



1980

## An Analysis of the Reactions of Elementary Teachers and Principals to the Role of Disciplinarian as Conducted Within a Selected Chicago Public School District

Floyd Malone Banks  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Banks, Floyd Malone, "An Analysis of the Reactions of Elementary Teachers and Principals to the Role of Disciplinarian as Conducted Within a Selected Chicago Public School District" (1980). *Dissertations*. 1895.

[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss/1895](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1895)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1980 Floyd Malone Banks

AN ANALYSIS OF THE REACTIONS OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AND  
PRINCIPALS TO THE ROLE OF DISCIPLINARIAN AS  
CONDUCTED WITHIN A SELECTED CHICAGO  
PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT

by

Floyd M. Banks

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate  
School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Degree of Doctor of Education

May 1980

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am much indebted to Dr. Melvin P. Heller my major advisor and committee chairman, and to Dr. Robert Monks and Dr. Phillip Carlin, members of the Advisory Board Committee whose expertise in the fields of Administration and Supervision has provided me with counseling and guidance during this study, and throughout my studies at Loyola University.

My profound gratitude is expressed to my District Eleven colleagues Dr. Orphen W. Bryan and the teachers and principals whose special consideration and cooperation made this study possible.

I am especially grateful to my friends and colleagues Dr. James L. Carpenter and Dr. Morven Ngaiyaye for encouragement and technical assistance.

Special gratitude is expressed to my brothers, sisters and friends who offered constant support and encouragement, and to my sons Floyd and Frank, whose existence as students motivated me to complete this study on student discipline.

Most of all, I am deeply grateful to my mother Mrs. Maggie Malone Banks, who disciplined me at an early age, and inspired me until her last days.

## VITA

The author, Floyd Malone Banks, is the son of George Banks and Maggie (Malone) Banks. He was born September 12, 1938 in Memphis, Tennessee.

His elementary school education was obtained at the Hamilton Elementary School of Memphis, Tennessee and secondary education at the Hamilton High School of Memphis, Tennessee where he was graduated in 1956.

He entered the Xavier University of Louisiana in September of 1956 and received the degree of Bachelor of Science with a major in the field of Health, Physical Education and Recreation in June of 1960.

He served in the position of teacher in the public schools of Chicago from 1960 to 1972.

In February of 1969, he entered the Loyola University of Chicago and received the degree of Master of Education in the field of Administration and Supervision in February of 1972.

He served in the position of assistant principal in the Chicago Public Schools from 1972 until 1975, and was awarded the principalship in January of 1975.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENT . . . . .	ii
VITA . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
Chapter	
I.    INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Purposes of the Study . . . . .	4
Research Questions . . . . .	4
Definitions of Terms . . . . .	6
Procedures and Methodology . . . . .	7
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	9
Organization of the Study . . . . .	10
II.   RESEARCH OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	11
The Student Discipline Problem . . . . .	12
Perceived Causes of the Student Discipline Problem . . . . .	16
The Family . . . . .	17
Television Violence . . . . .	22
The Expansion of Student Rights . . . . .	25
The School . . . . .	33
The Teacher . . . . .	39
The Principal . . . . .	48
The Student . . . . .	53
The Role of the Disciplinarian . . . . .	60
The Teacher-Disciplinarian . . . . .	60
The Principal-Disciplinarian . . . . .	69
Perceived Solutions to the Problem . . . . .	74
Previous Studies Related to Student Discipline . . . . .	76
Summary . . . . .	78
III.  INSTRUMENTATION, PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY . . . . .	81
Sample Population . . . . .	81
Instrumentation . . . . .	82
Procedures Used in Administering the Instrumentation . . . . .	83
Methodology . . . . .	84
Summary . . . . .	90

