

This article was downloaded by: [Bar-Ilan University]

On: 20 June 2015, At: 23:37

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



The Journal of Educational Research

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/vjer20>

Exclusion as a Way of Promoting Student Responsibility: Does the Kind of Misbehavior Matter?

Shlomo Romi^a, Ramon (Rom) Lewis^b & Merav Salkovsky^c

^a Bar-Ilan University, Israel

^b La Trobe University, Australia

^c Kibbutzim College, Israel

Published online: 31 Dec 2014.



[Click for updates](#)

To cite this article: Shlomo Romi, Ramon (Rom) Lewis & Merav Salkovsky (2014): Exclusion as a Way of Promoting Student Responsibility: Does the Kind of Misbehavior Matter?, The Journal of Educational Research, DOI:

[10.1080/00220671.2014.886177](https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2014.886177)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2014.886177>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Exclusion as a Way of Promoting Student Responsibility: Does the Kind of Misbehavior Matter?

SHLOMO ROMI
Bar-Ilan University, Israel

MERAV SALKOVSKY
Kibbutzim College, Israel

RAMON (ROM) LEWIS
La Trobe University, Australia

ABSTRACT. Three types of student misbehavior, varying in severity, were measured in self-report surveys completed by excluded students: distracting others, resisting teachers' attempts to ensure engagement with work, and aggressive behavior. Results show that excluded students exhibiting less severe misbehavior are more amenable to the logic of teacher explanations whereas students whose misbehavior is more severe appear to respond better to recognition of appropriate behavior before exclusion and follow-up discussions. The results indicate that teachers should be aware of the differential impact of classroom management techniques on students exhibiting different types of misbehavior.

Keywords: classroom management, discipline, excluded student, student responsibility, teacher–student relationships

Excluding students from class could be the first step in a process of repeated and prolonged isolation and suspension, which can end in the student being expelled or dropping out of school altogether (McIntosh, Flannery, Sugai, Braun, & Cochrane, 2008). The term *school-to-prison pipeline* (Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention [OJJDP], 2007; Wald & Losen, 2003) describes school failure, dropout, and involvement with the juvenile justice cycle as a result of being out of class too much of the time. This school-to-prison pipeline is a trajectory that may accelerate exponentially and begin with the first time students get into trouble at school, followed by being labeled a troublemaker and potentially dangerous, referred to the office, expelled to disciplinary alternative schools, and sent to prison (OJJDP, 2007; Pane, 2010).

Exclusion could be a junction where some students become motivated to assume more responsibility for their misbehavior while for others the road opens to alienation, resulting in students' disengagement and ultimate removal from schooling (Skiba, Peterson, & Williams, 1997;

Sprague & Walker, 2000). Thus, it is imperative to examine what classroom management techniques are most productive for teachers who desire to send students out of class, if the aim of exclusion is to help students become more responsible (Lewis, Romi, & Roache, 2012).

Classroom management is not related only to teaching and learning effectiveness—it is significant for students' social and psychological development. Teachers' choice of classroom management techniques affects students' concentration, attitudes toward schoolwork and their teachers, and the development of their pro-social values (Lewis, Romi, Katz, & Qui, 2008). Teachers who give their students appropriate autonomy help them attain more mature behavior, thus supporting the development of independent thinking and responsibility (Psunder, 2005). Research literature has addressed student responsibility and classroom management, but only little attention has been given to examining which management techniques promote student responsibility in classrooms (Elias & Schwab, 2006; Lewis, 2001; Lewis et al., 2012; Psunder, 2005; Romi, Lewis, & Katz, 2009). In the present study we aimed to identify which of the techniques teachers implemented prior to and after an exclusion promote responsibility, and whether the type of misbehavior that prompted the exclusion affects the degree to which students accept responsibility for the exclusion. In doing so it extends an investigation with a similar focus reported in 2012 (Lewis et al., 2012).

The view held here is that excluding students from the classroom is not a narrow disciplinary method, but one of the many classroom management techniques available to teachers. While the literature often employs the terms

Address correspondence to Shlomo Romi, Head, School of Education, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan 52900, Israel. (E-mail: Shlomo.Romi@biu.ac.il)

classroom management, behavior management, and discipline interchangeably, in the present study we use the umbrella term *classroom management* to include teacher strategies that manage student behavior, interaction, and learning (Martin & Sass, 2010). According to Pianta (2006), classroom management is a complex social, psychological, and emotional process, involving interactions and relationships between teachers and students. Successful classroom management requires more than actions taken to create and maintain a learning environment conducive to successful instruction. It also includes establishing and working within personal relationships with students, especially those students whose special needs or personal characteristics prevent them from complying with general instructions to the class (Brophy, 2006). Burden (2003) referred to a positive dimension of classroom management, particularly in regards to student–teacher relationships, and maintained that classroom management should encourage “positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation” (p. 3).

Exclusion from classroom is usually one of teachers’ last resorts, and generally occurs when the student’s misbehavior is salient or sustained enough to disrupt learning (Brophy, 2006). In Pianta’s (2006) view of classroom management in the context of relationship systems, excluding students from the classroom is a critical element in student–teacher relationships. Moreover, any examination of the impact of exclusion must consider the tension between the degree of teacher control and that of student autonomy and responsibility.

Interpersonal Influence in a Classroom

Some investigators (e.g., Pane, 2010; Vavrus & Cole, 2002; Winograd, 2002) have suggested that discipline be viewed as a social practice and a negotiation process, thus examining the “sociocultural factors that influence a teacher’s decision to remove a student from the classroom” (Vavrus & Cole, 2002, p. 87). While teacher–student relations are characterized by negotiation, teachers have greater power than students. Foucault (1978) saw power as dynamic and relational, with power and resistance being inextricably linked. Using different types of power influences the way change occurs, the permanence of such change and the ways in which power is established and maintained (Raven, 2008).

