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ABSTRACT

Black, Male, and Poor

The Intersection of Social Identities Effects on Special Education Evaluation Referrals for Emotional Disturbance

A Qualitative Study

Advisor: Susan Semel, Ed. D

Black male students, when compared to the total Special Education population, are disproportionately placed under the Emotional Disturbance category. Special Education evaluations, referred by general education teachers, lead to most Special Education placement (UFT, n.d.; Smeets & Roeleveld, 2016; & Woodson & Harris, 2018). This study was qualitative research via narrative inquiry. Two research questions investigated teacher participant responses to fictional vignettes and interviews: (1) Is the intersection of social identities of BMS, such as race, gender, and SES, responsible for how general education teachers respond to disruptive behaviors identical to externalizing ED traits in the classroom; and (2) Is it more likely for general education teachers to refer Black male students, regardless of socioeconomic status, than White male students with low- socioeconomic status for Special Education evaluation?

The vignettes used in this study encompassed three male students, aged 11, exhibiting academic and behavioral challenges identical to the externalizing behavioral traits for Emotional Disturbance in a general education classroom. The dependent variable was gender- male. The independent variables were race (Black or White) and socioeconomic status (low or middle). Findings show that Special Education evaluation referrals by general education teachers increase if students are Black, male, and have low-socioeconomic status. Black male students’ academic and behavioral challenges in general education classrooms eventually place them in Special Education for Emotional Disturbance.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

General education (GE) teachers request special education (SE) evaluations that eventually lead to most SE placement (Smeets & Roeleveld, 2016; UFT, n.d.; Woodson & Harris, 2018). Their perceptions of race, gender, and SES (socioeconomic status) heavily influence the decision process. Consequently, Black male students (BMS), when compared to the total SE population, are disproportionately placed in SE under the Emotional Disturbance (ED) category. I contend that BMS' intersection of race, gender, and SES increase their chances of being evaluated for SE under the ED category.

Statistical Evidence of Overrepresentation

Statistical evidence supports that there is a disproportionality of BMS in the SE category for ED when compared to the total SE and ED disability populations. In the 2018-2019 school year, there were 50.6 million students enrolled in public schools (NCES, n.d.a). White students accounted for 23.7 million public school students, and Black students accounted for 7.7 million (NCES, n.d.a). Within the U.S. public school population, 14% (7.1 million) of students between the ages of 3 and 21, received SE services (NCES, n.d.b). White students are the majority population in public schools. However, the percentage of students served under IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) was second highest among Black students at 16% compared to White students at 14%. In 2017, male students made up 67% of the SE system when compared to female students (NCES, n.d.b). Also, 7% of Black students received more services for ED in comparison to the 5% of all students (White, Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and Two or More Races) in the ED disability population (NCES, n.d.b).
Figure 1. Amount of White and Black Students in U.S. Public Schools. This figure illustrates that White students outnumber Black students in public schools.

Figure 2. Amount of White and Black Students in Special Education. This figure illustrates the disproportionality of Black students in SE compared to White students.
Figure 3. Black Students Categorized Under Emotional Disturbance Disability Compared to Other Races. This figure illustrates the disproportionality of Black students compared to all the other races in SE for the ED category.

Special Education Legislation

U.S. legislation has been implemented to improve educational equality. The Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA) of 1974 prohibits discrimination and racial segregation of students (Education Law, n.d.). It requires that school districts take measures in eradicating hindrances to students' participating equally in educational environments (Education Law, n.d.). IDEA provides students with disabilities Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) (Hulett, 2009). IDEA maintains that students should be appropriately evaluated and then placed in SE services (Hulett, 2009).

In 2016, the U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights issued documents to assist states, districts, and schools (including magnet and charter schools) with guidelines in recognizing, redressing, and preventing racial discrimination in SE because of disproportionality (Harper, 2017; Wrightslaw, n.d.). These documents explain the Title VI requirement that students
of all races, colors, and national origins have equitable access to GE interventions, a timely referral for an evaluation, and equitable treatment in the evaluation process (Wrightsaw, n.d.).

**Definition of Emotional Disturbance**

Emotional Disturbance (ED) is defined as a “condition exhibiting [at least one of five] characteristics over a long period and to a marked degree that adversely affects a child’s educational performance” (IDEA, n.d., paragraph 9):

1. An inability to learn that cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory or health factors;
2. An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers;
3. Inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances;
4. A generally pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; and
5. A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems (IDEA, n.d., paragraph 9).

Behavior Intervention Plans, IEPs (Individual Education Plan), and adjustments in the classroom environment support students with ED identification (Garrett-Hatfield, 2017).

IDEA’s definition of ED disability is obscure and questionable (Weinberg & Weinberg, 1990). The behaviors exhibited by one set of students may not occur with another set of students with the same diagnoses. Also, “a long period” is not an absolute quantity for specificity. Labeled students with ED may be performing poorly due to lack of motivation, not inability. States are left to develop criteria and interpretations for ED eligibility, leaving students inconsistently diagnosed. In other words, a student may qualify or unqualify for SE under the ED category depending on what state he or she resides (Weinberg & Weinberg, 1990).
There are two types of behavioral traits associated with ED: internalizing and externalizing (Emotional Disturbances, n.d.). Internalizing behavior characteristics include low self-esteem, depression, anti-sociability, inexplainable poor academic achievement, suicidal tendencies, substance abuse, anxiety disorders, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), specific phobias (e.g. autophobia, social phobia, etc.) obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), panic disorder, and eating disorder such as anorexia or bulimia (Emotional Disturbances, n.d.). Unexplainable poor academic achievement and the diagnoses of disorders such as Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), Oppositional Defiant Disorder (ODD), Conduct Disorder, and Bipolar Disorder are externalizing ED behaviors (Emotional Disturbance, n.d.).

Students exhibiting externalizing ED behaviors cannot control their anger, frustration, and failure. They tend to insult, provoke, threaten, bully, curse, and fight others, along with other forms of aggression (Emotional Disturbance, n.d.; NASET, n.d.). Gender wise, males are referred for SE services under the ED category more often than females (NCES, n.d.b). Also, male students are more likely to have externalizing behavior traits of ED. Whereas, female students are more likely to have internalizing behavior traits of ED (Emotional Disturbance, n.d.). There is a disproportionality of male students in the ED disability population. Externalizing ED behaviors such as deficits in attention, hyperactivity, talking back, cursing, non-compliance with authority (e.g. refusal to do work), fighting, throwing objects in the classroom (e.g. chairs, tables, etc.), calling out, and getting out of one’s seat without permission, disrupt with classroom instruction and are diagnosed more than internalizing behaviors (Emotional Disturbance, n.d.; NASET, n.d.). The focus of this study was externalizing ED behaviors in the GE classroom.

Civil rights organizations (Muhammad, 2016; NEA, n.d.a) question the price of SE for BMS labeled under the ED category as a remedy for disciplinary infractions in school because of
the increases of SE services over the last five years in the US (Marino, 2017). According to IDEA (n.d.), a disability label provides students with ED additional support in school environments so that they can have an equal accessible education as students without disabilities. However, the ED label stigmatizes students, isolates them from their peers, exposes them to a weak curriculum, and limits their access to higher education, especially when segregated in restrictive classroom settings (Bal, Betters-Bubon, & Fish, 2008). In 2015, only 3% of Black and Hispanic students with disabilities measured in reading proficiency, while less than 1% measured in math proficiency (Harper, 2017). In 2017, Black students with disabilities had the lowest percentage (64%) of graduating with regular high school diplomas compared to white students with disabilities (74%) (NCES, n.d.b). Students identified with ED have lower graduation rates than other students in SE (Samuels, 2018). At least 73% of youths, labeled with ED and who drop out of school, were arrested within five years (Mader & Butrymowicz, 2014).

Moreover, students with ED are often suspended, expelled, and miss the chance to learn with their peers (Bal et al. (2008); Lopez, 2018;). They are more likely than other students with disabilities to face long-term suspension or expulsion (Samuels, 2018). In 2014, less than 40% of the school day, 17% percent of Black students with disabilities were placed in restrictive classrooms, when compared to 11% of White students with disabilities (Harper, 2017). In the 2016-2017 school year, fewer than half of students in the ED category spent most of the day in a GE classroom (Harper, 2017). 13% of students with ED disability were in separate schools compared to the 3% of students with all disabilities (Samuels, 2018). Students with disabilities at 12% compared to students without disabilities at 5% were more likely to receive at least one out of school suspension (Harper, 2017). Suspension, specifically, has a high correlation with
increased dropout rates, grade retention, and contact with the juvenile justice system (Harper, 2017).

**Problem Statement**

BMS, even without disabilities, are more likely to be disciplined via out of school suspensions, in-school suspensions, referrals to law enforcement, expulsion, corporal punishment, and school arrests when compared to White students (Lopez, 2018). Tragically, BMS with ED are more likely to drop out of school and end up incarcerated as adults than BMS without disabilities (Cowan, 2016; Blake, Perez, & Daresbourg, 2010).

**Purpose of Study**

This study focused on the influence of BMS’ intersectionality of gender, race, and SES upon teachers’ perceptions of academic and behavioral challenges identical to externalizing ED behaviors. It investigated teachers’ perceptions of students when referring SE evaluations of which eventually lead to many BMS disproportionately placed into SE under the classification of ED. The results of this research will be used by teachers so that they can be aware of intersectional biases that could affect their pedagogical practices and interactions with students who may have disruptive behaviors in the classroom.

**Research Questions**

**Question 1**: Is the intersection of social identities of BMS, such as race, gender, and SES, responsible for how GE teachers respond to students’ academic and behavioral challenges identical to externalizing ED traits in the classroom?
**Question 2:** Is it more likely for GE teachers to refer BMS, regardless of SES, than White male students with low-SES for SE evaluation?

Chapter One discussed statistical evidence of the disproportionality of BMS in SE and ED disability category. It also discussed the legislation administered to remedy the unequal learning environments for students with disabilities and disparities in teacher requests for SE evaluations. Three additional chapters follow. Chapter Two provides a discussion about the SE evaluation process, theoretical frameworks, and research that may be responsible for teachers’ biases in race, gender, and SES influencing SE evaluation referrals. Chapter Three provides an outline of the study. Chapter Four presents the conclusion of which discusses the limits and possible future research for this study.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

An examination of the SE evaluation process is warranted because there are specific formalities that GE teachers and schools must undertake before evaluating students for disabilities. Critical Race Theory (CRT), Gender Order Theory, Culture Deficit Theory, and Intersectionality Theory can be used to analyze implicit biases and overgeneralized perceptions. Self-Fulfillment Prophecy Theory and Labeling Theory can analyze how teachers implicitly form positive or negative assumptions about their students and how these assumptions form pedagogical practices. This literature review provides a discussion about the SE evaluation process, theoretical frameworks, and research that may be responsible for teachers’ biases in race, gender, and SES influencing SE evaluation referrals.

**Special Education Evaluation Process**

An examination of the SE evaluation process is justified because the disadvantages outweigh the advantages of BMS under the ED category. According to Project IDEAL (n.d.), the three phases before SE evaluation are Recognition, Pre-Referral, and Referral for SE evaluation. In the Recognition phase, the GE teacher recognizes that the student has a low academic, socio-emotional, and/or behavioral performance for his/her age. The teacher confers with the student's family and provides anecdotal notes on the academic, socioemotional, and/or behavioral needs along with student work samples. The teacher and student's family document strategies utilized with the student and the progress made. Academic, socio-emotional, and/or behavioral performance are observed for signs of progress, and the student's family is informed. If there is no improvement, then the teacher notifies the student's family that the Response to Intervention (RTI) team will be involved (Project IDEAL, n.d.; UFT, n.d.). This action initiates the next phase, Pre-Referral.
The Response to Intervention (RTI) is a formalistic pre-referral process used by NYC schools during the Pre-Referral Phase (Project IDEAL, n.d.; UFT, n.d.). It identifies, develops, and implements alternative education strategies for students with recognized problems in the GE classroom. The RTI team consists of the GE teacher, all other teachers the student may have (e.g. art, music, gym, etc.), school counselor, an administrator (e.g. principal, school director, assistant principal, dean, etc.) specialists in literacy, math, and behavior, other school staff with whom the student is in contact, and the student’s family.

There are three Tiers in the RTI process (Project IDEAL, n.d.; UFT, n.d.). Tier 1 focuses on high-quality GE instruction within the standard curriculum and is theorized to be successful with 80% of pre-referral students (Project IDEAL, n.d.). Tier 1 should show student improvement. If performance does not improve, then students are moved to Tier 2. Tier 2 provides targeted group instruction with remediation to improve performance (Project IDEAL, n.d.). For example, literacy and math specialists instructing small groups in reading and mathematics skills. 15% of pre-referral students are theorized to be successful in Tier 2. If performance does not improve in Tier 2, then students are moved to Tier 3. Tier 3 consists of individualized interventions such as instruction catered only to the needs of the student (Project IDEAL, n.d.). RTI provides students with all the necessary interventions before SE evaluations. Every adult involved in the Pre-referral process must be in communication with one another about the progress of the student (Project IDEAL, n.d.; UFT, n.d.). If these interventions fail, then a SE evaluation takes place. SE evaluations should not take place when students do not receive interventions, or if there is a miscommunication among adults about the student’s progress (UFT, n.d.).

Therefore, a SE evaluation is the last resort for when a student continues to have trouble in the GE classroom setting after interventions (Project IDEAL, n.d.; UFT, n.d.). This official
evaluation referral by the principal begins the formal process of determining eligibility for student placement in SE services (UFT, n.d.). Parental/guardian consent is needed to initiate the SE evaluation (Project IDEAL, n.d.; UFT, n.d.). The RTI multidisciplinary team consists of the following experts in the SE evaluation: (1) the Educational Diagnostician, i.e., Psychometrist; (2) School Psychologists; (3) Special Educators; (4) all of the student's classroom teachers; (5) Related Service providers such as Physical Therapist, Occupational Therapist, Audiologist, Orientation and Mobility Specialist; (6) and/or medical doctors such as psychiatrists, ophthalmologists, and optometrists. These experts, along with parent(s)/guardian(s), provide multifaceted perspectives during the evaluation (Project IDEAL, n.d.). The school district must complete the SE evaluation within 60 days of referral. Parent(s)/guardian(s) rely on the convictions of the RTI team before giving consent for SE placement. The multidisciplinary team relies upon the student's interaction with his or her teachers. Teachers persuade SE evaluations for placement via their perspectives about the student's progress and choice of students' work (Bachoe & Fagley, 2011).

**Theoretical Frameworks on Gender, Racial, and SES Biases**

*Racial Bias.* Critical Race Theory (CRT) asserts that race is a social construct based on the belief that the superior race is White (UCLA, 2009). This social construct influences prejudicial normalcy against non-whites within American society (UCLA, 2009). CRT in education calls for GE teachers to investigate their perceptions and see if these perceptions obtain any implicit racial biases- instinctive, unconscious stereotyping and judgment along with racial undertones (Xie, 2015). Teachers need to understand that many of their perceptions about race are constructed in institutional racism, even if they do not think they have racial biases. Though there is legislation
prohibiting discrimination, such as the Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA) of 1974, 
racial stratification and disparities remain within institutional racism. Institutional racism exists in employment, housing, education, healthcare, and government.

Institutional racism differentiates from individual racism. Institutional racism is bias geared toward a group of people within the political, socioeconomic, and educational power structures that form institutions. Individual racism involves a person’s beliefs, attitudes, and actions based on stereotypes or prejudices against another race. Institutional racism is more detrimental than individual racism because it is ingrained in US society. It establishes inequality with an immobile societal transformation for equability (Ture & Hamilton, 1967). It reprehends and denigrates Black Americans through legislation and consensus of the status quo, i.e., the way of life for minorities as inferior to White Americans. Also, institutional racism benefits White Americans because it provides them wealth, privilege, and political power. Historical events such as slavery, segregation, along with surfeit incarceration rates of Black Americans are examples of political power structures grounded in institutionalized racism (Feagin, 2000).

For there to be an equal opportunity in education, minorities, specifically, BMS, would have to have access to the same curriculum, instruction, funding, and facilities as White students (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ledesma, M. C., & Calderon, 2015). Minority students, specifically, BMS students, are more likely to attend economically disadvantaged schools because most children attend schools in neighborhoods segregated by race and income. Due to inadequate funding, high-poverty schools are accountable for miseducating children who need more supports and services. Subsequently, this leads to a growing population of BMS who are underprepared for college and

---

1 Prohibits discrimination against faculty, staff, and students, including racial segregation of students, and requires school districts to take action to overcome barriers to students’ equal participation. It is one of a number of laws affecting educational institutions including the Rehabilitation Act (1973), Individuals with Education Act (IDEA) and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (Revolvy, n.d.).
the workforce. CRT asserts that these contingencies are the effects of white privilege (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ledesma, M. C., & Calderon, 2015; NEA, n.d.b).

**Gender Bias.** According to Conell (2005), Hegemonic Masculinity, included in Gender Order Theory, postulates why there are traditionally male-dominant social roles over women and other gender identities such as gay, transgender, transsexual, and bisexual. It analyzes why heteronormative masculinity considers certain behaviors as feminine. The following behavioral and psychological traits categorizes heteronormative masculinity: (1) aggression; (2) violence; (3) bravery; (4) emotional restraint; (5) physical strength; (6) athleticism; (6) competitiveness; (7) power; and (8) success. Some men in society feel pressured to conform and relate to these traits, which perpetuate a structure of gender-based hierarchy. Men, who do not conform to traditional masculine psychological and behavioral traits, are subordinated and socially marginalized in society. Men who do conform are said to partake in toxic masculinity.

As a reaction to second-wave feminism in the late 1980s, toxic masculinity originated in the Mythopoetic Men's Movement\(^2\) (McCombs, 1991). Toxic masculinity broadened itself to the field of psychology. It evolved to include the following labels as masculine stereotypes toxic for society: (1) socially dominant; (2) misogynistic; (3) homophobic; (4) rapist; (5) domestically violent; (6) bullies; (7) aggressive; (8) self-reliant; and (9) emotional repressed (Salam, 2019). Traditionally masculine traits such as devotion to work, athleticism, and providing for one’s family are not considered toxic, and these traits benefit society (Salam, 2019).

The socialization of boys normalizes toxic masculine stereotypes. In school, boys tend to prove their masculinity by displaying behaviors that are considered less feminine such as self-

---

\(^2\) Leaders of the mythopoetic men's movement believe that modernization led to the feminization of men. It encompassed self-help activities, workshops, and retreats for men (McCombs, 1991).
reliance, emotional repression, strength, and athleticism in fear of being bullied or ostracized (Frosh, Phoenix, & Pattman, 2003; Veissiere, 2018). Moreover, the media socializes girls that traditionally masculine behaviors are protective, honorable, are more attractive (Frosh et al., 2003). As a result, boys try to impress the opposite sex by displaying traditionally masculine attributes in school settings (Frosh et al., 2003; Veissiere, 2018). It is common for boys to display aggression toward other boys because they do not want to appear weak or feminine (Frosh et al., 2003; Veissiere, 2018). In the classroom, boys are less likely to ask for help, especially from female teachers and express their frustration due to failure via defiant acts such as talking back, noncompliance to do work or throwing desks (Maag, 2012). Unfortunately, display of these traditionally masculine psychological and behavioral traits lead to boys being suspended, expelled, or placed in SE classes for ED.

There are disparities between boys and girls in education. Overall, girls outperform boys in schooling (Jackson & Hillard, 2013):

- Boys receive lower report-card grades. [They] are far more likely to be grade repeaters. [They] suffer hyperactivity and stress nine times more frequently than girls. [They] are identified for special education more. Boys receive greater behavioral penalties. Boys comprise 70% of school suspensions. [They] are 80% of high school dropouts. [They] make up less than 44% of college populations. Boys, on average, are a year to a year and a half behind girls in reading and writing, according to the U.S. Department of Education (Jackson & Hillard, 2013, pp. 311-312).

Educational practices in classrooms are counter-productive and biased because boys have different learning approaches than girls. According to Jackson and Hillard (2013), boys are
perceived as academically deficient when, in fact, it is because of the ineffectiveness of the school environment and teaching practices. Perceived deficiency is also because boys have not physically developed the skill for required school tasks. According to Gurian and Stevens (2005), the cerebral cortex (responsible for memory, attention, thought, and language) and hippocampus (a region responsible for verbal memory storage) develop verbal skills in girls faster than boys. This part of the brain is responsible for vocabulary acquisition used for reading and fine-motor skills used for writing (Bonomo, 2010). It helps girls to retain sensory memory details, to multitask, and to make transitions easier than boys (Bonomo, 2010).

On the other hand, according to Gurian and Stevens (2005), the cerebral cortex is responsible for boys developing spatial and mechanical functioning four years faster than girls. Unlike girls, boys learn better by moving and with pictures, not just verbal cues. There are also biochemical differences in the brain when comparing boys and girls. Boys have less serotonin and oxytocin hormones (responsible for regulating social behavior and calmness) than girls. For this reason, boys act impulsively and fidget a lot.

Consequently, schools penalize boys for being defiant and misdiagnosed them for behavioral and learning disabilities. They cannot sit still, nor remain quiet for long periods compared to girls (Bonomo, 2010). Boys and girls can learn the same material, but how they learn should be different (Bonomo, 2010; Gurian & Stevens, 2005). Most teachers’ pedagogical styles are biased and geared toward girls.