	<u>Page</u>
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE OPINIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEW DATA RELATIVE TO THE STUDENT DISCIPLINE PROBLEM . . . . .	92
Data Presentation and Analysis . . . . .	96
Summary . . . . .	121
V. OVERVIEW, SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	123
Overview . . . . .	123
Summary of Findings . . . . .	124
Conclusions . . . . .	127
Recommendations . . . . .	129
Implications for Further Study . . . . .	130
APPENDIX . . . . .	131
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	136

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Teacher and Principal Responses to Ten Propositions Concerning the Causes of the Student Discipline Problem . . . . .	110
2.	Teacher and Principal Responses to Five Propositions Concerning the Role of the Teacher in Matters of Student Discipline . . . . .	112
3.	Teacher and Principal Responses to Five Propositions Concerning the Role of the Principal in Matters of Student Discipline . . . . .	113
4.	Teacher Responses to Policies, Procedures and Programs Needed to Remedy the Problem of Student Discipline . . . . .	119
5.	Principal Responses to Policies, Procedures and Programs Needed to Remedy the Problem of Student Discipline . . . . .	120

Floyd Malone Banks

Loyola University of Chicago

AN ANALYSIS OF THE REACTIONS OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AND  
PRINCIPALS TO THE ROLE OF DISCIPLINARIAN AS  
CONDUCTED WITHIN A SELECTED CHICAGO  
PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT

This paper analyzed the critical problem of how elementary teachers and principals in one Chicago Public School district viewed the role of disciplinarian and its accompanying functions. Data analysis was done based on information derived from a Likert-type opinionnaire and personal interviews from which a number of conclusions were drawn:

1. Teachers did not agree on the causes of discipline problems, nor did they disagree.
2. Principals did not agree on the causes of discipline problems, nor did they disagree.
3. Teachers and principals identified similar causes of discipline problems.
4. Teachers accepted the role of disciplinarian, but did not accept responsibility for student discipline.
5. Principals agreed as to the teacher's role in student discipline.
6. Teachers and principals agreed on certain aspects of the teacher's role in student discipline.
7. Teachers agreed on the role of the principal in student discipline.



8. Principals accepted the role of disciplinarian.
9. Teachers and principals agreed on the role of the principal in matters of student discipline.
10. Teachers did not agree as to what policies, procedures, and programs are needed to alleviate the student discipline problem.
11. Principals did not agree as to what policies, procedures, and programs are needed to alleviate the student discipline problem.
12. Teachers and principals did not agree as to what policies, procedures, and programs are needed to alleviate the problem of student discipline.

### Recommendations

An analysis of the results of the opinionnaire and interview questions would justify the following recommendations:

1. Teacher responsibilities for classroom discipline should be enumerated in the form of a job description and discussed with district teachers.
2. Staff development programs geared towards the identification of all possible causes of student discipline problems should be implemented.
3. Competence in classroom discipline should be made an intricate component of teacher efficiency ratings.

4. School committees should be formed in each of the schools in the district to study community problems that could possibly affect school discipline.
5. Rules and regulations established within the schools to govern student behavior should be based on needs relative to potential problems.

#### Implications for Further Study

1. Similar research should be done in other Chicago school districts to determine if commonalities exist in conclusions.
2. Research might be conducted in smaller school systems in order to gain better insight into teacher and principal perceptions regarding the problem of student discipline.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The American System of public education has survived amidst a storm of criticism that ranged from curricular irrelevance to racial segregation,<sup>1</sup> and more recently, the lack of student discipline and control. Student discipline has been a major national problem confronting elementary and high school educators with increasing frequency and was cited by the public as the most serious school problem in the past ten of eleven annual Gallup opinion polls.<sup>2</sup> Frequent conflict situations between students and teachers or student and students, a recent congressional investigation into student vandalism, and recent lawsuits and court rulings in the area of student suspensions authenticated the problem.<sup>3</sup>

A variety of factors are said to underlie the discipline problem such as: chronic and serious emotional problems among students, lack of parental involvement and concern into school matters, negative attitudes of teachers and

---

<sup>1</sup>Ronald and Beatrice Gross, eds., Radical School Reform, (New York: Simon and Schuster, Publisher, 1969).