Exclusion From the Classroom as Discipline Technique

Excluding a student from the classroom may be a powerful tool for reinforcing discipline and obedience. Disruptive students can be excluded so that the isolation gives them time to reflect, realize the errors of their ways, and re-encounter a similar situation with a change of behavior and attitude. Exclusion ranges from time-outs in the

classroom to office referrals, suspension, and expulsion from school (Lewis et al., 2012; Pane, 2010).

In an earlier publication focusing on the perceptions of students excluded from class Lewis et al. (2012) argued that the exclusion can serve the class, the student, and the teacher in that it removes a distraction from the class, thus protecting the learning of the other students. It may provide the teacher with the support of more senior staff, or simply provide the teacher with immediate relief. For the student, exclusion demonstrates the seriousness with which his or her misbehavior is regarded. However, it is a fine line that separates exclusion as legitimate classroom management from exclusion as a tool of social marginalization.

Research suggests that in general timeout successfully reduces a variety of student behavior problems, including noncompliance (Handen, Parrish, McClung, Kerwin, & Evans, 1992; Roberts, 1982), aggression (Jones, Sloane, & Roberts, 1992), and disruption and tantrums (Brantner & Doherty, 1983). However, it is yet to be determined whether exclusion will work equally successfully in all cases or whether the effectiveness of exclusion is related to the type of behavior that prompted it.

As mentioned previously, Lewis et al. (2012) reported students’ perception of what teachers to do prior to and after excluding a student. They note that teacher explanation, use of prior punishment, follow-up discussion, and the nature of that discussion, contributed to students accepting responsibility for being excluded, rather than blaming teachers. However, not all exclusions are prompted by the same type of misbehavior, and misbehavior varies in severity (e.g., not doing the work vs. hurting classmates). To extend the analysis conducted by Lewis et al. (2012), we used surveys completed by excluded students to measure different types of misbehavior, which can be seen as varying in severity, and examines whether the type of misbehavior matters in predicting students’ acknowledgement that they are responsible for their exclusion.

The Purpose of the Study

In the present study we aimed to examine the types of misbehavior for which student exclusion instills responsibility in students and the boundaries of its effectiveness. Specifically, it we aimed to identify which teacher techniques implemented prior to and after the exclusion promote responsibility (e.g., providing an explanation for the exclusion, telling the student that he or she must obey the teacher during the follow-up discussion), and whether the type of misbehavior influences their effectiveness.

Method

Sample

The study was conducted in five secondary schools (Grades 7–10) in the Melton network of the Western

Region of Melbourne, Australia, between June and September 2011. It followed an earlier study conducted in schools in Victoria, employing a similar but shorter survey, reported in 2012 (Lewis et al., 2012). The agreement of schools in the present study to provide deidentified data from excluded students was provided by school councils comprising principals, parents, teachers, and employees of the Education Department. These councils are empowered to make a limited range of decisions on behalf of the school community. Students were free to refuse to complete forms and in total, 18 (3%) of the 575 deidentified questionnaires provided were blank or unusable. Of the 18 unusable questionnaires, 14 came from one school (representing 8% of their responses), and four were from a second, smaller school, representing 10% of their contribution to the study. There were no apparent differences between these schools and the other three.

In most cases, the students answered the questionnaires during the period of exclusion and were given the questionnaire either in a time-out space or room or a senior teacher's room. In some schools, students collected a questionnaire from the school's reception office. The administration staff then sent the student to a class at least 2 years above or below their own, where they sat quietly in the back until the end of the period. When teachers were present, or if questionnaires were returned unanswered and students required assistance, they were helped to understand what was being asked of them.

At the time of the study, one of the authors (Ramon Lewis) was involved in professional development in the schools to improve relationships between students and teachers. The aim was to have teachers modify their classroom management practices to be more consistent with those of the Developmental Management Approach (DMA; Lewis, 2009). Participating school returned between 34 and 199 forms ($Mdn = 113$). Girls from the five schools completed only 10%, 15%, 27%, 33%, and 35% of exclusion forms, respectively, whereas boys accounted for 62%–87% overall, depending on grade level. Exclusion was most common in Grades 9, 8, and 7 (31%, 30%, and 23%, respectively), with the remainder (12%) from 10th-grade students. In three schools most forms were completed by ninth-grade students, whereas in the other two schools the majority came from seventh- or eighth-grade students.

Significantly, the unit of analysis in this study is the exclusion questionnaire, not the individual student excluded. A number of students were excluded more than once from class and the majority at least twice in the research period. Restricting sampling to one questionnaire per student would have distorted the data—not all teachers who exclude a particular student treat that student in the same manner, and their manner may vary on different occasions. Because this exploratory study aimed at capturing all exclusions by all teachers, we decided to consider all exclusions as units of data representing this aspect of school culture. It would have been of value to include

teachers' perceptions of their classroom management behavior, to complement the perceptions of the students, but this would be beyond the scope of this study, and will remain for future research. As we discuss in more detail later (see Limitations section), the focus of this study was the impact of perceived teacher behavior and students' views about the causes of such behavior. Only students could provide such data.

Instruments

The survey completed by excluded students comprised four sections containing a total of 41 closed questions. The first section contained 25 items, each giving a possible reason for the exclusion. Some items were designed to focus on the impact of the student's behavior on the safety of others (e.g., "I hurt other students' feelings"), their concentration ("I distracted other students from their work"), the teacher ("I argued with the teacher"), and passivity ("I did not have equipment for class"). The items were rated on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*).

The next section referred to the number of punishments received prior to the exclusion, whether the teacher explained the punishment, and whether (and how often) the teacher had acknowledged appropriate behavior prior to the exclusion. In the third section students were asked whether they had been asked to leave a classroom on an earlier occasion.

