

2019

Middle School and High School Teachers' Actual and Perceived Use of Praise and Reprimand

Melissa Beaudoin

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [School Psychology](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Beaudoin, Melissa, "Middle School and High School Teachers' Actual and Perceived Use of Praise and Reprimand" (2019). *Masters Theses*. 4340.

<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/4340>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.



Thesis Maintenance and Reproduction Certificate

FOR: Graduate Candidates Completing Theses in Partial Fulfillment of the Degree
Graduate Faculty Advisors Directing the Theses

RE: Preservation, Reproduction, and Distribution of Thesis Research

Preserving, reproducing, and distributing thesis research is an important part of Booth Library's responsibility to provide access to scholarship. In order to further this goal, Booth Library makes all graduate theses completed as part of a degree program at Eastern Illinois University available for personal study, research, and other not-for-profit educational purposes. Under 17 U.S.C. § 108, the library may reproduce and distribute a copy without infringing on copyright; however, professional courtesy dictates that permission be requested from the author before doing so.

Your signatures affirm the following:

- The graduate candidate is the author of this thesis.
- The graduate candidate retains the copyright and intellectual property rights associated with the original research, creative activity, and intellectual or artistic content of the thesis.
- The graduate candidate certifies her/his compliance with federal copyright law (Title 17 of the U. S. Code) and her/his right to authorize reproduction and distribution of all copyrighted materials included in this thesis.
- The graduate candidate in consultation with the faculty advisor grants Booth Library the nonexclusive, perpetual right to make copies of the thesis freely and publicly available without restriction, by means of any current or successive technology, including but not limited to photocopying, microfilm, digitization, or internet.
- The graduate candidate acknowledges that by depositing her/his thesis with Booth Library, her/his work is available for viewing by the public and may be borrowed through the library's circulation and interlibrary loan departments, or accessed electronically. The graduate candidate acknowledges this policy by indicating in the following manner:

Yes, I wish to make accessible this thesis for viewing by the public

No, I wish to quarantine the thesis temporarily and have included the **Thesis Withholding Request Form**

• The graduate candidate waives the confidentiality provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U. S. C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) with respect to the contents of the thesis and with respect to information concerning authorship of the thesis, including name and status as a student at Eastern Illinois University. I have conferred with my graduate faculty advisor. My signature below indicates that I have read and agree with the above statements, and hereby give my permission to allow Booth Library to reproduce and distribute my thesis. My adviser's signature indicates concurrence to reproduce and distribute the thesis

Graduate Candidate Signature

Melissa Beaudoin

Printed Name

School Psychology
Graduate Degree Program

Faculty Adviser Signature

Margaret Faess

Printed Name

Date

1/29/19

Please submit in duplicate.

Middle School and High School Teachers' Actual and Perceived Use

of Praise and Reprimand

(TITLE)

BY

Melissa Beaudoin

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

SPECIALIST IN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

2019

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

DATE

1/29/19

SCHOOL CHAIR
OR CHAIR'S DESIGNEE

DATE

1/29/19

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE

1/29/19

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE

1/29/19

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge all individuals that played an important role in this project. First, I would like to thank my family and friends for encouraging and supporting me throughout this project. I would like to thank my thesis chair, Dr. Margaret Floress, for her great insight, time, reflection, and guidance toward this study. Additionally, I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Ronan Bernas and Dr. Wesley Allen, for their great feedback, advice, and the time they dedicated toward this study. Finally, I would like to thank LeAnn Brown, Sara Caldwell, Korie Poe, Emma Riedesel, and Zach Yehling for their collaboration in collecting the data needed for this project.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	6
Introduction.....	7
Teacher Praise and Reprimand.....	8
Definitions.....	8
Teachers' natural use of praise and reprimand.....	11
Teacher Training and Their Perceptions of Praise and Reprimand.....	14
Theory for Teachers' Perceived Use of Praise and Reprimand	17
Literature Summary and Impact of Proposed Research	19
Methods	22
Participants and Setting.....	22
Materials and Instruments	23
Teacher demographic questionnaire.....	23
Teacher perception of praise and reprimand form	24
Praise and reprimand data collection form.....	25
<i>Operational definition: Praise type</i>	25
<i>Operational definition: Reprimand type</i>	26
Direct Observation Training	27
Procedures.....	28
Data Analysis	29
Results.....	30

Observations.....	31
Praise and Reprimand Frequency and Rates.....	31
Teacher Perceptions.....	32
Teacher Perceptions and Praise to Reprimand Ratios.....	33
Discussion.....	35
Limitations and Future Research.....	43
References.....	48
Appendix A.....	613
Appendix B.....	67
Appendix C.....	69
Appendix D.....	70
Appendix E.....	72
Appendix F.....	75

List of Tables

Table 1. Teacher and Classroom Demographics.....	58
Table 2. Teachers' Mean and Range of Observed Rate of Praise and Reprimand Statements per Hour	60
Table 3. Relationship Between Actual and Perceived Praise and Reprimand.....	61
Table 4. Relationship Between Actual and Perceived Praise Difference, Actual and Perceived Reprimand Difference, and Praise to Reprimand Ratio.....	62

Abstract

This study aimed to examine teachers' natural praise and reprimand rates among 66 middle and high school teachers. In addition, teachers' perceptions of how often they praised and reprimanded were compared to their actual use of praise and reprimands. A total of 1,320 direct-observation minutes were collected using 20-min observations for each teacher. After teachers were observed they completed a survey rating their perceived use of praise and reprimand. Teachers were observed to use significantly more general praise compared to behavior specific praise. They were also observed to use significantly more mild reprimands compared to any other type of reprimand. There was a statistically significant positive relation between teachers' actual and perceived use of general praise as well as statistically significant positive relations between teachers' actual and perceived use of mild, gestural, and total reprimand. Finally, there was a significant positive relationship between actual and perceived praise difference and actual and perceived reprimand difference. In other words, teachers that had a greater difference between their actual and perceived praise tended to have a greater difference between their actual and perceived reprimand. Future research directions and implications for teacher praise training to improve classroom management is discussed.

Middle School and High School Teachers' Actual and Perceived Use of
Praise and Reprimand

Introduction

Effective classroom management is positively related to student participation and ultimately student academic success (Reinke, Lewis-Palmer, & Merrell, 2008).

Unfortunately, many teachers report that they lack experience and preparation in dealing with student behavioral challenges (Coalition for Psychology in the Schools and Education, 2006; Martin, Linfoot, & Stephenson, 1999), are ill-equipped to address students' mental health needs related to behavioral challenges (Reinke et al., 2008), and would benefit from additional behavior management training (Dutton Tillery, Varjas, Meyers, & Collins, 2010). Effective classroom management is key to effective teaching because student disruptive behavior is minimized, which aids positive learning and social outcomes (Trussell, 2008).

Poor classroom management may also be related to teacher stress and burnout (Kyriacou, 2001) because dealing with high-levels of student misbehavior is emotionally demanding and stressful (Dicke, Elling, Schmeck, & Leutner, 2015). When teachers experience ongoing stress, it may negatively impact their social-psychological well-being and in turn influence how they address classroom management, student misbehavior, and the relationships they have with their students (Dicke et al., 2015). Classroom management training may help prevent teacher stress and burnout. For example, Dicke et al. (2015) found that approximately 40% of teachers who received classroom management training (consisting of classroom rules and procedures, organization, maintenance, interpersonal relationships, problematic behavior, communication, and

initial classroom environment) reported less rumination (i.e., less thinking about worrisome thoughts) and emotional exhaustion.

One classroom management tool that effectively decreases student misbehavior is teacher praise (Pas, Cash, O'Brennan Debnam, & Bradshaw, 2015). Higher rates of teacher praise and lower rates of teacher reprimand can positively impact classroom climate and how teachers manage student behavior in their classroom (Spilt, Leflot, Onghena, & Colpin, 2016). For instance, higher praise to reprimand ratios are associated with appropriate student behavior, increased rates of student on-task behavior, positive learning environments, and enhanced student engagement (Nafpaktitis, Mayer, & Butterworth, 1985; Sticher, Lewis, Whittaker, Richter, & Trussell, 2009). The next section will review the literature regarding praise and reprimand definitions, teacher training, and rates.

Teacher Praise and Reprimand

Definitions. Praise is defined as a verbal statement or gesture that signals teacher approval of a desired student behavior that goes beyond providing feedback for a correct academic response (Reinke et al., 2008). For example, a teacher who says, "great job" after a student correctly works through a math problem, would be considered praise. However, a teacher who says, "you are right" or "yes" after a student provides the correct academic response would not be considered praise.

Praise is commonly categorized into two types, general praise (GP) and behavior-specific praise (BSP; Floress & Jenkins, 2015; Reinke, Stormont, Herman, Wachsmuth, & Newcomer, 2015). GP is defined as "any nonspecific verbalization or gesture that expresses a favorable judgment on an activity, product, or attribute of the student"

(Floress & Jenkins, 2015, p. 4), whereas BSP is defined as “any specific verbalization or gesture that expresses a favorable judgement on an activity, product, or attribute of the student” (Floress & Jenkins, 2015, p.4). For example, “good job” would be considered GP because it expresses approval without explicitly identifying an action or characteristic associated with the student. On the other hand, “Nice job coloring in the lines” would be considered BSP because it provides clear feedback related to an explicit action performed by the student.

When teachers are trained to increase their use of BSP, student compliance, on-task behavior, and appropriate behavior improve (Brophy, 1981; Chalk & Bizo, 2004; Sutherland, Wehby, & Copeland, 2000). Recommended guidelines for the effective use of BSP include: the teacher delivering BSP near the student who performed the behavior that was approved, the teacher delivering BSP consistently when the approved behavior is observed, and the teacher delivering BSP contingent on student effort (rather than the student’s ability; Conroy, Snyder, Al-Hendawi, & Vo, 2009; Simonsen, Fairbanks, Briesch, Myers, & Sugai, 2008).

Reprimands are defined as “verbal comments or gestures made by the teacher indicating disapproval of student behavior” (Reinke et al., 2008, p 318). Reinke et al. (2015) described reprimands as either explicit and harsh. Explicit reprimands were defined as a “verbal comment or gesture by the teacher to indicate disapproval of behavior; concise (brief) in a normal speaking tone” (Reinke et al., 2015, p. 163). An example of an explicit reprimand is a teacher stating, “You need to have a seat” in response to a child walking around the room when the expectation is for students to be seated. Harsh reprimands were defined as a “verbal comment or gesture to indicate

disapproval of behavior using a voice louder than typical for the setting or harsh, critical, or sarcastic tone” and lasts for 30 seconds or longer (Reinke et al., 2015, p. 163; Reinke, Herman, & Stormont, 2013). Examples of harsh reprimands include statements such as “I will not tell you again!” (e.g., said in a raised voice that is strained) or “Do you think that was the right choice?” (e.g., using a sarcastic tone) compared to an explicit reprimand that instructs the student what to do instead (e.g. get back to work) after the presence of an undesired behavior (Reinke, Herman, & Stormont, 2013).

In the current study, GP and BSP definitions were used; however, reprimand definitions were further divided into four categories (i.e., mild, medium, harsh, and gesture). Mild reprimand is defined similarly to explicit reprimand used in the Reinke et al. (2015) study. Likewise, harsh reprimand is defined using the same definition used in the Reinke et al. study. However, after the principal investigator assisted in reviewing and coding teacher data for a video pilot project (Floress, Zoder-Martell, Beaudoin, & Yehling, under review), additional reprimand categories (i.e. medium and gestural reprimands) were observed and are used in the current study (see methods section for definitions). Harsh reprimands were rarely observed during video coding; however, teachers were frequently observed to use sarcasm when reprimanding students, which qualitatively appeared different than simply directing students to change their behavior. For this reason, medium reprimands were coded in the current study. Gestural reprimands were also observed in the video pilot study (Floress et al., under review), and Nafpaktitis, Mayer, and Butterworth (1985) included nonverbal gestures in their praise and reprimand definitions. For this reason, reprimand gestures were coded in the current study. Next, teachers' natural use of praise and reprimand is reviewed.

