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2. Who are sent to Rebound facilities? A profile analysis of referrals

The present study investigated the profile of students sent to Rebound facilities in an attempt to find out whether or not Rebounds cater for the educational needs of their students. Two hundred and ninety eight referrals were analyzed of students entering Rebound facilities from 2008-2012 in The Hague, the Netherlands. Students were mostly referred due to their externalizing behaviors; mostly disruptive behaviors and verbal violence offences. A Ward method of cluster analysis revealed two types of students sent to Rebounds: students with predominantly internalizing problems, motivation and learning related problems and students characterized by more externalizing behaviors and truancy but fewer motivation and learning related problems. The present study suggests that a one-size fits all disciplinary strategy like a referral to Rebound, which focuses on diminishing externalizing problem behavior, may not be the best solution for Rebound students.

SUBMITTED
Challenging or provocative student behavior, such as talking back to the teacher, or disruptive classroom behavior, is an issue for schools around the world (Osher, Bear, Sprague, & Doyle, 2010). Teachers find it difficult to deal with frequent disruptions during class (Frick, 2004), and feel that disruptions jeopardize good teaching and catering for students’ individual learning needs (MacBeath, Galton, Steward, & Page, 2004). Frequent, less severe intrusive disruptions are the most frequently teacher reported form of disturbing behavior, followed by less frequent, but more intrusive disruptions, like verbal or physical aggression toward classmates and, even less frequent, violence toward school staff (Frick, 2004; Munn, Johnstone, Sharp, & Brown, 2007). For coping with, or resolving the disruptions or problematic behavior, schools mostly use disciplinary measures like suspensions and expulsions. These exclusionary practices are meant to punish disruptive behaviors, get rid of the source of disruptions, and should allow the continuation of regular lessons.

However, expulsions and suspensions have drawbacks. Students miss lessons and effective learning time, and instead of improving their attitude toward school, exclusionary practices contribute to an increased chance of school disengagement and dropout (e.g., Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, 2010; Osher, Morrison, & Bailey, 2003; Suh, Suh, & Houston, 2007). Disruptive youths who are suspended from school upon their return have an increased chance to be set apart and join forces with other disruptive youths (Dishion & Dodge, 2005). A likely consequence is that the disturbing behavior continues or even intensifies (Atkins et al., 2002; Dishion & Dodge, 2005; Gottfredson, Gottfredson, Payne, & Gottfredson, 2005). This is particularly the case when the actions and attitudes of teachers and students toward the disruptive students are perceived as unfair by these students (Osher et al., 2010; Van Acker, 2007).

Although suspensions are more related to less severe, but frequent disruptive behaviors it was due to a severe incidence of student violence against a teacher that the Dutch Ministry of Education introduced the so-called Rebound facilities. These are time-out facilities for behaviorally challenging students. Rebounds prepare referred students for their return to the referring schools. These institutions are supposed to achieve drastic behavioral changes by using a strict and sometimes punitive approach towards students, and increase active student participation before sending the students back to their schools (School Inspectorate, 2007; Van der Hoeven, 2004). The number of available places have been growing ever since its start with an average increase of 8% per year (Van Veen, Van der Steenhoven, & Kuijvenhoven, 2007).

This article is about the fit between the Rebound facilities and characteristics of the referred students. Rebounds are meant for secondary school students who show maladaptive behavior in such a manner that school safety is at stake. Students diagnosed with a psychiatric disorder or with
learning disabilities are not eligible, because other schools and services are available that cater for these students’ needs. Moreover, Rebounds are not meant for students with a criminal record; Rebounds should focus exclusively on students demonstrating relatively milder externalizing problems. Do schools indeed refer only students with non-criminal, non-psychiatric type externalizing problems? And if not, what type of students are being referred and how can Rebounds be adapted to the needs of these students? The analysis of entrance patterns for Rebounds as much as for other out-of-school programs is important because it allows to correct undesirable referral practices and an evaluation of the fit between referrals and the program.