Finally, in the fourth section students were asked whether there had been a follow-up discussion after a prior exclusion, and if so, what its nature was. In this section, some items focused on teachers emphasizing the impact of the student's behavior on others (e.g., "tried to explain that you were stopping other kids from learning") whereas others explored a different path ("just told you off"). For these questions the response format was dichotomous (yes or no).

Because most questionnaires were completed shortly after students were sent out, it is likely that at least some students were still emotional when completing it, and their answers might have been different had they been given time to calm down. Nevertheless, the data present a valid assessment of the feelings and beliefs of the student at the time, and as such provide an insight into the significance of being sent out of class.

Procedure

The data were collected as a part of the DMA to classroom management (Lewis, 2009). DMA is an extensive professional development (PD) program that includes 4 days of instruction on classroom management to train the trainers. The DMA identifies a number of principles of management and some relevant skills (Lewis, 2011). The principles most relevant to this study highlight students'

rights and responsibilities and the need for teachers to stress these, in an adult manner, as a way of encouraging students to take responsibility for the negative impact their behavior has on other students' safety or learning.

To gather information on the frequency with which these techniques were being utilized in the schools participating in the PD, a survey was designed to provide data on students' perceptions of teachers' use of such techniques. As explained previously, the survey, conducted before the PD began, also provided reasons for the exclusion to determine to what extent students were likely to accept responsibility if teachers were using more of the recommended techniques described subsequently.

Results

Management Techniques Used by Teachers When Sending Students out of Class

The management techniques considered were those consistent with the DMA (Lewis, 2009) techniques, and included recognizing some appropriate behavior prior to exclusion, explaining (based on the learning and safety needs of other students), a series of up to three prior consequences, and a one-on-one follow-up discussion, focusing on the impact of the student's behavior on the classmates.

Table 1 reports the data related to explaining and to the employment of in-class punishments and recognition prior to exclusion. To allow comparison with data reported in our previous study, the results of that study are included in the last column of Table 1.

A little over one third of the students reported an explanation at the time of exclusion (35%) and almost a third (29%) registered the use of prior punishments. Approximately half of these students identified one prior punishment and nearly all (90%) noted 1–3. Although these figures are similar to those from our previous research

(Lewis et al., 2012), in the present study students reported fewer explanations and fewer prior punishments. Only 10% of respondents had their appropriate behavior recognized, and of these, 77% noted that it happened infrequently.

Follow-Up Discussion

The remaining questions focused on whether the teacher conducted a follow-up discussion after previous exclusions. Of the 287 students who had previous exclusions (55% of the sample), 86 (34%) reported that they had a follow-up discussion with the teacher. This was a lower rate than the 46% reported in our previous study.

Table 2 reports (in order of agreement) the percentage of students who indicated that their teacher addressed each of the eight elements listed during the follow up discussion. Once again any equivalent data reported in our previous study are included.

The most common themes characterizing discussions were acknowledgement of wrong (Item 1) or unacceptable (3) behavior, and the need for students to do what they are told (2, 4). The least cited themes referred to the behavior's impact on the learning (7) or comfort (8) of the other students. Inspection of the data reported in Table 2 shows that the students from the previous study reported that teachers addressed each focus point of the follow-up talk more frequently than they did in the present investigation. However the relative ranking of themes is very similar.

Students' responsibility. After we had gathered all the data, we conducted a factor analysis of students' support for alternative explanations for being excluded, to determine whether there are underlying factors that could account for the patterns of students' responses. A principal component analysis, with oblique (Oblimin) rotation was used, as any

TABLE 1 Teacher Classroom Management Behavior (n = 557)

Teacher behavior	Present study	Lewis et al. (2012)
Teacher explained the reason for exclusion (% yes)	35%	42%
Positive recognition prior to exclusion (% yes)	10%	
How many		
Many	7%	
Some	14%	
A few	47%	
Hardly any	30%	
Punishments prior to being told to leave	19%	29%
Number of punishments received		
1	54%	47%
2	24%	30%
3	11%	18%
4	5%	1%
>4	6%	4%

TABLE 2. Teacher Behavior During the Follow-Up Discussion (n = 86)

Teacher behavior	Yes	
	Present study	Lewis et al. (2012)
1 Attempt to help student see that he/she had done the wrong thing	56%	83%
2 Just told the student off	51%	63%
3 Attempt to help student to understand his unacceptable behavior	45%	68%
4 Student must obey the teacher	47%	—
5 Attempt to help student to work out a better behavior	40%	65%
6 Student must obey the rules	40%	—
7 Attempt to explain that student's behavior stopped other students from learning	29%	53%
8 Attempt to explain that student's behavior made other kids uncomfortable	15%	18%

dimensions were assumed related. For the purposes of this analysis responses were coded on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). The Scree test (Cattell, 1966) indicated that a four-factor solution explaining 56% of variance was optimal. Our previous study yielded only two factors, but that analysis was based on 11 items, not the 25 in the present questionnaire. Table 3 reports the questionnaire items and their loadings on each of the four factors.

Based on the four-factor solution (Table 3), four scales were developed: (1) Items 14, 22, 19, 18, 8, and 23; (2) Items 12, 7, 9, 25, and 3; (3) Items 16, 20, 15, 17, 21, 4, 24, and 11; and (4) Items 10, 2, 5, 13, 6, and 1. Responses to items comprising respective scales were tested for internal consistency, using a Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Five items (23, 3, 11, 6, and 1) were removed as their removal increased the reliability of their respective scale, and four scales were constructed.

The five items comprising the first scale were those that loaded on Factor 1. This scale is a little complex to interpret. Two items refer to avoiding work ("I didn't do enough work," "I did other stuff instead of the work"), causing one to wonder why a teacher would exclude a student for passivity. However, other items in the scale such as "I didn't do what the teacher says," "I ignored the teacher's instructions," and "I wouldn't do any work" suggest that the student was engaging in a power play with the teacher. Consequently this scale was called resisted teacher. The scale mean, standard deviation, and Cronbach's alpha are 9.25, 3.70, and .85, respectively.