**Socioeconomic Status Bias.** SES comprises an assortment of determinants: education completion, economic security, neighborhood, and consensus of perceived social class and status (Sadovnik, Cookson, & Semel, 2018). It consists of three levels- upper, middle, and lower (Sadovnik et al., 2018). SES translates into observable behaviors, such as dialects, accents,
preferences, manners, and styles attributed to each SES level (Simandan, 2018). Middle and upper-SES attributes and behaviors are associated with intelligence, and low-SES with ignorance (Simandan, 2018). SES, race, and ethnicity are often interconnected, making neighborhoods segregated. Low economic development, poor health conditions, and low levels of educational attainment are characteristics of neighborhoods with low-SES (Sadovnik et al., 2018).

Long term adverse effects on learning, behavior, and health, are connected to low-SES in childhood (Sadovnik et al., 2018). Low-SES is correlated with deficiencies in cognitive development, language acquisition, phonological awareness, vocabulary, memory, and socioemotional development (Sadovnik et al., 2018). Children with low-SES develop academic skills slower than children with middle or upper-SES (Sadovnik et al., 2018). Households with low-SES have less access to learning materials and experiences (e.g., computers, educational toys, cognitive skill-building activities, or tutors) (Sadovnik et al., 2018). Low-SES is correlated with students’ lack of concentration, indifference, and noncooperation in school (Morgan, Farkas, Hillemeier, & Maczuga, 2009). Children, with low-SES, endure more life hardships such as homelessness and inadequate health care that causes increase academic failure (Sadovnik et al., 2018). They also suffer depression because of perceived family economic stress that, in turn, negatively affects their academic outcomes (Sadovnik et al., 2018).

SES determines the quality of education that children receive (Sadovnik et al., 2018). Schools in low-SES communities are under-resourced, which adversely affects students’ academic achievement (Sadovnik et al., 2018). Higher family income leads to better educational opportunities because schools in upper or middle SES neighborhoods are better funded (Sadovnik et al., 2018). Low-SES schools are less likely to have qualified teachers with years of experience
and professional development (Sadovnik et al., 2018). Students with low-SES have higher school drop-out rates and graduate underprepared for college studies (Sadovnik et al., 2018).

Cultural Deficit Theory postulates that deficiencies in the home environment cause poor school performance (Persell, 1981). SES bias in education encompasses how teachers hold lower expectations for students with low-SES. They assume that students with low-SES will fail in school because of poor attendance and behavior problems. Teachers assume that these issues are because of the students’ home life, and they attribute deficits to these students. They believe that these students are incapable of learning due to cognitive delays or ineffective parenting when compared to students with middle and high-SES. These biased perceptions influence pedagogical practices such as nonchallenging curriculums and disengaging classroom environments (Sadovnik et al., 2018).

Intersectional Bias. Intersectionality Theory proposes that people face multiple oppressions at the same time due to the combination of their social identities of race, class, and gender (Collins & Bilge, 2016). An intersectionality framework is needed to provide a foundation for conceptualizing, developing and conducting transformative research related to disability and diversity (Garcia & Ortiz, 2013). Therefore, the intersection of race, gender, and SES should be analyzed together in order to examine whether students face multifaceted discrimination. Overrepresentation of BMS in SE for ED could be due to how educators view Black masculinity as antithetical classroom behaviors.

Masculinity forms men’s societal roles and differentiates between cultures and individuals (Connell, 2005). In Western society, the dominant form of masculinity is traditionally white, middle class, heteronormative, and dominant over women (Connell, 2005). BMS’ intersectionality of race and gender conflicts with white-middle-class masculinity because of the societal
oppression of black masculinity (Conell, 2005; hooks, 2004). The Constitution (a document declaring the equality of all men) classified Black Americans as the legal property of Whites (Feagin, 2000). Black Americans did not have equal rights to White Americans due to this legal recognition of inferiority (Feagin, 2000). The emasculation of Black males is a reoccurring theme within the historical events of enslavement, segregation, disproportionate incarceration, and police brutality (Feagin, 2000).

BMS internalize exploitative representations of Black male bodies in hip-hop culture and sports in search of Black masculinity (hooks, 2004). Hip-hop culture and sports entertainment favor patriarchal ideals of male domination through physical strength and financial independence (hooks, 2004). It gives BMS the sense of freedom tied to intellectual growth and equity in masculinity with White males (hooks, 2004). The construction of identity is relational to constructions of masculinity because it refers to the socially constructed characteristics that society expects for the male sex. Black men are depicted as independent, unemotional, aggressive, competitive, hardened, strong and confident. BMS internalize these traits as steppingstones toward manhood (hooks, 2004).

The depiction of the thug, stereotypical representation of Black masculinity in the media, also presents the image that all Black men are aggressive, violent, and angry (hooks, 2004). Rappers play to the White mainstream’s stereotypical gaze in order to make a profit (hooks, 2004). Due to the failing schools in many of the inner-city communities, the athletics and entertainment industries are attractive sites where many BMS aspire to be, in hopes of discovering wealth and prestige for the power attributed in White masculinity (hooks, 2004). Having money gives one access to power and privilege in a capitalist society, which many in Black working-class communities often dream of, but never experienced (hooks 2004). BMS are expected to conform
to dominant gender role expectations (e.g., to be successful, competitive, and aggressive), as well as meeting culturally specific requirements (e.g., cooperation, promotion of group, and survival of group) of the Black community, which often conflict (Conell, 2005; hooks, 2004).

Some BMS join gangs for validation of masculinity (hooks, 2004). Gang affiliation and hip-hop culture entail that BMS must prove their masculinity by committing violent acts to maintain street credibility (hooks, 2004). This street credibility is done by BMS being violent, homophobic, and heteronormative while degrading women (hooks, 2004). Mainstream media displays scholastic achievement among BMS as less desirable to the opposite sex and emasculates BMS who are intellectual. For example, the fictional genius, Steve Urkel, from the 1990s television show, Family Matters, is shown to be nerdy, weak, and longing for the attention of uninterested females (hooks, 2004). As a result, BMS will underperform academically in school to reassert their masculinity in front of peers and to look cool (hooks, 2004).

**Self-Fulfilling Prophecy.** Merton (1938) defined self-fulfilling prophecy as the beginning of “a false definition of the situation evoking a new behavior which makes the original false conception come true. This specious validity of the self-fulfilling prophecy perpetuates a reign of terror, for the prophet, will cite the actual course of events as proof that he was right from the very beginning” (Merton, 1938, p. 326). In the context of the education field, students’ competent or substandard performances are contingent upon with what teachers think their students can procure. If BMS perceive that their teachers hold convictions that they are capable of optimal academic or behavioral performances, then their actions will mirror these beliefs. If BMS believe that their teachers hold convictions that their academic or behavioral performances are deficient, then their actions will image these beliefs as well.
Labeling Theory. Labeling Theory is an analytic tool that determines and classifies, through societal locutions, the self-identity and the behaviors of individuals with labels (Knutsson, 1977). According to Becker (1963), Labeling Theory substantiates that within societies, the majority populations tend to negatively label minority populations as deviant, i.e., atypical from the standard or mainstream norms. It postulates that preconceived assumptions are processed to give individuals an association, i.e., traits they have not chosen for themselves. Therefore, people, labeled as deviants, are assigned new societal status based on character traits. Regardless if one possesses or dispossesses these deviant character traits, his societal status remains the same as deviant. Thereby, treating an individual like a deviant produces a self-fulfilling prophecy of deviant behavioral outcomes. Labeling individuals as deviant, isolates them from full participation in society, forcing the individual to identify with others labeled as deviants for acceptance.

Self-fulfilling Prophecy and Labeling Theory propose that the perception of teachers influence students’ academic and behavioral outcomes. Negative perceptions produce adverse outcomes. Once labeled, it is hard to change perceptions, even if behaviors are inconsistent with that label’s character traits. Consequently, labeling a child affects self-identity. Labeling also causes isolation. Individuals choose to revert to deviant behaviors so that they can belong with others labeled as deviants.

Separately, social identities such as race, gender, and SES increase BMS’ chances of being evaluated for SE in ED. Firstly, there is implicit racial and gender bias in schools in which teachers form low academic and behavioral expectations for them. Secondly, Black masculinity is viewed by school institutions as antithetical classroom behavior in need of punitive discipline measures and segregated education environments. Thirdly, teachers hold biased perceptions of students with low-SES. Since SES intertwines race and ethnicity, BMS live in low-SES, segregated
neighborhoods. Low-SES neighborhoods have schools in districts that are under-resourced and underperforming.

**Research**

Students perceive and react to low or high teacher expectations, and this produces negative or positive educational outcomes. Students modify their behavior to what they believe teachers expect of them. Alternatively, teachers with biased perceptions of students modify their pedagogical, assessment, and discipline practices to reflect these biases. It is a never-ending cycle of self-fulfilling prophecies induced by stigmatized labeling. The following research discusses biases in teacher perceptions, SE evaluations, and discipline procedures that lead to the placement of BMS in SE under the ED category.

*Teacher’s Expectations.* Rosenthal and Jacobson (1963) demonstrated through Self-Fulfilling Prophecy Theory, how teachers’ expectations of students are used to label students and inform pedagogical practices. At the beginning of the school year, an IQ test, entitled, *Tests of General Ability (TOGA)* was given to first and second-grade students. The TOGA test was used in the study because it did not assess academic skills such as language, literacy, and math. Also, teachers were unfamiliar with its format. The researchers renamed the TOGA test as the Harvard Test of Inflected Acquisition so that teachers would consider the test highly credible because of its affiliation with a prestigious university. Teachers were led to believe that students were entering school with low or high learning abilities. However, the test lacked this predictive validity. Students assigned higher learning abilities produced more significant educational outcomes than students assigned lower learning abilities. Therefore, high expectations of students produced positive academic and behavioral outcomes in school.
Hargreaves, Hester, and Mellor (1975) analyzed methods used for labeling students in the classroom. A study encompassing interviews and observations of secondary school teachers emphasized how teachers familiarized with their students attending the first year of school. Most teachers construct images of their students throughout the school year. Researchers observed that there were three stages for student familiarity: (1) Speculation- Teachers hypothesize about the types of students are in their class via the following: (a) appearance; (b) discipline conformity; (c) enthusiasm of and ability to do work; (d) student likeability; (e) relationships with other students; (f) personality; and (g) deviancy from school norms; (2) Elaboration- hypotheses about the types of students are tested, validated or invalidated, and then maintained or refined; and (3) Stabilization- perceived familiarity with students based on the teachers’ interpretations of the students’ actions. As a result, students labeled as deviant by the teacher in the second phase, speculation, remained labeled as deviant for the rest of the school year, even when behaviors were inconsistent with students’ labels. In other words, once teachers make impressions of their students and label them, that label sticks with their students for the whole school year, even if students change for the better.

Race and Gender Bias Research. Teachers’ assumptions and treatment of BMS are contingent on their combined bias of gender and race. Teachers possess lower academic and behavioral expectations for Black students than they do for White and Asian (Downey & Pribesh, 2004; Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007). This biased perception of ability is associated with the following: (1) High academic ability with White students is natural; (2) High academic ability with Asian students’ is the consequence of parental pressure; and (3) High ability with Black students is nonexistent and debatable (Staiger, 2004). Even when White students have the same disruptive
behaviors in the classroom as Black students, teachers observe disruptive behaviors from Black students as a problem (Downey & Pribesh, 2004; Ferguson, 2001).

Fish (2017) investigated the influence of race on teachers’ decisions to refer male students for SE or gifted services. The following independent variables were changed: race/ethnicity, giftedness, academic challenges suggesting learning disabilities, and behavioral challenges suggesting ED. After reading the fictional vignettes, teachers responded to the plausibility of referring students to either SE or gifted testing based on these variables. Results showed that when teachers read a vignette about male students with academic challenges, they were more likely to assign SE evaluation for White male students than BMS. This study proposed the biased notion that White male students, displaying lower academic performances, should be referred for SE evaluation because they can do better.

On the other hand, with BMS, low academic performance was anticipated and normalized within the classroom environment. Moreover, when teachers read vignettes about male students with behavior challenges, teachers referred BMS for SE evaluations and not White male students. This study suggests that teachers view BMS’ challenging behaviors as problematic compared to White male students. Also, even if the BMS showed the same academic strengths in the vignettes, teachers referred only the White male students to gifted testing. Therefore, there are disparities in the request for SE evaluations because the decision process is subjective (Fish, 2017).

Race and SES Bias. Black children are more likely to live in low- SES neighborhoods (US Census Bureau, n.d.). Students who attend schools with middle or high- SES status have teachers with higher expectations than students attending schools with low- SES (Palardy, 2008). Auwarter and Aruguete (2010) examined the effect of gender and SES on teacher expectations of students. Teacher participants read a fictional vignette about a student with academic and behavioral
challenges. The gender and SES of the student were used to create the following four conditions: (1) girl with low-SES; (2) girl with high SES; (3) boy with low-SES; and (4) boy with high-SES. The parents’ professions varied the SES. Teachers rated high-SES boys more favorably than low-SES boys, and low-SES students were perceived to have fewer optimistic educational outcomes than high-SES students. Therefore, teachers are more likely to develop negative impressions about low-SES students, especially if they are male.

ED Evaluations, Suspension, and Segregated/Restrictive Learning Environments. BMS with externalizing ED behaviors are in segregated/restrictive learning environments. Skiba, Poloni-Staudinger, Gallini, Simmons, and Feggins-Azziz (2006) evaluated the disproportionality of Black students classified with ED placed in restrictive SE settings when compared to students of other races with the same disabilities. Findings show that Black students were more likely to be identified and placed in segregated/restrictive educational settings. These educational settings are lower academic tracks that underprepare students for on-level student work, high-school graduation eligibility, and future college work (Sadovnik et al., 2018). Segregated/restrictive SE classrooms have low expectations for success and increased ED stigmas when compared to general or inclusive classrooms.

Hernandez, Ramanathan, Harr, and Socias (2008) investigated the referral and identification process in ED classification. Black students, identified with ED, were reevaluated for eligibility of continuation in SE services for this three-year longitudinal study. Researchers evaluated students for ED classification through the RTI pre-referral/intervention stages, assessment, eligibility determination, and the team considerations of supports. Several researchers also reviewed students’ cumulative files and IEPs along with demographic information via using an instrument developed by the Los Angeles Unified School District for data collection. As a
result, the number of students identified for ED decreased under reevaluation, indicating that there were flaws in the evaluation process.

An assumption that disproportionality in the severe discipline of Black students would be because Black students were performing more severe acts of misconduct than White students. However, such an assumption is not the case. BMS being Black and male increases their chances of being suspended or expelled (Losen & Skiba, 2010). When compared to 85% of White adolescent students having weapons, 95% of Black adolescent students faced suspension for this infraction (Nicholson-Crotty, Birchmeier, & Valentine, 2009). First-time minor offenses such as cell phone usage and dress code infractions were issued to Black students more than White students (Losen & Skiba, 2010).

Disproportionality in disciplinary actions is because of teacher and administrator subjectivity of infractions and unspecified consequences (Fabelo et al., 2011). In two longitudinal studies, Black students, more than white students, were likely to be suspended for being disrespectful and making noise, offenses that are less serious and subjective for teacher interpretation (Petras, Masyn, Buckley, Ialongo, & Kellam, 2011; Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2002). White students are more likely to be disciplined for objective school infractions like cursing or fighting (Skiba et al., 2002). In some cases, even after controlling for student behavior via subjective or objective infractions, there was still harsher discipline in schools with a larger enrollment of Black students (Skiba et al., 2002; Welch & Payne, 2010). Because of cultural differences between Black students and their teachers who are predominantly White, teachers may view Black students as insubordinate instead of active learners (Monroe, 2005; Townsend, 2000).

There is accepted evidence of racial, gender, and SES bias in SE evaluation referrals (Anderson, 1997; Kvande, Belsky, & Wichstrom, 2018; Warikoo, Sinclair, Fei, & Jacoby-
Senghor, 2016), but limited amount of studies on decisions in eligibility for ED identification due to intersectional biases of social identities (Donovan & Cross, 2002; Gillborn & Parker, 2015). The following study investigates the effect of teachers’ perceptions on BMS with intersectional identities of race, gender, and SES. Are BMS with low-SES more likely to be disciplined and then referred to SE evaluation for academic and behavioral challenges identical to externalized ED behaviors in school when compared to BMS with middle-SES or White male students with low-SES?
CHAPTER III: STUDY

Introduction

A qualitative study via narrative inquiry was used to observe GE classroom teachers’ attitudes about determinants leading to the overrepresentation of BMS referred for SE evaluation under the ED category. This chapter consists of the following: (1) Methodology; (2) Instrumentation; (3) Data; and (4) Data Analysis.

Methodology

Narrative inquiry is a qualitative methodology that typically focuses on the experiences and perspectives as told by the participants in the study (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Three fictional vignettes and interviews were methods used for investigation (Auwarter & Aruguete, 2010; & Fish, 2017). Vignettes include stimuli that portray real-life events which research participants are asked to respond (Given, 2008). They are valuable because it explores participants’ perceptions, attitudes, and impressions (Given, 2008).

Interviews were structured and unstructured. Structured interviews consist of questions that the interviewer prepares beforehand for the respondents to answer (Dapzury & Shrivastava, n.d.). Unstructured interviews are questions based on what the respondent says (Dapzury & Shrivastava, n.d.). Interviews are useful for getting the explanation behind a participant’s experiences (Dapzury & Shrivastava, n.d.). These interviews are encompassed with open-ended questions (responses that require deep thought and more than a one-word answer) and close-ended questions (responses that need quick and short answers) (ATLAS.ti, n.d.). The interviewer is part of the instrument of measure because narratives are linguistically subjective, and its connotation is open for interpretation (Dapzury & Shrivastava, n.d.).
Instrumentation

A structured interview was conducted on the phone or email to gain background information about potential participants (Appendix B, p.74). The vignettes attempted to answer the following research questions: (1) Is the intersection of social identities of BMS, such as race, gender, and SES, responsible for how GE teachers respond to students’ academic and behavioral challenges identical to externalizing ED traits in the classroom; and (2) Is it more likely for GE teachers to refer BMS, regardless of SES, than White male students with low- SES for SE evaluation?

The vignettes used in this study encompassed three male students, aged 11, exhibiting academic and behavioral challenges identical to the externalizing behavioral traits for ED in a GE classroom. In the first fictional story, the student, Jason, is Black and lives in a two-parent household which his parents are college graduates and SES is middle class. He currently attends a charter school that emphasizes discipline. In the second fictional story, the student, Jeffrey, is also Black. Unlike Jason, Jeffrey lives in a single-parent household headed by his mother who does not have a high school education. His SES status is low class, and he currently attends a public school in the inner city. In the third fictional story, the student, Alex, unlike Jason and Jeffrey, is White. Like Jeffrey, Alex’s SES status is low class and lives in a single-parent household headed by his mother, who does not have a high school education. Unlike Jeffrey, Alex attends a public school in a rural area. Therefore, the dependent variable is gender- male. The independent variables are race (Black, White) and SES (low or middle).

Teacher participants were asked to provide the next steps in helping Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex via pedagogical practices, classroom management strategies, and resources used at their schools. Also, these vignettes asked teacher participants if the students were candidates for SE
evaluation. Teacher participants could take notes and refer to their notes later for unstructured interviews. I did not collect teacher participants’ notes for data.

Data

Population and Sampling of Participants. I recruited a sample of NYS certified GE teachers of different races, ages, and genders that teach in elementary schools with a large population of BMS via the distribution of 100 flyers (See Advertisement Flyer in Appendix A, p.66). I distributed these flyers to family members, friends, church members, work colleagues, and students in the CUNY Graduate Center. The flyers served as a filter to ensure that the targeted population consisted of BMS. The original form had my cell phone number and school email address of which for this paper, I had concealed. The flyer also ensured that the respondents were NYS Certified Childhood Education teachers. It was expected to attract between 5 and 25 qualified participants.

