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A disproportionate number of Black students with disabilities experience exclusionary discipline practices (e.g., suspensions and expulsions) in K-12 public schools. This disparity persists, regardless of the severity of identified problem behavior, the school’s average socio-economic status, or the type of public school attended. Given that teacher education programs (TEPs) are pivotal training grounds for pedagogical and philosophical formation, it is crucial for TEPs to demonstrate accountability for building critical consciousness of the factors that produce and perpetuate this disparity. Gaining a fuller understanding of how pre-service special education teachers craft their perceptions of problem behavior during their TEPs may help to rectify this problem. This post-intentional phenomenological study explores the ways pre-service special education teachers from a special education teacher education program in the State of Illinois craft their perceptions of problem behavior and how social identity influences these perceptions. Participants \( n = 38 \) completed three tasks: 1. Social Identity Wheel; 2. Aspects of Identity Questionnaire-IV; and 3. Video Elicitation. Following the three activities, I randomly selected six participants \( n = 6 \) to sit with me for semi-structured interviews. Findings showed a patchwork of ways perception of problem behavior is crafted – the primary way stemming from personal childhood experiences. The influence of social identity on perception was inconclusive. Results have implications for special education teacher educators who are
committed to complying with Illinois State Board of Education’s (ISBE) newly adopted Culturally Responsive Teaching and Leading Standards for teacher education programs. Results also have implications for school personnel interested in following the recently released guidance from the Department of Education that helps public K-12 schools avoid discriminatory use of discipline against students with disabilities.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The purpose of teacher education programs (TEPs) is to prepare prospective teachers to grow in democratic ideal, specific discipline, knowledge of students and pedagogy, as well as practical experience in the classroom to effectively educate for an ecologically sustainable, pluralistically diverse, and economically competitive nation (DeMoss, 2017; Zhu et al., 2017). For as long as a century, literature on the topic of teacher education either calls out problems within the programs or calls for sweeping reform (Bergen, 1992; Borko et al., 2006; Conant, 1963; Darling-Hammond, 1997; DeMoss, 2017; Grima-Farrell et al., 2019; Koerner, 1963; Levine, 2006; Loughland, 2012; Martens, 1937; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Russell, 1936; Rust, 2010; Woodruff, 1958; Zelazek, 1990; Zhu et al., 2017). Recommendations for remediation usually take one of two stances of scrutiny: external gaze or internal gaze. Whereas an external gaze explores outside factors, in which things outside of the surveyor become subjects for scrutiny, an internal gaze places the surveyor, themself, as the subject for scrutiny. A surveyor who desires to solve a problem using an internal gaze approach is open to asking themselves two critical, key questions: 1. In what ways might I have contributed to the problem? And 2. How can I use my assets, resources and cultural capital to help solve the problem?

Of all the critiques of TEPs, I noticed one angle commonly downplayed throughout the discourse; that is the failure to address the significance and, at times, weaponization of social distribution of power within the classroom. Additionally, solutions assuming an internal gaze have been left out of the conversations. We educators committed to identifying and rectifying inequities in education cannot accept this. We must add to the conversation. We can do this by using a more critical lens through which we note and propose change to some of the most
egregious issues. One of those issues is the overrepresentation of Black students with disabilities in office referrals and exclusionary disciplinary consequences. Through a critical lens and an internal gaze, we can examine and interrogate the ways in which we train pre-service teachers to identify problem behavior.

This chapter describes the unresolved problem of disproportionate exclusionary discipline consequences experienced by Black students with disabilities in U.S. schools and the need for more research on solutions from an internal gaze. Background information, the problem statement, and the purpose of this research study are included. This chapter also contains the theoretical framework and research questions, along with the rationale behind the selected questions. The final sections include a discussion on the significance of the study, along with descriptions of key terms.

**Background**

Discipline data taken from U.S. schools consistently show disproportionate exclusionary practices (e.g., time-out, removal from class, in-school/out-of-school suspensions, expulsions) of Black students, particularly Black male students (U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights [OCR], 2021a; U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights [OCR], 2021b). Furthermore, statistics show that exclusionary discipline practices in U.S. schools affect Black students with a disability far more than most other students in the school system (Annamma, 2018; Brobbey, 2018; Fisher et al., 2021). Black students with disabilities are nearly three times more likely than their non-Black peers with disabilities to be identified as having problem behavior and to receive exclusionary discipline (Brobbey, 2018; Green et al., 2018; Skiba et al., 2013; Skiba et al., 2014).
Enduring findings confirm that classroom teachers tend to respond differently to similar behaviors according to race (Costenbader & Markson, 1994; Fenning & Rose, 2007; Rong, 1996; Welsh & Little, 2018). The origin of most discipline referrals comes from inside the classroom (Simson, 2014; Skiba et al., 2002; Welsh & Little, 2018). Behaviors that lead to office referrals are primarily those that are perceived as noncompliance or disrespect. Many of them, within the same classroom and written by the same teacher, provide minimal evidence of a consistent relationship between seriousness of offense and severity of consequence (Brobbey, 2018; George, 2015; Wright, 2015). Black students are referred to the office for more subjectively interpreted infractions, compared to their non-Black peers (Carter et al, 2016; George, 2015; Gilliam et al., 2016; Katz-Amey, 2019; McIntosh et al., 2018; Ritter & Anderson, 2018; Simson, 2014; Welsh & Little, 2018). This is especially true for black students with disabilities and/or receiving special education services (Annamma et al., 2020; Brobbey, 2018; Fisher et al., 2021; George, 2015; Kervick et al., 2019). The root of the problem rests more within the perceptions, feelings, and fears of schoolteachers than it does in the actual severity of the infraction (Fenning & Rose, 2007). Fear and threats to people’s comforts are antecedents of prejudice and discrimination (Stephan & Stephan, 2013). These inconsistencies reveal a pattern of disproportionality in the doling of school discipline based on race and disability. Although the federal government has mandated that school districts address this disproportionality, little guidance has been given on what substantial actions can be taken to alleviate the problem and improve future practices (U.S. Department of Education, 2022).

Given that schools across the nation have historically struggled to address these discipline disparities, critical examination of biases at the systemic level in creation of policies, implementation of interventions, and collection and evaluation of data are underexamined areas
and demand further examination. One influential area that calls for critical examination is in special education teacher education programs. Failing to properly train our special education teacher candidates may result in the continuation of the current inequitable practice of what I articulate as hyper-SLaP-ing Black students with disabilities – that is overly Surveilling, quickly Labeling, and aggressively Punishing Black students with disabilities (Annamma, 2018).

Behavior is complex and nuanced (Heino et al., 2021). It is influenced by mood (Lerner et al., 2015), genetics (Moffitt, 2017), personality (Chang & Sanna, 2003), psychology (Sher, 1997), mental health (Spielberger, 2013), environment (de Acedo Lizárraga et al., 2007), station of need (Kunc, 1992; Maslow, 1958), physiology (Andreassi, 2010; Vaillancourt & Newell, 2002), culture (de Acedo Lizárraga et al., 2007), and so many other factors, such as foods & drugs (Dinan et al., 2015; Volkow et al., 2016). By definition, problem behaviors are problems because they are actions that interfere with students’ learning and negatively impact their social, emotional, and academic development (Bambara & Kern, 2021). Problem behaviors are identified by their impact on students and their social systems more than by the actual forms the behavior takes. This means that problem behaviors are not static and objective. They vary with different people groups, settings, cultures, and social norms.

Due to the complexity, learning to identify what is considered deviance, or problem behavior, is a challenging task for pre-service teachers. Deviance is the violation of social rules and conventions (Abrams, 2022). Social rules are norms and expectations of thoughts and behavior situated in shared beliefs within a specific cultural group (Van Kleef et al., 2015). They are often unspoken, offering standards for what is appropriate/acceptable and inappropriate/unacceptable. Following unspoken social rules can help to create a safe
environment because they influence our behavior and interactions among people, except when they do not.

What if certain social rules were designed with intention to disadvantage or exclude cultural subgroups? What if a social rule is broken because a student is new to and unfamiliar with that specific culture? Should they be punished? To what degree? Our social identities often inform who we associate with and, conversely, who we avoid interactions with (Hogg, 2016). This process of identifying with particular social groups affects our behavior (Kalin & Sambanis, 2018). One’s social identity, therefore, can affect the behavior of the very person who is tasked with the important responsibility of evaluating a child’s behavior. Our ontological, epistemological, and axiological stance can also influence perception. I articulate the stance as our OEA position.

Ontology and epistemology are very similar. Ontology refers to our understanding of what is reality, or real (Al-Ababneh, 2020). Epistemology is our understanding of “knowledge” within that reality, and axiology measures the value of that for which we acknowledge to be truth (Al-Ababneh, 2020). Together, with and without our conscious knowing, our OEA position informs our perception of human behavior.

Problem behavior is only a problem because it is perceived to be one. How objective is perception? My work challenges assumed ideas and practices of determining what is considered to be problem behavior. I argue that any curricula that teaches pre-service teachers how to identify problem behavior without teaching them, as tools of assessment themselves, to understand the ways their own social identity may impact evaluation are no longer sufficient. In this investigation, I studied the phenomenon of perception crafting by pre-service special education teachers when defining and identifying problem behavior.
Current literature on teacher education reform calls for an urgent critical re-examination of the epistemology undergirding TEPs and transformative action steps going forward (Ellis et al., 2019; Giroux, 2018; Guillén et al., 2016; Liu, 2015; Orland-Barak & Wang, 2021; Shields, 2020; Zygmunt & Clark, 2016). We appear to be moving in the right direction—the direction that empowers pre-service teachers to see their world differently through a lens of equity, so they are more strategically positioned to change systemically discriminatory societal structures. But that has not proven to be enough to interrupt the systemic problem of hyper-\textit{SLaP}-ing Black students with disabilities (Annamma, 2018; Reid, 2015). Given that TEPs are pivotal training grounds for pedagogical and philosophical formation, it is crucial that they demonstrate accountability for building critical consciousness of the factors that produce and perpetuate the hyper \textit{SLaP} problem. Gaining a fuller understanding of how pre-service special education teachers craft their perceptions of problem behavior during their TEPs may help to rectify this problem. I want the findings from this study to help move special education TEPs toward a more effective solution.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will describe the problem of disproportionate exclusionary discipline of Black students with disabilities and how TEPs are presently falling short of effectively addressing the problem. I will outline the study in which I explored the phenomenon of \textit{perception crafting} by pre-service special education teachers when defining and identifying problem behavior. Additionally, I will share how I plan to examine how social identity influences perception of problem behavior.

\textbf{Statement of the Problem}

Research has shown that our perception of the world is influenced by our \textit{experiences} and our \textit{expectations} (Jordan et al., 2019; Sohn et al., 2019). Expectations are informed by our past
experiences and our experiences are often lived through a tinted lens of expectation. Certain people, things and situations can trigger us to interpret our sense of reality through a positive lens or negative lens, based on these two e’s.

Our perception of the world around us is also influenced by our social identities which are directly informed by our positionality (Gregory, 1974). Positionality refers to a person’s social and political context from which their identity is developed in terms of race, class, gender, sexuality, and ability status (Dictionary.com, 2022). Our social identity has the potential to influence, stigmatize and even bias our perception of behavior (Pescosolido et al., 2008). We all have unique social identity (Jenkins, 2014). We cannot separate ourselves from it, but we can grow in it. An effective teacher should remain aware of the influence of their point of perception and social identity when engaging in curriculum development, instruction, assessment, behavior management, and community engagement.

The special education teacher’s perception can influence their assessment of classroom behavior – theories of what qualifies as “disability, what qualifies as deviance, what smartness is, etc.; hypotheses about why a child is disturbed, challenged, disabled, or gifted; methodologies, or specific procedures used to identify, select, process, and analyze the student; and how student data is analyzed, interpreted and communicated (Sohn et al., 2019). All of the above steps in the assessment process result in drawn conclusions. These conclusions drive the high-stakes decisions that can and do affect the lives of students and their families for years far beyond their schooling.

This is particularly important in the field of special education because the present trend in K-12 public schools of over-issuing Black students with disabilities exclusionary discipline consequences is denying many of these students the Free and Appropriate Public Education
(FAPE) guaranteed to all students with an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). It is for that reason, in the current study I explored the ways in which pre-service special education teachers craft their perceptions of problem behavior. Since our social identity can affect our own behavior, even as we are tasked with the responsibility of evaluating student behavior, I also examined how social identity impacts these perceptions. Failing to seek an understanding of how pre-service special education teachers craft their perception of problem behavior and what part social identities play in that development may result in the continuation of the current inequitable practice of hyper SLaP-ing Black students with disabilities.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was to understand the ways in which pre-service special education teachers craft their perceptions of problem behavior. Additionally, this study explored how teacher social identity influences these perceptions.

**Theoretical Framework**

Three theoretical leaning posts helped me to think about how I might address the identified problem of practice: Critical Disability Studies (DisCrit), Indirect Perception Theory, and Transformative Leadership Theory (TLT).

DisCrit is a theoretical framework that builds further upon the work of Disability Studies and Critical Race Theory (Annamma, 2016; Annamma et al., 2018; Ladson-Billings, 2019; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Migliarini & Annamma, 2019). It considers how the intersection of disability and other multiply-marginalized identities can have a compounding and, oftentimes, adverse effect on individuals. Examining teacher preparation practices through a DisCrit lens enabled me to focus on the ways that the forces of racism and ableism circulate interdependently, often in invisible ways. It also helped me to highlight the social constructions of race and ability
and recognize the material and psychological impacts within the classroom. The seven proposed tenets of DisCrit are listed below.

1. DisCrit focuses on ways that the forces of racism and ableism circulate interdependently, often in neutralized and invisible ways, to uphold notions of normality.

2. DisCrit values multidimensional identities and troubles singular notions of identity such as race or dis/ability or class or gender or sexuality, and so on.

3. DisCrit emphasizes the social constructions of race and ability and yet recognizes the material and psychological impacts of being labeled as raced or dis/abled, which sets one outside of the western cultural norms.

4. DisCrit privileges voices of marginalized populations, traditionally not acknowledged within research.

5. DisCrit considers legal and historical aspects of dis/ability and race and how both have been used separately and together to deny the rights of some citizens.

6. DisCrit recognizes Whiteness and Ability as Property and that gains for people labeled with dis/abilities have largely been made as the result of interest convergence of White, middle-class citizens.

7. DisCrit requires activism and supports all forms of resistance. (Annamma et al., 2018, p. 19)

These tenets help to form the structure that supports my study’s theoretical assumptions. They stand in contrast with the common theoretical paradigm used throughout the field of special education: Behaviorism.

Behaviorism has long served as the prevailing paradigm from which special education TEPs teach their students how to identify and mold behavior (Algahtani, 2017; Anderson et al.,
Behaviorism supports that learning happens when a person responds favorably to some type of external stimuli (Lee, 2016; Lenjani, 2015; Skinner, 1988; Watson, 1928). Focusing only on observable behavior is problematic because it ignores the complexity of behavior, as if all behavior is willful. There is no acknowledgement of the multi-level why behind what we do. A DisCrit theoretical framework is helpful because it shifts the questions that are asked in special education from How can we fix students? to How can we make visible and reify the many invisible oppressive tools and constructs that U.S. schools have historically wielded against certain student populations that continue to be over-identified as needing to be fixed? I believe that identification and acknowledgement must come first before any effective actions and enduring accountability can mitigate educational inequities in special education.

A second theoretical framework that served as a leaning post to help me think about my research was Richard Gregory’s Indirect Top Down Theory of Perception (1970). According to Gregory, a teacher’s identity is a critical factor influencing the perception of behavior. The Indirect Top Down Theory of Perception helped me to frame perception. He argued that perception is not solely sensory-driven, but also constructed. Because most stimulus information from our environment is uncertain-able, we use higher cognitive information – such as stored knowledge and background experiences – to interpret it and make inferences about what we take in through our senses (Gregory, 1970, 1974). Gregory proposes that our perception is merely interpretations and conclusions based on existing and prior knowledge and experiences. We actively construct our perception of reality based on our environment, assumptions, expectations, and stored information.

Having constructivism as an overarching conceptual frame can be seen as a contradiction to the other critical frame that I have identified. However, I chose to avoid situating differing
theories as contradictions or as opposing. Instead, I utilized the lenses as valid perspectives and “theories I want to think with” (Vagle, 2018, p. 142). Moreover, constructivism can be critical when proper links are made. For example, reality is both socially constructed and shaped by power forces that exist in hierarchy. Following is a bulleted summary of Gregory’s (1970) Top Down Theory of Perception. Each overarching principle must be critically considered by its impact on the larger society.

- A lot of information reaches the eye, but much is lost by the time it reaches the brain. Gregory estimates about 90% is lost.
- Therefore, the brain has to guess what a person sees based on past experiences. We actively construct our perception of reality.
- Richard Gregory proposed that perception involves a lot of hypothesis testing to make sense of the information presented to the sense organs.
- Our perceptions of the world are hypotheses based on past experiences and stored information.
- Sensory receptors receive information from the environment, which is then combined with previously stored information about the world which we have built up as a result of experience.
- The formation of incorrect hypotheses will lead to errors of perception (Gregory, 1974).

**Transformative Leadership Theory**

Transformative Leadership Theory (TLT) is a critical approach I take in my role as teacher educator, and it is an approach that will enable me to address the root of the problem. Transformative educational leadership requires we focus on individual learning and group learning connected to the larger society (Shields, 2020). I identify with this approach because it
is grounded in the values of equity, inclusion, excellence, and social justice—all values that benefit students at both the individual and collective levels (Shields, 2020). It also challenges and critiques inequitable practices, oppression, and marginalization of students—all steps that will help to identify and eliminate inequities in teacher education.

Educator, author and speaker Carolyn M. Shields (2016) identified what she calls Eight Tenets of Transformative Leadership:

1. A mandate for deep and equitable change;
2. The need to deconstruct knowledge frameworks that perpetuate inequity and injustice and to reconstruct them in more equitable ways;
3. The need to address the inequitable distribution of power;
4. An emphasis on private and public (individual and collective) good;
5. A focus on emancipation, democracy, equity, and justice;
6. An emphasis on interconnectedness, interdependence, and global awareness;
7. The necessity of balancing critique with promise;
8. The call to exhibit moral courage.

In a transformative leadership approach, the change process begins with oneself—with conscientization (Freire, 2020; Shields, 2016). Transformation in programming requires a thorough and dramatic change in form, process, and product. I imagine this will be difficult in higher education, where respect for traditions of the past is highly esteemed and expected. Still, I will challenge areas where inequities exist with urgency. That will take morally courageous leadership (Gahl, 1984; Shields, 2014).

Synthesizing these three frameworks, this research study began with a baseline understanding of the following three conceptual themes that were central to the study.
I believe that perception is:

a) Constructed from sensory data, emotions, expectations, prior and existing knowledge and experiences

b) Informed by racism and ableism—two socially constructed systems that are connected, invisible, endemic, and presenting as a normal part of our society

c) Shaped by our identities (race, disability, class, gender, sexuality, etc.) in totality (impossible to separate) in both the doing (the perceiving) and the being (perceived)

Overview of Research Methods

To identify the ways in which pre-service special education teachers form their perception of what good behavior and bad behavior is, I conducted a post-intentional phenomenological study (Merleau-Ponty, 2013; Sartre, 2010; Vagle, 2019). I provide a rationale for this methodology in chapter 3. My aim was to illuminate the phenomenon of how their definitions are formed by accessing the first-hand perspectives of the main actors themselves: the pre-service teachers (Heidegger, 2005; Husserl & Moran, 2012). In contrast to the goal of similar phenomenological studies where the intention is to explore already-formed perceptions (Bernabé et al., 2016; Condy et al., 2012; McElhaney, 2016; Nganga et al., 2020; Waters & Russel, 2016; Yeh, 2010; Yeh & Lahman, 2007), I wanted to understand the phenomenon of the pre-conceptual making, or crafting, of perceptions.

Mark D. Vagle, American phenomenological education researcher and conceptual originator of post-intentional phenomenology, described intentionality as “how we are meaningfully connected to the world” (2014, p. 27). The ‘post’ identifies a direct association with post-structural approaches (Vagle, 2014). Post-intentional phenomenology requires
researchers to remain conscious of their own OEA positions, which is an ethical hemline of phenomenology’s concept of intentionality. However post-intentionality enables researchers to critique their own OEA position and performance in the field (Vagle, 2014). This particular approach was the most appropriate out of the list of other phenomenological approaches because it released me from having to draw out a rigidly defined essence of meaning of the phenomenon. At the same time, I was able to center pre-service teachers’ lived experiences as know-worthy, multiple, partial, and varied in contexts. The expectation to critically reflect on self, subjects and status quo sits comfortably with my inclination to interrogate and mine in an effort to only and always excavate experienced truths. Through a post-intentional approach, I was able to explore what this particular experience of perception crafting meant for pre-service special education teachers with varying social identities who are all receiving the same or similar training. Finally, through this means of research, those experiences could be understood as they were constructed in their multiple, partial, and various sociocultural contexts (Bhattacharya, 2017; Vagle, 2018).

**Research Questions**

The research questions (RQ) that guided the study are:

RQ1. In what ways do pre-service special education teachers decide what qualifies as normal, or permissible, classroom behavior?

RQ2. What are the ways pre-service special education teachers learn to determine if behavior has deviated from normal to problematic?

RQ3. How does social identity influence pre-service special education teachers’ perception of problem behavior?

RQ1 was chosen as the key question for this study as it directly targets the phenomenon of perception crafting. It is important to better understand how pre-service special education
teachers formulate their definition of what constitutes normal, or permissible, classroom behavior because whatever deviates from that standard tends to fall into the category of problem behavior. And the tendency has historically hyper-penalized Black students with disabilities, making this study necessary.

RQ2 was chosen for the same reason as RQ1; it targets the phenomenon of perception crafting. This question, however, is phrased slightly different. Whereas “normal” behavior is rarely explicitly taught, behavior identified as “deviant” or the kind that deviates from the norm is operationalized and categorized to more easily standardize the methods for controlling the behavior. The answers to this question helped me to better understand which sources carry the greatest influences and what epistemologies are preferred.

RQ3 was chosen because social identity is distinctively related to categorization and valuation in similar ways behavior is categorized and valuated. A person’s social identity is most influential when that person esteems membership in a particular group to be central to their self-concept. This study was anchored on three assumptions: 1. racism is the primary cause of inequality in education (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995); 2. disability, along with racism, are socially constructed categories historically used to exclude and oppress (Nielsen, 2012); and 3. we rely on our beliefs, values, social identity, and influences to interpret what we consider to be real and reality (Gregory, 1970). According to the third assumption, exploring how social identity influences the phenomenon of perception crafting may be key to establishing more effective steps to rectifying the problem of hyper-punishing Black students with disabilities through exclusionary discipline consequences.
Significance of the Study

The findings of this study have implications for both special education teacher educators and for K-12 school personnel. It should be of interest to individuals overseeing curriculum and instruction in teacher education programs. It should also be of interest to administrators and policy makers committed to bringing about systemic organizational restructuring in the areas of equity, diversity, and inclusion. While curriculum specialists and local board members have some degree of autonomy in establishing their own timeline in overseeing more culturally responsive curriculum adoption, policies and organizational restructuring, the same leniency is not given to the teacher educators in TEPs and K-12 school personnel. These two entities are being urged by both state and federal governments agencies to move with greater urgency.

It is imperative for special education teacher educators to remain committed to complying with Illinois State Board of Education’s (ISBE) newly adopted Culturally Responsive Teaching and Leading (CRTL) Standards for TEPs in Illinois (ISBE, 2021). Adopted in March 2021, the State of Illinois is giving TEPs no more than three years to demonstrate compliance. The hope is the standards will help pre-service teachers build the skills they need to better connect with, teach and lead students who may come from backgrounds and cultures that differ from theirs. By aligning their curricular goals to meet the CRTL standards, TEPs will be preparing pre-service teachers to meet four culturally crucial competencies. Future teachers will be better able to: 1. Engage in self-reflection and internal gazing; 2. Get to know their students’ families; 3. Connect their classroom curricula to students’ lives; and 4. Support student leadership.

This research is also significant to school personnel who are interested in following the recently released guidance from the Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights and Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. This federal guidance was designed to help
public K-12 schools, both, halt and avoid further discriminatory use of discipline against students with disabilities (USDOE, 2022). It is the most extensive guidance on the civil rights of students with disabilities regarding school discipline there has ever been in U.S. history.

My goal is to add to the literature in a way that may ultimately help to develop an explanatory theory of pre-service teachers’ learning about behavior identification & remediation during the critical years of teacher preparation. Doing so will help us to better understand the complex experiences and factors that influence whether, how, and to what extent pre-service teachers assess student behavior through a lens of equity. My hope in turning our attention to honest internal gazing is three-fold: 1. that we may uncover the root of discriminatory exclusionary discipline practices in U.S. schools which may 2. help us to identify unfair assumptions and unsuitable teaching practices related to behavior perceptions, and 3. that teacher education will use the robust truths to re-design more equitable curricular and instructional practices. Studying the ways in which future special education teachers craft their perception of behavior may be an important key to developing culturally competent curriculum for TEPs committed to deconstructing systems of oppression historically embedded in the field.

**Definitions of Key Terms**

**Bridling.** A post-intentional phenomenological process of trying to locate and name one’s assumptions of what is normal and what surprises them. In bridling, the researcher explores how their knowledge and past experiences play a part in producing the phenomenon (Vagle, 2018).

**Craft.** To craft means to make, fashion, or produce with care, skill, or ingenuity (Merriam-Webster, 2022).
Culturally Responsive Teaching and Leading Standards (CRTL). Adopted by the State of Illinois in March 2021, the CRTL standards encourage pre-service teachers to engage in deep and pointed self-reflection to remain accountable to building the skills necessary to better engage with their future students and families who may come from different backgrounds and cultures than them (ISBE, 2021).

Hyper-SLaP. This refers to the unjust practice currently happening in K-12 schools of over-surveilling, over-labeling, and over-punishing Black students with disabilities, in comparison to their non-Black peers with or without disabilities (Annamma, 2018).

Intentionality. In phenomenology, the term is used to describe the meaningful ways humans, or subjects, are connected to the lifeworld, or object (Soule & Freeman, 2019).

Lines of Flight. A term developed by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari in “A Thousand Plateaus (1987)”, post-intentional phenomenologists conceptualize the term in their philosophy as the infinite ways a phenomenon can “flee, elude, flow, and leak (Vagle, 2018, p. 191)” as it presents itself.

Perception. Perception is the ability to capture information through the sense organs, process the information, and actively make sense of the world through hypotheses based on past experiences and stored information (Gregory, 1970).

Pre-service teacher. This term describes college students with little to no classroom teaching experience who are enrolled in a teacher education program that trains them to become professional teachers (Cochran-Smith et al., 2016).

Problem behavior. Problem behavior can be internal or external, physical or emotional actions that interfere with students’ learning and negatively impact their social, emotional, and academic development (Bambara & Kern, 2021).
Social identity. Social identity is the part of a person’s self-concept that is informed by that person’s membership in groups defined by some shared attribute, such as gender, race, ethnicity, religion, socio-economic class, age/generation, language, political party, etc. (Kalin & Sambanis, 2018).

Teacher Education Program (TEP). These are teacher preparatory programs in higher education institutions designed with curriculum, instruction, and field-based teaching experiences with the supervision, support and mentorship of university faculty and K-12 cooperating teachers (Cochran-Smith et al., 2016).

Teacher Educator. A teacher educator is a university teacher who works in a TEP to help prepare the next generation of teachers (Zeichner, 2005).

Tentative manifestations. Drawing upon Merleau-Ponty’s (2010) and Deleuze & Guattari’s (1987) work, Vagle (2018) conceptualizes tentative manifestations as the fleeting, multiple, malleable, and in flux ways phenomena present itself for/to/by/through us.

Summary

My interest in researching this phenomenon of perception crafting in pre-service teachers stems from the years I was both a clinical supervisor of pre-service special education teachers during their practicum placements and also a faculty instructor teaching a course very similar to the one in which I conducted research. Throughout the years, I noticed that the course curriculum described problem behavior in broad terms while pre-service teachers encountered more specific examples in their practicum placements. However, the specific examples varied by school, school district, demographic student population, cooperating teacher, and disability category being served. Because of the wide variance in definitions and because disciplinary consequences can carry with it life-altering effects, I became interested in better understanding
the ways in which perceptions of problem behavior are formed during the critical years of teacher preparation.

I conducted a qualitative post-intentional phenomenological study to perform the internal gaze that has long been overdue in the field of special education teacher preparation. My hope is that the findings will bring us closer to understanding how social identity influences the phenomenon of perception crafting. It will also make a key contribution to our understanding of effective teacher education practice and its influence on developing future teachers who engage in critical inquiry. Ultimately, my hope in following this post-intentional analysis process is to generate novel understandings of the phenomenon that may potentially produce social change in how U.S. schools teach, perceive and address classroom behavior.

The remainder of this document includes four chapters: Review of Literature, Methods, Findings, and Critical Conclusions. One consistent theme found throughout the entire text is: *Loose and varied by design, with multiple contexts kept in mind.* Openness and creativity are encouraged; anything short of that places, what I refer to as, *L.I.D.s* (Limitations, Insecure existences, and Definitions that stifle) on a researcher’s freedom to explore and speculate about the findings. The research process followed by post-intentional phenomenologists honors some level of guidance and values protocol, but only to a degree. We find it imperative that rules and protocols in the research process are followed only to the point that they do not usurp unexpected opportunities or stultify tentative manifestations (Vagle, 2018). Following research practices solely due to tradition, convention, or expectation may diminish the openness and creativity necessary to engage in high quality phenomenological materials gathering and analysis.

Phenomenology as both a methodology and a philosophy acknowledges the intimate and intertwined connection between subject and object, researcher and research. Chapters 3 and 4
esteem this entangled intention through the inclusion of special tidbits sections directly from Research Journal entries. Chapter 3 includes important Afterthoughts from the researcher’s positionality and experiences that may have had an impact on any findings (Dahlberg et al., 2008; Heidegger, 2002). Chapter 4 highlights Ponderings that critically challenge philosophical exploration and understanding (Vagle, 2010). These ponderings also highlight tentative manifestations that may illuminate our intentional relationships with the world around us and how the phenomenon of perception crafting is manifested for us, to us, by us, and through us (Heidegger, 2002; Vagle, 2010).

In the next section, I conducted a partial review of relevant literature in which I introduced the research problem, provided historical context, situated the research problem in existing scholarly conversations and identified the phenomenon as it relates to the problem. In the end, I pointed out what was missing from the literature, and I introduced this current study that addressed the knowledge gap.

In the Methods section, I engaged in a brief but deep dive into the history of phenomenology. I thoroughly introduced the post-intentional research design and provided rationale as to why this was the best methodology for the current study. I outlined the components of the research study and included enriching Afterthoughts. In the end, I described how I collected and analyzed the phenomenological material.

In the Findings chapter, I reported and analyzed the results of the study through a post-intentional data analysis process. Descriptive data are presented first, and then findings organized around the questions are reported. I interpreted the data and included answers to the research questions that guided this investigation. I included Ponderings that connect the reader with the researcher’s intentional relationship to the research. These ponderings deposit
invitational seeds for further probing. Graphic displays of the findings are provided through tables and figures. This chapter will effectively set the foundation for posing critical questions, drawing conclusions and making recommendations for Chapter 5.

Chapter 5 includes a synthesis of the key points, reasoned deductions, and dangling curiosities that emerged from data analysis. In post-intentional phenomenology, knowledge is treated as partial, fleeting, multiple, and ever-changing (Vagle, 2018). Because phenomena are best explored using multiple theories, ideas, methods, and perspectives (Vagle & Hofsess, 2015), I placed theorists and philosophers in dialogue with one another. Just as many critical questions stimulated by the findings as there were conclusions are presented in Chapter 5. Finally, limitations, implications, applications to practice and policy, along with recommendations for future research are discussed.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In accordance with Vagle’s (2014) post-intentional phenomenology, I conducted a partial review of literature related to the study before beginning the investigation. For Vagle (2014), “The primary goal in post-intentional phenomenological approaches is to capture tentative manifestations of the phenomenon as it is lived—not to use existing theories to explain or predict what might take place (p. 124).” Munger (2007) holds similar beliefs, as he warns of the dangers of marrying oneself to an ideology: “This business of drifting into extreme ideology is very, very important in life. If you want to end up wise, heavy ideology is very likely to prevent that outcome (personal communication).”

I realize this is considered contrary to conventional norms of research. Traditionally, a comprehensive literature review that shows evidence of thorough synthesis and in-depth analysis is esteemed. Such literature reviews often qualify the researcher as an expert of the scholarly conversations on their topic. Growing in expertise is important, but how much is enough? At what point does reviewing literature from a phenomenological perspective become too much and begin to commandeer researcher perception and compromise critical thinking? It was important for me to remain resistant to unknowingly allowing the literature to characterize and situate the phenomenon in pre-determined research language. With a strategically planned partial review of the literature, I was able avoid being overly influenced by findings in similar studies and to remain as open as possible to lines of flight and tentative manifestations of the phenomenon as they presented themselves.

Search Strategies

I searched for articles in journals for the period of 2015-2022. The reason for the date restriction is because, though the problem is as old as the passing of Brown v. Board of
Education, it was hoped that current literature would help to inform current circumstances in what many consider to be “post racial-post pandemic” U.S. education. The central problem of investigation in this study is limited to U.S. classrooms; however, I did not impose a limitation of only U.S. education-related articles. Primary rationale for this decision is to enlarge the pool from which solutions are drawn. It may prove unproductive to expect productive draws from a poisoned well. Finally, articles were excluded if they were not published in English. The reason for this restriction was to keep the literature accessible to the investigator.

**History of Disproportionality**

Exclusionary discipline in U.S. public schools has been under scrutiny for several decades (Anderson & Ritter, 2016; McCarthy & Hoge, 1987; Simson, 2014; Skiba et al., 1997; Welsh & Little, 2018; Wu et al., 1982). According to the 2018 Civil Rights Data Collection report, the number of K-12 students who received one or more out of school suspensions during the 2015-16 school year had increased since systematic reporting began in the early 2000s (Gage et al., 2019). Exclusionary disciplinary actions deny students access to crucial instruction and increase their risks for truancy, dropping out, and incarceration (Kulkarni et al., 2021). Still, the impacts and outcomes tend to be worse for Black students, and most prominently with Black students who have an identified disability (Annamma et al., 2020; Skiba et al., 2013).

Forty years of research has exposed the gross inequity between the number of Black students who are punished through the use of exclusionary discipline practices compared to their White peers (Costenbader & Markson, 1994; Fenning & Rose, 2007; Gilliam et al., 2016; Katz-AmeY, 2019; McIntosh et al., 2018; Ritter & Anderson, 2018; Skiba et al., 2002). Black students with disabilities continue to be harmed from the severity of these types of disciplinary consequences at a more frequent rate than their non-Black peers with disabilities (Annamma et
Results of a national analysis of the disciplinary exclusion of Black students with disabilities revealed how the risk ratio differs for students in these two marginalized social identity groups. About 10% of Black students received a suspension, compared with 2.5% for all other racial/ethnic groups. About 23% of Black students with disabilities received a suspension, compared with ~9% for Latin@ and White students with disabilities, ~6% for Asian students with disabilities, and 21% for Native American students with disabilities (Gage et al., 2019).

The disproportionate exclusionary discipline of Black students with disabilities has been extensively documented, yet the viability and effectiveness of the solutions proposed and enacted to counter this problem are less well-understood. This chapter includes a partial review of scholarly literature on actions taken to address the problem of exclusionary punishing Black students with disabilities at a disproportionate rate in comparison to their peers. I begin with a critical review related to the problem, and I end with a call for more research on the phenomenon, due to an identified gap in the literature.

**Critical Review Related to the Problem**

Around the same time the phenomena of disproportionate exclusionary discipline consequences began to be investigated is when long-standing misattributions to the cause were being called out (Fenning & Rose, 2007; McCarthy & Hoge, 1987). Researchers began to recognize the root of the problem lied less within the behaviors of the students and more within the perceptions, feelings, and fears of school personnel (Fenning & Rose, 2007; Garro et al., 2021).

For decades, research has acknowledged the problem and has attempted to identify the factors that feed into the problem. However, a substantial body of that research has focused on
causes directly derived from the students as an explanation for the overrepresentation (Fenning & Rose, 2007; Skiba et al, 2000). In other words, much of the rationale used to support exclusionary discipline consequences is predicated on factors internal to the student, as if the deficit existed within them.

Students who are not perceived as “fitting in” with the norms of the general student population are most often the children who are less familiar with and less equipped to successfully negotiate the hidden curriculum (Casella, 2003). These students are often members of power minority groups, according to their social identities (race, ethnicity, nationality, dis/ability, first language, socioeconomic status [SES]; Carter et al., 2016; George, 2015; McFadden, Marsh, Price, & Hwang, 1992). Sadly, many of these students are unjustly hyper-surveilled, labeled, and punished (Hyper-SLaP-ed), being perceived as a threat. A student who is thought of as “a troublemaker” (Bowditch, 1993) or “dangerous” (Casella, 2003), for example, can be swiftly separated from their peers with the support of the school and greater community.

Researchers such as Casella (2003), Domenico (1998), Fenning and Rose (2007), and Skiba et al. (2000) argue that there is a more valid explanation. Evidence for the disproportionate number of students of color targeted for removal points to reasons related to school personnel perceptions, anxieties, and fears. Students who are perceived as not following the behavioral and social norms of the schools are labeled as “unsafe.” Couple that with teacher and administrator anxiety that comes from not feeling in control of a student, and we are left with fear of losing control in the classroom. Even when there is no actual threat of dangerous behavior, our most vulnerable students fall into the school-to-prison pipeline because of educators’ perceptions, anxieties and fears (Fenning & Rose, 2007). Recommendations have called for solutions that are more consistent with a wider, ecological approach. Many of the
solutions address the problem either at a systemic level or at a school-based level. Table 1 outlines some of the proposed solutions from both levels (Navarrete Thorn & Carr, 2023).

Table 1

**Solutions to Disproportionate Exclusionary Practices in Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemic Solutions</th>
<th>School-Based Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct statewide analysis of schools with disproportionate discipline data</td>
<td>Use exclusionary discipline only as a last resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require disproportionate schools to complete root cause analyses</td>
<td>Use positive behavior interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize root cause data to develop a corrective action plan</td>
<td>Develop trauma-informed behavior management plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require impacted schools to report their efforts and results to the state</td>
<td>Develop behavior assessments and appropriate intervention plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide needed resources for staff training</td>
<td>Use restorative approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct school climate surveys to determine responses are effective</td>
<td>Offer implicit bias and cultural competency training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make adjustments as needed</td>
<td>Develop and use classroom management techniques</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From Kennedy Krieger Institute’s *Disproportionate Discipline of Students with Disabilities;* kennedykrieger.org*

**Systemic Problems Require Comprehensive Solutions**

Acknowledging the systemically racist history of the U.S. educational system, some researchers have called for a critical examination of solutions that would best address the problem at the systemic level (Fisher et al., 2021; Kervick et al., 2019; McIntosh et al., 2018; Ritter & Anderson, 2018; U.S. Department of Education for Civil Rights, 2021). Suggested solutions address policy creation, data collection, accessibility to leadership positions, and biases at the system level.

Still, researchers like Ritter and Anderson (2018) caution us about the potential efficacy of discipline policy reforms. They remind us it is possible that school leaders respond to changes in statewide mandated disciplinary policies by altering their reporting habits instead of engaging in true reform. True as that may be, such a warning should not paralyze the U.S. Education
System from continuing to pursue equity in discipline. Recently, both the State of Illinois and the U.S. Department of Education took these necessary steps toward equity.

**State and Federal Guidance**

In March 2021, the State of Illinois issued a statewide mandate in hopes of making greater strides towards equitable school practices by increasing accountability in the teacher preparation stage. They did this by adopting Culturally Responsive Teaching and Leading Standards (CRTL). The CRTL Standards challenge pre-service teachers to connect curriculum, instruction, evaluation, & other classroom practices with students’ lives. Teacher education programs in Illinois have three years to implement the standards (Illinois State Board of Education, 2021).

Following suit in July of 2022, the United States Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR) and Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) released new guidance to help public K-12 schools fulfill their FAPE responsibilities for students with disabilities and avoid the discriminatory use of school discipline (U.S. Department of Education, 2022). U.S. Secretary of Education Miguel Cardona explained the rationale behind the new guidance: “Too often, students with disabilities face harsh and exclusionary disciplinary action at school (U.S. Department of Education, 2022).” This type of leadership from the federal government is crucial for establishing accountability at the systemic level. But a dilemma this pervasive requires a multi-level, multi-directional approach to make strides towards lasting change (O’Day & Smith, 2016). Systemic problems require comprehensive solutions.

