A Call for a System of Change

Elizabeth A. Jara
University of the Pacific

The philosophical musings of this educator, in a moment of pondering the murder of a former student possibly at the hands of another former student, demands an examination of the dynamic, reciprocal, and reflexive process involved in building resilience, and increasing positive outcomes for adolescent students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders (EBD). My reflexive and explorative modes of inquiry within the confines of established practices in literature, seek to derail a trajectory of limited options, outcomes, and tragic circumstances as experienced by my former students. A comprehensive understanding of fundamental components of programming is a necessary basis for my retrospective journey that calls for change in entrenched patterns of thought. As a teacher for adolescent students with EBD in a restrictive setting for nineteen years, I cannot help but ask myself, what, if anything could have changed the course of these two students' lives? In the time between first hearing of my former student's murder, and the subsequent search for and arrest of my other former student, I began an introspective journey through the process of reflexive analysis to share my own personal and professional experiences.

Upon hearing of these tragedies, my thoughts and feelings went immediately to sorrow, disbelief, blame, and hopelessness. Sorrow for both students and their families and disbelief knowing one of my students fell victim to such a tragedy (while another one of my students may have possibly been the perpetrator). I blamed myself: what did I not do? What did I miss? I felt hopelessness: Did anything I did even

matter? At this point, I reached out to my colleagues and administrators, resulting in the following comments: "You can't help them all," "I knew he had it in him," "I saw it all along," "I knew he would hurt someone one day," "He is crazy," "He is a sociopath," "Why are you so sensitive?" "Didn't you see it?" "You are only a teacher, not a parent, not a friend, you can only do what you can do." Amidst these comments and my own vacillating thoughts and emotions, I began to question the philosophical and theoretical underpinnings of systemic programing that might elicit this mindset. The profound and prophetic words of my colleagues and administrators underscore the basis of philosophical and theoretical ideology that impedes progress and growth. These words also push students on a trajectory of limited options and outcomes. The horrific events of my former students' lives and resultant disclosure of these perceptions and attitudes propelled me to examine and call for a change in the nature of educational programming.

At this juncture, I am forced to reflect upon philosophical and theoretical ideology that advocates the use of one-size fits all, evidence-based practices. These practices were engrained components of my teacher training, professional development, and systemic constructs. They purport the benefit of such practices as the only means necessary for ameliorating a trajectory of diminished student outcomes. In my search for answers regarding my two former students, and the recollection of wise words of another former student when discussing her own life journey, I became cognizant of my own evolutionary shift in philosophical and theoretical perspectives as a basis for teaching in restrictive settings.

Several years after a student was unexpectedly removed from my program, she asked me, "Why didn't you try harder?" This triggered me to initially become defensive and later ponder her probing question. As her teacher, I felt I worked hard to save her from more abuse and break the barriers she had built to receive the help that our program offered: which included supportive staff, intensive individual and group therapy, and social emotional learning. She had suffered an unimaginable amount of sexual, physical, and mental abuse and had extreme acting out behaviors. For the two years she was in my program this student had made much progress. She was unwittingly removed when her guardian found out I had called Child Protective Services (CPS) after a reported incident. Incredulously, I wondered how she could ask me this question, when in my mind, I had done all that I could. However, as I reflect upon this experience, coupled with the tragic outcomes of my two former students, I am forced to admit my own proclivity to self-righteousness. When in essence, this proclivity of defense, a necessary

shield of armor, hinders my ability to reflexively examine my ideals of student readiness for growth and change within the confines of current systemic constructs.