<sup>2</sup>George H. Gallup, "The Eleventh Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitude Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1978.

<sup>3</sup>David Schimmel and Louis Fisher, "Discipline and Due Process in the Schools," The Education Digest, January, 1978; Birch Bayh, "Seeking Solutions to School Violence and Vandalism," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1978, pp. 229-302.

principals, as well as a lack of cooperation between teachers and principals. Other factors said to underlie the problem have been a lack of student values, general student disrespect for authority, societal trends, television violence, inadequate curricula, and students who lack positive self images.<sup>4</sup>

Traditionally, teachers and principals have been required to perform the role of disciplinarian. For example, The School Code of Illinois makes clear the fact that teachers and other certified educational employees are to maintain discipline in the schools.<sup>5</sup> In Chicago, for example, public school principals are required by the Board of Education to supervise the establishment and maintenance of student discipline and control within a school building; and teachers are required to supervise the establishment and maintenance of discipline and control within the classroom.<sup>6</sup> Identical requirements are probably made of teachers and principals in other cities and states as well.

Since the responsibilities for student discipline and control are mandated to teachers and principals by state laws and boards of education, perhaps teachers and principals do

---

<sup>4</sup>Shirley Boes Neill, "Violence and Vandalism: Dimensions and Correctives," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1978, pp. 302-307; George H. Gallup, "The Tenth Annual Poll of the Public's Attitude Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1978.

<sup>5</sup>The School Code of Illinois, Compiled by N. E. Hutson, Legal Advisor, Circular Series A., No. 265, 1969.

<sup>6</sup>Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Board of Education, Sections 6-12; 6-13, Revised, 1964.

not feel responsible for student discipline; and perhaps the efforts of teachers and principals towards solving discipline problems exist only minimally. Hence, it remains unclear as to whether teachers and principals accept the responsibility for student discipline, whether conflicts exist in their role perceptions of each other, and whether there is agreement and cooperation in their attempts to establish and maintain proper student behavior. Clarifications pertinent to role perceptions and role conflict is provided by Stephen Knezevich:

...Let us concentrate on teachers as serving in counterpositions to the principal. It is not correct to assume that teachers are a homogeneous group or that one teacher thinks exactly like every other. Backgrounds, interests, and experience of teachers in a system vary widely. Relations between a heterogeneous group of teachers in a building and the principal can be important. Inability of either teachers or principal to cope with conflicting or ambiguous expectation in a given situation may arouse feelings of tensions and dissatisfaction.<sup>7</sup>

Since student discipline has continued to be a major problem, it is apparent that the following basic questions must be answered:

1. Do teachers and principals accept the role of disciplinarian?
2. Do teachers and principals agree as to how to handle student discipline problems?
3. Do teachers and principals work cooperatively together towards handling student discipline problems?

---

<sup>7</sup>Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, (New York: Harper and Tow Publishers, 1969), p. 106.

Consequently, a very critical need within educational administration has been to study the problem of student discipline by investigating the disciplinary role perceptions of teachers and principals aimed at determining role acceptance, the extent of cooperation among teachers and among principals, the extent of cooperation between teachers and principals, and to determine what programs, policies, and procedures are needed to improve the effectiveness of teachers and principals in promoting disciplined school environments.

#### Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are to determine the extent to which teachers and principals accept the role of disciplinarian, to determine if conflict situations exist within the role perceptions of teachers and principals in matters of student discipline, to determine to what extent teachers and principals agree on the causes of student discipline, and to recommend possible programs, policies and procedures to aid in the creation of school environments that are conducive to learning.

#### Research Questions

The research questions dealt with in this study are:

- (1) To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among teachers as to the causes of student discipline problems?