**School-Based Solutions**

Disparities in school discipline are the result of school personnel managing minor behavioral infractions by way of discretionary practices (Raffaele-Mendez & Knoff, 2003;
Welsh & Little, 2018). Literature on the topic overwhelmingly suggests that less severe behaviors such as ones perceived as non-compliance or disrespect require more subjective assessment (Raffaele-Mendez & Knoff, 2003; Welsh & Little, 2018). Research consistently show increased racial disproportionality for subjectively defined classroom behaviors and for actions categorized as more severe (Smolkowski et al., 2016). In a 2017 study, Girvan et al. examined the extent to which school discipline disproportionality between Black and White students was attributable to racial disparities in teachers’ discretionary versus nondiscretionary decisions. They analyzed the office discipline referral (ODR) records of 1,154,686 students enrolled in 1,824 U.S. schools. Their results showed that disproportionality in subjective ODRs explained the large majority of variance in total disproportionality. This largely leads to the problem schools face of discrepancies with discipline consequences. Table 2 contains a list of problem behaviors sorted by level of severity into two categories: Classroom Managed and Office Managed. The table is a synthesis of behaviors and categories from various ODR forms used in U.S. schools (SPPS, n.d.; The Next Level, n.d.; U.S. Legal Forms, n.d.)
Table 2

Behavior Levels: Common Office Discipline Referral Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Classroom Managed</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Office Managed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNP</td>
<td>Unprepared</td>
<td>WEA</td>
<td>Weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLK</td>
<td>Talk-out; Interrupting</td>
<td>AGG</td>
<td>Fighting or Aggressive physical contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRS</td>
<td>Disrespect</td>
<td>THB</td>
<td>Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>Disruption or Distraction (minor)</td>
<td>HAR</td>
<td>Harassment/Bullying (stdnt or tchr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTD</td>
<td>Put Downs</td>
<td>TRU</td>
<td>Truancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSG</td>
<td>Name calling/Teasing</td>
<td>SMK</td>
<td>Smoking/Tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF</td>
<td>Refusing to work</td>
<td>GND</td>
<td>Gang issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>Off task</td>
<td>DnA</td>
<td>Drugs or Alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOS</td>
<td>Out of seat</td>
<td>GAM</td>
<td>Gambling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TON</td>
<td>Inappropriate tone/Attitude</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Dress Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEC</td>
<td>Technology violations, inc. phone use</td>
<td>THF</td>
<td>Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INP</td>
<td>Inappropriate Comments/language</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>Documented chronic classroom infractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnA</td>
<td>Argumentative or Aggressive (minor)</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Insubordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFD</td>
<td>Gum, food or drink</td>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>Defiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAR</td>
<td>Tardy</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>Cut class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>Minor safety issues (eg., running)</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Insubordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LnC</td>
<td>Lying/Cheating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP</td>
<td>Sleeping</td>
<td>ELO</td>
<td>Elopement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLG</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Instigating conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDV</td>
<td>Emergency drill violations</td>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>Defiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAT</td>
<td>Late work/No HW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON</td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, Skiba, Chung, et al. (2014) examined evidence that contradicted the majority of the extant findings. They reviewed data from all public schools in a Midwestern state during the 2007-2008 academic year. Skiba and his team looked at factors that led to exclusionary disciplinary consequences and found that moderate-to-significant infractions such as fighting, drug use/possession predicted the likelihood of receiving a suspension or expulsion. Few studies since have reinforced these contrasting findings. Instead, numerous studies have only strengthened the claim that racial disparities exist in the relationship between behavior infraction and resultant consequence (Gregory & Weinstein, 2008; Okonofua & Eberhardt, 2015; Skiba, Chung et al., 2014; Wallace et al., 2008).
Researchers have suggested solutions to these disparities which are best addressed at the school building level (Carter et al., 2016; Darensbourg et al., 2010; Fisher et al., 2021; George, 2015; Green et al., 2018; McIntosh et al., 2018; Ritter & Anderson, 2018; Skiba et al., 2013; Welsh & Little, 2018). Skiba et al. (2013), for example, proposed the implementation of universal interventions such as schoolwide positive behavior supports, social emotional learning, restorative justice, and other race–culture specific interventions like culturally responsive classroom management. Darensbourg et al. (2010) focused on the role of school-based mental health professionals as a more ecologically responsive intervention. If schools leverage the unique set of skills mental health experts have, it may help to decrease Black students’ exposure to exclusionary discipline practices and the adverse outcomes that often follow.

Others have outlined practical approaches and strategies that can be used in schools and districts to acknowledge and address issues of racial inequality (Anderson & Ritter, 2020; Casella, 2003). The goal being not simply to talk about race, but rather to examine the school and district data to identify the extent of racial ethnic disparities, be willing to discuss those disparities and their causes, develop interventions that include race-conscious analysis of the causes, and monitor the effectiveness of the interventions honestly and thoroughly. Of course, all of these actions are taken while continually scrutinizing disaggregated data (Carter et al., 2016). It does not go unnoticed that all of the above steps mirror the well-known multi-tier system of supports (MTSS) process for ethically supporting students with accountability (Averill et al., 2011).

Data also reveal that social construction processes, such as the central establishment of school rules and common understanding of school leaders as to the meaning of what is “proper” and “acceptable” student behavior and what behaviors fall into deviance, according to that
understanding, are the most plausible explanations for this inequitable practice (Fenning & Rose, 2007; McCarthy & Hoge, 1987). For example, perception and fear of loss-of-control within the class contributes to which students receive exclusionary discipline consequences. These students are largely Black students.

**Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS)**

In the past ten years, implementation of MTSS to address problems with racial/ethnic disproportionality and school discipline have become more widespread (Fallon et al., 2021; Green et al., 2018; Gross et al., 2023; Bunch-Crump, 2015). Education reformists suggest that MTSS such as School-wide Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) and Response to Intervention (RtI) may be a more ethical solution to minimizing disproportionality. Fallon, Veiga, and Sugai (2021) argued how MTSS must prioritize racial equity and healing in U.S. schools. They propose four ways MTSS could promote racial equity and support the adults who are in the oppressive systems. School psychologists and support personnel can 1. empower students, families, and communities to engage in authentic and transparent partnerships with one another, 2. advocate to leaders in the field, 3. facilitate transformative professional development of staff, and 4. support classroom teachers as they strive to create inclusive and healing class communities. The authors take into consideration the root-causes of harm. And they frame their proposal with an ecological-behavioral paradigm.

In a 2016 publication, authors Belser, Shillingford, and Joe outline a model that integrated two frameworks as a support for marginalized students of color exhibiting problematic behavior. The integrated system includes MTSS and the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model (Belser et al., 2016). The combined support framework was introduced to address disciplinary concerns in a more balanced and systematic manner than in the past. It is
rooted in data-driven decisions that begin with collecting baseline data on students via surveys and screening measures and then analyzing the data to determine level of risk. The overlapping model provided objective alternatives to exclusionary disciplinary punishments which is a welcomed contrast to the subjective assessments historically used (Belser et al., 2016).

**Addressing the Problem at the Classroom Level**

Quantitative and qualitative studies consistently conclude that disparities in disciplinary practices occur most often in the classroom (Green et al., 2018; Kervick et al., 2019; Rafael-Mendez et al., 2003). A number of proposed solutions to rectify the problem look to the classroom teacher (Annamma et al., 2020; Katz-Amey, 2019; Rafael-Mendez et al., 2002; Simson, 2014). By reviewing and implementing the results of these studies, teachers have the opportunity to change their classroom practices to academically and behaviorally support their Black students with equity.

Some solutions have called on educators to simply reflect on how ability is both distributed and withheld in the classroom along racialized lines (Annamma et al., 2020). Others have implored teachers to imagine what new culturally responsive positive behavior supports could be implemented through a race conscious lens (Annamma et al., 2020; Green et al., 2018; Simson, 2014). Simson (2014) and Kervick (2019) suggest incorporating more restorative justice (RJ) practices into classrooms. Both Raffaele-Mendez et al. (2002; 2003) and Katz-Amey (2019) suggest that teachers adopt an ecological approach to help them understand why Black students are overrepresented in disciplinary actions. “Although the legacy of these issues runs deep, the solution is close to home: cooperation and communication in our own school communities” (Katz-Amey, 2019, p.41).
Some researchers identified solutions predicated on demands of behavior changes within the student, with the assistance of the classroom teacher (Bender, 2008, Borgmeier et al., 2015; Brobbey, 2018; Simson, 2014). Educational researchers Bender (2008) and Brobbey (2018) recommend we teach students self-determination strategies, emphasizing autonomy, self-regulation, psychological empowerment, and self-realization. Borgmeier et al. (2015) suggest we use functional behavior assessments to identify the logical reason, or the “why”, behind student misbehavior. If we can identify the function of the behavior, we will better be able to fashion an alternative and acceptable replacement behavior. This reasoning follows the historically errant practice of attempting to “fix” the student, rather than to look closer at the classroom teachers’ perceptions.

Of all proposed solutions, almost all call for some type of professional development (PD). The most often-mentioned topics for PD are instruction, classroom management, family engagement, data-based decision making, and diversity and cultural responsiveness training (Annamma et al., 2020; Green et al., 2018; Katz-Amey, 2019; Kervick et al., 2019; Mendez et al., 2002; Simson, 2014). Waitoller and Artiles (2013) reviewed a decades-worth of research on professional development for inclusive education and found that teacher development curricula is undertheorized. Additionally, most PD utilized a unitary approach toward difference and exclusion. They recommend schools use an intersectional approach to understand inequities in school practices, especially for issues rooted in disparate treatment according to marginalized social identity groups such as race/ethnicity and dis/ability.

**Solutions from an Internal Gaze**

Of the many proposed solutions to the problem of disparate disciplinary treatment across racialized lines, the majority assumed an external gaze for answers. An external gaze explores
outside factors, in which things outside of the surveyor become subjects for scrutiny. An internal gaze helps to center the surveyor and the impact they may have on the problem as the subject for scrutiny. An individual who desires to solve a problem using an internal gaze must be willing to ask themself two critical questions: 1. In what ways might I have contributed to the problem? And 2. How can I use my assets, resources and cultural capital to help solve the problem? The answers to those key questions can lift, what I call, the L.I.D. (limitations, insecurities, definitions) on finding possible, lasting, and inclusive solutions.

It is a wonder why more education reformers did not suggest an internal gaze, such as teacher limitations, perceptions, and biases. It seemed as if, for years, educators knew how to identify the problem, but they refused to name the possible root of the problem to be internal, related in some way to racism or biased perceptions by school personnel. Fortunately, recent research is beginning to suggest we begin to look inward (Fisher et al., 2021; Gilliam et al., 2016; Wright et al., 2014)

According to Gilliam et al. (2016), implicit biases may be reduced through interventions designed to either directly address biases or increase teachers’ empathy for children. The authors suggest guiding principles by which teachers might be able to “explore” and “discover” their own implicit biases in order to better deliver more equitable services. There have been proposals for teachers to participate in more training along with ongoing guidance to understand how best to use the information they are “discovering” about themselves. This may increase their empathic understanding of their students and avoid uncomfortable feelings of overwhelm and hopelessness, especially when teacher and child race do not match (Gilliam et al., 2016). Solutions centered around teacher perception of behavior and factors that influence perception need to be further explored.
From the stance of internal gazing, Wright et al. (2014) investigated the possibility of a link between the significant racial gap in the use of exclusionary school discipline with Black students and racial bias or racial antipathy. They used data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class to replicate the results of prior studies. From that, they estimated a second model that controlled for documented prior problem behavior. At first, their replicated studies showed clear evidence of a racial gap between the number of suspensions issued to Black students and White students. However, they found that the racial gap was fully accounted for by a measure of the documented prior problem behavior of the student. Wright and his team argue that the use of suspensions may not have been as racially biased as some have concluded. The authors highlight the importance of considering early problem behaviors.

**Research that Addresses Problem and Population**

The U.S. federal government has acknowledged the problem regarding the overuse of exclusionary discipline, particularly for Black students with disabilities. Yet there is limited research focusing wholly on Black students with disabilities and even less publicly available research documenting the analysis of proposed interventions to remedy the problem. Table 3 outlines research from the past ten years that addresses the problem, population, and proposed solutions.

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s), Date</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Study Setting</th>
<th>Gaze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cruz et al., 2021</td>
<td>To examine the effectiveness of school-based interventions in reducing disproportionality in discipline practices</td>
<td>Literature Review -included studies used experimental, quasi-experimental, or observational designs</td>
<td>20 articles met inclusion criteria</td>
<td>external</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Article Type</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Source Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fisher et al., 2019</td>
<td>To call for a review of the MDR process that tends to perpetuate discipline disparities of Black students with disabilities</td>
<td>Research article</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>external &amp; internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage et al., 2019</td>
<td>To determine the current national results regarding school discipline for Black students</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>database</td>
<td>external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green et al., 2018</td>
<td>To discuss the moral and ethical issues of the problem and provide ways schools can address and prevent it</td>
<td>Topics column</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kervick et al., 2019</td>
<td>To raise concerns regarding the efficacy of educational practices and policies that fail to protect students of color with disabilities</td>
<td>Research article</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulkarni et al., 2021</td>
<td>To call for local solutions; to outline implications for anti-racist and anti-ableist practices</td>
<td>Research article</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNeill et al., 2016</td>
<td>To search the literature for ethical solutions to the problem of exclusionary discipline practices</td>
<td>Comprehensive literature review</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rynders, 2019</td>
<td>To examine how implicit bias adversely impacts Black children; to explore how to combat the problem from a systemic level</td>
<td>Legal paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan et al., 2014</td>
<td>To explore the patterns and predictors of suspension</td>
<td>Hierarchical generalized linear modeling</td>
<td>39 schools in a Midwestern district ECLS-K database</td>
<td>external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright et al., 2014</td>
<td>To investigate the link between prior problem behavior and racial bias</td>
<td>Replication study</td>
<td>ECLS-K database</td>
<td>internal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N/A = not applicable

A synthesis of literature conducted by Cruz et al. (2021) examined the effectiveness of empirically inspected school-based interventions that were implemented to reduce disproportionality in discipline practices. The research yielded two key findings: 1. There is little evidence that the reviewed programs have the capacity to reduce discipline disparities; and 2. Programs commonly adopted by schools and districts (e.g., RJ, MTSS, PBIS, RtI) may inadvertently function as a protective agency for White and female students with and without
disabilities while failing to do so for Black students with and without disabilities. Proposed solutions are from an external gaze.

Fisher and colleagues (2020) used DisCrit theory to address the problem. They examined how the manifestation determination review (MDR) process in special education potentially leads to Black students with a disability disproportionately punished with exclusionary discipline consequences compared to their White and Black students with or without a disability. MDR is a mandated process under the U.S. federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). It is also a process that can easily slip into subjective determinations. The process of MDR tasks educators with determining whether students’ offending behaviors were related to their disability. The answer to that question will determine what type and level of disciplinary action the school can legally take. The MDR process comes with vague guidance, little clarity about who should be on the MDR team, and perpetuation of a race-neutral framework that most often harms students of color. Fisher et al. call for a multi-level review of this mandated process: federal, state, district, school, and individual levels. The authors compel that we reflect on the MDR process from both an external vantage point (federal, state, district, and school) and internal approach (individual).

Researchers Gage et al. (2019) collaborated to determine the current national results regarding school discipline for Black students with disabilities. They conducted a quantitative analysis using rates and weighted risk ratios. Findings indicated that Black students with disabilities continue to be grossly overrepresented in exclusionary discipline compared to their proportion within the population. Although their conclusions echo those of similar studies, theirs differ because the analysis was done at a national level. Still, proposed solutions take an external gaze. The results of their study have implications for research, policy, and practice.
Authors Green et al., in a 2018 article, discussed ways the U.S. educational system could address and prevent disproportionality in exclusionary discipline practices for Black students with disabilities. They recommended the following four action steps that could be taken to increase equitable practices: 1. Establish an equity team to create, maintain, and analyze actionable commitments to equity; 2. Create or re-evaluate equitable discipline policies. The equity team (from action step #1) should make sure the policies are taught to all staff and that they include a schedule and measures for accountability; 3. Support evidence-based decision making using a MTSS to provide academic, social-emotional, and behavioral frameworks to meet the needs of students; and 4. Use disaggregated data for conducting systematic, continuous review of discipline data. Data review meetings should include school leadership, equity team members, and other key stakeholders. Authors of this article argue that equity must become a top priority in our nation’s schools. The only way this is possible is through explicit efforts to improve equitable school policies and practices. Yet, proposed review of those policies and practices are from an external gaze.

Kervick and his colleagues (2019) hypothesize that the implementation of restorative practices can mitigate the problem with schools hyper SLaP-ing Black students with disabilities. In their article, Kervick et al. call for the adoption of more relational, nonpunitive restorative approaches to behavioral change, such as MTSS programs. They posit there is one caveat, though; that is the implementation of such restorative approaches must be done only with an emphasis on equity and equal educational access for all. The practical tools provided in the article are inclusive, accessible, and equitable. However, they are all strategies that address the problem from an external gaze.
Kulkarni et al. (2021) understand that exclusionary disciplinary actions against Black students with disabilities deny them from accessing essential instruction. These inequitable practices also increase students’ risks for truancy, dropping out, and incarceration. In 2021, they sent out a crucial call to action for researchers and practitioners to collaborate on local solutions to the problem. The authors contend that a problem this endemic, pervasive, and rooted in racism cannot be solved with a single intervention strategy. Simplistic, faddish approaches will neither be effective nor lasting. Instead, they outline implications for anti-racist and anti-ableist practices that center the knowledge and experiences of communities of color. From these frames, necessary and more culturally responsive practices are initiated. Notwithstanding, they are initiated from an external gaze.

A comprehensive literature review by researchers McNeill, Friedman, and Chavez (2016) revealed two possible alternatives to the problem: RJ and PBIS. Each approach was contrasted with the current approach of exclusionary discipline. Findings suggest that implementation of either intervention with the compliment of peer mediation would significantly improve student educational outcomes. In fact, their expansive review of the literature revealed dramatic decreases in suspensions (50-80% decrease within one month to a full school year), simply by replacing the punitive model with either intervention. For all that, the interventions were implemented as a result of reflecting from an external position.

Rynders (2019) wrote a paper that explored how the problem of implicit bias for Black children in the child welfare system and juvenile justice system translates to implicit bias problems in the special education system. Rynders claims that implicit bias contributes in large part to Black students being overrepresented in special education when compared to their peers, disciplined at higher rates than their white peers, and placed in more restrictive placement
settings. He elucidates how the federal government attempts to combat the problem through IDEA. The author also explores possible legal solutions lawyers can enact to combat implicit bias in the courtroom and in their own practice. Rynder’s paper was one of few I came across that proposed a counterstrategy using an internal gaze approach.

A 2014 study by Sullivan et al. (2014) used hierarchical generalized linear modeling to show how disability type, gender, race/ethnicity, and SES were significant predictors of suspension among students with disabilities. Findings from this study are unique because they determined that school characteristics were associated with increased risk of suspension among students with emotional disturbance. The authors argue there is a need to explore a wider variety of classroom and school factors that may account for inequitable discipline practices. As valid as the suggested exploration is, it would take place from an external, and not internal, vantage point.

**Gap in the Literature**

There is much literature addressing the problem of disproportionate exclusionary discipline practices against Black students, but those that focus primarily on Black students with disabilities is nominal. Of this minimal amount, most propose solutions from an external gaze. Solutions often center ecological factors or school-wide response programs as the vantage position from which problem behavior is identified and through which it is remediated. Few have taken a critical internal gaze. However, the 2014 study by Wright et al. that did look at the problem from an internal gaze still came up lacking. The researchers suggested that racial bias may not be as potent a factor as record of prior problem behavior of the student. What Wright and his team fail to acknowledge in their argument is that prior problem behavior is still behavior that might have been assessed through racially biased lenses. The authors, in their
conclusion, left a crucial gap that needs to be accounted for. And that gap is the influence of teacher perception on the identification of problem behavior.

Teacher Education and Preparation Programs (TEPs) oversee the crucial training period for new special education teachers. Few research studies examine the part TEPs play in either enlarging or lessening the problem. Even fewer, if any, study the influence of perceptions of behavior held by the pre-service special education teacher as a researcher in the assessment and evaluation of behavior. Finally, I have found no study that has examined the influence of social identity on this particular phenomenon. Given the significance of this issue, serious consideration should be given to this study.

Learning the ways in which pre-service special education teachers craft their perceptions of behavior and exploring how social identity influences the phenomenon can be transformative—leading to more equitable classroom practices. It can encourage conscientization, increase empathy, decrease complicity, and make room for deep dialogue (Shields, 2016). Teacher education programs can use this information to deconstruct any outdated, non-inclusive & discriminatory assumptions, values, and traditions and adopt more relevant, inclusive, and equitable frameworks. Future teachers can grow in habit of self-locating, identifying biases, and interrogating perception in practice. Together, it can lead to a decrease in discrimination on the basis of demographic identifiers (Jaramillo & Nohelty, 2021), a decline in the current trend of hyper-punishing students of color with exclusionary disciplinary measures (Annamma, 2018), a rise in culturally responsive classroom curricula (ISBE, 2021), and an increase in compliance with the federal law and Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) demands. However, expectations for special education TEPs to establish, esteem, and maintain such a level of self-
awareness continue to outpace training in how to support their engagement in this type of critical analyses (Darling-Hammond, 2016; Obiakor et al., 2010).

Research indicates that training should start in their teacher preparation program (Brobbey, 2018; Carter et al., 2016; Green et al., 2018; ISBE, 2021; Katz-Amey, 2019; Welsh & Little, 2018). The State of Illinois recognized this period of professional training to be crucial; and that is the reason why the CRTL standards were implemented in TEPs across the state, with a three-year start-up window before accountability measures are enforced (ISBE, 2021). The problem is that little research has been conducted on pre-service special education teachers’ processes of crafting their definition of normal behavior and, subsequently, behavior that deviates from the norm. It is for these reasons I was interested in pursuing this research.

Summary

Discipline data taken from U.S. schools consistently show disproportionate exclusionary practices of Black students with disabilities. It is particularly troubling for middle schools and high schools in the U.S., where nearly half of our schools suspended Black children with disabilities at higher rates than their peers. Research has now helped us to recognize the root of the problem lies less within the behaviors of the students and more within the perceptions, feelings, and fears of school personnel. Despite the many systemic-level and school-level solutions implemented to address this problem, the disparity continues to exist. Addressing and correcting this continued injustice in our U.S. education system towards Black students with disabilities must be a priority. After conducting a deep and partial literature review, I have identified a gap.

This study sought to fill this gap and serve as a catalyst to begin exploring the phenomenon of perception crafting within pre-service special education teachers. I chose to
begin this exploration through the life experiences and perspectives of advanced-level students enrolled in a midwestern TEP that graduates the majority of the special education teachers in its state. The methodology and design for this study follows in Chapter 3.
CHAPTER III: RESEARCH METHOD

Introduction

In the last ten years, numerous studies of pre-service teachers’ self-perception of readiness to address student behavior have been conducted. However, much of the research has surveyed general education pre-service teachers using quantitative methods (Lester et al., 2018; O’Neill & Stephenson, 2012; Peters, 2012; Zakaria et al., 2013). Few studies investigate the perceptions of pre-service special education teachers. Often, the purposes of these studies are to study the activity of perception-taking, while the phenomenon of perception-crafting has largely been ignored.

Studies are needed that will direct positive change within pre-service teachers’ crafting of perception of problem behavior. Although quantitative studies are more generalizable, they are limited because they are most concerned with discovering facts about a phenomenon. What often lacks is the understanding of the nuances behind social phenomena from the informant’s perspective (McLeod, 2019). Present practices of hyper-surveilling, -labeling, and -punishing, or “hyper-SLaP-ing”, Black students with disabilities, particularly by way of exclusionary discipline consequences, calls for a critical study of how teachers are identifying behavior as problematic. The ideal time to study this phenomenon is during the crucial years of training to become a professional educator.

Research today must get to the root of these inequitable practices. It is time to look beyond the what it is and further investigate the why and how it is. What is needed along this topic are more studies that investigate the meaning making of the structure of perception crafting. I was interested in exploring pre-service teachers’ experiences. More specifically, the phenomenon of perception crafting that directly informs how a person perceives behavior as
either acceptable or problematic. To be fruitful, it was important that the research approach provided for an open and reflective inquiry into the individual actions and motivations of pre-service teachers by probing their lived experiences, any long-held assumptions, and the influence of their social identity – one that explores the visible and the invisible influences. Phenomenology supports this type of meaning making (Crotty, 1998; Merleau-Ponty, 2013; Neubauer et al., 2019).

This chapter presents the philosophy and methodology chosen to explore how pre-service special education teachers craft their perception of problem behavior. I provide a brief synopsis of the history of phenomenology, including its foundational concepts and key principles. I describe all aspects of the post-intentional phenomenological design and the rationale for selecting the approach to inform the research. I discuss procedures used in the study and Vagle’s methodological process which served as the underlying guide in this inquiry. In this type of research design, data collection and analysis take place side-by-side. Juxtaposing these two steps helps the researcher more effectively use bridling while they encapsulate pre-service teachers’ unique experiences of identifying the phenomena. I include enriching tidbits from the researcher’s journal called Afterthoughts that exemplify this parallel process. The focus of this research is on subjective, personal experiences of the research participants’ perspectives in perceiving and interpreting the phenomenon.

**Qualitative Methodology**

This research study followed a qualitative approach. A qualitative method was more fitting over a quantitative or mixed methods design for many reasons. In qualitative approaches, researchers use inquiry to explore and uncover a deeper understanding of a topic by centering the perspective and experiences of the participants (Creswell, 2013). It was essential that detailed
data was gathered based on the pre-service teachers’ perspectives rather than the researcher’s perspectives and interpretations; qualitative design makes intentional room for this (Bhattacharya, 2017; Crotty, 1998; Husserl, 2002). Another primary purpose for using a qualitative design is because it is an open-ended process (Vagle, 2018). With a qualitative research process, the researcher can go further than close-ended, automatic responses and mine for the deeper data that participants can provide (Tenny et al., 2022). It provides a passageway for emotional data that often carries with it more transparency leading to more accuracy. This method of inquiry offers a systematic method of studying common themes that come from the shared lived experiences of pre-service teachers within the same Teacher Education Program (TEP; Moustakas, 1994). Finally, the research questions are best answered through qualitative research.

The following questions were used to guide the study:

RQ1. In what ways do pre-service special education teachers decide what qualifies as normal, or permissible, classroom behavior?

RQ2. In what ways do pre-service special education teachers learn to determine if behavior has deviated from normal to problematic?

RQ3. How does social identity influence pre-service special education teachers’ perception of problem behavior?

**Research Design**

Qualitative research designs such as ethnographic, grounded theory, narrative, case study, and phenomenological are all valuable in illuminating the voice, experience, and interpretation of phenomena by the subjects, themselves (Creswell, 2013). However, of these approaches, phenomenology stood ahead of them all as the qualitative approach most fitting to understand the
voice, experience, and interpretation of how pre-service teachers’ craft their perception of problem behavior (van Manen, 2017). Additionally, phenomenology is pertinent when studying the influence of a very personal, political, and dynamic human characteristic such as social identity on perception.

This phenomenological research design used many methods to collect data, including curricular documents, a questionnaire, video elicitations, semi-structured interviews, post-reflexion notebook entries, and research journal accounts. The focus of this study was on a more in-depth understanding of the phenomenon ingrained within participants’ life experiences and perspectives. The instruments that were used to collect data aided in parsing out the intricacies of the pre-service teachers’ experiences and perceptions. Findings that distill from common themes have the potential to assist teacher educators in their curricular and instructional decisions when teaching about behavior (Alase, 2017; Elliott, 2018). However, analysis in this study was a mix of tidy and messy. Some neat, common themes surfaced from inductive analysis. At the same time, some data did not fall into tidy categories, opening multiple ways of linking intentions between parts of discussions. This is expected in post-intentional phenomenology because life is not orderly; it is fleeting, ever-changing, affected while simultaneously affecting (Vagle, 2018). Still, the messy, tentative manifestations also have the potential to inform practices in Teacher Education Programs (TEPs; Qutoshi, 2018; Valentine et al., 2018).

**Phenomenology as a Philosophy and Research Methodology**

Phenomenology is both a philosophy and a method of inquiry (Qutoshi, 2018). In broad terms, it is a systemized study that humans engage in to understand fundamental truths about their world, their lived experiences, and their relationships to the world (Vagle, 2018). At the same time, it is an organizing strategy for researching those lived experiences and the
relationships to the world (Greening, 2019, van Manen, 2017). High quality phenomenological research follows an equal commitment to both: openness to philosophical exploration and competence of methods (Vagle, 2010; 2018). From its foundation, phenomenology is an approach that disrupts, interrogates, and illuminates taken-for-granted ways of being and doing to reveal intentional relationships with the world around us (Dahlberg et al., 2008; Heidegger, 1998; Vagle, 2018).

**Philosophical History of Phenomenology**

The roots of phenomenology as a science can be traced back to the early 20th century to Jewish-German atheist philosopher and mathematician, Edmund Husserl (1859-1938). Husserl developed the philosophy in direct opposition to French philosopher Descartes’, a.k.a. Cartesian, concepts (Husserl, 1927; Sheehan & Palmer, 1997; Vagle, 2018). Descartes asserted that human reasoning is distinctly separate from the body and the world. Cartesian philosophy profoundly informed positivism as a philosophical movement and greatly influenced both Western philosophy and mathematics (Vagle, 2018). According to Descartes, our consciousness was relegated solely to the mind. However, Husserl believed that the mind always remained in relationship with the object of its consciousness. He resisted the idea that we *reasoned the world*. “Rather, the world presents itself in our conscious relationship with it (Vagle, 2018, p. 29).”

Phenomenology focuses on what goes on within an individual, in an effort to obtain and make meaning of lived experience. It helps to gather knowledge about how we think and feel in as direct and unobstructed ways as possible (Bentz & Shapiro, 1998). Bracketing is the primary way phenomenologists gather unobstructed knowledge (Allen-Collinson & Evans, 2019; Tufford & Newman, 2012). It is the scientific process used in qualitative research where a researcher suspends personal judgment to mitigate preconceptions that may taint the research process and
focus on the true meaning of a subject’s experience (Sorsa et al., 2015; Tufford & Newman, 2012). By bracketing, researchers are freer to consider the what and how of their conscious processes and consciously put those aside in order to allow more essential acts of consciousness to become visible within themselves (Moran, 2000).

There are two broad strands of phenomenology. Transcendental, also known as descriptive, was developed by Edmund Husserl, and hermeneutical, also known as interpretive, is attributed to Martin Heidegger (Sloan & Bowe, 2014). With these differing approaches, there are different conceptions of what a phenomenon is.

Husserl conceptualized phenomenon as the essence of a human experience, resulting from the interconnectedness between the subjective individual and the objective world (Soule & Freeman, 2019). Husserl’s motto was “To the things themselves!” His goal was always to understand the essence of human experiences in their own terms—by the humans, themselves (Bentz & Shapiro, 1998). A common analogy theorists often visualize when making sense of Husserl’s stance is the idea of peeling an onion. The fundamental meaning, or essence, of the phenomenon is the onion’s core. To Husserl, phenomenology requires peeling away the social, cultural, etc. layers that distort what the onion truly is. The outer layers of preconceived and learned meanings of the object can be peeled back to reveal the core, or essence, of the object that has never changed (Husserl, 1927; Sheehan & Palmer, 1997; Soule & Freeman, 2019). For Husserl, humans make sense of the world, from an external gaze vantage point.

In contrast, Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), theorized phenomenon differently. Heidegger felt that Husserl focused too heavily on humans as objects and not enough on beings. He claimed that Husserl failed to critically examine the being of human beings (Heidegger, 1927; 1998). According to Heidegger, a phenomenon can better be described as a life activity as
it presents itself to, or as it is experienced by, a subject (Dahlberg et al., 2008). To him, the
science of phenomenology is “to let what shows itself be seen from itself, just as it shows itself
from itself” (Heidegger, 1927;1998, p. 30). Along this line of thinking, the work of a
phenomenologist does not merely uncover what “shows itself from itself” but goes even further
to bring awareness to what may be hiding behind a phenomenon’s appearance (Heidegger,
reconceptualization of phenomenon to a fever. A fever, which often can be identified with ease,
is a symptom of an underlying infection, which is significant and effectual, but not itself visible.
For Heidegger, humans actively engage in their world, interpreting it as beings in the world,
from an internal gaze.

**Intentionality**

Edmund Husserl also introduced the concept of intentionality. He argued that the best
way to study the nature of phenomena is to study the units of consciousness that the individual
presents themself as having (Husserl, 1927). He coined these units of consciousness as
intentional experiences (Husserl, 1927). Conversely, Heidegger moved the idea of intentionality
away from Husserl’s cognitive meaning-making and structures of the mind into a more full-body
meaning-making, human-world relational experience, with the world as the meaning context
Klaskow, 2011). Regardless of the phenomenological path travelled – of Husserl or of Heidegger
– the foundational ideas of intentionality remain consistent. First, intentionality has everything
to do with connections, how subject and object relate. Second, the quest to understand
phenomena cannot be reduced to the inadequacies of our perceptions of them (Heidegger,
1927;1998; Husserl, 1917;2002; Merleau-Ponty, 2013). These foundational ideas are exactly
what excited me about using a phenomenological research design. However, each philosophical
stance, on their own, were not as useful to this study as a third path was; that pathway is the post-intentional one. Let me explain, using one last analogy.

If Cartesian philosophy were a researcher attempting to make sense of a phenomenon taking place in a body of water, they might proclaim, “I understand something is happening in that body of water over there.” If transcendental, or descriptive, phenomenology were a researcher, they might say, “I am aware of what is happening, and I understand because I am standing by the body of water. The hermeneutical, or interpretive researcher would declare, “I am in the body of water, and I understand. If, however, post-intentional phenomenology were a researcher, they might proclaim, “I am in the body of water, and I am keeping my eyes open so that I can see through the water. I see something, but I cannot claim that I fully understand it because it is always changing, presenting differently where the sun is hitting the water vs. under the clouds, etc.”

**Post-Intentional Phenomenology as Philosophy**

I appreciate how both descriptive and interpretive philosophies recognize that our world and we, ourselves, are inconsistent and lacking. Both acknowledge that we will only understand true meaning when we accept that phenomena take shape while human consciousness is aware of phenomena in its context, while taking every measure to bracket researcher biases. But there is so much more affecting how a phenomenon takes shape. According to Vagle (2018), phenomena are always in flux, contextual, varied, and understood in part because they are simultaneously producing while being produced. With that, our findings will always remain partial and lacking. But that should not be a reason to forsake the methodology or deem it any less useful. Vagle coined this philosophy as post-intentional phenomenology.
Post-Intentional Phenomenology as Method

Conceptualized by phenomenologist Mark Vagle, post-intentional phenomenology is a research approach that is an outgrowth from phenomenological and post-structural philosophies (Vagle, 2018; 2019). Post-structuralism rejects binary valuations (right or wrong; beneficial or detrimental) and resists the idea that an experience can be truly, fully, and systematically known and/or represented by any structure, namely the structure of language (Farahani, 2014).

Following post-intentional phenomenology as method, researchers use theoretical frameworks less as lenses that frame analysis and more as a description of leaning posts upon which to think (Vagle, 2018). Orienting key theories from this approach allows me to explore the phenomenon of how pre-service special education teachers craft their perception of problem behavior while remaining open to other theories that emerge throughout my research (Vagle, 2018). As with other phenomenological approaches, the phenomenon is still treated as the unit of analysis. But to the post-intentional phenomenologist, a researcher can never fully understand a person’s reality because phenomena are constantly and concurrently in a state of being while also in the process of becoming. Phenomena are always in flux, multiple, partial, and “shaped, produced, and provoked by context” (Vagle, 2018, p. 146). In short, phenomena are continually in a state of doing and being. They are ever and always simultaneously provoking and being provoked by factors such as time, power, values, contexts, objects and subjects.

The Post-Intentional Phenomenon

To explain, I imagine a three-dimensional, ever-rotating, multi-helix of provocative factors (time, power, values, contexts, objects, and subjects) colliding and intersecting on cross-axes of phenomena. Arrows extend from provocative factors to other provocative factors, from phenomenon to other phenomenon, from provocative factors to phenomenon, and from
phenomenon to provocative factors, indicating the shifting and shaping of intentional meanings in, through, and over time and contexts. The helices, arrows and cross-axes are not fixed, but are overlapping, permeable and flexible, representing the fleeting, unpredictable intentional meanings that are constantly in states of producing and being produced. The spaces surrounding the phenomenon signify some pertinent and partial provocations. It is from these provocations I am attempting to explicate meaning and illuminate possibilities surrounding the phenomenon.

Figure 1 is a 2-dimensional depiction of the phenomenon model I just described.

**Figure 1**

2-D Model of the post-intentional model

*Note.* The model shows how phenomena interlap and are affected by factors (original design by Jamillah Gilbert)
**Post-Intentional Research Design**

This study followed a qualitative post-intentional phenomenological research design (Vagle, 2016; 2018; 2019). It was the more relevant research approach for this study because it recognizes the social construction of phenomenon, and that culture and social norms influence how a phenomenon is experienced and interpreted (Jones & Vagle, 2013; Vagle & Jones, 2012). Within the various phenomenological approaches, post-intentional was most useful for both acknowledging and capturing the dynamic, unstable, and ever-flowing meaning that is made from the phenomenon of perception crafting. This approach was also preferred because it aligned best with DisCrit’s recognition of the inter-effects of socially constructed identities on human experience. It also aligned most with Gregory’s Top Down theory of perception which explains perception to be a constructive process (Annamma et al., 2018; Gregory, 1970).

The post-intentional phenomenologist not only identifies a phenomenon of personal interest, but they also position the phenomenon in social context, around an issue that calls for change (Vagle, 2018). We acknowledge that all phenomena are both personal and social – meaning, they are lived out by individual subjects while simultaneously abiding in a constant state of provocation through social relations. This type of methodology is useful in studies of teaching, where the field is ripe for much social change.

The post-intentional methodological design for a study, such as this one, that examines the practice of teaching (as a post-intentional activity) fit most appropriately because the practice is animated and produced by a coil of visible and invisible complexities that the teacher may or may not be aware of (Vagle, 2019). The phenomenon of teaching is ever and always lived in context, fleeting, producing and produced, provoking and provoked by entangled complexities that are only experienced in part, with multiple truths. An individual’s perception is also crafted
by visible and invisible complexities. A post-intentional approach minimized the researcher’s influence as the authoritative interpreter and supported the position that perception crafting is impressionable and contextually established (Soule & Freeman, 2019).

**Bridling over Bracketing**

Qualitative researchers influence their own process by applying their pre-understandings during data collection and analysis of the phenomenon (Sorsa et al., 2015). To minimize this effect, phenomenologists practice bracketing (Allen-Collinson & Evans, 2019; Sorsa et al., 2015). Post-intentional phenomenologists believe it is unreasonable to engage in true bracketing (Vagle, 2018).

Like phenomena, the researcher is also in a continual state of doing and being. The researcher can never fully disassociate themselves from doing and being an effectual force powered by their held values, beliefs, and assumptions. Furthermore, they, the subject, are ever and always simultaneously influencing and being influenced by the research, the object (Alhazmi & Kaufmann, 2022).

Instead, post-intentional methodology encourages qualitative researchers to identify their value positions and describe how their perceptions have been crafted, to increase transparency. This way, post-intentional phenomenological researchers are free to interrogate, instead of suspend, their perceptions. This act is called bridling (Vagle, 2018). Bridling helped me to consciously challenge how my perceptions and value position frame my meaning-making during data collection and analysis.

**Lines of Flight**

Post-intentional phenomenology was also the more ethical and transformative approach for this particular research study because it recognizes the presence of lines of flight (Hong,
Traditionally, lines of flight refer to bolts of bottled energy that shoot off and break through the cracks in any system of control. Along their path, the light reveals and makes visible all openings and spaces once not known (Rayner, 2013).