Potential teacher participants contacted me via phone or email for the date and time available for the study. There were 12 respondents to the flyers, all of which were NYS certified teachers in Childhood Education 1-6 as verified by the website, Teacher Certification Look Up (NYSED, n.d.). I had chosen 8 participants because of the different representations of race, gender, and age (See Table 1, p. 30-31). All eight teacher participants filled out the Anonymity Form (See Appendix A, p. 67). This form granted them anonymity because they did not want me to use their names and schools in the study. Instead, I used race and gender to identify the participants (See Table 1, pp. 30-31).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>SES Growing Up and Parent Education</th>
<th>Knowledge of ED against Race, Gender or SES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black African American</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>BA in Education</td>
<td>NYS Childhood 1-6</td>
<td>0-1yr</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>5th grade General Ed</td>
<td>Low-SES: single mother-high school diploma</td>
<td>A little bit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black Guyanese American</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>MS in Childhood Ed. And Special Education</td>
<td>NYS Student with Disabilities 1-6</td>
<td>8yrs</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5th grade General Ed</td>
<td>Middle SES: Both parents are teachers Master Degrees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White Italian American</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>BA in Education</td>
<td>MS in Literacy</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>5th grade General Ed</td>
<td>Upper-middle Both parents Father has a DDS Doctor of Dental Surgery Mother has a Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>Not much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White Polish-American</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>MS in Childhood Education</td>
<td>NYS Childhood 1-6</td>
<td>11 yrs</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>5th grade Science</td>
<td>Middle Both parents are teachers and have Master Degrees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>SES Growing Up and Parent Education</td>
<td>Know ledge of ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHF</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black Puerto Rican</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>MS in Childhood Education and Special Education</td>
<td>NYS Childhood 1-6</td>
<td>5 yrs</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>5th grade General Ed</td>
<td>Low-SES Single mother no high school diploma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White Puerto Rican American</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>MS in Literacy</td>
<td>NYS Childhood 1-6 NYS Literacy B-6</td>
<td>18 yrs</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5th grade English-Language Arts</td>
<td>Lower Both parents no high school diploma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian Chinese-American</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>MS in Childhood Ed and Special Education</td>
<td>NYS Childhood 1-6 NYS Students with Disabilities 1-6</td>
<td>1-2 yrs</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>5th English-Language Arts and Social Studies</td>
<td>Upper-Both parents have medical degrees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian Chinese-American</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>BA in Childhood Education and Special Education</td>
<td>NYS Childhood 1-6 NYS Students with Disabilities 1-6</td>
<td>0-1 yrs</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>5th grade General Ed</td>
<td>Middle-SES Mother has Esthetician license. Father has no high school diploma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I requested teacher participants for at least 2 hours of their time and met them individually at their nearest library or comfortable public space in two sessions. They did not participate in the study with the other teacher participants. Two teacher participants, BM and BHM, worked at the same charter school, but I met with them on different occasions. In Session One, I issued the
vignettes and conducted unstructured interviews. After I completed all the interviews, read and organized my data, I met with teacher participants again in Session Two. In Session Two, I conversed with teacher participants about their interviews. I was able to clarify strategies implemented by the teacher participant and asked teacher participants about strategies that other teachers used. For participating in the study, I compensated teacher participants with $20.00 gift cards to one of the following: (1) Starbucks; (2) Dunkin Donuts; or (3) Target. Funding for these gift cards came from my checking account (See Advertisement Flyer in Appendix A, p.65). The main handicap to data collection included getting potential participants to respond and conflicts in scheduling.

Data for Vignette Responses. I had taken the vignette responses of the teacher participants and collected them on the chart entitled, Vignette Responses (See Table 2, p. 33-34). I labeled these responses as actions. Any actions that the teachers mentioned repeatedly, I recorded the teacher participant in the column. These responses came directly from the teacher participants.
Table 2. Vignette Responses

Key:  B (Black); W (White); H (Hispanic); A (Asian); M (Male); F (Female)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Jason</th>
<th>Jeffrey</th>
<th>Alex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Differentiated Instruction</strong></td>
<td>BM, BF, WM, WF, BHF, AM, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BF, WM, WF, BHF, AM, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BF, WM, WF, BHF, AM, and AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observation of Events Before Disruptive Behaviors</strong></td>
<td>BF, WHM</td>
<td>BF, WHM</td>
<td>BF, WHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refer to School Counselor and School Psychologist</strong></td>
<td>WM, BM, BF, WHM, BHF, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BF, WF, WHM, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BF, WF, and WHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refer to School Social Worker/ Social Service</strong></td>
<td>BF, BHF, WHM, WM, BHF, and AF</td>
<td>BF, BHF, WHM, WM, BHF, and AF</td>
<td>BF, BHF, WHM, WM, BHF, and AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refer to Literacy Specialist</strong></td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, and AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refer to Math Specialist</strong></td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, and AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refer to Behavior Specialist</strong></td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>BM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refer to Intervention Services</strong></td>
<td>BF, WHM, BHF, WM, and AM</td>
<td>BF, WHM, BHF, WM, and AM</td>
<td>BF, WHM, BHF, WM, and AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One on One Conferences</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Alex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class Tutoring</td>
<td>BM, AF</td>
<td>BM, AF</td>
<td>BM, AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Tutoring</td>
<td>WM, AF</td>
<td>WM, AF</td>
<td>WM, AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>BHF, WM, WF, and AF</td>
<td>BHF, WM, WF, and AF</td>
<td>BHF, WM, WF, and AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>BHF, WM, WF, and AF</td>
<td>BHF, WM, WF, and AF</td>
<td>BHF, WM, WF, and AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch Detention</td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, and AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal from Class</td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, AM, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, AM, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, AM, and AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, AM, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, AM, and AF</td>
<td>BM, BHF, WF, WM, AM, and AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion/ Transfer</td>
<td>AM, AF, WM</td>
<td>AM, AF, WM</td>
<td>AM, AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Court</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>BF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to SE Evaluation</td>
<td>AM, AF, WM</td>
<td>AM, AF, WM, BF, BM, WHM, BHF</td>
<td>AM, AF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher participants mentioned *Differentiated Instruction* (DI) as an action to improve the academic performances of the fictional vignette students, Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex (See Unstructured Interviews for Fictional Vignette Responses in Appendix B, pp. 78-81; Table 2, p. 33-34). The teacher participants defined DI as a teaching strategy that homogeneously groups students according to tiers of low, on-level, and high ability levels. 7/8 teacher participants (BM, BF, WM, WF, BHF, AM, and AF) would use DI by placing Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex in low ability groups for literacy and math. They stated that DI would be beneficial for Jason because of the following: (1) he lives in a two-parent household; (2) his parents are college-educated and they could help him with homework and projects; and (3) he lives a middle-class neighborhood with male role models. They stated that DI would be least effective with Jeffrey and Alex because of the following: (1) they live in a single-parent household with no male role models; and (2) their mothers are high school dropouts and cannot assist them in homework and projects. They stated that Alex would benefit a little more than Jeffrey in DI because Alex lives in a rural area in which
he can concentrate more and receive help from the community. 1/8 teacher participants (WHM) did not mention DI as an action to improve academic performance.

I asked one structured interview question: Do you think DI would work with Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? After teacher participants answered the structured interview question, I proceeded with unstructured interviews. Results showed that DI would benefit Jason more than Jeffrey and Alex; Alex more than Jeffrey. 7/8 teacher participants (BM, BF, WM, WF, BHF, WHM, and AF) stated that effective DI is contingent on pedagogical practices, but also students’ motivation to learn, parent involvement, and home/neighborhood environment. 7/8 teacher participants (BM, BF, WM, WF, BHF, WHM, and AF) stated that BMS who live in inner cities, single-parent households, have uneducated parents, and lack positive male role models/mentors, would less likely benefit from DI. 1/8 teacher participants (AM) stated that DI is in-class prevention and intervention for poor academic performance and is contingent on solely the pedagogical practices in the classroom.

Teacher participants mentioned Observation of Events Before Disruptive Behaviors as an action to improve behavioral performances of the fictional vignette students, Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex (See Unstructured Interviews for Fictional Vignette Responses in Appendix B, pp. 82- 83; Table 2, p. 33-34). During unstructured interviews, 2/8 teacher participants (BF, WHM) said that they would document the “triggers” or “antecedent events” (events that occur before externalized ED behaviors) of Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex. BF mentioned that she would inform the counselor about these triggers. She would “modify [her] approach, [students’] learning approach, environment, or management of other students so that [she] could avoid their behavioral responses and have an optimal learning environment” (See Appendix B, p. 82). WHM mentioned that documenting antecedent behaviors allow the teacher to “predict an event that is going to set off some kid. If [the teacher] know[s] the antecedent behavior, [the teacher] could provide methods to
avoid it or give the student coping strategies to endure it without disruptive behavior” (See Appendix B, p. 82). 6/8 teacher participants (BM, WM, WF, BHF, AM, and AF) did not mention this action.

I asked 6/8 teacher participants (BM, WM, WF, BHF, AM, and AF) this structured interview question: *Would documenting events before disruptive behavior help Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex?* 6/8 teacher participants (BM, WM, WF, BHF, AM, AF) said that documenting events before behavior would help them. Unstructured interviews followed. 5/8 (WM, WF, BHF, AM, and AF) teachers stated that disruptive behaviors in their classrooms were not as severe as the vignettes and did not need documentation. 6/8 teacher participants (BM, WM, WF, BHF, AM, and AF) stated that they did not have time during the school day to document because they were busy teaching.

Teacher participants mentioned *Refer to School Counselor and School Psychologist* as actions to improve behavioral performances of the fictional vignette students, Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex (See Unstructured Interviews for Fictional Vignette Responses in Appendix B, pp. 84-86; Table 2, p. 33-34). 6/8 teacher participants (WM, BM, BF, WHM, BHF, and AF) said they would refer Jason, 5/8 (BM, BF, WF, WHM, and AF) said they would refer Jeffrey, and 4/8 (BM, BF, WF, and WHM) said that they would refer Alex. 1/6 teacher participants (WF) said that she would refer Jeffrey and Jason to the school psychologist. 2/6 teacher participants (AM and WM) did not mention this action because counseling services are part of intervention services. 1/8 teacher participants (AM) state that school is for learning, and students should not have any excuses for academic failure: “I was raised to go to school and learn. Both my parents were first-generation Chinese-Americans, and they obtained their medical degrees. I didn’t have a choice to purposely fail because I didn’t want to be in school, or I had a bad evening at home […] there are no excuses” (See Appendix B, p. 86) 1/8 teacher participants (BHF) did not refer Jeffrey and Jason to
counseling but social services instead: “Jason and Alex have issues relating to poverty” and “social services will provide help for Jason’s and Alex’s mothers” (See Appendix B, p. 87).

I asked teacher participants the following structured interview questions: Why did you suggest that Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex should see a school counselor/psychologist? Who (Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex) would benefit the most and least from counseling? Why? 8/8 teacher participants said that counseling would benefit Jason the most and Jeffrey the least. Unstructured interviews followed.

During unstructured interviews, 8/8 teacher participants said that Jason would benefit more from counseling because of the following: (1) his parents are college graduates (BM, BF, WM, BF, WHM, and AF); (2) his parents can research better parenting methods (BM); (3) his parents have time to raise him (BM, BF); (4) he comes from a two-parent home with a male figure, i.e., father (WM and WHM); (5) his parents are more likely to implement school counseling strategies in their home; (6) his parents could use their social and economic resources to help Jason independently (WM, WF, and AM); and (7) he lives in a middle-class neighborhood (BHF).

7/8 teacher participants said that Jeffrey would benefit the least from counseling because of the following: (1) he is more likely to end up in a gang, incarcerated, or in jail (BF, BHF); (2) he undergoes peer pressure to fail because of his environment (BHF); (3) he lives in the inner-city that is filled with crime (WF, WHM, AF); and (4) he is Black and faces discrimination (BF, WF). 4/8 teacher participants said Alex would benefit from counseling because of the following: (1) he has better societal outcomes than Jason and Jeffrey because he is White (BF and WHM); (2) he lives in a rural area (BHF); and (3) he will eventually get himself together (WHM).
Teacher participants mentioned *Refer to School Social Worker/ Social Service* as actions to improve the academic and behavioral performances for the fictional vignette students, Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex (See Unstructured Interviews for Fictional Vignette Responses in Appendix B, pp. 87-88; Table 2, p. 33-34). 5/8 teacher participants (BF, BHF, WHM, WM, and WF) stated that social services would benefit Jeffrey and Alex. 3/8 teacher participants stated that Jeffrey and Alex should receive social services for the following reasons: (1) they have higher chances of already having a social worker assigned to them because their families receive financial assistance from the government (BF, WF, and BHM); (2) their mothers are uneducated (BHF); (3) there were no fathers or male role models in their households (BHF and WHM); (4) they have been in trouble in school and are failing (BHF); (5) they could be neglected because their mothers have friends and boyfriends (BF and BHF); (6) their mothers could have substance abuse issues (BHF); (7) social services could recommend them assistance from community-based programs (WHM); and (8) social services can provide Jeffrey and Alex “coping tools for whatever is bothering them” (See WHM in Appendix B, p. 88).

1/8 teacher participants (WF) recommended social services for Alex so that it could place him in group counseling or home for troubled boys. 3/8 teacher participants stated that involving social services would be unnecessary because the vignettes did not mention that the boys were in life-threatening harm (BM AM, and AF). Also, social services could do further damage by removing Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex from their homes (BM). 3/8 teacher participants least recommended Jason for social services because of the following: (1) both his parents have professional careers (BHF); (2) his parents made better life choices than the mothers of Jeffrey and Alex (BHF); (3) he has structure at home (BF and WF); (4) he lives in a good neighborhood; and (5) his parents have college degrees (BF).
Teacher participants mentioned *Refer to Literacy Specialist, Math Specialist, Behavior Specialist, and Intervention Services* as actions to improve academic and behavioral performances of the fictional vignette students, Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex (See Unstructured Interviews for Fictional Vignette Responses in Appendix B, pp. 89-92; Table 2, p. 33-34). 5/8 teachers (BM, BHF, WF, WM, and AF) referred Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex to a literacy specialist. 5/8 teachers (BM, BHF, WF, WM, and AF) referred Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex to a math specialist. 1/8 (BM) teachers referred Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex to a behavior specialist. 5/8 teachers (BF, WM, WHM, BHF, and AM) referred Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex to intervention services. Unstructured interviews followed.

During unstructured interviews, 2/8 teacher participants (WHM, AF) said that Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex would benefit from small group learning with literacy and math specialists. 1/8 teacher participants (BM) said Jason would benefit from referring to literacy and math specialists because he has support from home. 1/8 teacher participants (BM) said Jeffrey would least likely benefit from being referred to literacy and math specialists because he would not receive help from home. 2/8 teacher participants (WM, WF) said that Jason would benefit more from RTI services because his parents would remain involved in the process. 3/8 teacher participants (BF, WM, WF) said that Jeffrey and Alex would benefit least from RTI services because they do not have support at home. 4/8 teacher participants (WHM, AM, BHF, and AF) said that if Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex did not have undiagnosed disabilities, they would benefit from RTI services because of the one on one attention and small group learning.

Teacher participants mentioned *One on One Conferences, In-class Tutoring and Outside Tutoring* as actions to improve the academic performances of the fictional vignette students, Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex (See Unstructured Interviews for Fictional Vignette Responses in Appendix B,
Teacher participants defined one on one conferences as targeted skill instruction for individual students within literacy and math periods. They defined in-class tutoring as individual instruction for students during lunch or after-school hours. Also, they defined outside tutoring as paid individual instruction outside of school. Teacher participants stated that these actions to improve academic performances were beneficial to students if students did not have an undiagnosed disability. I asked the following structured interview questions: How would you conduct one on one conferencing? Who would benefit from one on one conferencing? Unstructured interviews followed.

During unstructured interviews, 8/8 teacher participants would implement one on one conferences with Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex. 2/8 teacher participants (BM and AF) suggest in-class tutoring for Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex if they needed more assistance than the one on one conferencing. AF said that she would do in-class tutoring for state exam preparation. 6/8 teacher participants (BF, BHF, WM, WF, WHM, and AM) said that they did not have time. Also, they would not do in-class tutoring alone with children (BF). 3/8 teacher participants (BM, BF, WM) referred one on one conferencing for Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex because one on one conferences give “[teachers] a perspective on how students do their work independently and can tap into how [their students] are thinking” (See BF in Appendix B, p. 93). 2/8 teacher participants (WM, AF) suggested outside tutoring for Jason because he is middle-class, and his family can supplement education at home with additional learning resources. 6/8 teacher participants (BF, BHF, WM, WF, AM) did not think to suggest outside tutoring because they teach high needs students who cannot afford it.

Teacher participants mentioned Incentives, Consequences, and Lunch Detention as actions to help improve the behavioral performances of the fictional vignette students, Jason, Jeffrey, and
Alex (See Unstructured Interviews for Fictional Vignette Responses in Appendix B, pp. 96-99; Table 2, p. 33-34). Teacher participants defined incentives as positive reinforcements for students who adhered to the classroom rules, routines, and culture. They defined consequences as actions taken after students failed to adhere to classroom rules, routines, and culture. Lunch detention is an example of a consequence in which students lose the opportunity to socialize with peers during lunch.

During unstructured interviews, 4/8 teacher participants (BHF, WM, WF, and AF) said that incentives and consequences would help motivate Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex with improvements in behavior. This improvement is contingent on whether they wanted to be part of the classroom culture and did not have any underlying behavioral or psychological disabilities: "The teacher can interact with [the] students besides giving consequences for misbehavior" (See BHF in Appendix B, p. 96). 5/8 teacher participants (BM, BHF, WF, WM, and AF) stated that lunch detention was their most useful consequence of deterring disruptive behaviors. 3/8 teacher participants (BM, WM, AM) stated that incentives, consequences, and lunch detention would not work because Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex have too many underlying issues.

Teacher participants mentioned Removal from Class, Suspension, Expulsion, Transfer, and Family Court as actions that their schools would take if the academic and behavioral performances of Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex did not improve (See Unstructured Interviews for Fictional Vignette Responses in Appendix B, pp. 100-103; Table 2, p. 33-34). During unstructured interviews, 6/8 teacher participants (BM, BHF, WM, WF, AM, and AF) stated that Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex would be removed and suspended for poor behavioral performances. 2/8 teacher participants (AM and AF) stated that Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex would eventually be expelled or transferred if their behavioral performance did not improve because of a zero-tolerance policy for disruptive students.
with academically low performances. 1/8 teacher participants (WM) said that Jason and Jeffrey would more likely be expelled from school than Alex for poor behavioral performance: “Alex lives in a rural area and possibly there aren’t any other schools in his community. He probably would be constantly suspended” (See Appendix B, p. 101).

2/8 teacher participants (BHF and WHM) said that their schools would more likely expel Jeffrey than Jason and Alex: (1) “Jeffrey is Black, and his mother is uneducated. She wouldn't be able to verbally handle the school if they considered expulsion or transfer” (BHF, Appendix B, p. 100); and (2) “Jeffrey, because he’s Black, his family has no education and is poor. Alex is poor, and his mother doesn’t have a high school diploma, but he is still White, and he is privileged because of that” (See WHM in Appendix B, p. 102). 1/8 teacher participants (BF) stated that Jeffrey would most likely go to family court than Alex: “Family court deals with violent students. Alex [is] in a rural area. I think he would most likely clean up his act because the environment is calmer [than the inner-city]” (See Appendix B, p.102).

I asked the following structured interview questions: (1) **Who would your school more likely refer for SE evaluation, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex;** and (2) **Would your school refer Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex to SE evaluation if they were girls with same the academic and behavioral performances?** During unstructured interviews (See Unstructured Interviews for Fictional Vignette Responses in Appendix B, pp. 105-107; Table 2, p. 33-34), 2/8 teacher participants (AM and AF) stated their schools would have Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex evaluated if RTI services were unsuccessful. 1/8 teacher participants (WM) stated that Jason and Jeffrey were more likely than Alex to be referred for SE evaluation because they were Black: “Alex lives in a rural area, and he will be fine […] He is going to straighten up eventually. Their [Jason and Jeffrey] behavior is going to attract negative influences. Even if Jason is not from the inner-city, he is still going to
face incarceration eventually if he doesn’t change his behavior because of racial profiling” (See Appendix B, p. 105).

4/8 teacher participants (BM, BF, WHM, and BHF) stated that Jeffrey was more likely to be referred for SE evaluation because of the following: (1) teachers believe that SE is an intervention for poor-performing students; (2) SE services will better define his underlying academic, behavioral, and psychological issues (BM, BF); and (3) Jeffrey has a low SES and lives in the inner city (BM, BF, WHM, and BHF):

Jeffrey is in the inner city and the statistics for Black men aren’t good. Alex is low class and has a mother without an education, but he lives in a rural area. It’s [rural] just a better neighborhood (See BM in Appendix B, p. 105) […] SE evaluation will provide Jeffrey the help he needs. Jason has two parents, lives in a better neighborhood. He is away from the violence. Alex […] is unexposed to what Jeffrey is exposed to (See WHM in Appendix B, p. 106);

(4) Jeffrey is more likely to be in jail or killed by gun violence (BF and BHF): “Jeffrey, on the other hand, is a statistic waiting to happen. His behavior is going to cause him to go to jail or even be killed” (See BF in Appendix B, p. 105); (5) Jeffrey’s mother does not have a high school diploma: “Jason parents are educated and will help him” (See BHF in Appendix B, p. 106); and (6) Jeffrey has a lack of male role models (See WM in Appendix B, p. 105).

7/8 teacher participants (BM, BF, BHF, WM, WHM, WF, and AM) stated that if Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex were girls, they would already have diagnoses for academic and behavioral disabilities because of the following: (1) Girls are less aggressive. If they are aggressive, then they must have a psychological disorder or behavioral disability (BM, BF, BHF, WM, WHM, and WF);
and (2) Society is more attentive to girls with emotional issues because they are considered weaker (WHM). 1/8 teacher participants (AM) stated that if Jason and Jeffrey were girls, he would refer them for SE evaluation: “Girls in aggressive neighborhoods are aggressive. [...] If RTI services are ineffective, [then] the team would suggest a SE evaluation” (See Appendix B, p. 106-107).