Teachers' natural use of praise and reprimand. When teachers are trained to increase their use of BSP, student on-task behavior increases (Allday et al., 2012; Chalk & Bizo, 2004; Sutherland et al., 2000; Thompson, Marchant, Anderson, Prater, & Gibb, 2012) and student disruptive behavior decreases (Reinke, Lewis-Palmer, & Martin, 2007; Reinke et al., 2008; Sutherland et al., 2000). Unfortunately, in the absence of consultation or intervention, teachers use praise infrequently (Floress, Jenkins, Reinke, & McKown, 2017b; Fullerton, Conroy, & Correa, 2009). When teacher praise is used correctly it is positively related to student academic success and negatively related to student disruptive behavior (Hawkins & Heflin, 2011; Kern & Clemens, 2007; Akin-Little, Eckert, Lovett, & Little 2004). When teachers praise student appropriate behavior, students are less likely to misbehave which contributes to an overall positive classroom climate (Reinke, Herman, & Stormont, 2013). Examining what strategies teachers use in the absence of training or consultation (i.e., naturally) may assist in determining teachers' professional development needs (Jenkins, Floress, & Reinke, 2015). Teachers' natural use of praise and reprimand may also be an indicator of a teachers' effective classroom management skills (Floress et al., 2017b).

Although there are few studies that have examined teachers' natural praise to reprimand ratios (Jenkins et al. 2015), researchers have been examining the natural use of these strategies since the 70s. White (1975) was one of the first to examine teachers' natural use of praise and reprimand, which she referred to as teacher "approval" and "disapproval" (p. 368). White and colleagues collected 8,340 minutes of direct-observation data across first through twelfth grade classrooms and concluded that

teachers' use of praise and reprimand declined as teachers taught older grades, however, praise declined more dramatically than reprimand (1975).

In a review of the natural praise rate literature, Jenkins et al., (2015) re-examined White's praise data and Floress, Caldwell, Beaudoin, & Yehling (in preparation) re-examined White's reprimand data into early elementary (i.e., first and second grade), late elementary (i.e., third through fifth grade), middle school (i.e., sixth through eighth grade), and high school (i.e., ninth, tenth, and twelfth grade). First and second grade, teachers delivered 43.7 praises and 33.2 reprimands on average per hour (1.3 to 1 ratio); third through fifth grade teachers delivered 21.0 praises and 31.2 reprimands per hour (.67 to 1 ratio); middle school teachers used 17.1 praises and 28.1 reprimands per hour (0.61 to 1 ratio); and high school teachers used 8.4 praises and 15.0 reprimands per hour (.56 to 1 ratio; Jenkins et al., 2015, p. 467; Floress et al., in preparation, p. 6; White, 1975).

Heller and White (1975) also examined junior high school teachers' natural use of praise and reprimand during teacher instruction to determine if teachers praised and reprimanded students differently based on reading ability. Results indicated that students in the low (below grade level for national norms) reading ability group received more teacher reprimands (38.1 reprimands per hour) compared to students in the high (at or above grade level for national norms) reading ability group (24.3 reprimands per hour; Heller & White, 1975). There may be other factors that influence teacher' praise and reprimand rates, like student' academic performance (Heller & White, 1975).

Nafpaktitis, Mayer, and Butterworth (1985) examined teachers' natural use of praise and reprimand. Specifically, the researchers examined the relation between teacher

approval and disapproval of appropriate and inappropriate student behavior. Results of the study concluded that high rates of praise (or approval) during inappropriate (off-task behavior) was related to higher rates of disruptive behavior. Teachers with low rates of reprimand and higher rates of praise were associated with high rates of student on-task behavior. The authors concluded that these findings provided evidence that high rates of teacher praise may be related to appropriate student behavior and low rates of teacher praise may be related to inappropriate student behavior. Furthermore, teacher reprimands were positively related to student off-task and disruptive behavior in the classroom (Nafpaktitis et al., 1985).

It is commonly recommended that teachers should provide a four to one praise to reprimand ratio (Loveless 1996; Walker, Ramsey, & Gresham, 2004). In other words, teachers should provide four praises to every reprimand. This recommendation is supported by Nafpaktitis et al. (1985) in that appropriate student behavior increased with higher rates of approval (i.e., praise) and lower rates of disapproval (i.e., reprimand). Furthermore, other studies have found that high teacher praise to reprimand ratios are related to increases in student academic engagement, positive and productive learning environments, and student appropriate behavior (Nafpaktitis et al., 1985; Sticher et al., 2009). No study has compared teachers' actual or observed praise and reprimand rates to their perceived praise to reprimand rates. However, teachers who understand how to effectively manage student classroom behavior, are more likely to use effective management strategies in the classroom when comparing self-reported strategies with observed strategies (Clunies-Ross, Little, & Kienhuis, 2008).

Clunies-Ross et al., (2008) studied how teachers self-reported classroom management strategies in relation to actual use of classroom management strategies. Of the 97 teachers that completed questionnaires on teacher management strategies, 20 of those teachers were observed by recording management strategies and student on-task behavior. Comparison of the questionnaires and observation concluded that teacher self-reports matched actual practice and teachers were more likely to report the use of more effective, proactive management strategies (e.g., active listening). The next section looks at teacher training and teachers' perceptions of praise and reprimand.

Teacher Training and Perceptions of Praise and Reprimand

When teachers receive training in evidence-based classroom management techniques, student and teaching outcomes improve (i.e. enhanced student engagement, appropriate student behavior, better organized instruction) compared to teachers who do not receive training (Evertson, 1985). Many teachers do not receive training or are inadequately trained, and as a result are not prepared to manage student classroom behavior. Begeny and Martens (2006) conducted a study on empirically based behavioral instruction practices with 110 pre-service teachers enrolled in elementary, secondary, or special education master's degree programs. Results showed that teachers felt inadequately trained in behavioral instruction practices, strategies, and programs (Begeny & Martens, 2006).

Teachers' perceptions of their behavior management skills (e.g. praise) may also be an indicator of their effective use of these skills. For example, teachers who are directly trained to use behavior management skills via self-monitoring and performance feedback methods, may be more likely to maintain their skills after training ends. Oliver,

Wehby, and Nelson (2015) trained four second-grade teachers (with high rates of disruptive classroom behavior) to use the Good Behavior Game (GBG), an evidence-based classroom management strategy. GBG is implemented by deciding the schedule of the game, clearly defining the negative behaviors to be scored, and then choosing the rewards for the winning team (i.e., the team who has the fewest negative behaviors). The teacher introduces the game to the class and puts the game into action. Teachers were taught how to implement the GBG via self-monitoring and performance feedback (Oliver et al., 2015). Prior to training, none of the teachers used the GBG. During implementation of the GBG, when teachers received performance feedback and self-monitored, their implementation accuracy ranged from 85-100%. Teachers also reported to be highly satisfied with self-monitoring and indicated that self-monitoring would be beneficial when learning to implement other academic or behavioral strategies (Oliver et al., 2015). These findings relate to the current study because they highlight that teachers who are trained via performance feedback and self-monitoring methods became more knowledgeable and accurate in their use of the GBG. Teachers who are more knowledgeable and accurate in their implementation of evidence-based strategies (e.g., praise), may use these strategies more effectively (i.e. use a higher praise to reprimand ratio).

Self-monitoring has also been incorporated into teachers' use of praise (Kalis, Vannest, & Parker, 2007; Sutherland & Wehby, 2001; Simonsen, MacSuga, Fallon, & Sugai, 2013). Kalis and colleagues (2007) examined whether training a teacher to self-monitor praise use would increase her use of praise. The teacher was a first-year high school teacher who taught five self-contained students identified with EBD (emotional-

behavioral disorders). At baseline, on average, the teacher used 1.75 total praise statements, which significantly increased at intervention (21 total praise statements; effect size 0.92). Praise rates also remained high after training (23 total praise statements; Kalis et al., 2007, p. 24). Similar findings were found for GP and BSP. At baseline, the teacher used 1.75 GP statements and 0 BSP statements. During intervention, GP statements increased to 16.66 and BSP statements increased to 4.43. Both GP and BSP had large effect sizes 0.84 and 0.91, respectively (Kalis et al., 2007, p. 24-25).

Performance feedback is another training method, that when used effectively, increases teachers' use of praise. Reinke et al. (2007) examined the impact of visual performance feedback on teachers' use of BSP using a multiple baseline design. Three general education elementary teachers received daily visual feedback showing their use of BSP with six targeted students. Results demonstrated that when visual feedback was applied, teachers' BSP increased systematically across all three teachers. The findings of this study along with the results from the Oliver, Wehby, and Nelson (2015) study, suggest that when teachers are taught to self-monitor or receive performance feedback, their use of praise increases.

No study has examined teachers' perceptions of their own use of praise. However, in an unpublished dissertation, Assuah (2010) examined *students'* perceptions of their teachers' use of praise. Interestingly, teachers may think they are praising their students more frequently than their students think they are receiving praise. In this dissertation, high school math teachers were asked to report how often they thought they were praising their students and compared this to how often students thought they were receiving praise (Assuah, 2010). Teachers thought they praised and encouraged students in their high

school algebra and geometry classes significantly more often than the students reported receiving teachers' praise and encouragement. This is an interesting finding because it gives insight into both teachers' and students' perspectives regarding teachers' use of praise in the classroom; however, it does not answer whether teachers are aware of how often they *actually* praise students. To date, no study has examined teachers' perceived use of praise and reprimand in comparison to their actual or observed use of praise and reprimand.

Theory for Teachers' Perceived Use of Praise and Reprimand

Performance feedback and self-monitoring may be effective training methods because teachers become aware of their performance by being taught to evaluate their own performance in comparison to a set training criterion. Teachers learn to assess their strengths and weaknesses, identify specific skills or actions that will improve their performance, and strive to match their performance to the set criterion (Kennedy & McGarthy, 2015). Teachers who are trained to increase their use of praise via feedback or who increase their use of praise via tracking how often they praise (i.e., self-monitor), may easily increase their use of praise because they learn to be more aware of what they are doing. Reinke et al. found that when teachers were trained to use classroom management strategies (e.g., praise) and received visual performance feedback, they increased their use of GP and BSP. In addition, after teachers were trained to implement classroom management strategies, their use of reprimands decreased along with classroom disruptive behavior (2008).

Using self-monitoring and performance feedback to increase teachers' use of praise are both supported by Bandura's social learning theory (1968). Social learning

theory is an agentic concept (e.g., it is influential to the course of events based on one's actions; Bandura, 1968) which is comprised of a triadic structure consisting of behavioral, environmental, and personal causal factors (Bandura, 2001). This means that human functioning is a product of the interactions between behaviors individuals engage in, the environmental factors that play a role in the individual's life, and interpersonal influences (Bandura, 2001; Bandura, 2005). Bandura also incorporated the idea of modeling into his behavioral theory which states that one's own behavior develops from referential performance in comparison to one's own self-performance (Bandura, 1986). Modeling is related to referential performance in that individuals are working towards a specific standard to establish change (Bandura, 1991). Additionally, both modeling and self-monitoring are used to evaluate one's own performance in comparison with one's personal standards and how others perform (Bandura, 1991).

Self-monitoring and performance feedback are purported to be effective in increasing teacher praise because teachers become more aware of their current performance through self-evaluation and feedback in comparison to set training criterion. Teachers likely increase their use of praise because they become more aware of the difference between their current performance and the set criterion. This is aligned with Bandura's social learning theory because of the interaction of the three factors: behaviors, intrapersonal influences, and environment. For instance, teachers' own performance and attributes (i.e. intrapersonal influences) may be influenced by environmental factors (i.e., the classroom or other individuals that the teacher works or interacts with) which further influence how the teacher performs (i.e., behavior). The next section will go over the literature summary and the impact of the current study.