- (2) To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among principals as to the causes of student discipline problems?
- (3) To what extent is there agreement or disagreement between teachers and principals as to the causes of student discipline problems?
- (4) To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among teachers as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline?
- (5) To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among principals as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline?
- (6) To what extent is there agreement or disagreement between teachers and principals as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline?
- (7) To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among teachers as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline?
- (8) To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among principals as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline?
- (9) To what extent is there agreement or disagreement between teachers and principals as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline?

- (10) To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among teachers as to the types of policies, procedures and programs needed to remedy the student discipline problem?
- (11) To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among principals as to the types of policies, procedures and programs needed to remedy the student discipline problem?
- (12) To what extent is there agreement or disagreement between teachers and principals as to the types of policies, programs, and procedures needed to remedy the student discipline problem?

#### Definition of Terms

The term discipline, as used in this Study, refers to the matter of obeying rules, respecting the authority of teachers and principals, and being considerate of fellow students who wish to learn in a peaceful atmosphere.

Disciplinarian refers to the function of managing and correcting student behavior in order to produce students who obey rules, respect authority and are considerate of the rights and properties of others.

The term teacher refers to all certificated personnel in a school used to instruct children on a regular basis.

Principal refers to that person designated by the Board of Education as the responsible head or line administrator in charge of the educational program within a particular building.



## Procedures and Methodology

The study was conducted in District Eleven of the Chicago Public School System. A total of nineteen elementary schools were in operation within the district at the time of the investigation. Each of the nineteen principals along with one teacher from each school were invited to participate. The number of teachers in the sample population was made to equal the number of principals. The Chi-Square statistical procedure was used to determine the extent of agreement between the teachers and principals and among the teachers and principals. Since fourteen of the nineteen schools were willing participants, the final sample consisted of fourteen teachers and fourteen principals. The teachers were chosen for the study through a process of random selection. Faculty rosters were obtained from each of the participating schools, and each teacher's three digit room number used as a means of identification. Then, by using an arbitrary starting point on a table of random numbers and alternating directions, the teachers were selected one by one.

A total of twelve hypotheses were derived from the research questions listed earlier and stated in the null. Data used in the analysis of the hypotheses were collected by a two-part Likert-type opinionnaire and six personal interview questions. The opinionnaire consisted of a total of twenty propositions. The first ten propositions in part one of the opinionnaire were composed of published statements pertinent to the student discipline problem and were

intended to solicit the respondent's agreement or disagreement relative to causes of the problem. The ten remaining propositions in part two of the opinionnaire were intended to solicit the respondent's agreement or disagreement regarding aspects of the disciplinarian role of teachers and principals. In each case, respondents were asked to select one of five options corresponding to their perceptions concerning the proposition. The five types of responses and their corresponding values as solicited by the opinionnaire are listed below:

Strongly Agree	(SA = +2)
Agree	(A = +1)
Maybe	(M = 0)
Disagree	(D = -1)
Strongly Disagree	(SD = -2)

The totals derived from the respondent's reactions to the propositions either indicated the group's positive or negative feelings or the group's agreement or disagreement with the propositions. The extent of agreement or disagreement between teachers and principals to the propositions was determined by application of the Chi-Square One Sample Test.<sup>8</sup> Hypotheses one, two, four, five, seven and eight were either accepted or rejected based on the simple majority of propositions which showed agreement. Hypotheses three,

---

<sup>8</sup>Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics: For the Behavioral Sciences, (McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, Toronto, London, 1956), pp. 42-47.

six, and nine were either accepted or rejected by applying the Chi-Square Test for Two Independent Samples.<sup>9</sup>

The personal interview technique was used to gather additional information relative to role perceptions and to obtain viewpoints pertinent to the improvement of student discipline. Interview data were used to determine trends or areas of agreement in the opinions of participants. This was done through an analysis of frequencies of similar reactions or responses to questions given by respondents. A response or reaction mentioned by sixty percent of the respondents was considered as agreement. Hence, group agreement or disagreement was determined where sixty percent or more of the interviewees responded similarly. Views expressed by interviewees were also compared to their school climate during the time of visitation and further analyzed for attitudinal statements directed against or in support of the existing situation.