Data Analysis

I analyzed and then labeled teacher participants structured and unstructured interview responses (See Unstructured Interviews for Fictional Vignette Responses in Appendix B, pp. 78-107) for positive and negative perceptions via referencing the Social Identity Indicators (See Appendix B, p. 74-77). I recorded the amount of positive and negative perceptions on two tables (See Table 3, p. 44; Table 4, p. 45) entitled “Positive and Negative Perceptions of Teacher Participants” and “Total Amount of Positive and Negative Perceptions.”
Table 3. Positive and Negative Perceptions of Teacher Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Jason</th>
<th>Jeffrey</th>
<th>Alex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>+ 10</td>
<td>+ 10</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF</td>
<td>+ 14</td>
<td>+ 17</td>
<td>+ 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td>+ 15</td>
<td>+ 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>+ 11</td>
<td>+ 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHM</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
<td>+ 12</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHF</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>+ 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Positive Perceptions of Teacher Participants. This figure illustrates the positive perceptions of Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex by teacher participants.
Figure 5. Negative Perceptions of Teacher Participants. This figure illustrates the negative perceptions of Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex by teacher participants.

Table 4. Total Amount of Positive and Negative Perceptions of Vignettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jason</th>
<th>Jeffrey</th>
<th>Alex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6. Total Amounts of Positive Perceptions. This figure illustrates the total amount of positive perceptions by teacher participants.

Data results showed that Jason received the highest total for positive perceptions (48) by all teacher participants with a mean of 6. Jeffrey received the least positive perceptions (0) of a
mean of 0. Alex received the mean of 5.25 positive perceptions (42), which is a difference of .25 from the highest total of positive perceptions. Jeffrey received the highest total of negative perceptions (72) with a mean of 9. Jason received the least total of negative perceptions (9) of a mean of 1.125. Alex received the mean of 5.875 negative perceptions (42), which is a difference of 3.125 from the highest total and 4.75 from the lowest total.

The intersection of race, gender, and SES had significant effects on how teacher participants responded to the academic and behavioral challenges of fictional students, Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex. Jeffrey, who is Black, male, and of low-SES, had no positive perceptions and the most negative perceptions by teacher participants. Jason, who is also Black and male, but with middle-SES, had the most positive perceptions and the least amount of negative perceptions by teacher participants. Although Alex is the same gender as Jason and Jeffrey, Alex’s race and geographic location (rural neighborhood and school) increased positive perceptions and decreased negative perceptions from teacher participants. Alex's total of positive perceptions was almost the same as Jason’s. These findings suggest the following: (1) Teacher participants have negative perceptions of BMS with low SES regarding academic and behavioral challenges; and (2) Being White increases positive perceptions regardless of academic and behavioral challenges.
IV. CONCLUSION

Limitations

In this qualitative research study via narrative inquiry, I issued fictional vignettes and conducted interviews afterward. Vignettes were very helpful in presenting hypothetical situations in which teacher participants had responses that revealed their perceptions about race, gender, and SES. Interviews also were helpful because they gave detailed information about closed-ended questions, and most importantly, it was the participants’ own words. However, the instrumentation of vignettes, interviews, and data collection provided limitations in the study.

Vignettes cannot measure what teacher participants would do with real children in real classrooms. There is a difference between self-reported behavior and real-life behavior. I do not feel that teacher participants in this study had the experience or shared enough of their own experiences with disruptive behavior because they all wanted anonymity. Many were in fear that the interview would go back to the CEOs of their charter schools, administrators, or colleagues. I was even limited in disclosing the location of the schools in NYC. I would have loved to observe the teachers in their classrooms with students that they found had academic and behavioral challenges. Unfortunately, all the teachers chosen for this study did not want me to observe their classrooms. If this were possible, I could have investigated the teachers’ real perceptions of their students besides generalizing from this study.

Also, the vignettes did not provide teacher participants with enough information about the teachers, students, and parental units. Teacher participants made negative assumptions about the parenting skills belonging to the mothers of Jeffrey and Alex. I could have provided more information about how the three fictional students behaved outside of school with their families. Also, the independent variable, low-SES, was heavily based on the employment of the fictional
mothers. Jeffrey and Alex were both of low-SES. However, I varied their neighborhood into urban (inner city) and rural. I believe that this was the reason why Alex had more positive perceptions attributed to him than Jeffrey. Perhaps the outcome of the study would have been different if Alex and Jeffrey were both from the inner city and lived in public housing. Also, Jason’s behavior was not as severe as the behaviors of Jeffrey and Alex. Jeffrey threw a desk, and Alex threw a book. Throwing a desk could have been viewed by teacher participants as a more severe behavior. I believe that this contributed to Jeffrey’s negative perceptions, as well. The severity of behavior should have been a dependent variable along with gender.

Interviewing teacher participants for this study was very time-consuming. I had to reschedule missed appointments, type the interview from my phone recordings, and transcribe the responses into measurable data. Also, with interviews, the connotation within conversations is left up to the researcher to interpret. Comments that I might find bias may not be considered bias by another researcher. The labeling of social identity indicators as negative or positive perceptions are debatable depending on who is reading this study. Also, I believe that some teachers were more revealing than others. I did sense that because there was anonymity, teachers expressed more freely than if the study revealed who they were. However, if I had developed a relationship with teacher participants before this interview, I believe teachers would have felt comfortable revealing more. Maybe teacher participants would have revealed more biased perceptions if they had been interviewed by a researcher who was the same race and gender as they. For this reason, I believe BF had the most negative perceptions because both she and I are the same gender and race.

There were limitations in data collection. If one were to analyze the negative perceptions of Jeffrey by individual teachers, he/she could first have ordered them from highest to least amounts: BF, WM, WHM, WF, BHF, AM, and AF. The generalization from the analysis would
be that the teachers who had the most negative perceptions about Jeffrey were BF, WM, and WHM. This generalization would be inaccurate. For example, AM scored very low in negative perceptions of the fictional students. However, his remark that White and Asian children behave better than Black students was a bias statement, and some would even deem it as racist (See Appendix B, p. 102). WM scored lower than BF in negative perceptions. However, his comments were biased through the intersection of race and gender: "I don’t think Alex would be as aggressive as Jason and Jeffrey" (See Appendix B, p. 101). WM’s comment about his having a better rapport with Black parents because he is white is biased as well (See Appendix B, p. 101). In hindsight, every perception recorded should have been discussed with the teacher participants to decipher implicit bias from recognized sociological disparities in education.

**Implications for Future Research**

There is a limited amount of research on the intersection of social identities belonging to BMS and how this affects their educational outcomes. Many researchers contribute the overrepresentation in SE evaluations solely to race and gender. However, just as this study illustrated, SES contributes to the decision process in SE evaluation as well, indicating that social identities are interdependent. All teachers, even teachers of the same gender and race as their students, have implicit racial, gender, and SES biases. Future research includes the following: (1) the effects of stereotypes against minority teachers and how this influences their pedagogical practices in the classroom; and (2) the professional development of teachers on identifying implicit biases before entering the classroom.

Stereotypes against minority teachers influence their pedagogical practices in the classroom. According to Pyke (2010), internalized oppression is when people of color begin to internalize racial stereotypes about their race. BM mentioned the racial disparities in his
school with how white teachers were treated more favorably than Black teachers (See Appendix B, p. 97). As a result, BM believed that administrators placed all the high achieving and better-behaved students in the classrooms of White teachers. Such perpetuates self-prophecy theory and labeling: For example, the students of BM will perform low because his class is the lower ability class. These negative perceptions can influence the educational community in that Black teachers may hold biases against BMS because of internalized oppression.

Further research can explore how discrimination against the intersection of social identities of Black teachers and students affects classroom culture. Perhaps minority teachers need more support from administrators in the classroom for retention since they leave at higher rates (Barnum, 2018). According to Barnum (2017), retention of Black teachers is important because research has linked teachers of color to better educational outcomes for students of color. Studies have found that Black students benefit from having Black teachers with increasing better test scores, fewer suspensions and expulsions, more referrals for gifted classes, and lower drop-out rates (Barnum, 2017). Also, Black teachers have higher expectations for Black students than any other race of teachers (Barnum, 2017).

Professional development of pre-service and current teachers on identifying implicit biases is necessary. The teacher participants in this study all answered that they did not hold any biases against race, gender, or SES, yet unstructured interviews revealed that they did. Teachers’ implicit biases are in operation even if they are unaware that they have them. Positive or negative perceptions have an impact on students because it influences expectations and pedagogical practices.
Although AM, WM, and WHM received lower negative perceptions about Jeffrey than BF, these three teachers made direct comments that showed their implicit biases. AM, who had the least amount of negative perceptions about Jeffrey, said that Black students were less behaved and academically unequipped than White and Asian students (See Appendix B, p. 102). He even suggested restrictive learning environments for Black students. (See Appendix B, p. 102).

WM displayed implicit bias because he viewed Alex’s academic and behavioral challenges more positively when compared to Jeffrey and Jason. Because of Alex’s race and place of residence, WM believed Alex was less aggressive: “I don’t think Alex would be aggressive as Jason and Jeffrey […] he is from a rural area and would be the only White kid in the school, I don’t think he would behave the same way. I think he would be calmer because he wouldn’t want problems with the Black kids” (See Appendix B, p. 101). WM viewed academic and behavioral challenges of Jason and Jeffrey negatively. For WM, their challenges in school predicted less favorable life outcomes than Alex: (1) “Let’s be realistic with statistics. Jeffrey is Black and will probably end up going to jail, in a gang, or dead” (See Appendix B, p. 108); (2) Their [Jason and Jeffrey] behavior is going to attract negative influences. Even if Jason is not from the inner-city, he still is going to face incarceration eventually if he doesn’t change his behavior because of racial profiling” (See Appendix B, p. 105). WM viewed Alex’s challenges in school as something that can be remedied with intervention from teachers because Alex was White: “The teachers in my school are predominately white, so he would relate to them more […] White teachers and students relate to one another more” (See Appendix B, p. 102). WM viewed the behavioral challenges of Jason and Jeffrey less rehabilitative: “I find that Black students who are disrespectful, disrespect everyone” (See Appendix B, p. 101).
WHM made direct comments about Jeffrey and Alex when it came to race. WHM believes that because Alex is white, he would eventually improve his behavior: “If Alex doesn’t end up on drugs, he will be all right […] Alex will eventually find his way” (See Appendix B, p. 96). On the other hand, because Jeffrey is Black, he has a less favorable future outcome: “Jeffrey is Black and statistically will end up in a gang, jail, or dead […] Jeffrey’s future looks grim. I’m just being honest […] Every day he goes to school, he probably worries about not getting shot” (See Appendix B, p. 80). These comments are indications that WHM has implicit biases against BMS because although Alex and Jeffrey had the same academic and behavioral challenges, Alex was viewed more positively.

AM, WM, and WHM said that they did not have any bias and during the interview. They did not seem to realize that their responses were offensive. Many teachers who exhibit biases are unaware that they have them. For these reasons, teacher degree programs and schools employing future teachers must provide implicit bias identification training. According to Zimmerman and Amin (2019), workshops are needed in all schools to combat implicit biases in teachers.

Discussion

Two research questions were investigated for this qualitative study via narrative inquiry. First, is the intersection of social identities of BMS, such as race, gender, and SES, responsible for how GE teachers respond to disruptive behaviors identical to externalizing ED traits in the classroom? Second, is it more likely for GE teachers to refer BMS, regardless of SES, than white male students with low-SES for SE evaluation? Findings show that the responses of teacher participants to academic and behavioral challenges identical to externalizing ED traits in the classroom are dependent on the intersection of race, gender, and low-SES. My hypothesis was supported. The chances of students' being referred for SE evaluation by GE teachers increase if
they are Black, male, and have low-SES. Academic and behavioral challenges will categorize these students under the ED disability label.

Independently, social identities such as race, gender, and SES increase BMS’ chances of being evaluated for SE in ED. There are implicit racial, gender, and SES biases in schools in which teachers form low academic and behavioral expectations for BMS. Society and school institutions view Black masculinity as problematic classroom behaviors in need of punitive discipline measures and segregated education environments (Losen & Skiba, 2010; Nicholson-Crotty et al., 2009; Skiba et al., 2002; Petras et al., 2011). As a result, SE placement for ED leads to high dropout rates and incarceration (Darensbourg, Perez, & Blake, 2010; & Cowan, 2016). Low-SES intertwines income and ethnicity. The poverty rate among Black Americans is at 21% compared to the overall 12.3% percent rate in the nation (Federal Safety Net, n.d.). Therefore, BMS living in low-SES, segregated neighborhoods, have schools in districts that are under-resourced and underperforming. People living in poor neighborhoods have poorer educational outcomes than people living in neighborhoods with middle or high-SES (Garcia & Weiss, 2017).

Based on the findings of this study, teacher participants had preconceived impressions of the fictional students and labeled them. Studies about disparities in education formed these stereotypical assumptions. Cultural Deficit Theory postulates that BMS’ home environment and culture cause poor school performances (Persell, 1981). Teacher participants attributed deficits to the fictional students because of their race, gender, and SES. They believed that these students were incapable of learning due to outside factors affecting classwork and behavior. Although this may be true, effective teaching and learning environments are the responsibility of the teacher. Teacher participants' biased perceptions influenced their possible responses via self- prophecy in that how they would help the fictional students with challenging behaviors would not work. In real
life, students perceive and react to low teacher expectations, and this produces adverse educational outcomes. Students change their behavior to what they believe their teachers expect of them. Teachers with biased perceptions of students change their pedagogical, assessment, and discipline practices to reflect these biases. It is an incessant pattern of self-fulfilling prophecies induced by stigmatized labeling.

As for gender, teacher participants stated that if Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex were girls, they would be less aggressive, and easier to mentor (See, Unstructured Interviews for Fictional Vignette Responses, pp. 106-107). They viewed aggressive females as an abnormality in gender traits. Therefore, teacher participants believed that if the fictional students were female, professionals would have diagnosed them for some behavioral or psychological disability. This finding suggests that teachers are more willing to work with female students’ behavior because teachers believe that girls are genetically prone to less aggression.
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VI. APPENDIX A

Advertisement Flyer

FREE!

TARGET

DUNKIN' DONUTS

STARBUCKS

Are you a New York State Certified Teacher licensed for Childhood Education 1-6 or/and Disabilities 1-6? Do you currently teach in public, charter, or private school with a high population of Black male students? Participate in my study and receive a $20.00 gift card for Starbucks, Target, or Dunkin Donuts if you are selected and come back for a second interview. Call/text me at XXX-XXX-XXXX or email me at XXXX@gradcenter.cuny.edu
Anonymity Form

I, Marilyn Bassett-Joseph, will not use the participant, ________________________________ name or

Name of Participant

school in my research thesis for the MALS program at CUNY Graduate Center.

x__________________________________________ Date ____________________________

Researcher

X__________________________________________ Date ____________________________

Participant Signature
2. Fictional Vignettes

Directions- Please read the following vignettes and answer the questions that follow on the space below entitled “Notes” and other sheets provided. These are your notes, and the interviewer will not collect them. Notify the interviewer when you are done and answer the questions the interviewer asks. Be free to refer to the vignettes, your notes, and experiences within your classroom as well.

Notes

You can use space on the back of this page.
Jason

Jason is a Black male, eleven years of age, is in the sixth grade, and attends a zero-tolerance charter school. He lives with both of his married biological parents, who are college graduates. They live in a middle-class neighborhood and own their home.

Jason's teacher decided to have a meeting with Jason’s parents about his engaging in a verbal altercation with another student which involved cursing. Consequently, the school gave Jason an in-school suspension at the “Culture Room.” A “Culture Room” is a classroom for students who refuse to adhere to the school’s strict rules with compliance. Students lose the opportunity to engage in extended classes (e.g., gym, music, and art) and socializing activities (e.g., sitting in the lunchroom or going to the yard for recess).

The following concerns were brought up by the teacher during the meeting: (1) Low-quality work below grade level performance as well as not turning in assignments; (2) talking back to teachers; (3) altercations with students with threats of “beating them up;” and (4) calling out in class and talking over others repeatedly. The teacher provided anecdotes and work samples for evidence in these areas of concern.

After speaking to Jason’s parents, the teacher learned that Jason was chosen in the lottery for admission to the charter middle school after being expelled from his private elementary school. His former private school opted out of taking the state exams for English-Language Arts and Math. Instead, his school used their assessments to measure literacy and math proficiency. Jason scored at a 4th-grade reading level for math and 3rd grade level for literacy. Jason’s parents already had him tested to rule out mental retardation, speech and language disorders, autism, learning disabilities (e.g., dyslexia, dyscalculia), hearing/vision impairment, multi-handicapping conditions, traumatic brain injury, neurological impairment, and any other medical conditions. Evaluators concluded that Jason had an “inability” to learn which intellectual, sensory, or health factors cannot explain.

Also, in his former school, Jason was unable to initiate or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers. In class, he was disruptive, called out, roamed the room, and talked back to teachers. He bullied other students and engaged in physical fights once or twice a week.
Jason’s parents seem completely cooperative and willing to do anything to help their son.

1. Pretend that you are Jason’s teacher, what actions would you take next by utilizing your schools’ resources to improve Jason’s academic and behavioral performance?
2. What would your school do if Jason’s academic and behavioral performance did not improve?
3. Do you think your school would have Jason referred for special education evaluation? Why or why not?
Jeffrey

Jeffrey is a Black male, eleven years of age, in the sixth grade, and attends his zoned public middle school in an inner-city neighborhood. He lives with his mother, who does not have a high-school diploma and works as a cashier, along with two other siblings. Jeffrey’s family lives in public housing.

Jeffrey’s teacher decided to have a meeting with his mother about his throwing a desk over in the classroom. Consequently, the school gave Jeffrey detention in the vice principal’s office during lunchtime. The following concerns were brought up by the teacher during the meeting: (1) Low Reading and Math proficiency scores; (2) Low quality work performance as well as not turning in assignments; (3) talking back to teachers; (4) altercations with students; (5) calling out in class repeatedly; and (6) getting out of seat without permission. The teacher provided anecdotes and work samples for evidence in these areas of concern.

The teacher decided to speak to Jeffrey’s former teachers and learned that Jeffrey exhibited this behavior before. Jeffrey was unable to initiate or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers. In class, he was disruptive, called out, and talked back to instructors. He bullied other students and engaged in physical fights once or twice a week. However, Jeffrey never threw desks, and this incident was his first time. The school, with the permission of Jeffrey’s mom, had Jeffrey tested. Examiners ruled out mental retardation, speech and language disorders, autism, learning disability, hearing/vision impairment, multi-handicapping conditions, traumatic brain injury, neurological impairment and any other medical conditions in the second grade. Examiners concluded that intellectual, sensory, or health factor could not explain Jeffrey's inability to learn. No action had been taken for Jeffrey to be evaluated for Special Education because they wanted Jeffrey to mature.

Jeffrey’s mom seems completely cooperative and willing to do anything to help her son.

1. Pretend that you are Jeffrey’s teacher. What would actions would you take next by utilizing your schools’ resources to improve Jason’s academic and behavioral performance?
2. What would your school do if Jeffrey’s academic and behavioral performances did not improve?
3. Do you think your school would refer Jeffrey for special education evaluation? Why or why not?
Alex

Alex is a White male, eleven years of age, in the sixth grade, and attends his zoned public school. He lives with his mother, who has no high-school diploma and works in a fast-food restaurant, along with three other siblings.

Alex’s teacher decided to have a meeting with Alex’s mother about his throwing a book across the classroom at the blackboard. Consequently, the school gave Alex detention after school. The following concerns were brought up by the teacher during the meeting: (1) Low Reading and Math proficiency scores; (2) Low quality work performance as well as not turning in assignments; (3) talking back to teachers; (4) altercations with students; and (5) calling out in class repeatedly. The teacher provided anecdotes and work samples as evidence for these areas of concern.

The teacher decided to speak to Alex’s former teachers and learned that Alex exhibited this behavior before in previous grades. Alex was unable to initiate or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers. In class, he was disruptive, called out, talked back to instructors, and walked out of the classroom to roam the hallways. He bullied other students and engaged in physical fights once or twice a week. In first grade, with permission from Alex’s mom, the school had Jason tested to rule out mental retardation, speech and language disorders, autism, learning disability, hearing/vision impairment, multi-handicapping conditions, traumatic brain injury, neurological impairment or any other medical conditions. Examiners concluded that Alex had an “inability” to learn unexplained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors.

Alex’s mom seems completely cooperative and willing to do anything to help her son.

