Spring 2022

Social Validity and Feasibility of the Five in 20 Classroom Management Observation Tool

Kaylee Hampton
Eastern Illinois University

Social Validity and Feasibility of the Five in 20 Classroom Management Observation Tool

Kaylee Hampton

Specialist in School Psychology Thesis

Department of Psychology, Eastern Illinois University

May 3rd, 2022

Abstract

The present study aimed to assess the social validity and feasibility of a standardized classroom observation tool intended to assess teachers' current use of the five features critical to effective classroom management. Forty-three observers who regularly conducted classroom observations (e.g., school psychologists) were recruited to complete 20-min observations in kindergarten through twelfth grade classrooms, and then complete an adapted behavior intervention rating scale to assess their social validity ratings of the tool. Due to COVID-19, observers could either complete a live observation or recall a previously completed observation. Of the 43 observations, 15 were live and 28 were recalled. To complete the ratings, observers answered 15 Likert-style items to produce a total score with a maximum of 75 points. Total rating of 60 points or higher were considered acceptable. Seventy-nine percent of participants rated the tool a score of 60 or higher, suggesting most found the tool acceptable. No significant differences were found in ratings of the tool between live vs. recalled participants, participants with or without graduate training in consultation and direct observation, or participants who obtained more objective or less objective data from the tool itself. Additionally, no significant correlation was found between BIRS ratings and number of observations participants typically conduct per month. Additional comments left by participants presented important themes, as well, including positive feedback on the inclusion of operational definitions and the breadth of data the tool can collect, concerns regarding subjectivity of the strategy quality ratings, and a surprising amount of hesitation to provide classroom management skills feedback to teachers because of how they may react or perceive it. Future research and implications of these findings are discussed.

Keywords: social validity, feasibility, teacher observation tool, classroom management, direct-observation, evidence-based strategies

Acknowledgements

I would like to first thank my thesis chair, Dr. Margaret Floress, for all the guidance and support she provided throughout every step of my thesis project. She went above and beyond making herself available to consult with me and provide input for the thesis paper, as well as assisted substantially with data collection and analysis to help ensure the accuracy of the results presented.

I would like to thank Allie Cardot for her collaboration in creating the Five in 20 tool, as well as for her continued support and advice. I would like to thank Jess White, Danielle Buechlein, and Bayleigh Townsend-Pasley, all of whom were crucial in the data collection and logistics without which this project could not have happened. I would also like to thank Dr. Assege HaileMariam and Dr. Wesley Allan for serving as members of my thesis committee. I deeply appreciate their time in reviewing and providing feedback on my thesis.

Table of Contents

Abstract 2

Acknowledgments 3

List of Tables 7

Introduction 8

Review of the Literature 9

Classroom Management 9

Consultation in the Schools 11

School Psychologists as Consultants 12

Social Validity 13

Classroom Management Observation Tools 15

Brief Classroom Interaction Observation-Revised 16

The Classroom Management Checklist 17

Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Intervention Support 17

The Classroom Management Observation Tool 18

The Classroom Management Assessment and Scoring System 19

Critical Feature Alignment, Efficiency, and Social Validity 19

The Five in 20 Classroom Management Observation Tool 22

Alignment with the Five Critical Features 22

Efficiency and Social Validity 23

Summary 24

Method 25

Participants and Setting 26

Measures 28
Participant Demographics Questionnaire 28
Five in 20 Observation Tool 28
Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS) 29
Additional Questions 29
Procedure 30
COVID-19 Adaptation 31
Analytic Plan 31
Results 34
Social Validity and Feasibility of the Five in 20 34
Identifying Need for Additional Training 36
Providing Recommendations for Further Training 36
BIRS Ratings and Classroom Observation 37
BIRS Ratings and Graduate Training 37
BIRS Ratings and Scores Obtained on the Five in 20 38
Recalled and Live Observation Comparison 39
Discussion 40
Social Validity 40
Feasibility 44
Limitations 45
Future Research 47
Conclusion 48
References 49

Appendices 55

Appendix A 55

Appendix B 58

Appendix C 59

Appendix D 60

Appendix E 61

Appendix F 62

Appendix G 63

Appendix H 64

List of Tables

Table 1: Classroom Management Observation Tools 20

Table 2: Observer Participant Demographics 27

Social Validity and Feasibility of the Five in 20 Classroom Management Observation Tool

Many teachers report they are not prepared to manage challenging student behaviors and would benefit from additional training (Kwok, 2017; Nagro et al., 2019; Reinke et al., 2011). One reason for this may be that pre-service teachers receive little pre-service, classroom management instruction because it is not built into their teacher education curriculum (Kwok, 2017). For instance, Christofferson and Sullivan (2015) surveyed teachers' pre-service education related to classroom management and found that teachers indicated classroom management was "skipped over" and felt dissatisfied with their training (p. 249). Another reason teachers may feel unprepared to address challenging student behavior is that with the passage of No Child Left Behind (No Child Left Behind [NCLB]; 2002) teachers are tasked with meeting all students' needs in the general education setting and are likely responsible for educating more children with academic and behavioral problems than in the past. For this reason, teachers' requests for additional training must be met. To do this, it is first important for consultants to have the necessary tools to provide meaningful and valid training recommendations to teachers related to their classroom management practices. Therefore, it is important for consultants to find tools easy to use and acceptable for consultation related to classroom management. This study is part of a grant-funded research project that aims to collect pilot data using the Five in 20 Classroom Management Observation Tool and assessing the tool's validity and reliability is an area of study. However, the purpose of this study is to assess the feasibility and social validity of the Five in 20 Classroom Management Observation Tool to determine whether consultants find this tool easy to use and acceptable for their practice in providing training recommendations.

Classroom Management

Classroom management is a skill and a culmination of strategies that educators use to mold and uphold a learning environment that is in order, supports students' social-emotional and academic learning, and maintains control in the classroom (Aldrup, et al., 2018, Damme, et al., 2016, Korpershoek et al., 2016, Kwok, 2017). Classroom management is made up of proactive and reactive strategies. Proactive strategies are used to provide encouragement to students for behavior that is appropriate (e.g., praise or creating classroom rules; Clunies-Ross, et al., 2008; Nagro et al., 2019). Strategies intended to decrease misbehavior are reactive and include reprimands and overcorrection (Ritz, et al., 2014). Proactive strategies should be used more frequently than reactive strategies because proactive strategies teach students *what to do,* strengthen appropriate behavior, and prevent misbehavior (Ritz et al., 2014).

To assist educators in identifying evidence-based classroom management strategies, Simonson and colleagues (2008) conducted an extensive review and identified 20 evidence-based, general classroom management practices, which they categorized into five *critical features,* which included: 1) maximize structure; 2) post, teach, review, monitor, and reinforce expectations; 3) actively engage students in observable ways; 4) use a continuum of strategies for responding to appropriate behaviors; 5) use a continuum of strategies to respond to inappropriate behaviors. To be considered evidence-based, Simonsen and colleagues indicated that strategies need to be evaluated using an experimental design and methodology, results of the studies reviewed needed to indicate that the classroom management practice was effective, and at least three, empirical studies evaluating the strategy needed to have been published in peer-reviewed journals (Simonsen et al., 2008).

The five critical features identified by Simonsen and colleagues (2008) fit well within the Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) framework that is used within schools to

promote student appropriate behavior school-wide, and many PBIS core strategies are evidence-based when utilized in the classroom setting (OSEP, 2019; Bethune, 2017). For example, within the PBIS framework, the first Tier 1 practice includes implementing school-wide positive expectations and explicit behavioral expectations are defined and taught to students. This is consistent with the second critical feature (i.e., post, teach, review, monitor, and reinforce expectations in the classroom) identified by Simonsen et al. (2008). The second Tier 1 practice, within the PBIS framework, includes procedures for establishing classroom expectations and routines consistent with school-wide expectations. This is also consistent with the second critical feature (Simonsen et al., 2008) and emphasizes the importance of consistency between expectations in the classroom and expectations in the entire school. The third Tier 1 practice, within the PBIS framework, includes using a continuum of strategies to promote appropriate and expected behavior. This is consistent with the fourth critical feature (i.e., using a continuum of strategies to respond to appropriate behaviors in the classroom) identified by Simonsen et al. (2008). The fourth Tier 1 practice, within the PBIS framework, is using a continuum of procedures for discouraging problem behavior, which is consistent with the fifth critical feature (i.e., using a continuum of strategies to respond to inappropriate behavior in the classroom) identified by Simonsen et al. (2008).

When implemented correctly, evidenced-based classroom management strategies decrease problem behaviors and increase student engagement and academic achievement (Simonsen et. al., 2020). As outlined in the previous section, there is considerable overlap between the Tier 1, PBIS practices and the five critical features identified by Simonsen and colleagues (2008). Similar strategies and practices are recommended to increase student appropriate behavior and decrease student inappropriate behavior in the classroom and school-

wide. When teachers implement evidence-based strategies in the classroom that are consistent with the school-wide system, like PBIS, student appropriate behavior is promoted throughout all school settings. However, to ensure these practices and strategies are implemented, school psychologists and other educational consultants must be able to measure teachers' use of these strategies efficiently and accurately. Therefore, when observation tools are designed to assess evidence-based classroom strategies, it should also be useful and feasible for practice. Consultants should be able to 1) determine whether teachers would benefit from classroom management training (based on their observed practices) and, if training is needed, 2) use the results of the observation to provide specific intervention recommendations.

Consultation in the Schools

Consultation is an indirect service that includes an expert (e.g., school psychologist) and a teacher that collaborate to improve student functioning (Klose et al., 2012). Consultation is frequently used to help teachers identify problems and develop interventions for academic or behavioral deficits. However, classroom management is one of the most challenging aspects of teaching and if carried out effectively has the potential to greatly benefit both teachers and students. Teachers and other school staff have little free time during the school day, so it is important for consultants to be efficient. Consultants need to be able to link assessment data quickly and accurately to intervention recommendations. Therefore, when consulting with teachers struggling with classroom management it would be helpful to have an observation tool that efficiently assesses the five critical features of effective classroom management, so meaningful recommendations are made. In this study, after completing the Five in 20 observation tool observers will indicate whether they believed the observed teacher needs additional training. Data obtained for the current study will help determine the likeability and

feasibility of the Five in 20 observation tool as determined by school psychologists who may use the tool to guide classroom management recommendations for teachers.