The second scale (based on Factor 2) contains five items referring to the teacher's dislike of the student ("The teacher hates me," "the teacher doesn't like me") and unfair treatment ("the teacher always blames me"; "I'm not the only one, the teacher just picks on me"). This scale, called teacher's fault, indicates a lack of acknowledgement of misbehavior. Its mean, standard deviation, and Cronbach's alpha are 10.52, 3.76, and .87, respectively.

Inspection of the seven items comprising the scale based on Factor 3 shows that four involved potentially harmful

behaviors ("I hurt other student's feelings," "I fought with other kids," "I pretended to fight with other kids," "I made other people feel unsafe"). The other three referred either to damaging property ("I broke stuff"; "I made marks on desks, tables or walls") or stealing ("I took things belonging to other kids"). This scale was called aggressive behavior. It has a mean of 9.10, a standard deviation of 3.01, and a Cronbach's alpha of .86.

The fourth and final scale (based on Factor 4) refers to distracting other students ("I distracted other students from their work," "I made it hard for other kids to do their work") and defying the teacher while doing so ("I called out when the teacher didn't want me to," "I talked to other kids when the teacher didn't want me to"). In general, the scale seemed to focus on distracting others and therefore was given this name. It has a mean, standard deviation, and Cronbach's alpha of 7.20, 2.84, and .79, respectively.

Consideration of the scales' average item means indicates that the most common reason for exclusion was that it was the teacher's fault, and reflected the teacher's unfairness. This scale had an average item mean of 2.64, which indicates a belief that is about halfway between a neutral position and agreement. The next most commonly selected explanations for exclusion relate to teachers' responses to students' resistance to their instructions, with an average item mean of 1.85, and the distraction of other students, averaging 1.80. Both of these reasons, however, are on average not acceptable to the excluded students. The final reason, aggressive behavior toward other students, has an average item mean item score of 1.30, indicating even more rejection.

When comparing the present answers to those of our previous study (Lewis et al., 2012), we found the same level of relative support for these kinds of explanations, with a little more resistance to teacher and less willingness to acknowledge distraction of other students in the present data.

Three of the four scales also revealed what may be interpreted as behavior patterns increasing in level of severity.

TABLE 3. Pattern Solution for Exclusion Reasons

Perceived reason for exclusion		Factor loading			
		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
14	I wouldn't do any work	.790	.037	.126	-.060
22	I did other stuff instead of the work	.785	.004	.043	.012
19	I didn't do enough work	.767	-.033	.040	.033
18	I didn't do what the teachers says	.708	.001	-.040	.115
8	I ignored the teacher's instructions	.611	-.081	-.106	.223
23	I moved around when the teacher doesn't want me to	.452	.038	.085	.234
12	The teacher hates me	-.040	.869	.025	.044
7	The teacher doesn't like me	-.081	.857	.042	.055
9	I'm not the only one, the teacher just picks on me	-.025	.838	.021	-.018
25	The teacher always blames me	.193	.740	-.109	-.042
3	I didn't really do anything, the teacher is unfair	-.064	.630	-.055	-.029
16	I hurt other student's feelings	-.016	-.019	.825	.017
20	I fought with other kids	-.057	-.066	.814	.033
15	I pretended to fight with other kids	.036	-.002	.785	-.114
17	I broke stuff	.052	.084	.763	.026
21	I made marks on desks, tables or walls	.122	.104	.708	.035
4	I made other people unsafe	-.195	-.159	.670	.155
24	I took things belonging to other kids	.228	.017	.512	.063
11	I arrived late to class	.263	-.022	.326	-.064
10	I called out when the teacher doesn't want me to	.035	-.052	-.083	.813
2	I distracted other students from their work	.101	-.160	-.001	.713
5	I talked to other kids when the teacher didn't want me to	.193	-.022	-.037	.642
13	I made it hard for other kids to do their work	.224	-.181	.203	.518
6	I argued with the teacher	.040	.239	.113	.445
1	I did not have equipment for class	-.054	.173	.128	.379

Distracting others may be argued to be the least severe form of misbehavior, followed by resisting the teacher and, finally, aggressive behavior. Therefore, in the data presentation that follows, reference will be made to levels of misbehavior.

With the exception of the teacher's fault scale, the scales have a negative skew and relatively low average item means. Students, on average, disagree with three of the four explanations, showing support for only the teacher's fault scale. Nevertheless, the scales display reasonable variance and have good reliability. The relationships among scales were examined by conducting correlations between them, and using Fisher's Z tests for comparisons of correlations).

The results of this analysis show significant relationships ($p < .001$) between all three types of misbehavior. Student acknowledgement of aggression correlated 0.39 with both distracting others and with resisting teachers, whereas these latter two correlated at 0.63, which was significantly higher ($Z = 5.49, p < .001$).

We conducted t tests for each scale to examine whether there is support for the assumption that students with prior exclusions report greater awareness of their misbehavior than those excluded for the first time. No statistically

significant differences ($p < .05$) were found between students with prior exclusions and first timers for scores on resisting teacher, $t(479) = 1.86, p = .051$; distracting others, $t(491) = 1.3, p = .126$; aggression, $t(491) = 1.26, p = .206$; and teacher's fault, $t(479) = 1.69, p = .092$.

To examine the effectiveness of various teacher classroom management behaviors, the four scales were next used as dependent variables in t -test analyses, which used student perception of a number of teacher behaviors as independent variables. The teacher behaviors included giving an explanation, use of prior punishments, and recognitions for the present exclusion and providing a follow-up talk after earlier exclusions. The results of these independent t tests are reported in Table 4, which records numbers in groups, means, standard errors, t values, probability estimates, and effect size estimates (Cohen's d) in parentheses for significant findings.