1. Pretend that you are Alex’s teacher, what would actions would you take next by utilizing your schools’ resources to improve Jason’s academic and behavioral performances?
2. What would your school do if Alex’s academic and behavioral performances did not improve?
3. Do you think your school would have Alex referred for special education evaluation? Why or why not?
VII. APPENDIX B

Potential Teacher Participant Structured Interview Questions

(1) What is your gender; (2) What is your race and ethnicity; (3) How old are you; (4) What is your education degree; (5) What is your highest degrees; (6) What is your teaching certification; (7) How many years of teaching experience do you have; (8) In which type of school do you teach: public, charter, or private; (9) What grade do you teach; (10) What do you know about Emotional Disturbance; (11) Do you hold any biases against race; gender; and socioeconomic status?
### Social Identity Indicators

**KEY:** Race (R), Gender (G), Socioeconomic Status (SES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Teacher Positive Perceptions</strong> + (Positive Stereotypes)</th>
<th><strong>Teacher Negative Perceptions</strong> - (Negative Stereotypes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two parent household (SES)</td>
<td>Single parent household (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured household because of two parents living there (SES)</td>
<td>Unstructured household because of two parents living there (SES). Single parent homes could have substance abuse issues and substance abuse issues (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban, rural (SES)</td>
<td>Inner-city (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs and rural areas are safer and calmer (SES)</td>
<td>Inner- city are dangerous and hectic (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs conducive for learning and are safer (SES)</td>
<td>Inner city isn’t conducive for learning and achievement (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs and rural areas are less stressful (SES)</td>
<td>Inner cities are stressful (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in the suburbs and rural areas have morals (SES)</td>
<td>People in the inner- city lack morals (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs and Rural areas have more role models (SES, R)</td>
<td>Inner city has less role models (SES, R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural and Suburban areas produce better life outcomes (SES, R)</td>
<td>Innercity produce negative outcomes (SES, R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs and rural areas produce less aggressive people (SES, G)</td>
<td>Inner city produces more aggressive people (SES, G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are more helpful in rural areas than inner city areas (SES, R)</td>
<td>People are unhelpful in inner city areas (SES, R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Educated (SES)</td>
<td>No high school diploma (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most likely to be Incarcerated or recruited by gang because of being black (R)</td>
<td>Least likely to be incarcerated or recruited by gang because of being white (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Positive Perceptions + (Positive Stereotypes)</td>
<td>Teacher Negative Perceptions - (Negative Stereotypes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White student is unmotivated and but has ability to academically perform better (R)</td>
<td>Does not have ability to academically perform better (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public assistance for minorities (R, SES)</td>
<td>White people are less likely on public assistance (R, SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher SES means higher cognitive abilities (SES)</td>
<td>Lower SES means lower cognitive abilities (SES).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student has age appropriate responsibilities because of high SES and more time to focus on school (SES).</td>
<td>Student has adult responsibilities because of low SES status and less time to focus on school (SES).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES means more likely to be around academically successful adults (SES).</td>
<td>Low SES means less likely to be around academically successful adults (SES).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban and Rural schools have fewer behavioral issues with students than inner-city schools (SES, R).</td>
<td>Innercity schools have more behavioral issues with students (SES, R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents with middle, high SES research and implement better parenting techniques (SES).</td>
<td>People with low SES don’t research better parenting techniques (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with low SES end up in prison (SES).</td>
<td>People with middle, high SES are less likely to be incarcerated (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural areas don’t have certified professionals, ie., school psychologists (SES)</td>
<td>Urban and suburban areas have certified professionals, ie., school psychologists (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle and high SES have help parenting and can be proactive mothers (SES)</td>
<td>Low SES, single mothers need help parenting or outsource their mothering (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most likely to be Incarcerated or recruited by gang because of being black (R, SES)</td>
<td>Least likely to be incarcerated or recruited by gang because of being white (R, SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Positive Perceptions</strong> + (Positive Stereotypes)</td>
<td><strong>Teacher Negative Perceptions</strong> - (Negative Stereotypes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle and high SES Parent Involvement in child’s Education (SES)</td>
<td>Low SES parent uninvolved in child’s education. (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES can’t supplement children’s education with outside tutoring or other resources. (SES)</td>
<td>Middle, high SES can supplement children’s education with outside tutoring or other resources. (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent works but has social network to not neglect children (SES)</td>
<td>Parent works long hours and neglects children (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle, high SES Parents are educated, smart (SES)</td>
<td>Low SES Mothers are uneducated, ignorant (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban schools have more resources than rural and urban schools (R, SES)</td>
<td>Rural and Urban schools have less resources than rural schools. (R, SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle, high SES most likely to graduate high school and go to college because both parents are educated (SES)</td>
<td>Low SES, least likely to graduate high school because parents don’t have a high school diploma (SES).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black people have less favorable outcomes in society (R).</td>
<td>White people have more favorable outcomes in society (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black people are penalized more harshly by the court system (R).</td>
<td>White people are penalized less harshly by the court system (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES have low skilled, minimum wage jobs (SES).</td>
<td>Middle, high SES have professional jobs (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle, high SES better life choices (SES).</td>
<td>Low SES, poor life choices (SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most likely to be married because of being white (R)</td>
<td>Least likely to be married because of being black (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black people are suspicious (R).</td>
<td>White people are innocent (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black people who are unsuccessful, will least likely get themselves together (R)</td>
<td>White people will eventually get themselves together (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Positive Perceptions</strong> + (Positive Stereotypes)</td>
<td><strong>Teacher Negative Perceptions</strong> - (Negative Stereotypes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black people have less opportunities than white people (R).</td>
<td>White people have more opportunities than black people (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black boys look up to rappers and athletes for male role models or for employment prospects (R, SES)</td>
<td>White kids listen to rap music or play sports for fun, they don’t try to be thugs or athletes (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black kids try to live like the lyrics of music (e.g. aggressive, glorifying gang violence, glorifying stripper life) (R, SES).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black people have worse employment options than white people (R).</td>
<td>White people have better employment options than black people (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black people live in worse neighborhoods than white people because of discrimination (R).</td>
<td>White people live in better neighborhoods with less crime (R).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unstructured Interviews for Fictional Vignette Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong>= Interviewer  <strong>BM</strong>= Black Male Teacher  <strong>BF</strong>= Black Female Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WM</strong>= White Male Teacher  <strong>WF</strong>= White Female Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHF</strong>= Black Hispanic Female Teacher  <strong>WHM</strong>= White Hispanic Male Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM</strong>= Asian Male Teacher  <strong>AF</strong>= Asian Female Teacher  <strong>G</strong>= Gender  <strong>R</strong>= Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SES</strong>= Socioeconomic Status  + Positive perceptions  - Negative perceptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differentiated Instruction

**BM**: I think DI would benefit Jason because his parents will ensure that he would do homework (SES, +). It would not work if Jason has a learning disability. Jeffrey and Alex live in a low income and single-parent home (SES, -). I was in the same situation as them when I was in school at the same age. There is no one to help at home with schoolwork because my mother was busy working (SES, -). At least, Jason has a father that can pitch in and help (SES, +). Jason’s parents are smart (SES, +). **I**: Is Jeffrey’s and Alex’s mother smart? **BM**: They don’t have a high school diploma (SES, -). **I**: Do you think they would be unable to help their sons in school? **BM**: No, they don’t have the time or skills (SES, -). Sixth grade is a struggle for parents even with a high school diploma. **I**: If Jeffrey and Alex had involved fathers, would work better? **BM**: Depends on the education of the fathers, but Jeffrey’s and Alex’s mothers need help in raising boys (G, -). Boys need male role models (G, -). The scenarios didn’t mention if Jeffrey and Alex were going to an afterschool program. Jason is going to be alright eventually after he gets diagnosed for some type of learning or psychological problem. He is in a structured home with both parents (SES, +). Plus, his mother and father are college graduates (SES, +). Jeffrey and Alex are left to fend for their own like I was. I had my basketball coach who mentored me. The scenarios don’t mention that they (Jeffrey and Alex) play sports or have mentors (SES, -).

**BF**: It (DI) will work if Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex don’t have some type of learning disability. I just think Jason is unmotivated or going through other psych issues that cause him to be unfocused (SES, +). His parents are educated and can provide help with his homework and projects (SES, +). With Jeffrey, I think that his environment is causing him to lose motivation to go to school (SES, -). His mother is raising him alone and probably works all these hours and can’t support him in schoolwork on a cashier’s salary (SES, -). He is probably on some type of public assistance (SES, -). The scenario says that she wants to help, but she doesn’t have the skills to do
so (SES, -). Alex is in the same boat as Jeffrey, but his environment is calmer (SES, +). I think Alex could just have some type of psychological issue or undiagnosed learning disability. I: Do you think that only Alex in the scenarios has a psychological issue or undiagnosed learning disability? BF: I don’t have enough information to make that assumption. I: Do you think that Alex’s mother has more skills than Jeffrey’s to help with homework? BF: They both didn’t finish high school, so no (SES, -). Alex lives in a rural area, so it’s like a town, right? I watch these tv shows with small towns and the people are neighborly (SES, +). Someone in the town is going to help Alex (SES, +). Alex is going to have some type of town job like fixing cars or working on a farm (SES, +). I mean, Jeffrey lives in a rough neighborhood (SES, -). He has no help except to get shot (SES, -). Plus, Jeffrey needs male figures in his life that will steer him the right way (G, - ). I: Is DI a community effort, I thought it only involved schoolwork, assessment, and homework? BF: DI does, but you asked which mother had the skills to help. Both mothers (Jeffrey and Alex) may not have the academic skills, but Alex’s mother has the social skills to get help Alex in a less dangerous community (SES, -).

WM: DI works with students in catching up with on-level students. However, students in the lower group rarely get out of the low ability group. There should be some improvement. I: Who would benefit more, Jason, Alex, or Jeffrey? WM: Jason would benefit more because his parents are educated and will make sure that he graduates from high school and go to college (SES, +). Alex and Jeffrey are living in poverty and will end up uneducated in poverty, especially Jeffrey (SES). I: Why Jeffrey and not Alex? WM: Let’s be realistic with statistics. Jeffrey is Black and will probably end up going to jail, in a gang, or dead (G, -). Alex is White and lives in a rural neighborhood, and they don’t have those types of issues if he stays drug-free (G, SES, +). Alex has better options for work like farming (SES, +). He’ll probably end up married with kids (SES, +). Boys like Jeffrey that live in the inner city, end up shot (SES, -). BF: What does this have to do with DI? WM: You must be self-motivated to learn, and Jeffrey’s environment isn’t conducive for learning (SES, -). Alex has less stress than Jeffrey (SES, +). Well less stress, if he doesn’t have psychological issues.

WF: Sometimes DI works, sometimes it doesn’t. Maybe it will work with Jason because his parents are both colleges educated (SES, +). I: Will DI work with Alex and Jeffrey? WF: Based on the information given, their mothers do not have high school diplomas (SES, -). Their mothers have minimum wage jobs and probably work all these hours to help supplement their income (SES, -). Besides, Jeffrey and Alex do not have fathers in the home (G, -). They lack male role models (G, -). There are a lot of sociological factors that affect the classroom. I: Who will benefit the least, Alex or Jeffrey? WF: Jeffrey because he lives in the inner-city and these young boys end up in gangs or jail, sometimes even death. I: What does that have to do with DI in the classroom? WF: Jeffrey, because he lives where he lives is unsusceptible for learning (SES). He doesn’t have an environment that promotes positive reinforcements for education, like literacy and the importance of going to school (SES). I: Does Alex have an environment susceptible to learning? WF: Alex lives in a rural community that is probably very Christian with a lot of morals (SES, -). Alex is around people outside of his home who are role models (SES, +). Alex will eventually find his way (SES, +). I: Will Jeffrey find his way? WF: Probably not, but I hope he does (SES, -). His future looks grim. I’m just being honest.

BHF: I don’t think DI works because kids who score low always score. They only catch up on the skills that they didn’t get in the previous grades. Jason probably has some type of learning disability or psychological issue. He has a good background and he should be functioning on a
higher level (SES, -). Jeffrey probably has a learning disability or psychological issue too. It doesn’t help that he lives in the hood with a mother without a high school diploma (SES, -). He’s just a statistic waiting to happen. I don’t know much about white people who live in rural areas, but I do know that their environment is calmer (SES, -). Alex will catch up (SES, -). Again, if he doesn’t have some learning or mental issue. I: Why is Jeffrey more at risk than Alex? BHF: Jeffrey is Black (R, -) and Alex is White (R, +). Statistics are different for them. Jeffrey is going to go through more adversity in life than Alex (SES, -).

AM: DI is how teachers teach to ensure that students are getting the material on a level and pace that they can understand. It should work. Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex have other issues going on that were undiagnosed. I: Out of the three, who is the most and least at risk if DI does not work? AM: DI doesn’t work if the teacher’s pedagogical methods are ineffective. If DI does not work, then intervention services must get involved. I: Are there sociological issues involved in DI working for students? AM: DI is in class- prevention and intervention, so the teacher must ensure that it works. What happens outside the classroom has nothing to do with what goes on in the classroom when it comes to the teacher’s teaching. The class environment must be a culture of learning.

AF: I sort the kids according to their levels and I form groups to teach targeted skills. I: Does DI work for your classroom? AF: I see improvement. I: Does sociological issues like parent involvement or neighborhood influence students benefiting from DI? AF: It can if the students can’t separate themselves from negative influences to learn. I: Who would benefit more from DI, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? AF: I think Jason because his parents can help him with his schoolwork (SES, +). I: Can Jeffrey’s and Alex’s mothers help them with their schoolwork (SES, -)? AF: No, they didn’t graduate from high school (SES, -). I don’t even think they have the time to help them. They work at minimum wage jobs and probably do a lot of overtime to pay bills (SES, -). Plus, there aren’t any fathers in the home to help (SES, -).

I to WHM: As a response to the scenarios, other teachers mentioned that they would use DI for Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex. Why didn’t you suggest this as an action to improve their academic performance? WHM: At the beginning of the school year, I assess children and place them in homogeneous ability groups. All teachers are supposed to do this for their students to learn. I did not view DI as an intervention strategy. I: Does DI work for you? WHM: Smaller classes work better than DI instruction with small groups. Lower ability groups get lost in an overcrowded classroom trying to learn difficult material. DI is supposed to teach children needed skills, who are on the same level. What happens is that the lower track students never reach the same level as the on-level students. Smaller class sizes ensure that everyone has the attention they need to learn. It also makes it easier for the teacher, because he can catch right at the moment when the student doesn’t understand the lesson. I: Would DI benefit Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex? WHM: It would benefit them all. There must be effective instruction and assessment going on. I: Do you think sociological factors like the neighborhood or home environment affect DI? WHM: It could if the child can’t concentrate to learn. I: Who, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex, would be less likely to concentrate during DI? WHM: Jeffrey of course. He lives in the inner city where we know is hazardous (SES, -). Every day he goes to school, he probably worries about not getting shot. He has no father in the home so there is no male role model (G, -). He probably helps his mother who works many hours in a minimum wage job (SES, -). I: Alex has no father and his mother works at a minimum wage job (SES, -). So, is Alex able to concentrate more than Jeffrey? WHM: Yes, Alex lives in a rural environment (SES, +). It’s safe, there is no gang or drug war taking place (SES). Alex can go to
school peacefully and concentrate if he does not have a learning disability or psychological disorders. **I:** Can Jason concentrate better than Jeffrey and Alex? **WHM:** Jason is not even in the same category as these students. He lives in a two-parent household which both parents are college-educated (SES, +). I am sure his parents are going to make sure that he finishes high school and goes to college (SES, +). Jeffrey’s and Alex’s mothers dropped out of high school (SES, -). Jeffrey and Alex have never witnessed firsthand of a family member close to academically achieve (SES, -). They are just living in a cycle of poverty. The only difference between Jeffrey and Alex is that Jeffrey is Black and statistically will end up in a gang, jail, or dead (R, -). Those are facts. Alex could end up on drugs since that’s what has been going on for that past few years. **I:** What’s been going on? **WHM:** The white drug epidemic. Well, if Alex doesn’t end up on drugs, he will be alright (R+, SES-).
Observation of Events Prior Disruptive Behavior

I to BF: You’ve mentioned that you would observe the behavioral triggers of Jason Jeffrey, and Alex. What are triggers? BF: I assume that Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex simply do not have these destructive behaviors in school for no reason whatsoever. Something before their behavior set them off. I would observe and anecdote what initiated this. I would then modify my approach, their learning approach, environment, or management of students so that I could avoid their behavioral responses and have an optimal learning environment. I: Do you modify your whole classroom for one student? BF: That’s what teachers do anyway if there is a disruptive student in the classroom. One child can deter the whole lesson or lessons for the day. In public school, there is no help. School safety removes violent students, but sometimes they are busy, and I am left alone to fend for myself. So, my main objective is to keep the peace so that everyone can learn. Everyone in my class is responsible for one another, and we do our best to make sure that everyone learns. Our objective is to not set each other off, and if we do, there will be no class incentives. Jason is in a charter school, so it may have a better discipline plan than public (SES, -). Alex’s school is rural and does not have that many issues in his classroom either (SES, -). But Jeffrey attends a school is in the inner-city like mine, and the best way to handle a boy like him in a school like ours is just what I said (SES, -).

I to WHM: You’ve mentioned in your response that you would document “antecedent events,” what does that mean? WHM: Years ago, before 2010, I had taken a workshop on behavior management. Basically, as teachers, we should observe not only for disruptive behaviors and how we respond to them but also what events lead to disruptive behaviors. Kids are kids and they will respond to stimuli the best way they know how "nurturaly" and naturally. I: What does "nurturaly" mean? WHM: Nurturaly means by nurture, how kids were raised. I coined that term when talking about people. People’s behaviors are because of genetics and nurture through parenting, schooling, and the environment. It’s my job as an educator to socialize students. I: Would documenting work for Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex, if so how? WHM: It would work because it keeps a flowing classroom. The teacher can predict an event that is going to set off some kid. If I know the antecedent behavior, I could provide methods to avoid it or give the student coping strategies to endure it without disruptive behavior. I: Do you do this for every student? Or, just the disruptive ones exhibiting dangerous behaviors like throwing desks or objects? WHM: I admit, I kind of ignore the quieter students because I know that they will do their work. But the disruptive ones, I learn their motives and what will set them off. I must get these students to pass the ELA State exams. I don’t have just 28 kids, I have 28 kids times 6 classes. I was hired to teach them ELA by any means necessary. I: Is there support for students that exhibit violent behaviors like fighting, throwing desks, or throwing objects from the administrators in your school? WHM: No, there is none. Just the teacher. For years, in my school, I did not get any help unless the AP [Assistant Principal] has something done directly to her. In my school, maybe it’s because I am a man, they expect me to handle situations by myself (G, -). I’ve built a reputation that I can handle the kids, and the kids and I have rapport. They might give me a hard time, but in the end, they respect me because they know that I respect them and want them to have an education.

BM: I get a gist of what causes certain children to react the way they do. I don’t have time to document anything. Most of the time I document what happens after the behavior. I: Why not document what happens before, especially if it is the same student exhibiting the same behavior? BM: I don’t have time in the day to do that. I: If you have a gist of what will cause a student to exhibit unwanted behavior, what do you do to deter the behavior? BM: I change my interaction
with the student if I am the cause. I stop the student that is bothering a student if that is another cause. If it has to do with some transitioning situation, I use the school’s point system to give or detract points. It works most of the time. The school doesn’t follow through with discipline even though it brags that charter school is better than public school. I: Why is discipline in charter school supposed to be better than public school? BM: Some charter schools have strong disciplinary actions like Jason’s school. The only time the school will get involved is if when a student is low performing and physically fights other students. Other than that, nothing much is done if the parents have no control over their kids. I: Would documenting events before disruptive behaviors help Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex? BM: Yes, if the teacher had time to do. I doubt that he does.

BHF: I have no time for that [observing causes of behavior]. Besides, my kids aren’t throwing desk and fighting in my room. My students know I don’t play. I: Would documenting events before disruptive behavior help Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex? BHF: Of course, then the teacher could know what causes them to snap and how to avoid it.

WM: Who has time to write about what causes behavior all day? I have to teach. I: Do you know what events happen before students who are known to have disruptive behavior in class? WM: No, and I don’t need to. I don’t have severe discipline issues like fighting and throwing stuff in my room. I: Would Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex benefit from documenting events before disruptive behavior? WM: They would, but I don’t think that most teachers have time to do so. Teachers have to be alert about what is going on around in their room. Not taking notes all day. Students need to be monitored.

WF: I don’t have too many issues in my room, just talking when it is supposed to be quiet work time. I don’t need to document events before disruptive behavior. Do you think Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex would benefit from document events before disruptive behaviors? WF: Sure, then the teacher can know why they are behaving the way they are and tell their mothers and counselor or anyone that could help them.

AM: My school doesn’t tolerate disruptive behavior. The parents sign a contract about attendance and behavior. They know that if they are in breach, their child will eventually be expelled. I don’t need to do that. I: Do you think documenting events before disruptive behaviors will help Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex? AM: It is a systematic approach. I guess it would work.

AF: Teachers are supposed to do that [observe for caused for behavior] in my school. I used to, but there is no time in the day. I: Do you think it would be beneficial to know what events cause Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex student disruptive behaviors? AF: Sure, I don’t have problems like that in my school, but it would help their teachers.
Refer to School Counselor/Psychologist

**BM:** Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex need to discuss what is going on with them emotionally. They need to talk about what’s up with them. I have referred students to counseling, and it has helped them. Jason would benefit the most because he has a strong home foundation (SES, +). **B:** Why wouldn’t it help Jeffrey and Alex? **BM:** No, I didn’t say it wouldn’t help them. **I:** Explain your answer. **BM:** Jason’s and Alex’s mother won’t have the time to reinforce the advice the counselor would suggest (SES, -). They are too busy surviving (SES, -). My mother was the same way. I love her and she sacrificed a lot. But she would outsource her mothering to other people because my dad wasn’t involved emotionally or financially. I rarely saw her because she was busy working. My sisters and I were at home alone taking care of ourselves. I didn’t have time to talk about feelings with my mom. She just wanted to know if I did my homework, and that I didn’t give my sisters a hard time. Kids need adults who are center in their lives to invest time with them. **I:** Is it possible that Jeffrey’s parents could be just as busy? **BM:** They’re educated and probably read books on how to parent (SES, +). Counseling will work with Jason if he does not have a psychological disorder. **I:** How do you know that Jeffrey’s and Alex’s mothers didn’t read books on parenting? **BM:** They don’t have a high school diploma (SES, -).