School Psychologists as Consultants

The school psychologist's role in schools is becoming increasingly more all-encompassing. Previously, school psychologists were often limited to giving assessments and determining special education eligibility. However, their unique skills for consultation and knowledge of evidence-based behavioral and academic interventions can be used to assist teachers to improve class-wide student behavior and academic outcomes for all students (Shernoff et al., 2016). School psychologists have extensive training in effective interventions as well as consultation practices. Consultation is an indirect service in which an expert and a teacher collaborate to improve student functioning (Klose et al., 2012). Consultants help teachers define the problems they are experiencing, assess and analyze the problem(s), introduce the teacher to interventions that are evidence-based and appropriate, ensure the intervention is implemented with fidelity, and evaluate intervention outcomes (Klose et al., 2012). Because teachers often feel overwhelmed by disruptive behavior and report feeling unprepared to address challenging behavior in the classroom, school psychologists are important resources in providing information and assistance to solve behavior problems in the classroom (Briere et al., 2015).

Through school-based consultation, school psychologists provide much-needed guidance to teachers who are struggling to manage student behaviors in the classroom. However, it is also important to acknowledge other school personal who commonly consult or conduct classroom observations to support classroom teachers. For example, staff such as special education teachers, social workers, etc. also utilize observations to help teachers with academic, behavioral, and social/emotional concerns in their classrooms. For these individuals to accurately provide

professional development to addresses a teacher's specific needs, consultants must first accurately and efficiently assess the teachers' current classroom management practices. This is best carried out via classroom observation because observable and quantifiable data regarding teachers' current classroom management practices can be gathered. This information is then used to guide intervention recommendations as well as monitor teachers' improvement after intervention. Further, observation of the teachers in their classrooms provides a more accurate picture of their classroom management than self-report measures, as teachers may over or underestimate their skills on self-report measures (Koziol & Burns, 1986). The availability of an effective and efficient classroom management observation instrument (which identifies the five critical features of classroom management) plays a critical role in guiding the consultation process because it may streamline or enhance the accuracy of the consultation process for some consultants. Furthermore, practitioners need to find observation tools easy to use and useful in assessing whether a teacher uses evidence-based strategies, as a teachers' current practice guides intervention recommendations. In other words, it is important to assess the feasibility and social validity of a classroom management observation tool. The importance of social validity, in relation to assessment tools, will be discussed in the next section.

Social Validity

The concept of social validity was first introduced by Wolf (1978) and described as a subjective measure of an intervention that takes into consideration the consumer's judgment of the "social significance of the goals..., the social appropriateness of the procedures...," and "the social importance of the effects." Later, Wolf's concept of social validity was narrowed into the idea of treatment acceptability, which refers to an "evaluation of whether treatment is appropriate

for the problem, whether treatment is fair, reasonable, and intrusive, and whether treatment meets with conventional notions about what a treatment should be" (Kazdin, 1980).

Understanding social validity is important because individuals are more likely to use interventions or instruments, they find acceptable. For example, Dart et al. (2011) conducted a study where teachers who were resistant to implementing classroom management interventions were able to briefly "test-drive" interventions and then implement the one they believed to be most acceptable. When teachers were given the option of implementing the interventions they deemed most acceptable, treatment integrity improved. In other words, when teachers chose the interventions they liked the most, they were more likely to implement the intervention as intended. Further, when the interventions were implemented as intended, academic engagement increased among students targeted for intervention (Dart et al., 2011).

Just as the social validity of interventions is likely to influence whether teachers use certain interventions, the social validity of assessments or observation tools are likely to influence whether school psychologists or consultants use certain instruments. The level of social acceptability can potentially predict the degree of adoption and use of a screening tool or service. Many past studies suggest that screening instruments that are perceived to be socially acceptable will be more readily adopted and used (Vannest et al., 2013). Therefore, if a tool is not readily used by school psychologists or consultants, social acceptability may be an issue (Vannest et al., 2013). If consultants find a tool cumbersome, inefficient, or not helpful to the consultation process, they may choose to modify the tool in a way that varies from standardization or not use it at all. Therefore, it is important to study the social validity of observation tools consultants use to guide teacher training and classroom management interventions. In this study, these concepts translate directly to the social significance, social appropriateness, and social importance of the

classroom management observation tool, as well as whether the tool is believed to be appropriate for gathering information to guide classroom management interventions.

Dart et al. (2011) drew a parallel between social validity/treatment integrity and "customer satisfaction." He argued that interventions (or observation tools in the case of this study) are susceptible to the opinions of the individuals who implement them, just as a product sale is susceptible to a satisfied customer. If an observation tool is said to be time and resource-efficient while still providing useful data that will guide intervention but consultants using the tool do not agree with those claims or dislike using it in general, then that tool is not likely to be used by consultants regardless of its validity or usefulness to guide intervention. The current study will evaluate the social validity of the Five in 20 observation classroom management tool from the perspective of a consultant. The following section reviews classroom observation tools in the literature.

Classroom Management Observation Tools

Teachers do not receive adequate preparation for classroom management in their preservice training (Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015); therefore, consultants need tools that are efficient and effective in recognizing teachers' areas of need to guide recommendations for professional development. For instance, a classroom management observation tool that is used to guide training recommendations should align with evidence-based strategies identified in the literature; there are various research-based strategies; however, the literature suggests many teachers do not implement these strategies in the classroom (Hagermoser-Sanetti et al., 2018). In addition, a classroom management observation tool should be easy to use, help consultants decide whether a teacher needs additional training, and (if training is needed) help consultants explicitly identify training recommendations. Currently, the tools available do not gather

information to easily inform teacher training (i.e., guide intervention recommendations), tools are time and resource intensive (which hinders the consultation process; Simonsen et al., 2020), or their social validity has not been assessed. There are tools that measure specific evidence-based practices, like praise (Markelz et al., 2020, Reinke et al., 2015, Sanetti et al., 2018), but few tools assess the five features critical to effective classroom management identified by Simonsen and colleagues (2008). The next several sections will review classroom management observation tools reported in the literature and Table 1 summarizes their alignment with the five critical features, efficiency, and social validity.

The Brief Classroom Interaction Observation – Revised

The Brief Classroom Interaction Observation – Revised (BCIO-R; Reinke et al., 2015) is a tool that was created to support, monitor, and evaluate teachers' use of classroom management strategies. To use the BCIO-R a consultant measures frequency counts of teacher use of behavior-specific praise, general praise, precorrections, opportunities to respond, explicit reprimands, and harsh reprimands. In addition, the consultant measures the frequencies of student disruptive behaviors and student aggressive behaviors (Reinke et. al., 2015). The article does not provide a visual representation of the BCIO-R observation form, but it is assumed that an observer would have each of the six categories listed on a sheet and tally the frequency in which each is observed.

The Classroom Management Checklist

The Classroom Management Checklist (CMC; MacSuga & Simonsen, 2011) was adapted from the critical features identified by Simonsen et al. (2008) and requires an observer to assess whether a teacher uses 10 classroom management practices. The observer looks for three classroom management strategies before class starts (i.e., greet students as they enter the

classroom, post schedule/routine and review it, post and review positively stated expectations) and seven strategies during instruction (i.e., prompted students to follow the expectations, provided multiple opportunities to respond, actively engaged students in observable ways, actively supervised the classroom, used one or more strategies to acknowledge appropriate behavior, provided direct/explicit corrections of inappropriate behavior, and provided more frequent acknowledgment for appropriate behaviors than inappropriate behaviors). The observer indicates on the checklist whether the strategy was implemented (i.e., checks “yes” for 2 points), partially implemented (i.e., checks “partial” for 1 point), not implemented (i.e., checks “no” for no points), or not applicable (i.e., checks N/A). The total number of "Yes" checks determines the teacher's overall classroom management score. Possible scores range from 0 (implementing no strategies) to 20 (full implementation of all 10 strategies; MacSuga & Simonsen, 2011). Following the checklist, either the observer or the teacher uses the overall score to complete an action plan to enhance (through intervention) or maintain the levels of implementation of three strategies from the checklist they have chosen to prioritize for intervention or maintenance.

Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Intervention Support

The Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Intervention Support framework (MO SWPBIS, 2017) is a system-level, multi-tiered behavior support framework that aims to link behavior expectations in all areas of the school and at different tiers of intervention. The framework is school-wide but includes recommendations of eight evidence-based Tier 1 classroom management strategies for behaviors within the classroom (i.e., expectations and rules, procedures and routines, encouraging expected behaviors, discouraging inappropriate behaviors, active supervision, opportunities to respond, activity sequencing and offering choice, and task difficulty). These eight classroom management practices increase instructional time and

student engagement while decreasing the occurrence of problem behaviors (MO SWPBIS, 2017). The accompanying observation forms for the MO SWPBIS framework include brief observation forms for expectations/rules or procedures/routines, and in-depth observation forms where frequency and additional comments are recorded. However, the in-depth forms only look at one of the eight strategies mentioned above (MO SWPBIS, 2017).

The Classroom Management Observation Tool

More recently, The Classroom Management Observation Tool (CMOT; Simonsen et al., 2020) was developed based on the Simonsen et al. (2008) Five Critical Features of Effective Classroom Management article. The CMOT includes two components, four "observation items" which were validated using factor analysis, and a checklist that contains empirically supported items to "look for" periodically (Simonsen et al., 2020). The "observation items" include four explicit, evidence-based strategies that are rated by the observer on a 4-point Likert scale from disagree strongly to agree strongly. The strategies include a) the educator effectively engaged in active supervision of students in the classroom, b) the educator effectively provided most/all students with opportunities to respond and participate during instruction, c) the educator effectively provided specific praise to acknowledge appropriate student academic and social behavior, and d) the educator provided more frequent acknowledgment for appropriate behaviors than inappropriate behaviors. If a teacher is rated as not demonstrating one of these items it is an indication of needed training (specific to that item/area; Simonsen et al., 2020).

The Classroom Assessment and Scoring System (CLASS)

The Classroom Assessment and Scoring System (CLASS; Pianta et. al., 2008) is a direct classroom management assessment tool that uses a combination of checklists and classroom observations to examine the quality of teacher-student interactions in the classroom. The CLASS

covers three crucial domains (and 11 specific behaviors within each domain) of teacher-student interaction: emotional support, classroom organization, and instructional support. It includes four to six cycles of 20-25-minute classroom observations (i.e., 20 min observing and 10 min scoring), which results in a total of 2 to 3 hours of observation per classroom. During observations, consultants use rubrics that help them measure the specific behaviors in each domain. For each behavior, the CLASS protocol gives observers concrete guidance on whether the given score should be "low" (scores of 1-2), "medium" (scores of 3-5), or "high" (scores of 6-7). Each teacher receives domain scores as well as an overall score on a scale of 1-7 (Pianta et. al., 2008).

Critical Feature Alignment, Efficiency, and Social Validity

Each of the currently available classroom management observation tools discussed were also evaluated based on their alignment with the Simonsen et al. (2008) five critical features for effective classroom management, as well as their time/resource efficiency and social validity and acceptability. These findings are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1.