Literature Summary and Impact of Proposed Research

Effective classroom management is important for student academic success (Reinke et al., 2008). Unfortunately, many teachers lack training and preparation in dealing with student behavioral challenges (Coalition for Psychology in the School and Education, 2006; Martin et al., 1999). Providing effective classroom management training (e.g., how to effectively implement praise) would better prepare teachers to manage student behavior (Dutton Tillery et al., 2010). Praise is an easy to use, effective classroom management tool that can positively impact classroom climate (Spilt et al., 2016). When teachers are trained to increase their use of BSP, student compliance, on-task behavior, and appropriate behavior improve (Brophy, 1981; Chalk & Bizo, 2004; Sutherland et al., 2000). Although a higher praise to reprimand ratio is recommended (i.e., 4 to 1; Loveless 1996; Walker, Ramsey, & Gresham, 2004), research from more than four decades ago (White, 1975) and more recent research (Floress et al., in preparation) suggest that middle and high school teachers' natural total praise to total reprimand ratios are much lower than this recommendation (approximately 1 to 1).

Few studies have examined teachers' natural praise and reprimand rates and of those studies the most recent (Nafpaktitis et al., 1985) was published more than three decades ago. Teacher's natural use of praise has been studied more recently among preschool, kindergarten, and kindergarten through fifth grade classrooms (Floress, Berlinghof, Radar, & Riedesel, 2017a; Floress & Jenkins, 2015; Floress et al., 2017b); however, only one recent study (Floress et al., in preparation) has examined rates among middle or high school classrooms and the Floress et al. study, only total praise to total reprimand rates were examined. Therefore, additional studies are needed that examine

teachers' use of different praise and reprimand types among middle and high school classrooms in the absence of intervention (or training). This information is likely to inform universal professional development and give an idea of where teachers (in the absence of training) compare to recommended standards (i.e., more BSP than GP).

Additionally, no study has examined whether teachers with high praise to reprimand ratios have a higher frequency of praise than those teachers with low praise to reprimand ratios. Understanding whether teachers with high praise to reprimand ratios are more likely to accurately identify their use of praise and reprimand may also be helpful for professional development training. If teachers with higher praise to reprimand ratios are more likely to accurately report their use of praise and reprimand, their (accurate) awareness may be an indicator that professional development supports are not needed. On the other hand, if teachers with lower praise to reprimand ratios are unaware of their use of praise and reprimand, these teachers may benefit from self-monitoring or performance feedback training to increase their use of praise. These training methods may be beneficial to increasing teachers' praise to reprimand ratios (especially among those who are unaware of their use of these strategies) because social learning theory suggests that when teachers self-monitor or receive feedback regarding their performance, they are more aware of their performance. Therefore, it is likely that teachers who are more aware of their performance, also praise at a higher rate because they compare their performance with a set standard (i.e., strive for a higher praise to reprimand ratio). Along these same lines, if teachers with low praise to reprimand ratios are unaware of their use of these strategies, teaching them to self-monitor or providing

them performance feedback may help them achieve a higher praise to reprimand ratio and increase their awareness of their use of these strategies.

As noted, previous literature has been inadequate regarding teachers' natural praise and reprimand rates and currently no study has examined how often teachers think they praise and reprimand. Therefore, the current study has two aims. The first is to extend the literature in this area by examining the frequency of middle and high school teachers use of different praise and reprimand types. A second aim of this study is to examine middle and high school teachers' perceptions of their praise and reprimand use to determine whether teachers with higher praise to reprimand ratios are more accurate in their perceived rates compared to teachers with lower praise to reprimand ratios. The following research questions are posed:

1) What are the praise and reprimand rates by type among middle and high school general education teachers? It is hypothesized that middle and high school teachers will use more GP than BSP (Floress & Jenkins, 2015; Floress et al., 2017a). It is also hypothesized that middle and high school teachers will use more mild reprimands than any other type of reprimand (i.e., medium, harsh, or gestural; Gable Hester, Rock, & Hughes, 2009).

2) Are teachers' perceptions of their use of praise consistent with their actual or observed use of praise? In other words, is there a relation between teachers' reported use of praise and their actual use of praise? Currently, no study has examined whether teachers' perceptions of praise are related to their actual use of praise; therefore, no specific predictions were made.

3) Are teachers' perceptions of their use of reprimand consistent with their actual use of reprimand? In other words, is there a relation between teachers' reported use of reprimand and their actual use of reprimand? As with praise, no study has examined whether teachers' perceptions of reprimand are related to their actual use of reprimand; therefore, no specific predictions were made.

4) Is there a relationship between teachers praise to reprimand ratios and their praise and reprimand accuracy? When self-monitoring and performance feedback strategies were implemented (i.e., teachers were more aware of their use of praise) teacher's use of praise increased (Reinke et al., 2008). However, no study has examined the relation between praise to reprimand ratios and teachers' accurate perception of their use of praise and reprimand. Therefore, it is hypothesized that teachers with higher praise to reprimand ratios will be more accurate in their use of praise and reprimand than teachers with lower praise to reprimand ratios.

Method

Participants and Setting

This study consisted of sixty-six middle school and high school, general education teacher participants from Central Illinois. Data collected for this study was combined with data collected from a previous study (Floress et al., in preparation). There were seven middle schools and eight high schools that participated in this current study. Of the 66 participants, 25 were middle school teachers and 41 were high school teachers (see Table 1). Participants ranged in age from 23-67 years (mean=39). All participants held a teaching certificate. Twenty-one teachers held a bachelor's degree and 45 teachers held a master's degree. Most participants were female (71%) and Caucasian (98%). Teaching

experience was well distributed across the sample (see Table 1) and approximately half of teachers (47%) reported that they took a behavior management class as a part of their teacher education program.

To participate, teachers needed to teach at least 20-minutes of lecture-based instruction. For example, traditional lecture-based classes with teacher-led instruction included Science, Math, English, or Social Studies classes. Teachers that taught less traditional classes (e.g., Music and Art) were also invited to participate *if* students were expected to be attentive to a teacher-led lecture (i.e. students were expected to look at and listen to the teacher at the front of the classroom) for at least a 20-minute period. Special education teachers and teachers who did not teach for a least 20-minutes of lecture-based instruction were excluded from participating (e.g., P.E., study hall, band). The reason for this was to ensure observations were consistent across classroom settings and participants. The first 40 teachers that participated in the 20-minute observation and returned their questionnaire received a gift card (valued at \$5). After 40 gift cards were distributed, participants received chocolate.

Materials and Instruments

Teacher demographic questionnaire. The teacher demographic questionnaire included 13 questions (see Appendix C). Demographic questions were completed after the teacher was observed. The questionnaire asked teachers to provide the following: sex, age, race, years of teaching experience, education level, teacher certification and type of teaching certificate (e.g., general education or special education), specialized training or professional development (e.g., crisis management training), location that the specialized training or professional development took place, grade and subject of the class that was

observed (e.g. freshman English), a description of the student population in the class that was observed (e.g., only general ed. students, mostly general ed. students etc.), and a rating of behavioral difficulty (e.g., much less difficult, somewhat less difficult, etc.) for the class that was observed compared to other classes that the teacher had taught in the past.

Teacher perception of praise and reprimand form. Teacher perception of their use of praise and reprimand was obtained using the teacher perception of praise and reprimand form (see Appendix D). This form included five rating scales where teachers were provided a definition for each type of praise (i.e., GP and BSP) and reprimand (i.e. mild, medium, harsh, and gesture) and then asked how many times they used each type of praise and reprimand within a 20-minute lesson (lecture). The teachers were directed to answer by circling the frequency of each type of praise and reprimand on a number line that ranged from 0-20. The definitions used on the teacher perception of praise and reprimand form were the same operational definitions used by observers to collect direct observation data (see operational definitions below). The teacher perception of praise and reprimand form asked teachers to indicate the frequency that they use each type of praise and reprimand within a 20-minute observation, so that their ratings lined-up with the actual length of the direct observation (20-minutes). Teachers were provided a number line to rate their frequency ranging from 0-20, because (based on prior research; Floress & Jenkins, 2015) it was unlikely teachers would provide more than 20 praises or reprimands per a 20-minute observation (i.e., praise or reprimand more than once per minute).

Praise and reprimand data collection form. The praise and reprimand data collection form was used to collect praise and reprimand frequency data during a 20-minute classroom observation. The form (see Appendix A) contained 20, 1-minute intervals. Each interval was divided into praise and reprimand type and delivery (see operational definitions below). Praise was broken down into two types (GP and BSP) and reprimand was broken down into four types (mild medium, harsh, and gesture). This form allowed observers to also measure how teachers deliver praise and reprimands (i.e., to individual students, a small cluster of students, or a large group of students). For this study, teacher delivery of praise and reprimand was not examined, so definitions for delivery will not be discussed.

To complete the form, trained research assistants (two undergraduate and three graduate students) listed the date of the observation, the school code, and the teacher code (school and teacher codes are given to ensure school and teacher information is kept confidential). Observers used a cued audio tape that aligned with each of the 20, 1-minute intervals on the form. Observers watched the teacher during each 1-minute interval and marked the frequency of praise and reprimand used within each interval. Observers also wrote the verbatim statement or gesture for each praise or reprimand observed during the 20-minute observation. Noted below are the operational definitions that were used to code praise and reprimand.

Operational definition: Praise type. Praise was coded into two categories: GP and BSP. GP was coded as any nonspecific verbalization or gesture that expresses a favorable judgement on an activity, product, or attribute of the student. Examples include: “Great”, “Nice Work”, “Thank you”, or thumbs up (see Appendix E). BSP was

coded as any specific verbalization or gesture that expresses a favorable judgment on an activity, product, or attribute of the student. Examples include: "That is a pretty picture you made!", "Good job getting right to work", "terrific job coloring your project", or "You are sitting like I asked"-gives star (see Appendix E).

Operational definition: Reprimand type. Reprimands were coded into four categories: mild, medium, harsh, and gesture. A mild reprimand was any concise (brief) verbal comment (using a normal speaking tone) that indicated disapproval of a student(s) behavior. The verbal comment could be an instruction following student misbehavior or a "redirection" of student behavior. Disagreeing with a student with the absence of sarcasm or a critical tone would be identified as a mild reprimand. Examples include: "No thank you", "Not now" or "That is not how we treat our friends" (see Appendix E).

A medium reprimand was defined as any verbal comment (using a sarcastic or critical tone) that indicated disapproval of a student(s) behavior. The verbal comment could be in the form of a question that was disapproving and had a mocking, rude, or critical tone. A sarcastic reprimand was marked if the teacher disagreed with the child using a critical tone. Examples include: "No it is not cold in here!" (critical) or "Is that your best work?" (critical, mocking), or "I don't remember telling you to write about mumpkins!" (sarcastic; see Appendix E).

Harsh reprimand was defined as any verbal comment (using a louder than typical tone for the setting) that indicated disapproval of a student(s) behavior. Harsh reprimand was marked if the reprimand implied negative consequences (e.g. a threat). Examples include: "One more outburst and no recess" (threat) or "How many times do I need to remind you to put your homework folder in your backpack!" (see Appendix E).

A reprimand gesture was defined as any gesture (without speaking) that indicated disapproval of student behavior (e.g., hands on hips). A reprimand gesture would be marked if a teacher physically guided a child's body to a preferred area or activity. Examples include: Teacher puts her hands on hips with a disapproving look towards students or a teacher shakes his or her head at a student when the student is disrupting class.

Inter-observer agreement. Of the 66, 20-minute observations, 38% were collected using two observers so interobserver agreement (IOA) could be calculated for total praise, praise types, total reprimand, and reprimand types. IOA was calculated using percent agreement (i.e., the number of agreements divided by the number of agreements plus disagreements; Mudford, Taylor, & Martin, 2009). Average IOA for praise was: BSP (98%, range 90%-100%), GP (92%, range 60%-100%), and total praise (95%, range 80%-100%). Average IOA for mild reprimand was (95%, range 78%-100%), medium (98%, range 86%-100%), harsh (100%, range 95%-100%), gesture (98%, range 90%-100%), and total reprimand (98%, range 90%-100%). IOA percentages indicated consistent and acceptable reliability among observers.