　　Tragedy and one provocative question impelled me to recognize my own growth as an educator, thus expounding upon my shift to encompass philosophical and theoretical perspectives that move beyond current prescribed, one-size fits all ideology. To do so, I lean upon my own philosophical orientations shaped by this *I Ching* quote that underscores the need to consciously explore responsible actions to influence outcomes:

> Man is in the center of events: the individual who is conscious of responsibility is on a par with the cosmic forces of heaven and earth. This is what is meant by the idea that change can be influenced" (Javary, 1997, p. 31)

I am not advocating that educators are solely responsible for diminished or tragic outcomes. As Hue (2011) asserts, "students have various needs to be fulfilled, not only in the classroom and at school, but also in the community and at home" (p.269). It may be true that we cannot predict other's motives, actions, inner state and conflicts, mental capacity and status, or alleviate all family and environmental factors. However, our own practices equally contribute to student outcomes (Daniels, 2011; Harris-Murri, King, & Rostenberg, 2006). Therefore, this necessitates the proposition to seek alternative philosophical and theoretical ideology as the basis for creating programming. We can and must set up a system that helps to build a resistant, resilient foundation in an attempt to circumvent tragic pathways and increase positive school and postsecondary outcomes. My purpose is to examine the dynamic, reciprocal, and reflexive process necessary to build systems of change for adolescent students with EBD in restrictive settings that foster resilience for increased quality of life. I may not posit definitive answers, or preventative measures of tragic outcomes. Yet, it is the hope that I can at least perpetuate an understanding, a different way of thinking that calls for needed systemic changes specific to relational and resilient aspects of programming for these students.

　　My own ideals of change are influenced by Vygotsky's social constructivist theory, resilience theory and Eastern thought derived from the philosophic ideology of the *I Ching*, or *Book of Change* as interpreted by Wilhelm and Wilhelm (1995). This philosophy, use of *I Ching* quotes, and aforementioned theoretical constructs provide the framework in which provocation of thought relating to my call for systemic change can occur. I challenge the reader to consider the paradigmatic shift

that can ensue when we seek to move beyond limitations to engage in unaccustomed thought. "When the idea of change is applied to the evolution of an individual man, of social groups and of the era, a series of makeshift hypotheses we have been accustomed to use in explaining events falls away" (Javary, 1997, p. 28). Before this evolution of change can occur, we as educators must willingly engage in this process. First and foremost, the process must include personal and systemic assessment of attitudes, beliefs, perspectives, and bias' towards working with adolescent students with EBD.

A critical component of this process is to first acknowledge the systemic need to apply a within person, philosophical approach to effecting change in students. Gilham (2011) discusses the use of a common language within the field of special education to promote ascribed attributes and characteristics through identification and diagnosis of disabilities and the resultant deficit paradigm: "our language is guided by our understanding of: the mental health diagnoses students have (and their subsequent coding), psycho-educational research as 'best practices' to support the challenges that come with such pathologization" (p.107). This approach creates a deficit paradigm that ascribes to the need to identify, categorize, and assign a particular pathology to students as a means for providing prescribed, evidence-based, one-size fits all practices and interventions.

As a special educator, I have fallen prey to this approach through the process of identifying and categorizing students based upon their disabilities as determined through the process of Individualized Education Planning (IEP) and subsequent mental health diagnosis. The within person theory minimizes societal factors, such as nature of relationships and cultural influences of family, community, and schools that cause or contribute to the defined disabilities. Furthermore, as discussed by Daniels (2011), this approach dichotomizes societal and individual factors; downplaying the dynamic and reciprocal nature of interaction: "The challenge which I wish to address is to formulate an approach which does not treat the individual and sociocultural levels as discrete forms of analysis but rather seeks to understand how they are interdependent, if not co-creative" (p. 105).

To ameliorate a trajectory towards diminished outcomes that extend beyond school, adolescent students with EBD in restrictive settings must be immersed in a school culture that fosters a holistic pedagogy and approach to supporting the whole person. It is an incredible responsibility to create a supportive, comprehensive, integrative, and interdisciplinary system of change, while also fostering and navigating the intertwining subtleties and nuances of each structural component.

