**HOW AND WHY EFFECTIVE CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT DEPENDS ON TEACHERS’ ABILITIES TO INVITE FAMILY INVOLVEMENT**

JOAN M. T. WALKER

JENNIFER PANKOWSKI

PACE UNIVERSITY

1. **INTRODUCTION:**

Our overarching thesis in this chapter is that to be effective classroom managers, teachers also need to be effective at inviting family engagement.

*Figure above: Depicts proportional emphasis/content of typical teacher professional education content. (Need current cites to back up); Also depicts how the primary outcome of student learning depends on the social context of teaching, first in creating the classroom LE/CM and then, in gaining knowledge of students through FE. Conclusion: Teachers cannot support schools academic achievement goals unless they also master effective CM; teachers cannot master CM without an understanding of/fluency with FE.*

Practically**, we assert that to be effective classroom managers, teachers must be able to build interpersonal relationships or partnerships with students and their families.** While partnership certainly requires both families and teachers’ commitments, we focus on teachers’ responsibilities because these professionals hold the major share of knowledge and power essential to the effective education of students. Teachers’ capacity to build relationships with families and students is critical because it is only when all parties are fully engaged and committed to sharing perspectives, knowledge, and information that each one’s goals for children’s learning and school success are achieved. We support our thesis by summarizing recent **evidence of how teacher-family interactions relate to student outcomes including achievement and the “inner resources” (Grolnick) needed for achievement.**

**Developmentally,** teachers’ ability to build relationships with families and students is important because children move daily between the social spheres of home and school. Successfully navigating this transition between home and school requires adaptation to different cultures, languages, norms and expectations. This is a significantly complex and often underestimated process/burden for children. Teachers can provide critical support to students by functioning as a ‘living bridge’ by viewing their work as creating a ‘mesosystem’ that supports children’s transition between home and school (Walker & Hoover-Dempsey, 2006, 2014).

Psychologically, **we argue that effectiveness in the two professional areas of family engagement and classroom management requires similar knowledge, skills and dispositions**. Uniting the two professional competencies is the underlying psychological construct of teachers’ capacity for partnership /social competence. Our definition of teachers’ social competence draws from evidence about shared attributes of family and classroom contexts that support child development. Consistent with our previous work, which drew parallels between the active ingredients of effective parenting and effective teaching (cites), we argue that teachers’ social competence in the context of both CM and FE involves their capacity to use three specific strategies or mechanisms—structure, autonomy support and responsiveness.

Finally, **we assert that these mechanisms of effectiveness can be taught and learned**. To support this argument, we summarize evidence of efforts to support pre-and in-service teachers’ capacity to invite families in the service of effective classroom management. In this section, we highlight innovations in teachers’ professional education including the use of simulations and other forms of experiential learning. We also showcase efforts to develop teachers’ responsiveness (e.g., cultural responsiveness, acknowledging and overcoming implicit bias, etc.)

**We conclude the chapter with recommendations for policy, practice and research.** As we have argued elsewhere (JW cites), it is essential that the field of teacher education recognize the social context of teachers’ work and the critical value of developing teachers’ social competence “soft skills” alongside the “hard skills” of content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. Psychologically, the field of teachers’ readiness and development of social competence represents a rich vein for researchers interested in how interpersonal skills co-develop alongside the traditional target areas of professional education. What is the nature of teachers’ social competence? What does it look and sound like when it is applied in the contexts of FE and CM? Intra-psychologically, how does it relate to teachers CK and PCK development? Inter-psychologically, how do teachers’ level/quality of social competence impact their partners in the enterprise of school? (students and families)

