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Aims

• Identify the characteristics of EBD pupils and to evaluate the stakes concerning their inclusion.

• Understanding the influence of teachers representations in their classroom practices.

• Reflect on evidence based practices:
  • What could really work in the classroom?
  • How to adapt what research shows for classroom practice?

• Student-teachers’ mobility as an asset in knowing different means of dealing with disturbing behaviors → openness.
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1. Background

- School inclusion $\rightarrow$ European educational policies touchstone.

- BUT EBD $\rightarrow$ greatest challenge to inclusion $\rightarrow$ debate about the best schooling modality for these pupils (p. ex. Coleman, Webber & Algozzine, 2008).

- Difficult behaviours + lack of support $\rightarrow$ stress and burnout risk for teachers (Doudin, Curchod-Ruedi, & Baumberger, 2009 ; Tsouloupas, Carson, Matthews, Grawitch, & Barber, 2010).

- Exclusion = teachers way to protect themselves from stressful situations and to last in their jobs (Doudin, Curchod-Ruedi, & Lafortune, 2010).
2. Behavioural problems in inclusive settings
2.1 Definitions

In research, there are three main conceptions:

- Psychopathological:
  - Conduct disorders
  - Opositionnal disorder
  - ADHD
  - Intermittent explosive disorder

- Psychoeducational

- Psychodevelopmental

- EBD
  - Behavioural difficulties
2.1 Characteristics of pupils with EBD

(Bradley, Doolittle, & Bartolotta, 2008)

Placement:
• 82% are in regular schools but spend 30% in special classes;
• 18% are in institutional settings;

In class:
• Less class participation;
• Lower grades;
• More severe punishments (64% disciplinary exclusion);

Long term:
• High risk → substance abuse and relational problems;
• High dropout risk (56% obtain a high school diploma);
• Employment difficulties;
• High involvement with the justice system.
What’s the situation in Switzerland?

Graphique 4.4. Proportion d’élèves présentant des troubles affectifs ou comportementaux dans le primaire et le premier cycle du secondaire, ventilés par structure d’accueil et par pays

Pourcentage selon la structure d’accueil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GRC*</th>
<th>PRT</th>
<th>CZE</th>
<th>NZL*</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>IRL*</th>
<th>CHE</th>
<th>ESP</th>
<th>AUT</th>
<th>NLD</th>
<th>BEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes ordinaires</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>70.58</td>
<td>85.17</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>47.13</td>
<td>68.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>60.94</td>
<td>31.92</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes spéciales</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.13</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>79.80</td>
<td>34.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>64.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Écoles spéciales</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>31.13</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>39.06</td>
<td>67.62</td>
<td>95.15</td>
<td>97.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(OCDE, 2000)
## SWITZERLAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Notes and sources used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of compulsory school aged pupils <em>(including those with SEN)</em></td>
<td><strong>Public Sector</strong> 713,325</td>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong> 44,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary 432,673</td>
<td>Secondary 280,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary 22,180</td>
<td>Secondary 21,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of compulsory school aged pupils who have SEN <em>(in all educational settings)</em></td>
<td><strong>Public Sector</strong> 24,737</td>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong> 12,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary 15,781</td>
<td>Secondary 8,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary 7,074</td>
<td>Secondary 5,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pupils with SEN in segregated special schools</td>
<td><strong>Public Sector</strong> -</td>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong> -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary -</td>
<td>Secondary -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pupils with SEN in segregated special classes in mainstream schools</td>
<td><strong>Public Sector</strong> -</td>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong> -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary -</td>
<td>Secondary -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pupils with SEN in fully inclusive settings</td>
<td><strong>Public Sector</strong> -</td>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong> -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary -</td>
<td>Secondary -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Inclusion/Exclusion: what do we actually talk about?

**Inclusion** (Vienneau, 2004, p. 129).

1. The full-time pedagogical inclusion of all students in a class with pupils of their same age;
2. The participation in all the learning activities of the group and in school’s social life;
3. The individualisation of the teaching-learning process.

**Exclusion** (Booth & Ainscow, 2002).

A temporary or long-lasting situation which impedes the full participation of the student in the regular school system.
2.2.1 School inclusion consequences

+ 

- Better performances in mathematics (Peetsma, Vergeer, Roeleveld, & Karsten, 2001).
- Positive models $\rightarrow$ peer tutoring or buddy system (Davis & Florian, 2004).

−

- Less availability of professional services in regular schools (Kaufman, Bantz, & McCullough, 2002).
2.2.2. Exclusion consequences

- Rupture, loss of references \(\text{(Doudin & Erkohen-Marküs, 2000)}\)

- Highlights school failure \(\text{(Doudin & Curchod-Ruedi, 2012)}\)

- Subjective experience: “destruction of the self” \(\text{(Dubet, 2000)}\)

- Deterioration of students’ behaviours and of their school results due to peer social reinforcement \(\text{(Gifford-Smith, Dodge, Dishion, & McCord, 2005)}\)
3. Teachers perceptions of their Pupils’ behaviours
Exercise: draw a house in a sheet of paper (5 min.)
According to teachers, behavioural difficulties consist in: (Schürch, 2014)

* Therefore, teachers’ definitions do not always match the ones which are used in research! → Collaboration difficulties + research – practice gap.
Research shows that some characteristics influence teachers’ manner of perceiving their pupils’ behaviours and their way of reacting to them:

3.1 Influence of teachers’ characteristics

- Attitudes (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002)
- Emotion-regulation abilities (Doudin, Curchod-Ruedi, Meylan, & Moreau, 2011)
- Self-efficacy (Almog & Shechtman, 2007)
- Stereotypes (Reyna, 2000)
Attitudes

An evaluative process of the person facing different objects which are present in their environment (Fiske & Taylor, 2011)