Tool	Alignment with 5 Critical Features	Efficiency and Social Validity
Brief Classroom Interaction Observation – Revised (BCIO-R)	-Assesses four of the five critical features (post, teach, review, and monitor expectations, engage students in observable ways, and both strategies to respond to appropriate and inappropriate behaviors). -The number of explicit strategies measured (i.e., forms of praise and reprimand) may be limited, which may not be comprehensive enough to guide training recommendations.	-The observation lasts 20 minutes, and observers only need to be trained to record frequency counts for six different strategies. Therefore, the BCIO-R is fairly time and resource efficient. -The lack of ability to inform intervention may outweigh its time/resource efficiency. -The BCIO-R has not been examined for social validity and acceptability.
The Classroom Management Checklist (CMC)	-Assesses four of the five critical features (post, teach, review, and monitor expectations, engage students in observable ways, and both strategies to respond to appropriate and inappropriate behaviors). -Observers look for ten explicit strategies, that fall within one of the four Simonsen et al. (2008) critical features the tool assesses.	-The brevity of this tool is beneficial time-cost wise, but the strategies observed are only rated on a three-point scale (not at all, partially, or fully), which may not provide specific enough data to guide training recommendations. -The tool has been assessed in practice with consultation, but it was not assessed for social validity from the participants who used it in the study.
Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Intervention Support (MOSWPBIS)	-Assesses four of the five critical features (post, teach, review, and monitor expectations, engage students in observable ways, and both strategies to respond to appropriate and inappropriate behaviors). -Observers look for ten explicit strategies, that fall within one of the four Simonsen et al. (2008) critical features the tool assesses.	-There is a good number of features and strategies assessed, but the observation forms for this tool are not comprehensive. Each strategy is observed/rated on its own separate sheet. This greatly decreases time and resource efficiency. -The latter concerns would likely influence social validity and feasibility of use, and the MOSWPBIS has never been examined for social validity.

The Classroom Management Observation Tool (CMOT)	-Assesses three of the five critical features (maximize structure, engage students in observable ways, and strategies to respond to appropriate behavior). One of the strategies observed also loosely aligns with the feature strategies to respond to inappropriate behavior, as well. -Factor analysis has been conducted with the CMOT to determine which features emerged as separate factors. Four of the five critical features were identified, leaving out critical feature 2 (post, teach, monitor, and review rules and expectations), because those items did not correlate strongly enough to be their own factor (Simonsen et al., 2020). -Although critical feature 2 was not a clear factor, the authors still emphasize the importance of this feature.	- The tool is brief as it only contains four evidence-based strategies, which provides rating data on each feature in a reasonable timeframe. -The tool may be limited in that the consultant does not record additional information such as frequency counts and/or additional comments regarding what they observed. -The exclusion of critical feature 2 creates the need for consultants to conduct another observation. -The CMOT has not been studied for social validity and acceptability.
The Classroom Assessment and Scoring System (CLASS)	-Assesses three of the five critical features (post, teach, review, and monitor expectations, engage students in observable ways, and responding to inappropriate behaviors). -Not included is feature four: responding to appropriate behavior, which is concerning because research has shown that strategies within this feature, such as behavior-specific praise, lead to positive student outcomes (Nafpaktitis, et al., 1985; Stitcher, et al., 2009).	-Requires a high level of sophistication and training to prepare observers to make consistent qualitative judgments using CLASS (Pianta et al., 2008). -Considering the extensive training of observers and the associated costs, the CLASS is likely unsuitable for use in many school settings. -The CLASS has never been assessed for social validity.

Five in 20 Classroom Management Observation Tool

The Five in 20 Classroom Management Observation Tool was developed collaboratively by the primary researcher (PI), other graduate students, and the PI's thesis advisor. The five in 20 observation was created to assess the five critical features of effective classroom management (Simonsen et. al., 2008). The tool features all five of the critical features as well as 21 evidence-based strategies that fall within each feature (Simonsen et al., 2008). Consultants observe a teacher for 20 minutes during teacher-led, class-wide instruction and observe whether the teacher uses the 21 strategies. The observation form is divided into the 5 critical features with corresponding strategies that are briefly defined. For each strategy, observers check yes/no for whether the strategy was observed during the 20-minute observation. If observed (i.e., checked yes) the observer rates the quality of the observed strategy (1 = not consistent with strategy definition to 5 = consistent with strategy definition). Additionally, there is space for comments specific to the teacher's implementation that may help the observer recall specifics from the observation later. Finally, there is space on the observation form for observers to tally (frequency count) the teacher's use of behavior-specific praise, general praise, as well as mild, medium, harsh, and gesture reprimands. The form also includes praise and reprimand definitions (see Appendix A).

Alignment with Five Critical Features. The Five in 20 tool features all five critical features and 21 evidence-based strategies associated with effective classroom management identified by Simonsen and colleagues (2008). This allows observers to collect data on teachers' use of all the strategies within one form during one observation. Further, the form allows for frequency counts of praise and reprimand which are helpful in comparing teachers' current frequency of praise compared to recommended rates (Floress & Jenkins, 2015) or recommended

praise to reprimand rates (Spilt, et al., 2016). Overall, the Five in 20 tool is well situated to assist consultants in assessing the five features critical to effective management and set consultants up to easily link their assessment to intervention and training recommendations.

Efficiency and Social Validity. The Five in 20 observation is completed in one 20-minute classroom observation. During a single observation, consultants determine whether the teacher uses each evidence-based strategy and to what extent that strategy is in line with its operational definition (i.e., the quality of its use). Consultants can also collect the frequency of teachers' use of praise and reprimand, which is important data because higher praise to reprimand ratios have been associated with increased rates of student on-task behavior, increased student engagement, and more positive classroom environments (Nafpaktitis, et al., 1985; Stitcher, et al., 2009). The Five in 20 observation form also includes operational definitions for the consultant to reference. Further, intensive training is not required, rather step-by-step directions (on the form) tell the observer how to collect the data. Due to the amount of data that can be collected in one classroom observation, as well as the efficient amount of training needed to use the tool, the Five in 20 classroom observation tool is both resource and time-efficient.

Like the other observations reviewed, the Five in 20 observation has not been assessed for social validity. To fill this gap in the literature, the current study aims to assess the social validity of the Five in 20 observation tool to determine whether consultants like the tool, whether it is easy to use, and whether it produces useful data that assists in guiding intervention or training recommendation. These are important aspects of social validity that can impact a consultant's decision to use an observation tool.

Summary

Many teachers struggle with the management of student behavior, which may impact some teachers' decisions to leave the field of education (Dicke et al, 2014). It is important to retain high-quality teachers and consultants can provide teachers the necessary assistance and training for them to successfully manage student classroom behavior. Therefore, consultants need to have a classroom management observation tool that identifies teachers who need additional training and those who do not, as well as help guide intervention or training recommendations. It is also crucial for consultants to judge a tool easy to use in their practice. Therefore, the overarching purpose of this study is to assess the feasibility and social validity of the Five in 20 observation tool. The following research questions were posed:

1. Do observers report the Five in 20 observation tool to be easy and feasible to use, as measured by the BIRS. It is hypothesized that observers will rate the tool to have high social validity, as it is aligned with the five critical features of classroom management and only requires a 20-minute observation.
2. Does the Five in 20 observation tool identify teachers who are judged by observers to not need additional training as well as teachers who are judged to need additional training? No hypothesis is offered.
3. Of the observers who indicate additional training is needed, are observers able to generate recommended areas for training or intervention? It is hypothesized that observers will be able to generate recommendations for training/intervention.
4. Do observers who conduct more observations rate the Five in 20 observation tool more favorably, as measured by the BIRS? It is hypothesized that consultants who conduct more observations may rate the Five in 20 observation tool more favorably because they will be more favorable toward a tool when it is something

that is a more significant part of their day-to-day duties and can help them obtain the information they need more efficiently.

5. Did observers with training in direct observation and consultation rate the Five in 20 tool more favorably, as measured by the BIRS, compared to observers without this training? It is hypothesized that consultants trained in direct observation and consultation will rate the Five in 20 observation tool more favorably because they have a larger knowledge base related to observation and consultation and will recognize/be favorable towards a tool aimed at guiding consultation related to classroom management.
6. Do observers who obtain objective/clear results (low Total Strategy Quality Scores and high Total Strategy Quality Scores) using the Five in 20 observation tool, rate the Five in 20 tool more favorably? It is hypothesized that observers who obtain objective results will rate the Five in 20 tool more favorably because the teachers' skills and deficit areas will be clear and lead to more efficient and confident conclusions when considering the need for additional training.

Method

This study, which aimed to assess the social validity and feasibility of the Five in 20 classroom management observation tool was part of a larger, externally funded grant project that examined several aspects of the Five in 20 tool. The PI was directly involved in the development of the observation tool (along with Dr. Margaret Floress, Allie Cardot, and Jess White), which aimed to assess the five critical features of effective classroom management identified by Simonsen and colleagues (2008). The PI also worked with Dr. Floress to adapt the Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS, 1991) to evaluate the social validity of a classroom

management observation tool rather than an intervention (as originally intended). Data collection began in the spring semester of 2020 and the PI was directly involved in the recruitment of participants and data collection. Data collection began in January of 2020 and continued through November of 2021. In March of 2020 when the COVID-19 pandemic closed many schools, the PI and other researchers developed an alternate method of participation (see Procedures section for additional detail). Between March of 2020 and November of 2021, participants were recruited for the study using both methods of participation, the original and the COVID-19 adaptation.

Participants and Setting

The PI and four research assistants recruited 48 observer participants (37 primary and 11 reliability) who conducted 20-minute classroom observations using the Five in 20 tool for the larger study on the tool. To be included in the larger study, primary observers needed to be practicing school psychologists, school psychology interns, or other educational professionals whose job description included conducting observations or providing consultation services. The larger study also recruited reliability observers (so inter-observer agreement could be calculated for the tool); however, reliability observers could include second-year, school psychology practicum students or educational professionals whose job description did not include conducting observations or providing consultation services.

The PI included both primary and reliability observers in the current study sample to examine social validity of the tool; however, many of the reliability observers did not meet criteria for inclusion in the current study, because conducting classroom observations were not part of their job responsibilities. Therefore, forty-three of the 48 observer participants met inclusion criteria and were included in data analysis for all six research questions (39 primary

and 4 reliability). Of these 43 participants, 15 participated in a live observation, and 28 participated using the recalled observation option. All participants were Caucasian, and most were female, school psychologists practicing in Illinois (see Table 2). There was an even distribution of participants working in rural, suburban, and urban school districts and most (77%) reported to have graduate training in direct observation and consultation.