The findings reported in Table 4 reveal that an explanation is associated with a greater likelihood of acknowledging attention-seeking behavior, $t(513) = 2.01, p = .045, d = .18$, and lesser likelihood of blaming teachers, $t(499) = 3.01, p = .003, d = .27$. In addition, receiving approval for good behavior prior to being excluded for misbehaving is associated with a greater likelihood of acknowledging

TABLE 4. Relationship Between Teachers' Excluding Techniques and Students' Perceptions of the Reasons for Their Exclusion

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	Prob. (Cohen's <i>d</i>)
Perceived explanation for exclusion						
Teacher's fault	Yes	175	2.47	0.98	3.010	.003 (.27)
	No	326	2.73	0.92		
Distracted others	Yes	179	1.89	0.73	2.009	.045 (.18)
	No	336	1.76	0.72		
Resisted teacher	Yes	179	1.90	0.70	1.073	.284
	No	331	1.83	0.77		
Aggressive behavior	Yes	180	1.34	0.49	1.408	.160
	No	335	1.28	0.41		
Received positives recognition before exclusion						
Teacher's fault	Yes	50	2.54	0.93	-0.817	.414
	No	452	2.65	0.95		
Distracted others	Yes	48	1.92	0.74	1.250	.212
	No	466	1.79	0.71		
Resisted teacher	Yes	49	2.05	0.76	1.940	.053
	No	461	1.83	0.74		
Aggressive behavior	Yes	48	1.47	0.59	2.840	.005 (.25)
	No	467	1.29	0.41		
Received punishment before exclusion						
Teacher's fault	Yes	94	2.71	0.94	0.841	.401
	No	411	2.62	0.96		
Distracted others	Yes	99	2.15	0.73	5.423	.000 (.49)
	No	420	1.73	0.69		
Resisted teacher	Yes	94	2.19	0.75	4.852	.000 (.43)
	No	419	1.78	0.73		
Aggressive behavior	Yes	95	1.36	0.40	1.371	.171
	No	424	1.29	0.44		

revenge-seeking behavior, $t(513) = 2.84, p = .005, d = .25$. In general the magnitude of the respective Cohen's *d* measures indicate small effect sizes. To test for the impact of the number of prior recognitions on acknowledging causation, a multivariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted where the four reasons for being excluded were the dependent variables and the number of prior recognitions (on a 3-point Likert-type scale including 1 (*hardly any*), 2 (*a few*), and 3 (*at least some*)) was the independent variable. By collapsing this variable into three categories it was possible to ensure at least 11 cases (questionnaires) per grouping. The multivariate $F(8,108)$ value of 1.05 was not significant ($p = .402$), indicating that the number of recognitions prior to exclusion did not have any significant effect. A similar multivariate ANOVA was conducted, using the same four dependent variables and the number of punishments on a 3-point scale (1, 2, more than 2) as the independent variable. By collapsing punishment into three categories it was possible to ensure at least 42 cases (questionnaires) per grouping. In this case the result was statistically significant, $F(8, 302) = 2.24, p = .024$. Inspection of the univariate F values indicated that the frequency with which students were punished prior to exclusion was

associated with a greater likelihood of acknowledging attention-seeking behavior, $F(2, 156) = 5.90, p = .003$, and passive work avoidance behavior, $F(2, 156) = 6.05, p = .003$. Scheffé post hoc comparisons were inspected to determine differences associated with the number of punishments provided (due to uneven sample sizes). The results show that students who received one punishment before being sent out were significantly ($p < .05$) less likely to acknowledge that they had distracted other students or resisted working than were those who had received three or more punishments.

Having established the degree of effectiveness of teachers' behaviors that occurred prior to or during the exclusion, the analysis now addressed the follow-up discussion between the teacher and the excluded student. As indicated previously, 34% of the students who had been previously excluded reported a follow-up discussion. The t -test analyses were conducted to determine whether the presence or absence of particular foci during the discussion related to the likelihood of students acknowledging resisting work, distracting others, and being aggressive, or whether they would hold the teacher responsible (see Table 5).

TABLE 5. Relationship Between Aspects of Teachers' Prior Follow-Up Discussions and Students' Perceptions of Reasons for Their Present Exclusion