Direct Observation Training

Five research assistants (two undergraduate and three graduate students) were trained to collect direct observation data. First, research assistants reviewed the operational definitions for praise type (i.e., BSP and GP) and reprimand type (i.e., mild, medium, harsh, and gesture, see Appendix E). Examples and non-examples of each type of praise and reprimand were discussed, and research assistants were encouraged to ask questions. Next, each assistant coded three training videos and were required to

demonstrate $\leq 80\%$ IOA with a previously trained assistant. Then the research assistant needed to code live in a classroom and demonstrate $\leq 80\%$ IOA with a previously trained assistant before they were considered trained and were sent out to collect direct observation data independently.

Procedures

IRB approval and then permission from school administrators (to recruit middle and high school teacher participants) was secured. Next, teachers were sent a recruiting flyer (see Appendix F) which provided a brief description of the study and the requirements for participation in the study. Teachers were not informed that praise and reprimand would be observed. Teachers that agreed to participate provided optimal times for observations to take place (i.e. times when they were likely to engage in a lecture for at least 20-minutes). To ensure confidentiality, each teacher was assigned an ID code. ID codes were used on classroom observation forms and teacher questionnaires.

Praise and reprimand data collection forms were used by the researcher and five trained research assistants to collect praise (i.e, GP and BSP) and reprimand (i.e., mild, medium, harsh, and gesture) data. All but one observation was completed in a single, 20-minute observation. After the observation was completed, the observer provided the teacher with the demographic questionnaire and teacher perception of praise and reprimand form. The researcher followed-up with the teacher to prompt the teacher to complete and return the forms in a sealed envelope (provided by the researcher) to the school office to be picked up by the researcher or a research assistant.

Data Analysis

To answer research question one, what are the rates of praise and reprimand type among middle and high school general education teachers, praise and reprimand types were collected via direct observations. Frequency counts for praise type (i.e., GP and BSP) were totaled from each 20-minute teacher observation. Similarly, frequency counts for reprimand type (i.e., mild, medium, harsh, and gesture) were totaled from each 20-minute teacher observation. Total praise (adding GP and BSP) and total reprimand (adding mild, medium, harsh, and gesture) were also calculated. So that the results of the current study can be compared to prior research, praise and reprimand per minute and per hour were calculated. The first hypothesis, that middle and high school teachers will use more GP than BSP, was analyzed using a t-test for dependent means. The second hypothesis, that middle and high school teachers will use more mild reprimand than any other type of reprimand (i.e., medium, harsh, or gestural), was analyzed using an ANOVA for repeated measures.

The second question, are teachers' perceptions of their use of praise consistent with their actual use of praise, was analyzed using Pearson's r correlational statistic. Pearson's r is a correlation coefficient that is used to determine if there is a relation between two variables (i.e., teachers' perceptions of their use of praise and their actual use of praise). The correlation coefficient can range from a negative relation (-1) to a positive relation (1) depending on the type of relation between the two variables (Taylor, 1990). Pearson's r values with a p -value of .05 or lower will be considered significant. This analysis was used with each type of praise (i.e., BSP and GP) and total praise to

determine if there was a relation between perceived and actual praise among middle and high school teachers.

The third question, are teachers' perceptions of their use of reprimand consistent with their actual use of reprimand, was analyzed using Pearson's r correlational statistic. This analysis was used with each type of reprimand (i.e., mild, medium, harsh, and gesture) and total reprimand to determine if there was a relation between perceived and actual reprimand among the middle and high school teachers.

The final research question, is there a relationship between teachers praise to reprimand ratios and their praise and reprimand accuracy, than teachers with lower praise to reprimand ratios, was also analyzed using Pearson's r correlational statistic. This analysis was used to determine if there was a relationship between three variables: actual and perceived praise difference, actual and perceived reprimand difference, and praise to reprimand ratio. Praise difference and reprimand difference was computed by finding the absolute value between each teacher's total perceived and total actual praise and reprimand. Praise to reprimand ratio was calculated by finding the greatest common divisor (gcd) between each participant's total actual praise and total actual reprimand. Praise to reprimand ratios were calculated by dividing each praise and reprimand actual total to the computed gcd. For example, one participant had 9 total actual praises and 3 total actual reprimands. The gcd was 3. therefore, praise to reprimand ratio was 3:1 (9/3 and 3/3).

Results

Observations

The primary researcher and five research assistants collected 66, 20-minute direct observations (i.e., 1,320 minutes or 22 hours) across middle and high school teachers. Frequencies of teacher praise type (i.e., GP or BSP) and reprimand type (mild, medium, harsh, or gesture) during teacher-led class-wide instruction were recorded. A total of 496 incidents of praise and reprimand were recorded. Across the 66 teachers, there were 186 incidents of GP and 44 incidents of BSP. There were 197 incidents of mild reprimand, 28 incidents of medium reprimand, 9 incidents of harsh reprimand, and 32 incidents of gesture reprimand.

One teacher (67th participant) was excluded from data analysis because her actual mild reprimand rates (50 total mild reprimands in a 20-minute observation) significantly exceeded the frequency rating range (0-20 per 20 min) on the teacher perceptions of praise and reprimand form. Additionally, her other reprimand rates were higher than typically observed (3 medium, 14 harsh, and 20 gesture). Since this teacher was not provided a form that would have given her the opportunity to accurately report her actual use of reprimands (given she exceeded the maximum, 20 per 20 min) and her significantly higher rates of overall reprimands, her data was removed from the sample (see limitations and future research for additional discussion).

Praise and Reprimand Frequency and Rates

To answer research question one (What are the praise and reprimand rates among middle and high school general education teachers?), praise and reprimand frequencies were collected from each 20-minute teacher observation. Across all 66 teachers, the

average rate of total praise was 10.45 per hour (total rate for the 20-minutes time 3 and then divided by total participants to get the average rate per hour. $(230 \times 3)/66 = 10.45$) and the average rate of total reprimand was 12.09 per hour (see Table 2). The average rate of GP was 8.45 per hour and the average rate of BSP was 2 per hour. The average rate of mild reprimand was 8.95 per hour, medium was 1.28 per hour, harsh was 0.41 per hour, and gesture was 1.85 per hour (see Table 2). Across the 66 participants, the average praise to reprimand ratio was 0.86 to 1. (see Table 2 for rate per min calculations). Of the 66 participants, 20 had more praises than reprimands. There were 3 teachers that had ratios reflecting the recommended 4:1 praise to reprimand ratios and 4 teachers that had higher than the 4:1 recommended ratio.

To determine whether middle and high school teachers use more GP than BSP, a t-test for dependent means was conducted. At an alpha level of .05, results show that GP ($M = 2.82, SD = 3.41$) was used significantly more often than BSP ($M = .67, SD = 1.71$), $t(65) = 5.37, p < .001$, (one-tailed), $d = 1.26$. Therefore, the sample of middle and high school teachers used more GP than BSP, which was a large effect size.

To determine whether teachers used more mild reprimands than any other type of reprimand (i.e., medium, harsh, or gesture), a one-way analysis of variance for repeated measures was conducted. At an alpha level of .05, there was a significant difference in reprimand frequency across the reprimand types, $F(1, 65) = 35.23, p < .001, \eta^2 = .35$ (large effect). Multiple t-tests with a Bonferroni correction further demonstrated that mild reprimand ($M = 2.98, SD = 4.83$) was used significantly more than medium ($M = .42, SD = .86$), $d = .75$, harsh ($M = .14, SD = .39$), $d = .64$, or gesture ($M = .48, SD = .77$), $d = .62$ reprimand. In other words, in the current sample, teachers used more mild reprimand than

any other reprimand type. The effect size was medium for each comparison. Medium reprimand and gesture reprimand were used significantly more often than harsh reprimand, $d = .90$. In the current sample, teachers used more medium reprimands and gesture reprimands compared to harsh reprimands, which was a large effect. There was no significant difference between medium reprimand and gesture reprimand. However, there was a medium effect ($d = .67$) between medium reprimand and gesture reprimand.

Teacher Perceptions

To answer research question two (Are teachers' perceptions of their use of praise consistent with their actual use of praise?) Pearson's r correlation coefficients were calculated among actual and perceived praise types (GP, BSP, and Total praise). At an alpha level of .05, there was a significant positive relationship between actual and perceived general praise, $r(64) = .27, p = .01$ (one-tailed). In other words, participants who were observed to use more GP also reported that they used more GP. This relationship between actual and perceived GP had a small, close to medium effect size. Actual GP in relation with perceived GP accounted for 7% of the variance between these two variables. BSP $r(64) = .06, p = .66$ (two-tailed) and total praise $r(64) = .20, p = .11$ (two-tailed) were not significant (both small effect sizes). Therefore, there was not a significant relation between teachers actual and perceived BSP (i.e., the correlation was close to zero).

Pearson's r correlation coefficients were also calculated for observed and perceived reprimand types (Are teachers' perceptions of their use of reprimand consistent with their actual use of reprimand?). At an alpha level of .05, there was a significant positive relation between actual and perceived mild reprimand $r(64) = .37, p = .002$ (two-

tailed). In other words, teachers who were observed to use more mild reprimand also reported that they used more mild reprimand, with a medium effect. Actual mild reprimand in relation with perceived mild reprimand accounted for 14% of the variance between the two constructs.

At an alpha level of .05, there was a significant positive relation between actual and perceived gesture reprimand $r(64) = .38, p = .002$ (two-tailed). In other words, participants who were observed to use more gesture reprimands also reported to use more gesture reprimands, with a medium effect. Actual gesture reprimand in relation with perceived gesture reprimand accounted for 14% of the variance between the two variables.

At an alpha level of .05, there was also a significant positive relation between actual and perceived total reprimand $r(64) = .37, p = .002$ (two-tailed). In other words, participants who were observed to use more total reprimand also reported to use more total reprimand, with a medium effect. Actual total reprimand in relation with perceived total reprimand accounted for 14% of the variance between the two constructs. Medium reprimand $r(64) = .17, p = .17$ (two-tailed) and harsh reprimand $r(64) = .12, p = .33$ (two-tailed) were not significant. In other words, the relation was negligible between observed and reported medium reprimands (small effect) and harsh reprimands (small effect).

Teacher Perceptions and Praise to Reprimand Ratios

For the fourth research question (Is there a relationship between teachers praise to reprimand ratios and their praise and reprimand accuracy?), Pearson's r correlation coefficients were calculated among actual and perceived praise difference, actual and perceived reprimand difference, and praise to reprimand ratio. At an alpha of .05, results

indicated that there was a significant positive relationship between actual and perceived praise difference and actual and perceived reprimand difference $r(64) = .30, p = .008$ (one-tailed). In other words, the greater the teacher's misperception between actual and perceived praise the greater the misperception between actual and perceived reprimand, this was a medium effect. Teachers that had a greater difference between actual and perceived praise were more likely to also have a greater difference between actual and perceived reprimand. Praise difference in relation to reprimand difference accounted for 9% of variance between the two variables. However, at an alpha level of .05, praise to reprimand ratios in relation to actual and perceived praise difference was not significant, $r(64) = .05, p = .34$ (one-tailed). Therefore, little relation was seen between the praise to reprimand ratios and actual and perceived praise difference, with a small effect that was close to zero. At an alpha level of .05, there also was no significant difference among praise to reprimand ratios in relation to actual and perceived reprimand difference, $r(64) = .04, p = .39$ (one-tailed). Additionally, there was little relation seen between praise to reprimand ratios and actual and perceived reprimand difference, with a small effect size close to zero. Possible accounts for these results are explored in the discussion section.