#### Limitations of the Study

This study was restricted to elementary schools and confined to District Eleven of the Chicago Public School System. It is not intended to reflect the perceptions of the teachers and principals of that district, nor is it intended to reflect the system-wide perceptions of teachers and principals.

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., pp. 104-111.

## Organization of the Study

Chapter I includes an introduction, purposes of the study, research questions, definitions of key terms, procedures, methodology and study limitations.

Chapter II provides a review of related literature and research pertinent to the student discipline problem, as well as some factors perceived to affect the roles played by teachers and principals in matters of student discipline.

Chapter III presents a description of the instrumentation used in the study and the procedures used to administer the instrument to the sample population.

Chapter IV includes a presentation and analysis of the data derived from the study.

Chapter V provides an overview and summary of the study, along with conclusions, implications and recommendations.

## CHAPTER II

### RESEARCH OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purposes of this study are to determine the extent to which teachers and principals accept or reject the role of disciplinarian; to determine if conflict situations exist within the role perceptions of teachers and principals; and to recommend possible policies, programs and procedures to aid in the creation of school environments that are conducive to learning.

Chapter I provided an introduction and the purposes of the study. The research questions, definitions of key terms, procedures, methodology, and study limitations were also provided in the same Chapter.

The purpose of Chapter II is to present a review of the related literature and research pertinent to the existence of the student discipline problem. In the review of the literature, attempts were made to authenticate the existence of the student discipline problem, to find a consensus of possible solutions to the problem, and to find similar studies that related to the problem. The Chapter was organized into five major topics: (a) the problem of student discipline, (b) perceived causes of student discipline problems, (c) the disciplinarian role of teachers and principals, (d) possible solutions to the problem of

student discipline, and (e) similar studies related to student discipline.

The investigation of perceived causes was done to identify the variety of factors relating to student discipline that could possibly affect the perceptions of teachers and principals. It was postulated that differences in perceptions concerning the causes of the student discipline problem, along with other factors such as personality, experience, background and role expectation, possibly serves as influencing factors in perceiving the disciplinarian role and functional approaches taken towards it. The disciplinarian role itself was reviewed in terms of theory and practice.

### The Student Discipline Problem

The lack of student discipline in elementary and high schools became a major concern during the past decade, according to George H. Gallup and was reported by nine of his ten annual opinion polls concerning the public's attitude towards the public schools to be the number one school problem.<sup>1</sup> Although Gallup's surveys purported to reflect national opinion only, other surveys, such as the ones conducted in

---

<sup>1</sup>George H. Gallup, "The Tenth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitude Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1978.

Chicago and Missouri, identified student discipline as serious local problems.<sup>2</sup>

The types of student discipline problems reported from across the country within the past eight years included murder, physical and sexual assaults on teachers, assaults on principals, thefts, fights among students, destruction of school and personal properties, violation of school rules and regulations, and disrespect of authorities--to name a few.<sup>3</sup>

During the 1969 school year, situations in a mid-western junior high school were depicted by Luvern L. Cunningham in the following way:

I had the feeling that I was walking on a live volcano. People were moving about the halls all the time. Classes were often noisy and rowdy. Fights broke out frequently, five between girls to every one among boys. The adult population was on pins and needles from time the building opened until school was out, hoping to make it through the day without large-scale violence.

In many ways, life at this junior high is a charade. Teachers walk through the corridors ignoring the rowdiness. The administrative staff takes the problem more seriously; they shout and cajole and urge and plead. The counselors talk with students about worlds of glitter and gold. The students stare and ignore.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Edward C. Lambert, "An Attitudinal Study of Missouri State Leaders Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1975, p. 279; Casey Banas, "Teacher Survey of Public Schools." Chicago Tribune, 22 January 1975; "Drugs, Discipline Problems Plague Chicago Principals." Chicago Tribune, 6 January 1976.