In discussions of counterculture behavior, the notion of lines of flight is used as a metaphor of resistance to rigid limitations, binaries, and definitions (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). Similarly, in phenomenological research, Vagle’s (2018) concept of three lines of flight can be understood as pushing back against the idea that lived experiences and knowledge can be captured and wholly comprehended (Vagle & Hofsess, 2015). Along the research path, the dynamic and transitory experiences of subjects play a part in revealing and making visible their lived truths – creating space for a more inclusive and comprehensive understanding of a phenomenon. Contrary to Husserl’s approach that focuses on the essence of a phenomenon, Vagle uses the metaphor of lines of flight to remind us to resist focusing on the essence – an aspect which we have neither capacity to apprehend nor should we have the audacity to even think we can capture (Benade, 2016; Vagle, 2018).

The first line of flight describes how phenomena are interpreted by how they connect and change with experience or context as opposed to simply explaining what they are (Vagle, 2018). The second line of flight describes how the subject changes as the phenomenon evolves. And the third line of flight regards the evolution of the subject’s consciousness, as they become ever-aware of their various positions with the rest of the world. According to Gregory’s (1970) Top-Down Processing Theory, the phenomenon of perception crafting is a lot like Vagle’s lines of flight. Both processes are complex, entangled, interconnected, and evolving as the world-context changes. It is the phenomenon’s interlaced state of being and becoming, paired with the
influence of group affiliation that will inform the actions taken to address this study’s problem of practice.

**Vagle’s Research Approach**

Vagle proposed a research process comprised of five components. The components are neither linear, nor regarded as a requirement; rather, Vagle encourages researchers to use only those elements that work well. The components include:

1. Identify a phenomenon in its multiple, partial and varied contexts.
2. Devise a clear, yet flexible process for gathering data appropriate for the phenomenon under investigation.
3. Make a post-reflexion plan.
4. Read and write your way through your data in a systematic, responsive manner.
5. Craft a text that captures tentative manifestations of the phenomenon in its multiple, partial, and varied contexts (Vagle, 2018, p. 121).

The post-intentional phenomenological approach strives for social change by bringing phenomenology into conceptual dialogue and play with other theories, philosophies, and ideas, for the purpose of producing a perspective of understanding that would not have been created in the same way on their own (Vagle, 2018). The intention of this study was to apply this process through the lens and leanings of theory(ies) to better understand the ways in which pre-service special education teachers craft their perceptions of what is acceptable classroom behavior and what is problematic classroom behavior. I am partial to critical theory, but I intentionally embarked on this open-minded approach because I have found no literature that has addressed the problem from this philosophical and methodological space. I wanted to see what might come
of such inter-theoretical playfulness, and I hope the work of the methodology itself helps to produce social change in the field of special education teacher preparation.

**Materials and Instruments**

I collected data from two data sources and used four instruments, and I used five phenomenological materials to help organize and elucidate the data. I gathered data through a questionnaire, a social identity wheel activity, a video elicitation, and a semi-structured interview. Additionally, I leveraged the utility of EdPuzzle, Microsoft Excel, and Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to organize the data. Finally, I used entries from my research journal, and post-reflexion notebook to assist in bridling and to elucidate the data.

**Social Identity Wheel.** This activity encouraged participants to identify their various social identities and to reflect on the ways those identities impact the way they perceive or treat others and the ways others perceive or treat them (University of Michigan, 2022). This information was value-adding to the study because it prepared them to further categorize those identities based on which matter most in their self-perception—similar to the exercise required by the Aspects of Identity Questionnaire (See Appendix A).

**Aspects of Identity Questionnaire (AIQ-IV).** This instrument, authored by J. M. Cheek and S. R. Briggs (2013), is a 45-item questionnaire that scores various identity orientations that reveal what parts of the participant’s identity are more important than other parts. The scale focuses on four aspects of identity: personal, relational, social, and collective identity. After completing the questionnaire, every participant generated a Social Identity Orientation (SIO) score, revealing which identities best defined them. This information was value-adding to the study because different aspects of one’s identity informs one’s positionality which directly impacts one’s unique perception of what constitutes reality (See Appendix B).
**SPSS.** I used this statistical software suite developed by IBM to conduct basic statistical analyses using the social identity data.

**Video elicitation.** Visual elicitation is the use of photographs and other visual images to generate organic responses (Bignante, 2010). This verbal or written discussion creates data and knowledge (Glaw et al., 2017). Multiple layers of meaning can be uncovered using this research method, as visual elicitations can arouse rich memories, deep emotions, and primal ideas. In this research study, I used a short video to elicit reactions and comments. Participants watched the last 3:40 minutes of a 5:00-minute video of a dramatized high school classroom depicting students interacting with the teacher and one another (Sabornie, 2015).

Video elicitation is useful in this research study. Although they are time consuming, I chose this method because it allowed me the latitude to more fully answer research questions one and two in a way that could not be fully done using the semi-structured interview alone. It provided me the opportunity to integrate data about participants’ perceptions of what problem behavior looked like in a classroom setting with their personal definitions of problem behavior. I took that data and blended it with participants’ beliefs, values, and past experiences gained from semi-structured interviews.

**EdPuzzle.com.** I uploaded and edited the video using an online platform called Edpuzzle. Edpuzzle is an educational tool used to infuse interactive content into pre-existing videos from numerous sources, such as original videos, TED talks or YouTube videos. Edpuzzle does not sell or rent students’ personal information to any third party for any purpose (https://edpuzzle.com). Embedded within the video were questions to prompt the participants to discuss their perceptions of problem behavior and the rationale supporting those perceptions.
more extensively. Appendix C has the embedded questions (VEQs), their timestamps, and the rationale supporting the chosen prompts.

**Microsoft Excel.** Microsoft Excel is a spreadsheet software developed by the American multinational technology corporation called Microsoft Corporation (Microsoft.com, 2023). It features computation capabilities, graphing tools and pivot tables. I used Excel to organize some of my research data.

**Semi-structured Interview.** An interview guide held the semi-structured, open-ended questions and probing sub-questions (See Appendix D). The purpose of the interview was to understand the self-reported experiences, perspectives, and values of the participants as they related to the phenomenon being studied -- perception crafting. The guide was given to two select individuals (non-research participants) one month before the study for an expert review and pilot test. The expert review was conducted to ensure construct and content validity, and the pilot test was conducted with a different two select individuals (non-research participants) to ensure validity and reliability.

**Research Journal.** I maintained a research journal that was started one month before the research study began. I used the journal to record all research activities, make note of all ideas, thoughts, and reflections on processes, challenges, and successes. The journal housed any speculations I held, problems I found of interest, possible solutions, references to investigate at a later date, interesting quotes and other tidbits. Entries from the research journal became post-intentional phenomenological material used during data collection and analysis (Vagle, 2018).

**Post-Reflexion Notebook.** This notebook was utilized as a generative methodological move to provoke possibilities for deeper qualitative inquiry. Like the research journal, entries from post-reflexion notebook became post-intentional phenomenological material used during
data collection and analysis (Vagle, 2018). Figure 2 outlines each research instrument and which Research Question(s) the data helped to answer. In the next section, I describe my data collection and analysis methods.

**Figure 2**

Four Research Instruments

- **Social Identity Wheel**
  - Participants identified their various social identities
  - This data helped to answer RQ3

- **Aspects of Identity Questionnaire-IV**
  - Participants reflected on the ways their identities impact the way they perceive or treat others
  - This data helped to answer RQ3

- **Video Elicitation**
  - Participants described the behaviors they perceived as problematic and the supporting rationale
  - This data helped to answer RQs 1 and 2

- **Semi-Structured Interview**
  - Participants self-reported experiences, perspectives, and values related to behavior
  - This data helped to answer RQs 1 and 2

*Note. The four research instruments used during this research study, including a description of how participants engaged with each instrument and research question(s) the data answered.*

**Phases of the Study**

The research study was conducted in three phases, and data was collected in each phase. The sample of pre-service special education teachers (N = 45) who participated in the first two phases were purposively chosen. Phases 1 and 2 included topical lessons and activities in which every student on the class roster was expected to participate. Phase 3 included semi-structured interviews.
From this point forward, I will refer to the total number of students (N = 45) as the *purposive sample*. Out of the purposive sample, I will refer to those who agreed to allow their data to be included in this research study as *participants*. Only participants who fully participated in Phases 1 and 2 were eligible to participate in Phase 3. I will refer to this group as *interviewees*.

Figure 3 shows the three phases of the current research study. In phase 1, participants participated in the class lesson on Social Identity. Data was collected through a social identity wheel activity during class and a 45-item questionnaire. Findings from Phase 1 materials were used to answer research question 3. During phase 2, participants participated in an all-class lesson about LIDs and how LIDs influence behavior. Other Phase 2 instruments used to collect data were video elicitation activity done during class and reflexive notes from the researcher’s journal. Results from data collected during Phase 2 were used to answer research questions 1 and 2. Phase 3 phenomenological material analyzed to also answer research questions 1 and 2 were transcripts from six semi-structured interviews with six interviewees and notes from the researcher’s journal and post-reflexion notebook.

**Figure 3**

Three Phases of this Research Study

[Diagram of three phases with details on what was done in each phase and the instruments used to collect data, along with the research questions addressed in each phase.]
**Phase 1**

A Social Identity Wheel activity and the Aspects of Identity Questionnaire (AIQ-IV) are the primary sources of data in Phase 1 of the research. I administered and collected the Social Identity Wheel activity during the 50-minute lesson I facilitated on the topic of Social Identity (See Appendix E for lesson plan). At the end of the lesson, I orally and visually provided explicit directions to help the purposive sample successfully log into the Qualtrics format of the AIQ-IV. The entire purposive sample was given sufficient time to complete Questionnaire before the class period ended. Data from Phase 1 helped to answer RQ3.

**Phase 2**

A video elicitation activity is the chief source of data in this phase. Following a 50-minute lesson titled *How Limitations, Insecurities, and Definitions (L.I.D.s) Influence our Behavior*, the entire purposive sample watched a 3:40-minute video and responded to prompts and questions embedded within the video. The video was of a dramatized classroom scene in which a variety of students exhibited problem behavior. I provided explicit directions (Appendix F), visually and orally, to help everyone successfully log into the video platform called EdPuzzle (https://edpuzzle.com). Participants were given sufficient time to complete the video elicitation activity before the class period ended. Data from Phase 2 helped to answer RQs 1 and 2.

**Phase 3**

Data in Phase 3 came from semi-structured interviews. In these interviews, participants were asked to ponder and share what key people and happenings, or events, played a role in shaping their understanding of what qualifies as permissible classroom behavior and what behavior they identify as problematic. They were also asked to reflect and discuss their most
memorable recollection of problematic classroom behavior; it could have been a true, lived experience or fictionalized. Data from this phase was used to answer RQs 1 and 2.

Setting

Phases 1 and 2 of this phenomenological study were conducted in two different classrooms of pre-service special education teachers (N = 45) attending the same advanced-level course on the topic of behavior assessment, with in-person instruction. All participants were third- and fourth-year students enrolled in the same TEP at a medium-to-large university in the United States Midwest. The participants in this study were limited to a sample of pre-service teachers in sections 1 and 2 of a three-section course. The third section was eliminated from the sample due to its significant difference in instructional modality, frequency, and student population. Course section inclusion criteria were as follows:

- Four-year program leading to Bachelor’s degree in Teacher Education
- The program is nationally and state accredited.
- Selected courses in all programs are held face-to-face during the typical school week, Monday through Friday
- Selected course had the topic of Assessment as one of the Course Objectives

Choosing a four-year accredited undergraduate program ensured the educational institution had undergone a rigorous evaluation process that held them accountable for teaching the foundations of assessment in special education (Kafaji, 2020). Face-to-face teacher education was most advantageous than other modalities for this study because participants would have had the opportunity to personally engage and collaborate with their peers and teacher from a wide range of backgrounds and power differentials. This modality presented avenues for gaining richer understanding through body language and voice (Gherhes et al., 2021). All of
these benefits aligned with a critical theory research paradigm that maintains understanding is constructed through a lens of human affairs and its connection to power (Howell, 2016). Finally, the research setting took place in an advanced-level pre-service course that included the topic of assessment as one of its primary course objectives. The process of assessing involves collecting information to make important decisions (Harlacher et al., 2014). Assessment methods can take the form of reviewing records, interviewing, observing, and/or testing. Teachers are continually assessing student behavior to make important decisions such as what direction to go with a lesson or activity or what action to take following an interaction. In education, more specifically special education, those important decisions can carry with them long-standing repercussions.

All of the semi-structured interviews in Phase 3 of the study were conducted in an office located in the academic center at the same university participants attended. The office door was closed during the interviews, and a “Do Not Disturb” sign was placed on the outside of the door to ensure no disruptions. The academic support center is where students go to receive content tutoring and participate in academic skills workshops. It is known and referred to by students as a relaxing, friendly and student-centered place of safety and support.

**Participants**

This study used purposive expert sampling. Purposive sampling in research studies is a type of non-probability sampling that is an effective aid in securing knowledgeable participants from the same or similar field of expertise or a certain cultural domain (Tongco, 2007). Expert sampling is a type of purposive sampling used when the researcher wants to collect information directly from individual or group respondent who are specialized or expert in the area of study (Etikan & Bala, 2017). I wanted to gain detailed knowledge about the specific phenomenon of
perception crafting amongst a specific population: pre-service special education teachers. They are the expert sources of data that address my research questions (Etikan & Bala, 2017).

Carrying out this type of sampling required that I had clear criteria and rationale for inclusion in this study (Padilla-Diaz, 2015). To extract the specific experiences of pre-service special education teachers, the only participants included were advanced-level undergraduate pre-service special education teachers attending a four-year teacher education program. Other inclusion criteria required that participants had not yet reached their student teaching semester and who were currently enrolled in a special education foundations course that included the topic of behavioral assessment as one of its primary course objectives. Inclusion criteria for participation in all three phases were as follows:

**Inclusion Criteria for Phases One and Two:**

- Advanced level undergraduate pre-service teacher (next-to-final or final year in their TEP program)
- Enrolled in a TEP leading to a special education degree
- Had not yet started their full day student teaching clinical experience
- Currently taking a course that had behavioral assessment as one of its primary course objectives

The above inclusion criteria helped me to capture the pre-service teachers who would likely have the most extensive base of content knowledge out of the total population of pre-service teachers in their TEP program, yet who would not have entered their semester of full-time clinical experiential teaching.

This sample was drawn from a larger population of special education students attending the same TEP (N = 686) at a 4-year medium-to-large university in the United States Midwest.
The purposive expert sample of students (N = 45) I invited to participate in this research study were enrolled in Sections 1 and 2 of three sections of the same 3-credit hour course titled “Class-wide and Individualized Behavior Supports”. All members were advanced level undergraduate pre-service teachers in the third-to-last semester of their TEP. No one from the sample had reached their student-teaching clinical semester yet. However, every student was actively participating in their practicum clinical semester in which they taught in a K-12 classroom two days per week. Students in the third of the three sections of this particular course were not included because it was a specialized section that differed from Sections 1 and 2 in instructional modality, frequency, and student population.

The third research question in this investigation asks about the influence of social identity on the phenomenon. To answer RQ3, participants answered questions about their social identity. All of the participants were between 19 and 25 years old. Seventy-eight percent of the participants self-identified as female, 16% male and 6% non-binary. Sixty-eight percent identified as White or Caucasian, 20% were Latin@ or Hispanic, 6% other or unknown, 3% Native American and 3% Asian. Sixty percent described themselves as heterosexual, 10% as bisexual, 10% are questioning, 5% identified as queer, and 15% abstained from answering. Thirty percent of the participants claimed to have a physical, speech, cognitive, or mental disability of some type. Twenty-five percent said they were able-bodied, and 45% did not answer.

Out of the purposive sample (N = 45), 38 participants (N = 38) agreed to allow their data to be included in this research study. Of the 38 participants, eighteen (N = 18) fully participated in both phases, making them eligible to participate in Phase 3. After three separate email
invitations over a two-week span, six interviewees (N = 6) from the eighteen agreed to participate in the Phase 3 semi-structured interviews.

Compared to a quantitative study where large sample sizes can increase the strength of the study and decrease the likelihood of errant conclusions (Martinez-Mesa et al., 2014), the smaller size of this qualitative phenomenological research study was intentional, valid and, in this case, preferred (Vagle, 2018). With roughly three dozen participants and six interviewees, I was able to engage in an in-depth exploration of the ways in which they have crafted their perception of both normal and abnormal classroom behavior. Unique examples of research with small sample sizes, such as this study, can yield new findings that are potentially highly relevant and worthy of dissemination (Boddy, 2016).

**Ethical Issues/Permissions**

Research began once the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Illinois State University approved the study. I understand that it is my responsibility to treat participants fairly and ethically. I provided every member of the purposive sample with an Informed Consent form to participate in Phases 1 and 2 (Appendix G). The form explicitly outlined the aspects of the study and participants’ rights. I communicated, both verbally and in writing, the purpose of the research, who the information is for, how the data will be used, what will be asked in the survey and interview, measures to ensure confidentiality, and the risks and benefits involved with participation. By doing this, I was able to ensure all participants were knowledgeable about the conditions of their participation.

All participants were required to sign an Informed Consent Form to participate in Phases 1 and 2. An additional Informed Consent to Interview Form (Appendix G) was signed for all
participants who agreed to participate in Phase 3. I obtained consent from the participants only, since no one was under the age of 18.

Possible ethical issues are confidentiality and anonymity, privacy, or beneficence (“Do No Harm.”). Students may feel judged about any personal value positions or social identities that differ from the class majority. The role I (the researcher) play as an instrument for collecting data may present an ethical issue. Students may feel unintended coercion to participate, simply for the fact that I am acquaintances with their course instructor. To ensure confidentiality, all materials, instruments, notes, and forms were kept in a locked file cabinet. The materials will remain in a secure and locked location for seven years following the conclusion of the research study. To ensure anonymity, I assigned a Personal Code to all members of the purposive sample, regardless of whether or not they consented to their data being used in the study. To eliminate student feelings of coercion in any way, both instructors left the room before I passed out Informed Consent forms. The instructors stayed outside of the room until all the forms were collected.

Six weeks before collecting data, I arranged a meeting with the faculty instructors for both sections. I did this to present the research study and sequence to them, to obtain their permission to conduct research in their courses and with their students, to collaborate with the instructors in determining the best time the two topical lessons would align with their curriculum, and to answer any questions the instructors may need clarified. The week before data was collected, I visited Section 2 of the course during the last 20 minutes of their Wednesday class and Section 1 of the course during the last 20 minutes of their Thursday class. I used the twenty minutes to introduce, present, and invite. I introduced myself to the purposive sample, presented the research study and purpose, and invited all students to participate.
There were 20 students on Section 1’s roster, but only 12 (60.0%) students in attendance the day I came in to present the study. Section 2 had 25 students on the roster, and 22 (88.0%) of those students were in attendance the day I presented the study. I passed the Informed Consent forms out to each student to read along as I went over the document. I read the same script and presented the same power point presentation in both sections. To encourage anonymity in their decision process, I removed myself from the classroom while the students in each section chose either to participate or not to participate. One student in each section was designated to collect the signed Informed Consent forms in a manila envelope.

Data Collection

In this post-intentional phenomenological research study, I used a variety of data sources that helped to illuminate the process and experiential factors that make up the crafting of perception. Data collection methods for this study were using a questionnaire, a classroom activity, video elicitation, semi-structured interviews, and notes from the research journal and post-reflexion notebook. In this section, I will detail how data was collected, what instruments were used, and novel noticings along the way. I have also included an Afterthought feature that will illuminate the post-intentional process. Afterthoughts are brief commentaries that will describe how to better attend to minor logistics that may make major impacts in future similar research studies.

Data from the Video Elicitation and Interviews in Phases 2 and 3 helped me to answer research questions 1 and 2. Data from the Social Identity Wheel activity and the Aspects of Identity Questionnaire in Phase 1 helped me to address my third research question. In addition, I maintained a reflective journal to document my actions, all happenings, and my reflections of both. During the interviews, I also kept a post-reflexion notebook that helped me to explore how
my own personal pre-conceptions, experiences and expectations framed what I observed and heard.

**Preparing to Collect Data**

Two weeks before I officially began collecting data for this research study, I practiced conducting the AIQ-IV and Video Elicitation on two volunteers. I reassured the volunteers that I would not use, share, or retain their responses, but that I simply wanted to do a trial run before I launched my research study. I decided to pilot these two activities for seven reasons: 1. I wanted to see if the links work; 2. I wanted to see if my directions were clear and able to be followed without problem; 3. I wanted to confirm a more realistic time to complete each activity; 4. I wanted to hear how the experience was from the perspective and voices of the volunteers; 5. I wanted to view the data reports and see what they looked like with multiple submissions; 6. I wanted practice making sense of the data; and 7. I wanted to see if, after looking at preliminary data, there were any further considerations or questions I should include.

To keep the course instructors aware of what their students would be discussing with me, I sent both instructors the two topical lessons, along with the power point presentations. I asked the instructors not to share the presentation with the students. One instructor followed my directions. However, the other instructor posted both presentations and the accompanying lesson materials on their course LMS page for the students. I did not want this to happen because I wanted to ensure both classes had equal access, presentation, and time with the content.

I also forwarded to the course instructors the step-by-step directions with pictures on how to access the AIQ-IV survey and how to log in to EdPuzzle for the Video Elicitation activity. I asked the instructors to either post the directions on their LMS course page or email the directions to the students directly. Only one of the two instructors honored my request.
**Social Identity Wheel Activity**

I led a 50-minute lesson on the topic of Social Identity for course section 2 on Monday and section 1 on Tuesday. As part of the lesson, the entire purposive sample who were in attendance those days completed both pages of The Social Identity Wheel worksheet. The activity encourages participants to identify social identities and reflect on the ways their identities become more keenly felt in different contexts and how their identities impact the ways they perceive themselves and others perceive or interact with them.

The first page includes a list of twelve social identity groupings, followed by examples under each grouping. Members of the sample were instructed to draw circles around the memberships they claim or that had been ascribed to them. They were encouraged to write in their own preferred terms, if they did not see an example that fit their identity. The second page of the Social Identity Wheel worksheet is a graphic organizer that has eleven different social identity categories listed on the outside of a circle (e.g., race, age, sex) and five numbered statements inside the wheel (e.g., “Identities you think about most often”; Identities that have the strongest effect on how you perceive yourself”). For each numbered statement (#1-5), participants decide which one or more of their identities best fits that statement. I used this data to describe the research study participants.

**Aspects of Identity Questionnaire (AIQ-IV)**

The Aspects of Identity (AIQ-IV) questionnaire was rebuilt using Qualtrics – a web-based survey software used to support teaching and research. The questionnaire was designed to be only a single-visit exercise for participants. The participants’ responses on the Qualtrics questionnaire were submitted to an account that only I had access to. I planned to analyze the responses and categorize them according to any notable themes or patterns.
I collaborated with the faculty instructors for each section to schedule the two days I planned to collect Phase 1 data. The experience of logging into the AIQ-IV Qualtrics survey differed by section. Overall, no students encountered any issue logging into the AIQ-IV. However, students in one of the sections had to complete an extra step which caused a handful of them to be delayed in logging in. The purposive sample, in totality, completed the questionnaire within ten-to-fifteen minutes. That was in line with what I had hoped for.

Four students were absent from Monday’s Section 2 class, and all four were participants. However, two additional students signed informed consent forms to join the participant list. I now have 23 participants from Sec.2’s M/W class. Of the 23 participants, 19 completed the Social Identity Wheel and AIQ-IV.

Three students were absent from Tuesday’s Section 1 class. Only one of the three were participants. However, six additional students signed informed consent forms to join the participant list. This led me to 15 participants from Section 1’s Tuesday/Thursday class. Of the 15 participants, 14 completed the Social Identity Wheel and AIQ-IV.

In total, 33 of the 38 (86.8%) participants completed the Social Identity Wheel and 33 of the 38 (86.8%) participants completed the AIQ-IV. I used this information to categorize and draw any correlations between themes and social identity categories.

~~ AFTERTHOUGHT: In my email to the instructors, I mentioned that the students will need to bring their earbuds/headphones to class to be able to listen to the video without distracting others. However, I failed to clearly ask instructors to tell the students to bring their earbuds. Neither did I remind them. This miscommunication caused problems for some. Many students already had earbuds they typically carry with them, but numerous students had to leave out of the room to find a quiet and secluded place they could play the video without disturbing others. Students who left the room were unable to be monitored to ensure there was no collusion. I recommend participants have access to personal audio devices for this instrument. ~~
**Video Elicitation**

During Day 2, I lead a self-developed lesson about self-identity and factors that often influence our behavior and our students’ behavior. The lesson was titled, “Be a L.I.D. Lifter”. “L” stands for *limitations*, “I” stands for *insecurities*, and “D” stands for *definitions*. I chose to facilitate this lesson because I wanted to be sure we discussed student behavior without explicitly teaching or even talking about problem behavior. It was important that I avoided explicitly teaching about problem behavior, because I did not want to influence student responses in the Video Elicitation activity they would be doing at the end of the lesson.

As students arrived, I gave them their materials packet that included a half-sheet to take guided notes during the power point presentation and the directions for logging into EdPuzzle on a front and back full sheet of paper. I set an alarm to alert me to 30 minutes remaining in class. The Video Elicitation activity takes an average of 15 minutes to complete. However, I wanted to leave enough time to account for some possible technical and/or logistical issues students might encounter while trying to log into EdPuzzle. In total, 29 of the 38 (76.3%) participants completed the Video Elicitation activity. Qualitative data from the video elicitations were inductively coded and analyzed for focal meanings.

**Semi-Structured Interviews**

Qualification criteria to participate in the Phase 3 – semi-structured interviews included the following: 1. Participant must have consented to participate in the research study; 2. Participant must have been in attendance for both days the lessons were taught; and 3. Participant must have fully completed the three measures in Phases 1 and 2. I went through the list of participants and determined which of the 38 completed all three measures. Of the fifteen
participants from Section 1, four (26.7%) fully completed Phases 1 and 2. Of the 23 participants from Section 2, sixteen (69.6%) fully completed Phases 1 and 2.

In the end, I calculated 20 participants of the original 38 (52.6%) who qualified to move into the Phase 3 semi-structured interviews. My goal was to obtain four volunteer interviewees from each section, totaling eight interviewees. After three invitation attempts, I garnered six participants from Section 2 and zero/null participants from Section 1. Appendix H is the personalized email I sent to each of the twenty participants who met the Phase 3 criteria. Following that is the reminder email sent to all scheduled interviewees.

Once I received an email from a participant indicating their willingness to be interviewed, I arranged an agreed-upon date, time, location/mode for the interview. I followed up with a confirmation email that included a calendar invite and either directions to my office or a link to a virtual meeting.

I conducted a practice interview with a non-traditional, undergraduate, pre-service special education teacher in her fifth semester of the same TEP this research study’s sample attends. The practice participant (P.P.) had not, yet, enrolled in the class on Applied Behavior Analysis. But, she had eight years of practical experience as a para-professional for a K-12 special education class in a northwest suburb of Chicago, Illinois. I was careful not to hold more than one interview in a day. I wanted to give myself time to reflect in both the research journal and the post-reflexive notebook, organize the transcript, the recordings, and prepare for the next interview.

Before the practice interview, I printed off the interview guide and attached a notes page to it. To ensure I had a back-up recording in case either of the technologies fails me, I prepped for two recordings: 1. Voice Recorder function on my laptop, and 2. Zoom audio recording to the
cloud. I took notes, throughout the interview. Some notes were key words and phrases said. I referred to these words and phrases as I dug deeper with follow-up questions. Other notes were changes I want to make to the wording of the questions for future interviews and changes I want to make to the actual Notes page.

~~AFTERTHOUGHT:~~ I experienced a couple of issues while attempting to audio record interviews. During one interview, the voice recorder feature on my laptop was temporarily interrupted by pop-up window. I saw this happen real-time and was able to click out of the error window. But, as a result, I lost about fifteen seconds of recording. During an interview conducted via the online conference platform Zoom, I selected the feature that recorded the interview to the cloud. However, it wasn’t until after the interview that I found out the Voice Recorder app on my laptop did not pick up any trace of the interviewee’s responses; it only picked up my questions and comments. I was relieved that I recorded using two tools. I recommend the researcher uses no fewer than two different audio recording tools during the interviews.  

~~AFTERTHOUGHT:~~ If I could redo the interviews, I would talk less, avoid saying “um” so much, talk more clearly, probe more, listen more deeply, and change some of my wording. For example, I ask participants to recall “situations”. I think a more accurate and appropriate word for those questions is “scenario”. I would replace situation with scenario because in U.S. semantics and culture the word situation can easily imply something problematic. Scenario, however, paints mental pictures of common or exemplary happenings.  

Post-Reflexion Notebook

Dahlberg et al. (2008) believe there is an intimate connection between phenomena, other phenomena, the research process, and the researcher(s) themselves. Bridling includes the process of bracketing, but it extends the practice beyond the focus on only the researchers’ preconceptions and biases. Bridling calls for an intentional acknowledgement of other ever-present factors impacting the tentative manifestations of phenomena (Dahlberg, 2006). Through the practice of bridling, I attempt to detangle myself from my own connections with the phenomenon and the research process, but with eyes wide open instead of closed.

I kept a post-reflexion notebook to actively engage in bridling throughout the processes of Phase 3 data collection and analysis. In the notebook, I systematically and carefully
confronted and sifted my own biases so that I did not determine the phenomenon through biased-colored lenses. Simultaneously, I examined the relationships introduced through the process of conducting the research. I patterned my post-reflexion notebook after one Martin (2020) maintained in her post-intentional phenomenological action research study. Appendices I and J are copies of the first page of the post-reflexion notebook and an October 28 entry from the notebook, respectively.

~~AFTERTHOUGHT: The first page of the post-reflexion notebook includes Assumptions of Normality, Bottom Lines, and OEA Statements. During Phase 3 of this interview, I only briefly reviewed the statements before writing an entry in the post-reflexion notebook. I carefully read through this first page just a couple of times before writing in the notebook. It would have been more helpful to slow down and read these statements before interviewing and before writing in the reflexion notebook. Doing this would have helped me to stay more conscious of what I believe, how I situate myself in the world, and how I aim to show up in my research. I recommend future researchers take the time to thoroughly read the statements before every interview and before reflecting in the notebook. This increased self-awareness will help them to engage in deeper reflection which will aid them in engaging in more honest and effective bridling.~~

Preparing for Data Analysis

In phenomenological research of all types, from descriptive to interpretive to lifeworld-oriented, it is a challenge to draw a line distinguishing data collection from data analysis; they are so intimately intertwined throughout all phases of a study. This particular research study used descriptive statistical analysis, inductive coding and analysis, and applied a whole-parts-whole process across multiple data gatherings. The Social Identity Wheel and Questionnaire data were coded first to ensure confidentiality. Then I used descriptive statistics and exploratory factor analysis to identify categories and trends. Qualitative data came from both recorded video elicitations and notes collected during the semi-structured interviews. Raw data from the video elicitation responses and interviews were coded, categorized and identified for focal meanings and salient patterns. Interviews were individually and collectively coded and analyzed using a
whole-parts-whole process. Finally, the collective analyses of the data from all three Phases were cross analyzed for comparisons, patterns, similarities, and discrepancies. In the next section, I will discuss the data analysis process I followed.

**Data Analysis**

Phenomenological analyses, regardless the type of approach being used, typically holds to a certain four commitments. Following are those commitments:

1. Whole-part-whole process.
2. A focus on intentionality and not subjective experience.
3. A balance among verbatim excerpts, paraphrasing, and your descriptions/interpretations.
4. An understanding that you are crafting a text – not merely coding, categorizing, making assertions, and reporting (Vagle, 2018, p. 167).

Furthermore, analysis of phenomenological material should be based on the type of approach used (Vagle, 2018). In this post-intentional phenomenological study, I leaned more on reflective lifeworld approaches (e.g., Dahlberg & Dahlberg; Vagle) rather than descriptive (e.g., Husserl; Giorgi) or interpretive (e.g., Heidegger; van Manen) approaches. From this approach, phenomena are understood to be simultaneously producing and being produced, provoking and being provoked. They are assumed to be “always and already” (Vagle, 2018, p. 229) exploding through an entangled context of social relations in the world. The goal of data analysis, using this research design, is to gain a keener awareness of what the phenomenon might become, rather than what the essence of the phenomenon is (Vagle & Hofsess, 2015).

As a post-intentional researcher, it is my task to write my way through these explosions by engaging in honest, continual, and critical interrogation and analysis. To achieve this, I used a multi-method approach throughout the three phases of the research study and the multiple data
gathering moments. I combined more traditional qualitative coding along with Vagle’s 5-step whole-part-whole transcript analysis and continual critical reflexion. This fused approach helped me to notice lines of flight, phenomenological explosions and multiple meanings which provided rich insight into what shape the selective phenomenon had taken during analysis. And as I go about the business of noticing, questioning, and reflecting, I was better able to “write my way” to conclusions. Table 4 outlines the data I will collect during each phase, the analysis tools and strategies I used, and the reason I chose each particular tool/strategy.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Analysis Strategy/Tool</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a. Social</td>
<td>a. Identification of groups,</td>
<td>a. This informed me of the social groups participants identify with; this also helped me to learn which social identities are most salient to participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>patterns, outliers, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wheels</td>
<td>b. Identification of groups,</td>
<td>b. a. This informed me of the social groups participants identify with; this also helped me to learn which social identities are most salient to participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. AIQ-IV</td>
<td>patterns, outliers, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey Responses</td>
<td>c. Inquiry-based written</td>
<td>c. This helped me to question, wonder, think, vent, laugh, celebrate &amp; vacillate—all of these are actions that prepared me to engage in bridling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Research</td>
<td>analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Entries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a. Video</td>
<td>a. Inductive Coding &amp; 4Q-2Pa</td>
<td>a. My approach to answering the research question is inductive, so my coding was done inductively. Also, I must continually interrogate my pre-understandings and developing understandings of the phenomenon. This helped me do that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elicitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Research</td>
<td>b. Inquiry-based written</td>
<td>b. This helped me to question, wonder, think, vent, laugh, celebrate &amp; vacillate—all of these are actions that prepared me to engage in bridling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Entries</td>
<td>analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Interview</td>
<td>a. 4Q-3Pa</td>
<td>a. This helped to make less-abstract the process of seeing what frames my seeing and seeing my blind spots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>b. Interview</td>
<td>b. R.I.G.H.T. 5-Step Analysis</td>
<td>b. This helped me to deconstruct the whole to place the material into dynamic dialogue with different theories to reconstruct a new whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Research</td>
<td>c. Inquiry-based written</td>
<td>c. This helped me to question, wonder, think, vent, laugh, celebrate &amp; vacillate—all of these are actions that prepared me to engage in bridling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Entries</td>
<td>analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Reflexion</td>
<td>d. 4Q-3Pb</td>
<td>d. This helped me to notice the lines of flight and to distinguish them from other lines <em>always</em> and <em>already</em> operating on the phenomenon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notebook Entries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 1: Social Identity Wheel & Aspects of Identity Questionnaire-IV (AIQ-IV)

I wanted to better understand how one’s social identity influences the phenomenon of perception crafting. In this research study, I used participant responses on the Social Identity Wheel activity and the AIQ-IV assessment. I used the nominal data from the Social Identity Wheel and first four questions on the AIQ-IV to gather demographic data and to match participants to their claimed social identities. I used the ordinal data from the AIQ-IV assessment to collect the self-reported levels of importance those claimed social identities hold for participants. Further, I used descriptive statistics, such as frequency/percentage distributions to describe the total number of participants by category. With this information, I was able to notice any directions of association between highly important social identities and held perceptions of problem behavior or patterns in the phenomenon of perception crafting. Data from responses to Phase 1 activities were cross analyzed with data collected in Phases 2 and 3 to help answer RQ3.

Social Identity Wheel. Before participants completed the social identity wheel activity, they were asked to engage in a self-examination. I gave them a list of twelve social identity groupings (gender, sex, race, ethnicity, age, etc.). Each grouping included three-to-eight example memberships under the grouping (e.g., SEX: female, male, intersex). Participants listed the social identity group memberships that they claimed or that were ascribed to them. Since terms we use to describe memberships may cause disagreement and since the list of examples was not exhaustive, I invited participants to pencil in their own preferred terms. I organized participants’ responses using MS Excel. First, I ascribed a single-digit number to each membership under the groupings (e.g., SEX: No answer = 0; Intersex = 1; Female = 2; Male = 3). Next, I created a matrix for responses by listing participant codes along the left column and social identity groups
in the top row. I placed one single-digit number in each cell, according to their responses. Finally, I input all of the Social Identity Wheel data using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS; Slate & Rojas-LeBouef, 2011a; 2011b), an IBM statistical software program.

I organized the data in a MS Excel sheet. In the far-left column “A”, I listed all the participants who turned in a complete Social Identity Wheel (N = 20) in alpha-numeric order, according to their personal code (e.g., AA01; AA02; BB02; CC01). The top row “1” included each of the eleven social identity categories. I started with the first participant, and I placed the numbered statement(s) in the cell under the social identity category they determined was the best fit. For example, Participant AA02 placed statement #1, 4 and 5 under the category “Race”. So, I put the numbers 1, 4 and 5 under the column “Race” in AA02’s row.

~~ AFTERTHOUGHT: I immediately hit a roadblock. That wouldn’t work. I needed to find a way in which I would be able to sort by identity groups, numbers, and students. I reached out to one of my committee members who helped me to brainstorm ways I could organize the data for easier analysis. That was helpful! I landed on assigning a separate column for each numbered statement for each of the eleven categories (e.g., Race 1; Race 2; Race 3; Race 4; Race 5). This way, every cell has no more than one piece of data in it. ~~

What I had hoped to gain from this particular data set was the list of social identities research study participants claimed for themselves, along with a ranking of which identities were most salient to the participants. I planned to use this information in two ways: First, I used the information in the description of participants. Second, I looked to see if there were any correlations between certain social identities and 1. perception or description of behavior; 2. alignment with personal definitions of problem behavior. Descriptive statistics were generated by running a frequency analyses.

Aspects of Identity Questionnaire-IV. I compiled the AIQ-IV Qualtrics reports into PDFs. First, I removed all responses and accompanying data from students who did not consent
to participate in the study. Thirty-two participant responses remained. I compiled a report of all
32 participants’ responses, and I saved the 16-page report in MS Word format so that I could cut
and paste information with ease. I also generated individual reports for each of the six
participants who participated in the Phase 3 semi-structured interviews. Data from the first six
items on the Qualtrics Survey were demographic questions that I added out of interest. This
information helped me to describe the set of participants, according to their social identities as a
group. The rest of the items are the exact questions on the AIQ-IV assessment. Data from
responses to these items helped me to answer RQ3, as they were answered by the six participants
from Phase 3.

The following two questions were addressed in this investigation: 1. Is there a significant
relationship between a pre-service special education teacher’s: (a) Video Elicitation Question
(VEQ) 1 completion percentage and (b) social identities? and 2. Is there a significant relationship
between a pre-service special education teacher’s: (a) alignment of their identification of
problem behavior with their idea (definition) of problem behavior and (b) social identities? A
Pearson chi-square statistical procedure was attempted to determine the answers to the above
questions.

**Phase 2: Video Elicitation (VE)**

Responses from video elicitations were analyzed to answer the following questions: 1. How do
participants define problem behavior? 2. How did participants learn to identify problem
participants use to describe students? 5. What words do participants use to describe behavior? 6.
How closely do participants’ identification of problem behavior align with their idea (definition)
of problem behavior?
The process of analyzing data from the video elicitations took considerable time. First, I reviewed the individual participant responses in EdPuzzle to determine the number of complete responses. Only the participants who submitted complete responses were able to continue on to the participant pool for semi-structured interviews. A complete response was one in which 100% of the video was viewed and every prompt was answered. Second, I decided how to transfer the data from the EdPuzzle platform into individual transcript documents. Finally, I used inductive coding and analysis for assessing statements likely to represent tacit clues. To do this, I looked at all the raw data from the video elicitation transcripts and chunked them into smaller units of meaning. Then, I categorized those units and looked within and across the categories to notice and identify any salient patterns.