**Rebound Facilities**

Rebound facilities provide classes away from students’ school, making sure that referred students cannot disturb instruction and learning in referring schools. Rebounds function as a time-out group for six to thirteen weeks. A Rebound class has a maximum capacity of 12 students. Students have weekly homework assignments provided by their own school, and their school work is supervised by Rebound staff. In addition, Rebound facilities offer a ten week EQUIP training meant to teach antisocial youth to think and act responsibly through peer-helping and skill-streaming methods (Gibbs, Potter, & Goldstein, 1995), with a strong component of restructuring behavior accompanying cognitions of antisocial youth. The focus on EQUIP makes that Rebounds cater for the needs of students with externalizing problems.

Rebound facilities do not use set starting dates, but can at any time cater for schools’ urgent needs to provide a time-out for a problematic student. Furthermore, recent studies on Rebound facilities have reported the lack of clear referral criteria allowing referring schools as well as Rebounds to specify whether reported behaviors are problematic or not (Inspectorate of Education, 2007; Kuijvenhoven, 2007). And indeed schools differ with respect to organizational, cultural, pedagogical, and didactic features. This means that some schools may lack in-school services to appropriately deal with challenging students and therefore produce more referrals than schools who have the necessary school services in place. The difference may also be reflected in, or correspond to, differences between school staffs’ perceptions of problematic behaviors. This means that some schools refer students to Rebound facilities who preferably should be placed in schools for special education, or juvenile correction programs (Kuijvenhoven, 2007).

Another source of variation in students admitted to Rebounds is the placement procedure. Rebound facilities use three different referral or placement procedures: regular placements, crisis placements and placements for observational purposes. Regular placements are initiated by school specific counseling teams that take the initiative to present a potential referral to a local care
coordination team (Kuijvenhoven, 2007; Van Veen et al., 2007). This team includes representatives of schools, police, and youth care institutions and assesses the urgency and justification of a referral to Rebound. Crisis placements are mostly started when school safety is at stake because a student caused an acute situation of physical insecurity, for example by starting a fight with peers. Finally, both school counseling teams and the local care coordination team can arrange a special placement for observational purposes. The students are involved in manifest problematic behavior, but too little information is available for evaluating its nature, extent and intensity, and hence there is too much doubt about a good fit with a possible treatment. The maximum stay for these diagnostic placements is six weeks and hence shorter than regular placements. The second type of placements, the crisis placements, is likely to best fit the formal eligibility criteria of the Rebounds, because the type of problems that warrant a crisis placement are the type of problems that the EQUIP intervention is meant to deal with. The third type, observation placements, counts with students who actually may not fit Rebound as an intervention approach.

**Referral Procedures**

Multiple studies have emphasized disruptive behavior as a major challenge for teachers. Conflicts arise when teachers fail in coping with the challenging students while not succeeding in providing learning opportunities for the whole class (MacBeath et al., 2004). Such conflicts may lead to referrals and provide a context that explains why referral procedures may produce false positives and false negatives. The first, a false positive, means that students are referred who may not fit the classroom, but do not fit a Rebound either. The second, a false negative, means that students who meet the criteria are actually not referred, for instance, because referring does not fit the school policy or ideology. That referrals not only depend on the extent to which student characteristics and behaviors meet particular criteria was also shown by Coşkun, Van Geel, and Vedder (2015), who found that referred immigrant students reported fewer behavior problems than referred national students. Katsiyannis and Williams (1998) showed that referrals may be made for the wrong reasons. For instance, they may reflect administrative convenience. This happens when school staff tries to avoid strict procedures for admissions into special educational services and opts for a simple but educationally suboptimal solution of simply getting rid of ‘undesirable’ students. Taken together, such results suggest that teacher appraisals of student behavior may not be flawless, and to some extent lead to incorrect student referrals. Studying referrals may therefore eventually provide useful information for teachers in regular schools as well as for educators and program developers who work in Rebounds or who adapt the interventions (Booker & Mitchell, 2011). Understanding reasons for Rebound placements might lead to reduction in referrals and optimization of the effectiveness of Rebound facilities.
**Current Study**