<sup>3</sup>Shirley Boes Neill, "Violence and Vandalism: Dimensions and Correctives," Phi Delta Kappan, January 22, 1978, p. 302.

<sup>4</sup>Luvern L. Cunningham, "Hey Man, You Our Principal?," Phi Delta Kappan, November 1969, pp. 123-128.

During the 1974 school year in Chicago, a sixteen year old sophomore was shot and killed in a crowded assembly hall over a twenty-five cents card debt; an elementary school principal was shot and killed by a fourteen year old student; and a sixteen year old girl, enraged by a poor grade she felt that she did not deserve, pushed the teacher down a flight of stairs.<sup>5</sup> In Pennsylvania, fighting among students disrupted classes for nearly one week in one suburban school while incidents of other disruption were reported in others.<sup>6</sup>

In Detroit, according to a 1975 Newsletter published by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the United States Department of Justice, a seventeen year old high school girl was beaten and stabbed by thirty of her girl classmates because she was more attractive and received better grades than they.<sup>7</sup>

The Memphis City School System reported six hundred and eighty assaults during 1977, with one hundred forty four of them directed against teachers or administrators. Miami's Dade County registered 1,153 attacks on teachers alone, while

---

<sup>5</sup>"ABC of School Violence," Time, 23 January 1978, editorial.

<sup>6</sup>Jack Slater, "Death of a High School," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1974, pp. 251-54.

<sup>7</sup>LEAA Newsletter, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., (May, 1975), p. 26.



New York students erupted in 2,420 attacks, half of them against teachers.<sup>8</sup>

The examples of student discipline problems cited above seemed to exemplify the seriousness of the problem, and were not but a very few of the many cases cited in the literature during the past decade.

A 1977 study done on school violence and vandalism by the National Institute of Education: Violent Schools--Safe Schools, concluded that the most dangerous place for city teen-agers to be is the inside of their own schools. The study also found that the great majority of all reported offenses in schools were committed by current students and that seventh graders were the most vulnerable to robberies and attacks. In addition, the study estimated that the annual national cost of school crimes ranged from \$50 million to \$600 million and predicted that, during the 1978 school year, one out of every nine secondary students would have something stolen during a typical month, one out of eight would be attacked, and among the nation's one million secondary teachers, 5,200 would be attacked--one fifth of them seriously.<sup>9</sup>

Concerning the national status of school violence and disruption, Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana stated in 1978:

---

<sup>8</sup>"ABC of School Violence," Time, 23 January 1978, editorial.

<sup>9</sup>Violent Schools--Safe Schools, The National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C. (December, 1977).

"In some schools, the problems have escalated to a degree that makes the already difficult tasks of education nearly impossible."<sup>10</sup>

The undisciplined atmosphere found in many schools across the nation apparently caused student discipline to be considered a major concern, and prompted school officials to ponder over its probable causes with hopes of finding possible solutions.

### Perceived Causes of the Student Discipline Problem

Seemingly, the perceived causes of the current upsurge in student discipline problems were multifaceted. Some believed the problem to be deeply rooted in the society, home, family structure and fundamental values of people.<sup>11</sup> Whereas, others perceived the problem to have originated from the effects of television violence, the expansion of student rights, the authoritative structure of the school, compulsory school attendance, permissive teachers and principals, and the students themselves.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>Birch Bayh, "Seeking Solutions to School Violence and Vandalism," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1978.

<sup>11</sup>Terrel H. Bell, "A More Viable Home-School Partnership," Education Digest, April 1975, p. 10.

<sup>12</sup>Gerald W. Marker and Howard D. Mehlinger, "Schools, Politics, Rebellion, and Other Youth Interests," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1974; Harry Passow, "Reforming America's High Schools," Education Digest, October 1975; Frank B. Brown, "Forced Schooling," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1973.

## The Family

Apparently, educators and others as well perceived the failure of parents to discipline their children at home and to involve themselves in school matters to be major factors contributing to the current student discipline problem.

