org/10.1300/J202v04n01_04)
- Wills, J. S. (2006). Authority, culture, context: Controlling the production of historical knowledge in elementary classrooms. In J. L. Pace & A. Hemmings (Eds.), *Classroom authority: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 33–62). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Winn, M. T. (2013). Toward a restorative english education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(1), 126–135.
- Winn, M. T. (2018). *Justice on both sides: Transforming education through restorative justice*. Harvard Education Press.
- Wong, D., Cheng, C., Ngan, R., & Ma, S. (2011). Program effectiveness of a Restorative Whole-

- school Approach for tackling school bullying in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 55(6), 846–862.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X10374638>
- Wong, J. (2015). The Psychology of Encouragement: Theory, Research, and Applications. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 43(2), 178–216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000014545091>
- Wong, J., Cheng, H. L., McDermott, R., Deng, K., & McCullough, K. (2019). I Believe in You! Measuring the experience of encouragement using the academic encouragement scale. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 14(6), 820–828.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2019.1579357>
- Woodcock, S., & Reupert, A. (2013). Does training matter? Comparing the behaviour management strategies of pre-service teachers in a four-year program and those in a one-year program. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(1), 84–98.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2012.753991>
- Woodcock, S., & Reupert, A. (2017). A tale from three countries: the classroom management practices of pre-service teachers from Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom. *Teacher Development*, 21(5), 655–667. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2017.1308431>
- Woodward, C. A., & Gliva-McConvey, G. (1995). The effect of simulating on standardized patients. *Academic Medicine*, 70(5), 418–420.
- Wrong, D. (1976). *Skeptical sociology*. Heinemann.
- Wrong, D. (2017). *Power: Its forms, bases and uses* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Wubbels, T. (2011). An international perspective on classroom management: What should prospective teachers learn? *Teaching Education*, 22(2), 113–131.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2011.567838>
- Zayyan, M. (2011). Objective structured clinical examination: The assessment of choice. *Oman*

*Medical Journal*, 26(4), 219–222. <https://doi.org/10.5001/omj.2011.55>

Zehr, H. (2015). *The little book of restorative justice: Revised and updated* (2nd ed.). Good Books.

Ziv, A., Small, S. D., & Wolpe, P. R. (2000). Patient safety and simulation-based medical education. *Medical Teacher*, 22(5), 489–495. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590050110777>

## Eryka Dever Murphey

4221 Rolling Gate Rd.  
Fort Collins, CO 80526  
edmurphe@syr.edu  
(505) 331-4757

### Education

---

- |  |                |
|--|----------------|
| <b>6-12 AMI Elementary Diploma Course</b><br>The Montessori Institute, Denver, Colorado  | September 2022 |
| <b>Doctor of Philosophy, Teaching and Curriculum</b><br>Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York<br>Dissertation Committee: Dr. Benjamin Dotger,<br>Dr. Mara Sapon-Shevin, Dr. George Theoharis | Fall 2022      |
| <b>Master's of Arts in Elementary Education</b><br>The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico<br>Director of the program: Dr. Eileen Waldschmidt                                    | Summer 2007    |
| <b>Batchelor's of Fine Art</b><br>Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado<br>Graphic design and drawing concentrations   | May 2001       |

### University Teaching Experience

---

- |  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| <b>Graduate Teaching Assistant</b><br><i>Department of Teaching and Leadership, School of Education,<br/>Syracuse University</i><br>Co-facilitated and coordinated EDU200 and EDU201   | Fall 2016 – Spring 2017 |
| <b>Graduate Research Assistant</b><br><i>Department of Teaching and Leadership, School of Education,<br/>Syracuse University</i><br>Completed data entry tasks supporting student placement,<br>evaluation, and record keeping<br>Assisted front office staff with administrative responsibilities | Fall 2015 – Spring 2016 |

## Refereed Conference Presentations

---

Sapon-Shevin, M., Morgan, C.A., Murphey, E.D., & Neddo, T. (April 2018). *Americans Who Tell the Truth—Bridging critical pedagogy from university to schools*. Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, New York, NY.

## Grants, Sponsorships, and Awards

---

<b>Teacher Training Sponsorship from Fort Collins Montessori School</b>	2022-2024
<i>6-12 AMI Elementary Diploma Course, The Montessori Institute, Denver, CO</i>	
<b>Graduate Student Organization Travel Grant</b>	2018
<i>Syracuse University, Graduate Student Organization, Syracuse, NY</i>	
<b>Graduate Assistantship</b>	Fall 2015-
<i>Syracuse University School of Education</i>	Spring 2017

## Research Experience

---

<b>Qualitative Research Apprenticeship</b>	Spring 2017
<i>Physiological Responses of Teacher Candidates in Clinical Simulations with Dr. Benjamin Dotger</i>	