**BF:** Counselors will provide the boys with alternative coping strategies. Only if the counselors are good and aren’t overwhelmed with the student population. I’ve asked my school counselor to meet with several students. I even had counselors visit my classroom for a session with my whole class, especially, if there is a conflict that could escalate into a fight. They’ve helped so far. I think counseling will help all of them. **I:** In the long run, who will counseling not help based on the information provided? **BF:** Jeffrey, if he doesn’t get the help or make the decision to improve. Jeffrey is going to end up in prison eventually because he is Black (R, -). **I:** Are Jason and Alex going to end up in prison if counseling does not help? **BF:** Alex maybe because he is what White people call white trash (R, -). But Jason comes from a middle class educated family (SES, +). Unless Jason is crazy, he is going to decide to eventually change. Now, he will end up in prison in high school if he doesn’t change. That’s just the fate of Black men in our community (R, -). At the end of the day, the world sees Black as Black. It doesn’t matter who your parents are or how much education you have. **I:** Is Jason better off than Alex? **BF:** Jason is Black. Alex is White. Alex is always better off (R, -). All Alex must do is decide to change. Doors will fly right open (R, -). Jason has a strong family that will help him if he does not make a mistake with the law and get himself arrested (SES, +). The law penalizes black boys and white boys differently (R, -). In America, white boys make mistakes or they’re crazy (R, -). Black boys are believed to do everything intentional and in our right state of mind which is prone to evil (R, -).

**I to WM:** Why did you refer Jason for counseling and not Jeffrey or Alex? **WM:** I did refer all of them. Intervention in my school includes counseling. **I:** Why did specifically, Jason, get referred to counseling? **WM:** Jason’s parents are educated, and I’ve dealt with parents who are educated. The best thing to do is to exhaust in-class resources before suggesting out of class resources. I could say to the parents, look we’ve tried this, and now it’s time to get the RTI team involved. **I:** What does counseling have to do with exhausting in-class resources? **WM:** I don’t waste time with parents like Jason’s. Their son is in a different situation and could get all the help that they need or want (SES, +). **I:** What is the situation? **WM:** Women raising men alone (G, -). There’s no father figure. My parents divorced, but my father was still in my life. My mother, whom I love dearly, can’t or never will understand what it is to be a boy or a man (G, -). Sometimes, topics are so embarrassing to discuss, that not having a father makes life confusing for boys (G, -).
I: Would you suggest a female counselor or male counselor for the boys? WM: Beggars can’t be choosers. However, the boys need someone, preferably male, to tell their innermost thoughts to besides their mothers (G, -). I: Do you refer disruptive students to counseling, and if so, does it work? WM: I do, but not for disruptive behavior. More for socioemotional issues. I: Does it work? WM: I guess so.

I to WF: Why did you suggest that Jason and Jeffrey should see school psychologists and not Alex? WF: I don’t think rural areas have the same resources as city schools (SES, -). I mean, who is Alex going to see with real credentials. I mean it’s a hick town, right? (SES, -) I: Why suggest a school psychologist and not a counselor? WF: I use the term interchangeably. I know that a school psychologist has a different degree than a counselor. But essentially, they do the same job of counseling. I: Do you think if Alex had a school psychologist in his school, he would be referred to one? WF: Of course. I: Do you think if Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex would all benefit from seeing a school psychologist? WF: Yes, I mean to an extent. A lot of their issues can be remedied by medication. Referring to the scenarios, they [Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex] had these issues for some time. I find it weird that they were not diagnosed with something. Especially, Jason, since his parents have the education and the economic resources to get him help (SES, +). I feel that perhaps either the boys’ behaviors are on purpose, or they’re just screwed in the head and need medication. I: Who would benefit the most from seeing the school psychologist? WF: Jason and Alex would benefit the most. I: Why not Jeffrey? WF: Jeffrey lives in the inner-city where there are a lot of obstacles for young black boys like crime (R, SES, -). Jeffrey is most likely going to end up in prison if he does not get help (R, SES, -).

I to BHF: Why did you suggest a counselor for Jason and not Jeffrey or Alex? BHF: I suggested that Jason and Alex should be referred to social services. I: Why social services and not a counselor like Jason? BHF: Jason and Alex have issues relating to poverty. The fact that the mothers are single and work a minimum wage job tells me that their sons need more than just counseling (SES, -). The boys need to be in some type of community program that will help them. I: Will counseling only help Jason and not Jason or Alex? BHF: Yes. Jason has support at home from parents who are educated (SES, +). He lives in a middle-class neighborhood (SES, +), and once he gets medication for his issues, he should be fine. Alex probably will be fine since he lives in a rural town (SES, -), but Jeffrey lives in an area with too much peer pressure to fail (SES, -). If the gangs won’t get him, a bullet will (SES, -). Plus, social services will provide help for Jeffrey’s and Alex’s mothers.

WHM: Counseling will help them to talk about their problems and give them that one on one time and strategies to deal with their behaviors. I refer students to counseling when I feel that they are going through non-academic issues affecting their schoolwork. I think counseling will benefit all of them. I: Who would benefit the most, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? WHM: Well, I said all of them. I: Which student would show the most improvement with counseling? WHM: I think Jason would. I: Why? WHM: I keep bringing up that he comes from a two-parent home that is college-educated (SES, +). They [Jason’s parents] will ensure that Jason would eventually get himself together. Alex will probably get it together (R, +), but counseling will not show results with Jeffrey because of his crime in his environment (SES, -).

I to AM: Why didn’t you refer Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex to school counseling or a school psychologist? AM: I referred them to intervention which is counseling. My school has a system in place to handle students who cannot resolve their issues within the classroom. I: Who would
benefit more from counseling, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex. AM: I think they would all benefit from
counseling, but Jason would benefit more because of his parents and economic background. He
has the social and financial networks to succeed (SES, +). I: Have you ever referred a student
for counseling without intervention? AM: No. I: Does any of your students have non-academic
issues affecting their school performance? AM: Probably, but I keep it very professional in my
classroom. My students come to school to learn or there is a swift consequence. I was raised to go
to school and learn. Both my parents were first-generation Chinese-Americans, and they obtained
their medical degrees. I didn’t have a choice to purposely fail because I didn’t want to be in school
or I had a bad evening at home. I: Do your students live in a high-crime area? AM: Yes, but I let
them know that there are no excuses. When they come to school, they should come to learn. I don’t
have a friendship with them. I: Do you feel that not having a friendship with your students is a
good thing? AM: No, I wish I could expose my jovial self, but I don’t want to lose control. My
kids can perform, and my school celebrates this.

AF: All these boys need counseling to share why they are behaving the way they are. I
would recommend counseling for students if I felt that they needed it. I: Did you ever have
students that needed counseling? AF: Not really, by the time that my students reach 5th grade,
they are already assigned counseling. My school doesn’t wait too long to get help for children who
need it. I: Do you have students who are receiving counseling? AF: Yes. I: Does it work? AF:
I never interacted with my students before they had received counseling. And I am sure that if it
were not working, they would no longer be attending my school with misbehavior. I: Who would
counseling help more Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex, and why? AF: Counseling would help Jason and
Alex more. Jason parents are college-educated and will make sure that he gets the help he needs
to succeed (SES, +). Alex lives in a rural area and will eventually become socialized (SES, +). I:
Why wouldn’t counseling help Jeffrey? AF: Jeffrey lives in a high crime area and will most likely
fall victim to that (SES, -).
Refer to School Social Worker/ Social Services

I to BF: Why did you recommend Jeffrey and Alex to school social worker/social services and not Jason? BF: I felt there was a higher chance that they would have a social worker assigned to them since most likely they could be receiving financial assistance from the government (SES, -). The social worker could visit their homes to find out what is going on. I: What could be going on in the homes of Jeffrey and Alex that would not be going on in Jason’s home? BF: Sometimes young single mothers neglect their kids to have a social life with friends and boyfriends (SES, -). Jeffrey and Alex could be acting out because of what is going on with their mothers in the home. I: Do you feel that Jason wouldn’t have those issues? BF: No, I think his life would be a little more structured (SES, +). I: How would a social worker help Jeffrey or Alex? BF: By providing outside counseling, mentorship programs, or community programs. At least, that is what the inner-city social workers would do. The rural one, I don’t know. I generalize. I: Do you think Jason could benefit from social services as well? BF: Why would I refer Jason to social services? He lives in a good neighborhood, has two parents with a college degree (SES, +). Jeffrey’s and Alex’s homelife are different than Jason’s.

I to BHF: Why did Jeffrey and Alex get referred to social services and not Jason? BHF: Alex and Jeffrey fit the profile of needing social services. Their mothers are uneducated (SES, -). There are no fathers in the household (SES, -). They have been in trouble often in school and are failing (SES, -). Jason doesn’t fit the profile because I assume both his parents have professional careers since they are both college-educated (SES, +). Jason lives in a middle-income neighborhood and family owns a home (SES, +). I: How would social services help Jeffrey and Alex? BHF: Home visits are warranted; I mean I don’t know what goes on in their home environment. Sometimes parents cover up well. Jeffrey’s and Alex’s mothers could be drug addicts, alcoholics, in abusive relationships with their boyfriends (SES, -). I mean, god knows what. I: Could Jason’s parents be of those characteristics that you’ve mentioned? BHF: No, it’s obvious that Jason’s parents made better choices in life than Jeffrey’s and Alex’s mother (SES, -).

I to WF: Why did you suggest social worker/social services for Alex and not Jason or Jeffrey? WF: I wouldn’t refer Jason to social services. He has a stable home environment (SES, -). I: Do Jeffrey and Alex have a stable home environment? WF: No, they do not. I assume that Jeffrey has a social worker already since he lives in the inner-city and probably is in the social services already (SES, -). There is no way that his mother is supporting him without any aid from the city (SES, -). I: Why would Jeffrey be receiving aid? WF: Kids like Jeffrey just do (R, SES, -). I: What do you mean, kids like Jeffrey? I: Black and Hispanic kids in the inner-city whose mother is uneducated, and the father isn’t around (R, SES-). I: Alex is not Black or Hispanic, could he be receiving benefits as well? WF: Alex probably is. However, I don’t know, that’s why I referred him to social services, so he could get help from them since his mother is unable to help him (R, SES, +). I: How would social services help Alex? WF: I would think they would place him in some type of group counseling or home for troubled boys. Alex doesn’t live in a stressful environment like the city (SES, +). He should not have these behaviors unless there is something psychologically wrong with him. I: Should Jason be having these behaviors since he lives in a middle-class neighborhood? WF: Jason could be going through peer pressure. Or, he could be trying to behave like a thug because he thinks it’s cool. A lot of Black boys in my school want to be either a rapper or an athlete. That’s if he is purposely screwing up and doesn’t have psychological issues (SES, -). I: Would Alex be purposely screwing up because he wants to be cool? WF: Alex lives in a completely different world than Jason and Jeffrey. Jason and Jeffrey
are affected by negative media portraying Black males as aggressive (R, -). Jason and Jeffrey must decide on what type of adults that they want to be: a productive one or a burden on society. I: Don’t white kids listen to rap music and look up to athletes as well? WF: White kids pretend (R, +). Black kids try to live the lyrics in these songs (R, -). Both think it’s fun, but white kids learn, as they get older that it’s just music or just a sport. I teach Black children whose parents are professionals and when asked what they would like to be when they grow up, they answer—a basketball player, singer, or rapper. I: Don’t white kids want to be country singers or baseball players? WF: White kids have options besides selling drugs to make a lot of money (R, SES +). There are more options because we are white (R, +) We have the option of having a good job and living in a good neighborhood since all the neighborhoods are segregated anyway (R, SES, +). And unfortunately, Black people regardless of profession, live in poorer neighborhoods because of discrimination (R, SES, -). Even the good Black kids get peer pressured into doing the wrong things (R, -).

I to BM: Why didn’t you suggest that Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex see a school social worker? BM: I didn’t think to. I: How would a social worker help them? BM: I don’t know, probably visit them at home and write a report. I: Do you think that would be helpful for them? BM: No, because the social worker could end up removing them from their homes and placing them in foster care for no reason. I: Do social workers remove children from homes for no reason? BM: Racist ones do. I: Alex is white, would he be removed? BM: Well he’s poor in an all-white town (SES, -). I don’t know. I: Do social workers help students in school? BM: I don’t see how. They aren’t teachers or psychologists.

I to WM: Why did not you suggest social services for Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex? WM: Why would I enlist social services? Are their parents abusive or on drugs? Are the mothers in an abusive relationship? Are they homeless? Are there any concerns that I am unaware of? I: The scenario didn’t say. So, no. WM: I would only involve children services or social services if I thought that to be the case.

I to WHM: Would social services benefit Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex? WHM: Jeffrey and Alex could benefit from social services. I: Why didn’t you suggest it as an action for improvement? WHM: Didn’t cross my mind. I mentioned that they should be referred to intervention services. The school counselor and psychologist on the team could refer them [Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex] to social services if it is needed. I wouldn’t refer any students directly to social services unless if they were neglected or abused. I: How could Jeffrey and Alex benefit from social services? WHM: Social services could provide their mothers with financial assistance as well as community-based mentor programs. Jeffrey and Alex could use strong male role models and coping tools for whatever is bothering them (G, -).

I to AM: Why didn’t you suggest social services for Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex? AM: I suggested intervention services. They are the ones that decide if social services are needed. I don’t involve myself in manners like that. If there is a concern with a student that involves social services, I don’t directly contact them. I go through the school counselor.

I to AF: Why did not you suggest social services for Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? AF: Social services should be called if there is a major concern that could cause the life of a child. I wouldn’t call because of a student’s academic or behavioral problems. That’s more of a counselor’s job. I: Are there any concerns with Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex that necessitate social services? AF: No, the scenarios did not mention that there were.
Refer to Literacy Specialist, Math Specialist, Behavior Specialist, and Refer Intervention Services

I to BM: How would reading and math group pullouts go about helping Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex? What actions would you take if there was no improvement?  

BM: The reading and math small group teachers remove students from classes during literacy and math classes to work on needed skills. If there were no improvement then, I wouldn’t know what to do except for continuing to help them in class.  

I: Do you have RTI services in your school?  

BM: I heard of RTI, but I don’t remember what it is exactly.  

I: RTI, is Response to Intervention Services. When everything the teacher does in the classroom doesn’t help the student in question, she can refer the student to a team of professionals such as reading and math specialists, behavior specialists, counselors, school psychologists, administrators, and other professionals. This is how students get academic/behavioral supports within the general education classroom. The students’ parents are in constant communication with the teacher. When these services do not help, then the student is referred for Special Education evaluation by everyone in the team- with the parents’ consent of course.  

BM: I know that we have specialists in my school, but I don’t know if there is a team.  

I: Did your school inform you about RTI by having workshops?  

BM: No, well we have a lot of workshops. Is every school supposed to have one?  

I: According to the mandates of IDEA, yes.  

BM: I don’t think some of my colleagues know that there is supposed to be one. I know that new teachers don’t know this. This is my first year, and half the staff is new hires.  

I: What do they do with students who do not improve, at academically?  

BM: I guess they leave them back a year or pass them on to the next grade.  

I: What do you do if students don’t improve?  

BM: This year, I complained to my dean and tried to get help for my students. Nothing much was done. I did most of the intervention. Some kids will be passed on to the next grade not having the prerequisite skills.  

Who would benefit from reading and math pull-outs more, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? Jason because I know that he will get the support from home (SES, +). Who would not benefit from reading and math pull-outs? Jeffrey because I know that there is no one outside of school to help him (SES, -).  

I to BHF: Your colleague, (BM) said that your school did not inform him of RTI services. How come do you know about these services and he doesn’t.  

BHF: I really don’t know. I’ll inform him today. I: Why not suggest for Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex for RTI services from the beginning? How does the literacy and math specialists help you?  

BHF: They pull out struggling students for reading and math small groups. They help deficient skills so that students will not fall behind. When this doesn’t help, I refer them to the RTI team.  

I: Who do you think would benefit from being referred to literacy and math specialists, and RTI services Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? They would all benefit if they don’t have to be evaluated for special ed.  

I to BF: You’ve mentioned that you would refer Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex straight to intervention services if strategies in your classroom didn’t work. What is an intervention service?  

BF: I work in the DOE and basically after I’ve done all that I could, or think I’ve could, I would refer that student to RTI services. I let the parents know that I tried differentiation, grouping, incentives, consequences, and involving them and nothing has improved, and I need a team, out of my class, to help.  

I: What is the team?  

BF: RTI team, the reading specialists, math specialists, vice-principal, counselors, school psychologists, all the other teachers that teach the student. The team and I work together. It takes a village to raise a child.  

I: Do RTI services work better than just referring students for SE evaluation?  

BF: You can’t refer a student to any SE services because the final decision for referral of evaluation is the principal. RTI usually helps students in catching
up on prerequisite skills. The team works along with the parents too, if the parents are involved. Most of the time it works if the teacher and the teamwork close together. I: Even with behavior? BF: RTI works if the student doesn’t have some type of disability or psychological disorder. If the student does, then the team suggests that there should be an evaluation. The principal has to get permission from the parents because the district has to do it. Very dot your I's and cross your T’s for legality purposes. I: What are legality purposes? BF: Lawsuits for not placing children in sped (Special Education). The school has to be sure if that is where the student belongs. I: Your colleague said that your school never informed him that there were RTI services. He wasn’t clear if the school had these services at all. How did you find out about them? BF: I was hired before him. The [charter school corporation] used to send newly hired teachers out of state for training. They probably stopped doing the training to promote some new curriculum program. I: Whose responsibility is it for teachers in your school to understand the procedures for RTI, if they have never heard of it? BF: The school’s, I guess the teacher should also ask questions if unclear about the process. I: If the teacher doesn’t know about the RTI process as you say, how could they ask questions? BF: Your right, the teacher can’t. I guess it’s the school’s responsibility. Things tend to fall apart after the winter break. Teachers and deans end up quitting and for the most part we get new staff. I: Are you going to inform BM now that you know that he doesn’t know? BF: Of course, my school has done him dirty. I am surprised that he stayed. He gets no support. I know, I’ve been there. I: Who do you think will benefit more from RTI, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? BF: Jason would. His parents would work along with the team by staying involved in the process (SES, +). I: Jason’s and Alex’s mothers would not stay involved and work along with the team? BF: They would end up being too busy (SES, -). I: Did the scenario say this? BF: They don’t have a parent helping at home (SES, -). They are probably overwhelmed (SES, -).

I to WM: You said that you would refer Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex to the reading and math specialists, and if that didn’t work you would refer them to intervention services. Why did you decide to approach this as a method to improve their performances? WM: I wouldn’t refer to them to the reading and math specialists. I would inform the specialists that I needed instructional tools to help aid them in my classroom. And what usually happens, when all else fails, I would refer them to my school’s intervention team. I: What is an intervention team? WM: The intervention team includes the dean for my grade, instructional coordinators, specialists, behavior specialists, all the teachers that teach the student referred, and counselor. There could be more, but I can’t think about it from the top of my head. I: What does the intervention team do? WM: They work with failing or troubled students before a referral goes out for the students for Special Education Evaluation. They help me out a lot. I couldn’t do it alone with all the kids in my room. I: What if the team couldn’t help these students? WM: Then the students would be referred to special education services. I: Who would RTI benefit most, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? WM: It would benefit Jason the most because parent involvement is crucial. I: Do you think Jeffrey’s and Alex’s mothers would be involved? WM: Maybe to a point. They work and are single mothers. I wouldn’t expect much since they are trying to support their families alone (SES, -). Who would benefit the least? WM: Jeffrey and Alex.

I to WF: You said that you would first refer Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex to the reading and math specialist in your school. If this didn’t help, you said that you would refer them to intervention services. Why not refer them straight to intervention? WF: I always ask for ideas for specialists before referring students to RTI. I don’t anymore since I’ve taught for so long and got a method to the madness in my room. I: So, why refer these students to RTI? WF: The scenarios didn’t mention
about the boys getting help before. To get this far into school, and there has not been any improvement, is disheartening. I know that the scenarios are fictional stories, but this happens. I: Do RTI services work? WF: Yeah, it helps the school weed out who needs to be in special ed. I: Who would it help more? Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? I: It would help Jason more since he has the educational support at home (SES, +). Jeffrey and Alex don't have that support (SES, -). RTI requires parent involvement.