Observations were 20-minutes in duration and took place in K-12 grade classrooms. All but one observation took place in the general education setting. One observation took place in a special education classroom. All observations took place during teacher-led, class-wide instruction. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, there were two methods of participation offered, either a direct observation or recalled observation (see procedures section for additional detail). In the current and the larger study, all primary observers, reliability observers, and teacher participants received a $15 gift card for their participation.

Table 2.

Observer Participant Demographics

Characteristics		N = 43	%
Sex	Female	34	79
	Male	9	21
Community	Urban	11	26
	Rural	17	39
	Suburban	15	35
Racial Background	African American	0	--
	Caucasian	43	100
	Hispanic	0	--
	Other	0	--
State	Illinois	35	81
	Indiana	3	8
	Nevada	4	9
	Wisconsin	1	2

Type of Observers	School Psychologist	36	85
	Social Worker	3	8
	Other	4	9
Training in Direct Observation/Consultation	Yes	33	77
	No	10	23

Measures

Participant Demographics Questionnaire

The demographic questionnaire (see Appendix B) consisted of eight questions. Observers and Teacher participants indicated their sex, race, age, job title, which state they work in, what kind of community they work in (i.e., rural, urban, suburban), and years of experience. Observers were also asked whether they previously took a course(s) in managing student behavior/what course(s) they took, if they previously took a graduate consultation course, and if they previously took a course on how to conduct direct-behavioral observations. Last, observers were asked whether their school had a Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) framework in place and whether their school used the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) to assess their PBIS system.

Five in 20 Classroom Management Observation Tool

The observation tool (see Appendix A) was developed directly from the five critical features and 20 strategies identified by Simonsen and colleagues (2008). To complete the observation form, observers looked for 21 strategies that are briefly defined (on the form) below each of the five critical features they belong to. During the 20-minute observation, consultants first indicated whether they observed each strategy. Next, they rated the quality with which the strategy was implemented on a Likert-style scale from 1 (not consistent with the definition) to 5 (consistent with the definition). There was also a space provided for observers to add comments,

which could assist in remembering specifics or examples about what was observed. In addition, the observation form included operational definitions of behavior-specific and general praise, as well as mild, medium, harsh, and gesture reprimands so that observers could record frequency counts of the teacher's use of these strategies.

Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS)

The BIRS is a 24-item measure originally developed to assess the acceptability of behavior interventions (Elliott & Treuting, 1991). However, the authors indicate that the language is written broadly so it can be applied to various interventions (Elliott & Treuting, 1991). The BIRS has high validity and reliability (i.e., coefficient alpha for the 24 items was found to be .97, Elliott & Treuting, 1991). For the current study, the language on the BIRS was adapted to assess the acceptability of an observation tool (i.e., the Five in 20 observation tool), rather than a behavior intervention (see Appendix C). Of the original 24 questions, 15 were retained and adapted. Some examples of adapted BIRS items include: "Most observers would find this observation tool appropriate for assessing teachers' classroom management strategies, I would be interested to use this observation tool to help guide teacher-consultation regarding classroom management strategies, and the observation tool is a good way to collect data on teachers' classroom management strategies." Nine of the questions were omitted due to their specificity toward the outcome of a behavior intervention, which made them not easily adaptable. Observers rated each item using a Likert-style format where they chose to what degree they agree or disagree with the statement. To score the BIRS the 15 items were summed with the total possible score being 75 (higher scores indicate higher acceptability). The internal consistency of the BIRS using the current sample (N=43) was α= .90, which is considered highly acceptable (Taber, 2018).

Additional Questions

The observers were also asked to answer two additional questions (see Appendix D). The first asked the observer to indicate "yes or no" to the following question: "Based on the data you collected using the observation tool, do you think the teacher would benefit from classroom management training?" If the observer indicated "yes," the observer was asked the following question: "Based on the data you collected using the observation tool, what specific critical features/strategies would you recommend be targeted for training?" This response was open-ended.

Procedure

Prior to recruiting participants, this project was approved by Eastern Illinois University's IRB. Recruitment for this study took place in the following ways: a) the study was advertised (see Appendix E) on the Illinois School Psychology Association listserve; b) advertised on the EIU School Psychology Facebook page; c) advertised by emailing EIU School Psychology alumni; and d) EIU School Psychology alumni were encouraged to advertise to peers/colleagues who may be interested.

When an interested observer participant emailed to indicate they wanted to participate in the study, the PI (along with other graduate and undergraduate students on the research team) provided the participant the study materials and followed up with a phone call to explain the materials (i.e., informed consent, demographics, Five in 20 observation form, BIRS) and answer any questions. Furthermore, the PI explained to observer participants that they would approach a teacher in the school they work and ask if they would like to participate with them. The observer scheduled a time to observe the teacher during a time when the teacher would be leading instruction for the entire class (i.e., the expectation is for students to be facing and listening to the teacher).

The observers used the Five in 20 observation tool to carry out a 20-min observation with the teacher participant. The observer was responsible for distributing and collecting the informed consent (see Appendices F, G, and H) and demographics form from the teacher (and the informed consent, demographics, and BIRS from the reliability observer, if applicable). All forms were pre-coded with a teacher, observer, or reliability observer ID before they were distributed (no identifying information was collected). Once the observer participant sent back the completed forms, the author reviewed them for completeness and then asked for an address to send the $15 gift cards.

COVID Adaptation

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, an additional method of participation was offered. During the Summer of 2020, it became apparent that many school districts would not be opening for in-person attendance beginning the 2020-2021 school year. To adapt our study to individuals who wanted to participate, but whose schools were not meeting in person, we created the option of a "reported" observation. To participate using this method, observers filled out the forms described above as they would for a live observation. Participants who participated in the reported version of the study filled out the Five in 20 observation form by recalling the information about a teacher they had previously observed (e.g., spring 2020), rather than filling out the observation form as they were observing that teacher. This allowed the participant to provide data on the classroom management practices of a teacher they are familiar with, without needing to observe that teacher in their classroom. Participation in the study via observation of an online class session (i.e., Zoom, Microsoft Teams, etc.) rather than recalling a past observation was considered; however, it was deemed that this would require altering the overall format of the study too greatly. Further, there are aspects of classroom management included in the Five in 20 sheet (e.g., posting

of rules in the classroom, classroom arrangement) that may have not been accurately observed in an online classroom session.

Analytic Plan

Research Question 1

The first research question (Do observers report the Five in 20 observation tool to be easy and feasible to use, as measured by the BIRS?) was answered by first calculating the total score for the BIRS for each observer participant. Next, the average of the total scores of all participants on the BIRS was calculated. This scale included 15 items that were rated from 1-5; therefore, the range of possible scores for each participant was 15-75. Ratings of 60 were considered acceptable overall ratings. A threshold of 60 was determined because if an observer rated all 15 questions a "4" (Agree) the total (lowest score possible) would be 60. Therefore, a minimum total of 60 would indicate that the rater "Agreed" that the tool was acceptable across all items. In addition, anecdotal comments about the tool left by observers at the end of the BIRS form were analyzed and themes were summarized.

Research Question 2

The second research question (Does the Five in 20 observation tool identify teachers who are judged by observers to not need additional training as well as teachers who are judged to need additional training?) was answered by examining the number of participants who indicated "yes" or "no" on item 16 (i.e., whether the teacher did or did not need additional training). The total "yes" responses and total "no" responses were summed, and percentages were calculated.

Research Question 3

The third research question (Of the observers who indicate additional training is needed, are observers able to generate recommended areas for training or intervention?) was answered by

determining what percentage of participants who indicated "yes" (that the teacher they observed did need additional training on item 16) were able to include a written comment on item 17 about what strategies or additional training they would recommend.

Research Question 4

The fourth research question (Do observers who conduct more observations rate the Five in 20 observation tool more favorably?) was answered by examining each participant's indicated average number of observations each month and their overall rating on the BIRS to determine if a higher number of observations is correlated with higher Total BIRS scores. This was done by calculating Pearson's correlation coefficient for the average number of observations per month and the total BIRS scores to determine if there was a positive relationship between average observations and total BIRS scores.

Research Question 5

The fifth research question (Did observers with training in direct observation and consultation rate the Five in 20 tool more favorably?) was answered by comparing the Total BIRS scores (of participants who indicated that they had direct observation and consultation training with those who indicated that they did not) to determine if there was a difference between the two groups. This was done by conducting an independent groups *t*-test to examine the total BIRS scores of participants who did have direct observation and consultation training and participants who did not to examine if the total BIRS scores of those who did receive training were significantly higher than those who did not.

Research Question 6

The sixth research question (Do observers who obtain objective/clear results using the Five in 20 observation tool, rate the Five in 20 more favorably?) was answered by looking at the

Total Quality Scores on the Five in 20 tool and splitting the scores into two groups (i.e., high and low scores and middle scores). These two groups were then examined to determine if participants who obtained obviously high or obviously low classroom management scores had higher BIRS ratings than participants who obtained middle range scores. This was done by conducting an independent groups *t*-test to examine the total BIRS scores of participants who obtained objective/clear 5 in 20 classroom management scores and participants who obtained middle range classroom management scores to determine if the total BIRS scores of those who obtained objective results were significantly higher than those who obtained middle-range scores.

Results

Social Validity and Acceptability of the Five in 20

To answer Research Question 1 (Do observers report the Five in 20 observation tool to be easy and feasible to use), the BIRS ratings of each of the 43 observer participants were totaled. A threshold score of 60 was used to determine if each participant considered the tool to be socially valid. Of the 43 participants, 79% (34 of 43) had a total BIRS score of 60 or higher. This suggests the Five in 20 tool was socially acceptable and valid according to most participants in this study. Nine participants had BIRS scores below 60 (range 56-59). The participants who scored the Five in 20 less than 60 were descriptively analyzed by the PI, but no theme or pattern was apparent. Two of the nine observations were live and seven were recalled observations. All observers were primary (rather than reliability observers). All nine of the lower rating participants were varied in demographic features (e.g., years of experience, school setting). The items on the BIRS were also descriptively analyzed to determine if certain items were rated

lower by multiple participants. However, participants appeared to have a lower rating style throughout all items rather than any specific items.

Anecdotal Comments

While the total BIRS score was used to assess participants social validity, additional information may be gleaned from participants' anecdotal comments about the tool. Participants could write additional comments regarding the Five in 20 tool after completing the measure. Twenty-three participants left anecdotal comments, which were descriptively analyzed, and the following themes were identified. Overall feedback was positive (see additional details below) and the following themes were identified: a) mention of definitions/examples the tool provides for each critical feature and the strategies within it; b) suggestions related to how the tool could potentially be used in practice; c) comments regarding the length of the observation; d) comments regarding the inclusion of quality ratings on the tool; d) comments that expressed concern about teachers' willingness to accept feedback on their classroom management practices that were observed using the tool, as well as whether the observer felt comfortable providing that feedback in their role.