The purpose of the current study is to gain insight in characteristics and problems of students referred to Rebounds and create a basis for evaluating the fit or misfit between referred students and the Rebound. Studies on students in Rebound facilities hitherto mainly used general descriptions of student populations rather than reporting statistics on specific student characteristics and behaviors (cf. Kuijvenhoven, 2007; School Inspectorate, 2007). The current study will report the outcomes of an analysis of the referral files of Rebound students. In addition, cluster analyses will be used to identify subtypes of students sent to Rebound facilities, using specific characteristics and identified problems as input. By studying the referral files, and by using cluster analyses we will gain insight in the reasons why students were referred, and we can establish which problems tend to characterize students referred to Rebound facilities. We will then evaluate to what extent these characteristics and clusters fit the Rebound institutions, namely students who show disruptive but not delinquent externalizing behavior.

The variables used in the cluster analysis refer to types of problem behaviors reported, the nature of relationships with peers and teachers, the complexity of problematic behaviors, and school related problems reflected in grades, number of suspensions, truancy, and motivation or learning attitudes. We expect to find that, given the high need of schools to have easy means to cope with problematic students (Kuijvenhoven, 2007; School Inspectorate, 2007), schools will tend to refer students even when the students are not really eligible given the earlier mentioned inclusion and exclusion criteria and given the focus of the EQUIP intervention on behavior modification. Hence, profiles of referred students may be more diversified than they are meant to be. Moreover, we expect more diversified profiles based on the fact that the different types of placements anticipate such more diversified profiles. When split out between types of placements we expect that crisis placements will correspond to placements that best fit the Rebound in that such placements most clearly take inclusion and exclusion criteria into account.

**Method**

**Participants**

For this study we analyzed 298 referrals of students entering Rebound facilities from 2008-2012. The ages ranged from 12 to 17 years ($M_{age} = 14.52; SD = 1.16$). The sample consisted of 218 (73.2 %) boys and 80 girls (26.8 %). Furthermore, the sample included 211 students (70.3%) with an immigrant background (1st and 2nd generation). Two hundred and thirty-nine students were from junior vocational high schools (80.2%), 24 from schools preparing for university education (8.1%),
nine visited other educational facilities (3.4%) and for 26 students we could not find the relevant information in their files (8.4%).

Measurement

The referral files were scored by the researchers with respect to the following categorical items: (1) the type of referral (crisis, regular, observation placement); (2) being discussed in a local care coordination team (yes/no); (3) having contact with an attendance officer (yes/no); (4) any family support (yes/no); (5) expulsion (expelled or not); teacher reports on: (6) externalizing (yes/no); (7) internalizing (yes/no); or (8) motivational problem behaviors (yes/no); (9) problematic relationship with peers (yes/no); and (10) problematic relationship with teachers (yes/no); (11) the complexity of the problematic behaviors (from 1 very complex to 4 not complex at all), (12) whether or not students attend special needs classes (yes/no), (13) truancy (not at all; occasionally; frequent to very frequent), and (14) academic performance (pass; fail; varies). In addition, the information in the files about types of externalizing behaviors was scored as regards the prevalence of (15) verbal violence against school staff, (16) (threatening with) physical violence against school staff, (17) (threatening with) physical violence against other students, (18) disruptive behavior during class, and (19) disruptive behavior after class but on school premises. These behavioral items (15 – 19) had a dichotomous response scale (yes/no). Scoring meant largely copying information from the files. How the information represented in the files had been collected could not be checked. The student records were completed by school staff.