Herein lies the predicament of melding the philosophical ideology of the *I Ching* and evidence based practices put forth within the education system. The *Book of Change*, originating in China contains texts that are thousands of years old. Individuals sought to gain structure, knowledge, and guidance from these texts to influence their own fate within an Imperialist society that exercised jurisdiction upon the destiny of people that could change at will (Wilhelm & Wilhelm, 1995). The philosophical basis of the *I Ching* as a guide helps to gain understanding of the self and awareness of the unfolding of actions and events within the archetypical human experience. The significance of these texts and resulting philosophy that guide and promote change through self-awareness and consequences of one's actions to alter fate and destiny can greatly impact life outcomes (Hue, 2011, Wilhelm & Wilhelm, 1995). Comparatively, employing this philosophical basis for both students and educators within the prescribed system of evidence-based practices deemed beneficial by "experts" can most certainly affect fate and destiny. Hue (2001) further supports this philosophical basis in discussing the process of analysis related to identifying and creating systemic constructs of resilience:

> The analytical framework of moving 'inward', 'outward', 'backward' and 'forward' was adopted. Moving 'inward' was to discover their inner feelings towards students with behavioural problems, whereas with moving 'outward', the constructs of the school in which they worked and the community to which their students belonged were explored. Moving 'backward' and 'forward' was to narrate how these teachers made sense of their 'past' experience to 'the present' in terms of the development of school guidance and the promotion of resiliency. (p. 264)

My purpose is not to completely discount all systems of supports and services for adolescent students with EBD or to imply that all systems are "Imperialistic" in nature. As some practices instituted within school settings, such as School Wide Positive Behavioral Intervention Support (SWPBIS), provide a much needed system of guidance, structure, consistency, support, and care (Coffey & Horner, 2012; Gonsoulin & Lampron, 2013; Sugai & Horner, 2006). However, within and outside of these systems, we must recognize that there are much more complexities involved in educating adolescent students with EBD. Most importantly, I am not advocating the use of oracles and ancient texts to structure programming for adolescent students with EBD. However, I am proposing a more thorough exploration of this philosophical basis in conjunction with theories discussed further in this paper-specifically to utilize as the foundational base to support and augment prescribed systems of programming. Such a diversion of thought when contem-

plating and designing programs may enhance outcomes and prevent the "permanent ossification of the institutions" (Wilhelm & Wilhelm, 1995, p.5). The needs of adolescent students with EBD may not, and cannot always be addressed within one prescribed ideology. Therefore, I ask that we push beyond conditioned thinking to embrace philosophical ideologies that create a transformative, paradigmatic shift while attempting to meet the myriad of needs of adolescent students with EBD in restrictive settings.

The advent of SWPBIS in general, special, and alternative education settings is integral to setting the foundational components of such programming. SWPBIS helps to create a school-wide foundation utilizing evidence based practices such as Response to Intervention (RTI), Multi Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) models to create a unified culture of safety, security, and support for academic, social, and emotional learning (Coffey & Horner, 2012; Sugai & Horner, 2006). Much of the literature related to SWPBIS and programming for students with EBD addresses creating and implementing systems that target environmental, behavioral, academic, social/emotional, and mental health structures and systems. SWPBIS utilizes applied behavioral analysis (ABA) as the basis of all programming and interventions.

Sugai and Horner (2006) suggest, "the SWPBIS approach emphasizes the adoption and sustained use of effective behavioral practices to maximize academic and behavioral outcomes" (p.248). We must recognize that certain foundational supports of SWPBIS, i.e. RTI, MTSS, and UDL, are crucial components of all school settings. Sugai & Horner (2006) further expand upon this as they identify integral components of school culture and climate: "the collective actions of individuals within the school contribute to the school as a whole" (p. 248). However, we must also recognize that within the context of SWPBIS, ABA is the foundation of all interventions. The use of fidelity to a model within the context of applying ABA principles and interventions are encouraged as best practices for adolescent students with EBD (Gonsoulin & Lampron, 2013). Yet, we must not acquiesce to this prescribed philosophy of one- size fits all interventions. Gilham (2011) provides a compelling argument against one ideological approach to students in restrictive school settings:

> These institutions are incredibly powerful in self-determining what counts as truth and best practice. Although academia may have long ago recognized the implications of Kuhn's work for science and the social sciences, the daily phenomena I am a part of, especially these meetings I refer to, speak incessantly of the power of the positivistic,

objectivistic, foundationalist approaches to truth within education and the 'psy' sciences within health. Special Education is often insulated from its own anomaly, blind to itself. It has few mirrors in the hallways of the discourse. (p. 113)

Therefore, SWPBIS, with a basis steeped in ABA is not the panacea for all students; begging the question; what is best practice for adolescent students with EBD that are not amenable to interventions outlined in SWPBIS and traditional ABA practices?