In post-intentional phenomenology, data analysis rarely commits to one way or the other, but instead moves across approaches to place data in dialogue with one another. I followed a slightly different path, using a more traditional coding method to analyze the VE transcripts, while also remaining reflexive, critical, and open to noticing lines of flight. I chose a blended method of coding with deep reflexion for an important reason. Data from the VE transcripts exist without the compliment of observed personal interaction between researcher and participant. Without the powerful communication that comes from facial expressions, gestures, posture, and tone of voice, I had to rely solely on meaning derived from participants’ written responses. Inductive coding allowed the narrative to emerge from the data, itself, as opposed to starting with preconceived notions of what the meaning chunks should be. I anticipated that the process will be iterative, meaning I would move back and forth between various stages and processes of analysis (Bhattacharya, 2017), and I was correct.
Preparing VE Transcripts for Analysis. Although every student in Sections 1 and 2 was assigned a personal code and completed the Edpuzzle video elicitation, I only wanted to download and review the responses from the students who agreed to participate in the research study. I followed the following steps in Edpuzzle to download the participants’ responses into an excel document:

1. I went to the Edpuzzle homepage (edpuzzle.com) to log in to my account.
2. I logged into my account, using my account username and password.
3. I selected the class where the assignment was located from the list under “My Classes” on the left-hand side of my screen. I had previously named the class “SED 388 Research Study”, and the name of the assignment is “Problem Behavior”.
4. I clicked on the assignment: “Problem Behavior”.
5. One-by-one, I deleted all entries from non-participants. I did this by clicking on the ellipsis (…) next to every Personal Code that did not appear on the list of participants, then clicking “Unassign”. This left responses from 29 participants.
6. Of the 29, I deleted any partial or incomplete entries. There were no partial or incomplete entries, so 29 video elicitation responses remained.
7. To get a print-ready document of all 29 responses, I clicked the ellipsis (...) towards the top of the page.
8. From the drop-down list, I selected, "Download grades".
9. I wanted to include the text from participants’ responses to the embedded questions, so I checked the box that said, “Include questions and response texts”.
10. Finally, I clicked "Download" to confirm my choice.
By following these steps, I was able to download a CSV file of all the complete responses from participants.

Once I gathered all participant responses into an Excel document, I sub-titled it “MASTER” and made a copy of it, sub-titling the second version “CODED”. I chose to do work on the second document to ensure I would always have a clean, base copy of the responses. Having a second copy gave me more freedom to explore and attempt coding without worry of accidentally erasing data.

~~Afterthoughts:~ As I read the video elicitation responses, I noticed that some students did not fully answer the questions. Either they did not take the time to thoroughly read the questions, or they read the questions, but chose not to invest the time needed to fully answer the questions. This may be due to one or more of these factors:

A. No incentive from a relationship: I was a stranger in their classroom
   a. In the future, I will increase my time getting to know students more on the front end.

B. Unclear purpose: I had 20 minutes to introduce the study and ten minutes to gather signed consent forms.
   a. In the future, I will work on increasing buy-in by taking more time helping students draw connections between what they already know, what they are currently learning in the classroom, and what they will be doing and contributing to the field with their participation in the research study.

C. No incentive of grade: Participation in this study was voluntary, and even though every student was expected to participate in the two class lessons and their correlating activities, they knew that no grade or participation points would be applied.
   a. In future IRBs, I will plan to offer some type of incentive (possibly monetary) for participation.

D. Early dismissal: Students were aware that they were free to leave as soon as they finished the video elicitation
   a. In the future, I will plan to have a structured closure and dismissal, following the video elicitation.

E. Unfamiliarity with the Edpuzzle platform: Some students might have faced the challenges that often accompany using a new online platform
   a. In the future, I will ensure students have previously used the platform and received feedback and/or guided support.

F. Ran out of time: Some students might have had trouble reading or processing within the 15-minute period allotted
   a. In the future, I will allot more time to complete the activity. I will also be sure to set up screen reader functionality for those who would prefer to use it. ~~
Preparing VE Transcripts for Coding. The purpose of this post-intentional phenomenological study is to investigate the ways in which pre-service teachers craft their perception of problem behavior. Data from the video elicitation activities helped to answer research questions one and two (RQ1 and RQ2). RQ1 asks: In what ways do pre-service special education teachers decide what qualifies as normal, or permissible, classroom behavior? RQ2 asks: What are the ways pre-service special education teachers learn to determine if behavior has deviated from normal to problematic. These questions help to guide what words, phrases, and statements I highlighted. Since the research questions inquire about ways along with the contexts in and from which those ways originate, I focused on words, phrases, and statements having to do with being, seeing, doing, perceiving, thinking, understanding, deciding, etc., along with settings, situations, circumstances, and time periods.

I completed coding in a spreadsheet program by Microsoft called Excel. I chose not to use more sophisticated coding systems, such as NVIVO or Atlas.ti because my data set is not very large; so, the free and familiar Excel program would suffice. I inserted two columns: “Emergent Code” and “Reflective Note” after VEQ1, VEQ6 and VEQ7. I highlighted key statements, and I included the emergent code in the column adjacent to the statement. If statements applied to more than one emergent code, I copied and pasted the statement into a separate row and added the code. Doing this helped me to sort my data once I completed the coding process. I also included reflective notes that included any analytical noticings, interests, and insights I gained while coding.

Coding VE Transcripts. VEQ1 has three parts: Part 1 – Definition of problem behavior (WHAT); Part 2 – Means through which participant determines what problem behavior is (HOW); Part 3 – Contexts in which participant learned to identify problem behavior (WHERE).
Table 5 presents the codes that emerged inductively from participants’ responses to each of the parts.

- **DIS** = Distraction/Disruption. Any type of behavior that a rational teacher would assess as interfering with normal academic functions. Examples include persistently talking out without being recognized or exhibiting a behavior that captures other’s attention away from the lesson-related task.

- **SUB** = Subjective criteria. Any type of behavior infraction that determined *problematic* more by teacher’s personal feelings and opinions as opposed to objective criteria. Examples include accusations of “disrespect”.

- **EXP** = Broken classroom rule/Broken rule. Any type of behavior that does not follow along with clearly outlined expectations, rules, and procedures of a classroom. EXP differs from DIS in that DIS adversely impacts more classmates than EXP, which primarily adversely impacts the student, alone. Examples include out of seat without permission and not following teacher directives.

- **HRM** = Harm/Safety concern. Any type of behavior that threatens the physical, mental, emotional, or environmental care of self, others, or things within the classroom. Examples include physical and verbal bullying and property damage.

- **REO** = Reoccurring misbehavior. Any type of chronic misbehavior, however small or significant. Examples include consistently mumbling under breath after teacher directions or cutting in front of classmates when lining up.

- **VIC** = Vicariously learned/Learned from informally watching others. A way of learning that allows individuals to learn from the experience of others through sensing, seeing, feeling, and empathizing.
• OBS = Formal observation. A way of learning by formally watching, memorizing, and then mimicking targeted behaviors.

• LSN = Formal lesson/Curricular experience. A way of learning from engaging in a learning activity during class time. The activity is based in the instructor’s road map of what needs to be learned and how it will be done effectively. LSN differs from VIC and OBS in that VIC is learning alongside, while OBS is learning outside and LSN is learning inside.

• PCE = Personal childhood experience. Unique and personal lived experiences are identified as the circumstance, setting or situation in which important information was gained.

• TEP = Teacher Education Program. Courses, curricular lessons, or formal/informal educational interactions during the teacher preparation program are identified as the circumstance, setting, or situation in which important information was gained.

Once I derived the codes, I counted how often each were mentioned within the video elicitation answers to VEQ1.

Table 5

*Codes from Video Elicitations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>HOW</th>
<th>WHERE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS: distraction/disruption</td>
<td>VIC: vicarious learning from consequences of others (informal)</td>
<td>PCE: personal childhood experience(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB: subjective criteria</td>
<td>OBS: observations (formal)</td>
<td>TEP: class(es) taken in the Teacher Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP: not following expectations</td>
<td>LSN: explicit lessons on behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM: harmful/unsafe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REO: reoccurring/chronic infractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After coding VEQ1, I was also interested in knowing which part(s) of the question participants answered most and which part(s) they answered least. Knowing what percentage of the participants answered the HOW question may provide more information on how explicitly
pre-service teachers are being trained in identifying behavior and how wholistic the criteria is that pre-service teachers use. Knowing what percentage of participants answered the WHERE question may provide more information on how readily pre-service teachers can attribute their knowledge to the context, place, setting or situation in which it was gained.

In preparation for coding VEQs 2-7, I carefully watched the 3:40-minute video a few times. While doing so, I assigned each of the students in the video segment a number (ST#). There were eight students in the video. Afterwards, I created a diagram of the classroom that reflected their seating chart, as seen on the video (Figure 4). Then, I charted problem behavior, as seen in Table 6. I determined what was problem by what was observable and measurable and according to Bambara & Kern’s definition (2021): Problem behavior can be internal or external, physical or emotional actions that interfere with students’ learning and negatively impact their social, emotional, and academic development. While charting, I noted observable, measurable examples of problem behavior from at least three and as many as six of the eight students within each time stamp segment. With multiple examples of problem behavior during each segment, I was most interested to see what behaviors the research study participants identified as problematic and which ones were overlooked.

Figure 4
Seating Chart from Video Elicitation

![Seating Chart from Video Elicitation](image-url)
Note. This is a diagram of the seating arrangement of the eight students in the video elicitation segment. Students are numbered by their place on the chart (e.g., ST4 sits in seat 4).

Table 6

Video Elicitation: Problem Behavior Breakdown by Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>00:55</th>
<th>01:30</th>
<th>2:05</th>
<th>2:45</th>
<th>3:17</th>
<th>3:34 (Top 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Off-task; Writing a note; picks up newspaper &amp; puts it down</td>
<td>Loudly coughs and passes note to ST6</td>
<td>Grabs passed note, reads it &amp; audibly laughs</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Off-task; stands up &amp; walks to back wall; Returns to seat, but does no work</td>
<td>Not wrkng; talks with ST4; Asks for ST6’s note; shows to ST4</td>
<td>Off-task; stands up &amp; walks to back wall</td>
<td>Off-task; not working</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Indignant verbal outburst</td>
<td>Whispers to ST3;</td>
<td>Throws paper ball at ST8; Talks back to tchr</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Turned in seat; staring off; off-task; no work</td>
<td>Turned in seat; staring off; off-task; no work</td>
<td>Turned in seat; staring off; off-task; no work</td>
<td>Turned in seat; staring off; off-task; no work</td>
<td>Turned in seat; staring off; off-task; no work</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Leans over to tell a secret to ST7 while teacher talks</td>
<td>Off-task; Grabs passed note and reads it</td>
<td>Off-task; writes note &amp; passes it to ST2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Leans over to tell a secret to ST6 while teacher talks</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Loud pencil tapping</td>
<td>Loud pencil tapping</td>
<td>Loud pencil tapping</td>
<td>Loud pencil tapping</td>
<td>Loud pencil tapping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#2,4,5,6,7 #2,3,5,6,8 #2,3,4,5,6,8 #4,5,7,8 #3,5,8 #3,5,8

Note. ST = Student; The top row includes the time stamps of questions # 2-6 within the video

I used a color code system to visually organize the information. VEQs 2-6 asked the same three sub-questions. For example: VEQ#3 (01:30) - Describe the problem behavior you witnessed in the previous section of this video. 1. Describe the student(s) who displayed problem behavior; 2. Describe what the student(s) did that was problematic; 3. State why the behavior
was a problem. I changed the font color to red for participant responses to sub-part 1. Answers to sub-part 2 were changed to green font, and sub-part 3 was purple.

Color-coding the sub-parts helped me to read, code, and analyze the data with more ease. To analyze the language and word choices used to describe the students (sub-part 1), I knew to read the words in red font. To code the identified problem behaviors (sub-part 2), I read the green font. The rationale for why the identified behaviors qualified as problematic was always purple. Additionally, I colored the fonts of all emergent codes to match the information it represented. To see an example of the color-coded data, refer to Appendix K.

Analyzing the final Video Elicitation question #7 followed the same organizational process as with VEQs 2-6. VEQ#7 (03:34) - After watching this video segment of a class lesson, answer the following prompts: 1. State which were the top two most problematic behaviors; 2. Support your claims; explain why you chose those two. I color coded the identified problem behavior in green font, the perpetrators in red font, and the rationale for naming the behavior the “most problematic” in purple. I used a table to keep track of: a) codes for the two behaviors each participant determined to be most problematic; and b) which students were identified. I analyzed this data to learn more about what behaviors pre-service special education teachers consider to be most problematic in this video segment and why they perceive them rated highest in problem-causing than the other behaviors they identified. Knowing the what and the why provided a fuller understanding of RQ2’s “In what ways…”, or how.

**Phase 3: Semi-Structured Interviews**

The typical way to analyze phenomenological material is using a whole-part-whole analysis process (Vagle, 2018). Whole-part-whole analysis involves deconstructing taken-for-granted understandings and assumptions, thinking with various theories, analyzing with post-
reflexions, and reconstructing novel knowledge and possibilities. In post-intentional phenomenology, it is important to conduct one round of deliberate line-by-line reading of interview transcripts followed by thoughtful analysis using post-reflexions and field notes. The post-intentional phenomenologist is then tasked with bringing their conscientious reading of these materials into lively and productive dialogue with various theories to think with.

For this investigation, I followed a five-step, modified version of Vagle’s (2018) analysis process outlined in his book Crafting Phenomenological Research. Vagle describes the steps, but I have gone further to name the steps and to add certain questions to analyze with (See Table 7). In this research study, I refer to the five steps as the R.I.G.H.T. analysis process. Following this course helped me to become quite intimate with the data, as the steps were rinsed through consistent post-reflexion, resting along the theoretical railings of DisCrit and Top Down Processing, and in playful dialogue with other philosophies and ideas. The five-step R.I.G.H.T. analysis process is listed as follows:

Step 1 – (Whole) **Read entire text. Read full transcript**

Step 2 – (Part) **Identify focal meanings. Deconstruct line-by-line #1**

Step 3 – (Part) **Group focal meanings. Analyze using 4Q-3Pa & b questions**

Step 4 – (Part) **Highlight meanings not previously identified. Analyze using post-reflexions and field notes**

Step 5 – (Whole) **Transfuse meanings. Think through with theories to reconstruct**

After conducting the interviews, I organized the transcripts for analysis, using the base transcript from the Zoom recording. I cut the entire transcription from the .vtt file and pasted it into a .doc file with 0.5in. margins. I manually cleaned up each transcript using intelligent verbatim transcription. With this type of transcription, I transcribed every word, but omitted any
pauses, repeated words, involuntary noises, and filler words, such as “ahs” and “ums” where meaning is not attached to them. I used this transcription method for two primary reasons: 1. These involuntary noises and fillers will not provide any significant amount of insight into the conversation, and 2. I will have the essential information that will enable me to effectively code and analyze the content.

As I read through the text, I included a time stamp about every 5 minutes within the transcripts to make review a bit easier. I, then, organized the dialogue according to speaker (me & interviewee). While doing this, I did not focus on ensuring proper punctuation or capitalization.

As I listened to the recording, there were responses that either piqued my interest to want to probe deeper or that hinted to likely philosophical and pedagogical stances held by the interviewees. I decided to highlight these responses so that I could easily return to them, once I began the 5-step R.I.G.H.T. analysis process. Though this process was arduous, I absolutely saw benefits of transcribing and manually cleaning it up myself. I was able to get more intimate with the praxis, the participants, and the product.

I focused on those conventions of writing once I properly attributed the spoken/written text to its correlating speaker. I went through the text a second time, while listening to the recorded audio of the interview. This helped me to clean up any incorrect punctuation or capitalization errors. It also helped me to correct any inaccurately transcribed dialogue/words. Once that was done, I began the 5-step R.I.G.H.T. analysis process.

Greater understanding is gained as the researcher follows the whole-part-whole analysis method (Vagle, 2018). This analysis method extends from the notion that focal meanings (e.g., happenings) must always be thought about in relation to the full context (e.g., larger
situation/setting; Vagle, 2018) from which they happened. The focal meanings, or parts, are placed in dialogue with other focal meanings experienced by others to reconstruct and illuminate a new whole. Vagle advises the researcher to deconstruct the new whole to find the ‘tentative manifestations’ of the phenomenon (Vagle & Hofsess, 2015, p. 339). Through this method of analysis, meaning can be made and described across individual accounts.

During the months of data collection, I reflected on the process using three different data collection tools: a Research journal, Interview notes, and a Post-Reflexion notebook. For effective analysis, it was essential that I pull all the various logs together into one document. I established a Microsoft Excel document and designed it in a way that allowed me to see interviewees’ answers, any intra- and inter-participant patterns, lines of flight, inconsistencies, and provocations. I organized the interview data in Excel by interviewees, freezing the top row of participant codes. Along the far left column were each of the eight interview questions (IQ#s), Specific noticings, such as shocking moments, where I included key notes. Appendix L provides a glimpse of the organization of the Interview Analysis document in Excel.

~~ AFTERTHOUGHTS: In future interviews, I will be careful to ensure the audio recording equipment and platforms are ones that will yield quality recordings. This is especially essential in phenomenological studies because human life experience in relation to the phenomenon is the primary unit of analysis. The data must be as pure and accurate as possible for increased validity in data analysis.

-One mistake I made was forgetting to ask Participant UU02 to change their name to their assigned code on Zoom. As a result, I could see the participant’s name in the bottom left-hand corner of her box whenever she spoke. In the future, I will be careful to include this step to honor my promise of anonymity and confidentiality. For this research study, I did my best to look away from the screen during the times they spoke, and their image and name appeared. Instead, I focused more on reading and cleaning up the transcript. Despite my error, I am thankful that I do not personally know any of the pre-service teachers from this cohort of the TEP. Outside of seeing their name, the lack of familiarity with this participant helped to maintain their anonymity with me.

- I went off-script in the last interview. Because of it, this last interview (#6) lasted about 22 minutes longer than the averaged time of the previous five. The time stamp for IQ#1 was at 8 minutes and 30 seconds (8:30). What?! I suspect my relaxed interview style was due to the knowledge that XX02 would be the last data collected, and I was feeling accomplished. After all,
everything I am doing in this research study is “a first” for me, and I’m having feelings of accomplishment with every small step, because they are big ones to me. Still, note to self: Stick to the script!! ~

Organization and systems help me, not only in this dissertation journey, but also in life. I spent a considerable amount of time creating and organizing the document for interview transcript analysis. I found it ironic how much structure helps me to more effectively think through the information that I plan to analyze from a philosophical and methodological position that rejects structuralism. Post structuralist epistemology often held by post-intentional phenomenologists challenges binaries, essentialism, rigid hierarchies, and governed stratification of knowledge, ontologies, and axiologies. Add to that, the practice of bridling instead of bracketing requires that I restrain (not suspend, as in bracketing) my pre-understandings, avoid making definite what is indefinite, and allow the phenomena to present itself (Dahlberg et al., 2008). It is for these reasons I designed and followed a multi-step plan as an aid while I analyzed the interview transcripts. Appendix M is a copy of the Reminder Page from the Phase 3 Notes Guide.

I read and re-read my Assumptions of Normality, Bottom Lines, and OEA Statement page (p. 3 in the Phase 3 Notes Guide) every time I prepared to engage in data analysis. At first, I was concerned that the repetition would have more of a numbing effect on my bridling efforts. But surprisingly, I found this practice to do the opposite. I became more cognizant of what I held to as my “truths” and beliefs, which helped me to bridle more effectively. Increasing my self-awareness only ever better positioned me to see, consider, and even challenge ideas that were both convergent and divergent to my own.
Post-intentional phenomenology recognizes the complex entanglement that exists between researcher and the object of research. Such an intimate, interwoven relationship makes it impossible to separate the truth of the phenomenon from the truth of the subject experiencing the phenomenon, from the truth of the investigator studying both. In his own words, Vagle (2009) described this entanglement best:

“To this end, I theorize that validity in phenomenological research might best be described through intentionality, because the validity will always move with and through the researcher’s intentional relationship with the phenomenon – not simply in the researcher, in the participants, in the text, in their power positions, but in the dynamic intentional relationships that tie participants, the researcher, the produced text, and their positionality together (p. 585).”

I used a research journal throughout the three phases of data collection to stay actively aware of this entanglement. I found it only appropriate to represent this complicated, intertwined relationship by including portions of journal entries as special additions, or “tidbits”, within the last three chapters of this phenomenological text. Chapter 3 tidbits are titled Afterthoughts. Chapters 4 and 5 are titled Ponderings and Tentative Manifestations, respectively. Journaling helped me to reflect in, through, of, and about the research study. I wrote in the moment(s), through my emotions, of predictive ponderings, and about logistical and ethical issues.

Post-Reflexion Notebook

I maintained and reflected using a post-reflexion notebook before, during, and after the semi-structured interviews, and then throughout the data analysis process. Before each interview, I read and re-read my initial post-reflexion statement. Immediately following each
interview, I journaled in my post-reflexion notebook. The post-reflexion plan was designed as an effort to bridle the research study by acknowledging my assumptions and ideas about the phenomenon (Dahlberg et al., 2008; Vagle, 2018). I wanted to remain forthright and cognizant of my own preconceptions and positionality, beliefs and bottom lines so that I actively ensured they did not serve as the primary lens though which I analyzed the phenomenon. Of course, this was insofar as possible.

In post-intentional phenomenology, we understand that the researcher’s interaction with the phenomenon plays a role in the production of the phenomenon, itself, and cannot be completely set aside during analysis. This post-reflexion plan helped me to bridle my presumptions and expectations alongside of the lived experiences of the participants conveyed through the interviews. My hope was this post-intentional process of analysis would lead to a deeper understanding of the phenomenon by centering and privileging the voices of the participants while acknowledging the space my own view takes up. Table 7 includes the critical questions I asked myself while engaging in pre- and post-reflexion during Phases 2 and 3 of the research study. In the next section, I will discuss the assumptions this research study was predicated upon.

Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Question Set</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2     | 4Q-2Pa       | 1. What is my understanding, regarding the participant’s response?  
2. Why do I believe that understanding to be?  
3. What is/are another/some other possible way(s) to understand?  
4. How open am I to one or more of these alternative understandings? (Vagle, 2018, p. 224) |
### Assumptions

This study is predicated upon four facts: 1. Racism is the primary cause of inequality in education (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995); 2. Disability, along with racism, are socially constructed categories historically used to exclude and oppress (Nielsen, 2012); 3. Fear and threats to a social group’s ways of life are antecedents to prejudice and discrimination (Stephan & Stephan, 2013); and 4. We rely on our beliefs, values, social identity and influences to interpret what we consider to be real and reality (Gregory, 1970).

The baseline of my research paradigm is the acknowledgement of epistemological racism. The central argument for epistemological racism states that epistemologies, along with their related ontologies, grow from the social history of a particular social group, almost always the historically dominating social group (Scheurich & Young, 1997). Unlike the many historically marginalized people groups in America who see their understanding of reality as a specific perspective, the dominant group of white Americans see their understanding of reality as the truth (Taylor, 1999). “To a large degree, the dominant group…makes its own community the center of the universe and the conceptual frame that constrains all thought. Thus, the dominating
group creates or constructs ‘the world’ or ‘the Real’ and does so in its own image, in terms of its ways and its social-historical experiences (Scheurich & Young, 1997, p. 7).”

I openly acknowledge that perspective and perceptions of truth, fairness, and justice are not objective but, in fact, subjective to the observer, recognizing the way ‘objective’ facts are used to promote the interests of the white majority (Ladson-Billings, 2019). This paradigm provided a baseline structure for my research to focus on institutionalized racism and overstep the false hope of colorblindness and the myth of meritocracy. There exists a dichotomy in U.S. public schools as it pertains to which and with what ease, students are given access to resources, afforded the benefit of the doubt, and are seen as inherently good as opposed to which students do not get those luxuries (Carter et al., 2016; Katz-Amey, 2019; Ritter & Anderson, 2018; Skiba et al., 2002).

This paradigm guided how I collected data and wrote about it. I reject the idea that there is one singular truth that can be “discovered” by way of objective, controlled, detached research. Instead, I collected data by getting more closely involved with the participants; I wanted to try and understand the phenomena of perception crafting, particularly of problem behavior, and what part, if any, social identity plays in perception.

This study can possibly be conceptualized as an examination in awareness at the meta level. This is quality critical research. Quality critical research is that which intimately considers the extent to which the subjects’ misapprehensions about the dominant ideology and normative ways are exposed. This type of research takes into account the degree to which it works to deconstruct and disempower those very inequitable structures that have been identified (Rehman & Alharthi, 2016). Furthermore, as a critical education researcher, I was careful to remain hyper-aware of my own epistemological presuppositions I brought to the research.
In short, I critically researched in what ways pre-service special education teachers craft their perceptions of that which is normal and that which is deviant or deviates from the norm. I examined how social identity impacts these perceptions. Better understanding this phenomenon may be an important key to TEPs developing culturally competent special education teachers who are willing to deconstruct systems of oppression historically embedded in the field.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

Some potential limitations for this study were procedural bias, response bias, and researcher bias. Procedural bias may have influenced the results, particularly if the participants felt rushed to respond during the video elicitation portion (Theodor, 2022). I addressed this by embedding the video in an easy-to-use platform that allowed them to revisit parts of the video, time stamp, notate and edit their responses, all within a reasonable window of time.

Because the purpose of this post-intentional phenomenological study was to explore such an individualized and intimate human possession as *perception*, participants may have felt the need to protect themselves from judgement, and they may have tried to give the answers they thought were “correct.” I did what I could to avoid this type of response bias through three means: 1. I reassured participants of their anonymity; 2. I reminded participants this their participation was voluntary and in no way connected to their course or their course grade; and 3. I asked more indirect questions than direct questions and more open-ended as opposed to close-ended questions (Enago Academy, 2021).

Researcher bias may have affected impartiality as my personal OEA position, prejudices, and biases may have inclined me to view, analyze and report data through a filter of personal ontology, epistemology, and axiology. I used an interview guide to help me avoid researcher bias. In addition, an Interview guide helped to provide structure and inter-participant
consistency during the interview process to ensure all participants got the same interview experience (Roulston & Shelton, 2015).

An additional potential limitation may have been the study’s capacity to be generalizable, due to a narrow demographic pool of participants. However, in this study, what was being pursued was a personal experience, not generalizability. Furthermore, information from one TEP still has the merit of contributing to the body of existing literature, particularly when used for comparative analysis. For example, suppose participants were majority Black female pre-service teachers from a northern U.S. state. My research findings may yield more meaning when compared to other programs in a different U.S. region, where Black female teacher candidates are not the majority.

Delimitations of this study are the sample size, population traits, geographic location, instructional modality, course topic, and methodology. I conducted my research at a medium-sized Special Education teacher preparation program in Illinois. With more time, I would have preferred to conduct this same study at four different programs from four different regions in Illinois. However, I have chosen to study only one class because I am only one person, and I am constrained to a timeline that can only be met if I limit the sample size.

The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) has recently adopted Culturally Responsive Teaching and Leading Standards (CRTL) for TEPs in Illinois. It is for this reason that I have selected to conduct my study in an Illinois-based TEP. The special education TEP I have selected for my study is the highest quality program of its kind in the state of Illinois. Because I am an employee at that same university, it may appear as if this decision is one of convenience. But that is not the case.
Face-to-face teacher education was more advantageous than other modalities for this study because participants would have had the opportunity to personally engage and collaborate with their peers and teacher from a wide range of backgrounds and power differentials. This modality presented avenues for gaining a richer understanding through body language and voice (Gherhes et al., 2021). All of these benefits aligned with a critical theory research paradigm that maintains understanding is constructed through a lens of human affairs and its connection to power (Howell, 2016).

Finally, the research setting took place in an advanced-level pre-service course that included the topic of behavioral assessment as one of the primary course objectives. The process of assessing involves collecting information to make important decisions (Harlacher et al., 2014). Assessment methods can take the form of reviewing records, interviewing, observing, and/or testing. Teachers are continually assessing student behavior to make important decisions such as what direction to go with a lesson or activity or what action to take following an interaction. In education, more specifically special education, those important decisions can carry long-standing repercussions.

**Credibility, Trustworthiness & Rigor**

To ensure trustworthiness and credibility, individual interview data went through multiple rounds of line-by-line review. All interviews were also analyzed collectively. Video elicitation responses contributed to trustworthiness and rigor of the findings through member checking (Glaw et al., 2017). Finally, the collective analyses of the data was cross analyzed for comparisons, trends, and discrepancies.

Additionally, I maintained a research journal to provide evidence of iterative questioning of the data. I also maintained a post-reflexion notebook to assist in bridling my personal
experiences, values, and perceptions. I returned several times to the data to examine it. The intimate encounter with data through the R.I.G.H.T. analysis process, along with the maintenance of two reflective journals lessened researcher bias during analyses and interpretations.

Summary

The methodology for this study is qualitative post-intentional phenomenology. The purpose of this phenomenological study was to better understand the ways in which pre-service special education teachers craft their perception of problem behavior. Through this methodology, a more meaningful understanding of the phenomenon of perception crafting can be assessed. Finding the ways in which future teachers craft their perceptions and further exploring how social identity impacts perception may help teacher educators to critically identify what must be addressed to ensure the curriculum for teaching about behavior in TEPs is culturally responsive. This type of study is a powerful way to better understand the perceptions of future special education teachers who will soon be making high-stakes, life-impacting decisions from their assessment of student behavior. Data collected and analyzed in this chapter were summarized to foreground the next chapters, which explain the tentative manifestations of the data, findings, critical conclusions, potential limitations, implications, and applications to future research, TEP practices and policies.
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

Using post-intentional phenomenological philosophy, inquiry and methodology, this study sought to better understand the ways in which pre-service special education teachers craft their perceptions of problem behavior. Additionally, the study investigated how social identities influence perception. The following questions were used to guide the study:

RQ1. In what ways do pre-service special education teachers decide what qualifies as normal, or permissible, classroom behavior?

RQ2. What are the ways pre-service special education teachers learn to determine if behavior has deviated from normal to problematic?

RQ3. How does social identity influence pre-service special education teachers’ perception of problem behavior?

To present the results of this study, Chapter 4 will review the process of analysis and how the findings were categorized. Results are organized and presented as they were collected, chronologically, through the Phases. Data collected from two measures during Phase 1 helped to answer RQ3. Data collected from Phase 2 video elicitations were coded and analyzed inductively. Data from Phase 3 semi-structured interviews were coded using the same method used in Phase 2, in addition to R, I, G, and H in the R.I.G.H.T. analysis process. Themes that emerged from Phases 2 and 3 findings provided insight that helped to answer RQ1 and RQ2. General descriptive data will be presented first followed by analyses. Chapter 4 concludes with answers to the three research questions. Note: The fifth and last step in the R.I.G.H.T. analysis process “T” will be discussed in Chapter 5.

At its central core, phenomenology is a critical approach to studying lived experiences and how phenomenon are manifested for/to/by/through us (Heidegger, 2002). Phenomenological
analyses using a post-intentional design attempt to unveil our taken-for-granted perspectives to reveal contextual, multiple, partial, and fleeting glimpses of phenomenon as they manifest for, to, by, and through lived, not theorized, experiences (Vagle, 2010). The activity of bridling that post-intentional phenomenologists engage in during data collection and analysis challenges them to remain open – open in a philosophical way, open to be critical and contemplative, open to self-interrogation of held beliefs and assumptions, and open to seeing how the phenomenon, itself, wants to be studied (Vagle, 2018). In bridling, one cannot help but to enter research with questions and leave with even more questions.

As both a catalyst and a result of this commitment, I include special tidbits from my Research Journal titled Ponderings. It is my hope these additions to the text from the researcher’s positionality will encourage the reader to further explore tentative manifestations and lines of flight that burst forth from the data.

**Review of Analysis Process**

Social Identity data collected during Phase 1 were analyzed to obtain descriptive statistics for cross tabulation across categories and for general purposes to describe participants. Phase 2 data collected from video elicitations were coded and analyzed inductively. The information was organized using Microsoft excel in table format to effectively analyze language use, taken-for-granted perspectives of lived experiences, focal meanings, and tentative manifestations. Phase 3 data from six semi-structured interviews were also organized using Microsoft excel in table format. Data gathered from the interviews were also analyzed for language use, taken-for-granted perspectives of lived experiences, focal meanings, and tentative manifestations. But the more personalized gathering method provided both means and ends for a deeper level of analysis.
Unique from other qualitative methodologies, phenomenology gives weight to every data piece and every lived experience equally. This means data analysis was never a process of looking for significance through repetition; I honored the individuality of each participants’ lived experiences as they related to the phenomenon. As a result, this method yielded manifold and fruitful findings. In the next section are the findings from the Social Identity Wheels, Aspects of Identity Questionnaires, Video Elicitations, and Semi-structured Interviews.

**Phase 1 and 2 Social Identity Findings**

One of the goals of this investigation is to determine the influence of social identity on the phenomenon. The following definitions of each social identity category come from the online reference source dictionary.com.

- **Race** is a socially constructed category of identification based on physical characteristics, ancestry, historical affiliation, or shared culture

- **Ethnicity** is a social group that shares a common and distinctive culture, religion, language, or the like

- **Sex** is a label assigned to a person at birth, usually male or female and sometimes intersex, and typically based on genital configuration

- **Gender** is either the male or female division of a species, especially as differentiated by social and cultural roles and behavior

- **Sexual orientation** is one's inherent attraction to a sexual partner of a certain gender, or the absence of gender preference in a sexual relationship

- **Religion** is a specific fundamental set of beliefs and practices generally agreed upon by a number of persons or sects
**SES** is the position or standing of a person or group in a society as determined by a combination of social and economic factors that affect access to education and other resources crucial to an individual’s upward mobility.

**Dis/ability** is a physical or mental handicap, especially one that hinders or prevents a person from performing tasks of daily living, carrying out work or household responsibilities, or engaging in leisure and social activities.

Thirty-eight participants participated in the Social Identity Wheel lesson and activity, but only twenty students handed their completed sheet to me. The data from the students were connected to their video elicitation videos. This requirement narrowed the number of participants from 20 to 19. The activity provided two types of descriptive data: self-claimed social identities of the participants and a list of which identities are most significant to participants in different social contexts. Table 8 displays the frequency and distribution of participants’ claimed social identities for the following identity groups: Race, Ethnicity, Sexual Orientation, Religion, and Disability.

Of all the participants who chose to answer the questions regarding their identities, the majority claimed to be of white race (84.2%). A majority (63.2%) of participants self-reported as heterosexual. The religious majority (36.8%) were of Christian faith, and more participants identified as having some type of disability (31.8%) than those who identified as able-bodied (26.3%).
Table 8

**Participant Social Identity Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin@</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro-American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able-bodied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuro Divergent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Disability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Disability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Illness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Ill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to participants’ self-claimed social identities, I was also interested in their responses to four of the Social Identity Wheel questions - Q1, Q2, Q4, and Q5 (See Appendix E). These questions encouraged participants to consider their identities critically and how their identities are more or less keenly felt in different social situations. Question 1 asks which identities participants think about most often. Question 2 asks which identities participants think about least often. Question 4 asks which identities have the strongest effect on how participants perceive themselves. Question 5 asks which identities have the greatest effect on how others perceive them. Table 9 show participants’ responses to Questions 1, 2, 4, and 5.

Upon analysis of the social identity wheel responses, I noticed some interesting results. Below, are some of the findings and some of my ponderings extending from the data:

**Gender** (N = 10) and **Socio-Economic Status** (N = 7) were the top two identities participants said they think about most often. Within this same sample, **Sex** (N = 2) received one of the lowest responses. In other words, only two of the twenty participants said they think about their sex most often.

**Ponderings:**
-75% (N = 15) of the participants identified as “woman.” How much did that fact influence the results?
-Who did the fifteen participants who admitted to thinking about their gender most often identify as having problem behavior in the video elicitations?
-If women make up the majority (77%) of public-school teachers in the U.S. (NCEE, 2022), and if they also think about that identity most often, then how might their hyper-awareness of that social identity influence their perceptions of behaviors exhibited by the boys in their classrooms?
-What conclusions might we be able to draw from participants whose responses were very different from the top two? ~

**National Origin** (N = 9), **First Language** (N = 7), and **Sex** (N = 6) are the top three identities participants said they think about least often.

**Ponderings:** What conclusions might we be able to draw from participants whose responses were very different from the top two? ~
Physical, Emotional, Developmental (PED) Dis/Ability (N = 9) and Age (N = 7) were the top two responses for identities that have the strongest effect on how participants perceived themselves.

~~ Ponderings:
-Dis/Ability refers to capacity/capability, physically, emotionally, and developmentally. Age often refers to maturity, physically, emotionally, and intellectually. Both can become objects of harsh judgement from others, which can influence self-esteem and confidence. Participants in this study admitted that these two social identities have the strongest effect on how they perceive themselves. I wonder how self-judgement and confidence level from these two identity categories influence how our new, often-young pre-service special education teachers perceive, assess, and respond to student behavior in their classrooms.
-What conclusions might we be able to draw from participants whose responses were very different from the top two? ~~

Gender (N = 12) and Race (N = 8) were the top two responses for identities that have the greatest effect on how others perceive participants.

~~ Ponderings:
-There is a connection between gender being the identity participants said they think most often about and the identity they believe has the greatest effect on how others perceive them. Knowing that to be their truth, then how might their gender influence how they craft their perception of problem behavior?
-Like gender, race is socially constructed. I wonder how this answers RQ3.
-I also wondered how some participants’ responses mirrored others and according to what social identity markers.
-I also wonder what might be some interesting and telling responses from participants who found themselves in the minority for some of the categories. ~~

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1. Identities you think about most often</th>
<th>Q2. Identities you think about least often</th>
<th>Q4. Identities that have the strongest effect on how you perceive yourself</th>
<th>Q5. Identities that have the greatest effect on how others perceive you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Language</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis/Ability</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SES = Socio-economic status

In this research investigation the total number of participants was 38 students in their school’s special education Teacher Education Program (TEP). Thirty-two of the participants completed the AIQ-IV scale. I filtered the participants until I had only the data from those who completed all of the measures in Phases 1 and 2. This left me with data from 19 participants. I conducted a second round of filtering to pull out only the responses from each of the six participants who participated in the Phase 3 interviews.

I collected three pieces of data from this instrument, which included demographic data, a Social Identity Orientation (SIO) score, and social identity statements of salience. The demographic data was used to describe the participants, collectively and more fully to understand which social identity groups participants claimed as important to them, individually. The SIO score and statements of salience ratings were used to capture individual differences in participants’ readiness to categorize themselves in certain groups as measured by the degree of importance they assigned to each.

**Most and Least Salient Identity Statements**

When looking at the collective data from all participants, I was most interested in identifying which statements were rated highest for salience (“Extremely important to my sense of who I am”) and which statements were rated lowest for salience (“Not very important to my sense of who I am”). A rating of “5” is the highest for salience, and a rating of “1” is the lowest.
To identify the identity statements with the highest and lowest collective ratings, I highlighted any statement with a mean rating of $\geq 4.50$ and $\leq 3.00$, respectively. The top seven statements and five lowest identity statements for saliency can be seen in Table 10.

Table 10

**Most and Least Salient Identity Statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Most Salient ($\geq 4.50$)</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Least Salient ($\leq 3.00$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My personal goals and hopes for the future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>My popularity with other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>My relationships with the people I feel close to</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>My religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Being a good friend to those I really care about</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>My feeling of pride in my country, being proud to be a citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>My occupational choice and career plans</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Being a sports fan, identifying with a sports team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Developing caring relationships with others</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>My commitments on political issues or my political activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>My language, such as my regional accent or dialect or a second language that I know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>My sexual orientation, whether heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, or other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 3 Social Identity Findings**

Table 11 displays each of the six Interviewees responses to Questions 1, 2, 4 and 5 on the Social Identity Wheel. Race and gender were the top two identities the interviewees thought about most often. They thought about their age least often. They believed their socioeconomic status had the strongest effect on how they perceived themselves, and race and gender had the greatest effect on how others perceived them.

Table 11

**Responses to Social Identity Wheel Questions #1, 2, 4, and 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant FF02</th>
<th>Q1. Identities you think about most often</th>
<th>Q2. Identities you think about least often</th>
<th>Q4. Identities that have the strongest effect on how you perceive yourself</th>
<th>Q5. Identities that have the greatest effect on how others perceive you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>First Language</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Dis/Ability</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KK02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** SES = Socio-economic status

**Social Identity Orientation**

Six participants continued into Phase 3 of the investigation by participating in semi-structured interviews. I specifically sought to know the SIO scores of these six, because that information would tell me how high a value each interviewee tends to place on their overall social identity when constructing their self-definition. According to the scoring guidance and rubric, a high SIO score is above 28, and a low one is below 20. Participants KK02, UU02, RR02, and XX02 place the highest values on their social identities, with SIO scores of 29, 28, 28, and 27, respectively. Participants LL02 (SIO = 24) and FF02 (SIO = 23) place medium to low-medium value on their social identities when constructing their self definition. Table 12 displays the SIO scores of each of the six interviewees.