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	Prob. (Cohen's <i>d</i>)
Tried to help you to understand why your behavior was unacceptable	Teacher's fault	Yes 57	2.26	0.94	2.106	.038 (.19)
		No 24	2.72	0.76		
Distracted others	Yes 60	1.98	0.80	0.544	.588	
	No 24	1.88	0.59			
Resisted teacher	Yes 60	1.96	0.75	0.150	.881	
	No 23	1.93	0.75			
Aggressive behavior	Yes 59	1.34	0.44	-0.140	.889	
	No 24	1.36	0.62			
Tried to explain that you were stopping other kids from learning	Teacher's fault	Yes 36	2.13	0.89	-2.645	.010 (.24)
		No 44	2.64	0.84		
Distracted others	Yes 37	2.16	0.89	2.106	.040 (.19)	
	No 46	1.81	0.55			
Resisted teacher	Yes 37	2.09	0.79	1.537	.128	
	No 45	1.84	0.69			
Aggressive behavior	Yes 37	1.42	0.47	1.082	.282	
	No 45	1.30	0.52			
Tried to explain that you were making other kids feel uncomfortable	Teacher's fault	Yes 21	2.26	0.83	-0.910	.365
		No 59	2.47	0.92		
Distracted others	Yes 22	2.27	0.84	2.323	.023 (.21)	
	No 61	1.86	0.67			
Resisted teacher	Yes 22	2.15	0.86	1.379	.172	
	No 60	1.89	0.69			
Aggressive behavior	Yes 21	1.59	0.56	2.617	.011 (.23)	
	No 61	1.27	0.45			
Tried to help you see that you had done the wrong thing	Teacher's fault	Yes 65	2.25	0.85	-3.590	.001 (.32)
		No 15	3.12	0.77		
Distracted others	Yes 67	1.96	0.75	-0.292	.771	
	No 16	2.02	0.73			
Resisted teacher	Yes 67	1.97	0.76	0.220	.827	
	No 15	1.92	0.69			
Aggressive behavior	Yes 67	1.38	0.50	0.928	.356	
	No 15	1.25	0.46			
Tried to get you to work out a better way to behave	Teacher's fault	Yes 52	2.23	0.84	-2.520	.014 (.23)
		No 28	2.75	0.92		
Distracted others	Yes 53	2.09	0.80	2.360	.021 (.21)	
	No 30	1.74	0.55			
Resisted teacher	Yes 53	2.11	0.78	2.623	.010 (.24)	
	No 29	1.67	0.59			
Aggressive behavior	Yes 52	1.43	0.55	2.149	.035 (.19)	
	No 30	1.22	0.35			
Just told you off	Teacher's fault	Yes 41	2.68	0.96	2.942	.004 (.26)
		No 38	2.11	0.74		
Distracted others	Yes 43	1.96	0.80	-0.249	.804	
	No 39	2.00	0.69			
Resisted teacher	Yes 42	1.87	0.76	-1.307	.195	
	No 39	2.08	0.72			
Aggressive behavior	Yes 43	1.31	0.49	-1.040	.301	
	No 38	1.42	0.51			
Tried to tell you that you must obey the rules	Teacher's fault	Yes 49	2.33	0.88	-0.985	.327
		No 31	2.54	0.92		

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 5. Relationship Between Aspects of Teachers' Prior Follow-Up Discussions and Students' Perceptions of Reasons for Their Present Exclusion (Continued)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	Prob. (Cohen's <i>d</i>)
Distracted others	Yes	52	2.03	0.76	1.066	.289
	No	31	1.85	0.70		
Resisted teacher	Yes	52	2.01	0.69	0.844	.401
	No	30	1.87	0.84		
Aggressive behavior	Yes	51	1.36	0.47	0.138	.891
	No	31	1.35	0.54		
Tried to tell you that you must obey the teacher's instructions Teacher's fault	Yes	57	2.31	0.87	-1.577	.327
	No	23	2.66	0.93		
Distracted others	Yes	59	1.95	0.72	-0.340	.289
	No	24	2.01	0.79		
Resisted teacher	Yes	59	1.99	0.72	0.737	.401
	No	23	1.86	0.81		
Aggressive behavior	Yes	59	1.32	0.48	-0.973	.891
	No	23	1.44	0.53		

According to the results in Table 5, there are teacher actions that can help excluded students to be more likely to reject the notion that it is the teacher's fault and that he or she is discriminating against them because of dislike. Such actions include helping the student understand why the behavior was unacceptable, $t(79) = 2.11, p = .038, d = .19$; explaining that the behavior disrupted classmates' learning, $t(78) = 2.65, p = .010, d = .24$; explaining that the student had done the wrong thing, $t(78) = 3.59, p = .001, d = .32$; and trying to get the student to work out a better way to behave, $t(78) = 2.52, p = .014, d = .23$. Just telling off the student was not effective in helping students to take responsibility for their exclusion and significantly increased the likelihood that the students perceived that the exclusion was the teacher's fault, $t(77) = 2.94, p = .004, d = .26$.

Furthermore, excluded students were more likely to accept that their behavior distracts other students if the teacher had tried to explain that the behavior prevented classmates from learning, $t(81) = 2.11, p = .040, d = .19$, and made some students feel uncomfortable, $t(81) = 2.32, p = .023, d = .21$. The excluded students were also more accepting of distracting others, $t(81) = 2.36, p = .021, d = .21$; resisting teachers, $t(80) = 2.62, p = .010, d = .24$; and aggressive misbehavior, $t(80) = 2.15, p = .035, d = .19$, if the teacher tried to help them work out a better way to behave. Additionally, excluded students were more likely to accept that their behavior is aggressive toward others if the teacher tried to explain that the behavior made some students feel uncomfortable, $t(80) = 2.62, p = .010, d = .23$, and then tried to help the student work out a better way to behave, $t(80) = 2.15, p = .035, d = .19$.

Finally, excluded students were more likely to accept that *they resisted doing the work* if the teacher tried to get the student to work out a better way to behave, $t(80) = 2.62, p = .010, d = .24$. Telling students to obey rules and

the teacher had no significant impact ($p < .05$) on the likelihood of these students acknowledging that their behavior caused the exclusion.

Discussion

This study examined students' perceptions of teachers' behavior prior to and after excluding a student. The results reinforce those published previously (Lewis, 2001; Lewis et al., 2012), namely that teacher's explanations, use of prior punishment, follow-up discussion, and the nature of that discussion, appeared to contribute to the development of students accepting responsibility for being excluded, rather than perceiving the exclusion as the teacher's fault. However, the present results highlight the need to be aware of the differential impact of classroom management on students who distract others, resist teachers' attempts to ensure engagement with the work, or act aggressively.

The three types of misbehavior assessed in this study can be represented as reflecting more serious and antisocial forms of behavior. For example, although repeatedly distracting people appears to be relatively minor misbehavior, decades of research (Adler, 1927, 1930; Dreikurs, Grunwald, & Pepper, 1971) have established that when such behavior recurs, it may reflect the early stages of seeking peer acceptance and the development of feelings of low self-worth. This view has been convincingly promoted by LeFrancois (1997) and Lewis and McCann (2009). In contrast, students' power-seeking behavior, like resisting teachers' attempts to make them work, represents a more severe type of misbehavior and a more intense sense of doubt. Finally, revenge-seeking behavior, such as damage to fellow students or property, reflects severe self-doubt and is a more serious type of misbehavior.