My students experience unimaginable trauma, abuse, poverty, mental illness, bullying, and academic and social challenges within their homes, school, and community. This often contributes to their internal and/or external challenges; with resultant maladaptive behaviors that greatly affect interpersonal relationships. Murray and Pianta (2007) address implications of these relationships within school context as applied to academic, mental, and social-emotional well-being: "Students with high incidence disabilities are a particularly vulnerable population and many of these students are in need of explicit and direct support from caring adults" (p.110). These relationships "can have powerful and lasting effects" (Murray & Pianta, 2007, p. 110) and are integral to growth and development that significantly affect social, academic, and lifelong outcomes. With the risk of sounding like an espousal of literature, I must support my assertion in identifying the most critical components of programming for adolescent students with EBD in more restrictive settings. These critical components encompass the dynamic and reciprocal relationships that occur between students and staff to build resilience.

Most unfortunately, this integral piece of programming is often overlooked and undervalued. Literature has shown the significant impact of student and teacher relationships on academic, social and emotional growth, and outcomes in general education settings (Hamre & Pianta, 2001; Murray & Pianta, 2007). Yet, the impact of these relational aspects upon student growth, change, and resilience is not fully addressed within the implementation and maintenance of School Wide Positive Behavioral Intervention Supports (SWPBIS), and related programming. I have experienced and been a witness to the lack of attention and value placed upon relational aspects of programming for adolescent students with EBD. Rather, value is placed more upon "evidence based practices" that champion the benefits of fidelity to guided, prescribed interventions and models that are implemented utilizing scripted pedagogical practices.

Within the context of the discussion of critical attributes of relationships for programming, I will again look to the *I Ching*, along with the

introduction of Vygotsky's Social Constructivist theory and resilience theory. By explaining Vygotsky's theory of social constructivism, I am further laying the theoretical foundation of programming for adolescent students with EBD. Vygotsky along with Wilhem and Wilhelm's interpretation of the *I Ching* or *The Book of Change* (1995) assert that human development is dependent upon the context of environment, whereas the environment is dependent upon the stage of development. Vygotsky (1994) illustrates this synergistic process in his discussion of the child development: "Also an organism internally prepared absolutely requires the determining influence of the environment in order to be able to accomplish that development (p. 64). Furthermore, Vygotsky expresses:

> This structure is not an outward, ready-made creation. It originates in conformance with definite laws at a certain stage of natural of the child. It cannot be forced on the child from the outside, it always originates inwardly, although it is modeled by the deciding influence of external problems with which the child is faced and the external signs with which it operates....the active part is here played by the organism which masters the means of cultural behavior supplied by the environment. (p.62-64)

This paradox illustrates the importance of understanding that students' environmental influences change according to their stage of development, awareness, and the emergent desire to experience and understand. Most importantly, environment is shaped and created by the adults within students' family, schools, and community. The synergistic process of development, environment, and social relationships are equally significant: most importantly, when this process is aligned with the unfolding and awareness of the self within cultural, societal, and systemic contexts. As described in Hue (2011), teachers liken this process to "'a seed in the earth', which would grow beautifully when the optimum conditions of soil, light and temperature were reached." (p. 265) These processes ultimately result in students acquiring abilities to resist, recover, and overcome risk factors and adverse life challenges, defined as resilience (Hue, 2011; Richardson, 2002; Vanderbilt-Adriance & Shaw, 2008).