Table 12

**Social Identity Orientation Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FF02</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Low-Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK02</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL02</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 (continued)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX02</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU02</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR02</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 displays each of the six Interviewees and which statements they identified to be most salient to each of them, personally. Knowing this information helped me to answer some of my *Ponderings*. I was intrigued upon noticing the large span in difference of number of identity statements selected as most salient between the six participants. One participant marked only three of the 45 statements to be *Extremely important* to their sense of self, while another participant marked the highest rating for 30 of the 45 statements (See Table 13). I initially wondered if any one or more of the social identity markers might be consistent with other participants who also rated a large number. After comparative analysis, it was determined that there was no relation between any social identity group and the high or low number of statements deemed most salient amongst the interviewees.

Table 13

*Most Salient Identity Statements According to Interviewees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Statement</th>
<th>FF02</th>
<th>KK02</th>
<th>LL02</th>
<th>XX02</th>
<th>UU02</th>
<th>RR02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The things I own, my possessions</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 My personal values and moral standards</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 My popularity with other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Being a part of the many generations of my family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 My dreams and imagination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 The ways in which other people react to what I say &amp; do</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 My race or ethnic background</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 My personal goals and hopes for the future</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 My physical appearance (height, weight and body shape)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 My religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 My emotions and feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 My reputation, what others think of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Places where I live or where I was raised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 My thoughts and ideas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 My attractiveness to other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 My age, belonging to my age group or my generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 My gestures &amp; mannerisms, the impressions I leave</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 The ways I deal with my fears and anxieties</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 (continued)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>My sex, being a male, female, or non-binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>My social behavior: the way I act when meeting people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My feeling of being a unique, distinct person from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>My relationships with the people I feel close to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>My social class, the economic group I belong to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>My feeling of belonging to my community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Knowing that I continue to be essentially the same inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Being a good friend to those I really care about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>My self-knowledge, my ideas about the person I am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>My commitment to being a concerned relationship partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>My feeling of pride in country and being a citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>My physical abilities, being coordinated and athletic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sharing significant experiences with my close friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>My personal self-evaluation, my opinion of myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Being a sports fan, identifying with a sports team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Having mutually satisfying personal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Connecting on an intimate level with another person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>My occupational choice and career plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Developing caring relationships with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>My commitments on political issues or activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>My desire to understand the thoughts/feelings of friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>My academic ability and performance, grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Having close bonds with other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>My language, regional accent, or dialect or 2nd language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>My feeling of connectedness with those I am close to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>My role of being a student in college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>My sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings from Video Elicitations

Twenty participants watched the three-and-a-half-minute video dramatization of a high school classroom. In the video, there were eight students seated around two rectangular tables and one teacher who appeared to be facilitating a lesson activity. Seven of the eight students (ST#s 2-8) exhibited some form of problem behavior, according to the definition in Chapter 1, while one student (ST #1) did not. There were at least three students exhibiting some type of problem behavior, within each of the 30- to 45-second timestamped segments. From a quick visual survey of race, four of the eight students in the video (ST#s 2, 3, 4, and 6) appeared to be students of color and the remaining four (ST#s 1, 5, 7, and 8) visually appeared to be White.
Table 14 outlines the students who could be seen in the video exhibiting problem behavior during each time stamp and a brief description of the behaviors.

Table 14

*Video Elicitation: Problem Behavior Breakdown by Student*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST#</th>
<th>00:55</th>
<th>01:30</th>
<th>2:05</th>
<th>2:45</th>
<th>3:17</th>
<th>3:34 (Top 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Off-task; Writing a note; picks up newspaper &amp; puts it down</td>
<td>Loudly coughs and passes note to ST6</td>
<td>Grabs passed note, reads it &amp; audibly laughs</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Off-task; stands up &amp; walks to back wall; Returns to seat, but does no work</td>
<td>Not wrkng; talks with ST4; Asks for ST6’s note; shows to ST4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Indignant verbal outburst</td>
<td>Whispers to ST3;</td>
<td>Throws paper ball at ST8; Talks back to tchr</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Turned in seat; staring off; off-task; no work</td>
<td>Turned in seat; staring off; off-task; no work</td>
<td>Turned in seat; staring off; off-task; no work</td>
<td>Turned in seat; staring off; off-task; no work</td>
<td>Turned in seat; staring off; off-task; no work</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Leans over to tell a secret to ST7 while teacher talks</td>
<td>Off-task; Grabs passed note and reads it</td>
<td>Off-task; writes note &amp; passes it to ST2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Leans over to tell a secret to ST6 while teacher talks</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Loud pencil tapping</td>
<td>Loud pencil tapping</td>
<td>Loud pencil tapping</td>
<td>Loud pencil tapping</td>
<td>Loud pencil tapping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ST# = #2,4,5,6,7 #2,3,5,6,8 #2,3,4,5,6,8 #4,5,7,8 #3,5,8 #3,5,8

Note. ST# = Student # according to seating chart; The top row includes the time stamps of questions # 2-6 within the video

After reading the responses to the WHAT, HOW, and WHERE parts of Video Elicitation Question (VEQ) #1, I derived six emergent codes from participants’ responses to the question that asked them to define *problem behavior*. Three codes emerged from the responses about the means through which participants determine what problem behavior is. I derived two emergent
codes from participants’ responses to the question that asked them to name the location or situation in which they learned to identify problem behavior (Table 15).

Table 15

*Codes with titles and descriptions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Distraction/Disruption</td>
<td>Any type of behavior that a rational teacher would assess as interfering with normal academic functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Subjective criteria</td>
<td>Any type of behavior infraction that determined <em>problematic</em> more by teacher’s personal feelings and opinions as opposed to objective criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Broken classroom rule</td>
<td>Any type of behavior that does not follow along with clearly outlined expectations, rules, and procedures of a classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
<td>Harm/Safety concern</td>
<td>Any type of behavior that threatens the physical, mental, emotional, or environmental care of self, others, or things within the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Reoccurring misbehavior</td>
<td>Any type of chronic misbehavior, however small or significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>Vicariously learned</td>
<td>A way of learning that allows individuals to learn from the experience of others through sensing, seeing, feeling, and empathizing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBS</td>
<td>Formal observation</td>
<td>A way of learning by formally watching, memorizing, and then mimicking targeted behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSN</td>
<td>Formal lesson</td>
<td>A way of learning from engaging in a learning activity during class time. The activity is based in the instructor’s road map of what needs to be learned and how it will be done effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCE</td>
<td>Personal childhood experience</td>
<td>Unique and personal lived experiences are identified as the circumstance, setting or situation in which important information was gained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP</td>
<td>Teacher Education Program</td>
<td>Courses, curricular lessons, or formal/informal educational interactions during the teacher preparation program are identified as the circumstance, setting, or situation in which important information was gained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I, then, counted how often each were mentioned. Thirty-eight percent of the definitions alluded to behaviors that caused disruption or distraction to the learning environment. Twenty-six percent of the definitions alluded to behaviors measured according to subjective criteria. Eighteen percent of the definitions alluded to behaviors that failing or refusing to comply and
follow teacher/classroom expectations. Nine percent of the definitions alluded to behaviors that
caused harm or compromised safety. Nine percent of definitions included chronic classroom
infractions. Table 16 contains the eleven codes, the meaningful information each code
represents, and how often they were mentioned in participant responses.

Table 16

Frequency of Codes in Participant Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>HOW</th>
<th>WHERE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS: distraction/disruption</td>
<td>VIC: vicarious learning from consequences of others (informal)</td>
<td>PCE: personal childhood experience(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB: subjective criteria</td>
<td>OBS: observations (formal)</td>
<td>TEP: class(es) taken in the Teacher Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP: not following expectations</td>
<td>LSN: explicit lessons on behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM: harmful/unsafe</td>
<td>PCE: personal childhood experience(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REO: reoccurring/chronic infractions</td>
<td>TEP: class(es) taken in the Teacher Education Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>HOW</th>
<th>WHERE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS: ************* 13</td>
<td>VIC: ***** 5</td>
<td>PCE: ************* 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP: ***** 6</td>
<td>OBS: ** 2</td>
<td>TEP: ************* 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REO: *** 3</td>
<td>LSN: ** 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM: *** 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB: ********* 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 38% of the definitions included DIS
- 26% of the definitions included SUB
- 18% of the definitions included EXP
- 9% of the definitions included HRM
- 9% of the definitions included REO

**Ponderings:** About one-third of the way through coding, I began to notice two tendencies amongst the participants’ responses. 1. Participants often told me WHERE they learned to identify what problem behavior is, but they rarely made note of HOW they learned to identify the behavior as being problematic; and 2. Many more participants attributed their learning to their educational experience(s) in their TEP than what I had expected. This was a surprise because I don’t remember more than one interviewee who mentioned their TEP class(es) as the place they learned to identify what problem behavior is. I wonder if the setting had an influence on the participants’ responses. For example, the VE questions were answered while the students were in their course classroom. However, the semi-structured interview questions were answered in my office, which is located on the lower level of a non-academic campus building. Or, maybe I need to hold that thought and continue coding more responses to VEIQ1. After all, I still have nearly 2/3 more participants to code before I can begin drawing conclusions. ~~
As was noted in the previous chapter, knowing which part(s) of VEQ1 participants answered most and which part(s) they answered least was of interest to me. Table 17 displays this information. An “X” indicates the participant answered that specific part of VEQ1.

Knowing what percentage of the participants answered the HOW question may provide more information on how explicitly pre-service teachers are being trained in identifying behavior and how wholistic the criteria is that pre-service teachers use. Knowing what percentage of participants answered the WHERE question may provide more information on how readily pre-service teachers can attribute their knowledge to the context, place, setting or situation in which it was gained. Nearly all of the 29 participants (86.2%; N = 25) defined WHAT problem behavior is. A little more than two-thirds of the participants (69.0%; N = 20) stated WHERE they learned to identify problem behavior; I noticed only one-third of the participants (34.5%; N = 10) explained HOW they learned to determine what problem behavior is.

Table 17

*Three Parts of VEQ #1 Answered by Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>HOW</th>
<th>WHERE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA01</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC01</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE01</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FF02</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH01</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI01</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KK02</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LL02</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM01</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RR02</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN01</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QQ01</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 (continued)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QQ02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*UU02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VV02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*XX02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YY02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZZ02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25/29</th>
<th>10/29</th>
<th>20/29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ptpcnt = participant; Participants in bold with asterick participated in Phase 3 interviews.

**Words Used to Describe**

Paying close attention to words participants used to describe students, I found:

1. Which students were noted for having problem behavior, and how the students were described
2. Which behaviors were noted as problematic, and how the behaviors were described
3. How closely responses to these five questions align with participants’ personal definition of problem behavior from VEQ1.

**How Participants Described Students**

Questions two through seven in the video elicitation exercise asked participants to identify and describe which student(s) exhibited problem behavior. As I read through participants’ responses to each of the VEQs, I noticed the various ways participants described the students in the video. Though it was never an initial goal of mine to analyze the various strategies participants used in describing the students, I quickly found a close review of their word choices intriguing. Students in the video were described in the following ways:

1. According to their location in the classroom: E.g., “One student in the front left...”; “The one in the back…”
2. According to their emotional state: E.g., “The student who was frustrated in the first part of the video…”
3. According to their perceived gender: E.g., “The two girls…”

4. According to their perceived gender and location in the classroom: E.g., “The girl in the front…”; “The boy in the back right…”

5. According to their race, perceived gender, and location in the classroom: E.g., “He is an African American male sitting in the back of the class.”

6. According to their clothing: E.g., “The student in the white shirt...”; “The girl in orange…”

7. According to their race and clothing: E.g., “The student is African American wearing a collared shirt.”

8. According to their clothing and their location in the classroom: E.g., “The student was in the back row wearing a red shirt.”

9. According to their behavior: E.g., “Students laughing and not paying attention…”; “The students passing notes…”

**Exhibited Behavior v. Perceived Behavior**

Table 18 is a comparison chart of exhibited behavior and perceived behavior. In the top row is a list of the students in the video who were exhibiting problem behavior according to the five timestamp segments for VEQs 2-6. The row below that includes a list of which students the participants identified as exhibiting problem behavior and how many times the student was identified during that segment. The bottom row includes the same list, along with the percentage of participants who identified the ST#’s behavior as **problematic**.

There were eight students (ST#) in the 3:40 video segment for the Video Elicitation activity. Of the eight students, the four with the darkest skin coloring (as I visually perceived it)
were ST#s 2, 3, 4, and 6. One or more of these same four students were most often identified as having problem behavior in every one of the timestamp segments.

Table 18

**Exhibited Behavior v. Perceived Behavior from Video Elicitation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Stamp</th>
<th>00:55</th>
<th>01:30</th>
<th>2:05</th>
<th>2:45</th>
<th>3:17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VE students exhibiting problem behavior during time stamp</td>
<td>ST# 2, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
<td>ST# 2, 3, 5, 6, 8</td>
<td>ST# 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8</td>
<td>ST# 4, 5, 7, 8</td>
<td>ST# 3, 5, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency participants identified VE students as exhibiting problem behavior during time stamp</td>
<td><strong>ST4: 24</strong></td>
<td><strong>ST2: 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>ST2: 27</strong></td>
<td><strong>ST4: 27</strong></td>
<td><strong>ST3: 15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2: 6</td>
<td>ST3: 9</td>
<td>ST5: 2</td>
<td>ST5: 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST4: 6</td>
<td>ST5: 5</td>
<td>ST7: 3</td>
<td>ST8: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST6: 9</td>
<td>ST6: 16</td>
<td>ST5: 6</td>
<td>ST8: 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST7: 8</td>
<td>ST8: 9</td>
<td>ST6: 21</td>
<td>ST8: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of instances VE students were identified for exhibiting problem behavior during time stamp</td>
<td><strong>ST4: 85.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>ST2: 78.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>ST2: 96.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>ST4: 96.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>ST3: 53.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2: 21.4%</td>
<td>ST3: 32.1%</td>
<td>ST5: 7.1%</td>
<td>ST5: 39.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST4: 21.4%</td>
<td>ST5: 17.9%</td>
<td>ST7: 10.7%</td>
<td>ST8: 10.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST6: 32.1%</td>
<td>ST6: 57.1%</td>
<td>ST5: 21.4%</td>
<td>ST8: 42.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST7: 28.6%</td>
<td>ST8: 32.1%</td>
<td><strong>ST6: 75.0%</strong></td>
<td>ST8: 14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How Definitions and Identification of Behavior Aligned**

Once I coded the participant responses from the Video Elicitation, I compared the code percentage from their definitions with the code percentage from their VEQs 2-6 to see how closely they aligned. I did this because I wanted to know how common it is for a pre-service teacher’s idea of what problem behavior is (definition) to match their identification of problem behavior when they see it. More than one-third (35.7%) of the participants were misaligned between idea and identification. Table 19 outlines which participants’ theoretical definition of problem behavior aligned with their practical identification of problem behavior.
### Table 19

**VEQs #2-6: Alignment with Definition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition from EVQ1</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Aligns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA01 “Problem behaviors are those that <strong>distract</strong> students and keep them from doing what the teacher wants or <strong>expects</strong>.”</td>
<td>DIS; EXP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA02 “…not following the <strong>rules</strong>.”</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB02 “Problem behavior is a type of behavior that <strong>continues</strong> to happen.”</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC01 “Problem behavior is when a student <strong>acts out</strong> and <strong>disrupts</strong> class.”</td>
<td>DIS; SUB; EXP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD02 “Problem behavior is when a student or teacher is <strong>disruptive</strong> to the learning environment”</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE01 “Problem behavior is something that <strong>distracts</strong> a classroom as a whole”</td>
<td>DIS; SUB; EXP; HRM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE02 “Problem behavior is any behavior that is not the expected classroom behavior.”</td>
<td>DIS; EXP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*FF02 “…behavior that <strong>disrupts</strong> instruction and the learning environment.”</td>
<td>SUB; EXP; HRM</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*GG02 “…anything <strong>harmful</strong>, or <strong>disruptive</strong>.”</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH01 “problem behavior is a behavior that causes a <strong>distraction</strong> or has the student being unable to learn.”</td>
<td>DIS; SUB</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH02 <strong>DID NOT ANSWER</strong></td>
<td>DIS; SUB; HRM</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH01 “A problem behavior is a behavior that we find to be <strong>undesirable</strong>.”</td>
<td>DIS; EXP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*KK02 “Problem behavior in the classroom is any behavior that <strong>disrupts</strong> the learning of an individual or the class.”</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*LL02 “…<strong>aggressive</strong> or <strong>disrespectfully defiant</strong>.”</td>
<td>DIS; SUB</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM01 “Problem behavior is when a person carries out a <strong>behavior that is not seen as acceptable</strong> in that environment or community.”</td>
<td>SUB; EXP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*RR02 “Problem behavior is a behavior that **occurs due to an existing problem in one’s life.”</td>
<td>DIS; SUB; EXP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN01 “Problem behavior is behavior that <strong>puts ones safety or the safety of others at risk</strong>.”</td>
<td>DIS; EXP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP01 <strong>DID NOT ANSWER</strong></td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP02 “Problem behavior is a behavior that is <strong>repetitive</strong> and occurs throughout the school year.”</td>
<td>DIS; EXP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QQ01 “…behavior that is <strong>undesired</strong> in any setting.”</td>
<td>SUB; EXP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QQ02 “…any behavior that <strong>distracts</strong> the rest of the class from learning”</td>
<td>DIS; SUB</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT02 “…behavior that <strong>becomes bothersome</strong> to others.”</td>
<td>DIS; SUB; EXP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*UU02 “Problem behavior is a behavior that results to a consequence positively or negatively by a teacher.”</td>
<td>DIS; EXP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VV02 “Problem behavior is <strong>issues</strong> that get in the way of things.”</td>
<td>DIS; SUB; EXP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW02 “…<strong>distracting</strong> behavior.”</td>
<td>DIS; EXP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*XX02 <strong>DID NOT ANSWER</strong></td>
<td>DIS; SUB; EXP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YY02 “Problem behavior is when a student is not following the behavior that is expected of the class.”</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZZ02 “Problem behavior is behavior that can be measured.”</td>
<td>DIS; SUB; EXP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also analyzed the data to determine if there was a correlation between alignment of definitions against six of the participants’ social identity data (race, ethnicity, sexual orientation,
religion, SES, dis/ability) using Spearman’s rho correlation. I italicized any findings I found to be particularly interesting or calling for further analysis. The following percentage of participants, according to their social identity grouping, aligned their identification of problem behaviors in the video elicitation exercise with their personal definition of problem behavior.

**RACE:** The single participants (0.0%) who identify as either Asian Pacific or Latin@ did not align with their definitions. Nine out of sixteen participants (56.3%) who identify as White aligned.

**ETHNICITY:** Two out of two participants (100.0%) who identify as Irish aligned with their definitions. The single (0.0%) participants who identify as either Chinese or Mixed Ethnicities did not align. One out of two (50.0%) participants who identify as Mexican aligned with their definitions. The single participants (100.0%) who identify as either Italian or Jewish aligned. One out of five (20.0%) participants who identify as Euro-American also aligned with their definitions.

**SEXUAL ORIENTATION:** The one (0.0%) participant who identify as bi-sexual did not align with their definition. Six out of twelve (50.0%) participants who identify as heterosexual aligned. The one (100.0%) participant who identify as queer aligned with their definition. One out of two (50.0%) participants who identify as questioning also aligned.

**RELIGION:** Five out of seven (71.4%) participants who identify as Christian aligned with their definitions. The single participants (0.0%) participants who identify as either Questioning or Atheist did not align. Two out of three (66.7%) participants who identify as Agnostic aligned with their definitions. One out of two (50.0%) participants who identify as Catholic also aligned.

**SOCIAL CLASS:** Two out of four (50.0%) participants who identify as coming from a working-class background aligned with their definitions. Neither of the two (0.0%) participants
who identify as coming from a lower-middle class background aligned. One out of two (50.0%) participants who identify as coming from a middle-class background aligned with their definitions. *Five out of eight (62.5%) participants who identify as coming from an upper-middle class background aligned.*

**DIS/ABILITY:** Three of the five (60.0%) participants who identify as being able-bodied aligned with their definitions. The only participants (0.0%) who identify as neuro-divergent, having a cognitive disability, a mental illness, or a chronic illness did not align with their definitions. The single participants (100.0%) who identify as either having a speech disability or a learning disability also did align.

**How Participants Described Behavior**

I was interested in finding how often the word “disrespect” was used and which scenario was being described when the word was used. To do that, I used the Control-F function on the keyboard to locate all appearances of the word throughout the Video Elicitation transcripts. Table 20 outlines the number of times *disrespect* was used, the sentences carrying the word, the participants who used the term, and which student in the video participants were referring to when using the word.

Table 20

*Use of the Word “Disrespect” to Describe Behavior in VE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Subject(s) Being Described</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DD02</td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>“…he disrupted the class and became <em>disrespectful</em>”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>“… the most disruptive and <em>disrespectful</em> to the classroom”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF02</td>
<td>E9</td>
<td>“The behavior was problematic because it was <em>disrespectful</em> to the teacher.”</td>
<td>ST4; ST6; ST7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L9</td>
<td>“…note passing can lead to some difficult social situations and is <em>disrespectful</em> to the teacher and class.”</td>
<td>ST2; ST3; ST4; ST6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ02</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>“Problem behavior is when students are disrespectful, distracting others, harming others.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td></td>
<td>“It was disrespectfully said.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK02</td>
<td></td>
<td>“The teacher disrespected and humiliated the student in front of the class.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15</td>
<td></td>
<td>“…the student who was loudly disrespectful to the teacher and was yelling…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL02</td>
<td>B16</td>
<td>“I consider problematic behavior as being aggressive or disrespectfully defiant.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L16</td>
<td></td>
<td>“I also found the student saying he did not like the assignment problematic because I see it under the scope of disruptive, but him not liking the assignment is not disrespect.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM01</td>
<td>L17</td>
<td>“The students were being disrespectful and not following the teachers directions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR02</td>
<td>E18</td>
<td>“He disrespected the teacher and the time she was putting in.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QQ02</td>
<td>E23</td>
<td>“It was disrespectful to the teachers and disruptive to his classmates.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT02</td>
<td>H24</td>
<td>“…the one in red is being disrespectful and the one tapping his pen is being distracting.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VV02</td>
<td>H26</td>
<td>“…the student was causing distractions and also disrespecting the teacher.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Disrespect” appeared fifteen times throughout the transcripts. One of the fifteen times was a participant stating what was not necessarily an indication of disrespect. One participant used the word to describe the classroom teacher’s behavior. Another participant used the word twice. The first time was to describe ST6 and ST7 whispering while the teacher was talking and ST4’s tone toward the teacher. The second time was to describe how passing notes during class is disrespectful to the teacher. Two of the fifteen times appeared in participants’ attempt to define problem behavior. One definition implied that disrespect can be aimed at anyone or anything in the classroom: “Problem behavior is when students are disrespectful, distracting others, harming others.” The second definition implied that disrespect is aimed at the teacher through defiance: “I consider problematic behavior as being aggressive or disrespectfully defiant.” The remaining
nine times the word *disrespect*, or a derivative of the word, appeared were in participants’ descriptions of ST4’s interaction with the classroom teacher. All in all, 12 of the 15 times (80%) the word “disrespect” appeared, it was used to describe what students dole to teachers. The one in a position of power and authority was depicted as the recipient of disrespect and lack of courtesy.

I also analyzed the data to determine if there was a correlation between use of the word “disrespect” against six of the participants’ social identity data (gender, sex, race, ethnicity, religion, SES) using Spearman’s rho correlation. I italicized any findings I found to be particularly interesting or calling for further analysis. The findings follow.

**GENDER:** Four of the fifteen (26.7%) participants who identify as woman used the word “disrespect” to describe ST4. One of the two (50.0%) participants who identify as man used the word to describe ST4.

**SEX:** Similar to the statistics for gender, four of the sixteen (25.0%) participants who identify as female used the word “disrespect” to describe ST4. One of the two (50.0%) participants who identify as male used the word.

**RACE:** *Neither (0.0%) of the participants who identify as either Asian or Latin@ used the word “disrespect” to describe ST4. But five of the sixteen (31.3%) participants who identify as White used the word.*

**ETHNICITY:** One of the two (50.0%) participants who identify as Irish used the word “disrespect” to describe ST4. *None (0.0%) of the participants who identify as Chinese, Mexican, or Mixed Ethnicities used the word.* However, the two (100.0%) participants who identify as either Italian or Jewish used the word to describe ST4. And one of the five (20.0%) participants who identified as Euro-American used the word.
**RELIGION:** Three of seven (42.9%) participants who identify as Christian used the word “disrespect” to describe ST4. None (0.0%) of the participants who identify as Questioning, Catholic, or Atheist used the word. One of the three (33.3%) participants who identify as Agnostic used the word.

**SOCIAL CLASS:** One of the four (25.0%) participants who identify as coming from a working-class background used the word “disrespect” to describe ST4. Neither of the two (0.0%) participants who identify with lower-middle class SES used the word. Both (100.0%) of the participants who identify with the middle-class SES used the word to describe ST4. And two of the eight (25.0%) of the participants from upper-middle class SES used the word.

I was also interested in seeing how the participants described ST4’s public, verbal challenge with the teacher during the first and fifth timestamp segments. To do that, I went back through the transcripts and re-read any responses in which the participant named ST4’s behavior as problematic during those segments. I made a list of the words used to describe what ST4 was doing during those segments. I also used the Control-F function on the keyboard to locate all derivatives of the words *yell*, *scream*, and *argue* throughout the VE transcripts. Table 21 outlines the numerous times the terms were used, the sentences carrying the word, the participants who used the term, and which student in the video participants were referring to when using the word.

Table 21

*Use of The Words “Yell” and “Scream” to Describe Behavior in VE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Subject(s) Exhibiting Bhvr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE01</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>“The two most problematic behaviors were when the kid in the back screamed this was stupid”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH01</td>
<td>L11</td>
<td>“The screaming out and throwing of a paper were the most distracting…”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM01</th>
<th>E17</th>
<th>“The student who <strong>screamed</strong> at the end was being problematic because he <strong>screamed</strong> at the teacher…” “The behavior was a problem because the students were supposed to not talk and <strong>yell</strong> at the teacher…”</th>
<th>ST4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H17</td>
<td></td>
<td>“The student was <strong>screaming</strong> at the teacher. The student was not following directions and <strong>screaming</strong>.”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L17</td>
<td></td>
<td>“The <strong>screaming</strong> and students not paying attention… The <strong>screaming</strong> was also not necessary in the classroom.”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC01</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>“It was a problem because he <strong>yelled</strong> out in class and didn’t raise his hand”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td></td>
<td>“He started <strong>yelling</strong> and distracted the whole class.”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE01</td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>“he <strong>yelled</strong> out in class that the lesson was stupid”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td></td>
<td>“the one in the back who at <strong>yelled</strong> out originally”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE02</td>
<td>H8</td>
<td>“Throwing paper and <strong>yelling</strong> at the teacher.”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td></td>
<td>“The student throwing paper and <strong>yelling</strong> back at the teacher…”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG02</td>
<td>E10</td>
<td>“the student in the red shirt <strong>yelled</strong> out saying that the reading was stupid”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ02</td>
<td>L14</td>
<td>“<strong>Yelling</strong> at them for asking a question in a rude way”</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK02</td>
<td>E15</td>
<td>“This student engaged in an <strong>argument</strong> with the teacher…” “…the teacher themself displayed problem behavior when they <strong>yelled</strong> back at the students…”</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15</td>
<td></td>
<td>“…Student in red crumples up paper and throws it then <strong>yells</strong> disrespectful things to the teacher.”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L15</td>
<td></td>
<td>“…the student who was loudly disrespectful to the teacher and was <strong>yelling</strong>…”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP01</td>
<td>E20</td>
<td>“Boy in the back started <strong>yelling</strong> about how he didn’t see the point of this.”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP02</td>
<td>H21</td>
<td>“The student in the red shirt Getting up and <strong>yelling</strong>…”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I21</td>
<td>“The student is <strong>yelling</strong>.”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VV02</td>
<td>E26</td>
<td>“They were <strong>yelling</strong>, whispering and laughing as a distraction to peers…”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L26</td>
<td></td>
<td>“The student in the back <strong>yelling</strong> at the girls in the front…”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YY02</td>
<td>E29</td>
<td>“He started <strong>arguing</strong> with the teacher…”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F29</td>
<td>“…the student in the black was faking a cough then started <strong>yelling</strong>.”</td>
<td>ST4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L29</td>
<td>“She didn’t care to help and wasn’t being nice and not helping her kids just <strong>yelling</strong> at them”</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The words “yell”, “scream”, “argue” or a derivative of either of the three were found 29 times within the transcripts. Three of the 29 instances described the teacher’s behavior. The remaining 26 appearances of the words came from twelve participants who described their perception of the manner in which ST4 interacted with the teacher. Twelve participants is nearly half of the sample who completed the Video Elicitation.

I also analyzed the data to determine if there was a correlation between use of the words “yell” or “scream” and six of the participants’ social identity data (gender, sex, race, ethnicity, religion, SES) using Spearman’s rho correlation. I italicized any findings I found to be particularly interesting or calling for further analysis. The findings follow.

**GENDER:** Six of the fifteen (40.0%) participants who identify as a woman used the words “yell” or “scream”. *Neither (0.0%) of the participants who identify as a man did.*

**SEX:** Similarly, six of the sixteen (37.5%) participants who identify as female used the words “yell” or “scream”. *But neither (0.0%) of the participants who identify as a male did.*

**RACE:** *Neither (0.0%) of the participants who identify as Asian or Latin@ used the words “yell” or “scream.” However, six of the sixteen (37.5%) participants who identify as White used the words.*

**ETHNICITY:** *Both (100.0%) of the participants who identify as Irish used the words “yell” or “scream” to describe the behavior of ST4. However, none (0.0%) of the participants who identify as Chinese, Mexican, Italian, or Mixed Ethnicities used the word. The singular participant (100.0%) who identifies as Jewish used the words, and one of the four (25.0%) participants who identify as European-American used the word.*

**RELIGION:** *Mirroring the statistics for “disrespect”, three of the seven (42.9%) participants who identify as Christian used the words “yell” or “scream” to describe the behavior of ST4.*
Neither (0.0%) of the participants who identify as Questioning or Atheist used the word. One of the two (50.0%) participants who identify as Agnostic used the words, while the one participant (100.0%) who identifies as Catholic used the word.

**SOCIAL CLASS:** *Two of the four (50.0%) participants who identify with the working-class used the words “yell” or “scream” to describe ST4’s behavior.* Neither of the two students from lower-middle or middle-class used the words. *Yet, four of the eight (50.0%) participants who identify with upper-middle class used the words.*

**Significant Relationships**

I attempted to run Pearson chi square analyses to determine if there was a significant relationship between social identities of the participants and: 1. Alignment between Identification of problem behavior and Identification of problem behavior; and 2. Completion level of VEQ1. Unfortunately, this was not possible because there was not enough data to establish significant relationships.

**VEQ7: Top Two Most Problematic Behaviors**

The highlighted students (ST#) in Table 22 below were identified as demonstrating one or both of the top two most problematic behaviors out of the 46 documented responses. Those two students are ST3 (30%) and ST4 (72%). The highlighted codes were the top two types of behaviors perceived as most problematic in the video clip out of the 46 documented responses. Those two behaviors are *distraction/disruption* infractions and breaking of class rules and expectations (objective and subjective).
Table 22

*Top Two Most Problematic Students/Behaviors from VE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST#</th>
<th># out of 46</th>
<th>% in top 2 list</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th># out of 46</th>
<th>% in top 2 list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>HRM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>REO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ST# = Student # according to seating chart

Findings from Semi-Structured Interviews

To find the ways in which pre-service special education teachers craft their perception of what constitutes problem and permissible classroom behavior, the researcher examined the transcripts from six semi-structured interviews through a *whole-part-whole* analysis process I refer to as the Five-Step R.I.G.H.T. Analysis Process, outlined below.

Step 1 – (Whole) **Read entire text. Read full transcript**

Step 2 – (Part) **Identify focal meanings. Deconstruct line-by-line #1**

Step 3 – (Part) **Group focal meanings. Analyze using 4Q-3Pa & b questions**

Step 4 – (Part) **Highlight meanings not previously identified. Analyze using post-reflexions and field notes**

Step 5 – (Whole) **Transfuse meanings. Think through with theories to reconstruct**

Appendix N includes results from each of the interviews. I extracted meaningful data from participants’ responses that addressed the phenomenon. Results are organized by participants’ answers to the Interview Questions (IQs) followed by findings from Steps 2, 3, and 4 (R.I.G.H.T.). I coded some interview data using the same codes that were used during analysis of Phase 2 data (See Table 23). Key terms and phrases used by participants were captured.
through underlining. These words and phrases were viewed as “key” because, in context, they called for further analysis. Additional thinking-through notes are also included. These notes are italicized for easy identification. The final step in the R.I.G.H.T. Analysis process -- Step 5 (R.I.G.H.T.) – will include ponderings from research journal entries and productions emerged from collected data from all three phases placed in innovative, conceptual dialogue with various theories and ideas. My hope in following this post-intentional analysis process is to generate novel understandings of the phenomenon that may potentially produce social change in how U.S. schools teach, perceive and address classroom behavior.

Table 23

Interview Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>HOW</th>
<th>WHERE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS: distraction/disruption</td>
<td>VIC: vicarious learning from</td>
<td>PCE: personal childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB: subjective criteria</td>
<td>consequences of others (informal)</td>
<td>experience(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP: not following expectations</td>
<td>OBS: observations (formal)</td>
<td>TEP: class(es) taken in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM: harmful/unsafe</td>
<td>LSN: explicit lessons on behavior</td>
<td>Teacher Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REO: reoccurring/chronic infractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tentative Manifestations

Data analysis followed a post-intentional blueprint. It was an iterative process in which I became familiar with the data, chunked them into focal meanings, wrote through my bridling and thought across theories, philosophies and methodologies to see what might be produced and provoked by such playfulness (Vagle, 2019). In doing so, I understood the collection of phenomenological material as it burst forth and took shape into salient insights within social context. Analytic productions and provocations that emerged from analysis of all the phenomenological material follow. I will discuss each of these nine tentative manifestations in greater depth in Chapter 5.

1. Students with Socio-Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities Not Preferred
2. High School Influential for Career Decision
3. Productive Learning Environment
4. Childhood Most Common Time Period for Perception Crafting of Problem Behavior
5. Participants with Certain Shared Identities Tend to Assess Behavior Similarly
6. Weaponizing Words
7. Students of Color Hyper-Surveilled
8. Behavior Levels Matter

Answers to the Research Questions

I began this investigation with three guiding questions. Each question pinpointed exactly what I wanted to find out in my exploration of the phenomenon. The research methodology purposive sample, setting, and collected data all helped to bring forth multiple, partial, emerging productions that aided in answering the three research questions. Following are answers as the researcher perceived the phenomenon be produced within social context of the population of study (Vagle, 2018).

Research Question 1

In what ways do pre-service special education teachers decide what qualifies as normal, or permissible, classroom behavior?

Pre-service special education teachers who participated in this study decide what qualifies as permissible classroom behavior through four primary ways. The most impactful way is through the lessons they learned from personal childhood experiences. They also decide what is acceptable by how well student behavior meets the teacher expectations for the classroom. In addition, pre-service teachers decide what is positive classroom behavior from formal lessons and clinical experiences during their TEP program of study. Finally, they rely on their own feelings and discretion to determine what is permissible.

Answered With a Definition. Some participants answered RQ1 with a definition of what permissible behavior is. For example, “anything that encourages good relationship with learning
and good relationship with the people in the classroom.” (KK02); “any behavior that creates an environment where learning is a priority” (KK02).

**Answered With Descriptions and Examples.** Some answered by describing what permissible behavior looks like or they provided examples: “respecting your teachers and your peers” (FF02); “kindness towards others” (LL02); “following classroom rules, like remaining at your desk” (LL02); “having your eyes up at the board following along with the teacher, writing in your own guided note packet, following along, raising your hand when you have a question…” (XX02); “getting through the lesson as they should” (UU02).

**Answered Using Non-Examples.** Some participants answered RQ1 by describing what it *is not*. For example, “not using foul language with your peers” (RR02); “no distractions or disruptions” (UU02); “not disrupting other’s learning” (FF02); “not being distracted by your phone or your peer who is sitting next to you” (XX02);

**Answered With Rationale.** And some participants went further by providing rationale behind their answer: “…for safety reasons” (LL02); “…because all the students are peers, and they should use one another to reach their goals uh, instead of bring each other down.” (RR02); The ways in which they came to determine what is permissible classroom behavior was almost always based on subjective discretion.

**Places, People, Situations.** Some answers to this question also fell into one of three categories: places, people, situations. Some responses to PLACES were: “as early as elementary school” (FF02); “That’s kinda where those ideas are formed of…this is what you should be doing…this is what compliance looks like…these are the people who are in charge…these are the people you have to listen to.(KK02)”; “during recess” (UU02). Some responses to PEOPLE were: “seeing…how the teacher reacts to it” (FF02); “based off of the way I saw other teachers
tackle behavior” (LL02); “My parents always held me to a very high standard…I never wanted to let my parents down” (XX02); “definitely the teacher” (UU02). Some responses to SITUATIONS were: “seeing how other students react to things” (FF02); “trying to gauge whether that would be an acceptable thing to do” (KK02); “seeing some really crazy behaviors” (LL02); Many of the ways that were mentioned crossed all three categories. For example, Participant UU02 touched on all three categories. This is what she shared:

“I remember in second grade. If we did not finish our work, my teacher would not let us go out for recess until we finished it. And I was a struggling reader. That was just pretty traumatizing on me because I needed help, and I couldn't do it. I was like. Oh, I guess I need to like finish my work.”

The memory UU02 shared is one non-example way she learned how to determine what is permissible classroom behavior.

**Personal Childhood Experience.** When asked RQ1, every participant referenced an indelible memory from elementary school in which either they or a classmate behaved in a specific way, and because of that specific behavior, they publicly received a consequence from the teacher. Regardless of whether the behavior received praise or punishment, the memory stayed with them. Their teacher’s response to the behavior indirectly taught them what is permissible. However, two participants admitted they came to that determination organically: “I was just able to understand my mistakes and learn from it.” (RR02); “I think I formed my own take on what’s permissible and what’s not.” (LL02)

**Lessons from Their TEP.** Perception crafting continues into Teacher Education Program (TEP) years, but less-often referenced and most-often molded from direct lessons about
applied behavior analysis (ABA) and indirect lessons learned from observing behavior and consequences in their clinical placements

Evidence of Cultural Competence. The responses from several of the participants showed evidence of cultural competence. Many of them expressed belief that exceptions sometimes needs to be made, according to contexts. For example, “…but I think those vary, depending on what classroom you’re in.” (FF02); “No other students are apparently bothered by it, so I think it kind of depends on the context.” (FF02); “It depends (on) what activity you’re doing in the classroom.”; “as long as the student is still engaged” (XX02); “Maybe they’re having an emotional day…” (UU02). When I asked where they learned to make these unique and important considerations, all of them attributed their knowledge to one or more courses in their TEP. These programs oversee the crucial training period for new special education teachers. For this reason, it is pertinent TEPs provide instruction on culturally sustaining pedagogy throughout and for the duration of their preparation programs.

Great Expectations. A common theme amongst the participants in answering this question was how they often used the word “expect” or a derivative of the word (expecting, expectation, etc.) For example, “if you were expected to be doing something”; “behavior that I would expect and might consider ‘quote’ normal would be…” (FF02); “expected behaviors” (XX02); “Were you asking about expected behaviors…or, like, not problem?” (FF02); “pretty much always be typical, expected, and permissible” (FF02); “If you were expected to be doing something, that’s what you should be doing instead of goofing off.” (KK02); “I’d expect my students to follow those classroom procedures.” (LL02); “This is my expectation. Do not take advantage of it.” (LL02) The word was often used when referring to the opposite of problem behavior. The issue this presents is that expectations tend to be ambiguous, changing with

Predictive expectations are based on our previous experiences or on the experiences of close people. It is what we think might happen. Normative expectations are based on what we assume will happen, based on the norm and shared social values. Deserved expectations are the most subjective. They are what we believe should happen, based on what we feel we deserve (Delgado, 2020). It is likely that all three types of expectations are upheld in our classrooms.

Connection to Theory. This research study used three theoretical frameworks as guard rails upon which to lean and think through: DisCrit (Annamma, 2016), Indirect Top Down Theory of Perception (Gregory, 1970), and Transformative Leadership Theory (Shields, 2020). DisCrit recognizes whiteness and ability as property (Harris, 1993) and that any significant gains made by marginalized people groups are the result of interest convergence (Annamma et al., 2018). Along with that, Gregory’s (1970) Theory of Perception proposes that our perception of reality is actively constructed by our past experiences and expectations.