I to WHM: You’ve mentioned that you would refer Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex to RTI services. Would you enlist help within your classroom from reading specialists and math specialists? WHM: I’ve been teaching for a long time, and I can identify which students will need the extra help the first week of school through assessment them. I work along with their families, and eventually, they will improve. If they don’t, I inform the RTI team. I: What happens if RTI doesn’t work? WHM: Then, it’s more likely that they need special education services. I: Have you found RTI successful? WHM: Yes, especially if the family is involved. If the family isn’t, then it’s not. RTI collaborates with me in helping at-risk students. I: What professionals make up RTI services. WHM: It’s a whole bunch of people: reading and math specialists, assistant principals, counselors, social workers, school psychologists, after-school programs. The whole school gets involved. I: What if RTI services don’t work? WHM: The student is referred for special education evaluation. The district makes the final decision. Teachers don’t decide in the process. They interview me and review the students’ work. What I say along with the family mostly counts. I am the one teaching the student every day. The families would know their child better than anyone else. I: Who would RTI help more, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? WHM: All. They all could benefit from one on one attention and small group learning.

I to AM: Why send Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex to RTI services right away? AM: If my methods weren’t helping them in the classroom, then that is what I would do. I: Does RTI work? AM: RTI services assist me in educating students with low performance. I: How long do you wait to enlist students in RTI services? AM: Usually, after the first report card, or the second progress report. I: Do you collaborate with your colleagues since you only teach ELA and Social Studies? AM: Usually, there is a consensus with the other teachers about the problems of a student. If there are problems in one classroom, most likely there’s a problem in all classrooms. I: Does RTI work? AM: It works for those students who aren’t supposed to be in special education. Who would benefit from RTI services the most, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? AM: I think it would benefit all them if they don't have an undiagnosed disability.

I to AF: You’ve mentioned that you would ask help from another ELA teacher and another Math teacher to improve the academic performances of Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex. If this strategy did not work, then you would refer them to intervention services. Why did you suggest these actions? AF: As the idiom says: “Two heads are better than one”. I ask teachers about what they are doing in their classrooms to help students in mine. Maybe their strategies will work along with mine. I: Has this strategy work before with students like Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex? AF: I never had students with disruptive behaviors as severe as Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex. However, I would try to seek help from someone. I: What happens when these strategies don’t work? AF: I would request the intervention team. I: How would you go about with the request? AF: I would inform my dean that I need the help of the team. She would have already known which students had issues in my room and what strategies I was using. She would put in the request. I: What professionals are in the intervention team? AF: All the professionals in the building that have an affiliation with the student that needs services. That means myself, parents, reading and math specialists, behavior
specialist, extension teachers like music, art, science, and gym, counselors, I mean everyone. *I:* Do they help you in the classroom? *AF:* Yeah, they help teachers. I guess, I mean I never needed them. *I:* What if the intervention team doesn’t improve the students’ performances? *AF:* I guess the student gets evaluated for special ed and if they do not need special ed they probably will get kicked out or transferred. Who would benefit most from RTI, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? It would help all of them if they don't need to be placed in special ed.
One on One Conferences, In-class Tutoring and Outside Tutoring

BM: I use class time to keep an eye on all three students while they produce work. I: How? BM: I don’t stay in one place when I teach unless I am using the interactive board in front of the room. I walk around the classroom and check students’ work with a key. It just makes it easier than checking their work at the end of the day. Everything piles up, and I don’t have time during the day to check work. I don’t like bringing too much work home. I: How much time does one on one conferences take? BM: I meet my students at the conference table desk during independent work, depending on the level of the students. Students who need help, I see twice a week. The students who are not, I meet every other week. It shouldn’t take more than 5 minutes. I: Does that give you enough time if there is a student in need of more assistance? AM: That’s why I use the lunch period to tutor or extension time to offer more help. I: What is extension time? AM: Kids are dismissed fifteen minutes before four. Teachers have to stay to work in their classrooms or on lesson plans until 4:30. I take that time to tutor kids after school, with the families’ permission of course. I: Does the extra tutoring after school help them? BM: Yes, it does. I: And do you do this tutoring for free? BM: Yes, I don’t get paid for it. I: Do you have time to help all the students that need tutoring? BM: I only work with students that really need help. I: Why not suggest for your students or Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex to pay for tutoring? BM: I didn’t think of that. Well, Jason could probably pay for it (SES, +). But not Jeffrey and Alex (SES, -). I: Would you think tutoring would help Jason or Jeffrey and Alex if they could afford it? BM: One on one teaching helps students.

I to BF: One on one conferences happen at a scheduled day and time during independent work time. Each child meets with the teacher twice a week for reading, writing, and math for at least 5 minutes. There are so many students sometimes I don’t meet with all of them. Or, school isn’t in session on certain days. So, I prioritize the low performing students. I: Does conferencing work with all students, and do you have enough time? BF: Yes, it gives me a perspective on how students do their work independently. I can tap into how they are thinking. There is not a lot of time. Most of the conferring happens during small group work. I: Would you take your personal time to tutor high needs students? BF: No. I will not be alone with students outside of school hours. Students that need extra assistance will be referred for RTI services. I wished I lived in a world where I could do that. But, I need my license. I don’t want kids lying on me. I: Would you suggest for families to pay for tutoring? BF: If they could afford it. I didn’t think of suggesting outside tutoring. Most of the time parents do not have the financial resources to pay for tutoring or learning centers. I: Do you think Jason’s family could afford it? BF: Yes, I could have suggested tutoring for him (SES, +). I: Who would one on one conferences more, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? I think it would benefit all of them, and the teacher so that she could see how to help them.

WM: One on one conferences are used by teachers to work with individual students for literacy and math. It takes about 5 minutes a day and one student per session. There should be at least 5-6 students seen in a period. I: Is that enough time to help high needs students? WM: Yes, if you target the skills that need to be worked on. I find it effective. I: What happens if there is not enough time? WM: Then, I assign homework to the student that would be due to me the next day so I can see if they need further help in the skill. I: Do you give this homework on top of the homework that the student may already have? WM: Well, yes, if there isn’t an exam the next day or if the skill is a prerequisite in learning the current lesson. I: Do you provide lunchtime tutoring or after-school hours tutoring for students? WM: No, I use that time to plan and mark papers. Sometimes, I still don’t have time to finish my paperwork, and I bring work home. The work gets
overwhelming. Charter schools request accountability through portfolio work and assessments all the time. I: You’ve mentioned that you would suggest that Jason get outside tutoring, why not Jeffrey and Alex? WM: That’s what middle-class families do. They supplement education at home with additional resources. Jeffrey and Alex do not have economic or social networks to get tutoring. Well, Jeffrey may have some free community-based program since he lives in the inner-city. Alex lives in a rural town (SES, -). I doubt he has access to free tutoring. I: Would you find a community-based organization that provided tutoring for Jeffrey? WM: That’s the job of the parent-teacher board, parent coordinator, or school social worker. I: In your experience, have the parent-teacher board, parent coordinator, or social worker find tutoring for high needs students? WM: I don’t know, I’ve never asked. I: Have you ever had students that could use outside tutoring but couldn’t afford it? WM: Most likely, yes. I: Did you help your students get the tutoring? WM: No, I did not. I don’t have the time. Some of the time, I hope that eventually, they will pick up the skills once they go on to the next grade. However, RTI services help a lot with extra instruction. Who would one on conference help more, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? I think Jason, his parents would be able to assist him at home more (SES, +). I: Why not Jeffrey or Alex? WM: They don’t have enough support at home (SES, -).

WF: I sit with each student once a week for about 5 minutes during Reading Workshop and Math Workshop small groups or independent work. I: Does one on one conferences work? WF: My school targets the skills that students need to work on. I find it is helpful when there is an objective to these meetings. I: Do you provide lunch tutoring or after school tutoring? WF: No, I don’t have time. I: Would you suggest that families pay for outside school tutoring? WF: I would if I worked in a community that had the finances to do so (SES, -). Most of these parents are trying to make the rent and pay other bills. I: Does your school have a way for students to receive tutorial services just in case they needed extra help? WF: My school has a community-based program that provides homework help for students. Tutoring may happen there. I: Are you sure? WF: No. I: Why not suggest tutoring for Jason, his parents might afford it. WF: I didn’t think to do that. In my experience of teaching in the classroom that is high needs, I always assumed that the parents were financially unable to (SES, -). I: Who do you think one on one conferences would help more, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? WF: I think it would help all of them. Unless if they have a disability.

WHM: I have one on one meeting with my students for reading and writing during small groups and independent work. I: Does it work? WHM: It depends. I reach who I can reach. I: Do you provide lunch tutoring or afterschool tutoring for your students who don’t get the help during conferences? WHM: I honestly don’t have the time, but I do utilize the community for extra help with tutoring and mentoring. My students get the extra help that way. I: Does it work? WHM: When the community helps, students are helped. I: Would you suggest outside tutoring for your students? WHM: They wouldn’t be able to afford it (SES, -). I: What about Jason, could you have suggested tutoring for him? WHM: I didn’t think much about it. Usually, I don’t. I guess Jason’s family could afford it. Tutoring would help him. Especially, professional tutoring. I: Who would one on one conferencing help more, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? WHM: It could help all of them really if they don’t need to be in special education.

BHF: I sit with students individually during ELA small groups and math small groups. I: For how long? BHF: Up to five minutes. I: Is that enough time? BHF: Yes, if I home in on a specific skill. I: What happens if the student does not improve on the skill? BHF: I assign them differentiated classwork and homework. Then there are RTI services, that’s what they are there for. I: Do you provide lunch or after school hours of tutoring? BHF: No, I don’t have time. The
kids have programs after school that tutor them. **I:** Do you know this for certain? **BHF:** Yes, [name of program] provides homework help and tutoring. They work along with the instructional coordinator on what skills or subjects their tutors need to focus on. **I:** Who would one on one conferencing help the most, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? **BHF:** Probably Jason and Alex. **I:** Why? I think they would be able to do the work and concentrate more. Jeffrey's environment distracts him from learning (SES, -).

**AM:** I use my skills data to meet with students during reading, writing, and math. I see 5 to 6 students a day for about 5 minutes while students are independently working or if I am in small groups. **I:** Do you provide lunch or afterschool tutoring for students who do not perform the skills targeted during the day? **AM:** No, why? **I:** So that these students can get extra help. **AM:** The school has a program that assists students with homework. My homework is differentiated according to the skills needed. I do not have time to tutor with detailed lesson planning and the marking of assessments. **I:** So, what happens if the students do not acquire the skills needed? **AM:** RTI services provides small group pull-outs for at-risk students. That’s how our school operates. **I:** You suggested that you would ask Jason’s parents to get a tutor for him. Why Jason and not Jeffrey and Alex? **AM:** Jason’s parents would be able to afford one (SES, +). Jeffrey and Alex would not be able to afford it (SES, -). **I:** What would you suggest for Jeffrey and Alex? **AM:** RTI services would be able to assist them. My job is to teach them during school hours. I do all I can during school hours. Who would one on one conferences help the most, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? **AM:** If skills are targeted, it should be able to help all of them, if they don’t have additional issues.

**AF:** One on one conferences is for about 5 minutes with about 5-6 students during the Reading, Writing, and Math blocks. Sometimes I do it during small groups. I try to meet all the students in a week. Sometimes I do not, and I prioritize the lower group students. **I:** Do you have enough time for these conferences, and have you’ve seen improvement? **AF:** It’s targeted skills conferences. I look at an area of difficulty, and I work with the students on that specific skill. I’ve seen improvement. **I:** What if there is no improvement? **AF:** The specialists will intervene. **I:** Do you provide lunch tutoring or afterschool tutoring for students? **AF:** Yes, usually during the month before the state exam. By then, a lot of teachers are assisting students after hours. **I:** Who would one on one conferences help more, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? **AF:** It would help them all. Their academic deficiencies would be addressed.
Incentives, Consequences, and Lunch Detention

**I to BHF:** You’ve mentioned that you would use incentives. Your colleague (BM) says that your charter school isn’t strong on discipline. How do you manage your classroom without school-based consequences? **BHF:** I already know that my school helps the White teachers over the black ones. They give the white female teachers all the support that they need. They think because we are Black, we should identify with students more and be able to control them. It is a whole bunch of racist crap. Plus, the White teachers get all the praise with how good their classroom management are, when in fact the school puts the worst kids in all the Black teachers’ classes. So, it makes it look like the Black teachers have the worst management. These White teachers stay for a year or two years anyway. I told (BM) to start an incentive system like parties, trips, or other things that his kids like. It’s his first year and he is having a rough time. My school penalizes teachers but will not give support. **I:** Would it be best to say that teachers’ classroom management strategies like incentives deter unwanted behavior? **BHF:** That and having a good rapport with parents. At least, my parents are involved and support me. Do you find incentives effective? **BF:** Yes, we live in a country based on incentives. Our school system is based on incentives or an increasing pay scale. Kids perform better if they are working toward a goal. The teacher can interact with her students besides giving consequences for misbehavior. **I:** Do incentives help students internalize positive behavior? **BHF:** Students need to internalize behaviors, but in my school, there are no school-wide consequences. Most kids don’t want to be in school, they must be in school. So, incentives or prizes give them something to work for. It could be a pizza party, ice cream party or a pajama party. These events are fun for them. They love it and my students perform well for them. **I:** Do use consequences in your classroom even if the school doesn’t have a school-based one? **BHF:** Yes, I usually will take away recess or free-choice time. **I:** What is free choice time? **BHF:** It is another incentive that I give at the end of the day where my students can interact with each other in a respectful volume and tone. Sometimes the whole class will play a game. Students who miss that opportunity, usually are sent down the hall to another teacher. **I:** Does the teacher send you his/her students as well? **BHF:** I share my lunch with her and get photocopies made for her. **I:** Who would incentives and consequences help more, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? **BHF:** It would benefit all of them if they wanted to be part of the classroom community or didn’t have a behavior or psych disorder.

**I to BM:** Do you use incentives in your classroom? **BM:** I have a good rapport with my students. I usually don’t give out prizes. **I:** Is lunch detention your only consequence in your class for these behaviors and does it work? **BM:** The kids hate it, so they will curb their behavior so that they will not get it. After lunch, is a different story, sometimes I have to give lunch detention to students the next day for unproductive behaviors. They will behave before lunch so that they could be with their friends. **I:** Are you aware that your colleague has parties as incentives? **BM:** I can barely live on the salary that I have between paying for graduate school out of pocket, paying for rent, food, and train and bus fare. The little money that I have, I save or pay back my student loan. I can’t afford parties all the time. **I:** Do you think your school would benefit from a school-based incentive or consequence procedures? **BM:** Definitely, the behavior of the students would be better. A school could have a great curriculum, but if there are no discipline procedures, students can’t regulate themselves to learn. That’s what makes a successful charter school. Some of the behaviors that we have in that school, you would mistake for a struggling public school. **I:** Do other teachers in your school have the same issues as you? **BM:** Only Black and Hispanic teachers. For some reason, we get the worst of the kids- low performing and horrible behavior (R, -). [BM]
pointed out to me all the students last year who had issues during 4th grade and how they were placed in her, mine, and [another teacher’s] classroom. The high performing and the behaved students were in the white teachers’ classrooms. When one of the teachers started to have issues with a student, the dean and the behavior specialist ran to help her with removing the student right away. When I call the dean, she is either busy or the behavior specialist said that it’s not his job to remove disruptive students. **I:** Did you tell them that you observed the difference between how the white teacher is treated and yourself? **BM:** I can’t discuss that with them. I will never have received a commitment letter for the Fall. **I:** Was your teacher effectiveness rating affected by the school not helping you? **BM:** Yes, I must improve by the end of the school year. I know that they will keep me because they see me in school tutoring after hours. I just wish things were fair. **I:** Who do you think would improve more with incentives and consequences, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? **BM:** I don’t they would help if the boys have personal issues.

**I** to **WM:** What type of incentives do you use in your classroom? I have board games, video games for the class computer, or free time at the end of the week on Friday. Students that have a certain amount of points get to choose what they want to do on Friday afternoons. Sometimes if it is warm outside, I will bring students to the schoolyard. Sometimes we watch a movie and I will buy popcorn. **I:** Does it work to deter unwanted behaviors in your classroom? **WM:** It does, along with consequences and the color system in my school. **I:** So, it’s safe to say that because your school has school-based consequences, this aids in your effective classroom management? **WM:** Of course, there is so much that I could do as a teacher. **I:** Who conducts lunch detention, the school or you? **WM:** We have a system in which students are placed in the auditorium during recess. They sit in silence until recess is over. Students hate this and for the most part, they will behave to avoid it. Teachers take turns in “lunch detention duty” along with the dean. **I:** Do students stay silent the whole time? **WM:** If they do, their parents are informed that their child will receive an out of school suspension. Eventually, students who don’t comply end up being transferred. Parents are afraid of that, so students, for the most part, receive consequences without grievance. They know how the school operates, and they want to attend there instead of their local public school which doesn’t have many resources. **I:** Who would consequences and incentives work with Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? **WM:** Depends if they want to be part of the class and if they don’t have an undiagnosed disability.

**I** to **WF:** Do you have consequences and incentives in your classroom? If so, why didn’t you mention the in the vignette responses? **WF:** Of course, I do, I just didn’t think to mention it. **I:** Could you elaborate what type of consequences and incentives you have in your room? **WF:** I have a whole class incentive so that if all my students follow directions and routines simultaneously, they will get a marble in a jar. Once the jar is filled, students can have a movie day or party. **I:** How many marbles does the jar hold? **WF:** 137. **I:** Have students filled the jar? If so, how long does it take to fill the jar? **WF:** Yes, it supposed to take two weeks, 10 marbles a day. One for each routine: (1) quiet pack down [unpacking bookbag]; (2) Independent review work; (3) Quiet transition to literacy, math, science, social studies; (4) uninterrupted literacy class; (5) Quiet transition to Specials [art, music, gym, dance, science]; (6) Quiet transition from specials; (7) Specials teachers good report; (8) Quiet line-ups; (9) Quiet pack up; and (10) Organized dismissal. Sometimes students can earn more than 10 per day. Individual incentives include positive phone calls to parents, prizes at the end of the day, helping other teachers during lunch, or a private pizza party for exceptional students. **I:** What about consequences? **WF:** The only real consequence that I have would be my taking away recess. I call parents, and if the behavior persists, I include the
I: So, your dean supports in your disciplining students? WF: Only if the student is extremely disruptive in the classroom. I: Who would benefit more from using incentives and consequences, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? WF: Neither one of them if they do not want to acclimate into the classroom.

I to WHM: Do you use incentives and consequences, and if so, how and why? WHM: I have reasonable consequences that go along with the behavior. For the most part, I learned long ago that it’s not the incentive or consequences, but the culture of your classroom and how you interact with your students. I have a no-nonsense attitude when it comes to my students. But, my students know that I care about them, their families, and overall well-being. I treat them now and then, but it’s sporadically. I don’t need to bribe my students. I: Do you have help with discipline? WHM: No, I don’t. My students know that I will go back and inform their families about their behavior. They know that I will get help from a community source to intervene or help them in crisis. For me, consequences and incentives work in the beginning, but it’s the relationship that matters overall. I’ve built respect in my school and community. Students want to learn and listen. I: Who would incentives and consequences benefit more, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? WHM: If the classroom doesn't have a responsive culture, or if they have disabilities than incentives and consequences will not work.

I to BF: Why only use incentives with Jason and not Jeffrey and Alex? BF: My incentives are not in my classroom. At the beginning of the school year, I enlist parents into rewarding their children at home. I tell them when their child does well in school set up something their child would work towards at home. If the student does something negative at home but positive in school, the parents cannot take away the incentive. I: That’s hard to do. If a child is behaving all week at school, and then something disrespectful happens between the child and the parent, the parent has the right to take away their child’s reward. BF: I explain to them to keep consequences separate. Children should be rewarded for doing excellently in school. Parents want their children to be successful in school and eventually go to college. Incentives at home will give students motivation to do well in school. I: What about for uninvolved parents? BF: I supply the incentive by asking the students what they like to do in school. I might even buy them lunch from a restaurant of their choice. I: What are your consequences? BF: That’s the thing, I don’t have any except lunch detention which students miss the opportunity to hang out with friends. I keep communication with families and the student knows that their families will learn about everything that they are or are not doing. I: So, how do you keep the families involved? BF: I tell them that if they want a child who wants to succeed in school, his or her family must show support from home. Families should reward good work in school. There are too many aversive messages that fast money through drug dealing or sports is better than education and getting a profession (SES, -). I see the results. I: Why does Jason get the incentives and not Jeffrey and Alex? I know, I didn’t mention it in my response, but I meant for all three of them to get incentives. I: Would consequences and incentives work with them, or just some of them. BF: I believe all of them if there isn't some underlying issue.

AM: Do you use incentives and consequences? AM: I use the incentives and consequences provided by the school. I: So, the school has a pervasive incentive and consequence program? AM: Yes, only if the teacher follows the correct procedure for the school’s discipline procedures. Because, I do, I do not have real discipline issues in my class. I: So, the school-based incentives and consequences support your classroom management strategies? AM: That is accurate to say.
I: Do you think your school's consequences and incentives would benefit Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex? AM: No, I do not. They have other issues beyond these measures.