1. **Evidence of how teacher-family interactions relate to student outcomes including achievement and the “inner resources”** 
   1. **family engagement in children’s education** is a critical contributor to student achievement across grade levels and ethnic groups (e.g., Wilder, 2014; UPDATE CITES OF META-ANALYSES/META-SYNTHESES; e.g., Dumont, Trautwein, Nagy, & Nagengast, 2014; Hill & Tyson, 2009; Jeynes, 2012).
   2. **when teachers and parents work *together*, student learning and engagement are enhanced; conversely, when home and school are not aligned, student success is hindered** (Christenson & Reschley, 2010; Henderson, Mapp, Johnson & Davies, 2007; Hill & Chao, 2009; Hughes & Kwok, 2007).
   3. **Several investigators have focused on understanding how, why, and under what circumstances specific elements of** **family, school, *and family–school relationships*** support students’ school success across the preschool through secondary years (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Crosnoe, 2009; Fan & Williams, 2010; Grolnick, Kurowski, & Gurland, 1999; Lavenda, 2011; Pomerantz, Moorman, & Litwack, 2007).
   4. **Appears to work along multiple pathways** (see earlier editions: makes teachers more effective in the classroom, enhances student engagement, amplifies families’ contributions—academic socialization as key).
   5. **The rest of this section needs to update research in the mesosystem/overlap since 2014. It could be organized by the Qs used in 2014 (see comment in this section) OR it could be organized according to trends observed in the research.**
2. **Evidence** of how 3 core mechanisms—structure, autonomy support and responsiveness—function to support children’s development in the ecologies of home and classroom.
   1. **Define the 3 mechanisms; give examples of how they appear across contexts**

To understand classrooms as developmental contexts and teachers as socializing agents, several investigators have drawn explicitly from the parenting literature to argue that effective teachers are like good parents in that they use responsiveness, autonomy support, and firm behavioral control to support student learning and engagement (Walker, 2009; Wentzel, 2002). In this section, we summarize recent research on teachers’ use of these three authoritative practices and each one’s relation to varied student outcomes. **To explain *how* the three teacher behaviors influence student learning and development, we integrate parenting style theory with self-determination theory**. Self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000) is a robust framework arguing that all humans have an intrinsic need for relatedness, autonomy, and competence. When these needs are met, healthy social development and learning ensues; when they are not met, less healthy outcomes ensue.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Parenting Example** | **Effective Classroom Management Strategies** | **Practices for Inviting Family Engagement** |
| Structure | Setting a curfew | Setting expectations for classroom behavior; Observing consistent routines; Applying consequences; | Explain teaching goal; Offer relevant supporting evidence/material; Describe actions taken; |
| Autonomy support | Adjusting curfew to child maturity | Providing bounded choices; Allowing freedom of movement in the classroom; Allowing students to work alone or in pairs; | Positioning family as expert on the child; Asking families what approaches work (or not) for them; Asking for suggestions, strategies. |
| Responsiveness | Providing child with resources to observe curfew | Providing resources that allow students to succeed; Recognizing students as individuals with unique interests and abilities | Ask families’ preferences for communication; Ask families’ hopes and dreams for the child; |

* 1. **Assemble evidence of work involving these 3 attributes—self-determination theory research—HOW THEY function/ influence student outcomes**

How do parenting style theory and self-determination theory fit together? Recall Darling and Steinberg’s (1993) assertion that parenting style alters the effectiveness of a given parenting practice by influencing student openness to parental influence. From this standpoint, constellations of parent and teacher practices that reflect responsiveness *and* demandingness influence student social and cognitive development only to the extent that students are willing to “tune in” to parents’ and teachers’ socialization eff orts. Essentially, style theory affirms that student socialization is a co-constructed process in which parents/teachers and students play active roles. Self-determination theory complements style theory by offering an explanation for *how* parents and teachers can engage students in the socialization process. From a self-determination perspective, students are more likely to attend to and internalize parent and teacher expectations when their intrinsic needs have been met. Thus, to foster positive student social and academic outcomes, teachers and parents must express support and warmth to meet students’ need for relatedness and use behavioral control, adjusted to students’ developing capacity for self-sufficiency, to meet students’ needs for competence and autonomy.

**Firm Control/Structure**

The term “classroom management” is synonymous with structure. Structure involves setting expectations, giving clear directions, and generally establishing order (Doyle, 1986), and it has been positively associated with student learning and engagement (Emmer & Stough, 2010; Evertson & Weinstein, 2006). Teachers who provide structure help students understand what is required and offer guidance on how to achieve an expected outcome; these teacher characteristics, in turn, support learning because they foster students’ sense of competence (Jang, Reeve, & Deci, 2010). Structure is often confused with control or the lack of student choice; however, in effectively managed classrooms, **teacher structure and autonomy support are positively correlated.** **Moreover, both variables promote student engagement but in different ways.** For example, Jang, Reeve, and Deci (2010) found that high school teachers who gave clear directives were actually *more* likely to support student interest and initiative than less structured teachers. Further, these authors found that structure supported students’ behavioral engagement, whereas autonomy support was associated with cognitive engagement. Put simply, effective classroom managers tell students what they expect, make academic work personally relevant to students, and then get out of the way.