Based on data collected, these pre-service teachers have decided that the ability to behave or exhibit permissible behavior is the ability to meet or fit in to expectations. Instead of behavior being a skill, like so many other classroom skills, that elicit support, it easily became “another thing to surveil, perpetuating a commitment to whiteness as property (Annamma, 2015, p. 293; Harris, 1993).” But in Chapter 2 we were reminded that students who are not perceived as “fitting in” with the norms of the general student population are most often the children who are less familiar with and less equipped to successfully negotiate the hidden curriculum (Casella, 2003). These students are often members of marginalized social identity groups (Carter et al., 2016; George, 2015; McFadden, Marsh, Price, & Hwang, 1992). This further supports DisCrit’s
claim that the socially constructed forces such as racism and ableism circulate interdependently, often in invisible ways to uphold notions of normality and what is “permissible.”

Gregory’s (1970) proposal that our perception of reality is actively constructed by our expectations must also be considered in how the phenomenon of perception crafting takes place. This means that our perception of what is reality and truth extends from something as inconsistent and subjective as our expectations. This being so, it is imperative that school personnel commit to testing and interrogating their expectations for cultural competence.

**Research Question 2**

*What are the ways pre-service special education teachers learn to determine if behavior has deviated from normal to problematic?*

The primary four ways pre-service special education teachers learn to determine if behavior has deviated from normal to problematic is through curriculum in their TEP classes and from reliance on their own definition and discretion. Other ways are through past childhood experiences and observations of their cooperating teacher during their clinical classroom placements.

**Answered With a Definition.** Participants provided answers to RQ2 in various ways. They defined *problem behavior*. For example, “…generally, just anything that harms others, whether it’s intention or unintentional…the impact is still the same” (FF02); “anything that disrupts the students’ learning or prevents them from participating or having a relationship with learning” (KK02); “It creates a negative environment or an environment where it’s not safe to learn to it’s not safe for their peers to learn.” (UU02)

**Answered With Descriptions and Examples.** Some gave examples of what problem behavior looks like, such as… “hurting your other classmates, like if that’s verbally like how
you’re treating them” (LL02); “blatantly rude to their teacher” (FF02); “phone usage” (FF02); “being distracted” (KK02); “talking with your peer while the teacher is talking” (XX02); “shouting things out” (LL02); “disrespect in the form of cursing out a teacher” (XX02); “defiance” (XX02); “physically, if they’re throwing things” (XX02); “loud, yelling” (UU02); “kids disrespecting one another, which could look multiple ways” (RR02); “purposely triggering one another” (RR02); “ignoring one another” (RR02).

**Answered Using Non-Examples.** Participants also offered non-examples like those provided for RQ1: “not keeping your hands to yourself” (LL02); “lacking empathy for each other (FF02); “not raising your hand” (KK02); “not abiding by expectations” (KK02); “not being engaged” (UU02).

**Answered with Rationale.** Participants also provided rationale for why they deemed a behavior to be a problem. What was interesting is how many more participants provided rationale for what is problem behavior compared to what is permissible behavior. “If you’re making other people feel unsafe, if you’re unsafe that is a problem.” (KK02); “No one’s thinking about how that impacts the other one.” (LL02); “It should be a safe environment for other students.” (LL02); “because it does throw off the environment for the whole classroom” (LL02); “It creates a hostile environment.” (LL02); “It makes other students feel scared or nervous.” (LL02); If it’s happening every day, then I would say it’s problematic.” (KK02); One participant admitted they come to that determination organically: “…kind of formulating my own thoughts of what it is. I don’t think I was ever specifically told the words, ‘This is what a problem behavior is. This is what the definition is. (KK02)”

**Places, People, Situations.** Responses to this question also fell into the three categories: places, people, situations. Some responses to PLACES were: “accumulation of my time both in
high school and in my pre-service education” (KK02); “through my clinical experiences” (KK02); “I would say that I kinda just came to the conclusion sort of through several places.” (FF02); “(In school) they would have those charts like green light, red light or yellow.” (LL02); “I think the biggest would be school.” (XX02); “elementary school” (XX02). Some responses to PEOPLE were: “I think it was based on my teacher’s reaction.” (LL02); “stories that you hear from your friends” (UU02). Some responses to SITUATIONS were: “my time as a student who exhibited some problem behaviors” (FF02); “Early memories” (KK02); “going over to friends’ houses and seeing how their parents treat their kids.” (XX02); “Getting my first red card … I got in trouble with my mom after that and with the teacher.” (UU02); “to the point where they had a talk with the teacher and the principal. That's when I knew like. Oh, that's a problem behavior.” (UU02); Participant UU02 shared another example for RQ2 that touched on all three categories. This is what she shared:

“As a kid, when there was a student who was misbehaving, this teacher would call that student and I would see that that student would go to the principal. They would get in trouble for either like yelling or not doing their work, hitting others, being disrespectful to the teacher or other students. So moments like that, and to the point where they had a talk with the teacher and the principal. That's when I knew: Oh, that's a problem behavior. I shouldn't ever do that because I would get in trouble!”

**Overly Concerned by Threat of Harm.** Again, the ways in which participants learned to determine the point at which behavior deviated from permissible to problem were often inconsistent, vague, and subjective. A popular concern amongst all of the participants was safety or the threat of harm. The widespread use of these phrases concern me because only a very
slight percentage of office discipline referrals are actually due to unsafe behaviors. Yet, we live in a world in which the words *I felt unsafe* and *I felt threatened* are weaponized against others, particularly Black and Brown individuals.

**Evidence of Cultural Competence.** Like in RQ1, the responses from some of the participants showed evidence of cultural competence. For example, one participant asserted, “So actually, being off task is not necessarily a problem behavior, if it’s what they need to do to feel like they're in a safe environment.” (LL02); “It can get a little fuzzy, but you’re looking at the impact of the words and actions…” (KK02); “It may be disruptive, depending on the context, it’s not necessarily harmful.” (FF02); “With the cultural thing, some groups of students will say not fake insult but playfully kind of like, get on each other’s nerves. From an outside perspective it could be seen as harmful, if you aren’t very familiar with the dynamic of the students.” (FF02); “There would be exceptions to how that behavior would be dealt with rather than not calling it a problem behavior.” (KK02); “I would find the reason why that student is acting that way.” (UU02); “I feel that if there isn't a trigger that I would say it's problem behavior and they're just acting out. But if there was a trigger to make them do something. I would view that as an exception depending on what happened.” (RR02)

**Program-Self and Personal-Self.** Throughout this study, there were two distinct “selves” participants presented: their program-self and their personal-self. The side of them that was the program-self came out during the classroom-based data collection activities in Phase 2. The program-self tended to provide responses that sounded a lot like, what might be considered as, correct answers on a quiz. For example, when participants were compelled to type their answer to RQ2, most of them referenced their TEP as the location in which they learned to determine what problem behavior looked like. When asked to provide a definition of problem
behavior, participants often repeated the same or similar definition as their classmates. It was evident they all learned the same terminology and key phrases to provide a sufficient, or correct, answer. However, Phase 3 interviewees who offered responses verbally presented a different side. It was a side that I perceived to be closer to their personal-self.

When asked RQ2 face-to-face, these same participants who had once attributed their answer to their TEP did not readily identify any type of instruction at first. Instead, they quickly drew on a childhood memory. Furthermore, when there was mention of an experience from their TEP, the story referenced a recent happening from their clinical classroom placements and not their coursework. Whether their responses came from their program-side or the personal-side, in phenomenological research all answers were considered to be equally valid.

**Subjective Determinations.** A common theme amongst the participants in answering this question was how they recognize problem behavior by the perceived-to-be negative impacts on external elements, such as being mean to peers and teachers or causing harm to others. “Once that problematic behavior starts to affect other students in the classroom and the teacher’s ability to teach that’s where it kind of enters that more serious realm (XX02).” Few participants mentioned behaviors that have an adverse impact on the student, themselves. Overwhelmingly, the claims of adversely impacting external class components were almost always washed in subjective determinations.

**Connection to Theory.** Past experiences inform our subjective determinations (Beijaard, 1995; Cohen et al., 2008; Duncker, 1939). Gregory (1970) argues that our perceptions of the world are hypothesis based on past experiences and stored information. That is why, despite demonstration of cultural considerations, most participants still evaluated behavior to be problematic as a default. Once a student’s behavior deviated from teacher expectations of
permissible, or norm-fitting, it was perceived as a problem. Many of the participants who acknowledged the importance of considering contextual factors when assessing behavior were the same ones who definitively described problem behavior without caveat.

The common theme of threat to external classroom components begs for deeper exploration. Threatening disruptions perceived by pre-service teachers as “being mean to peers and teachers” or “causing harm to others” or behavior that “starts to affect…the teacher’s ability to teach” have great capacity to lack validity. They can either be first-hand information directly presented to the sense organs or information indirectly constructed as a possibility, falling into the What came first? The chicken or the egg? conundrum. According to the Top Down Theory of Perception (Gregory, 1970), a lot of information reaches the eye, but about 90% is lost by the time it reaches the brain. The brain, then, has to guess what a person sees based on past experiences. How many Black students with disabilities have been excluded from school and denied a federally-mandated Free and Appropriate Education (FAPE) because of what was guessed about their actions and intentions?

We actively construct our perception of reality (Piaget, 2013; Saberwal, 1996). Gregory’s Theory of Perception (1970) discusses the construction of perception. The tenets of DisCrit Theory acknowledge the invisible ways oppression is upheld as normal along with the material and psychological impacts from being set outside of the western cultural norms. Both theories play a part in the construction of a school-based knowledge framework that identifies what problem behavior is and who is likely to exhibit problem behavior.

The second tenet of Shields’ (2016) Transformative Leadership Theory (TLT) highlights the need to deconstruct those types of knowledge frameworks that perpetuate inequity and injustice. Schools must reconstruct them in more equitable ways. Simply put, it is imperative
that multiple layers of checks and balances are put in place to ensure high-stakes decisions, such as exclusionary punishment, are not misused or weaponized as a tool to disadvantage some students. However, I realize the solution is not as simple. None of the inequitable practices I am attempting to address will produce long-standing change, unless we first examine those knowledge assumptions at the larger school-, district-, and systemic level. It can not and should not only focus on what teachers do in the classroom. Indeed, pre-service teachers and practicing teachers are part of a system, and the U.S. model in K-12 is state and locally oriented (top-down) and not bottom-up. For lasting change, we must “first understand and critically analyze educational marginalization and school failure -- eliminating deficit thinking, addressing color-blind racism, and opening curriculum space” (M. Nur Awaleh, personal communication, March 19, 2023).

Shields’ (2016) third TLT tenet recognizes the need to address the inequitable distribution of power. In this current study, I found pre-service teachers covertly using bullying strategies, which is an abuse of power. There was widespread use of terms and phrases that alluded to some type of threat of harm. This is significant because we now recognize the root of the problem of the pushout of Black students with disabilities rests not so much within the behaviors of the students, but more so within the perceptions, feelings, and fears of school personnel (Fenning & Rose, 2007; Garro et al., 2021). When we flippantly use terms that bring into question the safety of the classroom, especially in the age of school shootings, we are in danger of centering and weaponizing the perceptions, feelings, and fears of school personnel at the demise of our students. The school-to-prison pipeline is an example of the devastation the misuse of these escalating terms could bring.
**Research Question 3**

*How does social identity influence pre-service special education teachers’ perception of problem behavior?*

Finding the answer to this final research question was a challenge for two primary reasons. First, with such a small sample size, it was difficult to determine if a noted outcome was the result of a true correlation. Second, to determine how a social construct so complex as social identity influences an equally complex process such as perception as it interprets a human operation as contextual as behavior, further assessing it with such subjective determination required that I make more assumptions than was comfortable making. In short, the answer to RQ3 was inconclusive.

Nonetheless, there were redeemable contributions from the social identity data. I used the data to describe participants in Chapter 3. I was able to notice response tendencies by certain social identity groups and use the information to direct further exploration of dangling curiosities. Lastly, as the phenomenological researcher (the subject) I used the dense data to become more familiar with the participants and how they might find themselves engaging with the phenomenon (the objects) through their social identities. In pursuit of answers to RQ3, I ended with more critical questions than conclusions, which, to the phenomenologist, can also be a cause for celebration. *How does social identity influence pre-service special education teachers’ perception of problem behavior?* Following are a few notable manifestations that might be used to bring us closer to an answer, at most or a possibility, at least.

**Connection to Theory.** Video Elicitation student #4 (ST4) was overwhelmingly surveilled and depicted as disrespectful and aggressive by the research participants. By a quick visual assessment, it is evident to the viewer that ST4 is a medium-brown skinned, heavy-set,
male-presenting student. In short, he appears to be a large, black male student. ST4 is a fictionalized student, but this research study exists today due to how often disabled Black students are unjustly hyper-surveilled, labeled, and punished (Hyper-SLaP-ed), being perceived as a threat. Although, it is not clear from the video the dis/ability status of ST4, DisCrit theory considers how the intersection of dis/ability and other multiply-marginalized identities can have a compounding effect on individuals, especially in the school system.

I found that neither of the participants who identified as either Asian or Latin@ used any derivative of the word “disrespect” to describe Video Elicitation ST4. Nearly one third of the participants who identify as White used the term “disrespect” to describe ST4. None of the students who identified as Chinese, Mexican, or Mixed Ethnicities used the word to describe ST4, but both participants who identified as Italian or Jewish used the word. Neither of the two students who identify with lower-middle class SES used the word. However, both of the participants who identify with middle-class SES described ST4 as being disrespectful.

Twenty participants completed the video elicitation. Yet, the terms (or derivatives of) “yell” or “scream” were used 29 times to describe ST4’s slightly increased volume when he voiced his protest to the teacher. Forty percent of the participants who identify as women and 38% who identify as female used the words “yell” or “scream”, while neither of the only participants who identified as men and male did. Transformative Leadership Theory recognizes the need to deconstruct unjust knowledge frameworks (Shields, 2016). I wonder how much the presence of majority women teachers in the field of education has on the construction of what is framed as “screaming?”

Thirty-eight percent of the participants who identify as White used the words, but neither of the participants who identify as Asian or Latin@ did. Both of the participants who identify as
Irish used the words “yell” or “scream” to describe the behavior of ST4. Forty-three percent of the participants who identify as Christian and the lone participant who identifies as Catholic used the terms. Again, I wonder how much the presence of majority citizens who identify as Christian has on the construction of what is framed as “yelling?”

Half of the participants who identified with the working class and half of those who identify with upper-middle class described ST4 with those aggressive terms, while neither of the two students from lower-middle or middle-class used the words. If there is, indeed, any true correlation between social identity group and evidence of characterizing ST4 using inaccurate and aggressive terms, then that information would be troubling, but significant. As was mentioned in Chapter 2’s literature review, a student who is thought of as “a troublemaker” (Bowditch, 1993) or “dangerous” (Casella, 2003) can easily become victim to social separation from their peers.

Lastly, of all the social groups categories, participants who identified as upper-middle class demonstrated the closest alignment between what they defined problem behavior to be and what they consistently identified as problem behavior. I analyzed the self-reported social identity denominations of each Interviewee from Phase 3 by looking for relationships or tendencies and lines of flight between identity groups and answers to the interview questions. No further connections were noted between social identities of the total participant sample of any kind and perception of problem behavior.

**Summary**

Through this study, I was challenged to think critically about the various ways pre-service special education teachers craft their perception of problem behavior. In this chapter, analysis of the phenomenological material from a purposive sample, 38 participants and six
interviewees were reviewed and analyzed. This analysis brought forth nine provocations from their experiences which suggest the ways in which pre-service special education teachers craft their perceptions of problem behavior are not as stable and sure as some may believe. I concluded Chapter 4 with the answers to the three guiding research questions.

In the final chapter, I will further explore the nine tentative manifestations that surfaced. I do this by using applicable theories, ideas, and philosophies as posts upon which to bounce possible new understandings of the phenomenon. I pose critical questions in Chapter 5, and I propose conclusions. Finally, I discuss limitations, implications, applications, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER V: CRITICAL CONCLUSIONS

The term conclusion has numerous definitions. In two definitions, conclusion is described as 1. a final decision; and 2. a reasoned deduction or inference (Dictionary.com, 2022). As it relates to a research paper, the Conclusion section includes a synthesis of key points, ending with a final decision or a reasoned deduction (Purdue Writing Lab, 2022). A strong conclusion is designed in such a way that the audience finishes the text with a solid understanding of why the research should matter to them (Sacred Heart University Library, 2020). In this final chapter, conclusions are not the only thing I am aiming for. It is not enough for me to end with only final decisions or even reasoned deductions. I also desire to leave readers with Critical Questions from which they might springboard into new and/or further exploration of this phenomenon.

The final chapter of this paper is titled “Critical Conclusions” because I include a synthesis of the key points, reasoned deductions, and dangling curiosities that emerged from lines of flight. This chapter will include an overview of the research study, a summary of the findings, and an in-depth discussion section. The fifth step of the (Whole-Part-Whole) R.I.G.H.T. analysis process: Transfuse Meanings will follow. In this final step, I will engage in critical discussion by using applicable theories to think through tentative manifestations that may have had an impact on any findings. I end the chapter with acknowledging the limitations of this study, detailing implications for Teacher Education Programs (TEPs), describing applications for future practice, and recommendations for further research. It is my hope, in doing so, to “re-conceive intentional connections (Vagle, 2018, p. 191).” I want the reader to search for greater understanding beyond conclusive deductions of what things are; I want them to critically and continuously seek to know more of how things connect. This is key to post-intentional phenomenology (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Vagle, 2018).
Research Study Overview

This post-intentional phenomenological study explored the ways pre-service special education teachers from a special education teacher education program in the State of Illinois craft their perceptions of problem behavior and how social identity influences these perceptions. Post-intentional phenomenology requires researchers to remain conscious and critical of their own value positions and how that impacts and understands the phenomenon. Through this approach, I was able to center pre-service teachers’ lived experiences and understand them as they were constructed in their various sociocultural contexts.

The study was comprised of three phases, and I used purposive expert sampling. The participants (n = 38) were all advanced level undergraduate pre-service teachers in the third-to-last semester of their Teacher Education Program (TEP). Six participants agreed to participate in the Phase 3 semi-structured interviews. I collected data through the use of a social identity wheel activity, a questionnaire, a video elicitation activity, and interviews. Following the post-intentional philosophy, I also used data from my research journal and post-reflexion notebook.

In this research study, I used nominal data from the Social Identity Wheel and the first four questions on the Aspects of Identity Questionnaire to gather demographic data and to match participants to their claimed social identities. I used ordinal data from the questionnaire to determine how salient some social identities were over others for participants. Further, I used descriptive statistics to describe the total number of participants by category. With this information, I was able to notice any directions of association between highly important social identities and held perceptions of problem behavior. I used inductive coding and inquiry-based written analyses of research journal entries to analyze data from the Video Elicitations. Finally, I used inductive coding, a post-intentional 5-step transcript analysis process, and inquiry-based
written analyses of both the Research Journal and Reflexion Notebook to analyze data from the interviews.

**Summary of Findings**

The influence of social identity on perception was inconclusive. However, findings showed a patchwork of ways perception of problem behavior is crafted. Pre-service special education teachers who participated in this study decide what qualifies as permissible classroom behavior through four ways. The primary way is from what lessons they personally and vicariously learned during their childhood years in school. Additionally, they decide by how well student behavior meets teacher expectations (explicit or assumed) and from experiences facilitated throughout their TEP. Finally, they rely heavily on their own feelings and discretion.

Similarly, there were four primary ways pre-service special education teachers learn to determine if behavior has deviated from normal to problematic. Again, the primary way is from past childhood experiences. The second and third ways are through formal instruction and curriculum in their TEP classes and from reliance on their own definition and discretion. Finally, pre-service teachers vicariously learn from observing their cooperating teacher in their clinical classroom placements. They mimic what is currently being modeled to them.

**Discussion**

**Gaining Consent**

I was pleased to receive 21 (95.4%) signed consent forms from Section 2. However, I was disappointed and confused when I counted only nine (75.0%) signed consent forms from Section 1. By the expressions on their faces and their attentive outward behavior, it seemed as if both classes appeared to be open to participate. I wonder what factors caused the different responses. *Did teacher-student rapport play a part?* I presented to both classes using a script to
guide my presentation. However, I did go off script at times that I felt more explanation and/or spontaneity was appropriate. Did my off-script remarks play a part in the different levels of interest? Besides the discrepancy in number of students willing to participate, I also noticed that the majority of students in Section 2 requested a copy of the final report be shared with them, while the majority of the participants from Section 1 declined a copy. Also, when I asked if there were any questions, one student in Section 2 asked me a personal question – appropriate, but unrelated to the study. No questions were raised from Section 1. The professor from Section 1 informed me that there were eight absent students that day. He wanted to know what I wanted to do. I told the professor that I would like to present the opportunity for students who missed the presentation to be presented the choice to participate on the first day I come in to teach. He agreed. I did the same for the two students that were absent from Section 2.

Collecting Data from Phases 1 and 2

Many students encountered problems logging into the EdPuzzle class I created for the video elicitation activity. Most of the problems were due to failure to follow the directions I spelled out. Two students reported a problem with the questions not showing up during the video. We problem-solved and rectified the issue by refreshing the page. One student was the last to log on. She kept getting an error message. We found out it was due to the Personal Passcode I had assigned to her. The passcode had no alphabets, but the EdPuzzle program requires at least one alphabet in a user’s password. We solved the student’s log-in problem by giving her a new password that contained an alphabet.

The low completion rates from Phases 1 and 2 can be attributed to two factors: absences and incompletion. Absences – Some students were not in attendance on the days participants completed the measures. To ensure all participants had equal exposure to the preliminary topical
information from the facilitated lesson, I only counted the submissions from participants who were present during the lesson. I did not consider the late submissions from participants who were absent during the lesson; however, all students were still expected to complete the participants, as they were introduced and counted as class activities. **Incomplete Video**

**Elicitation** – Some students were present for the lesson but failed to complete the entire video elicitation activity. The *EdPuzzle* platform keeps track of which participants logged in, the time of log in, the duration, participant responses, and what percent of the video each participants watched. I only counted video elicitation responses from the participants who watched 100% of the video. Of the 29 participants who started the video elicitation activity, 21(72.4%) fully completed it.

**Collecting Data from Phase 3**

Something I learned from the practice interview was how important it is that I take time to create a warm and comfortable environment. I did not do this at first, but I noticed P.P. was answering the first questions as if they were being tested. Most likely, this was due to how formal the questions were written. For example, one question asked if they could “name” certain key places, people, and situations. When I noticed P.P. tense up upon hearing the term *name*, I quickly re-worded the question to ask them to “describe” any key places, people, and situations. Their response flowed significantly smoother for this change and other re-wordings I made along the way.

At the end of the interview, I asked P.P. if they had any questions about the research study or any comments about the experience. It was exciting to hear them probe into the purpose & significance of the study and any hypotheses I had going into it. They also asked about the purpose behind a couple of the questions and what I was hoping to gain from asking those
questions. Answering P.P.’s questions and engaging in dialogue with them sparked something in me, for sure! I recognized how much I love this research study, how interested I am in hearing the collective responses, in analyzing the data, and in learning any findings that arise. I was able to make important adjustments for the Phase 3 interviews, because of the practice interview.

The questions I asked during the semi-structured interviews centered the lived experiences of the participants and the meaning they made out of them. For example, one question asked, “Walk me through your most memorable experience with problematic classroom behavior. It could have happened in real life, or it could have been something of fiction that you saw, read, or heard about. Try to describe what you saw and felt.” Through phenomenological interviewing, participants were free to openly share their personal experiences, values, expectations and understandings. I planned to use this data to explore the interconnected meanings that manifest.

Ideally, I would have taken at least one week in between each interview to manually type out each transcript and begin the 5-Step R.I.G.H.T. analysis of each transcript. Instead, I held interviews at a quicker rate, averaging 1-2 interviews per week over a five-week period. I did this solely because of time limits. It was imperative that I collected all data before the end of the semester. Part of the criteria for both the participants and the setting required students be actively enrolled in their qualifying course at a very particular stage in their TEP journey. I needed to collect data before the end of their current semester because any time beyond that point would disqualify participants from the research study.

**Analyzing Data from Phases 1 and 2**

After coding participant responses from the video elicitation, I charted which students in the video (ST#) were identified as displaying problem behavior and how many times. This
information revealed two things: 1. I learned how thorough and aware pre-service teachers are in identifying problem behavior; and 2. I learned which students and/or which behaviors tended to be surveilled most.

**Step 5 of R.I.G.H.T.: Transfuse Meanings and Think Through Theories**

Following post-intentional methodology, I became familiar with the phenomenological material through an iterative process of bridling, reflecting, and thinking across theories and philosophies to see what might be produced. I attempted to understand the collection of data as tentative manifestations took shape into salient insights. The following nine manifestations emerged from analysis.

1. Students with Socio-Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities Not Preferred
2. High School Influential for Career Decision
3. Productive Learning Environment
4. Childhood Most Common Time Period for Perception Crafting of Problem Behavior
5. Participants with Certain Shared Identities Tend to Assess Behavior Similarly
6. Weaponizing Words
7. Students of Color Hyper-Surveilled
8. Behavior Levels Matter

In this section, I will think across theories so that we might discover new, useful information, and inform conclusions. It is my hope that the reader will journey with me.

*Students with Socio-Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities Not Preferred*

Not one participant expressed interest in teaching students of any age/level receiving special education services for social-emotional, behavioral, or mental health challenges. Furthermore, not one participant shared a defining experience in special education that involved interacting in a program that served students services for social-emotional, behavioral, or mental health challenges. Pre-service teachers’ self-efficacy in classroom management may be an influence. Self-efficacy is a person’s belief in their ability to be successful at accomplishing
specific tasks in specific contexts (Bandura, 2015). A pre-service teacher with low self-efficacy in classroom and behavior management may be hesitant to willingly place themselves in a classroom leadership position in which they don’t believe they will be successful.

Compelling evidence supports that teachers’ sense of efficacy is related to student school-related outcomes (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2002). In other words, teachers are more likely to perceive they can impact student outcomes when they have a strong sense of self-efficacy. If this is true, then the opposite would imply that teachers who have low self-efficacy are more likely to perceive they have little control over influencing student outcomes. The less control a teacher feels they have over students, the more fear and anxiety is felt (Casella, 2003; Domenico, 1998; Fenning & Rose, 2007; Skiba et al., 2000). This is significant because we found in our literature review (Chapter 2) that even when there is no real threat of danger, Black students with disabilities are disproportionately issued exclusionary punishments because of educators’ perceptions, anxieties and fears (Fenning & Rose, 2007).

~~ **Critical Questions:** I am left wondering *How much of a pre-service teacher’s claims of problem behavior has to do with the teacher’s sense of efficacy in classroom management versus the actual behavior?*  ~ ~

**High School Influential for Career Decision**

Five of the six Interviewees referred to an experience in high school that positively influenced their decision to pursue the field of special education. According to the Social Development Model, the most important units of socialization are family, schools, peers, and community (Hawkins & Weis 2017). All four units influence behavior. The concept of bonding is central to the model. It is a direct development from an individual’s involvement in a social unit. Bonding leads to increased belief in the social unit’s values, which ultimately influences behavior within that social unit.
INVolvement => Bonding => Belief in social unit’s values => Behavior

The model hypothesizes that individuals learn behavior (prosocial or antisocial) from their social environment and that we are socialized through four processes: 1. Perceived opportunities for involvement in activities and interactions with others; 2. Actual involvement; 3. Skill for involvement and interaction; and 4. Perceived rewards from involvement and interaction. (Catalano et al., 2004, p. 252).

In keeping with the Social Development Model, we can deduce that research study participants who were involved in their high school in some positive social capacity developed a bond with that social unit. Bonding increased their belief in the unit’s values which impacted their behavior so much so that it served as a determinant in their college and career trajectory. That is powerful! What was powerful in the social development of participants when they were in high school must be equally as powerful for all students.

critical questions: If involvement produces such positive social outcomes, then why are so many Black students with disabilities experiencing adverse outcomes? What are schools not doing to foster and maintain increased student involvement? How can we effectively leverage school connectedness as a mechanism to improve school outcomes for the same students who are most at risk for experiencing school disconnectedness through exclusionary disciplinary consequences? What interventions have been implemented to increase school connectedness as a mechanism to improve school outcomes for students? ~

Productive Learning Environment

Most of the participants stressed how important it is that a productive learning environment is maintained as they described what permissible classroom behavior is and/or what problematic classroom behavior is. But what constitutes a learning environment and what is the measure of a productive learning environment?

Educators at Western Governors University (WGU) claim that a learning environment is more than just a physical classroom; it also includes the classroom culture or atmosphere,
teacher’s instructional style, and sense of physical, emotional, psychological, and intellectual safety (WGU, 2021). Studies have shown that productive learning environments aid in increasing and improving positive school outcomes such as student focus and retention of information (Afari et al., 2013; Entwistle, 1991; Nijhuis et al., 2008). It is not lost on me that the object of so many participant’s near-obsessive concern with protecting —the learning environment—is the very thing we are withholding from our disabled Black students. This vulnerable population to whom the U.S. federal government has promised a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive (learning) environment (LRE) continues to be hyper punished and excluded from their learning environments.

Researchers Radovan and Makovec (2015) examined the characteristics of students’ motivation and its connection with perceptions of the learning environment. Their findings showed a significant correlation between the intrinsic goal orientation self-efficacy and control beliefs. In other words, the most important elements of a learning environment to students are the perception of the usefulness of the topics and lessons, a feeling of autonomy, and teacher support. Their findings are congruent with student-centered teaching and learning theories. What is concerning is the learning loss that happens to Black students with disabilities outside of these learning environments. My desire is to see the same level of energy with which pre-service special education teachers commit to protecting the learning environment be given to creatively implement learning opportunities where disabled Black students feel heightened autonomy and genuine support from them.

~~ Critical Questions: At what point does a student’s behavior move the needle from a productive learning environment to a disrupted learning environment? Is it when at least one student is distracted from learning? What if the distracted student is highly distractable? What if the distracted student was fishing for an excuse to be distracted? What if the student covertly instituted the distraction to begin with? Is the one assessing the behavior primarily focused on the loudest or most demonstrative behaviors? Or maybe the learning environment is disrupted
with more than one student is distracted. Do the answers to the above questions carry the same considerations? Or different because there are more students disrupted from learning? ~

~ Critical Questions: The description of a productive learning environment offered by WGU placed the primary onus on the teacher for its maintenance, while researchers Radovan and Makovec touted student autonomy and student-centered instruction and learning as central. How much responsibility rests on the level of engagement garnered from the curricular and instructional decisions of the classroom lead? What amount of the responsibility rests on the student? Is it as binary as I am making it out to be? ~

Childhood Years Most Common Time Period for Perception Crafting of Problem Behavior

All six of the Interviewees (100%) referred to a personal childhood experience (PCE) when they described where and when they learned what behavior qualified as permissible and what qualified as problem behavior. However, hearing how the young adult pre-service teachers lean so heavily on the core values, experiences, and beliefs they grew up under was not surprising. Substantial research supports the consistent relationship between attitudes and values learned during childhood and those carried into adulthood (Cunningham, 2001; Duh, 2016; Pearce & Thornton, 2007).

In 2001, Cunningham researched the influence of parental attitudes and behaviors on children’s attitudes toward gender and household labor in early adulthood. Findings showed that adult children’s gender roles and attitudes are associated with maternal gender role attitudes measured during both early childhood and teenage years. A 2007 study on how religion shapes family ideologies in young adulthood was conducted (Pearce & Thornton, 2007). Results showed a consistent relationship between religion and attitudes in adulthood. From early childhood years, an individual’s religious characteristics shape ideologies. Almost a decade later, Duh (2016) conducted a study on the impact of childhood experiences on young Gen Y money attitudes and materialism. Results showed that perceived stress had a strong positive impact on
later-life affective money attitudes. I chose to highlight these studies because all three address key components of perception: beliefs, values, past experiences, and attitudes.

Still, change is possible and has been proven! Solid evidence exists that support the lifelong openness model of attitude change (Krosnick & Alwin, 1989; Miller & Sears, 1986; Tyler & Schuller, 1991). Two important change models that account for people’s relative openness to a change of attitude through the life cycle are: 1. Impressionable years hypothesis (Krosnick & Alwin, 1989) and the lifelong openness model (Miller & Sears, 1986). The impressionable years hypothesis suggests that individuals are highly susceptible to attitude change during late adolescence and early adulthood, but the susceptibility drastically drops and stays low throughout the rest of the life cycle. The lifelong openness views attitudes as consistently open to change in adulthood.

Two studies were conducted using these models (Tyler & Schuller, 1991). The goal was to investigate how open individuals of varying ages were to change their attitude toward government. Findings revealed that attitudes of the older participants changed as much or even more in response to their personal experiences as did those of the younger participants. This is important because we now know that personal experiences are the main contributors to our perceptions and knowledge. But we do not have to be stagnant, or stuck, in our past experiences. New experiences have the capacity to unseat and alter our perceptions, re-construct new knowledge, and change our attitudes toward a person, place, thing, or idea.

**~ Critical Questions: Although it is good to know that young adults maintain the capacity to continue changing and growing in their empathy, knowledge of others, and lifeworld experiences, ability does not equal aspiration. What part does inclination and willingness play in attitude change within the perception crafting of pre-service teachers? ~**
Participants with Certain Shared Identities Tend to Assess Behavior Similarly

Educator, researcher, and author James A. Banks has written widely on the topic of knowledge as a social construction (Banks, 1993; 1996; 2020). To Banks, knowledge is conceptualized broadly, as the way an individual explains or interprets reality. It includes ideas, values, and interpretations and is socially constructed, reflecting the values, interests, and actions of its creator. (Banks, 1993). Banks’ definition of knowledge aligns closely with Gregory’s (1970) definition of perception. According to Gregory, perception is the ability to capture and process information to make sense of the world based on past experiences and stored information. Our perception of the world is influenced by our experiences and our expectations (Jordan et al., 2019; Sohn et al., 2019). Like knowledge, our perceptions are also influenced by our social identities (De Cremer & van Dijk, 2002; Gregory, 1974). In sum, information we perceive is stored as knowledge. To the creator, or perceiver, they are one and the same.

Why is this important? According to Banks (1993), the knowledge that we create is largely influenced by the interpretations of our experiences and by our positions within certain social, economic and political systems, groups and structures of a society. In other words, as it does to our perceptions, our social identities heavily influence what we store dearly as knowledge. This is important because it means that our perception of behavior and our knowledge of what and who is pro-social and what and who is anti-social are significantly influenced by our social identities.

According to the goal transformation hypothesis, individuals with differing social identity orientations can be encouraged to cooperate for social change by increasing the salience of their group membership (De Cremer & van Dijk, 2002; De Cremer & Van Vugt, 1999). The stronger
a person identifies with a group, the more the person is motivated to work with others in the
group to address a social problem (De Cremer & van Dijk, 2002).

Critical Questions: Since our perception and knowledge of behavior are significantly
influenced by our social identities, what accountability markers can the classroom teacher
install in their classroom management system today to neutralize implicit bias? The problem is
so traumatic and pervasive that we simply cannot wait for policies to change before taking
action. How does the goal transformation hypothesis answer to Freire’s conjecture that “The oppressed
must be their own example in the struggle for their redemption (Freire, 2020, p. 54).”? ~

Weaponizing Words

During analysis of the Video Elicitation (VE), I noticed the pointed use of the words
disrespectful and disrespect. Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries (2023) defines disrespect as: a lack
of respect or courtesy for someone or something. According to that definition, any willfully
demonstrated classroom behavior that either went against known/stated behavioral expectations
or that caused a classmate to be distracted from their work would qualify as lacking respect or
courtesy. Still, participants used the word disrespect only when describing how Video Elicitation
ST4 addressed the teacher at the beginning of the video and at the end of the video. It was never
used to describe how their behaviors impacted their classmates.

Critical Questions: Why was the incessant pencil tapping from ST8 not named
“disrespectful”? Or the distracting and off-topic public announcement made by ST7 not viewed
as lacking courtesy? ~

A few unsettling responses I read during VE analysis are what sparked my interest to
review the language used by participants to describe behavior. One participant described their
perception of the question ST4 asked the teacher in the first segment. They wrote, “This student
engaged in an argument with the teacher…” From how I perceived it, I only heard ST4 loudly
question the purpose behind the assignment in the first segment and loudly challenge their
dismissal from the room in the fifth segment. Another participant described ST4 as “yelling” at the teacher. A little later, I read another participant’s description of the student; they depicted ST4 “screaming” at the teacher.

When one considers what an argument looks like, I believe most would imagine a heated verbal exchange between two or more people that lasts longer than one cycle of back-and-forth. In the first timestamp segment of the video, ST4 loudly challenges the teacher by asking, “Why do we have to read this junk? This is so stupid!” Matching the student’s volume level, the teacher retorts, “Be quiet! No talking without teacher permission! Don’t you know the rules? What’s wrong with you?!?!” ST4, then, turns in their seat, faces their assignment, and does not respond.

From my own perception, the teacher-student verbal exchange did not constitute an “argument.” Furthermore, when one recalls a mental picture of a child yelling or screaming, I would confidently bet that the cognition would depict a young person with their mouth wide open, aggressive posturing, muscles tight, chin jutted forward, and possibly pronounced veins in head and neck or discoloration of face from strain. Both of the words imply a level of rage that I, personally, did not perceive from ST4’s behavior.

Twelve participants who described their perception of the manner in which ST4 interacted with the teacher used weaponized words. Twelve is nearly half of the sample who completed the Video Elicitation. That is an alarming percentage. It is well-documented that Black boys in school are perceived through a criminalized lens (Basile et al., 2022; Carey, 2020; Essien & Wood, 2022), especially Black boys with disabilities (Hines et al., 2018; Nanda, 2019; Williams & Lisbon, 2022). Their behaviors are Hyper-\textit{SLaP}-ed and habitually described as disrespectful and aggressive (Carey, 2020; Webster & Knaus, 2021). Narratives such as these persist, in large part, through pervasive use of biased language.
I do not assume that my perception is the most accurate. What I do know, though, is that teacher perception of student behavior and the words we use to describe our perception carry with it consequences for students that have lasting impact. Language is powerful. Our use of it, be it intentional or unintentional, can communicate hidden messages that are an outgrowth from our life experiences (Braddock, 2020; Stahl, 2016). Some people refer to this phenomenon as “reading between the lines.” Since perception is both a physiological (senses) and a cultural (experiences & expectations) phenomenon (Merleau-Ponty, 2004), exploring participants’ word choices aided me in answering RQ2.

~~Critical Questions: I wonder how our notions of what it means to be an adult influences what language we reserve only or primarily to describe youth’s behavior toward adults. On an office discipline referral, would the word disrespect influence a different disciplinary consequence than distraction? If so, then might we ever be guilty of weaponizing the word against our students?~~

Students of Color Hyper-Surveilled

I created a comparison chart of exhibited behavior and perceived behavior, using participant responses from VEQs 2-6. This data was value-adding because it revealed which students in the video were surveilled most often, compared to their classmates who were also exhibiting problem behavior during the same segment(s). I was particularly interested in this information, being fully aware of the current practice of Hyper-SLaP-ing specific populations of students in Pre-K-12 classrooms across the U.S. Of the eight students, the four with the darkest skin coloring (as I visually perceived it) were the top four most often identified as having problem behavior in every one of the timestamp segments. Why?

What might be the reason for a passive observer who holds no stake in the situation to jump so quickly into this harmful teacher practice? Foucault (2012) might identify the research participants’ behavior behind the anonymity of a computer screen as surveillance. Foucault
describes surveillance as wielding power to discipline for the purpose of ranking, ordering, and normalizing individuals (Foucault, 2012). In line with Foucault’s analogy of the panopticon, the observers in the tower (participants viewing the video elicitation) know what the prisoners do their cells (students in video segment); but the prisoners are unaware the observer is there (computer screen).

Social psychologists might explain this tendency by referencing the Attribution theory. The theory divides the way people attribute causes to happenings into two types: internal and external. Internal attributions connect cause and effect to factors within a person, such as ability or attitude. External attributions assign causality to an outside factor, like traffic or weather. According to the attribution theory, pre-service teachers may unknowingly attribute deviance to something internal to students of color (Kelley, 1967).