Structure of the Tool, Definitions, and Examples. Several participants noted that the definitions and examples helped them know exactly what to look for and would likely help with inter-rater reliability because two observers could ensure they were looking for the same features/strategies in an observation. Participants also reported the definitions and examples helped make the tool easy to learn to use in a short amount of time.

Using the Tool in Practice. Participants indicated how they would like to incorporate the tool into their behavior consultation with teachers, and possibly use it to collect data for Problem Solving Team meetings (e.g., when individual students have behavior problems in the

classroom). It was also suggested that the tool could be used to progress monitor a teacher's classroom management skills if they wanted to improve in specific areas.

Length of the Observation. There was mixed feedback regarding the length of the observation (20 minutes). Some participants commented how they liked that they could get so much information in a short amount of time. However, others reported they felt one 20-minute observation was not sufficient time to judge a teacher's classroom management because not all the strategies are demonstrated/ observed in a single observation.

Quality Ratings. Several participants noted that they found the quality ratings to be subjective, and confusing when a strategy was not observed (the observer was only supposed to rate the quality of the strategy when the strategy *was* observed). See discussion for suggestions on how this could be improved for future research.

Teacher feedback. Many participants reported they would like to use the tool to give teachers feedback regarding their classroom management, but their role doesn't allow for this type of consultation due to their other responsibilities. Additionally, many participants reported concern about how teachers may receive classroom management feedback. Participants mentioned that teachers may be unreceptive to feedback on their classroom management because they might perceive it as evaluative feedback, which would typically come from an administrator and not a school psychologist. Therefore, it was frequently suggested that the tool could be useful for administrators to use as part of teachers' evaluations.

Identifying Need for Additional Training

To answer Research Question 2 (Does the Five in 20 observation tool identify teachers who are judged by observers to not need additional training as well as teachers who are judged to need additional training), the number of observers who indicated "yes" for additional training

and observers who indicated "no" for additional training were summed and compared to the total number of participants. Of the 43 total participants, 20 (47%) indicated the teacher they observed did need additional classroom management training, and 23 (53%) indicated the teacher did not need additional training. The number of teachers needing and not needing additional training was nearly even, which preliminarily suggests the Five in 20 tool was able to identify both teachers who do need additional training and teachers who do not need additional training.

Providing Recommendations for Further Training

To answer Research Question 3 (Of the observers who indicated additional training is needed, are observers able to generate recommended areas for training or intervention), the percentage of observers who indicated (i.e., marked "yes") the teacher did need additional training and provided a written comment for item 17 (i.e., what strategies or additional training would you recommend) was determined. Twenty observers indicated the teacher they observed needed additional training and all 20 of those observers provided at least one training recommendation for that teacher. This suggests that when observers from this sample concluded additional training was needed, they were able to generate at least one training recommendation. These findings preliminarily suggest the Five in 20 tool may be helpful in guiding training recommendations.

BIRS Ratings and Classroom Observation

To answer Research Question 4 (Do observers who conduct more observations rate the Five in 20 observation tool more favorably) the relationship between each participant's average number of observations per month and their overall rating on the BIRS was examined. This question aimed to answer whether observers who conducted more observations would rate the tool more favorably. Pearson's *r* correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the direction

and strength of the linear relationship between number of classroom observations conducted per month and BIRS rating scores. There was a slight, but not statistically significant, positive relationship between more observations conducted per month and higher BIRS scores, $r(41) = .20$, $p > .005$ (one-tailed). In other words, observers who conducted more observations per month had slightly higher BIRS scores ($r^2=.04$). Higher number of observations per month accounted for 4% of the variance between the two constructs.

BIRS Ratings and Graduate Training

To answer Research Question 5 (Did observers with training in direct observation and consultation rate the Five in 20 tool more favorably), was answered by comparing the Total BIRS scores of participants who indicated they had both direct observation and consultation training with those who did not. This question aimed to determine whether there was a difference in acceptability of the Five in 20 tool based on whether observers had graduate training in consultation and direct observation. An independent samples t-test was conducted on BIRS scores for observers who received graduate consultation and direct observation training and observers who did not. At an alpha level of .05, there was no significant difference $t(41)=0.72$, $p> .005$ (one tailed) $d=6.06$. Observers who received training ($M = 65.88$, $SD = 6.29$) did not rate the Five in 20 tool significantly more acceptable (higher BIRS scores) than observers without training ($M = 64.30$, $SD = 5.10$).

BIRS Ratings and Scores Obtained on Five in 20

To answer Research Question 6 (Do observers who obtain objective/clear results using the Five in 20 tool, rate the tool more favorably), was answered by looking at the Total Quality Scores on the Five in 20 tool and splitting the scores into two groups (i.e., high/low scores and middle scores). This research question aimed to determine if observers who obtained objectively

high or objectively low scores on the Five in 20 tool would rate the tool more favorably (higher BIRS scores) than observers who obtained middle range scores (i.e., less objective) on the Five in 20 tool. The total range of scores was split into three equal groups, with the lowest range (24-48) being considered objectively low, the middle range (49-73) being considered middle, and the highest range (74-99) being considered objectively high. The high/low score groups were combined to form one group, and the middle score group the other. An independent samples t-test was conducted on BIRS scores for observers who obtained high/low scores and observers who obtained middle range scores. At an alpha level of .05, there was no significant difference $t(41)=3.14$, $p< .005$ (one tailed) $d = 6.09$. Observers with high/low scores on the Five in 20 tool (M = 65.81.36, SD = 6.06), did not rate the Five in 20 tool significantly more acceptable (higher BIRS score) than observers who obtained middle range scores (M = 65.23, SD = 6.11).

Recalled and Live Observation Comparison

Acceptability of the Five in 20

The current study included data from 43 observer-participants. However, due to the large numbers of COVID-19 related school closures/remote learning that took place during data collection (i.e., 2020-2021 school year), researchers offered a live or recalled observation to participants. Considering this, an additional research question was asked to determine whether there were differences in acceptability based on observation type (i.e., live vs. recalled). Of the 43 participants, 15 (35%) collected live observation data and 28 (65%) collected recalled observation data. Within the recalled observation group, 75% (21 out of 28) of participants had a BIRS score of 60 or higher (the indicated threshold of acceptability), whereas 87% (13 out of 15) of live participants had a BIRS score of 60 or higher.

Additionally, the live and recalled BIRS were compared using a *t*-test for independent samples to determine if there was a significant difference between the two groups. Results showed there was not a statistically significant difference $t(41)=5.97$, $p< .005$ (two tailed) $d = 6.07$. The live group (M= 66.27, SD=6.68) and recalled group (M=65.11, SD=5.72) BIRS ratings were not significantly different. It is important to note these groups were uneven and obtaining equal numbers for each group would have been ideal.

Need for Teacher Training

Differences were noted between live and recalled groups when determining if the observed teachers did or did not need additional training. In the live group, 20% of participants concluded that the teacher did need additional training and 80% concluded that the teacher did not. On the other hand, in the recalled group, 61% indicated additional training was needed, and 39% concluded additional training was not needed. When the groups were combined, 47% indicated additional training was needed and 53% indicated it was not. As stated previously, participants across both groups who indicated the teacher did need additional training were able to provide recommendations for training.

Discussion

The current study examined 43 participants' social validity ratings of the Five in 20 Classroom Management Observation Tool as measured by an adapted version of the BIRS (Elliott & Trueting, 1991). Participants completed the Five in 20 tool, developed by the PI and other researchers, during a 20-minute, live classroom observation or a recalled (previously completed) classroom observation to gather information regarding the teacher's use and quality of 21 classroom management strategies. Most observations were conducted in general education classrooms, with only one occurring in a special education classroom. Most observers were

female, Caucasian school psychologists working in Illinois who had received training in direct observation and consultation. After completing a live or recalled observation using the observation tool, participants filled out the adapted BIRS, to assess whether the observers found the tool was feasible to use and acceptable.

Social Validity

Most participants (79%) in this study found the Five in 20 Classroom Management Observation Tool to be socially valid and acceptable (i.e., a BIRS total score of 60 or higher and positive anecdotal comments). No specific patterns emerged from the participants (21%) whose BIRS data fell below 60. Rather, participants whose scores fell below the acceptable threshold seemed to provide overall lower (less positive) ratings across the 15 items. Overall, these findings are promising in that almost 80% of participants found the tool feasible and reported they would use the tool. Research suggests when individuals find interventions acceptable, they are more likely to implement the intervention with fidelity (Dart et al., 2011). Considering most observers found this tool acceptable, observers may also be more likely to use the tool as intended (i.e., with increased fidelity), which is important when using observation data to make training recommendations.

Participants provided positive anecdotal feedback on the structure of the tool, its inclusion of definitions/examples of each strategy to be observed, as well as different ways the tool could be incorporated into practice. For example, the suggestion that the tool could be useful when collecting data for student-centered behavioral consultation is excellent. When collecting information on student problem behavior, all parts of the environment can be a factor in that behavior. Therefore, collecting data on the classroom management of the student's teacher can be insightful information into the behavior, as well as potential solutions. In addition, some

participants indicated using the tool to provide feedback to teachers regarding classroom management was a concern. Feedback differed on whether participants felt providing classroom management feedback fell within their role (note 85% of the sample included school psychologists), which raises questions regarding the teacher-consultant relationship.

The Teacher-Consultant Relationship

Thirty percent of participants mentioned some type of hesitation in using this, or any, tool to provide teachers feedback on their classroom management skills citing concern for how teachers would perceive and/or react to the feedback. This concern from participants (85% of whom are practicing school psychologists) was surprising and unexpected and a few possible explanations are offered. First, data from this study were collected during the COVID-19 pandemic and it is widely accepted and acknowledged that the pandemic has (and continues) negatively impacted educators. Student behavior concerns are reportedly higher, and teachers are more stressed and may feel less in control of their classrooms than ever before (Pressley, 2021). It is likely that school psychologists or personnel providing consultative services may have experienced elevated teacher reactivity, defensiveness, or even aggression (not typically observed) because of a more hectic and stressful learning environment during the pandemic. Considering this, it is possible participants' concern for providing teachers feedback may have been influenced by unprecedentedly stressful times (Baker et al., 2021). Due to the pandemic, consultants may be more weary/uncomfortable providing feedback to educators.