I to AF: Do you use incentives and have consequences in your classroom? AF: Yes, of course. I: Could you elaborate on what incentives or consequences that you have? My school uses its consequences and incentives. For the most part, students are rewarded and punished at home for not having a set amount of points for the day. Students perform for these points throughout the school year and they receive certificates and acknowledgment from their families for a job well done. I: Do you think Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex would benefit from your school’s consequence and incentive program? AF: No, students like them end up being expelled or transferred.
Removal from Class, Suspension, Expulsion, Transfer, Family Court

**I to BM:** I understand that there is no outside help in your classroom for disruptive behavior. You said that constantly disruptive students would get suspended and eventually expelled or transferred. Do you think the suspension of students works? **BM:** Absolutely, I have seen an improvement. When parents miss work because they must be home; they get on their kid’s case. Plus, once students are suspended, they are in the line of being expelled or transferred out of the school. **I:** Does the school provide tutoring for outside suspensions? If not, do students that end up falling further behind? **BM:** Maybe, but what else is there for schools to do? Major infractions like cursing teachers, fighting, violent outbursts that can potentially harm other students and must be addressed. Students come to charter schools for safety and discipline. Well in my school there is no discipline, but there is safety. **I:** Who would most likely get suspended or expelled in your school, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? All three of them. **I:** Does race or SES matter? **BM:** Charter schools are too busy trying to perform well on state exams. Students with low academic performance are encouraged to leave if they have behavior problems. Now, if the three of them were pulling level 4’s [high score] on the state exams, that would be a different story. SES doesn’t matter when a school is trying to renew its charter.

**I to BF:** Does your school remove, suspend, or expel disruptive students from the classroom? **BF:** No. Public school students in NYC have rights. The school has school safety for incidents like an assault with students against students or students against teachers. Then, the administration would consider suspension depending on how severe the injuries. Family court deals with violent students. As for disruptive students, teachers are left to fend for themselves. **I:** So, what would happen with Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex? **BF:** I would suggest if Jason doesn’t have some type of disability or psychological issue for his family to take him to one of those dormitory schools for behavior (SES, +). Jeffrey would have to go through the motions of his behavior and hopefully, he would not end up in family court or juvi [juvenile detention center] (SES, -). I don’t know what would happen with Alex in a rural area. I think he would most likely clean up his act because the environment is calmer (SES, R, +). Or, just become a convict too (SES, -). **I:** So, your school does not offer these actions to handle discipline. **BF:** The DOE doesn’t want to be sued. So, no. **I:** If your school were to remove, suspend, expel students from the classroom/school, who would most likely receive these actions Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? **BF:** Jeffrey and Alex. Jason’s parents would probably have lawyers that would fight against this action and sue the district (SES, +). The school wouldn’t mess with professional parents. Jeffrey’s and Alex’s mother aren’t a threat (SES, -). **I:** Do you think race has to do with who gets suspended or expelled? **BF:** Of course, Black people receive harder convictions for lesser crimes than White people (SE, -). **I:** Do you think Alex would be expelled from his school in an urban neighborhood? **BF:** No, Alex wouldn’t be suspended or expelled because he’s White (SES, +).

**I to BHF:** Out of the three, who would most likely be suspended or expelled from your school, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? **BHF:** Suspended, all three. Expelled, probably just Jeffrey. **I:** Why? **BHF:** The teachers and administrators are mostly white. They wouldn't expel Alex because he's white. They probably would mentor him (R, +). Jason's parents are educated and have good jobs, so the school would work along with them more (SES, +). Jeffrey is black and his mother is uneducated (R, SES, -). She wouldn't be able to verbally handle the school if they considered expulsion or transfer (R, SES, -). They would say Jeffrey wasn't a good fit. There is no strong discipline in my school, but failing students bring the school's test scores down.
I to WM: You’ve stated that Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex would be removed from class or suspended for disruptive behavior. However, only Jason and Jeffrey would be expelled or transferred. Why not Alex? WM: Alex lives in a rural area and possibly there aren’t any other schools in his community. He probably would be constantly suspended. I: Are Jason and Jeffrey most likely to be suspended and expelled because they are Black? WM: No, it’s just that the students in my school are mostly Black. I: What if Alex was in your school, would he be expelled eventually if he did not improve his behavior? WM: Sure, I guess. I don’t think Alex would be as aggressive as Jason and Jeffrey (R, -). I: Why not? WM: Because he is from a rural area and would be the only White kid in the school, I don’t think he would behave the same way. I think he would be calmer because he wouldn’t want problems with the Black kids (R, -). I: So, his behavior would improve because he is in a Black school and he is white. WM: He wouldn’t fit in and probably would do his work and listen to the teachers more. I: Why would he listen to the teachers more? WM: The teachers in my school are predominately white, so he would relate to them more (R, -). I: Do the students who are black relate to their teachers because they are white? WM: It’s different. I: How is it different? WM: I find that black students who are disrespectful, disrespect everyone. Also, in my school, the parents and students don’t give the white teachers a hard time like the Black teachers. They don’t have much to disagree about with us. I guess because we’re white (R, +). I: Do Black parents feel that white teachers know more than Black teachers? WM: At times, I think they do. There is another black male teacher in my school, and they give him a hard time. I mean the students and the parents. I guess because they aren’t used to seeing black teachers (R, -). I: Is your principal Black? WM: No. I: So, your parents prefer White teachers over Black ones. I: Yes. I: Would do well in your school because the students are Black and he’s White with teachers? WM: It sounds bad, but it’s true (R, +). I: So, are you operating on White privilege in your school? WM: In the context that I am using, because I am White, I have better interactions with black parents than the black teachers in my school. I: Are black teachers getting support from the school the same as white teachers? WM: They should. I: Do they have lower-performing students in their classes? WM: Most of the time they do. I: Do the students enter underperforming from the beginning of the school year? WM: I don’t know. I know that in my class there is a balance of low, medium, and highs, but in their classes, they are mostly lows. I: Do you think your school is tracking lower-performing students with black teachers? WM: I don’t know.

I to WF: Out of the three, who would most likely be suspended and expelled in your school, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? All three, my school has a no-tolerance policy, especially for low performing students. My school doesn’t want any students bringing down their state exam scores. I: Do you think students of color are treated more harshly than white students when it comes to discipline? WF: Most students of color in NYC attend schools with other students of color. There is racial segregation because of neighborhoods. Anyone can see that. I: Do you think white students, like Alex, in white schools, would be suspended or expelled? WF: Most charter schools are in neighborhoods of color. White students go to school in white neighborhoods. I: What about the Black kids that attend mixed schools, are they treated more harshly than white students? WF: I don’t know. Schools can’t be outwardly racist, it’s against the law. You asked what would happen to Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex if they were to attend my school. The answer is that they would be suspended and eventually be kicked out. That’s just the policy of the school. The only way the school would tolerate them is if they were academically high performing students.

I to WHM: Does your school remove, suspend, or expel disruptive students from the classroom? WHM: No, I told you. As long that I have been in the public-school system, I’ve
handled disruptive kids on my own. Now violent kids are different. The police get involved through school safety. Then it becomes a whole thing with child protective services and family court if the child is suspended. I: So, you alone handle disruptive behavior. Do you have any assistance in your room? WHM: Intervention services with counseling, parents, and community programs are helpful. I live in my neighborhood and am involved with the people in the community. I would never allow disruptive behavior to get to the point of a child being arrested. I: Who would most likely be removed, suspended or expelled, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? WHM: Jeffrey because he’s Black and his family has no education and is poor (R, SES, -). I: Alex is poor, and his mother doesn’t have a high school diploma, but he is still White, and he is privileged because of that (SES, +). I am Puerto Rican and can pass for White. In Brooklyn, people think that I am either Italian or Russian until they hear my first and last name. I have White privilege and I know that. My mother looks like a typical Latina or a light-skinned black woman. When I became a teenager, I began to understand the difference in how people treated her and myself. Alex is White, and he will never be viewed the same way as Jason or Jeffrey (R, +). He will always get respect because of the color of his skin (R, +). When I look at police brutality, what happened to Puerto Rico after Hurricane Maria, or how they treat Mexican immigrants, I see how this country treats people of color. Now, Jason’s background affords him to be protected legally if he doesn’t do anything that breaks the law (SES, -). Once he breaks the law, he’s just another incarcerated black man (SES, -). White people must understand that they are afforded opportunities in the color of their skin.

I to AM: Out of the three, who would most likely to be suspended or expelled, Jason, Jeffrey or Alex? All three, it’s the policy for underperforming students with poor behavior. Do you think students of color are treated more harshly than white students when it comes to discipline in schools? AM: No, because children of color behave worse than White or Asian students (R, -). At least, form my experience. I: Could you elaborate for me? AM: I was raised to go to school, learn, and study hard to do well. Many Black kids come to school and refuse to learn (R, -). The school environment must be rigid with no room for leniency for Black students because Black students can’t have the freedom in the room to learn. Before becoming a teacher, I used to substitute for [an agency that serviced substitute teachers for charter and private schools]. I knew that [this charter school] was the best one when it came to discipline compared to other charter schools. I subbed in classes which behavior was so awful, that if I didn’t have a master’s degree in teaching, I would have changed my profession. I had received this position after the winter break because the teacher moved to another state. In my first week, I was disrespected. The first day I was hired, two BM students were making fun of me and said that I was the Chinese food delivery man. Those students were scared by the administration, that if they were to disrespect me again, they would lose their seat to children on the waiting list. The mothers of the BMS reprimanded them, and I haven’t had a problem since then. I have learned to keep it all business in this neighborhood. Why couldn’t they just sit and learn? Why do teaching black kids have to be a struggle? I knew then that I had to follow the procedures of the school, and not try so hard to be liked and just to teach. I: Do your students like you? AM: Probably not. I: Do you care? AM: No, not really. I: Do you realize that you have said that White and Asian students are better behaved than Black students? Do you have any proof? AM: I went to private school because both my parents were doctors and could afford it. I’ve never been to public school. The Black students, which were few, really worked hard and behaved scholarly (SES, +). I have never been around impoverished Black kids. I have sat in a bar with White teachers who went to school with Black students, and they said that Black students were always getting into fights and failing exams. Eventually, most of them ended
up in lower tiered classes. I: Do you think it’s because of their race that they were tracked for the lower-tiered classes? AM: No, I think it’s because black kids don’t want to learn (R, -). Well not all black kids, again, why can’t they sit and just let the teacher teach? Everybody wants to blame race, but we Chinese come here as immigrants, and we can flourish. We study and work hard. Some black people do, and the ones that don’t make black look dysfunctional. I: Do you think Jason and Jeffrey are exhibiting disruptive behaviors in class on purpose because they are black? AM: Jason, because of his socioeconomic status, may genuinely have some undiagnosed disability or psychological disorder. Jeffrey could be just replicating negative behaviors in his environment (SES, -). The culture in my classroom counteracts the culture in its surrounding community. I stress to my students that conflicts aren’t resolved like the street or reality television. In the educated world, we resolve things intellectually and with civility. If my students behave differently, I do not hesitate in deducting points and giving them a school consequence. I go even further by telling their families which pretty much want what their child said or did. No matter how vulgar or embarrassed I am to relay such information. The students call me a snitch behind my back and how they hate me. I will rather be hated than disrespected. They learn and perform whether they dislike me. I give no room for mediocrity.

I to AF: Do you think minority students are disciplined more harshly in school than white students? AF: I am a minority, and I wasn’t disciplined more harshly. I mean, if students come to school to learn, they shouldn't have a problem. My mother worked in a nail salon and my father cooked and delivered Chinese food. We lived in a predominately Black and Hispanic neighborhood. My parents immigrated from China before I was born. I was one in four Chinese students in my school that were predominately black and Hispanic. All the Chinese students were outperforming the other students. We would go to school and do our work while the black and Hispanic students fooled around. I always assumed it was because Asian people were smarter. Well, that’s what other people who were Asian thought. We believe that we are smarter than everyone. When I went away to Brown University, I still had that belief that Asians are smarter than other races. We outperform everyone in any every standardized exam. After becoming a teacher through [a teacher recruiting program], I have come to realize it’s not that we Asians are smarter, it is just that we study harder and set goals for achievement. Teachers can decrease the achievement gap if we can instill that work ethic into Black and Hispanic children (R, -). We give them the skills, persistence, and consistency and they will be able to achieve. I: Do black students have a culture deficit and that’s why they are unable to learn? AF: I am aware of culture deficit theory, and that’s not what I mean. I am trying to say that Black children in inner cities must be taught that there is more to life than rap music, basketball, and VH1. They all can be Barak and Michelle if they work hard. I: Do you think that because you are Chinese you are viewed differently than someone who is black? More opportunities are afforded to you based on your appearance and the prejudiced notion that Black people are intellectually inferior to Asian people? AF: That belief wouldn’t exist if black people were to change that belief themselves. Everything isn’t about race. Black immigrants come to this country and surpass the American born Black people. The issues in the black community can only be resolved by the black community. Once there is a change then their reputation would be one of excellence as well. I: So, you are admitting that more opportunities are available to you because you are Asian and not black. AF: I am saying that Black people have a bad rep because they have a culture that promotes it (R, -). They think acting White is not talking black. However, they’re speaking White. English is Anglo Saxon. To speak Black means to speak one of the many dialects belonging to the 54 countries in the continent of Africa. That’s like over 1000 languages. You told me to tell my students that when they give
me a hard time speaking standard English in class. Speaking Ebonics, on purpose is just speaking English incorrectly. I: I never said that Ebonics was wrong. I said that students must learn how to code-switch between the way they speak with friends and family at home and how they speak at school and work. Who would most likely be suspended or expelled in school, Jason, Jeffrey, or Alex? AF: The school would eventually expel all three of them. They have poor academic and behavioral performances.
Referral for Special Education Evaluation

BM: I felt that evaluation for Jeffrey would benefit him more because he could finally get the help that he needs. I: Do you think Black males are referred to SE more than White Males? BM: I am aware that there are more Black students in special ed than White, but this isn’t a race issue. This is more of a background issue. Jeffrey is in the inner city and the statistics for Black men aren't good (SES, -). Alex is low class and has a mother without an education, but he lives in a rural area (SES, +). It’s just a better neighborhood. I: Does being Black influence Jeffrey’s chances of being evaluated for special education? BM: Yes, because he needs help, and SE evaluation will define his issues. I: So, SE services, in your eyes, are an intervention for poor-performing students. BM: Yes, it is an intervention for a successful life. I: If Jeffrey were a girl, would she have been sent for SE evaluation? BM: No, I don’t think she would have the same issues as Jeffrey because she would have been diagnosed quicker (G, +). What if Jason and Alex were girls, they would have been diagnosed faster? BM: I don’t think they would have gone this far without a diagnosis. I: If So, you don’t think the school would have Jason, Jeffrey or Alex evaluated for SE if they were girls.

BF: Jeffrey needs all the support that he could get. I: Don’t Jason and Alex need support as well? BF: Jason has both parents who are college-educated and professional. They are eventually going to find help for him (SES, +). The principal wouldn’t put in an evaluation referral for him after RTI doesn’t work. She would have the parents file, and if they don’t, he wouldn’t be evaluated. No one wants a lawsuit. Alex lives in a rural area, it’s not the inner city. He isn’t at risk (SES, +). Jeffrey, on the other hand, is a statistic waiting to happen. His behavior is going to cause him to go to jail or even be killed (R, SES, -). I: What if Jeffrey were a girl, would you have suggested SE evaluation? BF: Honestly, no. I think I could have helped her more being a woman (G, +). I could provide her mentorship. If that didn’t help, then I would have the mother take her to the hospital for help. I: What if Jason and Alex were girls? BF: I would do the same. I: So, if the boys were girls, you would approach them differently. Yes, I would be able to help them more if they didn’t have mental issues.

I to WM: You said that Jason and Jeffrey would have a special education evaluation, why not Alex? WM: Jason and Jeffrey are more at risk because they are young Black males (R, -). They need to find out what is wrong and get help. Alex lives in a rural area and he will be fine (R, SES, -). Boys like him end up working on a farm to support their families (R, SES, -). He is going to straighten up eventually (R, +). I: Jason and Jeffrey aren’t going to straighten up? WM: Their behavior is going to attract negative influences. Even if Jason is not from the inner-city, he still is going to face incarceration eventually if he doesn’t change his behavior because of racial profiling (R, -). Jeffrey lives in the inner-city, and I already explained what goes on there (R, SES-). I: What goes on there? WM: No real role models except for drug dealers, gang members, and basketball players (G, -). I: What if Jason and Jeffrey were a girl, would you approach to help her the same way? WM: Girls in the inner-city can be aggressive, so I would approach a girl like Jeffrey the same as Jeffrey (SES, -). A girl like Jason, I think she would be diagnosed with some type of psychological disorder. Her background doesn’t reflect her actions (SES, +). I: Does Jason’s background reflect his actions? WM: It would, if he is purposefully behaving that way. I mean like a thug so he could be viewed as cool. I: What if Alex were a girl? WM: I think she would be already diagnosed. Her environment wouldn’t produce that type of behavior. There would be something wrong. I: So, girls, with aggressive behaviors automatically have a psychological
disorder if they don’t live in an aggressive area. Is that what you are trying to say? **WM:** Okay. Well, maybe if they are on drugs, opioids or meth.

**I to WF:** Why did you suggest SE evaluation for Jeffrey and Alex, but not Jason? **WF:** Jeffrey and Alex need help because their mothers need support (SES, -). Once they are labeled with a disability, they will get the help that they need. Jason’s parents have the finances to get him real help in a professional setting like a hospital (SES, +). **I:** What if Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex were girls? Would they have been approached the same way as the boys? **WF:** I don’t think so. Most girls can be reasoned with when it comes to violent behavior unless they have an undiagnosed disability. **I:** So, would you suggest SE evaluation for a girl? **WF:** If I felt that they had a disability. **I:** how do you know that these girls don’t have a disability? **WF:** I don’t, but most girls who are violent have some type of mental disorder. **I:** Are boys more naturally aggressive than girls? **WF:** Yes, sane girls.

**I to WHM:** Why did you suggest SE evaluation for Jeffery and not for Jason and Alex? Jeffrey lies in a high-risk neighborhood and there are more negative influences that will promote his violent tendencies (R, SES, -). SE evaluation will provide Jeffrey the help he needs. Jason has two parents, lives in a better neighborhood (SES, +). He is away from the violence. Alex lives in a rural area and is unexposed to what Jeffrey is exposed to (SES, +). What if Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex were girls, would you view their situations the same way? **WHM:** Actually, I wouldn’t. **I:** Why? **WHM:** There is no reason for a girl there must be some psychological issue going on (G, +). **I:** What about a girl like Jeffrey? I would refer her to SE if RTI services didn’t help. I just think if these boys were girls, their issues would have been resolved (G, +). I think society is more attentive to girls because they are considered weaker (G, +). Boys see as aggression as a rite of passage (G, -). **I:** So, if Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex were girls, they would have been diagnosed with a disability already. **WHM:** Yes, especially if they are aggressive

**I to BHF:** Tell me your reasoning behind suggesting Jeffrey for SE evaluation and not Jason and Alex? I feel Jeffrey is more at risk if he does not get help because he’s Black and lives in the inner city (R, SES, -). He is going to end up incarcerated or dead (R, -). Jason and Alex are less of a risk because of where they live (SES, +). Jason parents are educated and will help him (SES, +). Alex lives in a rural area where it is calmer (SES, +). **I:** So, it is a geographic issue with Jeffrey. Would you have suggested SE evaluation if Jeffrey were a girl? **BHF:** Yes, because she lives in a high-risk area as well (SES, -). I think her issue would be more psychological. **I:** What if Jason and Alex were girls would they be viewed the same way? **BHF:** No, because their issues would be psychological (G, +). Usually, girls are not as violent as boys unless their environment socializes them that way (G, +). The inner city produces violent girls (SES, -), the suburbs and rural areas, most of the time, do not (SES, -). There must be something wrong with their cognitive wiring. **I:** Do you think maybe that’s the reason why they should have a SE evaluation? **BHF:** They should have a psychological evaluation. SE gives high-risk students educational, psychological, and behavioral support that could not get from general education. A psych evaluation focuses on the mind and behavior. It will determine whether they need medication. **I:** Is aggressiveness only associated with boys, and that's why aggressive girls have psychological disorders? **BHF:** I think so.

**I to AM:** Why did you suggest that Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex be evaluated for SE? **AM:** If my school ruled out that RTI servicers were unsuccessful, the next step would be a SE evaluation referral. **I:** Are you following protocol? **AM:** Yes, following procedures allow teachers in my
school from making subjective decisions. **I:** Would you approach the situation differently if Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex were girls? No, I would follow the same steps. **I:** Do you think girls are less aggressive than boys and if they are aggressive, there is some psychological issue? **AM:** There is a possibility of such depending on their genetic tendencies and how these tendencies flourish under certain environmental conditions. Girls in aggressive neighborhoods are aggressive. Nevertheless, as you said I follow protocol. If RTI services are ineffective, the team would suggest a SE evaluation. Only with the parents’ permission of course.

**I to AF:** Why were Jason, Jeffrey, and Alex suggested to have a SE evaluation? **AF:** If RTI didn’t work, then the intervention services would request for them to be evaluated. They make the final decision. **I:** What if they were girls, would they still be viewed in the same way? **AF:** I think if they were girls, they would have had an IEP already (G, +). Especially with fighting and disruptive behavior. Low performing students with aggression issues would have been labeled by testing grades [3rd grade to 5th grade] to ensure that the school’s test scores wouldn't be affected. Girls aren't naturally aggressive unless they have a disability (G, +).