Annamma (2018) describes this type of hyper-surveillance as the excessive scrutiny in the anticipation of problem behaviors, attitudes or presence. She asserts that it is often applied to multiply-marginalized student populations. The course hyper-surveillance runs in schools often leads to a practice of interacting with the students from a deficit mindset (much like internal attribution), then labeling then more surveillance, finally ending in exclusionary punishment.

Add to the hyper-surveilled student’s race another marginalized identity such as disability or low SES, and the student’s culpability increases. From a DisCrit lens, this is a very real possibility (Annamma, 2016; 2018). DisCrit argues that a person’s social identities cannot be separated (e.g., race, disability, class). A person’s identities interact collectively to shape their experience of the world. It is essential that we consider them altogether.

Critical Questions: There were only four students of color in the video elicitation classroom scenario. Seven of the eight students exhibited problem behavior more than once throughout the 3:40 minute segment, yet those students were the top four most often identified as having problem behavior. They were evidently hyper surveilled and the words used to describe their
behaviors were weaponized against them. All of this occurred in a hypothetical, dramatized setting. I have been impressed with the level of cultural competence I have seen and heard from the participants. How much more damage might pre-service teachers from less culturally-aware TEPs do, knowingly or unknowingly?

BLM: Behavior Level Matters

It was not uncommon for phase 2 and 3 participants to initially describe a behavior that fell into the “Office-Managed” behavior column (See Table 2, Chapter 2), but would later dial the description down to a “Classroom-Managed” level. This is significant, because the safety and concern level of the behavior as it is initially described by the classroom teacher will most likely determine the outcome the student experiences (Girvan et al., 2017; Smolkowski et al., 2016). For example, participants often identified Video Elicitation ST4’s behavior as “LNG” Aggressive language toward students/staff, especially when he balled up his assignment and threw it at his classmate. When they described the behavior as problematic, their descriptions often spoke of his aggression. Yet, in their explanations as to why they would name the behavior as problematic, participants decreased the behavior’s alarm level by reducing it to the code level of DIS “disruption or distraction-minor”. In their explanations, participants rarely mentioned the safety concern.

It is not uncommon for a teacher who is feeling high levels of stress to escalate the depiction of an issue in the heat of the moment. High teacher stress has been proven to have an impact on work outcomes, such as links to burnout, classroom culture, absenteeism, and behavior management (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Madigan & Kim, 2021; von der Embse et al., 2019). Authors of the Prosocial Classroom Model stress the importance of teachers’ social and emotional competence (SEC) and well-being in the development and maintenance of important teacher responsibilities, particularly effective classroom management. But what if
occupational stress is not the cause for escalating the description? Participants in this study were not necessarily experiencing occupational stress when they elevated the behavior from a classroom-managed behavior to an office-managed one.

I wonder how often something similar to this plays out in the classroom. For example, if a student launches a paper airplane as a projectile at a classmate across the room, the teacher immediately recognizes how that act disrupts the class. When asked to describe the behavior, the urgency of issuing a consequence can be elevated when the act is described as a safety concern. However, when the need to shine a spotlight on the behavior passes and the teacher is later asked to explain why the behavior caused a problem, the teacher reduces the concern back down to “disruption/distraction”. In these instances, there is a greater chance the student will be dealt a more severe and restrictive disciplinary consequence for a safety/harm violation over a distraction/disruption violation.

~~ Critical Questions: What are the sociopolitical forces that make our reliance on exclusionary discipline practices and oppression of Black students a necessary evil? How can this study kick a leg out from under this reliance? ~~

Problem Behavior: Idea v. Identification

When asked to describe what problem classroom behavior encompasses, five of the six Interviewees included some form of threat to student safety. However, only one out of the five described that level and type of behavior when asked to imagine problem behavior in their dream classroom (IQ8). Further, I compared the code percentage from Phase 2 participants’ definitions of problem behavior with the code percentage from their VEQs 2-6 to see how closely they aligned. More than one-third (35.7%) of the participants were misaligned between idea and identification. This is significant because any degree of misalignment opens an avenue for identifying behavior as problematic with increased inconsistency and subjectivity. Subjective
criteria and inconsistency in labeling may be the impetus for the Hyper-SLaP-ing of Black and Brown students with disabilities. To this end, I believe the issue stems from the gap between theory and practice. But which theory? And why is there such prevalent misalignment?

Pre-service special education teachers enrolled in the TEP involved in this research study typically have long learned about behavior from Alberto and Troutman’s (2013) textbook titled “Applied Behavior Analysis for Teachers.” Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) is a scientific approach to understanding behavior (Horner & Sugai, 2015). In the field of education, ABA is overwhelmingly embraced by educators who consider themselves behaviorists. The approach is founded on a set of principles that focus on molding behavior and learning through external and environmental means. For decades, the approach and principles of ABA have been both widely embraced in the field of special education when teaching and learning about behavior and widely criticized.

One criticism of ABA is the over-reliance on punishments as well as rewards (Matson & Taras, 1989). Although punishments are no longer used in ABA, many still hold disdain for the continued misapplication of the principles in today’s classrooms (Trump et al., 2018). Another criticism is that ABA is too focused on eliminating behaviors. Some educators emphasize that more focus needs to be on building skills and what students should be doing, instead of what they should not be doing (Lord, 2022).

ABA has been the focus of many studies over the last forty years (Baer et al., 1968; Chaabane et al., 2009; Gorycki et al., 2020; Krantz & McClannahan, 1998). A vast number of them have effectively proven that this approach can help children diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder learn new behaviors (Alotaibi, 2016). It has also been said that Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is a design of ABA implemented at a level of
social importance (Alotaibi, 2016; Horner & Sugai, 2015). Though there are proven benefits to this approach, it is easy to understand how a pre-service teacher who might be trained carelessly in ABA can develop a pedagogy of behavior management from an approach of deficit-thinking and punishment.

Critical Questions: For many years now, we have all been agreement that issues arise with pre-service and new teachers, due to the gap in theory and practice, yet we have done little-to-nothing to effectively address the gap. What is something that can be done today?

Limitations

There are limitations to this study that must be considered. The purposive sample of participants were amid one of their busiest semesters as a teacher. Their tight schedules and limited time and energy impacted their willingness to participate in the study. There was no incentive presented for participation, outside of the scholarly experience and service that comes with participating. The limited number of participants prevented the researcher from being able to run rigorous analyses on the correlation between social identity and perception of behavior, The duration of the study presented limitations, along with the social identity instruments I used. Finally, another major limitation was the narrow demographics of the participants.

First, inclusion criteria for this purposive sample required that participants be advanced level undergraduate pre-service teachers who had not yet started their full day of student teaching clinical experience. Students who fit the criteria at this chosen TEP were in the second semester of their third year. The timing caught the students in the semester of their initial clinical experience -- one of the busiest semesters of their program. They were all trying to figure out how to balance the load of being a full-time student with the new stresses that come with entering the schools as a pre-service teacher. In addition, many of the participants were fitting part-time jobs into their already tight schedules. That placed participation in Phase 3 of this study
very low on their list of priorities. As a result, I was only able to garner six interviews out of 38 participants, even after three recruitment attempts.

I believe that if I had offered an incentive of some type, such as a $10 gift card to a local campus eatery, participation in the semi-structured interviews would have increased. Even in the midst of one of their busiest semesters, the promise of food and/or money is still highly regarded amongst college students. I did not consider incentives as an option until after the IRB approval process had completed. By that time, it was too late. Lack of incentives definitely surfaced as a limitation.

Because of the low participant sample (N = 38), I was unable to determine correlational significance between perception of behavior and social identities. Not having this information limited in my ability to draw conclusions beyond descriptive data, such as frequency. Additionally, the size sample (38) was too small to generalize any conclusions to the larger population of all pre-service special education teachers.

Given the constraint of the inclusion criteria that limited my sample to one specific semester of students during one specific semester and given the amount of data I had planned to collect from the participants, in addition to the late start for introducing the study to participants, the short remaining duration of time to complete this study may have impeded its findings. I would have liked to spend more time with the participants, introducing the study, answering questions, teaching the lessons, and administering the data collection instruments. The topics of personal perceptions and social identity are sensitive in nature. More time to form trust with the participants might have yielded responses evidenced with greater transparency and reflection.

The two instruments I used to collect Social Identity data proved to be a limitation because they asked for incongruent data which made analysis difficult. One question on both the
Social Identity Wheel and the Adapted version of the Aspects of Identity Questionnaire -IV (AIQ-IV) asked participants to select which social class they most identify with. Whereas the Social Identity Wheel provided six options according to the group names (e.g., working class, upper-middle class, etc.), the Adapted version of the AIQ-IV listed five options according to annual family household income (e.g., under $25,000, $25,000-$49,000, etc.). Another question on both instruments asked participants to select their gender. They both gave users four options, but the options were not the same. The Social Identity Wheel offered a. woman, b. male, c. transgender, d. post-gender. The Adapted AIQ-IV offered a. non-binary, b. female, c. transgender, d. male. Additionally, directions in the Social Identity Wheel encouraged participants to write in their own preferred terms if they did not see a membership that best fit their identity. The AIQ-IV was an electronic instrument and did not have the capacity for write-ins. Finally, since social identities are socially constructed and often self-claimed, understanding what a group is solely by the name is not always intuitive (e.g. What is the difference between Upper Class and Owning Class?; Queer and Non-Binary?; Agnostic and Atheist?). Setting aside time to clarify social identity group names would have been helpful, and one instrument, not both, would have sufficed.

Another major limitation was the narrow demographics of the participants. Nearly 80% of the participants shared the same cultural lens of being either white, female, or both. Their personal life experiences likely differ, however there are societal benefits they have received because of their race or their majority presence in the schools. To extend the understanding of experiences, more research with participants from more diverse social identities should be completed.
Implications – *What Would This Mean?*

When I initially conceptualized this investigation, I knew that I wanted to end with a well-researched product that could be widely disseminated and add uniquely to the body of literature. The frustrating and pervasive problem of neglect (social, emotional, intellectual, etc) of multiply-marginalized students in the U.S. education system continues to be studied, but it is time to move away from the creation and implementation of programs in response to external attributions to the problem. There is a need for more internal gazing. This is personal.

My interest in researching this phenomenon stems from the years I was both a clinical supervisor of pre-service special education teachers during their practicum placements and also a faculty instructor for the same course from which the study’s expert sample came. I noticed that the course curriculum described problem behavior in broad terms while pre-service teachers encountered more specific examples in their clinical placements. Furthermore, the examples of problem behavior varied by school, school district, race/ethnicity, first language, cooperating teacher, and disability category being served. Because of the wide variance in definitions and because disciplinary consequences can carry with it life-altering effects, I became interested in better understanding the ways in which perceptions of problem behavior are formed during the critical years of teacher preparation.

My research questions targeted data surrounding pre-service special education teachers’ perception crafting of problem and permissible behavior. I also explored the influence of social identity on perception of problem behavior. I addressed all three questions through a research design that encouraged me to bridle my own assumptions and allowed me to think across theories to possibly produce new ways of understanding the phenomenon. Findings showed a patchwork of ways perception of problem behavior is crafted – the primary way stemming from
personal childhood experiences. The influence of social identity on perception was inconclusive. Implications for future practice and application are as follows:

TEPs may benefit from ensuring their curriculum provides learning experiences that help pre-service teachers: a) establish their individual OEA statement, as it pertains to children’s behavior; b) access recollections of childhood experiences; c) identify any formation-defining scenarios; d) acknowledge any assumptions of normality, bottom lines, & conclusions drawn from those experiences; e) compare how some assumptions may differ from their professed OEA statement; and f) determine how and/or why any discrepancies can and/or should be reconciled and re-aligned.

Furthermore, definitions of problem behavior held by cooperating teachers and administrators during pre-service teachers’ clinical placements may differ from their own professed OEA statement. TEPs may benefit from facilitating similar reflective exercises. Pre-service teachers should be provided opportunities to compare any discrepancies and to plan how and/or why better alignment can and/or should happen.

Results of this study have implications for special education teacher educators who are committed to complying with Illinois State Board of Education’s (ISBE) newly adopted Culturally Responsive Teaching and Leading Standards for teacher education programs. Results also have implications for school personnel interested in following the recently released guidance from the Department of Education that helps public K-12 schools avoid discriminatory use of discipline against students with disabilities.

Applications – What Can We Do?

The problem addressed in this paper is the overrepresentation of Black students with disabilities in the issuance of exclusionary discipline consequences in U.S. schools. Implicit bias
is known to influence discretionary interpretations of uncertain behaviors. The findings suggest that it may be a promising pathway to provide pre-service special education teachers with strategies to engage in consistent internal gazing to counterbalance the effects of implicit bias. Explicitly teaching strategies that require honest reflection and anti-racist planning is another step TEPs can take toward achieving equity in school discipline.

For the pre-service teacher, a substantial amount of perception formation happens during the school-age years (K-12), oftentimes from indirect lessons learned through vicarious or personal, school-based lived experiences. This can be problematic if any type of discrimination (e.g., race, disability, sex, age, religion, socio-economic status, etc.) played a part in singling out the student, naming the behavior as problematic, or determining the consequence as deserved.

Perceptions and knowledge are socially constructed and influenced by the social groups we identify with. This being true, teacher educators have at least two crucial responsibilities. First, they, themselves, must learn how to identify types of knowledge that reflect particular perspectives and OEA positions. Next, Banks would contend that teacher educators have a responsibility to prepare pre-service teachers “to become critical thinkers who have the knowledge, attitudes, skills, and commitments needed to participate in democratic action to help the nation close the gap between its ideals and its realities (Banks, 1993, p. 5).”

We also need to begin introducing teacher stress interventions and other protective factors in responding to stress within the TEP curricula. More and more, special educators are reporting high levels of stress in their positions (Cancio et al, 2018). Increased demands and decreased available resources can cause this stress. Likely, it will come with the position. Some byproducts of teacher stress is a decreased sense of efficacy, job satisfaction, student engagement and classroom management (von der Embse et al., 2019). Teachers’ classroom management
practices have a direct impact on student outcomes--social, emotional, academic, and behavioral (Gage et al., 2018).

This study has demonstrated that Teacher Education Programs are the primary places where pre-service special education teachers learn the theory behind what problem behavior is. But it is overwhelmingly from vicariously learned and personally-lived childhood experiences where they craft their perception of what both permissible and problem behaviors are in practice.

Other ways in which pre-service teachers craft their perception is through formal observations and lessons. Findings also reveal some of the ways in which pre-service special education teachers determine what qualifies as permissible classroom behavior is by determining what a behavior is not (according to their definition of problem behavior), through subjective measures, such as how a behavior makes them feel, how they perceive student behaviors are helping to maintain a productive learning environment, how respectful they perceive a student is being, and how minimal their auditory or visual imprint is in the classroom.

Finally, this study has presented a possible connection between race, SES, religion and perception of problem behavior. With this awareness, TEPs and teacher educators should commit to teaching pre-service special education teachers the what, how, and why of bridling. Genuinely and effectively implemented, the practice of bridling by pre-service teachers may help to keep TEPs in Illinois compliance with the CRTL standards. More importantly, it may aid in preventing the hyper punishing of Black students with disabilities by way of exclusionary disciplinary practices.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study surveyed a limited number of pre-service special education teachers enrolled in one specific course offered through a singular teacher education program at a medium-sized
midwestern state university. Because these findings are partial, contextual, and limited, this study should be used as a runway from which further studies launch to further understand if any of the “ways” by which pre-service special education teachers craft their perceptions of problem behavior are poisoned lines or blockages toward equity and growth.

Extensive data was collected and analyzed on the collective responses of participants, as it pertained to identification of students who exhibited problematic behavior in the video elicitation. What this research study did not do was take or analyze data on individual participants’ identifications of students. Individual responses would have been meaningful because, when cross analyzed with social identity information, SIO scores and saliency statements, it could possibly better answer RQ3. A deeper analysis using this missing information and a larger participant sample is recommended for future research on the topic. I also recommend, better yet request, future researchers explore possible answers to the critical questions presented throughout Chapter 5. Each question serves as seed for further studies.

Summary

I am not yet sure what changes to social justice and equitable access to education may come from this study on perception crafting. I am certain that I want to bring attention to the importance of engaging in critical internal gazes when addressing inequitable educational practices. I am not the first to propose this positional stance; work like this has been done for over thirty years. My goals are to meaningfully contribute to the existing body of work and to use what I learn from this study to affect change in how we teach about behavior in TEPs.
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APPENDIX A: SOCIAL IDENTITY WHEEL

1. Identities you think about most often

2. Identities you think about least often

3. Your own identities you would like to learn more about

4. Identities that have the strongest effect on how you perceive yourself

5. Identities that have the greatest effect on how others perceive you

Adapted for use by the Program on Intergroup Relations and the Spectrum Center, University of Michigan.

Resource hosted by LSA Inclusive Teaching Initiative, University of Michigan (http://sites.lsa.umich.edu/inclusive-teaching/).
Social Identity Groups

Social identity groups are based on the physical, social, and mental characteristics of individuals. They are sometimes obvious and clear, sometimes not obvious and unclear, often self claimed and frequently ascribed by others. For example, racial groupings are often ascribed as well as self-claimed. Government, schools, and employers often ask an individual to claim a racial identity group or simply ascribe one to an individual based on visual perception. Other social identities are personally claimed but not often announced or easily visually ascribed such as sexual orientation, religion, or disability status.

For the purpose of this self-examination please identify the memberships you claim or those ascribed to you. Below are examples of social identity groupings. Since issues of social identity often are the basis of much social conflict, it is reasonable to expect that even the terms we use to describe them may cause disagreement. So feel free to use your own preferred terms for the material below.

Examples
(Feel free to use your own language for your identities.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Woman, Man, Transgender, Post-Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Intersex, Female, Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Asian Pacific Islander, Native American, Latin@, Black, White, Bi/Multiracial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Irish, Chinese, Puerto Rican, Italian, Mohawk, Jewish, Guatemalan, Lebanese, European-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation/</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Pan-Attractional, Heterosexual, Queer, Attractionality, Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Spirituality</td>
<td>Hindu, Muslim, Buddhist, Jewish, Christian, Pagan, Agnostic, Faith/ Meaning, Atheist, Secular Humanist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class</td>
<td>Poor, Working Class, Lower-Middle Class, Upper-Middle Class, Owning Class, Ruling Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Child, Young Adult, Middle-Age Adult, Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dis)Ability</td>
<td>People with disabilities (cognitive, physical, emotional, etc.), Temporarily able-bodied, Temporarily disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation(s) of Origin and/or Citizenship</td>
<td>United States, Nigeria, Korea, Turkey, Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal or Indigenous Affiliation</td>
<td>Mohawk, Aboriginal, Navajo, Santal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Size/ Type</td>
<td>Fat, Person of Size, Thin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marginalized Group**: social identity groups that are disenfranchised and exploited

**Privileged Group**: social identity groups that hold unearned privileged in society

The Program on Intergroup Relations, University of Michigan
APPENDIX B: ASPECTS OF IDENTITY QUESTIONNAIRE (AIQ-IV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument Title</th>
<th>Aspects of Identity Questionnaire (AIQ-IV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Author</td>
<td>Cheek, J. M. &amp; Briggs, S. R.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AIQ - IV

INSTRUCTIONS: These items describe different aspects of identity. Please read each item carefully and consider how it applies to you. Fill in the blank next to each item by choosing a number from the scale below:

1 = Not important to my sense of who I am
2 = Slightly important to my sense of who I am
3 = Somewhat important to my sense of who I am
4 = Very important to my sense of who I am
5 = Extremely important to my sense of who I am

1. The things I own, my possessions
2. My personal values and moral standards
3. My popularity with other people
4. Being a part of the many generations of my family
5. My dreams and imagination
6. The ways in which other people react to what I say and do
7. My race or ethnic background
8. My personal goals and hopes for the future
9. My physical appearance: my height, my weight, and the shape of my body
10. My religion
11. My emotions and feelings
12. My reputation, what others think of me
13. Places where I live or where I was raised
14. My thoughts and ideas
15. My attractiveness to other people
16. My age, belonging to my age group or being part of my generation
17. My gestures and mannerisms, the impression I make on others
18. The ways I deal with my fears and anxieties
19. My sex, being a male or a female
20. My social behavior, such as the way I act when meeting people
21. My feeling of being a unique person, being distinct from others

Continued - (AIQ-IV, page 2)
1 = Not important to my sense of who I am
2 = Slightly important to my sense of who I am
3 = Somewhat important to my sense of who I am
4 = Very important to my sense of who I am
5 = Extremely important to my sense of who I am

22. My relationships with the people I feel close to
23. My social class, the economic group I belong to whether lower, middle, or upper class
24. My feeling of belonging to my community
25. Knowing that I continue to be essentially the same inside even though life involves many external changes
26. Being a good friend to those I really care about
27. My self-knowledge, my ideas about what kind of person I really am
28. My commitment to being a concerned relationship partner
29. My feeling of pride in my country, being proud to be a citizen
30. My physical abilities, being coordinated and good at athletic activities
31. Sharing significant experiences with my close friends
32. My personal self-evaluation, the private opinion I have of myself
33. Being a sports fan, identifying with a sports team
34. Having mutually satisfying personal relationships
35. Connecting on an intimate level with another person
36. My occupational choice and career plans
37. Developing caring relationships with others
38. My commitments on political issues or my political activities
39. My desire to understand the true thoughts and feelings of my best friend or romantic partner
40. My academic ability and performance, such as the grades I earn and comments I get from teachers
41. Having close bonds with other people
42. My language, such as my regional accent or dialect or a second language that I know
43. My feeling of connectedness with those I am close to
44. My role of being a student in college
45. My sexual orientation, whether heterosexual, homosexual, or bisexual
SCORING FOR AIQ-IV

[version 4, which adds RI to AIQ-IIIx, thus adding 10 new RI items and changing sequence = item # $ of some old items] (Summer 2001 for 2002 SPSP Poster)
For details of AIQ-IIIx and its History and Bibliography, see Identity Orientations.

PI = Personal Identity Orientation
RI = Relational Identity Orientation
SI = Social Identity Orientation
CI = Collective Identity Orientation
(SP = Special items [not scored on scales])

Each of the scale scores is the sum of the answers (1-5) given to those items.
For AIQ-IV 45 items, the scoring numbering is:

PI = 2 5 8 11 14 18 21 25 27 32 [sum of answers to 10 items]
RI = 22 26 28 31 34 35 37 39 41 43 ["" 10 items]
SI = 3 6 9 12 15 17 20 ["" 7 items]
CI = 4 7 10 13 24 29 38 42 ["" 8 items]
[SP = 1 16 19 23 30 33 36 40 44 45 (10 items not scored on scales)]**


***Additional use of an ad hoc "scale" of SP items and single items: In a set of analyses of additional data from the sample described above, Dollinger created a new AIQ-IIIx scale named "Academic Identity" by summing 3 SP items pertaining to the importance of career plans, academic performance, and the student role [AIQ-IIIx SP's # 30, 32, & 34; M =11.9, SD = 2.0] to relate to Achievement coding of the autophotography essays (obtained t = .27). In addition, the AIQ religion item [CI # 10] correlated .16 with the Religion photo code, and the AIQ-IIIx physical abilities item [AIQ-IIIx SP # 27] correlated .23 with the Athletics code for the autobiographical photo essays. (Dollinger, S. J. (1996). Autophotographic identities of young adults: With special reference to alcohol, athletics, achievement, religion and work. Journal of Personality Assessment, 67, 384-398.) ("Academic/college" on AIQ-IV = 36 40 44)

**Note: AIQ-IV #23 ('social class') loaded on both SI and CI in college students (especially on SI at Dartmouth) but we expect it should probably load as a CI item among non-college adults.

In general, the SP items are intended to provide at least single item assessment of the subjective importance of dimensions that have been included in various theories and measurement models of multidimensional self-esteem (e.g., Briggs, S. R. & Cheek, J. M. (1986). The role of factor analysis in the development and evaluation of personality scales. Journal of Personality, 54, 106-148.)
APPENDIX C: VIDEO ELICITATION QUESTIONS, TIME STAMPS, & RATIONALE

Note 1 (0:00) – “In this short dramatization, you will witness problematic classroom behavior from both the teacher and the students. Do not pay attention to the teacher's behavior (It will be addressed at another time.). In this exercise, you will pay close attention to student behavior and answer questions along the way.”

VEQ1 (0:05) – “In your own words, define problem behavior.”

_Rationale_: When we define something, we actually limit its meaning to something we can specifically conceptualize so we are better able to generalize it (Vocabulary.com, 2022).

By asking participants to define “problem behavior” I am compelling them to determine and clearly communicate the essential qualities and boundaries of the concept.

“How did you learn and where did you learn to identify what problem behavior is?”

_Rationale_: Responses to this question will contribute to the answer for the primary research study question: In what ways do pre-service special education teachers craft their perception of problem behavior?

VEQ2 (0:55) – “Describe the problem behavior you witnessed in the first 50 seconds of the video. 1. Describe the student(s) who displayed problem behavior.”

_Rationale_: I am interested in which student(s) were noted. I am also interested in the language used to identify the student(s).

“How did you learn and where did you learn to identify what problem behavior is?”

_Rationale_: I am interested in which behaviors are noticed. I am also interested in the language used to describe the behavior.

“How did you learn and where did you learn to identify what problem behavior is?”
**Rationale:** I am interested to see how closely their rationale aligns with their personal definition of problem behavior (from VEQ1)

VEQ3 (1:30); VEQ4 (2:05); VEQ5 (2:45); VEQ6 (3:17) – “Describe the problem behavior you witnessed in the previous section of this video.

1. Describe the student(s) who displayed problem behavior
2. Describe what the student(s) did that was problematic.
3. State why the behavior was a problem.”

**Rationale:** Same rationale as that from VEQ2

VEQ7 (3:37) – “After watching this video segment of a class lesson, answer the following prompts:

1. State which were the top two most problematic behaviors.”

**Rationale:** Problem behavior is only a problem because it is perceived to be one.

Research has uncovered that the identification of severe problem behavior rests more within the perceptions, feelings, and fears of schoolteachers than it does in the actual severity of the infraction. Of all the problem behaviors noted and described in VEQ2 through VEQ6, I am interested to see which classroom episodes participants determine to be the most severe or problematic.

“2. Support your claims; explain why you chose those two.”

**Rationale:** I am interested to see if any specific social norms or social rule violations are mentioned. I am also interested in what, if any, attributions to people/lessons/experiences that participants include in their explanation. Again, this helps to inform the answer to the primary research study question.
APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Name of Participant:
Date of Interview:
Scheduled Time of the Interview:
Start Time:  End Time:  Total Time:

(Participant’s Name) – First, I want to say Thank you for your participation in this study. My interest in this research stems from the years I was both a clinical supervisor of students during their practicum placements and also a faculty instructor teaching a class very similar to yours. I noticed that the course curriculum described problem behavior in broad terms but teacher candidates like yourself encountered more specific examples in your clinical placements. On top of that, those specific examples of problem behavior always seemed to vary by school district and by school, by cooperating teacher, disability category, and by the race-ethnicity of the students. Because of the wide variance in definitions and because disciplinary consequences can carry with it life-altering effects, I am interested in better understanding the ways in which perceptions of problem behavior are formed during the critical years of teacher preparation. This is a phenomenological study that explores the ways in which you have come to identify what problem behavior looks like. The following interview questions will be asked to all participants who volunteer to be interviewed. Remember the data collected in this study will remain confidential, and you may choose not to answer any question that you feel uncomfortable answering.
Research Questions:
RQ1. In what ways do pre-service special education teachers decide what qualifies as normal, or permissible, classroom behavior?

RQ2. What are the ways pre-service special education teachers learn to determine if behavior has deviated from normal to problematic?

RQ3. How does social identity influence pre-service special education teachers’ perception of problem behavior?

Interview Questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question Type (Bhattacharya, 2017)</th>
<th>Interview Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Background Information</td>
<td>Please tell me about yourself and what sparked your interest in becoming a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Background Information</td>
<td>Which population in special education are you most interested in working with? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>How would you describe normal, or permissible, classroom behavior? AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Are there any exceptions? Why would they qualify as exceptions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Task-Related Grand Tour</td>
<td>Can you describe the key places, people and situations in which you learned what normal, or permissible, classroom behavior should be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>How would you describe problem classroom behavior?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Are there any exceptions? Why would they qualify as exceptions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Task-Related Grand Tour</td>
<td>Can you describe the key places, people, and situations where you learned how to recognize what can verifiably be categorized as problem behavior?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Walk me through your most memorable experience with problematic classroom behavior. It could have happened in real life or something of fiction that you saw, read, or heard about. Try to recall and describe what you saw and felt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Specific Grand Tour</td>
<td>Let’s take a moment to dream a bit. Imagine yourself teaching in your dream classroom. Describe what you see. What does it sound like? Where is your school located?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>No classroom is perfect. If one of your dream students is exhibiting problem behavior, what might they be doing?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Interview Question</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Please tell me about yourself and what sparked your interest in becoming a teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Which population in special education are you most interested in working with? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How would you describe normal, or permissible, classroom behavior? AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Are there any exceptions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why would they qualify as exceptions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Can you describe the key places, people, and situations in which you learned what normal, or permissible, classroom behavior should be?</td>
<td>PLACES? PEOPLE? SITUATIONS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How would you describe problem classroom behavior? AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Are there any exceptions? Why would they qualify as exceptions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Can you describe the key places, people, and situations where you learned how to recognize what can verifiably be categorized as problem behavior?</td>
<td>PLACES? PEOPLE? SITUATIONS?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walk me through your most memorable experience with problematic classroom behavior. It could have happened in real life or something of fiction that you saw, read, or heard about.

Let’s take a moment to dream a bit. Imagine yourself teaching in your dream classroom. Describe what you see. What does it sound like? Where is your school located?

No classroom is perfect. If one of your dream students is exhibiting problem behavior, what might they be doing?

(Participant’s Name) -- Thank you for agreeing to this interview. I don’t take it for granted that you were willing to share your past experiences, present thoughts, and future dreams with me. I guarantee that your contribution to this research study is going to make a positive impact on the field of special education.

Is there anything more you’d like to add?
APPENDIX E: SOCIAL IDENTITY LESSON PLAN

| Lesson Overview | The Social Identity Wheel worksheet is an activity that encourages students to identify social identities and reflect on the various ways those identities become visible or more keenly felt at different times, and how those identities impact the ways others perceive or treat them. The worksheet prompts students to fill in various social identities (such as race, gender, sex, ability, disability, sexual orientation, etc.) and further categorize those identities, based on which matter most in their self-perception and which matter most in others’ perception of them. The Social Identity Wheel can be used as a prompt for small or large group discussion or reflective writing on identity. |
| Learner Objectives | 1. To encourage students to consider their identities critically and how identities are more or less keenly felt in different social contexts. 2. To illuminate how privilege operates to normalize some identities over others. 3. To sensitize students to their shared identities with their classmates, as well as the diversity of identities in the classroom, building community and encouraging empathy. |
| Steps | 1. Post different social identity categories around the room and have the students go through the list of questions (below), moving to the identity that best answers the question. Students can discuss with other students who chose the same identity. You can lead a debrief after the activity. 2. Have students complete the Social Identity Wheel worksheet.   a. First, circle identities on identity group page   b. Next, complete social identity wheel by placing a “1, 2, 3, 4, or 5” under the identity group that best matches the statement. |
| Challenges | 1. The students may not perceive the activity as relevant to the course and may exhibit resistance. |
2. Students may not be familiar with particular concepts, or they may have different assumptions about those concepts that the activity assumes.

3. If the wheel is used as a discussion prompt or if students are in close quarters and are able to see what their peers have written on their worksheets, this exercise may feel especially vulnerable to students with invisible identities that they may not want to disclose to the class.

Note: Disclosure in verbal or written form should always be voluntary and discussion questions should be broad enough that students can opt to not talk.

**Materials**

1. Social Identity Wheel handout
2. Social identity categories to post around room
3. List of questions

**Citations**

Adapted for use by the Program on Intergroup Relations and the Spectrum Center, University of Michigan

**Questions:**

1. What part of your identity do you think people first notice about you?
2. What part of your identity are you most comfortable sharing with other people?
3. What part of your identity are you least comfortable sharing with other people?
4. What part of your identity are you most proud of?
5. What part of your identity did you struggle the most with growing up?
6. What part of your identity is the most important to you?
7. What part of your identity is least important to you?
8. What part of other people’s identities do you notice first?
9. For what part of your identity do you feel you face oppression for most often?
10. For what part of your identity do you feel you receive privilege for most often?
11. For what part of your identity do you feel least comfortable with at this university?
12. Which of your own identities would you like to learn more about?
13. Which identity has the strongest effect on how you see yourself as a person?
14. What part of your identity do you see having the most effect on your interactions with students?
15. What part of students’ identities do you most often see affecting their interactions with you?
APPENDIX F: LOG IN INSTRUCTIONS FOR PHASES 1 & 2

Directions for completing the AIQ-IV & Video Elicitation

A) Aspects of Identity Questionnaire – IV (AIQ-IV)

INSTRUCTIONS: The first four items ask demographic information. The following 45 items describe different aspects of identity. Please read each item carefully and consider how it applies to you. It takes about 15 minutes to complete. You may skip any question you do not want to answer.

**IMPT:** Your Personal Class Code is __________

Fill in the blank next to each item by choosing a number from the scale below:
1 = Not important to my sense of who I am
2 = Slightly important to my sense of who I am
3 = Somewhat important to my sense of who I am
4 = Very important to my sense of who I am
5 = Extremely important to my sense of who I am

Here is the link: [https://illinoisstate.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_cYCLxpYuKtPZz26](https://illinoisstate.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_cYCLxpYuKtPZz26)

B) Video Elicitation using EdPuzzle

INSTRUCTIONS: In this short video, you will witness problematic classroom behavior from both the teacher and the students. *DO NOT* pay attention to the teacher's behavior. In this exercise, you will PAY CLOSE ATTENTION TO STUDENT BEHAVIOR and answer questions along the way. This activity should take no longer than 15 minutes.

**HOW TO LOG INTO EDPUZZLE**

1. Open the link: [https://edpuzzle.com/assignments/6309190a1368f2410ff054cd/watch](https://edpuzzle.com/assignments/6309190a1368f2410ff054cd/watch).
2. Do not log into your personal Edpuzzle account! Instead, select Sign Up
3. Select Sign up with Edpuzzle

IMPT: Your Personal Class Code is ______

Enter your assigned code in the First Name, Last Name, and Username,
Enter your assigned code 2x in the Password fields (Example: ZZ06ZZ06)

4. Select “Join Class”
Informed Consent Form - Coursework

The Crafting of Pre-Service Special Education Teachers’ Perceptions of Problem Behavior: A Post-Intentional Phenomenological Study

You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Jamillah Gilbert, PhD Candidate in the Educational Administration & Foundations (EAF) Department at Illinois State University (ISU).

What is the purpose of the study?
The purpose of this study is to understand the ways in which pre-service special education teachers craft, or form, their perception of problem behavior. The study is interested in what experiences contribute to how you define and identify problematic student behavior. There is no deception in this study. I am interested in hearing about your lived experiences as you prepare to become a successful and effective special education teacher.

Why are you being asked?
You have been asked to participate because we are interested in talking with undergraduate ISU special education teacher candidates: 1. who are currently enrolled in a special education foundations course that includes the topic of behavioral assessment as one of its primary course objectives and 2. who have not yet reached their student teaching semester. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You will not be penalized if you choose to skip parts of the study, not participate, or withdraw from the study at any time.

What would you do?
Regardless of whether or not you choose to participate in the research, as a student in your section of SED 388, you will be expected to participate in the following class activities: Social Identity Wheel activity, Aspects of Identity Questionnaire, and Video Elicitation. If you choose to participate in this study, you are giving me permission to use your responses and scores as part of my research data. You are also giving me permission to contact you at a later time to be interviewed. However, you won’t have to decide to participate in the interview until if/when you are contacted. The total time involved in the study will be one semester.

1. **Social Identity Wheel activity** – You will be asked to complete a Social Identity Wheel activity, which will take 10-15 minutes. This activity encourages participants to identify their various social identities and to reflect on the ways those identities impact the way they perceive or treat others and the ways others perceive or treat them.

2. **Aspects of Identity Questionnaire** – You will be asked to answer a 45-item questionnaire. The items describe different aspects of your identity. You will consider how each item applies to you. The questionnaire will take 15-20 minutes.

3. **Video Elicitation** – You will watch a 3.5-minute video dramatization of a middle school classroom scene, and you will answer four questions related to classroom behavior. The video elicitation will take 10-15 minutes.
Are any risks expected?
We do not anticipate any risks beyond those that would occur in everyday life. Self-reporting on personal topics such as perception and identities may present possible emotional discomfort. To reduce these risks, measures are in place to protect the identity of all participants. Moreover, you may withdraw at any time, and you may choose not to answer any question that you feel uncomfortable answering.

Will your information be protected?
We will use all reasonable efforts to keep any provided personal information confidential. All data will be coded, and your name will not be associated with them. In addition, the coded data will be made available only to the researchers associated with this project. After your data has been deidentified, your data may be used in other research projects. The recorded data will be destroyed after seven years. Information that may identify you or potentially lead to reidentification will not be released to individuals that are not on the research team. The research is being conducted for a dissertation in the EAF department at ISU. Once the study is completed, the findings will be published and accessible to the public online. However, when required by law or university policy, identifying information (including your signed consent form) may be seen or copied by authorized individuals.

Could your responses be used for other research?
We will not use any identifiable information from you in future research, but your deidentified information could be used for future research without additional consent from you.

Who will benefit from this study?
Though no incentives are offered for participation, potential benefits of this study apply to your academic role and your practitioner role. The information collected in this study can add to your self-awareness and your preparedness for classroom management. Understanding the ways in which future teachers form their perception of problem behavior will offer practical knowledge to researchers and teacher educators within higher education institutions. This knowledge can help to inform culturally responsive curriculum adoption. Additionally, the information collected in this study can add to the current scholarly literature in a way that may ultimately help to develop an explanatory theory of pre-service teachers’ learning about behavior identification & remediation during the critical years of teacher preparation. All of these potential benefits may provide gains for teachers, administration, policy makers, and most importantly the students.

Whom do you contact if you have any questions?
If you have any questions about the research or wish to withdraw from the study, contact

Primary Investigator/ Dissertation Committee Chair: Dr. Mohamed Nur Awaleh, manuraw@ilstu.edu

Co-Investigator/Researcher: Jamillah Gilbert, jrgilbe3@ilstu.edu

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, contact the Illinois State University Research Ethics & Compliance Office at (309) 438-5527 or IRB@ilstu.edu.

**Documentation of Consent**

Sign below if you are 18 or older and willing to participate in this study.

Signature _______________________________        Date ______________________

*You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

---

**Note:** If you would like a copy of the study findings, please include your e-mail address below:

___ Yes. I would like a copy of the study findings
   E-mail Address:

___ No. I would not like a copy of the study findings
The Crafting of Pre-Service Special Education Teachers’ Perceptions of Problem Behavior: A Post-Intentional Phenomenological Study

You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Jamillah Gilbert, PhD Candidate in the Educational Administration & Foundations (EAF) Department at Illinois State University (ISU).

What is the purpose of the study?
The purpose of this study is to understand the ways in which pre-service special education teachers craft, or form, their perception of problem behavior. The study is interested in what experiences contribute to how you define and identify problematic student behavior. There is no deception in this study. I am interested in hearing about your lived experiences as you prepare to become a successful and effective special education teacher.

Why are you being asked?
You have been asked to participate because we are interested in talking with undergraduate ISU special education teacher candidates: 1. who are currently enrolled in a special education foundations course that includes the topic of behavioral assessment as one of its primary course objectives and 2. who have not yet reached their student teaching semester. Your participation in the interview portion of this study is voluntary. You will not be penalized if you choose to skip some questions or withdraw from the interview at any time.

What would you do?
If you choose to participate in the one-to-one interview portion of this study, you will have a series of open-ended questions regarding your personal experiences that have contributed to your perception of what problem behavior in school looks like. Individual Interviews can be performed in person, via phone, or virtually and may take between 45-60 minutes. Note: Interviews will be audio recorded for accuracy and analysis purposes, and transcripts will be reviewed by the researcher.

Are any risks expected?
We do not anticipate any risks beyond those that would occur in everyday life. It is recognized that recording interviews can be discomforting to some people. Additionally, self-reporting on personal topics such as perception and identities may present possible emotional discomfort. To reduce these risks, measures are in place to protect the identity of all participants. Moreover, you may withdraw at any time, and you may choose not to answer any question that you feel uncomfortable answering.