Second, and more concerning explanation, for why some participants expressed concern for providing teachers classroom management feedback may be related to school psychologists' deviation from training in consultation and their relationships with teachers. First, as emphasized previously, behavioral consultation is an important area of school psychology training (Klose et

al., 2012). The role of a school psychologist in a consultation relationship is to explore and collect data on anything in the environment that may be influencing, producing, or related to the concern that is presented (Briere et. al., 2015). However, open-ended responses from participants suggest assessing how a teacher's classroom management skills are contributing (positively or negatively) to the learning environment would lead to negative outcomes (i.e., discomfort and conflict between the consultant and teacher). In this light, the consultant is not considering the teacher's influence on the instructional, learning environment, and instead is primarily focused on evaluating or determining where the problem lies within the student. When participating in a consultative relationship to improve outcomes for students, behaviorally or academically, evaluating a teacher's role in the situation is crucial and should be viewed as an opportunity to constructively collaborate rather than evaluate a teachers' performance (Briere et al., 2015). Administrators who fill the role of providing evaluative feedback are trained to do so but are not specifically trained in helping collect data and provide solutions for behavior problems in the way that school psychologists are. These findings were enlightening and may suggest despite training, school psychologists in practice may largely be practicing in a narrow, traditional role. When considering this, it makes sense that many participants in this study (largely school psychologists) did not think of the uses of this tool in that light.

Observations Completed

The current study hypothesized that participants who conducted classroom observations more frequently would find the tool more acceptable. This was hypothesized because participants who are more familiar with conducting observations might be more likely to find the tool socially acceptable and recognize how it could benefit practice (i.e., consultation). However, there was not a statistically significant positive correlation between frequency of observations

and total BIRS ratings. While not a strong correlation, higher number of observations did positively relate to higher BIRS ratings. Considering the anecdotal comments regarding concern for providing teachers feedback, future research should examine to what extent participants engage in consultation focusing on teacher feedback. In other words, not only the frequency of observations, but the type of observations (and for what purpose) may prove to be more strongly correlated with higher BIRS ratings.

It is important to mention the smaller sample size of 43 participants and its effect on the power of the calculation in examining BIRS ratings and classroom observations conducted. Furthermore, most participants (79%), regardless of how many observations they regularly conducted, found the tool acceptable. It is possible that whether an observer finds a tool acceptable or useful has more so to do with the specific tool (e.g., time-efficiency, ability to produce useful data) and less to do with how many observations they regularly conduct.

Previous Training

It was also hypothesized that participants who had received training in both consultation and direct observation would find the tool more acceptable. This was hypothesized because, like participants who conduct a higher number of observations, participants who have had training in consultation and direct observation may have a better understanding of the importance of the tool (i.e., the critical features for effective classroom management) and how it could be useful to consultation. However, there was not a significant difference in total BIRS scores between participants who had direct observation and consultation training and participants who did not. It is important to note that the groups were uneven in this calculation, with 33 participants who had training and 10 participants who did not. In the future, a larger overall sample and equal groups would be ideal. In addition, as mentioned above, most participants (79%) found the tool

acceptable, and this may have skewed the results as well if the likeability of the tool was influenced more by the tool itself than by previous training of the participants.

Feasibility

Need for Additional Training

It is important to determine whether a tool is useful to the consultation process. In the current study, this was examined by determining whether the tool could identify both teachers who need additional training and those who do not. Results suggested the tool did identify teachers who did and did not need classroom management training. Furthermore, the participants who indicated that the teacher they observed needed additional training were able to provide at least one training recommendation. These findings are an important first step in assessing the feasibility and usefulness of this tool. However, an important next step would be to validate whether teachers who are identified as needing additional training, using the tool, do in fact need additional training. In addition, it is important to determine whether the training recommendation provided is accurate based on the data collected using the tool. In other words, does the observer directly use the data from the observation to recommend a classroom management strategy that was not observed or observed with poor quality. If the recommendation can be linked to actual data obtained from the tool, the usefulness of the tool in practice would be strengthened, which would likely strengthen the social validity and acceptability of the tool.

Five in 20 Scores

It was hypothesized that participants who gained objective and clear information (high or low scores) using the tool would rate the tool more acceptable than participants who obtained mid-range scores. However, this hypothesis was not supported, as there was not a significant difference in BIRS scores between participants who obtained objective high/low scores and

participants who obtained mid-range scores. As mentioned previously, most participants in this study rated the Five in 20 tool socially acceptable. Therefore, it is possible participants may find the tool acceptable regardless of whether they obtain more objective or less objectives scores using the tool.

Limitations

There are limitations in this study that are important to note. First, the overall sample size for the study was relatively small. Further, although the demographic make-up of the sample (largely White women) does reflect the national demographic of school psychologists in the U.S. currently, it does make it difficult to generalize the results of the study to a larger, more diverse population. In addition, the portion of the sample made up of participants who completed live observations was smaller (N = 15) than those who completed recalled observations (N = 28). A larger sample of individuals who completed live observations and used the Five in 20 tool in real-time would strengthen social validity results. Considering only 15 participants completed the tool using a live observation, future research should replicate these findings with a larger live sample.

Collecting the data for this study during the COVID-19 global pandemic created several limitations. COVID-19 likely influenced participation and hindered participants' ability to participate in the use of the Five in 20 tool. Additionally, the stress school professionals experienced during the pandemic was (and continues to be) unprecedented. This stress may have influenced participants' responses. It is also possible that participants who completed a recalled observation may have been more influenced by pre-existing beliefs, opinions, or knowledge (less about a teacher in their ratings (i.e., less accurate), compared to participants who completed a live observation. Perceptions of the Five in 20 may be less accurate than if the observers were to

use the tool in a live classroom observation. Participation in the study via observation of an online class session (i.e., Zoom, Microsoft Teams, etc.) was considered, however it was deemed that this would require altering the overall format of the study too greatly. Further, there was concern that many aspects of classroom management included in the Five in 20 sheet would not be accurately observed in an online classroom session.

Another limitation is the ability to determine how accurately each participant collected data using the observation tool. One factor that would influence accuracy is participant training on the tool. The PI attempted to minimize this limitation by offering to set up a phone call with each participant to review the tool and answer any questions about conducting the observation. Many participants took advantage of this, but not everyone. Future research should examine the reliability of the tool. Preliminary research suggests inter-observer reliability is moderate for number of strategies used, and moderate to substantial for quality ratings (Cardot, 2021). However, future research might examine whether observers who watch a 20-minute classroom recording obtain similar data to a pre-established "key."

Future Research

Replicating this study using a larger sample of live observations would help strengthen the acceptability findings reported in this study. Future research should also be conducted on the overall psychometric properties of the Five in 20 so that its reliability can be assessed. This could be done by implanting a feature to ensure that participants are correctly coding what they observe (i.e., a short video training). Another avenue for future research could examine whether participants are 'correctly' determining whether a teacher needs more classroom management training based on the data that is collected from the Five in 20 observations. This could be done by looking at the overall scores compared to whether the teacher was deemed to need training or

not, as well as looking at whether the training recommendation was something that could be linked directly to what was observed.

The anecdotal comments provided by participants on the BIRS brought forth some areas of potential research. These include examining the quality ratings component of the Five in 20 for ease of use, as well as incorporating a measure of how this tool would function in teacher/consultant relationships aimed at improved classroom management skills. Some feedback expressed that the quality ratings on the Five in 20 were confusing (i.e., how to rate when the strategy was not observed) or subjective and not explicit enough on how to rate. In future research, modifying the Five in 20 to include even more explicit and clear directions on a) the guideline of not rating strategies for quality if they were not observed and b) instructions on how quality ratings should be decided based on what is being observed would hopefully increase not only socially validity of the tool, but also reliability of quality data being collected. Other areas of exploration could include examining social validity and acceptability of the Five in 20 observations from the perceptions of the teachers being observed to determine their thoughts on the tool's assessment of their classroom management skills, as well as potentially their thoughts on the feedback the observer provides based on the observation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study examined observer-participants' social validity and acceptability ratings of the Five in 20 Classroom Management Observation Tool as measured by an adapted version of the Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS). Classroom management is a critical component of the teaching profession in which training is often not provided sufficiently in pre-service programs. Therefore, it is important that there is an efficient and socially valid measure of teachers' classroom management skills to determine if they may benefit from additional

training to improve the classroom environment and potentially positively impact teacher attrition. Results from this study suggest most participants in this study found the Five in 20 tool was socially valid and acceptable.

References

Aldrup, K., Klusmann, U., Lüdtke, O., Göllner, R., & Trautwein, U. (2018). Social support and classroom management are related to secondary students' general school adjustment: A multilevel structural equation model using student and teacher ratings. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 110(8), 1066–1083. https://doi-org.proxy1.library.eiu.edu/10.1037/edu0000256.supp (Supplemental).

Baker, C. N., Peele, H., Daniels, M., Saybe, M., Whalen, K., & Overstreet, S. (2021). The Experience of COVID-19 and Its Impact on Teachers' Mental Health, Coping, and Teaching. *School Psychology Review*, *50*(4), 491–504.

Bethune, K. S. (2017). Effects of Coaching on Teachers' Implementation of Tier 1 School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support Strategies. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *19*(3), 131–142. https://doiorg.proxy1.library.eiu.edu/10.1177/1098300716680095.

Briere, D. E., Simonsen, B., Sugai, G., & Myers, D. (2015). Increasing new teachers' specific praise using a within-school consultation intervention. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 17(1), 50–60. https://doiorg.proxy1.library.eiu.edu/10.1177/1098300713497098.

Cardot, A. (2021). Five in 20: An exploratory study to develop and pilot an observation tool used to assess the five features critical to effective classroom management. *Masters Theses*. 4875.

Christofferson, M., & Sullivan, A. L. (2015). Preservice teachers' classroom management training: A survey of self-reported training experiences, content coverage, and

preparedness. *Psychology in the Schools*, 52(3), 248–264. https://doi-org.proxy1.library.eiu.edu/10.1002/pits.21819

Clunies, R. 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 behavior. *Educational Psychology*, 28(6), 693–710. https://doi-org.proxy1.library.eiu.edu/10.1080/01443410802206700.

Damme, A. M., Kane, E. J., Olson, A., Peterson, R. L. (2016). Classroom management. Building & Sustaining Student Engagement. Retrieved from https://k12engagement.unl.edu/strategy-briefs/Classroom%20Management%206-8-16.pdf

Dart, E. H., Cook, C. R., Collins, T. A., Gresham, F. M., & Chenier, J. S. (2011). Test driving interventions to increase treatment integrity and student outcomes. *School Psychology Review*, *41*(4), 467–481.

Dicke, T., Parker, P. D., Marsh, H. W., Kunter, M., Schmeck, A., & Leutner, D. (2014). Self-efficacy in classroom management, classroom disturbances, and emotional exhaustion: A moderated mediation analysis of teacher candidates. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 106(2), 569–583. https://doi-org.proxy1.library.eiu.edu/10.1037/a0035504.supp (Supplemental)

Elliott, S. N., & Treuting, M. V. (1991). The Behavior Intervention Rating Scale: Development and validation of a pretreatment acceptability and effectiveness measure. *Journal of School Psychology*, 29(1), 43–51.