A fourth motivation for misbehavior, a need to withdraw to prevent further displays of inadequacy (Dreikurs et al.,

1971), did not seem to be a stimulus for exclusion. It is possible that some behaviors, which had been categorized as resisting teachers' attempts to make students do the work, may have been motivated by the students' genuine feelings of inadequacy. However, as explained previously, they seem more closely associated with challenging the teacher's power. Unless some of the students in this study had teachers who were ultra-sensitive and over-reacted to their students' passivity, genuine student withdrawal from work is not a significant source of exclusion from class.

With Dreikurs et al.'s (1971) ideas in mind, it is of interest to note that they perceived misbehavior of all types as stemming from low self-concept combined with a need for recognition. It may be argued that a need for power and a need for recognition are more closely associated than either of these needs and the more confronting, need for revenge. Therefore, although Dreikurs et al. postulated that students move from attention seeking to power seeking, then to revenge seeking, the gap between the latter two may be greater than that between the former two.

The Impact of Teachers' Exclusionary Behavior

Teachers' explanations appeared to have had a positive influence all students, making them less likely to see the exclusion as the teacher's fault and blame the teacher, so that the use of rational explanation or informational power (Raven, 2008) can dissuade students from believing that teachers exclude them because of dislike. However, explanations that indicate that it is the students' behavior that caused the exclusion are accepted only by students whose misbehavior was of a low level (e.g., distraction of others). Perhaps the tone and delivery of the explanation plays a role here—if the explanation is proportionate to the seriousness of the behavior, a more severe act may elicit an explanation that could be perceived as belligerent. In such cases, students may not be affected positively, because the discussion would reflect less relationship or referent power and more legitimate power.

The argument that students who engage in more serious forms of misbehavior may be less likely to listen to the teacher's reasoning also appears to apply to the impact of punishments prior to exclusion and a follow-up discussion after exclusion. Both of these techniques positively influence students' displays of lower levels of misbehavior to accept responsibility for the exclusion, but have no significant impact on students who had tried to hurt others emotionally or physically. Once again it may be argued that attempts to discuss the exclusion and to use logic to convince the student to accept responsibility fail to affect students who feel most emotionally distanced from teachers (Dreikurs et al., 1971; Lewis & McCann, 2009), and even punishments have no positive effect on students who feel rejected by their teachers.

In contrast, and as reported previously, teachers' recognition of a student's appropriate behavior prior to

exclusion motivates those students who engage in more serious forms of misbehavior to acknowledge wrongdoing. It may therefore be argued that the more serious the misbehavior and the more severe the self-doubt, the more benefit there is to providing reward power—recognition when the student has done the right thing. Unfortunately, even though reward power (Raven, 2008) is more important to those students who feel most deprived of recognition and acceptance, research shows that students who misbehave receive far less reward than those who learn and behave well (Beaman & Wheldall, 2000).

In conclusion, students exhibiting less severe types of misbehavior respond more productively to one type of management process (informational power), whereas those who engage in more severe types of misbehavior are more likely to acknowledge their wrongdoing if their relationship with the teacher is strengthened through the use of reward power. Consequently, it appears that the most effective management response may be dependent on the type of misbehavior—one student may need positive reinforcement before being excluded from the class, while another needs an explanation of what he or she has done wrong.

This finding of differential needs also appears to be apparent in understanding the relative success of the follow-up discussion. In general, teachers who simply tell students off and employ legitimate power, motivate students to relinquish responsibility and blame the teacher for the exclusion. In contrast, those teachers who attempt to have students understand the negative impact of their behavior on others and try to engage them in identifying a better way to behave receive less blame for the exclusion. Such logic also promotes the less severely misbehaving students to acknowledge their contribution to the exclusion, but does not have any effect on students who are attempting to hurt others. Nevertheless, when teachers do discuss that a student's misbehavior is potentially hurting others, the most severely misbehaving students are influenced to acknowledge their contribution to the exclusion.

In light of these findings, it is disappointing to note that only approximately one third of excluded students acknowledged receiving an explanation at the time of the exclusion, 20% reported a prior punishment, only 10% perceived positive prior recognition, and about one third had a follow-up discussion with their teacher. The most common reasons cited for the exclusion is teachers' dislike of them and unfairness. Even when teachers gave punishments prior to the exclusion, approximately half of those students who received prior punishment reported that they were excluded from the classroom after only one preliminary punishment. These findings might imply that teachers, who use exclusion as a management practice, tend not to use other classroom management techniques or other systems of classroom management. However, an interpretation of these findings must be accompanied by considering that these are the perceptions of excluded students and may be inaccurate. Nevertheless, these perceptions affect how responsibly they react.

Limitations

The unit of analysis in this study was the exclusion form, not the student excluded. Thus, the data do not represent information regarding individual students, but rather describe exclusion as a whole. Another point that can be perceived as a limitation is basing the research on data received from students only. Accordingly, future researchers should employ objective measures that could confirm or refute students' reports. However, the importance of the subjective perceptions of students toward classroom management could be assumed as a prerequisite for understanding the students' role in classroom interactions and for the further development of their autonomy and responsibility.

Despite these limitations, the research clearly supports the idea that there are two main ways to manage students. One focuses on external (teacher's) control and the other internal (students' self-control, self-discipline, and responsibility) control (Elias & Schwab, 2006). The results of the present study highlight the positive effects of teachers' involving students in an analysis of their misbehavior and its impact on others. As argued by Psunder (2005), participation and involvement in decision making about discipline management play important roles in the development of student autonomy and responsibility. Moreover, through cooperation and decision making students are motivated for independent thinking and critical evaluation, which provide students with practical experience for living in a democratic society.

FUNDING

The research project reported in this paper was in part sponsored by the Institute for Education and Community Research, School of Education, Bar-Ilan University, Israel.