Discussion

The current study aimed to extend the literature on teachers' natural use of praise and reprimand types among middle and high school teachers. In addition, this is the first study to examine teachers' perceptions of praise and reprimand use compared to their actual (or observed use). The average total praise to reprimand ratio for this study was 0.86 to 1 among middle and high school teachers and was higher than findings reported by White (1975), which was 0.58 to 1 among middle and high school teachers. Findings

from the current study are consistent with previous study findings (Jenkins et al., 2015; Heller and White 1975; White, 1975), in that on average teachers used more total reprimands than total praise. When looking at reprimand types, middle and high school teachers used mild reprimand more than any other reprimand type (medium, harsh, and gesture). Additionally, middle and high school teachers used more general praise (GP) than behavior specific praise (BSP). Middle and high school teachers were more accurate in their perceived use of GP compared to their actual use of GP. Teachers were also more accurate in their perceived use of mild, gestural, and total reprimand when compared to their actual use of these reprimand types. Finally, middle and high school teachers that had a larger difference between actual and perceived praise tended to have a larger difference between actual and perceived reprimand.

In the current study, middle and high school teachers used significantly more GP than BSP, which was consistent with prior research (Jenkins et al., 2015; Floress & Jenkins, 2015; Floress et al., 2017b). When looking at hourly rates from this study and previous research, there are notable similarities. Floress & Jenkins (2015) examined GP and BSP among 4 kindergarten teachers. Teachers used 8.8 BSP per hour and 38.5 GP per hour (0.23 to 1 BSP to GP ratio; Floress & Jenkins, 2015). Floress et al. (2017b) examined kindergarten through fifth grade teachers' use of BSP and GP in general education classrooms. Overall, teachers used 5.9 BSP per hour and 28.9 GP per hour (0.20 to 1 BSP to GP ratio; Floress et al., 2017b). These previously reported ratios were consistent with the current study where overall totals of BSP and GP were 2 and 8.45, respectively (0.24 to 1 BSP to GP ratio).

Teachers may use more GP than BSP because many people use GP automatically as a social nicety (e.g., “good” or “thank you”; Floress et al., 2017b). Teachers may also use BSP less often because BSP is more effortful. BSP requires an individual to think about what the student is specifically doing (e.g., “Thank you for cleaning up your makers”). This may be particularly difficult when teachers are trying to use BSP with students who display behavior problems because teachers may find it challenging to identify behavior to praise. Because GP requires less strategy it may be easier to deliver quickly. For example, showing a child a thumbs up gesture can be delivered in less time than telling a child they did a nice job finishing their math homework. Additionally, teachers may use more GP because teachers determine that the student knows what the teacher is talking about and therefore, teachers are relying on student awareness of their directed general praise. For instance, a teacher may say “good job” after a student lines up and may think that the student knows that the praise is connected to the specific behavior or expectation.

It is also possible that on average teachers use more GP compared to BSP because most teachers do not receive training on how to use praise effectively. Therefore, teachers may not be aware of the research support for BSP (i.e., when teachers increase their rate of BSP, student behavior improves; Brophy, 1981; Chalk & Bizo, 2004; Sutherland et al., 2000) or that BSP is recommended over GP because students are more likely to make the connection between the behavior they performed and teacher approval (Brophy, 1981; Chalk & Bizo, 2004; Sutherland et al., 2000).

On average, teachers used more total reprimand than total praise. This could be because teachers may find it easier to acknowledge and correct inappropriate or unwanted

behavior than look for appropriate or desired behavior. As mentioned above, this may be especially true for students who exhibit more inappropriate behavior and praise opportunities are difficult to identify. Teachers are more likely to react to misbehavior rather than utilize proactive strategies (e.g., praise), despite the fact that proactive strategies are likely to deter inappropriate behavior (Clunies-Ross, Little, & Kienhuis, 2008; Little, Hudson, & Wilks, 2002; Safran & Oswald, 2003). Teachers that use reactive strategies, tend to respond negatively to student's inappropriate behaviors instead of responding positively to appropriate behaviors (Clunies-Ross, Little, and Kienhuis, 2008; Little, Hudson, & Wilks, 2002). Shook (2012) found that even when teachers were trained and aware of proactive strategies, they did not alter their previous strategies or utilize proactive strategies when problem behaviors occurred.

Middle and high school teachers also used more mild reprimands than any other type of reprimand (i.e., medium, harsh, gesture), which was consistent with findings reported by Reinke et al. (2013). In the Reinke et al. study, the authors measured kindergarten through third grade teachers' use of mild (or explicit) and harsh reprimands. On average, the 33 teachers in the sample averaged 39 mild reprimands and 1.2 harsh reprimands per hour (2013). In the current sample, reprimands were broken into four categories (i.e., mild, medium, harsh, and gesture). Teachers used 8.95 mild reprimands, 1.28 medium reprimands, 0.41 harsh reprimands, and 1.85 gestural reprimands per hour. It may not be surprising that middle and high school teachers in the current sample used fewer mild reprimands than the kindergarten through third grade teachers in the Reinke et al. (2013) sample. In 1975, White demonstrated that teachers total praise and total reprimand decline as teachers taught older students.

Teachers may use more mild reprimand (compared to any other type of reprimand) because pointing out minor student misbehaviors may be reinforcing to teachers (Maag, 2001). Approximately 95% of students comply when they receive mild forms of reprimand (Maag, 2001). Therefore, teachers may continue to use mild reprimands because most of the time students' behavior in the moment improves (i.e., unwanted behavior stops). Maag (2001) argued that educators and society in general consider reprimands easy to use, effective (for most children without severe behavior problems) and an acceptable practice for handling misbehavior (Maag, 2001).

As previously mentioned, it may be especially difficult for teachers to find ways to praise a student who engages in more inappropriate than appropriate behavior. Teachers may find it intuitively easier to react to misbehavior (i.e., reprimand) than to strategically plan and grow appropriate behavior (i.e. praise; Maag, 2001). Effective classroom management focuses on strengthening student appropriate behaviors (e.g., praise) rather than relying on reprimands. This creates a positive classroom climate, where instead of students complying to escape the threat of punishment, students are more likely to find education and learning enjoyable (Skinner, 1972; Skinner, 2014).

There was a significant, positive relation between actual and perceived GP in the current sample. In other words, teachers that used higher rates of GP were more likely to report using higher rates of GP. Despite there being no previous research examining whether teacher's perceptions of praise are related to their actual use of praise, this is an interesting finding considering the argument that teachers use GP without thinking about it (i.e., automatically; Floress et al., 2017b). The findings from the current study indicate that teachers may be more aware of their use of GP, despite the argument that teachers

may use GP statements more automatically, which in turn, causes these statements to be more habitual while teaching (Bennett, 1989). GP had a stronger correlation (.27) than BSP (.06). When examining the data, the majority of the teachers reported that they were using BSP (that ranged from 1 to 15 per 20 min), but there was no occurrence of BSP observed. Therefore, this was reflected in the weak correlation for actual and perceived BSP which resulted in only 0.3% of the variance shared. However, GP had a stronger correlation with teacher's reported GP closer to the observed GP which resulted in 7% of the variance shared (a small effect).

There was no significant correlation between actual and perceived BSP and actual and perceived total praise. As noted above, many teachers reported using BSP when there was no actual BSP observed. These results suggest that teachers report they are using BSP when observations indicate that they are not. One potential explanation for this is that teachers are aware that they should be utilizing BSP and report using BSP when, in fact, they are not. Another possible explanation is that teachers think they are using BSP when they are using GP, or they may not understand the difference between GP and BSP, or they may not understand BSP. This finding may suggest that universally teachers may benefit from explicit praise training.

Actual and perceived total praise (both GP and BSP) was also not significantly correlated. Overall, teachers reported using a significantly larger amount total praise (both GP and BSP) than what was actually observed. This could be due to the very weak correlation for BSP (probability of 0.66) which is included as part of total praise. Total praise had a probability of 0.11, which is close to the alpha level, however both BSP and total praise had small effects. These results show that there was a very small relation

between actual and perceived total praise. However, when looking at the variance, there was only 4% variance that was shared between actual and perceived total praise. This indicates that there is minimal interaction between actual and perceived praise when looking at total praise.

Significant correlations between perceived and actual use of mild, gesture, and total reprimand were identified. As with praise, there has been no previous research that has examined actual and perceived reprimand. A possible explanation for a higher correlation between actual and perceived mild reprimand could be the familiarity of what mild reprimand is, particularly based on the definition that mild reprimand is a redirection of student behavior. Teachers have previously reported great confidence in using redirection as a classroom management strategy for student behavior (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Rosas & West, 2009). The significant relationship between actual and perceived gestural reprimand could also be due to teacher beliefs that non-verbal strategies are successful in managing student behavior (Reupert & Woodcock, 2010). A significant positive relationship between actual and perceived total reprimand was most likely due to the significant correlation of actual and perceived mild reprimand which accounted for most of the total reprimand.

Most teachers reported that they used more medium reprimands than was observed. Likewise, most teachers believed they used more harsh reprimands than was observed. Reprimand types may have been complex given there were four types, possibly making the categorization of perceived reprimands difficult for teachers. Teachers may also have believed that they were delivering more severe reprimands when they were only mild reprimands.

In regard to the final research question, “Are teachers with higher praise to reprimand ratios more accurate, than teachers with lower praise to reprimand ratios?”, praise and reprimand differences in relation to praise to reprimand ratios were not significant. The hypothesis that teachers with higher praise to reprimand ratios would be more accurate in their use of praise and reprimand than teachers with lower praise to reprimand ratios was not supported by the data. One possible reason for this may have to do with teacher’s self-awareness on their use of total praise and total reprimand. Individuals that use self-monitoring strategies may be more aware or “in-tune” with their behaviors, particularly regarding teachers and behavior management strategies. One important question to consider is if teachers can accurately identify whether they are more positive than negative overall? If teachers can accurately identify their use of praise and reprimand, then strategies such as the praise training, performance feedback, and self-monitoring should be further researched to determine if these are factors that attribute to higher praise to reprimand rate accuracy.

Future research might examine whether teachers who have received praise training are more accurate in their perceived use of praise and reprimand compared to untrained teachers. As mentioned before, when teachers are trained in behavior management, particularly the use of BSP, student compliance, on-task behavior, and appropriate behaviors increase (Brophy, 1981; Chalk & Bizo, 2004; Sutherland et al., 2000). Results of this study did not find a significant difference in accuracy between teachers with higher praise to reprimand ratios and teachers with lower praise to reprimand ratios and teachers in this sample did not receive praise training. Therefore, a lack of training may have influenced participants’ perceptions of praise and reprimand in

that they were less accurate (regardless of whether they had higher or lower praise to reprimand ratios). Future research on teacher training is discussed in the limitations and future research section below.

The significant positive relationship between actual and perceived praise differences and actual and perceived reprimand difference was surprising. These findings indicate that teachers with larger differences between actual and perceived praise tended to have larger differences between actual and perceived reprimand. This may be explained by teachers' overall lack of awareness for their own classroom management. In other words, teachers may not be strategically using praise or reprimand and therefore are not clued into how or how often they use these strategies. These results are interesting considering future classroom management (self-monitoring or performance feedback) training research, which may influence teachers' awareness of these large differences between actual and perceived praise and reprimand.