Before further discussing resilience, I must continue to expand upon Vygotsky's social constructivism theory. Vygotsky's theory examines the social frameworks that influence how individuals construct their internal schema of knowledge and psychological attributes that influence how they participate in their world. Gergen, (1985) supports this assertion within the discussion of psychological and social processes: "The explanatory locus of human action shifts from the interior

region of the mind to the processes and structure of human interaction." (271) The basis of this theory intertwines with the *I Ching* when discussing individual development and change within social and cultural constructs. Throughout the different stages of the development of self, the awareness of individual distinctions apart from cultural and societal constructs emerge. Time and change remain the constants that support this individual growth. Throughout each stage, patterns of behavior, learning, social, and emotional development transpire allowing for the growth and development process of each individual (Wilhelm & Wilhelm, 1995). Within each stage, the lens in which they view the world and their scope of interaction and participation also evolve (Wilhelm, 1995; Vygotsky, 1994). Vygotsky's theory helps to create a paradigm in which we can view current educational practices and program development for adolescent students with EBD.

While Vygotsky's theory originated as a study of language and cognitive development, it is important to acknowledge his contribution to the development of social constructivism within the conversation of working with adolescent students with EBD. This is especially pertinent when examining developmental stages relative to social interactions, cultural context, and environment, along with the progression from external to internal locus of control and influence. This social framework is based upon societal expectations and rules that may be static or transitory in nature. Thus, navigating, understanding and participating within societal expectations and rules requires the ability to adapt to the requirements set forth within this construct as well as the transitory nature dependent upon who deems and where the constructs are set (Gergen, 1985; Hruby, 2001; Hue, 2011). This meta-cognitive ability to effectively understand, navigate and participate within given societal constructs is dependent upon the societal framework in which internal schema and psychological attributes were unconsciously developed (Gergen, 1985; Hruby, 2001). Most crucial to understand and acknowledge are students' individual views, attributes, participatory actions, and behaviors are dependent upon early and continuing relationships and interactions within this framework (Gergen, 1985).

Thus, adolescent students with EBD in restrictive settings may not respond favorably to traditional evidence based behavioral methodology, and prescribed "one size fits all" interventions and interactions that advocate fidelity based upon generic application of ascribed attributes and characteristics. It is the adult-child relationships that are integral to the formation and foundation of students' construct of knowledge, and social and cultural structures that greatly impact all aspects of their life experiences (Poulou & Norwich, 2002). While I cannot control

the social and cultural structures of my students' home and community environment, I most certainly have a moral and ethical duty to exert influence over their school environment to increase quality outcomes, create change, and build resilience. The power of adult-student relationships and my moral and ethical duty to foster such relationships is further evidenced in this *I Ching* quote: "The universality of its power includes all levels in all dimensions; every seed that is planted grows and matures within its scope" (p. 28).

It is already well documented that students with EBD have limited or nonexistent protective factors and experience more significant and prolonged periods of fluctuations across most domains of functioning (Masten, 2001; Vanderbilt-Adriance & Shaw, 2008). Thus, "atypical" patterns of development and reactions become evident and more pronounced across academic, social, emotional, and behavioral domains (Masten, 2001; Yeager & Dweck, 2012; U.S. Department of Education, 2004). The struggles that students exhibit further complicate their abilities to foresee solution-focused mechanisms that can change outcomes. Yeager & Dweck (2012) confirm this proposition in their discussion of student mindsets regarding malleability and to "the psychology underlying adolescents' resilient responses to academic and social challenges." (P. 302) Rather students view and operate utilizing instinctive, reactive coping strategies for participating in their given environment. Thus resulting in internal and/or external social, emotional, and behavioral distress (Hue, 2011; Yeager & Dweck, 2012).