According to Terrel H. Bell, former United States Commissioner of Education, approximately 60 percent of the pre-school-age children in the United States were hauled off to a day care service or to a neighboring surrogate mother, while both parents hustled off to a job so that the two-income family could keep up with the fast pace and somewhat misplaced values found in today's way of life. "Unstable homes, with parents in motion day and night and over weekends," said Bell, "makes the school's job difficult if not impossible." Bell further stated:

We have become a materialistic nation. We are-- more and more--becoming a rootless society and a nation of restless seekers of thrills and kicks. As a people we are spoiled by our affluence . . . we think more about money than marriage--more about chrome than children. . . .

. . . Troubled schools are located in troubled neighborhoods, where families are becoming unglued beyond repair. As we talk about our many educational problems, we must recognize that trouble at school and trouble at home seem to go hand in hand.<sup>13</sup>

Bell's belief that parents had failed their children was apparently shared by Dorothy W. Gross. According to Gross, more and more children have limited access to adults

---

<sup>13</sup>Bell, "Viable Partnership," p. 12.

due to working parents, rising birth rates among adolescent girls who are themselves immature, and parents who are either too busy to deal with their children, or are burdened with their own unsatisfied needs.<sup>14</sup>

Emery Stoops, et al., seemed to consider the actions, attitudes and or values of parents to be related to the student discipline problem:

Through the last four decades, parents have been in the gradual process of abdication. The head of the household gave way to joint husband-and-wife powers which encouraged children's playing one head against the other. When a spank-the-bottom parent was canceled out by a permissive mate, the kids ran wild through the home and right into the classroom. Permissiveness is the dust bowl that has blown Grapes-of-Wrath children straight into Miss Remington's second grade class. And the parents? Either they are nowhere to be found or they say, 'I can't control Jack (or Jill) anymore.'<sup>15</sup>

Many teachers also attributed the problem of student discipline to parents. One Atlanta elementary teacher said:

. . . I think the problem of discipline starts at home. Many parents come to me and say, 'Well, I can't do anything with my child.' And somehow they expect that the school will be able to succeed where they have failed. . . .<sup>16</sup>

Another Atlanta elementary teacher commented:

. . . Most of the parents of children in this school and not just in my classroom, never set foot in the door until things have gotten out of hand and their children

---

<sup>14</sup>Dorothy W. Gross, "Improving the Quality of Family Life," Childhood Education, November-December 1977, pp. 50-54.

<sup>15</sup>Emery Stoops and Joyce King Stoops, "Discipline or Disaster?" Phi Delta Kappan Fast Back, No. 8., Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation, 1972.

<sup>16</sup>Linda Chavez, "Teacher to Teacher," American Educator, Summer, 1978, p. 7.

have been disciplined. And then they show up, sometimes with weapons, making verbal threats. So far, no one has gotten hurt, but that has often been because there was someone else from the school to intercede.<sup>17</sup>

According to a 1974 Chicago Tribune Newspaper survey, 82 percent of the Chicago public teachers who participated, blamed parents for the actions of disruptive students. During the interviews conducted by The Tribune, one teacher said:

The violent background of the children in my school greatly lends to the discipline problem. These children, in the majority, know no guidance, discipline, love, or physical or emotional attention in their home lives. Often they are unsupervised. This leaves the schools with the job of socialization rather than academics.<sup>18</sup>

This attitude among Chicago teachers was seemingly projected in the results of the third biennial survey conducted by the National Education Association which reported that teachers' main concern regarding student discipline was too little support from parents.<sup>19</sup>

Apparently, this attitude among teachers relative to parent discipline was well founded. George H. Gallup, in a study for the Kettering Foundation, found that some parents seldom talked with their children, were uninterested in what their children did in school, had no rules about the use of television, bedtime or study hours, and gave no help with homework or in seeing to it that it was done. He also found

---

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>Casey Banas, "Teacher Survey of Public Schools," Chicago Tribune, 22 January 1975.