Limitations and Future Research

The current study is the first to look at teacher perceptions regarding their own use of praise and reprimand, however, there are limitations to note. One limitation is the demographic and sample size of the teacher participants for this study. Most participants in this study were Caucasian and came from rural Central Illinois which limits the generalizability of the results of this study to all middle and high school teachers. Results may differ based on teachers from suburban and urban settings, other US regions (e.g., east, south, or west coast), or teachers from different racial backgrounds. For example, research suggests that students from low social-economic and racially diverse backgrounds tend to receive differentiated patterns of behavior management treatment

and more severe infractions than their Caucasian peers (Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2002). For example, this may have been at play with the one teacher whose outlier data was removed from the current sample. This teacher was employed at an urban middle school that was undergoing significant personnel, administrative, and system-level changes. It was widely understood that working at this school was stressful for staff, which may have influenced this teachers' use of reprimand. When teachers report higher levels of stress, they tend to be more punitive (i.e., used more reprimands; Floress et al., in preparation). Future research should examine rates of teacher praise and reprimand in urban schools and the influence of stressful teaching environments on teachers' natural use of praise and reprimand. To obtain a larger and more diverse sample, researchers should also consider using video technology and online surveys. Teachers could record their own use of praise and reprimand and send video footage to researchers to code.

Another study limitation was the length and setting of the 20-min observation. To ensure consistency across observations, observers only observed teachers during lecture-based instruction. However, this means that teacher use of praise and reprimand during transitions or other class time (e.g., independent seat work or group work) was not captured. It is possible that teachers' use of praise and reprimand could have been higher or lower if these other class times were included.

In addition, each teacher was only observed once for 20-minutes. The brief, 20-minute observation allowed for a larger sample of teachers to be included in the study. For example, Floress et al. 2017b collected 200-min observations per teacher across 28 teachers. It is possible that praise and reprimand rates may have been different if

additional observations were conducted for each teacher. For instance, some teachers had no recorded praise or reprimand and it is possible that different rates may have been captured with additional observations.

Finally, the time of year is a limitation that could have impacted praise and reprimand rates. Data was collected over four academic semesters. Student behavior and/or teachers' praise and reprimand may vary based on when the observations took place during the school year. Future research could look specifically at different times of the year (e.g., beginning of the school year vs. end of the school year). Future research could look to see if there are any fluctuations in student behavior, rates of praise and reprimand, and teacher's perceptions of their use of praise and reprimand at different points in the year.

Given these limitations and that this is the first study to examine teachers' actual and perceived use of praise and reprimand, additional research is sorely needed. Researchers should consider manipulating teacher BSP training to determine whether differences are found between rates of praise and reprimand and teachers' ability to accurately report their use of praise and reprimand in the classroom. The current study only included teachers who had not received praise training. Future research could look at comparing teachers who receive BSP training (via self-monitoring and/or performance feedback) and those who receive no training.

As previously discussed, teachers may not understand the different praise types (GP and BSP) and may not understand how to deliver BSP correctly. Self-monitoring is one effective teacher training tool used to increase rates of praise. Self-monitoring is a way for teachers to be accountable of their own performance in the classroom. Previous

research has shown that teachers trained in using BSP and self-monitoring strategies, increased their rates of praise and those rates maintained beyond the intervention (Kalis, et al., 2007; Oliver, Wehby, & Nelson, 2015; Pinter, East, & Thrush, 2015; Thompson et al., 2012.).

Video, self-monitoring is one type of self-monitoring training method.

Researchers might examine whether using video, self-monitoring improves teachers' self-reported accuracy of praise and reprimand use in the classroom. Thompson and colleagues (2012) looked at performance feedback training for increasing BSP and teachers reported that they became more aware of their praise behavior (i.e., one teacher mentioned that she never realized she used a certain word as much as she did) or where their praise statements were directed (i.e., one teacher noted that she tended to favor one side of the classroom with praise statements over the other). In addition to increased awareness, teachers that used video feedback intervention also indicated that they would be willing to use this intervention again (Pinter et al., 2015). Overall, self-monitoring through the use of video feedback training is beneficial in helping teachers identify their own classroom interactions and develop effective classroom management strategies (Thompson et al., 2012).

Self-monitoring strategies may be more intensive for teachers to use and the acceptability of using this strategy may not transcend across all teachers. In these situations, performance feedback is an effective strategy for increasing praise in the classroom because it is not as intensive for the teacher and provides current performance feedback of the teacher's behavior (e.g., GP and BSP; Reinke et al., 2007). Reinke et al., (2007) used visual performance feedback (i.e., visual representation displaying the

amount of BSP that was observed and recorded for that day) to examine the impact on teacher use of BSP. In the Reinke et al., (2007) study, teachers significantly increased their rates of BSP after receiving performance feedback (i.e., researcher observed the teacher's praise in the classroom). Additionally, other forms of performance feedback can be used to provide "in the moment" feedback for teachers, with wireless technology (Scheeler, McAfee, Ruhl, & Lee, 2006) or even feedback via email (Barton, Pribble, & Chen, 2013).

The goal of this study was to examine middle school and high school teachers perceived and actual praise and reprimand use. Overall, the current study provides additional support to the existing research regarding teachers' natural praise and reprimand rates. Few studies have examined the natural rates of praise among middle school and high school teachers and no studies have examined teachers' perception regarding their use of praise and reprimand in comparison to their actual use of praise and reprimand prior to this study. Further research is needed to help guide teacher praise training and to provide praise and reprimand rates that can be generalized to general education teachers working across the US. Finally, further research is important in helping to support teachers to stay in the field and increase the likelihood of student academic and behavioral success.

References

- Akin-Little, K. A., Eckert, T. L., Lovett, B. J., & Little, S. G. (2004). Extrinsic reinforcement in the classroom: Bribery or best practice. *School Psychology Review, 33*, 344-362.
- Allday, R. A., Hinkson-Lee, K., Hudson, T., Neilsen-Gatti, S., Kleinke, A., & Russel, C. S. (2012). Training general educators to increase behavior-specific praise: Effects on students with EBD. *Behavioral Disorders, 87-98*.
- Assuah, C. K. (2010). *Student and teacher perceptions of teacher oral communication behavior in algebra and geometry classrooms* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Nevada, Reno.
- Bandura, A. (1968). A social learning interpretation of psychological dysfunctions. *Foundations of abnormal psychology, 293-344*.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. DOI:10.4135/9781446221129
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 50(2)*, 248-287. DOI:10.1016/0749-5978(91)90022-L
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory of mass communication. *Media psychology, 3(3)*, 265-299. DOI: 10.1207/S1532785XMEP0303_03
- Bandura A. (2005). The evolution of social cognitive theory. In K. G. Smith & M. A. Hitt (Eds.) *Great Minds in Management*. (pp. 9-35) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Barton, E. E., Pribble, L., & Chen, C. I. (2013). The use of e-mail to deliver performance-based feedback to early childhood practitioners. *Journal of Early Intervention, 35*(3), 270-297. DOI: 10.1177/1053815114544543
- Begeny, J. C., & Martens, B. K. (2006). Assessing pre-service teachers' training in empirically-validated behavioral instruction practices. *School Psychology Quarterly, 21*(3), 262. DOI: 10.1521/scpq.2006.21.3.262
- Bennett, P. (1989). Is praise always positive. *Connection (TMEC-MENC), 3*(2), 12-13.
- Brophy, J. (1981). Teacher praise: A functional analysis. *Review of educational research, 51*(1), 5-32.
- Chalk, K., & Bizo, L. A. (2004). Specific praise improves on-task behavior and numeracy enjoyment: A study of year four pupils engaged in the numeracy hour. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 20*(4), 335-351. DOI: 10.1080/0266736042000314277
- Clunies-Ross, P., Little, E., & Kienhuis, M. (2008). Self-reported and actual use of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and their relationship with teacher stress and student behaviour. *Educational Psychology, 28*(6), 693-710. DOI: 10.1080/01443410802206700
- Coalition for Psychology in Schools and Education. (2006, August). Report on the Teacher Needs Survey. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Center for Psychology in the Schools and Education.
- Conroy, M. A., K. S., Snyder, A., Al-Hendawi, M., & Vo, A. (2009). Creating a positive classroom atmosphere: Teachers' use of effective praise and feedback. *Beyond Behavior; 18*, 18-26.

- Dicke, T., Elling, J., Schmeck, A., & Leutner, D. (2015). Reducing reality shock: The effects of classroom management skills training on beginning teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 48*, 1-12. DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2015.01.013
- Dutton Tillery, A., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., & Collins, A. S. (2010). General education teachers' perceptions of behavior management and intervention strategies. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 12*(2), 86-102. DOI: 10.1177/1098300708330879
- Evertson, C. M. (1985). Training teachers in classroom management: An experimental study in secondary school classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Research, 79*(1), 51-58. DOI: 10.1080/00220671.1985.10885648
- Floress, M. T., Berlinghof, J. R., Rader, R. A., & Riedesel, E. K. (2017a). Preschool teachers use of praise in general, at-risk, and special education classrooms. *Psychology in the Schools, 54*, 519-531. DOI: 10.1002/pits.22014
- Floress, M. T., Caldwell, S., Beaudoin, M., & Yehling, Z. (in preparation). Teachers' praise-to-reprimand ratios and perceptions of self-efficacy and stress.
- Floress, M.T. & Jenkins, L.N. (2015). A preliminary investigation of kindergarten teachers' use of praise in general education classrooms. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 59*, 253-262. DOI: 10.1080/1045988X.2014.942834
- Floress, M. T., Jenkins, L. N., Reinke, W. M., & McKown, L. (2017b). General Education Teachers' Natural Rates of Praise: A Preliminary Investigation. *Behavioral Disorders, DOI: 10.1177/0198742917709472*

- Floress, M. T., Zoder-Martell, K., Beaudoin, M., & Yehling, Z. (under review). Teacher praise to reprimand ratios during small and large group instruction: A video pilot study.
- Fullerton, E. K., Conroy, M. A., & Correa, V. I. (2009). Early childhood teachers' use of specific praise statements with young children at risk for behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*, 118-135.
- Gable, R. A., Hester, P. H., Rock, M. L., & Hughes, K. G. (2009). Back to basics: Rules, praise, ignoring, and reprimands revisited. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 44(4), 195-205. DOI: 10.1177/1053451208328831
- Hawkins, S. M., & Heflin, L. J. (2011). Increasing secondary teachers' behavior-specific praise using a video self-modeling and visual performance feedback intervention. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 13(2), 97-108. DOI: 10.1177/1098300709358110
- Heller, M. S., & White, M. A. (1975). Rates of teacher verbal approval and disapproval to higher and lower ability classes. *Journal of educational psychology*, 67(6), 796. DOI: 10.1037/0022-0663.67.6.796
- Jenkins, L. N., Floress, M. T., & Reinke, W. (2015). Rates and types of teacher praise: A review and future directions. *Psychology in the Schools*, 52(5), 463-476. DOI: 10.1002/pits.21835
- Kalis, T. M., Vannest, K. J., & Parker, R. (2007). Praise counts: Using self-monitoring to increase effective teaching practices. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 51(3), 20-27. DOI: 10.3200/PSFL.51.3.20-27

- Kennedy, D., & McCarthy, D. (2015). The importance of feedback and why effective leaders will provide it and seek it. *Engineers Journal*
- Kern, L., & Clemens, N. H. (2007). Antecedent strategies to promote appropriate classroom behavior. *Psychology in the Schools*, 44(1), 65-75. DOI: 10.1002/pits.20206
- Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational review*, 53(1), 27-35. DOI: 10.1080/00131910120033628
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 17(2), 201-227. DOI: 10.1080/09243450600565829
- Little, E., Hudson, A., & Wilks, R. (2002). The efficacy of written teacher advice (tip sheets) for managing classroom behaviour problems. *Educational Psychology*, 22(3), 251-266. DOI: 10.1080/01443410220138494
- Loveless, T. (1996). Teacher praise. In H.K. Reavis, M.T. Sweeten, W.R. Jenson, D.P. Morgan, D.J. Andrews, & S. Fister (Eds.), *Best practices: Behavioral and educational strategies for teachers* (pp. 59-63). Longmont, CO: Sopris West Educational Services.
- Maag, J. W. (2001). Rewarded by punishment: Reflections on the disuse of positive reinforcement in schools. *Exceptional children*, 67(2), 173-186.
- Martin, A., Linfoot, K., & Stephenson, J. (1999). How teachers respond to concerns about behavior in their classroom. *Psychology in the Schools*, 36, 347-358.