Hue (2011), asserts the theory of resilience, grounded in Confucianism, serves as a foundation of self-discovery of inner strengths and abilities through the innate development of the self. However, this journey requires a core structural base built akin to a trellis for flowering plants, or as a teacher in Hue's (2011) article states:

> If there are no bamboo frames for them to climb up and grow over, they just grow everywhere in a mess. However, if there are bamboo frames set up for them to climb over, they can grow along them, in very beautiful ways. (p. 266)

This trellis, or bamboo frame while built within parameters of policies, procedures, mandates and cultural and societal norms, is most imperative for student growth and outcomes. The laying of these frames, the very nature of constructing, is greatly affected by the hands that place them, carefully or haphazardly, determining the path that will be followed (Gilham, 2011; Hue, 2011).

At this juncture, I must again hauntingly reflect upon the fate of my two students, and the wise words of my other former student

asking me, "Why didn't you try hard enough?" I wonder, what, if anything could have been done differently to change two of my students' life course? How did I lay the frames for their trellis? Did I try hard enough to carefully lay enduring, supportive, flexible structures to help determine their path? Did I push hard enough past the parameters and prescribed guidelines, policies, procedures, and mandates given for building and supporting the trellis' to best meet the significant needs of my students? How carefully did my staff and I build these frames and tend to the seeds that were entrusted to us, already fragile, ready to wither or grow within our "scope" of care? I have already discussed that the contemplative nature of this article may not find or answer definitive questions. I must also note that, most importantly, I will not be able to completely answer my own proposed questions. This is to be expected, as part of the reflexive process may not always answer questions, and in fact can pose more for further exploration. Rather, I use these questions to guide and create a shift in thinking, understanding, and acknowledging student and staff relationships as the foundation of all programming for students with EBD in restrictive settings.

These relationships and interactions are often the pivotal turning point that can create lasting change in the lives of adolescent students with EBD (Montague & Rinaldi, 2001; Poulou & Norwich, 2002). Everything else; evidence based practices, interventions, supports and services, are the individual pieces that are placed upon this foundation to collectively form the frame in which resilience and change can occur. I argue that all adults within the education system have a collective, universal power to make lasting impact upon students' lives and the lens in which they view and experience their world. Thus, necessitating the need to quit shifting blame, making excuses, and critically examine how this system will uphold and support the placement of each piece of this structure for students with EBD in restrictive settings.

I recall being asked, in reference to the outcome of my two students, upon my insistence that programming be designed and implemented for resilience building, if resilience is innate? Thus, it is "either there or not" or whether resilience could be developed? At this point in my career, I assert as a testament to the passion and dedication of students, staff, and most families I work with, along with a myriad of favorable outcomes, that resilience in fact can be fostered and developed. In hindsight, I must honestly admit my limited past ability to understand the impact of resilience upon the outcomes of my students-significantly, knowing and recognizing that the environment within my classroom greatly attributed to my students' ability to gain resilience for increased future outcomes. I knew the significance of creating an environment

conducive to learning and social/emotional growth. I also recognized the complexities of programming and providing the needed foundations for my students. Therefore, I relied heavily on "expert" advice and support that at this point in my career, admittedly, was not always best for my students. I am not in any way attempting to lay blame upon any one person. Rather, accepting that as a less experienced teacher, I was limited by my own narrow scope and vision of programming for adolescent students with EBD in restrictive settings. These limitations created opportunities for fear and powerlessness to impede my vision and voice in creating a protective environment conducive to building resilience and change: most significantly for understanding the critical need for staff that had a shared vision of ethical, philosophical, and theoretical ideology in working with adolescent students with EBD in restrictive settings. At this moment I truly understand exactly what was meant by my student's question, "why didn't you try hard enough?" However, a more evocative question, posed by my educational mentors and leaders should have been, "how do we help you to understand?

It is at this final stage of my reflexive journey, that I reflect upon the meaning of this *I Ching* quote in support of my call for change:

> Change is the "begetting of all begetting" it is said, the overflowing abundance of the force for which there is never standstill nor cessation. It is in constant change and growth alone that life can be grasped at all. (Javary, 1997, p. 26)

I argue for a system that works to ameliorate and change the trajectory of decreased outcomes for adolescent students with EBD. This system of change must begin at the systemic level in which a new way of thinking about philosophical and theoretical perspectives is encouraged and embraced. The core tenets of programing must address the critical need to promote the malleability of resilience and pathways that are built through relationships (Hue, 2011; Yeager & Dweck, 2012). This understanding requires a shift in thinking that moves beyond the prescribed, institutionalized practice of implementing only "one size fits all" evidence based policies and practices.