**Autonomy Support**

Teacher support for student autonomy involves teacher speech and behaviors that rely on students’ inner motivational resources, such as personal interest, rather than on extrinsic reasons for learning, such as grades or consequences. Teacher support for student autonomy is positively related to important student outcomes including engagement, content understanding, grades, and well-being (Reeve, 2009). Consistent with the idea that autonomy support is an instructional “signal” that leads students to choose to tune in rather than tune out (Walker, 2009), adolescents’ perceptions of autonomy support fosters their engagement in learning, and its perceived absence can lead to deliberate student disengagement (Collins & Laursen, 2004). **Autonomous environments promote learning and engagement by increasing cognitive involvement and effort and by decreasing boredom** (Ryan & Deci, 2000). So, like good parenting, effective teaching involves provision of choice, the avoidance of intrusion, and connecting student choice to personal interests and goals. Again, however, Reeve’s (2009) research indicates that teachers, especially at the secondary level, tend to be more controlling than autonomy supportive during instruction.

**Teachers benefit from supporting student autonomy**. For example, Hafen and colleagues (2012) found that if high school students perceived that their classroom encouraged autonomy in the first few weeks of the year, their engagement increased throughout the course. By contrast, students in classrooms with less perceived autonomy typically declined in engagement. These findings echo classroom management research indicating that the opening weeks of school are a developmentally sensitive period and that classroom norms and culture established early on by teachers can result in very different student outcomes later in the year (Bohn, Roerhig, & Pressley, 2004; Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Walker, 2008). Although autonomy support might seem more developmentally appropriate during adolescence, as early as third-grade students can distinguish among different forms of teacher autonomy support (i.e., providing choice versus explaining relevance) and, like adolescents, are negatively influenced by forms of autonomy suppression (e.g., intrusiveness; Assor, Kaplan, & Roth, 2002).

**Responsiveness**

Teacher responsiveness can be defined as emotional support (e.g., providing comfort, warmth) and as meeting students’ needs as individual learners (e.g., connecting academic content to student interests). In a notable meta-analytic study, learner centered or responsive teacher–student relationships (TSRs) were linked to a range of K–12 student outcomes including increased participation, critical thinking, satisfaction, achievement, motivation, social connection, and reduced disruptive behavior (see Cornelius-White, 2007). From a self-determination perspective, responsive TSRs affect learning through their impact on students’ feelings of psychological safety, which lead, in turn, to increased student engagement and academic self-efficacy. Given this, it is logical to assume that negative TSRs can accelerate problematic behaviors and hinder students’ success; however, few studies have examined this trajectory (cf. Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2007).

Positive TSRs at entry to school have been found to predict positive social and academic outcomes in middle school (Hamre & Pianta, 2001), and they hold particular benefits for at-risk students and those with learning difficulties (e.g., Baker, 2006; Hamre & Pianta, 2005). In general, African American and Latino students benefit more from positive TSRs than their white peers (Hamre & Pianta, 2005); however, African American students tend to have less supportive TSRs than their Latino and White counterparts (Hughes & Kwok, 2007). Sadly, levels of teacher responsiveness are generally low but variable across elementary school classrooms (Pianta, Belsky, Houts, Morrison & the NICHD ECCRN, 2007). Moreover, the average quality of TSRs declines across the elementary school years (O’Connor & McCartney, 2007). This is troubling given that the transition to secondary school is often the beginning of a downward motivational and academic spiral for many adolescents (Barber & Olson, 2004). At a developmental period when they might benefit most from positive TSRs, adolescents are least likely to experience them.

TRANSITION TO NEXT SECTION: Helping secondary teachers learn the critical role of positive TSRs in adolescent learning and how to forge positive relationships with students (*and their families*) holds promise as a tool for increasing teacher effectiveness and enhancing adolescent school outcomes.