Procedure

The present study was conducted as a file analysis. Referrals to Rebound facilities are registered in a computerized system and available through intranet. With permission of the board of collaborating schools, that manages the Rebounds on behalf of the schools and functions in loco parentis, all files from students referred between the school years 2005 and 2012 were made available for analysis. However, we used files entered between 2008 and 2012, because these were the most complete files on intranet. The referral papers and forms in the files were completed by school social workers (73.6%) or by vice-head teachers (26.4%).

Results

Earlier Attention for Students’ Problems

In the present sample 75 (25.2%) students came to the Rebound through a crisis placement. One hundred and eighty five (62.1%) came through a regular placement, and 21 (7.0%) cases were not definitely referred and admitted to the Rebound, but came for observational purposes. For 19
students the type of placement was not specified in their files (6.4%). Table 1 shows descriptive data of students being discussed in local care coordination teams, and whether or not they had any previous contact with an attendance officer. Most of the students were discussed previously in care coordination teams (62.4%) and had contact with an attendance officer before their referral (63.4%). Chi-square tests revealed an association between the type of referral and being discussed in a care coordination team $\chi^2 (2, 270) = 21.16, p < 0.01$. A large proportion of students who were placed due to a crisis situation were not discussed in such a team ($N = 40; 58.0%$), while students with a regular placement were more often discussed ($N = 131; 72.4%$). Earlier contacts with an attendance officer, were unrelated to referral type, but they were positively associated with students’ suspension rate $\chi^2 (1, 249) = 5.74, p < 0.01$. Students’ suspension rate and whether or not students were discussed in care coordination teams, were unrelated.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptives of earlier attention for students’ problems</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Missing (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussed previously in teams</td>
<td>186 (62.4%)</td>
<td>99 (33.2%)</td>
<td>13 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance officer</td>
<td>189 (63.4%)</td>
<td>81 (27.2%)</td>
<td>28 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Behavioral Problems as Predictors of Referrals**

Table 2 represents descriptive data for students’ problem behavior. Referral files report that 95% of the Rebound adolescents are characterized by externalizing problem behavior. When specifying externalizing behavior, disruptive behavior (65.1% of referred students) and verbal violence against school staff (45.3% of referred students) are the most reported types. Physical violence against school staff was the least reported type of externalizing behaviors (10.4% of referred students). Around 30% of the students had problematic relations with peers as well as with teachers and chi-square statistics showed both types of problematic relationships to be related $\chi^2 (1, 225) = 78.75, p < 0.01$. The most prevalent reason for problematic relations between teachers and students however, was disruptive behaviors in classrooms $\chi^2 (1, 228) = 18.73, p < 0.01$ (see Table 2 for numbers and proportions).
Table 2

Descriptive teacher reports on student behavior (298 student files)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Missing (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing behavior</td>
<td>254 (85.2%)</td>
<td>25 (8.4%)</td>
<td>19 (6.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing behavior</td>
<td>52 (17.4%)</td>
<td>188 (63.1%)</td>
<td>58 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal violence against school staff</td>
<td>135 (45.3%)</td>
<td>103 (34.6%)</td>
<td>60 (20.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Threatening with) physical violence against school staff</td>
<td>31 (10.4%)</td>
<td>206 (69.1%)</td>
<td>61 (20.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Threatening with) physical violence against students</td>
<td>79 (26.5%)</td>
<td>158 (53.0%)</td>
<td>61 (20.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive behavior during class</td>
<td>194 (65.1%)</td>
<td>43 (14.4%)</td>
<td>61 (20.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic student-teacher relation</td>
<td>97 (32.6%)</td>
<td>128 (43.0%)</td>
<td>73 (24.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic student-peer relation</td>
<td>89 (29.9%)</td>
<td>147 (49.3%)</td>
<td>62 (20.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square tests showed disruptive behavior during class and violence against school staff to be associated with the type of referral: disruptive behavior during class was related to a regular placement $\chi^2 (1, 220) = 18.36, \ p < 0.01$, and students who used violence against school staff had a higher chance of being processed as crisis referrals $\chi^2 (1, 220) = 4.01, \ p < 0.05$. Student overall externalizing behaviors $\chi^2 (1, 253) = 11.89, \ p < 0.01$, and (threatening with) physical violence against peers $\chi^2 (1, 216) = 6.86, \ p < 0.01$ corresponded to students having a history of expulsions. Students’ internalizing problems $\chi^2 (1, 220) = 3.68, \ p = 0.06$, and verbal violence against school staff $\chi^2 (1, 216) = 3.72, \ p = 0.06$ were marginally related to having a history of expulsions. Problematic relations with peers $\chi^2 (1, 217) = 1.36, \ p = .24$ and teachers $\chi^2 (1, 207) = 0.51, \ p = 0.82$ were not associated with earlier expulsions.