I must also assert that while I advocate having shared core tenets, and a foundational philosophical and theoretical basis of programming, a culture that values a multi-disciplinary approach to collaboration, collegiality, and coordination is of utmost importance. Systems of change must also possess the ability to assess organizational risk factors, be willing to change, rebound, and thrive within adverse situations (Phillips, Turner, & Holt, 2014). Significant aspects of organizational structure must also encompass proactive, strength based, and

process oriented constructs of resilience and social-emotional competence of all service providers with a goal of obtaining the best possible outcomes for adolescent students with EBD (Teasley, & Cruz, 2014; Daniels, 2006; Phillips, Turner, & Holt, 2014).

At the final writing of this article that calls for a system of change, I was confronted with the news of the arrest of my former student on a rape and murder charge. This tragic ending to two students lives, both entrusted in the care of myself, and a system that is meant to nurture, protect, and circumvent such endings forces me to wonder if this call is enough. My conclusion is that this call is the beginning. It is with this in mind that I encourage open thinking to employ the philosophical underpinnings of the *I Ching* philosophy to understand the archetypal, universal experience as the basis of dynamic and transformative essence of change. The melding of *I Ching* philosophy, Vygotsky's social constructivist theory, and resilience theory can create an understanding of the continual loop of shifting, emerging, and retreating processes that occur within societal and cultural constructs of relationships, interactions, and expectations (Hue, 2011; Javary, 1997; Wilhelm & Wilhelm, 1995; Vygotsky, 1995). This knowledge may then allow for the possible recognition of the crucial moment to intervene and alter the course within the natural phenomenon of change to more favorable outcomes. Thus moving from asking, "what could have been done differently?" To stating, "I did something different."

References

Anastasiou, D., & Kauffman, J. M. (2011). A social constructionist approach to disability: Implications for special education. *Exceptional Children, 77*(3), 367-384.

Birch, S. H., & Ladd, G. W. (1997). The teacher-child relationship and children's early school adjustment. *Journal of School Psychology, 35*(1), 61-79. doi: http://dx.doi.org.pacificlib.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/S0022-4405(96)00029-5http://dx.doi.org.pacificlib.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/S0022-4405(96)00029-5

Coffey, J. H., & Horner, R. H. (2012). The sustainability of schoolwide positive behavior interventions and supports. *Exceptional Children, 78*(4), 407-422.

Daniels, H. (2006). Rethinking intervention: Changing the cultures of schooling. *Emotional & Behavioural Difficulties, 11*(2), 105-120. doi:10.1080/136327 50600619273

Evans, C., Weiss, S. L., & Cullinan, D. (2012). Teacher perceptions and behavioral strategies for students with emotional disturbance across educational environments. *Preventing School Failure, 56*(2), 82-90. doi:10.1080/ 1045988X.2011.574170

Fowler, L. T. S., Banks, T. I., Anhalt, K., Der, H. H., & Kalis, T. (2008). The association between externalizing behavior problems, teacher-student relationship

quality, and academic performance in young urban learners. *Behavioral Disorders, 33*(3), 167-183.

Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist, 40*(3), 266-275.

Gilham, C. (2011). Beyond the monster's wanting and doing: Special education as a barrier and diacritical hermeneutics as possibility. *Canadian Journal of Education, 34*(3), 103-118.

Graduate Student Instructor Teaching & Resource Center, University of California, Berkeley. http://gsi.berkeley.edu/gsi-guide-contents/learning-theory-research/social-constructivism/

Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early Teacher–Child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development, 72*(2), 625.

Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., Downer, J. T., DeCoster, J., Mashburn, A. J., Jones, S. M., . . . Hamagami, A. (2013). Teaching through interactions. *Elementary School Journal, 113*(4), 461-487.

Harris-Murri, N., King, K., & Rostenberg, D. (2006). Reducing disproportionate minority representation in special education programs for students with emotional disturbances: Toward a culturally responsive response to intervention model. *Education & Treatment of Children, 29*(4), 779-799.

Hruby, G. G. (2001). Sociological, postmodern, and new realism perspectives in social constructionism: Implications for literacy research. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(1), 48.

Hue, M. (2011). Developing resiliency in students with behavioural problems in hong kong secondary schools: Teachers' narratives from a school guidance perspective. *Pastoral Care in Education, 29*(4), 261-272. doi:10.1080/02643944.2011.626067

Javary, C. (1997). *Understanding the I Ching*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications Inc.

Johnson, B. (2008). Teacher-student relationships which promote resilience at school: A micro-level analysis of students' views. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 36*(4), 385-398. doi:10.1080/03069880802364528

Lago-Delello, E. (1998). Classroom dynamics and the development of serious emotional disturbance. *Exceptional Children, 64*(4), 479-492.

Lampron, S., & Gonsoulin, S. (2013). PBIS in restrictive settings: The time is now. *Education & Treatment of Children, 36*(3), 161-174.

Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development, 71*(3), 543-562.

Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 227-238. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227

Masten, A. S. (2014). Global perspectives on resilience in children and youth. *Child Development, 85*(1), 6-20. doi:10.1111/cdev.12205

Montague, M. & Rinaldi, C. (2007). Classroom Dynamics and Children at Risk: A Followup. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 24*(75), 75-82.

Murray, C., & Pianta, R. C. (2007). The importance of teacher-student relationships for adolescents with high incidence disabilities. *Theory into Practice,*

46(2), 105-112. doi:10.1080/00405840701232943

Phillips, M. D., Turner, M. G., & Holt, T. J. (2014). Exploring resiliency within schools: An investigation of the effects of protective factors. *Youth & Society, 46*(1), 89-111. doi:10.1177/0044118X11425644

Poulou, M., & Norwich, B. (2002). Cognitive, emotional and behavioural responses to students with emotional and behavioural difficulties: A model of decision-making. *British Educational Research Journal, 28*(1), 111-138. doi:10.1080/01411920120109784

Richardson, G. E. (2002). The metatheory of resilience and resiliency. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 58*(3), 307-321.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. R. (2006). A promising approach for expanding and sustaining school wide positive behavior support. *School Psychology Review, 35*(2), 245.

Teasley, M. L., & Cruz, D. (2014). Diversity and related services personnel: Challenges, strategies, and solutions through culturally competent collaborative practice. *School Social Work Journal, 39*(1), 51-72.

U.S. Department of Education. (2004). Retrieved from http://idea.ed.gov/explore/view/p/http://idea.ed.gov/explore/view/p/%2Croot%2Cregs%2C300%2CA%2C300%252E8%2C

The Vygotsky Reader retrieved from https://www.marxists.org/archive/vygotsky/works/reader/

Vanderbilt-Adriance, E., & Shaw, D. (2008). Conceptualizing and re-evaluating resilience across levels of risk, time, and domains of competence. *Clinical Child & Family Psychology Review, 11*(1), 30-58. doi:10.1007/s10567-008-0031-2

Vygotsky, L. S. (1994). *The Vygotsky reader.* Van der Veer & Valsiner, Eds. Blackwell Oxford. (n.d.). In WordSense.eu | Dictionary. Retrieved from http://www.wordsense.eu

Wilhelm, H., & Wilhelm, R. (1995). *Understanding The I Ching: The Wilhelm Lectures on the Book of Changes*. Princeton, NJy: Princeton University Press

Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). Mindsets that promote resilience: When students believe that personal characteristics can be developed. *Educational Psychologist, 47*(4), 302-314. doi:10.1080/00461520.2012.722805