(This is a chance for us to talk about how teacher ed should mirror the ‘nested’ work of teachers—work with s’s first (CM), then move to working with families in the context of conversations *about* students. Opp to connect to FE Handbook chapter on experiential pedagogies/core practice, Walker, 2019)

1. **How these 3 core mechanisms of effectiveness can be taught and learned**
   1. **Policy / standards**

Since 2006, U.S. education policy has reflected increasing attention to the overlap between the contexts of home and school and the role each plays in the larger societal aims of schooling. For example, **policy focused on family engagement has included increasing calls to offer families the right to choose educational avenues for their children that diverge from the traditional options of private and public schooling (e.g., charter schools, home schooling). In terms of policy relevant to schools and classrooms, there has been intense scrutiny of teacher practice and the adoption of performance benchmarks that focus on holding teachers and schools accountable for student achievement. (Danielson, 2011, CEC 2015), IDEA, 2004; section 300.322**

From a developmental perspective, these policies represent efforts to distribute responsibility for children’s education ***across*** schools and families. They also demonstrate increased awareness that effective teaching pertains to both skillful classroom management *and* to teachers’ family engagement skills. These two areas of professional competence are embodied in Danielson’s (2007, 2011) Framework for Teaching, which contains four domains of teacher performance: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities. **The Classroom Environment domain (Domain 2)** articulates abiding challenges in classroom management, including management of instructional groups, transitions and materials, and monitoring and responding to student misbehavior. It also recognizes the importance of the psychological dimensions of classroom management such as teacher expectations, student pride, and the value of academic learning. **The Professional Responsibilities domain (Domain 4) (**Phaneuf & McIntrye, 2011) includes classroom-related activities such as providing families with information about instructional programs and their individual student. Perhaps most importantly, this domain also emphasizes teachers’ efforts to *engage* families in the school’s instructional programs or goals. **Within each domain, teacher performance is compared to four levels of effectiveness (ranging from highly effective, effective, developing and ineffective).** Grounded in this framework, many school districts across the United States now use **a formal approach to teacher evaluation that views classroom management and family engagement as interdependent professional obligations.**

HOWEVER, there is wide variation in how local school communities support families and teachers. For example, the No Child Left Behind Act requires that all Title I schools and school districts (including charter schools) have a written plan that makes parents partners in their children’s education; unfortunately, **most school districts have an uneven record of translating written policy into systematic and equitable opportunities for family engagement** (Weiss, Lopez, & Rosenberg, 2010). Moreover, as evidenced in a status report on teacher professional development, **teachers across the United States have few high-quality opportunities to learn about classroom management and family engagement** (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009). This latter issue is particularly troublesome given that **most teacher preparation programs also fail to offer substantial training in these areas** (Epstein & Sanders, 2006; Stough, 2006). **The question remains: How will teachers meet new and increasingly rigorous standards for classroom management and family engagement without support?**

* 1. Efforts to enhance pre- and in-service **teachers’ capacity for inviting families** as partners in the enterprise of school (Hoover-Dempsey, Walker, Jones & Reed, 2002).

While parent-teacher collaboration can yield positive outcomes for students, in part, through teachers’ improved classroom management, translating this body of work into appropriate evidence based strategies and practices for classroom use is both limited and a relatively new area (2016 citation—what is this?). This section offers examples of **how teachers can develop specific knowledge, skills and dispositions for partnering with families in ways that allows them to create a classroom learning environment that meets all student needs**.

Danielson 2, only mentions respect for culture and background, and "limiting favoritism, but not linked to bias, SPED or disipline 4 doesn't mention

**What is taught:**

1. **PTCC**: **Parent-teacher conversations** are one opportunity for communication and collaboration that takes place in schools. Epstein et al. (2009) as well as Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1995, 2005) have described communication as one relevant aspect of parental school involvement. So far, research has shown that parent-teacher conversations, including parental consultation and information exchange, can lead to parent outcome variables, such as parental satisfaction, perceived benefit, and parental motivation toward school involvement (Akers, 2005; Grady, 2013; Hilkenmeier, Wiescholek, & Buhl 2017; Hilkenmeier & Buhl, 2017; Minke & Anderson, 2003; Sacher, 2005). However, these effects depend on the quality of the conversation whether it successfully leads to an increase in parental motivation and well-being (Hilkenmeier, 2017).
   * Communication with parents vs. information sharing (informative). We need families as collaborative partners, currently the Danielson Framework only mentions families one time in Domain 4c, under communication with families. Proficient teaching practices are defined as, “The teacher provides frequent and appropriate information to families about the instructional program and conveys information about individual student progress in a culturally sensitive manner. The teacher makes some attempts to engage families in the instructional program” (Danielson, 2011, 2013). This definition in the rubric represents merely a one directional approach to family engagement and does not actively collaborate with families to develop a meaningful connection, rather this becomes a “checklist” of administrative duties for the teacher. The rubric which represents the National Standard for teacher evaluation only sites specific examples of what proficiency rather than a systematic approach to teacher development. It is our belief that these standards represent a portion of teacher development towards an effective collaboration with parents that will result in effective CM and student outcomes.
   * The use of PD and other strategic models of family engagements such as Walker 7 steps, and (Walker & see annotation xyz) and cite)
2. **PBIS, FBA, BIP, RTI**
   * As national educational trends continue to shift towards a more inclusive educational environment, teachers and families need continued resources for the collaborative use of PBIS, Functional Behavior Assessments (FBA), Behavior Intervention Plans (BIP) and the role of RTI in the classroom environment. Historically, the Danielson Framework has not included these in its framework or rubric, leaving only the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA) 2004 as the only guide and reference for standards in special education policy for both behavior management and collaboration with families, this is problematic as it is a policy that is limited both in its dated structure and its lack of evidence-based strategies to serve as a guide for effective practice. Research is now focusing on becoming less reactive and more proactive approaches to CM through the use of PBIS (Netzel & Eber, 2003) and FE (Moore et al., 2016).
   * The use of Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) and strategies for implementation (Bethune, 2017, Wells, 2018). Additionally, PBIS and the role on family engagement are also not mentioned or used as an example for effectively management student behaviors in the classroom and home environments for students with exceptional behavioral needs.