Other School Problems and Referrals

Of the 298 referral files, 125 (41.7%) reported students’ failing grades in the past year, 16 (5.3%) reported good grades, and 87 (29.0%) sufficient grades (passed). Furthermore, 93 students (31.2%) had been occasionally truant, whereas 39 (13.1%) frequently or very frequently did not come to school, and 117 (39.3%) students had never been truant. Most students (55.0%) showed motivational problems and/or a problematic work attitude (48.0%) (See Table 3). Problematic relationships with either teachers or peers were unrelated to motivational problems and academic achievements. Student motivational problems were related to students’ academic achievement $\chi^2 (3, 220) = 48.94, \ p < 0.01$, whereas problem behavior was unrelated to students’ academic achievement.

Neither students’ grades nor problematic work attitudes and motivational problems were related to students’ earlier expulsions. However, truancy $\chi^2 (4, 233) = 13.31, \ p < 0.05$ and
motivational problems $\chi^2 (2, 209) = 9.21, p < 0.05$ were related to the type of referral. The largest percentage of unmotivated (54.1%) and truant (70.8%) students had a regular placement.

Table 3
Teacher reports on school problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Unknown (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivational problems</td>
<td>165 (55.0%)</td>
<td>58 (19.3%)</td>
<td>77 (25.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic work attitude</td>
<td>143 (48.0%)</td>
<td>66 (22.1%)</td>
<td>89 (29.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cluster Analysis on Behavioral and School Related Problems

For defining student profiles we conducted cluster analysis. We used Ward’s method because we do not have outliers in our data and have no reason to believe that the outcome will result in clearly unequally sized clusters (Mooi & Sarstedt, 2011). Because such analyses can be conducted on complete cases only, data of 164 of the original 298 students were included. The variables entered were gender, ethnicity, education level, the type of referral, truancy, overall externalizing and internalizing behaviors and motivational problem behaviors, relationship with peers and teachers, the complexity of problematic behaviors, and academic achievements. Two clear clusters emerged from the analysis. Cluster 1, was characterized by more internalizing problems, more motivational problems, and more problematic work attitudes, but less externalizing problems than found in students in cluster 2. Furthermore, cluster 1 showed zero truant behavior among Rebound students. Cluster 2 involved more externalizing behaviors, but less motivational problems and 100% truant behavior. Crisis placements were significantly more present in Cluster 2 (33.8%), and regular placements in Cluster 1 (81.0%).
Table 4  
*Frequencies by scale for the two-cluster solution (Total N = 164)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Cluster 1 (N = 84)</th>
<th>Cluster 2 (N = 80)</th>
<th>Fp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing behaviors</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>5.708**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing behaviors</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>4.632**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of problems</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>2.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient grades</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>1.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational problems</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>12.377**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic work attitude</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>2.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>150.453**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior vocational high school</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>3.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.094**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p <.10; ** p <.05.

**Discussion**

The current study aimed to get a better view of characteristics and problems of students referred to Rebounds and to evaluate the quality of fit between referrals and the intervention that Rebounds stand for.