REFERENCES

- Adler, A. (1927). *Understanding human nature* (W. B. Wolfe, Trans.). New York, NY: Garden City.
- Adler, A. (1930). *The education of children* (E. Jensen & F. Jensen, Trans.). New York, NY: Greenberg.
- Beaman, R., & Wheldall, K. (2000). Teachers' use of approval and disapproval in the classroom. *Educational Psychology, 20*, 431–446.
- Brantner, J. P., & Doherty, M. A. (1983). A review of timeout: A conceptual and methodological analysis. In S. Axelrod & J. Apsche (Eds.), *The effects of punishment on human behavior* (pp. 87–132). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- 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). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Burden, P. R. (2003). *Classroom management: Creating a successful learning community*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley/Jossey-Bass Education.
- Canter, L. (1976). *Assertive discipline*. Los Angeles, CA: Lee Canter Associates.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The Scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1*, 245–276.
- Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B., & Pepper, F. (1971). *Maintaining sanity in the classroom: Illustrated teaching techniques*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Elias, M. J., & Schwab, Y. (2006). From compliance to responsibility: Social and emotional learning and classroom management. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 309–341). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, Vol. 1: Introduction*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- French, J. R. P. Jr., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150–167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Glasser, W. (1969). *Schools without failure*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Handen, B. L., Parrish, J. M., McClung, T. J., Kerwin, M. E., & Evans, L. D. (1992). Using guided compliance versus time out to promote child compliance: A preliminary comparative analysis in an analogue context. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 13*, 157–170.
- Jones, R. N., Sloane, H. N., & Roberts, M. W. (1992). Limitations of "don't" instructional control. *Behavior Therapy, 23*, 131–140.
- LeFrancois, G. (1997). *Psychology for teaching*. New York, NY: Wadsworth.
- Lewis, R. (1997). *The discipline dilemma* (2nd ed.). Melbourne, Australia: The Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Lewis, R. (2001). Classroom discipline and student responsibility: The students' view. *Teaching and Teachers Education, 17*, 307–319.
- Lewis, R. (2009). *Understanding pupil behavior: Classroom management techniques for teachers*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lewis, R. (2011). The developmental management approach to classroom management. In D. Hopkins, J. Munro, & W. Craig (Eds.), *Powerful learning: A strategy for systemic educational* (pp. 96–108). Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Lewis, R., & McCann, P. (2009). Teaching "at risk" students: Meeting their needs. In L. J. Saha & A. G. Dworkin (Eds.), *International handbook of research on teachers and teaching* (pp. 895–905). New York, NY: Springer.
- Lewis, R., Romi, S., Katz, Y. J., & Qui, X. (2008). Students reactions to teachers' classroom discipline in Australia, China, and Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 715–724.
- Lewis, R., Romi, S., & Roache, J. (2012). Excluding students from classroom: Teacher techniques that promote student responsibility. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*, 870–878.
- Martin, N. K., & Sass, D. A. (2010). Construct validation of the behavior and instructional management scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 1124–1135.
- McIntosh, K., Flannery, K., Sugai, G., Braun, D., & Cochrane, K. (2008). Relationships between academics and problem behavior in the transition from middle school to high school. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 10*, 243–255.
- Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention. (2007). *The office of juvenile justice delinquency prevention's model programs guide*. Retrieved from http://www.dsgonline.com/mpg2.5/mpg_index.htm
- Pane, D. M. (2010). Viewing classroom discipline as negotiable social interaction: A communities of practice perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 87–97.
- Pianta, R. C. (2006). Classroom management and relationships between children and teachers: Implications for research and practice. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management, research, practice and contemporary issues* (pp. 685–709). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Psunder, M. (2005). How effective is school discipline in preparing students to become responsible citizens? Slovenian teachers' and students' views. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 273–286.
- Raven, B. H. (1965). Social influence and power. In I. D. Steiner & M. Fishbein (Eds.), *Current studies in social psychology* (pp. 371–382). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Raven, B. H. (2008). The bases of power and the power/interactional model of interpersonal influence. *Analysis of Social Issues and Public Policy, 8*, 1–22.
- Roberts, M. W. (1982). The effects of warned versus unwarned time-out procedures on child noncompliance. *Child and Family Behavior Therapy, 4*, 37–53.
- Romi, S., Lewis, R., & Katz, Y. (2009). Student responsibility and classroom discipline in Australia, China and Israel. *Compare, 39*, 439–452.
- Skiba, R. J., Peterson, R. L., & Williams, T. (1997). Office referrals and suspension: disciplinary intervention in middle schools. *Education and Treatment of Children, 20*, 295–315.
- Sprague, J., & Walker, H. (2000). Early identification and intervention for youth with antisocial and violent behavior. *Exceptional Children, 66*, 367–379.

- Vavrus, F., & Cole, K. (2002). "I didn't do nothin": The discursive construction of school suspension. *The Urban Review*, 34, 87-111.
- Wald, J., & Losen, D. J. (Eds.). (2003). *New directions for youth development: Deconstructing the school-to-prison pipeline* (No. 99). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Winograd, K. (2002). The negotiative dimension of teaching: Teachers sharing power with the less powerful. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 343-362.

AUTHORS NOTE

Shlomo Romi is a faculty member in the School of Education at Bar-Ilan University, Israel. His research interests focus on nonformal education, characteristics of at risk

adolescents, as well as topics in educational psychology, such as classroom management and the integration of children and adolescents with special needs into normative educational frameworks.

Ramon (Rom) Lewis is a staff member of the Faculty of Education at Latrobe University, Melbourne. His research interests focus on classroom management, and stress and coping.

Merav Salkovsky is a faculty member of the School of Education in the Special Education Department, Kibbutzim College, Israel. Her research interests focus on classroom management in regular and special education.