While research in this area of CM and FE has been developed, what appears to be lacking is a means of providing teachers with the necessary road map and protocol tools to implement and subsequently an effective means for assessing their success in this implementation. As our understanding of time and culture have developed and expanded over the past decade since the Danielson Framework was last revised (2007, 2011, 2013), we need to begin to shift and expand our approach to supporting teachers and families with regard to classroom management.

* 1. **Who is taught**: what’s available at the pre vs inservice level? Is more offered to SpEd and ECE? That appears to be the trend.
  2. **How is FE taugh**t? Opens door for research on innovations
     1. IDEA of COACHING!!! PARENTS AND TEACHERS:-Bethune, 2017, Reddy et al. 2021, Fettig et al., (2015)
     2. Simulations/experiential learning environments (see Walker, 2019 for examples; chance to cite our sims/case studies work)
     3. Danielson- Domain 4, self-reflection however reflection is only on teaching content, not on CM or FE (bias, control vs. care)

1. **Recommendations for policy, practice and research**
2. Policy: Teacher professional standards designate classroom management and family engagement as part of teachers’ professional responsibilities. For example, the Danielson Framework for Teaching (2013) and CCSSO criteria…..While important, rarely emphasized.
3. Teacher education curriculum reform: Recognize FE and CM as core practices; show how they fit criteria (Grossman)
   1. Is this where we refer the reader to the resources/appendices for practitioners? Who is the target of our resources for practitioners? Is it K-12 teachers? Teacher educators? Both?
   * Resources for Practitioners
   * 7 steps-walker
   * 7 steps-pankowski
   * Avatar simulations (Pankowski & Walker, 2016)
   * Cases –Bias / -control vs care
   * Danielson coupled with specific “action steps”
4. Education/psychological research: Recognize the social context of teachers’ work and the critical value of developing teachers’ “soft skills” alongside the “hard skills” of content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge; That is, what connects Domains 2 and 4 of the DFT is the underlying psychological construct of social competence.
   1. Need to acknowledge constructs like implicit bias

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter has drawn from the literatures on parent engagement and classroom management to underscore the potential that teachers and families—**and productive family-teacher relationships**—hold for increasing teachers’ and parents’ effectiveness in supporting student learning and school success.

* **We have argued.. TELL EM OUR THESIS AGAIN.**
* **TELL EM THE EVIDENCE BASE WE DREW FROM** To make our case, we have drawn from a growing body of research demonstrating that … ….
* Grounded in this summary of research, we have offered **a set of recommendations for how to….** transform our knowledge into action.
  + “if our society is to achieve its aim of a good education for every child, then parents and teachers *both* must be informed about—and empowered to fulfill—the critical part each plays in the collaborative enterprise of students’ successful schooling.”
  + Recognize CM and FE as core practices
  + Reform teacher education and continuing education to follow a practice-based approach using situated/experiential pedagogies
  + Update frameworks of teaching to acknowledge previously overlooked aspects of FE and CM
    - Use new tools and evidence-based models, coaching, to teach/address ethically charged, thorny problems, e.g., Psychology has some answers from research on how to mitigate implicit bias <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3603687/>

**\*\*\*\*END\*\*\*\***
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