Kazdin, A. E. (1980). Acceptability of alternative treatments for deviant child behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 13, 259–273.

Klose, L. M., Plotts, C., & Lasser, J. (2012). Participants' evaluation of consultation: implications for training in school psychology. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(7), 817–828. https://doi-org.proxy1.library.eiu.edu/10.1080/02602938.2011.576310.

Korpershoek, H., Harms, T., de Boer, H., van Kuijk, M., & Doolaard, S. (2016). A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Classroom Management Strategies and Classroom Management Programs on Students' Academic, Behavioral, Emotional, and Motivational Outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 86(3), 643–680.

Koziol Jr., S. M., & Burns, P. (1986). Teachers' accuracy in self-reporting about instructional practices using a focused self-report inventory. *Journal of Educational Research, 79*(4), 205–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1986.10885678

Kwok, A. (2017). Relationships between instructional quality and classroom management for beginning urban teachers. Educational Researcher, 46(7), 355–365. https://doi-org.proxy1.library.eiu.edu/10.3102/0013189X17726727

MacSuga, A. S., & Simonsen, B. (2011). Increasing teachers' use of evidence-based classroom management strategies through consultation: Overview and case studies. *Beyond Behavior*, 20(2), 4–12.

Markelz, A. M., Riden, B. S., Zoder-Martell, K. A. (2020). Reliability assessment of an observation tool to measure praise characteristics. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions.* Published on-line February 21, 2020.

Nafpaktitis, M., Mayer, G. R., & Butterworth, T. (1985). Natural rates of teacher approval and disapproval and their relation to student behavior in intermediate school classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(3), 362-367.

Nagro, S. A., Fraser, D. W., & Hooks, S. D. (2019). Lesson planning with Engagement in mind: Proactive classroom management strategies for curriculum instruction. *Intervention in School & Clinic*, 54(3), 131–140.

OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (2019). *Positive behavioral interventions & supports*. Retrieved from www.pbis.org.

Pressley, T. (2021). Factors contributing to teacher burnout during COVID-19. *Educational Researcher, 50*(5), 325–327.

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.proxy1.library.eiu.edu/10.1037/a0022714.

Reinke, W. M., Stormont, M., Herman, K. C., Wachsmuth, S., & Newcomer, L. (2015). The Brief Classroom Interaction Observation–Revised: An observation system to inform and increase teacher use of universal classroom management practices. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 17(3), 159–169.

Ritz, M., Noltemeyer, A., Davis, D., & Green, J. (2014). Behavior management in preschool classrooms: Insights revealed through systematic observation and interview. *Psychology in the Schools*, 51(2), 181–197. https://doi-org.proxy1.library.eiu.edu/10.1002/pits.21744

Sanetti, L. M., Williamson, K. M., Long, A. C. J., & Kratochwill, T. R. (2018). Increasing in service teacher implementation of classroom management practices through consultation, implementation planning, and participant modeling. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 20(1), 43–59. https://doi-org.proxy1.library.eiu.edu/10.1177/1098300717722357.

Shernoff, E. S., Frazier, S. L., Maríñez-Lora, A. M., Lakind, D., Atkins, M. S., Jakobsons, L., … Patel, D. A. (2016). Expanding the role of school psychologists to support early career teachers: A mixed-method study. School Psychology Review, 45(2), 226–249. https://doi-org.proxy1.library.eiu.edu/10.17105/SPR45-2.226-249

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.

Simonsen, B., Freeman, J., Kooken, J., Dooley, K., Gambino, A. J., Wilkinson, S., VanLone, J., Walters, S., Byun, S. G., Xu, X., Lupo, K., & Kern, L. (2020). Initial validation of the Classroom Management Observation Tool (CMOT). *School Psychology*, 35(3), 179–192. https://doi-org.proxy1.library.eiu.edu/10.1037/spq0000357

Spilt, J. L., Leflot, G., Onghena, P., & Colpin, H. (2016). Use of praise and reprimands as critical ingredients of teacher behavior management: Effects on children's development in the context of a teacher-mediated classroom intervention. *Prevention Science*, 1 7(6), 732-742.

Stitcher, J. P., Lewis, T. J., Whittaker, T. A., Richter, M., Johnson, N., & Trussell, R. (2009). Assessing teacher use of opportunities to respond and effective classroom management strategies. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 11*, 68-81.

Taber, K.S. (2018). The use of cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Res Sci Educ 48*, 1273–1296.

Vannest, K., Harrison, J. R., & Reynolds, C. R. (2013). Social acceptability of five screening instruments for social, emotional, and behavioral challenges. Behavioral Disorders, 38(3), 171–189.

Wolf, M. M. (1978). Social validity: The case for subjective measurement, or how behavior analysis is finding its heart. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 11, 203-214.

Appendix A

Observer Code: _____ Job Title: _____ Reason for the Observation: _____(e.g., re-eval, consultation).

Reliability Observer Code: _____ Job Title: _____ Date: _____ School Code: _____ Observation Length:_____

Teacher Code: _____ Class Description_____ (e.g., 5th grade general ed). How many students in the classroom _____ ?

Directions 1) **STRATEGY:** Indicate if the classroom strategy was observed during the 20-min observation.

2) **QUALITY:** If a strategy was observed, indicate the quality of the observed strategy (1 = poor, 5 = great).

3) **FREQUENCY:** Using the operational definitions, tally the frequency of Praise and Reprimands observed during the 20-min observation.

	Critical Feature	Classroom Strategy & Description	Observed Yes or No	Quality (Inconsistent with Description … Consistent with Description)	Comments/Notes
1	Maximizing Structure & Predictability	• Easy Traffic Flow (physical arrangement of the room (e.g., adult can easily move in the isle & btw furniture, can access all of room, no roadblocks, no visual obstructions).	☐ ☐	1 2 3 4 5	
		• Structured (teacher-imposed organization, lesson plan is clear, students are aware of current classroom objectives; visual aids are informative and not distracting)	☐ ☐	1 2 3 4 5	
		• Rules Posted (classroom rules are visible, positively stated, large enough to read, succinct, linked to SW expectations).	☐ ☐	1 2 3 4 5	
		• Schedule Posted (e.g., picture schedule or written schedule. Visible, devl. appropriate for grade).	☐ ☐	1 2 3 4 5	
2	Establishing and Teaching Expectations	• Rules: Taught & Reviewed (expectations are taught & reminders are provided frequently...used to prevent misbehavior AND after misbehavior occurs).	☐ ☐	1 2 3 4 5	
		• Active Supervision (e.g., close proximity to students, moving frequently, not stagnant in one location). Actively attending to student behavior, little socializing).	☐ ☐	1 2 3 4 5	
3	Engaging Students in Observable Ways	• Opportunities to Respond (OTR) (e.g., uses response cards, white boards, electronic responding with a focus on choral responding).	☐ ☐	1 2 3 4 5	
		• Direct Instruction (modeling the skill, leading students through content with examples and making connections. Assessing student knowledge to guide continued instruction, not relying on worksheets, e.g., "I do, we do, you do").	☐ ☐	1 2 3 4 5	
		• Class-Wide Tutoring (students are paired strategically to enhance learning, use of response trials, immediate error correction/feedback, teacher actively supervises tutoring).	☐ ☐	1 2 3 4 5	
		• Computer Assisted Instruction (use of technology that allows each student one-on-one **instruction** without leaving the classroom)	☐ ☐	1 2 3 4 5	
		• Guided Notes (lecture or chapter outlines providing main ideas where students can follow along filling in additional ideas, devl appropriate for grade).	☐ ☐	1 2 3 4 5	

4	Recognizing Appropriate Behavior using Various Strategies	• Using Behavior-Specific Praise (verbal praise clearly identifying student behaviors that earn teacher approval, e.g., "Great job lining up quickly and quietly!"). • Token Economies (students earn points or coupons for appropriate/expected behavior that can later be exchanged for prizes or activities). • Class-Wide Group Contingencies (a common expectation is set for entire class and all students earn positive outcome if expectation is met, e.g., if everyone works quietly during small groups the class receives extra recess). • Behavior Contracts (document written by teacher and student that outlines expected behavior and outcomes when those expectations are or are not met, is devl appropriate for grade, e.g., home-school note, CICO).	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5	
5	Responding to Inappropriate Behavior using Various Strategies	• Brief Instructional Corrections for Inappropriate Behavior (undesired behavior is clearly and immediately identified & an alternative/appropriate behavior is concisely identified, e.g., you pushed Sam, you need to say "excuse me" when you want to pass by). • Performance Feedback (students view their performance – compared to a set criterion - visually, e.g., charts, graphs, behavior card. Academic (ORF) or behavioral (e.g., transitions under 2 min, homework turned in). • Planned ignoring (identify minor misbehavior to ignore and withhold attention, corrective comment, or redirection when students engage in those minor misbehaviors). • Differential Reinforcement (Responding to i.e., commenting, describing, praising appropriate behavior, while ignoring minor misbehavior. Responding to any behavior OTHER than the identified misbehavior). • Response Cost (stimulus, e.g., token or coin, is removed due to engagement in undesired behavior) • Time Out from Reinforcement (removal from reinforcement, e.g., playing with peers, peer or teacher attention, activity, for a **BRIEF time**, i.e., 10 min or less).	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5	

Praise Frequency		**Reprimand Frequency**			
Behavior Specific	**General**	**Mild**	**Medium**	**Harsh**	**Gesture**

PRAISE DEFINITIONS:	
Behavior Specific	Any **specific verbalization or gesture** that expresses a favorable judgment on an activity, product, or attribute of the student (examples below). *Thank you for sitting criss cross *Good job cleaning up *Nice work helping *That is a pretty picture! *I like how you raised your hand
General	Any **nonspecific verbalization or gesture** that expresses a favorable judgment on an activity, product, or attribute of the student (examples below) *Great! *Nice Work *Hi-five or Thumbs up (gesture w/ no verbalization) *Gives token (no verbalization) *Thank you *Perfect