• Three components:
  • Affective
  • Cognitive
  • Conative

In a general manner, research shows that teachers’ hold negative attitudes towards school inclusion of pupils with behavioural difficulties (ex. Avramidis & Norwich, 2002).
Self-regulation sources

Personal efficacy

(Bandura, 1995)

Emotion regulation abilities

(Doudin, Curchod-Ruedi, & Meylan, 2013)
Stereotypes
Stereotypes in school

• Influence teachers’ expectations

• May become a self-fulfilling prophecy

• Related to different characteristics:
  • Gender
  • Socio-economical level
  • Origin
  • Child with/without a diagnostic
Stereotypes influence teachers’ perceptions and their practices
Aims at:

Understanding the influence of novice student-teachers’ characteristics in their tendency to include or to exclude pupils with behavioural difficulties.
3.2.1 We analyze:

1. The links between
   - attitudes towards inclusion,
   - self-efficacy,
   - burnout dimensions (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, reduced efficacy),
   - emotion regulation abilities (emotions felt – emotions shown)

2. The influence of these factors on their declared tendencies to include a pupil with behavioural difficulties (based on a case vignette).
3.2.2 Methods

Population

218 first-year student teachers from a Swiss teacher university (13% male, 87% female, mean of age = 21.9 years).

Instruments

- Attitudes towards the inclusion of pupils with EBD scale (MacFarlane & Woolfson, 2013);
- Discipline and classroom management self-efficacy scale (Emmer & Hickman, 1991);
- Maslach Burnout inventory, students version (MBI-SS, Schaufeli, Martinez, Pinto, Salanova, & Bakker, 2002);
- Teachers emotion regulation questionnaire (Curchod-Ruedi & Doudin, 2009);
- Inclusive-exclusive practices questionnaire.
3.2.3 Results

A) Factor correlations

Attitudes ($r = .37, p < 0.01$) and self-efficacy ($r = .30, p < 0.01$) show a significant positive correlation with students’ tendencies to inclusion.

Emotional exhaustion ($r = -.14, p < 0.05$) and emotions shown ($r = -.17, p < 0.05$) show a significant negative correlation with students’ tendencies to inclusion.

B) Hierarchical regression analyses

Emotions shown and exhaustion did not significantly predict tendencies to include, however attitudes and self-efficacy did significantly predict these tendencies and explained 17% of the variance.
4. Evidence-based practices for the classroom
4.1 Research-based practices: some examples

Classroom Management:
Predominance of behavioural and cognitive-behavioural interventions.

Behavioural strategies
• Rewards
• Punishments (ex. Recess suppression)

Cognitive-behavioural strategies
• Self-regulation training programmes
• Aggression management programmes

Importance of favouring positive interventions → PBS support, (Sugai & Horner, 2002).
Social skills training

Most of these pupils present difficult interpersonal relations with their peers and adults (Landrum, Tankersley, & Kauffman, 2003).

Interventions difficult to evaluate because of:

1. Lack of generalisation
2. Lack of reliability criteria
3. Difficult to evaluate the improvement of these pupils

Generally, these interventions are highly contested → Replacement Behaviour training (Maag, 2005).
Collaborative practices

Importance of a multidisciplinary collaborative practice is indisputable.

Team-schools: a model of collaboration (Heath et al., 2004).

• Each school → team of professionals who work with teachers through a consultative approach.

Effects:

• improving of pupils’ self-image and the reduction of internalizing symptoms.

• greater tolerance by teachers and more inclusive views, caused by a better understanding of these pupils’ difficulties.
5. What is the reality in the classrooms?

"Well, Timmy, it looks like you’ve just earned yourself 10 minutes in the cage with Mr. Whiskers."

http://www.behavioradvisor.com/WhiskersTigerCartoon.JPG
Teachers’ classroom management practices

Teachers rarely base their classroom practice in research results.

Most of the time, these interventions are very specific and difficult to generalise.

Some examples of the strategies that are the most frequently used by teachers are (Schürch & Doudin, 2014):

- Behaviour contracts
- Admonitions
- Direct instructions
- Praise and reward
6. Mobility and Teacher education

Which advantages can be inferred about student teachers’ mobility related to classroom management and attitude changes?

(Sierra et al., 2011)
7. Conclusions

Developing positive attitudes towards inclusion and enhancing student teachers’ sense of self-efficacy, most particularly linked to behavioural difficulties management, seems an essential objective of future teachers’ education.

This could promote equality and better social conditions and learning for students most at risk.

Mobility can be an aid to this objective, by reinforcing students’ self-efficacy and by broadening their minds…
Can you help me, Mrs. Martin? This wasn't covered in any of my education courses.
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**B) Prédicteurs des tendances à l’inclusion ou à l’exclusion**

Analyse de régression hiérarchique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>ET b</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacité</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacité</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Épuisement</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Émotions montrées</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** $R^2 = .14$ for step 1, \(\Delta R^2 = .17\) for step 2, \((p < .001)\) and \(\Delta R^2 = .20\) for step 3 \((p < .05)\)
Using the enter method it was found that attitudes (F(1,216) = 33.765, p < .001, R^2 = .14, R^2_{Adjusted} = .13), self-efficacy (F(2,215) = 22.53, p < .001, R^2 = .17, R^2_{Adjusted} = .17), exhaustion and emotions shown (F(4,213) = 10.74, p < .001, R^2 = .20, R^2_{Adjusted} = .18) explain a significant amount of the variance in the tendencies to include or to exclude these pupils.

Emotions shown and exhaustion did not significantly predict tendencies to include (Beta = -.01, t(19) = 1.17, ns), however attitudes and self-efficacy did significantly predict these tendencies (Beta = .50, t(19) = 2.53, p < .05).