Melnick, DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1520-6807(199907)36:4<347::AID-PITS7>3.0.CO;2-G

Mudford, O. C., Taylor, S. A., & Martin, N. T. (2009). Continuous recording and interobserver agreement algorithms reported in the Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis (1995–2005). *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 42(1), 165-169.

DOI: 10.1901/jaba.2009.42-165

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. DOI:

10.1037/0022-0663.77.3.362

Oliver, R. M., Wehby, J. H., & Nelson, J. R. (2015). Helping teachers maintain classroom management practices using a self-monitoring checklist. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 51, 113-120. DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2015.06.007

Pas, E. T., Cash, A. H., O'Brennan, L., Debnam, K. J., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2015).

Profiles of classroom behavior in high schools: Associations with teacher behavior management strategies and classroom composition. *Journal of School Psychology*, 53(2), 137-148. DOI: 10.1016/j.jsp.2014.12.005

Pinter, E. B., East, A., & Thrush, N. (2015). Effects of a video-feedback intervention on teachers' use of praise. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 38(4), 451-472.

DOI: 10.1353/etc.2015.0028

Reinke, W. M., Herman, K. C., & Stormont, M. (2013). Classroom-level positive behavior supports in schools implementing SW-PBIS: Identifying areas for

- enhancement. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 15(1), 39-50. DOI: 10.1177/1098300712459079
- Reinke, W. M., Lewis-Palmer, T., Martin, E. (2007). The effect of visual performance feedback on teacher use of behavior-specific praise. *Behavior Modification*, 31, 247–263. DOI:10.1177/0145445506288967
- Reinke, W. M., Lewis-Palmer, T., & Merrell, K. (2008). The classroom check-up: A classwide teacher consultation model for increasing praise and decreasing disruptive behavior. *School Psychology Review*, 37(3), 315-332.
- 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. DOI: 10.1177/1098300715570640
- Reupert, A., & Woodcock, S. (2010). Success and near misses: Pre-service teachers' use, confidence and success in various classroom management strategies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(6), 1261-1268. DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2010.03.003
- Rosas, C., & West, M. (2009). Teachers Beliefs about Classroom Management: Pre-service and Inservice Teachers' Beliefs about Classroom Management. *International Journal of Applied Educational Studies*, 5(1).
- Safran, S. P., & Oswald, K. (2003). Positive behavior supports: Can schools reshape disciplinary practices?. *Exceptional children*, 69(3), 361-373. DOI: 10.1177/001440290306900307

- Scheeler, M. C., McAfee, J. K., Ruhl, K. L., & Lee, D. L. (2006). Effects of corrective feedback delivered via wireless technology on preservice teacher performance and student behavior. *Teacher education and special education, 29*(1), 12-25. DOI: 10.1177/088840640602900103
- Shook, A. C. (2012). A study of preservice educators' dispositions to change behavior management strategies. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 56*(2), 129-136. DOI: 10.1080/1045988X.2011.606440
- 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*, 351-380. DOI: 10.1353/etc.0.0007
- Simonsen, B., MacSuga, A. S., Fallon, L. M., & Sugai, G. (2013). The effects of self-monitoring on teachers' use of specific praise. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 15*(1), 5-15. DOI: 10.1177/1098300712440453
- Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. (2000). The Color of Discipline: Sources of Racial and Gender Disproportionality in School Punishment. Policy Research Report.
- Skinner, B. F., (1972). *Beyond freedom and dignity*(No. 04; BF319. 5. O6, S5.). New York: Bantam Books.
- Skinner, B. F. (2014). *Contingencies of reinforcement: A theoretical analysis* (Vol. 3). BF Skinner Foundation.
- 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.

Doi/abs/10.1177/1098300708326597

Sutherland, K. S., Wehby, J. H., & Copeland, S. R. (2000). Effect of varying rates of behavior-specific praise on the on-task behavior of students with EBD. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 8(1), 2-8. DOI:

10.1177/106342660000800101

Sutherland, K. S., & Wehby, J. H. (2001). The effect of self-evaluation on teaching behavior in classrooms for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *The Journal of Special Education*, 35(3), 161-171. DOI:

10.1177/002246690103500306

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, 17(6), 732-742. DOI: 10.1007/s1121-016-0667-y

Taylor, R. (1990). Interpretation of the correlation coefficient: a basic review. *Journal of diagnostic medical sonography*, 6(1), 35-39.

Thompson, M. T., Marchant, M., Anderson, D., Prater, M. A., & Gibb, G. (2012). Effects of tiered training on general educators' use of specific praise. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 35(4), 521-546. DOI: 10.1353/etc.2012.0032

Trussell, R. P. (2008). Classroom universals to prevent problem behaviors. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 43, 179-185. DOI: 10.1177/1053451207311678

Walker, H. M., Ramsey, E., & Gresham, F. M. (2004). *Antisocial behavior in school: Evidence-based practices*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.

White, M. A. (1975). Natural rates of teacher approval and disapproval in the classroom. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 8(4), 367-372. DOI: 10.1901/jaba.1975.8-367

Table 1.

<i>Teacher and Classroom Demographics</i>		<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Teacher Sex</i>			
	Male	19	29%
	Female	47	71%
<i>Teacher Racial Background</i>			
	American Indian/Alaska Native	1	2%
	White/Caucasian	65	98%
<i>Age</i>			
	23-29	11	17%
	30-39	26	39%
	40-50	16	24%
	50+	11	17%
	No Response	2	3%
<i>Grade</i>			
	Sixth Grade	4	6%
	Seventh Grade	13	20%
	Eighth Grade	8	12%
	Ninth Grade	12	18%
	Tenth Grade	3	5%
	Eleventh Grade	11	17%
	Twelfth Grade	5	8%
	Multiple High School Grades	10	15%
<i>Years of Teaching Experience</i>			
	1-5	12	18%
	6-10	15	23%
	11-15	13	20%
	16-20	9	14%
	20+	17	26%
<i>Highest Educational Degree Obtained</i>			
	Four Year College Degree	21	32%
	Master's Degree	45	68%
<i>Classroom Make-up</i>			
	Only general ed. students	26	39%
	Mostly general ed. students	38	58%
	Equal mix general ed. and special ed. students	2	3%

<i>Classroom Difficulty Rating</i>			
	Much less difficult	13	20%
	Somewhat less difficult	19	29%
	Average difficulty	23	35%
	Somewhat more difficult	8	12%
	Much more difficult	3	5%

<i>Behavior Management Class Taken</i>			
	Yes	31	47%
	No	33	50%
	No Response	2	3%

Table 2.

Teachers' Mean and Range of Observed Rate of Praise and Reprimand Statements per Hour

	Mean	Range
Praise Type		
BSP	2 (0.1)	0-30 (0-0.5)
GP	8.45 (0.14)	0-54 (0-0.9)
Total Praise	10.45 (0.17)	0-54 (0-0.9)
Reprimand Type		
Mild	8.95 (0.15)	0-96 (0-1.6)
Medium	1.28 (0.02)	0-12 (0-0.2)
Harsh	0.41 (0.007)	0-6 (0-0.1)
Gesture	1.85 (0.03)	0-9 (0-0.15)
Total Reprimand	12.09 (0.2)	0-102 (0-1.7)

Note: Rate per minute is provided in parentheses

Table 3.

Relationship Between Actual and Perceived Praise and Reprimand

Type	r
<i>Praise Type</i>	
General Praise (GP)	.27*
Behavior Specific Praise (BSP)	.06
Total Praise	.20
<i>Reprimand Type</i>	
Mild Reprimand	.37*
Medium Reprimand	.17
Harsh Reprimand	.12
Gesture Reprimand	.38*
Total Reprimand	.37*

Note: * Indicates significant correlations at $p < .05$.

Table 4.

Relationship Between Actual and Perceived Praise Difference, Actual and Perceived Reprimand Difference, and Praise to Reprimand Ratio

	Actual and Perceived Praise Difference	Actual and Perceived Reprimand Difference	Praise to Reprimand Ratio
Actual and Perceived Praise Difference	-		
Actual and Perceived Reprimand Difference	.30*	-	
Praise to Reprimand Ratio	.05	.04	-

Note: * Indicates significant correlations at $p < .05$.

Appendix A

Teacher Observation Form

Observer: _____
Date: _____

Status: (circle one) Primary or Reliability Partner: _____
School ID: _____ # students in class _____ Teacher ID: _____

		Minute 1		Minute 2		Minute 3		Minute 4		Minute 5	
		#	Verbatim	#	Verbatim	#	Verbatim	#	Verbatim	#	Verbatim
Specific	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
General	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
Mild	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
Mod	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
Harsh	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
Genl.	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										

Notes:

		Minute 6		Minute 7		Minute 8		Minute 9		Minute 10	
		#	Verbatim	#	Verbatim	#	Verbatim	#	Verbatim	#	Verbatim
Specific	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
O	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
Mild	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
Mod	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
Harsh	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
Gen.	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										

Notes:

			Minute 11			Minute 12			Minute 13			Minute 14			Minute 15				
			#	Verbatim				#	Verbatim				#	Verbatim					
Specific	In				Specific	In				Specific	In				Specific	In			
	Sm					Sm					Sm					Sm			
	Lg					Lg					Lg					Lg			
Cont.	In				Cont.	In				General	In				Cont.	In			
	Sm					Sm					Sm					Sm			
	Lg					Lg					Lg					Lg			
Mild	In				Mild	In				Mild	In				Mild	In			
	Sm					Sm					Sm					Sm			
	Lg					Lg					Lg					Lg			
Mod	In				Mod	In				Mod	In				Mod	In			
	Sm					Sm					Sm					Sm			
	Lg					Lg					Lg					Lg			
Harsh	In				Harsh	In				Harsh	In				Harsh	In			
	Sm					Sm					Sm					Sm			
	Lg					Lg					Lg					Lg			
Cont.	In				Cont.	In				Cont.	In				Cont.	In			
	Sm					Sm					Sm					Sm			
	Lg					Lg					Lg					Lg			

Notes:

		Minute 16		Minute 17		Minute 18		Minute 19		Minute 20	
		#	Verbatim	#	Verbatim	#	Verbatim	#	Verbatim	#	Verbatim
Specific	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
General	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
Mild	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
Med	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
Harsh	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										
Genl.	In										
	Sm										
	Lg										

Total time: _____							
Total Specific Praise	IND _____	SM _____	LG _____	Total General Praise	IND _____	SM _____	LG _____
Total Mild Reprimand	IND _____	SM _____	LG _____	Total Med Reprimand	IND _____	SM _____	LG _____
Total Harsh Reprimand	IND _____	SM _____	LG _____	Total Gesture Reprimand	IND _____	SM _____	LG _____

Appendix B

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Classroom Strategies and Teacher Perceptions

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Dr. Margaret Floress, Emma Riedesel, and Melissa Bezadoin from the Psychology Department at Eastern Illinois University.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. Please ask questions about anything you do not understand, before deciding whether or not to participate. You have been asked to participate in this study because you teach children in the middle school and high school setting.

• PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study is to examine middle school and high school teachers' use of classroom management strategies in general education classrooms. Research suggests that specific teacher strategies are linked to positive student behavioral and academic outcomes; but there is little information about how often teachers use these strategies. Furthermore, there is no information examining these skills across middle school and high school (e.g., 7th-12th grade) general education classrooms or relating them to teachers' perceptions of classroom strategies and student discipline.

The goal of the current study is to determine the typical, or normative, rate of classroom strategies used among middle school and high school teachers during classroom instruction. In addition, we are interested in whether there is a relationship between the number of strategies used and teacher perceptions of strategies and student discipline. We are not asking you to do anything differently. We simply want to count the number of times you use specific strategies. Our goal is to help educators, administrators, and researchers understand how often teachers use classroom strategies within a typical classroom setting and whether or not there is a relation to teachers' perceptions of strategies and student discipline.

• PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to:

- 1) Allow research assistants to complete one, 20-minute observation in your classroom during class instruction (lecture). The trained research assistants will sit in an inconspicuous place in your classroom and will quietly and unobtrusively observe.
- 2) Provide the researchers with a schedule of potential observation times. Class instruction will be coordinated with research assistant schedules. A week prior to the observation we will communicate the name of the research assistant and confirm that the planned observation time still fits with your schedule.
- 3) Complete a brief questionnaire (approximately 5 minutes to complete).

• POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

It is unlikely that you will experience significant physical or psychological discomfort from participating in the study. However, research assistants will be observing your classroom, so there may be some degree of discomfort associated with being observed.

Observational and questionnaire data will be collected anonymously by assigning identification numbers (e.g., T-1, T-2). If requested, general results regarding the study will be provided to participants and school administrators, but information regarding observations of a specific classroom will not be disclosed. Any information will be combined across all participating classrooms in the participating schools.

• POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

Participating in this study is likely to benefit you and the field of education in general. First, sometimes participants in these kinds of studies enjoy being part of research. It can be exciting to be involved in research that is geared towards helping other educators and researchers have a better understanding of the way that general education classrooms work. Additionally, there is little information regarding teachers' natural use of strategies in general education classrooms. There have been a few studies examining strategies in special education classrooms, but hardly any information exists about how teachers use classroom strategies in general education classrooms.

• INCENTIVES FOR PARTICIPATION

All participants who participate in this study will receive a small token of appreciation (e.g., chocolate).

• **CONFIDENTIALITY**

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Confidentiality will be maintained by several means. You will be assigned an identification number that will be used to collect observational data and questionnaire data.

Original observation and questionnaire data will be housed inside a locked filing cabinet in Dr. Floress' research lab for approximately 3 years. After 3 years, all observation and questionnaire data will be destroyed.

• **PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL**

Participation in this research study is voluntary and not a requirement or a condition for being the recipient of benefits or services from Eastern Illinois University or any other organization sponsoring the research project. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind or loss of benefits or services to which you are otherwise entitled. There is no penalty if you withdraw from the study and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

• **IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS**

If you have any questions or concerns about this research, please contact:

Margaret Floress, Ph.D.
217-581-3523
mfloress@eiu.edu

• **RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS**

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

You will be given the opportunity to discuss any questions about your rights as a research subject with a member of the IRB. The IRB is an independent committee composed of members of the University community, as well as lay members of the community not connected with EIU. The IRB has reviewed and approved this study.

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. I have been given a copy of this form.

Printed Name of Participant

Signature of Participant

Date

I, the undersigned, have defined and fully explained the investigation to the above subject.

Signature of Investigator

Date

This study IRB #16-085 has IRB approval

Appendix C

Teacher Demographic Questionnaire

Your Name: _____

Sex (circle): Male Female

Age: _____

Racial Background (circle): American Indian/ Alaska Native Asian Black or African American Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander Caucasian or White

Other: _____

Do you have your teaching certificate (circle)? Yes No

I am a certified (circle): General Education Teacher Special Education Teacher Specialists Teacher Teacher's Aid

Other: _____

Years of Teaching Experience: _____

Highest Educational Degree Obtained (circle): Two Year College Degree Four Year College Degree Master's Degree Doctoral Degree

Special Training: For example: Crisis management training (member of school's crisis management team), attended Antism Awareness Workshop, PBIS training, or received special training in reading intervention.

Location of Training / Provided by: _____

Name of Class Observed For example: Freshman Algebra _____ (grade) _____ (subject)

The Class observed includes (circle): Only general ed. students Mostly general ed. students and some special ed. students An equal mix of general ed. students and special ed. students Mostly special ed. students and some general ed. students Only special ed. Students

How would you rate the behavioral difficulty of the class observed (as a whole) compared to other classes you have taught in the past? (circle answer below)

1
Much less difficult
2
Somewhat less difficult
3
Average difficulty
4
Somewhat more difficult
5
Much more difficult

Appendix D

Teacher's Perceived Use of Classroom Skills

We would like to better understand how often teachers think they are using the following skills in the classroom. For the following questions please 1) read the definition, then 2) estimate how often you use each skill in a 20-min class-wide lesson.

- SPECIFIC PRAISE:** Any specific verbalization or gesture that expresses a favorable judgment on an activity, product, or attribute of the student. Examples: "Great point, thanks for contributing!" "I'm glad you got your work turned in on time" "Class, great job keeping your volume down."

While giving a 20-min class-wide lesson, how often (how many times) do you use SPECIFIC PRAISE with students (combine class-wide and individual specific praise).

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

- GENERAL PRAISE:** Any nonspecific verbalization or gesture that expresses a favorable judgment on an activity, product, or attribute of the student. Examples: "Great work" "Awesome" "Thank you."

While giving a 20-min class-wide lesson, how often (how many times) do you use GENERAL PRAISE with students (combine class-wide and individual general praise).

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

- MILD REPRIMAND:** Any verbal comment (delivered in a normal tone considering the setting) by a teacher to indicate disapproval of student behavior. The verbal comment can be an instruction following student misbehavior. Reprimand is concise (brief) and may be described as a teacher "redirection" of student misbehavior. Disagreeing with a student with the absence of sarcasm or a critical tone would be considered a mild reprimand. Examples include: "This is not the time to be talking" "No thank you" "You know better" "Sit right here."

While giving a 20-min class-wide lesson, how often (how many times) do you use MILD REPRIMAND with students (combine class-wide and mild reprimands).

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

- MEDIUM REPRIMAND:** Any verbal comment (using a sarcastic or critical tone) by a teacher to indicate disapproval of student behavior. The verbal comment is concise (brief) and may be in the form of a question that is disapproving and has a mocking, rude, or critical tone (i.e., rhetorical, not a real question). Disagreeing with a student using a critical tone is considered a medium reprimand. Examples: "I don't remember telling you to sit and talk to your friends (sarcastic tone)" "No, it's not cold in here" "Is that your best work? (mocking)"

While giving a 20-min class-wide lesson, how often (how many times) do you use MEDIUM REPRIMAND with students (combine class-wide and individual medium reprimands).

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

5. **HARSB REPRIMAND:** Any verbal comment (using a louder than typical tone for the setting) by a teacher to indicate disapproval of a student behavior. Harsh reprimands include the implication of negative consequences (i.e., a threat) or any prolong discussion (30 sec or longer) about misbehavior. Examples include: "One more disruption and someone is going to ISS" "Excuse me!" "I won't say it again" "How many times do we need to go over _____! (loud)."

While giving a 20-min class-wide lesson, how often (how many times) do you use **HARSB REPRIMAND** with students (combine class-wide and individual harsh reprimands).

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

6. **GESTURE REPRIMAND:** Any gesture (without speaking) that indicates disapproval of a student behavior (e.g., hands on hips). Gesture occurs when a student is physically guided or prompted to a preferred area or activity. Examples: Shaking head to communicate "stop doing that" Student refuses to get up from desk, teacher touches elbow to indicate "get up."

While giving a 20-min class-wide lesson, how often (how many times) do you use **GESTURE REPRIMAND** with students (combine class-wide and individual gesture reprimands).

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

Appendix E

BEHAVIORAL CLASSROOM DEFINITIONS: Type of Praise		
Behavior Specific Praise:	Any <u>specific verbalization or gesture</u> that expresses a favorable judgment on an activity, product, or attribute of the student. Examples include	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That is a <u>pretty</u> picture you made! - That is a <u>cool</u> shirt you are wearing - <u>Terrific job</u> coloring your project - <u>Thank you</u> for sitting so nicely 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>I like</u> how you are sitting still - <u>Good job</u> getting right to work - That is <u>nice</u> sharing - You are sitting like I asked – <u>gives star</u>
General Praise:	Any <u>nonspecific verbalization or gesture</u> that expresses a favorable judgment on an activity, product, or attribute of the student. Examples include:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Great - Nice Work - Thumbs up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perfect - Thank you - Hi-five

BEHAVIORAL CLASSROOM DEFINITIONS: Type of Reprimand		
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.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No thank you - Not now 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No, come sit down (child at desk, while other children are at the rug) - That is now 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.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I don't remember telling you to write about mumpkins! (sarcastic) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No it's not cold in here! (critical) - Is that your best <u>work</u>? (critical, mocking)
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).	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One more outburst and no recess (threat) - I won't tell you again (threat) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excuse Me! - How many times do I need to remind you to put your homework folder in you backpack!
Gesture Reprimand:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher puts her hands on hips with a disapproving look towards students. - A child is not sitting on the carpet so the teacher moves over the child, grabs the child's hand, and moves the child to the carpet. - A teacher shakes their head at a student when the student is disrupting class. 	

Additional Examples for Middle School and HS Teachers

SPECIFIC PRAISE: Any specific verbalization or gesture that expresses a favorable judgment on an activity, product, or attribute of the student. Examples: "Great point, thanks for contributing!" "I'm glad you got your work turned in on time" "Class, great job keeping your volume down."

MILD REPRIMAND: Any verbal comment (delivered in a normal tone considering the setting) by a teacher to indicate disapproval of student behavior. The verbal comment can be an instruction following student misbehavior. Reprimand is concise (brief) and may be described as a teacher "redirection" of student misbehavior. Disagreeing with a student with the absence of sarcasm or a critical tone would be considered a mild reprimand. Examples include: "This is not the time to be talking" "No thank you" "You know better" "Sit right here."

MEDIUM REPRIMAND: Any verbal comment (using a sarcastic or critical tone) by a teacher to indicate disapproval of student behavior. The verbal comment is concise (brief) and may be in the form of a question that is disapproving and has a mocking, rude, or critical tone (i.e., rhetorical, not a real question). Disagreeing with a student using a critical tone is considered a medium reprimand. Examples: "I don't remember telling you to sit and talk to your friends (sarcastic tone)" "No, it's not cold in here" "Is that your best work? (mocking)"

HARSH REPRIMAND: Any verbal comment (using a louder than typical tone for the setting) by a teacher to indicate disapproval of a student behavior. Harsh reprimands include the implication of negative consequences (i.e., a threat) or any prolong discussion (30 sec or longer) about misbehavior. Examples include: "One more disruption and someone is going to MS" "Excuse me!" "I won't say it again" "How many times do we need to go over _____! (loud)."

GESTURE REPRIMAND: Any gesture (without speaking) that indicates disapproval of a student behavior (e.g., hands on hips). Gesture occurs when a student is physically guided or prompted to a preferred area or activity. Examples: Shaking head to communicate "stop doing that" Student refuses to get up from desk, teacher touches elbow to indicate "get up."

Appendix F



Psychology Department
600 Lincoln Avenue
Charleston, Illinois 61920-3099

Office: 217-581-2127
Fax: 217-581-6764
Web: <http://psych.eiu.edu/>

Classroom Strategies & Teacher Perceptions

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Margaret Floress, Ph.D., Melissa Beaudoin, B.A., & Emma Riedesel, B.A., from the Psychology Department at Eastern Illinois University.

- **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of the study is to examine middle school and high school teachers' use of classroom management strategies in general education classrooms. There is little information about how often teachers use specific strategies in general education, especially among middle school and high school teachers. We are also interested in the relationship between classroom strategies and teacher perceptions of classroom strategies and student discipline.

- **PROCEDURES**

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to:

- 1) Allow research assistants to complete ONE, 20-minute observation in your classroom during class instruction (lecture).
- 2) Complete a Brief questionnaire (approximately 5 minutes to complete).

- **INCENTIVES FOR PARTICIPATION**

If you are one of the first 40 participants to participate in this study you will receive a small gift of appreciation (valued at approximately \$5).

- **IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS**

If you are interested in participating or hearing more information about this study, please contact

<p>Margaret Floress, Ph.D. 217-581-3523 – office 812-219-8419 - cell mfloress@eiu.edu</p>

This study IRB #16-085 has IRB approval