REPRIMAND DEFINITIONS:	
Mild Reprimand:	Any **verbal comment (using a normal speaking tone)** that indicates disapproval of a student(s) behavior. The verbal comment can be an instruction following student misbehavior. The reprimand is concise (brief). Also referred to as a "redirection" of student behavior. Disagreeing with a student with the **absence of sarcasm or a critical tone** would be identified as mild. *No thank you *Not now *No, come sit down (child at desk, while other children are on carpet) *That is not how we treat our friends
Medium (Sarcastic) Reprimand:	Any **verbal comment (using a sarcastic or critical tone)** that indicates disapproval of a student(s) behavior. The verbal comment can be in the form of a question that is disapproving and has a **mocking, rude, or critical tone**. A sarcastic reprimand is marked if the teacher disagrees with the child using a critical tone. *I don't remember telling you to write about mumkins! *No, it's not cold in here (critical disagreement) *Is that your best work? (critical) (child misspelled word, sarcasm)
Harsh Reprimand:	Any **verbal comment (using a louder than typical tone for the setting)** that indicates disapproval of a student(s) behavior. Harsh reprimand is also marked if the reprimand implies negative consequences (e.g., a threat). *One more outburst and no recess (threat) *I won't tell you again *Excuse me! (loud) *How many times do I need to say _____
Gesture Reprimand:	Any **gesture (without speaking)** that indicates disapproval of a student behavior (e.g., hands on hips). Teacher may also gesture by **physically guiding the child's body** to a preferred area or activity *Hands on hips (disapproving look) *Teacher physically guides child to correct location *Shakes head when student interrupts

Epstein et al., 2008; Office of Special Education Programs, 2016; Simonsen et al., 2008

Appendix B

Participant Code:

1. Please indicate your sex (circle): Male Female Non-binary Prefer not to answer

2. Please indicate your race

- ○ American Indian or Alaska Native
- ○ Asian
- ○ Black or African American
- ○ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- ○ White
- ○ Two or more races (please specify) _____
- ○ I prefer not to answer

3. Please indicate your age. _____

4. Please list your job title? _____

5. In what state do you work? _____

6. How would you describe the community in which you work? (circle): Rural Urban Suburban

7. How many years of experience do you have _____ years.

8. Have you taken an undergraduate or graduate course that focuses on managing student behavior?

- ○ Yes, please provide the name of the course (if possible) _____
- ○ No
- ○ Other _____

Appendix C

Directions: Now that you have used the observation tool, please evaluate it by circling the number which best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement. You must answer each question. *observers (e.g., school psychologists or other staff who provide consultation)		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	This would be an acceptable observation tool to use to assess teacher's classroom management strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Most observers would find this observation tool appropriate for assessing teachers' classroom management strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
3	The measure should prove effective in collecting data on teachers' classroom management strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I would suggest the use of this observation tool to other observers who provide consultation to teachers regarding classroom management strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Most observers would find this observation tool useful for assessing teachers' classroom management strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I would be interested to use this observation tool to help guide teacher-consultation regarding classroom management strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
7	The observation tool would *not* result in negative side effects for the observer when providing consultation to teachers' regarding classroom management strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
8	The observation tool would be appropriate for working with a variety of teachers/classrooms when providing consultation for classroom management strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
9	The observation tool is consistent with those I have used to guide consultation related to classroom management.	1	2	3	4	5
10	The observation tool is a fair way to assess teachers' classroom management strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
11	The observation tool is reasonable for assessing teachers' classroom management strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I like the procedures used in this observation tool.	1	2	3	4	5
13	The observation tool is a good way to collect data on teachers' classroom management strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
14	The observation tool would assess teachers' classroom management strategies efficiently.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Overall, the observation tool would be beneficial for observers providing consultation services related to classroom management.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix D

Imagine you are engaging in consultation with the teacher you observed.

16	Based on the data you collected using the observation tool, do you think the teacher would benefit from classroom management training?	Yes	No
	*If Yes – continue to question 17..... If NO – end		
17	Based on the data you collected using the observation tool, what specific critical features/strategies would you recommend be targeted for training?		

Enter response here:

Additional Comments:

Appendix E

Participants needed

All school psycholgoist are invited to participate who work in a K-12th grade setting.

Participation incentive

All participants will earn $15

Research tasks

Observer

- Approach teacher and ask if they would like to participate as well
- Approach another observer to collect reliability data
- Complete a 5 in 20 observersation
- Information gathered is anonymous

Teacher

- Allow observer to complete 5 in 20 observation during a whole-class lesson
- Information gathered is anonymous

Reliability partner

- Complete a 5 in 20 observersation
- Complete social validity scale
- Information gathered is anonymous

If interested please contact

Alexandria Cardot
School Psychology Graduate Student
akcardot@eiu.edu

Dr. Margaret Floress, Thesis Chair
Thesis Chair
mfloress@eiu.edu

Help support student research on classroom management!

This study is being reviewed by Eastern Illinois Institution Review Board (IRB).

Appendix F

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH – Primary Observer Form

Assessing Teachers' Classroom Management Practices

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Kari Meyer, SSP and Margaret Floress, PhD. Your participation in the study is entirely voluntary. Please ask questions about anything you do not understand.

Purpose of the Study
We are interested in piloting an observation tool which may prove useful to school psychologists who consult with teachers regarding effective classroom management practices.

Procedures
Observer participants will approach a teacher and ask if they would like to participate in the study with you. If they agree, you will observe the teacher for a single 20-min observation, while they provide a whole-class lesson, using the pilot tool intended to measure classroom management practices. After the observation, you will complete a demographics and observation acceptability survey (approx. 8 min). ***You may also recruit a second observer to collect observation data with the same observation tool simultaneously (so that reliability can be assessed). You will receive a $15 gift card for your participation.

Potential Risks and Discomforts
This study has been approved by the Eastern Illinois University Institutional Review Board. (#). There are no foreseeable risks associated with participating in this study.

Confidentiality
All participant forms will be coded (e.g., A-1) to keep participant data confidential. Your name (or other personal information) will not be paired with your demographic, observation, or acceptability data. Collected data will be emailed to Dr. Floress' and downloaded onto a password protected computer in her locked office. All participant data will be stored for at least 3-years. Dr. Floress, Ms. Meyer, Ms. Allie Cardot and Kaylee Hampton (two school graduate psychology, research assistants) will be the only persons with access to data.

Anticipated results are expected to provide insight into teachers' classroom management practices and the acceptability of the observation tool. We hope that the results from this study will help develop an efficient observation tool that school psychologists can use to guide meaningful consultation recommendations.

If you have questions or concerns about this research, please contact: Margaret Floress, Ph.D., at 217.581.2127 or mfloress@eiu.edu. If you have any questions or concerns about the treatment of human participants in this study, you may call or write:

Institutional Review Board
Eastern Illinois University
600 Lincoln Ave.
Charleston, IL 61920
Telephone: (217) 581-8576
E-mail: eiuirb@www.eiu.edu

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue my participation at any time without consequences of any kind or loss of benefits or services. I have been given a copy of this form.

_____
Participant's Signature Date

_____
Investigator's Signature Date

Appendix G

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH – Reliability Observer Form

Assessing Teachers' Classroom Management Practices

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Kari Meyer, SSP and Margaret Floress, PhD. Your participation in the study is entirely voluntary. Please ask questions about anything you do not understand.

Purpose of the Study
We are interested in piloting an observation tool which may prove useful to school psychologists who consult with teachers regarding effective classroom management practices.

Procedures
Reliability observer participants will observe a teacher for a single 20-min observation, while they provide a whole-class lesson, using the pilot tool intended to measure classroom management practices. This observation will take place simultaneously with the observation conducted by the primary observer. After the observation, you will complete a demographics and observation acceptability survey (approx. 8 min). You will receive a $15 gift card for your participation.

Potential Risks and Discomforts
This study has been approved by the Eastern Illinois University Institutional Review Board. (#). There are no foreseeable risks associated with participating in this study.

Confidentiality
All participant forms will be coded (e.g., A-1) to keep participant data confidential. Your name (or other personal information) will not be paired with your demographic, observation, or acceptability data. Collected data will be emailed to Dr. Floress' and downloaded onto a password protected computer in her locked office. All participant data will be stored for at least 3-years. Dr. Floress, Ms. Meyer, Ms. Allie Cardot and Kaylee Hampton (two school graduate psychology, research assistants) will be the only persons with access to data.

Anticipated results are expected to provide insight into teachers' classroom management practices and the acceptability of the observation tool. We hope that the results from this study will help develop an efficient observation tool that school psychologists can use to guide meaningful consultation recommendations.

If you have questions or concerns about this research, please contact: Margaret Floress, Ph.D., at 217.581.2127 or mfloress@eiu.edu If you have any questions or concerns about the treatment of human participants in this study, you may call or write:

Institutional Review Board
Eastern Illinois University
600 Lincoln Ave.
Charleston, IL 61920
Telephone: (217) 581-8576
E-mail: eiuirb@www.eiu.edu

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue my participation at any time without consequences of any kind or loss of benefits or services. I have been given a copy of this form.

_____

Participant's Signature Date

_____

Investigator's Signature Date

Appendix H

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH – Teacher Form

Assessing Teachers' Classroom Management Practices

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Kari Meyer, SSP and Margaret Floress, PhD. Your participation in the study is entirely voluntary. Please ask questions about anything you do not understand.

Purpose of the Study
We are interested in piloting an observation tool which may prove useful to school psychologists who consult with teachers regarding effective classroom management practices.

Procedures
Teacher participants will be observed for a single 20-min observation while providing a whole-class lesson. A school psychologist (or other consultant) in your district will conduct the observation using the pilot tool intended to measure classroom management practices. Teacher participants will also complete a brief demographic survey and a 10-question, multiple choice measure related to praise. You will receive a $15 gift card for your participation.

Potential Risks and Discomforts
This study has been approved by the Eastern Illinois University Institutional Review Board. (# 19-102). There are no foreseeable risks associated with participating in this study.

Confidentiality
All participant forms will be coded (e.g., A-1) to keep participant data confidential. Your name (or other personal information) will not be paired with your demographic or observation data. Collected data will be emailed to Dr. Floress' and downloaded onto a password protected computer in her locked office. All participant data will be stored for at least 3-years. Dr. Floress, Ms. Meyer, Ms. Allie Cardot, and Kaylee Hampton (two school graduate psychology, research assistants) will be the only persons with access to data.

Anticipated results are expected to provide insight into teachers' classroom management practices and the acceptability of the observation tool. We hope that the results from this study will help develop an efficient observation tool that school psychologists can use to guide meaningful consultation recommendations.

If you have questions or concerns about this research, please contact: Margaret Floress, Ph.D., at 217.581.2127 or mfloress@eiu.edu. If you have any questions or concerns about the treatment of human participants in this study, you may call or write:

Institutional Review Board
Eastern Illinois University
600 Lincoln Ave.
Charleston, IL 61920
Telephone: (217) 581-8576
E-mail: eiuirb@www.eiu.edu

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue my participation at any time without consequences of any kind or loss of benefits or services. I have been given a copy of this form.

_____
Participant's Signature Date

_____
Investigator's Signature Date