Our findings on disciplinary practices and referrals to Rebound facilities, resemble findings from studies in other educational settings in other countries. Referrals and expulsions in such settings rarely deal with serious offences, but often concern disruptive offences and attendance issues (Frick, 2004; Munn et al., 2007; Mendez & Knoff, 2003; Skiba & Rausch, 2006). Students were mostly referred through a regular placement procedure with externalizing behaviors, particularly disruptive behaviors and verbal violence offences. Both types of externalizing behavior were related to being involved in problematic relations with teachers and students.

As expected the crisis placements involved proportionally more frequently students with externalizing problems than the regular placements did. The crisis referrals generally were more in accordance with the formal inclusion and exclusion criteria for placements in Rebounds. The Ward method of cluster analysis revealed two types of students sent to Rebound facilities in which the first...
cluster involved more internalizing problems and motivation and learning related problems. The second cluster stood for more externalizing behaviors, hundred percent truant behavior (varying from occasionally to very frequent), and more crisis referrals, but less motivation and learning related problems. This concurs with other studies showing that truant students are more likely to show risky, and physically aggressive behaviors than students who regularly attend school (Eaton, Brener, & Kann, 2008; Sinclair, Christenson, & Thurlow, 2005).

We stated in the introduction that teacher referrals may not be perfect. However, we found that most students referred to Rebound facilities actually demonstrated externalizing problem behaviors. This suggests that referrals are at least accurate in so far as that students without externalizing problem behaviors tend not to be referred. Furthermore, relatively few students demonstrated more severe problems such as violence against school staff. The majority of referrals were also discussed in team meetings, which suggests that decisions are not made on a whim. However, the first cluster reported internalizing problems, and frequent motivation and learning related problems. These are challenges that the Rebounds are not specifically equipped for. This first cluster suggests that half of the referred students need another type intervention paying more attention to students’ internalizing problems, learning problems, and school motivation.

Limitations and Implications

A major limitation of the study was the dichotomous structure of variables, that is, the student were categorized as either or not presenting problem behavior. To better understand problem behavior, a more fine-grained scoring of, for instance, externalizing behaviors might have led to a better appreciation of subtypes of problem behavior. Secondly, the present study would have benefitted from a valid and standardized collection of primary data using well-validated instruments. We had to work with information from school staff without knowing how they gathered their information in the first place. This information, while being very important for students’ school lives, may have been more or less accurate, valid or biased. Furthermore, the lack of baseline data or a normative standard to assess differences between referred and non-referred students, and the lack of control variables like availability and use of in-school counseling services and policies, may have jeopardized the internal validity of our study. Finally, the findings are of correlational nature and do not allow causal reasoning.

As schools try to find a way to deal with disruptive and externalizing behaviors (MacBeath et al., 2004), the present study suggests that a one-size fits all disciplinary strategy, which mostly focuses on behavioral changes, may not be the best solution for Rebound students. Our two cluster solution shows that most of the students need additional support in motivation and learning related
problems, next to their daily homework supervision. This finding resembles School Inspectorate’s (2007) finding that Rebounds lack an adequate instructional climate. In settings like Rebounds students easily miss out on effective learning time (Scott & Barrett, 2004), while having relatively low grades. To catch up they run a risk of getting or feeling overloaded or rather overwhelmed with schoolwork and consequently may become even less motivated (e.g., Osher et al., 2003; Gregory et al., 2010; Suh et al., 2007). Preventive intervention programs, such as school wide positive behavior supports, which focus on specific, positive behavioral expectations, might improve school climate and support positive bonds with alienated students, rather than excluding them (Gottfredson et al., 2005; Horner, Sugai, & Anderson, 2010; Skiba & Rausch, 2006). When student behavior is not responding to such preventive interventions, more individualized and intensive support should be provided (Gage, Sugai, Lunde, & DeLoreto, 2013). However, this should not imply ‘more of the same interventions, or more sanctions or punitive strategies’, but rather positive, evidence-based, programs targeted to the unique learning and behavioral histories and characteristics of the students, specifying and setting goals for personal academic and behavioral achievements.
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