Will your information be protected?
We will use all reasonable efforts to keep any provided personal information confidential. All data will be coded and your name will not be associated with them. In addition, the coded data will be made available only to the researchers associated with this project. Recorded data will be maintained on an external hard drive which will be stored in a secured environment when not in use.
use. After your data has been deidentified, your data may be used in other research projects. The recorded data will be destroyed after seven years. Information that may identify you or potentially lead to reidentification will not be released to individuals that are not on the research team. The research is being conducted for a dissertation in the EAF department at ISU. Once the study is completed, the findings will be published and accessible to the public online. However, when required by law or university policy, identifying information (including your signed consent form) may be seen or copied by authorized individuals.

Could your responses be used for other research?
We will not use any identifiable information from you in future research, but your deidentified information could be used for future research without additional consent from you.

Who will benefit from this study?
Though no incentives are offered for participation, potential benefits of this study apply to your academic role and your practitioner role. The information collected in this study can add to your self-awareness and your preparedness for classroom management. Understanding the ways in which future teachers form their perception of problem behavior will offer practical knowledge to researchers and teacher educators within higher education institutions. This knowledge can help to inform culturally responsive curriculum adoption. Additionally, the information collected in this study can add to the current scholarly literature in a way that may ultimately help to develop an explanatory theory of pre-service teachers’ learning about behavior identification & remediation during the critical years of teacher preparation. All of these potential benefits may provide gains for teachers, administration, policy makers, and most importantly the students.

Whom do you contact if you have any questions?
If you have any questions about the research or wish to withdraw from the study, contact

Primary Investigator/ Dissertation Committee Chair: Dr. Mohamed Nur Awaleh, manuraw@ilstu.edu

Co-Investigator/Researcher: Jamillah Gilbert, jrgilbe3@ilstu.edu

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, contact the Illinois State University Research Ethics & Compliance Office at (309) 438-5527 or IRB@ilstu.edu.

Documentation of Consent

Sign below if you are 18 or older and willing to participate in the individual interview portion of this study.

Signature __________________________________        Date ______________________

*You will be given a copy of this form for your records.
APPENDIX H: E-MAIL INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN INTERVIEWS

Hello (Student),

It was a joy meeting you in your SED 388 class earlier this month! I want to convey my sincere appreciation for you agreeing to participate in my research study. Again, the purpose of this study is to understand the ways in which pre-service special education teachers form their perception of problem behavior. I am interested in hearing about your personal experiences as you prepare to become a successful and effective special education teacher.

Would you be willing to sit for an interview with me? Interviews can be performed in person or virtually, and they may take between 45-60 minutes. Just as a reminder: This research study is completely unrelated to SED 388. Your participation in the interview would be voluntary, and your decision would have no impact on your SED 388 course. You may choose to skip some questions or withdraw from the interview at any time. I will be audio recording the interview for analysis purposes. Your name will not be associated with any of your responses, and the recorded data will be destroyed after seven years.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

(Researcher)

Reminder Email

“Hi (Student),

Thank you, again, for agreeing to interview with me tomorrow afternoon, (Day of the week), (Date), from (Start Time – End Time). My office is located in the (Location), room (#). The (Location) is located in the lower level of the (--) Center (the big lobby that connects This Building & That Building).

See you soon 😊!”

(Researcher)
APPENDIX I: PAGE ONE OF RESEARCHER’S POST-REFLEXION NOTEBOOK

Assumptions of Normality:

1. Human subjects in social settings tend to police their own thoughts and behaviors according to external expectations. Human subjects in social settings rarely ever live out their unbridled thoughts. Human behavior is an outgrowth of thought – conscious or unconscious. Humans are naturally inclined toward self-preservation. The study of phenomena within human subjects will always only provide a partial view. Meaningful, but partial.

Bottom Lines:

1. Knowledge is “partial, situated, endlessly deferred, and circulating through relations…” (Vagle, 2018, p. 188)”

2. Phenomena are always in flux, contextual, multiple, partial, and simultaneously producing while being produced (Vagle, 2018).

OEA Statement:

I believe that perception is:

1. Constructed from sensory data, emotions, expectations, prior and existing knowledge, and experiences

2. Informed by racism and ableism—two socially constructed systems that are connected, invisible, endemic, and presenting as a normal part of our society

3. Shaped by our identities (race, disability, class, gender, sexuality, etc.) in totality (impossible to separate) in both the doing (the perceiving) and the being (perceived)

4. The partial lens through which knowledge is known and through which phenomena are understood
DATE: 10/28/22

RECORD/NOTATE:
• Moments of instinctive resonance and dissonance
• Assumptions of normality
• Bottoms lines (beliefs, perceptions, perspectives, opinions) we refuse to shed
• Moments of shock

THINK ABOUT:
• My role as a researcher
• My assumptions, beliefs, perspectives, personal experiences

Assumption of normality:
-It is normal for teacher candidates in this particular TEP in this particular region of the state to be predominantly White and generally unaware of cultural considerations that can and need to be made when interacting with students.

Belief:
-The location and age of most memorable life experiences that impact our perspectives tend to mostly stem from elementary school and ages 5-11yrs.

Changing perspective:
-Yesterday, I wrote how I assumed pre-service teachers were more self-aware and passionate about becoming a teacher. I feel so embarrassed to admit this to myself, but at the same time, I also didn’t think pre-service teachers at this stage in the program, who are White and attending a TEP in this region of the state could authentically be as culturally competent as this student seemed to be. Today’s interviewee provided such authentically insightful responses to my questions about problem behavior that it was evident she was not simply reciting what she had read in a textbook, but what she understands and has adopted as truth.

-I was also surprised to hear how both yesterday’s and today’s interviewees attributed their decision to teaching special education from a personal experience in high school.
APPENDIX K: COLOR CODING SYSTEM FOR ANALYSIS OF VIDEO ELICITATION

Figure K.1. Examples of color-coding process of participant responses from video elicitation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMERGENT CODE</strong></td>
<td><strong>REFLECTIVE NOTE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEQ#5 (02:45) - Describe the problem behavior you witnessed in the previous section of this video.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Describe the student(s) who displayed problem behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Describe what the student(s) did that was problematic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. State why the behavior was a problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMERGENT CODE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFLECTIVE NOTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy in the front tapping pencil very loudly and boy in the back right throwing paper. This is problematic because the boy in the front was distracting other students and the boy in the back was destroying his paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people may think that the boy in the back had problematic behavior by standing up, but maybe he needed to pace, so I do not think it’s problematic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student in the front right is tapping pencil loudly and the aggravates student in the back row. The back row student crumples up newspaper and throws it. This is problematic because the student should not be throwing things in class and should not have ruined the assignment he was working on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One student gets up in the back and is not working on the reading. The student in the front left has still not started reading either, both students are not on task doing what they should be doing and this is problematic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTD; DIS; OFF; ANA; QOS; DIS; SUB; EXP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-VEQ2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-VEQ3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-VEQ4: “...not super harmful; but…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-VEQ5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-VEQ6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-VEQ7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure K.2. Example of color-coded participant responses to the video elicitation, emergent codes, and reflective notes
## APPENDIX L: EXAMPLE OF INTERVIEW ANALYSIS & NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview Notes</td>
<td>FF02</td>
<td>KK02</td>
<td>LL02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Tell me about yourself: Told about high school</td>
<td>Always wanted to be a teacher; Decided in h.s. to pursue special education</td>
<td>Biggest interest in becoming a Sp. Ed. teacher happened in h.s. as a mentor in art &amp; disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Population of interest: E.C.; early intervention; life skills</td>
<td>DHH &amp; LBS; More marketable</td>
<td>LBS1 &amp; Bi-lingual students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Describe normal behavior: (+) respectful to peers; (+) NOT disrupting learning of others; (+) PBIS: &quot;Be respectful. Be responsible. Be safe. Be ready to learn. EXCEPTIONS? No!&quot;</td>
<td>(+) any behavior that creates an environment where learning is a priority; (+) helps students feel safe; (+) fosters a good setting for learning; EXCEPTIONS? Yes! &quot;...unless it becomes unsafe to themselves or others or hinders learning.&quot;</td>
<td>(+) respecting teachers &amp; peers; (+) not using foul language; (-) not breaking class rules; EXCEPTIONS? Yes! &quot;I guess if its impacting their learning ... If they're not listening zoned out, it's not bad, but its problematic.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Where normal was learned: VIC; OBS; LSN; PCE; TEP</td>
<td>VIC; OBS; LSN; PCE; TEP</td>
<td>VIC; OBS; LSN; PCE; TEP</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Describing problem behavior: DI; SUB; EXP; HRM; REO</td>
<td>DIS; SUB; EXP; HRM; REO</td>
<td>DIS; SUB; EXP; HRM; REO</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Where problem was learned: VIC; OBS; LSN; PCE; TEP</td>
<td>VIC; OBS; LSN; PCE; TEP</td>
<td>VIC; OBS; LSN; PCE; TEP</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Most memorable experience &amp; Why memorable:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching; flexible seating; well-lit; K-3; adequate staff support; students communicating; working together; PROBLEM: damaging items HRM; physically hitting students; staff HRM; note: This description is more extreme than her memorable behavior from IO? Why? Is it b/c what me.</td>
<td>Teaching in sign language; older students, deaf students with learning disabilities, para-prof; students actively participating</td>
<td>Strong relationships with students; Students are empathetic &amp; understanding in their diversity; Students expressing their feelings &amp; working through conflicts together; PROBLEM: non-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semi-Structured Interview w/ KK02

Interview Date: 10/28/22     Interview Time: 2:00pm

Reminders:

☐ Review Assumptions of Normality, Bottom Lines, & OEA Statement
☐ Review Interview Notes for Participant
   ○ Reflect on the following 4Q-3Pa questions:
     ▪ In what moments do I instinctively connect with participant’s response? In what moments do I instinctively disconnect?
     ▪ What are my assumptions of normality?
     ▪ What are my bottom lines? What beliefs, perceptions, perspectives and opinions do I refuse to shed?
     ▪ In what moments am I shocked by a participant’s response?
☐ Review Post-Reflexion Notebook entry for Participant
   ○ Reflect on the following 4Q-3Pb questions:
     ▪ Where might I have retreated to either/or thinking?
     ▪ Where might I appear “certain” of what something means?
     ▪ Where might I have extended to something creative and intriguing, but then backed off to something a bit safer?
     ▪ Where might I appear “uncertain” of what something means?
☐ Review Research Journal entry from date of interview
☐ R.I.G.H.T. Analysis of Transcript
   Step 1 – Full text: (Whole) Read entire transcript.
   Step 2 – Deconstruct line-by-line #1: (Part) Identify focal meanings.
   Step 3 – Deconstruct line-by-line #2: (Part) Group focal meanings.
   Step 4 – Deconstruct line-by-line #3: (Part) Highlight meanings not previously identified
   Step 5 – Reconstruction: (Whole) Transfuse meanings
Interviewee FF02

Step 1: Interview Questions

1. Tell me about yourself: FF02 talked about high school.

2. Population of interest: Early childhood; early intervention; life skills

3. Description of permissible behavior: (+) respectful to peers; (-) NOT disrupting learning of others; (+) PBIS's "Be respectful. Be responsible. Be safe. Be ready to learn. EXCEPTIONS?
   No!

4. Where “normal”/permissible was learned: VIC; OBS; LSN; PCE

5. Describe problem behavior: HRM

6. Where problem behavior was learned: VIC; OBS; PCE

7. Most memorable experience with problem behavior: Scribbling out work; sliding in chair; laying down on floor; shoves rolling chair; Why? Nervous to be teaching, numerous behaviors; happened so quickly; disrupted direct instruction

8. Dream classroom and Problem behavior in dream classroom: Co-teaching; flexible seating; well-lit; K-3; adequate staff support; students communicating; working together; Problem Behavior: damaging items HRM; physically hitting students; staff HRM; Note: This description is more extreme than her memorable behavior from IQ7. Why? Is it b/c what we dream and what we experience are not always congruent? Pblem Bhvr in the imagination can look like typical extreme bhvr depicted in media. But bhvr in real life can be perceived as "problematic" w/o even crossing over into the category of "extreme", if the behavior leaves the teacher feeling powerless.

Step 2: Focal Meanings and Lines of Flight
1. Defining experience for decision to pursue special education: High school as a peer helper in a Life Skills program

2. Words/Phrases used to describe behavior: …quote normal…; unacceptable; intent v. impact; triggers

3. Focal meanings emerged from interview: relationships; individualize perception of and response to behaviors; intent v. impact; productive learning environment; cultural competence

**Step 3: Grouped Focal Meanings and Tentative Manifestations**

1. Shocking moments during interview: FF02 spoke about systemic things teachers put up with that initially turned her off to teaching but did not go into detail; recognizes individual needs & importance of considering cultures, contexts & communication styles; When asked who's to determine whether it's harmful, FF02 responded, "The recipient...the person who's being impacted by it."

2. Noticings during interview: I noticed FF02's memorable experience had more to do with their feelings of powerlessness and overwhelm than it had to do with their own description of what problem behavior looks like.

**Step 4: Post-Reflexions**

1. Where might I have retreated to either/or thinking? I believe that when a person reflects on defining moments in their life (for example, the circumstances that encouraged you to want to become a teacher), there should be a spark of excitement that is either reflected in their voice/tone/volume/rate, body/posture/movement, face/eyes/smile. This was not the case for FF02. They maintained a deadpan expression as they recalled their experience. *Note: This may be due to any number of reasons: a) Maybe they’re just not a demonstrative person; b)
Maybe there was something about the interview environment that was unsettling. For example, I did see them fan themselves a couple of times and pull their shirt from their skin as if they were sweaty; c) Maybe they were preoccupied with other thoughts and not fully present in the moment.

2. Where might I appear “certain” of what something means? I believe that when a person reflects on defining moments in their life (for example, the circumstances that encouraged you to want to become a teacher), there should be a spark of excitement that is either reflected in their voice/tone/volume/rate, body/posture/movement, face/eyes/smile. Note: This was not the case for FF02. They maintained a deadpan expression as they recalled their experience. This may be due to any number of reasons: a) Maybe they’re just not a demonstrative person; b) Maybe there was something about the interview environment that was unsettling. For example, I did see them fan themselves a couple of times and pull their shirt from their skin as if they were sweaty; c) Maybe they were preoccupied with other thoughts and not fully present in the moment.

3. Where might I have extended to something intriguing, then backed off to something safer? (None)


~~ Ponderings: This is only my first transcription, but I’m wondering how many participants recalled a male student when I inquired about a memorable recollection of problem classroom behavior.

-The interview went well. Pretty smoothly. No issues, except for the time the voice recorder feature on my laptop was temporarily interrupted by a pop-up window. I saw this happen in real-time and was able to click out of the window. But, as a result, I lost about fifteen seconds of recording. This is EXACTLY why I am glad I made the decision to record the interviews using two different tools. So, even though one recording has a spot with fifteen seconds of dead air time, the second recording captured the entire conversation.

-Once again, as I asked some of the questions, I realized I could re-word a few of them either to sound more natural or to read more clearly. I will make those changes for my next interview.~~
I am surprised at how quickly the interviews are wrapping up. Both the practice interview yesterday and the interview today were done in less than thirty minutes. I wonder if I should be doing more to probe further, or if this is ok. I will ask (advisor) next week. ~

~~ Ponderings: FF02's answers seemed to be guarded and surfcy. It seemed this way by how quickly she responded to the questions, her tone sounded non-committed/dismissive at times, and her body language and posture while sitting communicated uncertainty and guardedness. I wonder how I could have helped the participant feel more at ease. Was it my voice? Was it the location or the environment? Was it the seating arrangement? Were there any pre-conceived conceptions (or misconceptions) I could have addressed? If so, maybe I could have more effectively fostered deeper reflection and garnered deeper-thought answers. ~~

Interviewee KK02

Step 1: Interview Questions

1. Tell me about yourself: Always wanted to be a teacher; Decided in high school to pursue special education
2. Population of interest: Double certification: 1. Deaf and Hard of Hearing; 2. Learning and Behavior Specialist
3. Description of permissible behavior: (+) any behavior that creates an environment where learning is a priority; (+) helps students feel safe; (+) fosters a good setting for learning; EXCEPTIONS? Yes! "…unless it becomes unsafe to themselves or others or hinders learning."
4. Where “normal”/permissible was learned: PCE
5. Describe problem behavior: DIS; HRM
6. Where problem behavior was learned: PCE; TEP
7. Most memorable experience with problem behavior: student put glue stick in mouth; Why? problematic bc we had to deal with it for his safety
8. Dream classroom and Problem behavior in dream classroom: Teaching in sign language; older students; deaf students with learning disabilities; para-pros; students actively
participating; Problem Behavior: students not participating EXP; taking cochlear implants out EXP; closing eyes EXP; turning around EXP; eloping HRM; EXP

**Step 2: Focal Meanings and Lines of Flight**

1. Defining experience for decision to pursue special education: High School as a peer helper in an adapted P.E. program & TA in a high-support classroom

2. Words/Phrases used to describe behavior: When KK02 described behavior in theory, behavior is described as active, not passive: e.g., it creates an environment where learning is a priority; anything that with learning and a good relationship with the people in the classroom. However, KK02 remembered getting in trouble as a child for "doing kid things", not doing what they were "expected encourages a good relationship to be doing...", and "goofing off"

3. Focal meanings emerged from interview: Spoke of importance of knowing the "why" behind behavior; individualize perception of and response to behaviors; productive learning environment; language & cultural competency

**Step 3: Grouped Focal Meanings and Tentative Manifestations**

1. Shocking moments during interview: KK02 made an indirect reference to the need for cultural competence & responsiveness when they said the following statement: "That population of students who a normal LBS1 certified teacher would not really be able to serve well bc they don’t um speak the same language or understand the same things. Is something that is really kind of motivating me to stay in both.”

2. Noticings during interview: I noticed when KK02 described behavior from ideals and theory, behavior was active and not passive. However, when they referenced their childhood experiences with learning about behavior, behavior became passive, a response to match
authoritative expectations (EXP): e.g., “This is what you should be doing in a classroom.
This is what compliance looks like. These are the people who are in charge. These are the people you have to listen to.” This was also true when they described the problem behavior in their dream classrooms. Almost all of the examples were EXP infractions.

Step 4: Post-Reflexions

1. Where might I have retreated to either/or thinking? I admittedly noted my belief that the location and age of most memorable life experiences that impact our perspectives tend to mostly stem from elementary school and ages 5-11yrs. But I want to challenge this "either K-12...or TEP" thinking when I discuss perception of problem behavior. I hardly ever consider the influence of home, family, and community on perception of problem behavior, unless a participant refers to it. Is it because I'm investigating problem behavior in a classroom, specifically? Even so, our perceptions are heavily influenced by our life experiences, and not just life experiences in a school setting.

2. Where might I appear “certain” of what something means? I assumed it normal for teacher candidates in this particular TEP in this particular region of the state to be predominantly White and generally unaware of cultural considerations that can and need to be made when interacting with students. I feel so embarrassed to admit this to myself, but I didn’t think pre-service teachers at this stage in the program, who are White and attending a TEP in this region of the state could authentically be as culturally competent as KK02 seemed to be.

3. Where might I have extended to something intriguing, then backed off to something safer? KK02 provided such authentically insightful responses to my questions about problem behavior that it was evident she was not simply reciting what she had read in a textbook, but what she understands and has adopted as truth. Simply recognizing this observation is not
enough. I should and could extend this "noticing" to something intriguing by critically exploring the specifics of who, what, when and where KK02 attributed to be most influential in her coming to those understandings.

4. Where might I appear uncertain of what something means? I was surprised to hear how both FF02 and KK02 attributed their decision to teaching special education from a personal experience in high school. Note: I wonder why participants refer to early childhood school experiences when they pinpoint times they learned about classroom behavior. Yet, they refer to older childhood school experiences when they pinpoint the experiences that influenced their decision to become a special education teacher. Why? And is it telling that no one has yet to refer to a high school experience working with problem behavior that influenced their decision?

~~ Ponderings: -I was so impressed with the cultural competence of this participant. After the interview, I made a similar note, and they informed me to not be surprised if I come across many more during the interviews bc the TEP (per their report) “does a really good job” teaching them how to be culturally responsible.
-Compared to yesterday’s participant, it appeared like this participant was much more comfortable. I wonder what the difference was? Personality? Time of day? My presence?
-For the next interview, before conducting the interview, I want to be sure I intentionally think about my role as a researcher, my assumptions, beliefs, and personal experiences, and bridling as much as I can. This is a key practice in post-intentional phenomenological research, and I want to be sure I actually practice it and not just perform the steps. ~~

Interviewee LL02

Step 1: Interview Questions

1. Tell me about yourself: Their biggest interest in becoming a special education teacher happened in high school as a mentor in an included art class.

2. Population of interest: LBS1 & Bi-lingual students
3. Description of permissible behavior: (+) respecting teachers & peers; (-) not using foul
   language; (-) not breaking class rules; EXCEPTIONS? Yes! "I guess if it’s impacting their
   learning … If they're not listening/zoned out, it's not bad; but it's problematic."

4. Where “normal”/permissible was learned: OBS; PCE

5. Describe problem behavior: SUB; HRM

6. Where problem behavior was learned: VIC; OBS; PCE

7. Most memorable experience with problem behavior: Student cursing at a teacher

8. Dream classroom and Problem behavior in dream classroom: Strong relationships with
   students; Students are empathetic & understanding in their diversities; Students expressing
   their feelings & working though conflicts together; Problem Behavior: non-compliant
   because of distraction EXP; DIS; Note: This description differs from both their description of
   problem behavior (IQ5) that was almost all HRM and their memorable behavior from IQ7
   cursing.

Step 2: Focal Meanings and Lines of Flight

1. Defining experience for decision to pursue special education: High school, when partnered
   with a peer with a disability

2. Words/Phrases used to describe behavior: Impact of one behavior on another (safety, harm,
   hurt, lacking empathy); LL02 described behavior as actively impacting the environment: e.g.,
   "I find that problematic just because the classroom just feels very like it."; "it doesn't make it
   a safe ... environment for other students."; "…because it does throw off the ... environment
   for the whole classroom. It creates a hostile environment."
3. Focal meanings emerged from interview: relationships; feelings toward/about; intent (mal v. not mal); productive learning environment; language & cultural competency; Note: Yet LL02 made some culturally insensitive statements

Step 3: Grouped Focal Meanings and Tentative Manifestations

1. Shocking moments during interview: In IQ5b, LL02 referred to the importance of looking beyond the surface of the behavior and at the underlying intent. They described problem behavior by separating the behavior and its impact on the learning environment from the student: "I might still consider it a problem behavior, and the behavior still needs to be addressed. But my response might be different if there was no mal intent."

2. Noticings during interview: Note: LL02 recognized phenomena of misdiagnoses of a SLD or speech disability in ELL students, due to cultural-linguistic barriers, but did not mention phenomena of mis assessment of problem behavior due to cultural-linguistic barriers; LL02 often referred to how people and experienced made her feel; Also, LL02 usually explained what is not to describe what is. Relationship is important to LL02; In their answer to IQ3b, Note: LL02 drew a distinction between "bad" behavior and "problematic" behavior; LL02 made some assumptions: "Behaviors are being done, and no one's thinking about ... how that impacts the other one." AND "... and then it makes other students feel, like, scared or nervous."

Step 4: Post-Reflexions

1. Where might I have retreated to either/or thinking? I expected to hear more stories of memorable experiences from elementary school teachers, but the first 3 Interviewees have referred to their high school experience as being most influential. From my personal experience and from my generation, it was our grade schoolteachers who veteran teachers
like myself often reference when we reflect on our greatest influencers to become teachers. However, I’m not hearing that as much with this group. I wonder why? Is it because there are more opportunities now for students in gen ed. classes to mentor, buddy, and interact with students receiving special education supports than there were in the past? Or am I retreating to either/or thinking w/ elementary ed v. high school?

2. Where might I appear “certain” of what something means? I am understanding, more and more, that these pre-service teachers are thinking more critically about what problem behavior can be …and independent of any prompts from me. Today, LL02 described problem behavior by separating the behavior and its impact on the learning environment from the student. Note: Though the behavior is problematic because it is negatively affecting the learning environment, and must be dealt with, the child is not a problem child. Therefore, my response must be different, case-by-case.

3. Where might I have extended to something intriguing, then backed off to something safer? I noticed that LL02 spoke of "permissible behaviors" and then the opposite was referred to twice as "crazy" behavior. Note: Though, I understood what she meant, I wish I had probed a bit further to ask her to describe what "crazy" behavior is in her mind. I would have done this because I firmly believe language is powerful, and our word choices tell us about ourselves. Additionally, LL02 commented on how well-behaved her 5th grade class was but made an unconscious (I think) underhanded slight at CPS schools: "I think we had a pretty well-behaved class...and that was in CPS too." Note: I wish I had probed further to uncover what assumptions she was expecting me to make by mentioning "that was in CPS too." Was I expected to be shocked that a CPS class could be well-behaved? If so, then why? According to Chicago Public Schools website (2023), 82.3% of the current racial makeup of CPS
students is either Hispanic or Black, 72.7% are economically disadvantaged, 22.4% are English Learners (ELL), and 15.3% have IEPs.

4. Where might I appear uncertain of what something means? LL02 said, "But now I see those behaviors more often, and I think now I almost. I want to say they're normalized, but it's not a huge deal. "It's just you just have to tackle it." Note: I am uncertain of what LL02 means when they say, "You just have to tackle it." What is being assumed? Does "tackle" mean address the behavior? If so, how might this behavior be classified? (Classroom-Managed? Office-Managed?) The answer to that will provoke the direction and level to which the behavior is "addressed." What if the manner in which the behavior is "tackled" instigates or escalates the behavior?

~~ Ponderings: I am becoming more comfortable with the process/logistics. For example, I prepare the paperwork ahead of time, I set up the recording mechanisms ahead of time, and I assemble the seating. I also take a bit more time to welcome the interviewee, engage in chit chat, and offer them a snack of their choosing (open access snacks I always have available for all individuals who visit my office). As a result, I am noticing an increase in comfort with the interviewees. These changes are noted by their relaxed posture, frequent smiles, and increased eye contact with me before, during, and after the interview. -I still feel as if I want to probe deeper after some responses. However, I am also hyper-aware to not ask leading questions. I know that summarizing is an indicator of active listening. At times, I feel like summarizing an interviewee’s response to help lead into a follow-up question or to transition to the next interview question. But I want to be careful not to overpower or underwrite their voice and experience by summarizing from my own understanding. I will do some reading over the rest of this week to help give me guidance on what to do from this point forward. ~~

Interviewee XX02

Step 1: Interview Questions

1. Tell me about yourself: Described themself as having a love for learning and a positive experience in school.

2. Population of interest: Life skills; Still deciding
3. Description of permissible behavior: (+) eyes on board; (+) on task; (+) following along; (+) equal participation; (+) respectful language; (+) taking turns; (+) raising hand; (-) not being distracted 

EXCEPTIONS? Yes! Depends on activity OR if student has other needs (like moving, fidgeting, alternative seating...but staying engaged)

4. Where “normal”/permissible was learned: VIC; PCE

5. Describe problem behavior: EXP; HRM

6. Where problem behavior was learned: VIC; PCE

7. Most memorable experience with problem behavior: HS Lunchroom, there was a huge physical altercation that involved security guards

8. Dream classroom and Problem behavior in dream classroom: high school classroom; smaller class size; Instructional setting; Group tables in rows & flexible seating option in back; teacher's desk in front; sensory area in back; students enjoying talking with one another; friendly interactions and sharing stories with one another; students eager to be attentive; 

Would like to move to Colorado to a school that has funding and resources needed. 

*Note: This classroom layout resembles the old school "classic" classroom; Problem Behavior: off-task behavior EXP; talk-outs EXP; off-topic EXP; non-compliance EXP

**Step 2: Focal Meanings and Lines of Flight**

1. Defining experience for decision to pursue special education: No specific defining experience; overall, love for learning and positive experience in high school

2. Words/Phrases used to describe behavior: Twice in the interview, XX02 described problem behavior as behavior that adversely impacts teacher instruction & other students' learning. 

*Note: They never mentioned any type of behavior that disturbs the student's own learning.*
3. Focal meanings emerged from interview: individualize perception of and response to behaviors; productive learning environment; follow expectations

**Step 3: Grouped Focal Meanings and Tentative Manifestations**

1. Shocking moments during interview: (None)

2. Noticings during interview: I noticed XX02 exchanged the word "permissible" for "expected"; When XX02 was asked to describe permissible behavior, they shared examples of classroom expectations (eyes on board, raise hand, follow along, etc.). They also described the possible result ("didn't get into trouble much") and intention ("didn't want to let parents & teachers down" EXP) behind a student's demonstration of permissible behavior, as opposed to describing the actual behavior. Even XX02's explanation of exceptions to IQ5 and the problem behavior in his dream classroom centered on pleasing others, meeting their expectations, and not disrupting others. *Note: People-pleasing - XX02 seems to highly esteem the approval of others and meeting others' expectations.*

**Step 4: Post-Reflexions**

1. Where might I have retreated to *either/or* thinking? I noticed XX02 applied more critical thought to their responses as I probed further. For example, when I asked them to describe “permissible classroom behavior” IQ3 and “problem classroom behavior” IQ4, their responses were what some might consider as standard and expected. In IQ3b and IQ4b, I asked if there were any exceptions. Both times, they hesitated and seemed confused by the question. As they began to answer, and I probed further for more clarity, the responses included thoughtful consideration of possible reasons/scenarios for exceptions. Both times, this surprised me, because I had begun to believe XX02’s worldview was limited to one of a typical suburban, middle-class high-incidence, low-severity, standard.
2. Where might I appear “certain” of what something means? I am fairly certain that it is no coincidence that XX02 is a pre-service teacher who is so beholden to following expectations and pleasing authority figures and also dreaming of a traditional, old-school classroom set up; *Note: I believe XX02 shared their honest-to-goodness thoughts, ideas, and dreams. But I also believe that their worldview in which they perceive, think and dream is limited to the confines of the world they lived.*

3. Where might I have extended to something intriguing, then backed off to something safer? I saw how XX02 periodically looked to me for affirmation and assurance, as they answered the interview questions. At times it seemed as if they responded as if they were in a job interview, hoping to impress me with their answers. I believe they have successfully fulfilled the roles of “good son”, “good brother”, “good friend”, “good student”, etc., so much and so often that they were hoping to win me over with “good interviewee”. I wonder how much of their answers were sincere and honest and how much was role-playing. Maybe role-playing (and the positive consequences he received as a result) was so endemic that they’ve (posturing and sincerely responding) become one-in-the-same.

4. Where might I appear uncertain of what something means? When describing why they wanted to go into teaching, XX02 said this: "I want to be able to replicate this, which maybe it means teaching in that same area, same school. Or Maybe it means going somewhere else and trying to have … build that same sort of environment in a different school." *Note: I wonder what XX02 means by "build"? They used the word "replicate", and that makes me wonder if their desire is to attempt to repeat the same or similar environment and experiences they had in school. Hopeful thinking and planning is great; but I worry about the rigidity and blind spots that go along with trying to repeat history.*
Ponderings: I anticipate these last three transcripts will take considerably longer, because the interviews lasted about ten minutes longer. I think the longer interview times can be attributed to two factors: First, as I became more familiar with the interview process, I felt more comfortable to slow down and take more time to build rapport. Second, with more experience interviewing, I increasingly understood the importance of allowing the participants to take their time in thinking and responding. I also grew more apt to ask follow-up and/or clarifying questions. Interestingly though, with each interview, I became more committed to sticking to the script.

Interviewee UU02

Step 1: Interview Questions

1. Tell me about yourself: Identified self as a member of an ethnic minority group during growing up years; ESL; struggling reader
2. Population of interest: Life Skills; Academic; high school
3. Description of permissible behavior: (+) following directions; (-) no distractions or disruptions; (+) going with the flow; EXCEPTIONS? No! “It wouldn’t be considered problematic if, let's say, a student is not engaged.”
4. Where “normal”/permissible was learned: LSN; PCE
5. Describe problem behavior: DIS; HRM; REO
6. Where problem behavior was learned: PCE
7. Most memorable experience with problem behavior: As a child, getting first Red Card in class. Why memorable? Traumatic to disappoint, embarrassing; No bad behavior after that. Heard story of a student who threw desks, yelled and screamed. Why memorable? other students had to be protected. Note: UU02 exhibited people-pleasing behaviors
8. Dream classroom and Problem behavior in dream classroom: High school CPS (Pilsin or Cicero); I see students sitting @ their desks; I'm reading a book or teaching and having other adults in the room; I am the only one talking; Students are listening to me. Note: This sounds
like a traditional "old school" classroom, where students are seen and not heard, and everything is in neat order. Problem Behavior: Student is interrupting DIS; EXP, disrespectful to me or their peers; SUB.

Step 2: Focal Meanings and Lines of Flight

1. Defining experience for decision to pursue special education: Growing up, UU02 never had a teacher they could relate to. They want to be the kind of role model to their students that they never had as a child.

2. Words/Phrases used to describe behavior: "Slowing down learning of other kids" I would find the reason, or the why, behind the student acting that way; If it's daily, then it is problematic; I'd want to find out the reason for the continued behavior.

3. Focal meanings emerged from interview: Spoke of importance of knowing the "why" behind behavior; individualize perception of and response to behaviors productive learning environment

Step 3: Grouped Focal Meanings and Tentative Manifestations

1. Shocking moments during interview: I find it intriguing (more than shocking) that UU02 mentioned the importance of being sensitive to the "why" behind behavior. But, twice they alluded to seeking understanding to the why behind recurring misbehavior. Note: What if the misbehavior is not reoccurring? Does that no longer warrant an analysis of the function? What is it about recurring behavior that UU02 can relate to and sit with longer than one-time incidents of mayhem or disruption?

2. Noticings during interview: I found it interesting when UU02 said, "I'm trying to get my words." Note: Was this because they were trying to find the perfect words for the perfect response? or Were they simply trying to find the words for their most honest response? I also
noticed that I tended to get more from UU02 from probing further. They were not always forthright with details. At one point, I clarified UU02's response by summarizing what they said, and then I asked, "Am I correct?" Instead of confirming or disconfirming, they asked, "Is that what you want?" Note: UU02 seems to be hyperconscious of saying and doing things in the "right" way. I wonder if their hyperawareness of RIGHT and WRONG of their own behavior is an awareness that they bring into their own classroom?

Step 4: Post-Reflexions

1. Where might I have retreated to either/or thinking? As the interview progressed, I began to change my initial suspicion that today’s participant was not fully being transparent. Initially, I felt as if they were trying to say the right words and neatly respond to the messiness of the situations I verbally painted. However, I think I may be wrong. From certain responses, recollections, and descriptions…even in their dream scenario, the participant valued neatness and all things aligned to rule-following and order. This still may be indicative of some influencing cultural and language factors, or it may not be. Note: But, what if it's not either/or? What if the truth lies somewhere in the middle or even outside of those dichotomies? And if so, what might that even mean for this study? Well, for one: A teacher who values neatness, order, and rule-following may be quick to call anything that even slightly deviates from expectations as "deviant" or "problematic".

2. Where might I appear “certain” of what something means? I believe culture and language may have interfered with today’s participant fully being transparent in her responses. I believe this because a couple of times during the interview, they mentioned the difficulty they were facing describing in “words” what they wanted to say. They even stated, “I’m
trying to get my words.” This statement, alone, is not a common phrase such as, “I’m trying to find my words.”

3. Where might I have extended to something intriguing, then backed off to something safer? When UU02 discussed how, when, where, and from who they learned what problematic classroom behavior was, they said, "That's when I knew like. Oh, that's a problem behavior like I shouldn't be … shouldn't ever do that because I would get in trouble." Note: I wish I had probed further the reason behind their self-correction from "be" to "do". I just wonder how closely UU02 equates problem behavior with "being" as opposed to "doing".


**Interviewee RR02**

**Step 1: Interview Questions**

1. Tell me about yourself: RR02 described favorite pastime activities, personal life experiences, and their own personality

2. Population of interest: High school age; Disability program type is “not as important as respect.”

3. Description of permissible behavior: (+) students sitting at desks; (+) doing work; (+) paying attention to the teacher; (+) eyes toward front; (+) raising hands; (+) students respecting one another; EXCEPTIONS? Depends! Depends on student's intentions Note: RR02 often had responses that I found difficult to make sense of. I had a hard time following their lines of thought.

4. Where “normal”/permissible was learned: PCE

5. Describe problem behavior: SUB

6. Where problem behavior was learned: PCE
7. Most memorable experience with problem behavior: In current placement, a student was on their device, not listening to the clean version of a song. Student got into a yelling match with the teacher. It escalated to where the student and teacher were pushing each other. Why Problematic? Because it became physically aggressive.

8. Dream classroom and Problem behavior in dream classroom: Teaching in same high school they attended; Smartboard, desks in groups, kids smiling and laughing; Teacher stands up front teaching; pictures of family on teacher desk; paraprofessionals & aides; bell-ringing; pencils on paper; pens clicking; talking in general. "It's a happy place." PROBLEM: Students hitting each other HRM; verbally abusing each other HRM

~~ Ponderings: After re-reading my 12/15/22 journal entry, I see how I made the statement, "...I became more committed to sticking to the script." Well...that quickly changed. This increase in text from dialogue mostly came from how off-script I got during the interviews. I heard myself immediately providing further detail and explanation to the questions for clarification, even before there was any indication from the participants that they even needed it. This is not what I was aiming for. I really did want to hear from the participants more and less of my own voice. I should note, however, that I felt more comfortable and personable and sounded less sterile and rehearsed when I organically went off script. I noticed the more comfortable I felt and sounded the more comfortable (relaxed posture, smiling, etc.) the participants appeared during the interviews. I should also note that some of my excess talking came from me re-reading participant responses to refresh their memory in preparation for a follow-up question. I also did this in instances where participants would unknowingly answer an upcoming question in part. During those times, I would ask the question, re-read their previous response and ask if they had more to add to elaborate on their pre-mature answer. ~~

Step 2: Focal Meanings and Lines of Flight

1. Defining experience for decision to pursue special education: In high school, joined the special education club and fell in love with the field. Also, coached Unified Sports team. Enjoyed watching students have fun and play together.

2. Words/Phrases used to describe behavior: Problem behavior is more "sporadic"--not always expected.
3. Focal meanings emerged from interview: respect; togetherness; familiarity

Step 3: Grouped Focal Meanings and Tentative Manifestations

1. Shocking moments during interview: I was shocked to realize that RR02 was neither a deep nor critical thinker. RR02 admitted that his dream classroom would be in his old high school. He said he didn't "like change much" and it would be "getting back to the school that guided me." *Note: This statement aligns with so much of the cocoon/encasing/embalming of time and life experiences that RR02 seem to value.*

2. Noticings during interview: I notice RR02 expects and values quiet compliance. RR02 said that if a student is triggered from "past trauma", then he would be willing to not be so quick to label behavior as "problem". *Note: On the surface, this appears to be a trauma-informed consideration. However, the way RR02 phrased their answer made it clear that these determinations were very subjective and conditional-heavy. The "If they were triggered, then ... But if not, then..." All of the "if's" are according to teacher assessment and perception. I noticed the only time RR02 spoke with certainty the entire interview was when he insisted that he would never tolerate physical or verbal abuse in his classroom.*

Step 4: Post-Reflexions

1. Where might I have retreated to either/or thinking? Re Dream Classroom: "It's a happy place." *Note: I wonder if "happy" is the presence of some things or the absence of some things? But I also wonder if it needs to be either/or.*

2. Where might I appear “certain” of what something means? From the interview, I noticed that RR02 often centered their own view, experiences, thoughts, values, and expectations. From that centering, they drew conclusions concerning student behavior and intent behind behavior.
3. Where might I have extended to something intriguing, then backed off to something safer?

   Note: This participant’s responses so much mirrored the responses of the only other male interviewee that I am beginning to wonder if the commonality was influenced by the fact that they: a. graduated from the same high school (1 year apart); b. grew up in similar socio-economic & geographic situations; c. were of the same sex and gender; d. if it was just coincidental; or e. if it was a little of both?


   ~~~ Ponderings: It is becoming clear that, though I did my best to reassure participants that they are free to: a. take their time in answering; b. answer honestly, without worry of retribution; c. be their authentic self in any space I occupy; c. provide, what some may consider to be, messy answers because this “is not a test or quiz with right and wrong answers”, the majority of the participants who interviewed still remained guarded to a degree, searching for the “right” answers, and experiencing brain freeze at times. I’m starting to question what I could have done differently to design the interview in a way that would put participants at greater ease. Greater ease might produce more complete details of lived experiences. ~~~