## Elementary Teaching Experience

---

<b>Upper Elementary Lead Guide</b>	Fall 2022
<i>Fort Collins Montessori School, Poudre School District</i>	
<b>Second Grade Teacher</b>	Fall 2006 – Spring 2013
<i>Painted Sky Elementary School, Albuquerque Public Schools</i>	
Planned, taught, and assessed second grade students using a variety of teaching methods and resources	
Integrated lessons across content areas, differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students, encouraged parent involvement	
Created a safe, productive, and creative environment conducive to learning and respectful of diversity	
<b>Student Teacher</b>	Spring 2006
<i>Chamisa Elementary School, Albuquerque Public Schools</i>	
Student taught in Doreen Garcia's second grade classroom	



## Teaching Credentials

---

<b>Colorado Teaching License</b> <i>Master Certificate</i> Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education (K-12) Elementary Education (K-6) Visual Arts (K-12)	2018 – 2022
<b>New Mexico Teaching License</b> <i>Level Three-A Instructional Leader K-8 Elementary License</i> Visual Arts Endorsement Reading Endorsement	2006 – 2022
<b>National Board Certification</b> <i>Early Childhood Generalist</i>	2011 – 2021

## Professional Accomplishments

---

<b>Painted Sky Elementary School Certificate of Excellence</b> <i>Outstanding performance and lasting contribution on PSES Math Goal Team</i>	2010
<b>Painted Sky Elementary School Certificate of Excellence</b> <i>Outstanding performance and lasting contribution on PSES Instructional Council</i>	2009
<b>Painted Sky Elementary School Certificate of Excellence</b> <i>Outstanding performance and lasting contribution on PSES Math Goal Team</i>	2009
<b>Dossier Completion – Albuquerque Public Schools</b>	2010
<b>Golden Key National Honor Society</b>	

## Professional Leadership

---

<b>Second Grade Head Teacher</b> <i>Painted Sky Elementary</i>	2010 – 2012
<b>Math Goal Team Leader</b> <i>Painted Sky Elementary</i>	2008 – 2010
<b>Instructional Council Co-Facilitator</b> <i>Painted Sky Elementary</i>	2008 – 2010
<b>Albuquerque Public Schools Professional Development Facilitator</b> <i>How Aspects of Number Relate to Student Learning</i>	October 2009

<b>Albuquerque Public Schools Professional Development Facilitator</b> <i>Professional Learning Communities</i>	October 2009
<b>Albuquerque Public Schools Curriculum Map Co-Creator</b> <i>Worked in a group of three teachers over a two-week time to create district utilized second and third grade mathematics curriculum maps.</i>	Summer 2008

## Professional Development

---

<b>TESOL Summer Institute</b> <i>3 courses at The University of New Mexico and a co-teaching practicum</i>	Summer 2012
<b>Promethean Training</b> <i>24 contact hours</i>	2012
<b>Wilson Foundations Workshop</b> <i>21 contact hours</i>	2010 – 2011
<b>EPSS Planning Session 1: HYIS and PDSA</b> <i>7 contact hours</i>	2008
<b>Everyday Mathematics Summer Institute</b> <i>24 contact hours</i>	2008
<b>Building Computational Fluency, K-5 Workshop</b> <i>30 contact hours</i>	2008
<b>District Certification in the Teaching of Limited English Proficient Students</b> <i>48 contact hours</i>	2007 – 2008
<b>Exploring Linear Functions in the K-8 Curriculum</b> <i>16 contact hours</i>	2007
<b>New Teacher TREK</b> <i>16 contact hours</i>	2006

## Professional and Community Service

---

<b>Vindeket Foods Volunteer</b> <i>Unloaded and inventoried pallets of rescued food for community distribution</i>	2020 – 2022
<b>Fort Collins Montessori School Parent Volunteer Committee Treasurer</b> <i>Attended monthly meeting and completed treasurer duties</i>	2019 – 2022
<b>Fort Collins Montessori School Parent Volunteer Committee Member</b>	2017 – 2018

*Attended monthly meeting and volunteered to support Fort Collins  
Montessori School teachers and staff*

**Fort Collins Montessori School Upper Elementary Classroom Volunteer**  
*Co-taught art lessons*

2019

## Professional Affiliations

---

- *American Educational Research Association (AERA)*
- *Association Montessori Internationale (AMI)*
- *AMI – Elementary Alumni Association (AMI-EAA)*

## References

---

**Benjamin Dotger, Ph.D.**

*E-mail: bdotger@syr.edu*

*Tel: 315-443-1937*

*Professor, Chair of the Department of Teaching and Leadership*

*School of Education, Syracuse University*

**Mara Sapon-Shevin, Ph.D.**

*E-mail: msaponsh@syr.edu*

*Tel: 315-443-5088*

*Professor, Teaching and Leadership Department*

*School of Education, Syracuse University*

**George Theoharis, Ph.D.**

*E-mail: gtheohar@syr.edu*

*Tel: 315-443-9080*

*Professor, Teaching and Leadership Department*

*School of Education, Syracuse University*