<sup>19</sup>"Teacher Opinion Poll," Today's Education, September-October 1975, pp. 92-93.

that children from so called better homes were not behaving appreciably better than those from less advantaged ones.<sup>20</sup>

Chicago principals also placed much of the blame for the problems at school on the home lives of their students. Seventy-one percent of them polled in 1976 indicated that students were not well prepared for school by their families.<sup>21</sup>

John Ryor, president of the National Education Association, stated that schools were expected to perform a function parents have abdicated, thereby forcing teachers to take on more responsibility, which leads to tension. According to Ryor, stress resulting from classroom discipline problems, fear of violence, and occupational frustration is causing teachers to leave the profession.<sup>22</sup>

In expressing his views on the adult attitude towards school and current youth problems, James S. Coleman said:

. . . An essential part of the current problem is simply that adults have mutually agreed to relegate young people to schools. By doing this, adults assume that they then are free to turn their attention to other things.

We must seriously question whether the adult community can afford to be as inattentive to and as uninterested in young people as it has been. . . .<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>George H. Gallup, "The Public Looks at the Public Schools," Today's Education, September-October 1975.

<sup>21</sup>Casey Banas, "Drugs, Discipline Problems Plague Chicago Principals," Chicago Tribune, 6 January 1976.

<sup>22</sup>Chicago Sun-Times, 7 July 1978, p. 2.

<sup>23</sup>As reported in Harold G. Shane, "The Problems of Youth," Today's Education, September-October 1975.

In an attempt to stimulate parent involvement with children, Reverend Jesse Jackson, National President of the civil rights organization, Operation Push, launched a national program to enlist the aid of parents, as well as students themselves in fostering better discipline in the home and in school. During a speaking engagement in Los Angeles to over 2,000 students, Jackson said:

Children stay off the streets, discipline yourself, don't emulate the pimp's life-style and dress. Strive to better yourself, because you are the only one who can do it. Mothers and fathers, support your child's teachers and principals; raise babies, don't just make them; come to school to get your child's report cards; teach your child respect. . . .<sup>24</sup>

Broken homes were also cited as playing a major role in the behavior problems of students. A recent three-year study of over 2,000 ninth graders done in Ohio by Mary Conyers, revealed that students from two-parent homes evidenced lower absence rates, higher grade averages, and better behavior patterns than did students from single-parent homes.<sup>25</sup>

The failure of parents to discipline their children and to involve themselves in school matters was perceived by teachers, principals, and others to be a major cause of the student discipline problem. Evidence also revealed that children from so-called better homes did not behave

---

<sup>24</sup>Robert W. Cole, "Black Moses: Jesse Jackson's Push for Excellence," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1977.

<sup>25</sup>Mary G. Conyers, "Comparing School Success of Students from Conventional and Broken Homes," Phi Delta Kappan, April 1977, p. 647.

appreciably better than those from less advantaged ones. Children from two-parent homes, however, tended to demonstrate a better behavior pattern than did those from single-parent homes.

### Television Violence

The abundance of violence portrayed on television was considered by many educators to play a meaningful role in promoting aggressive and disruptive behavior among students. According to Benjamin Spock, a noted children's doctor:

. . . What children see on television and in the movies is often absolutely horrible, shocking and immoral. It's irresponsible to let children see so much violence all of the time. . . .<sup>26</sup>

Gail Slater identified three possible detrimental effects of watching television violence to be imitation, desensitization, and victimization. According to Slater:

. . . Considering the possible effects of television violence, researchers have centered on: Imitation--the concern that kids may imitate what they see; desensitization--the concern that the barrage of violent action on television may lessen the impact of real life conflicts; and victimization--the possibility that, if children identify more with the victim of television aggression than with the aggressor, they may think the world is a more violent place than it really is.<sup>27</sup>

Slater also felt that television had become the third parent for American children as well as the primary educational force outside the family. She further stated that by

---

<sup>26</sup>As reported in Harold G. Shane, "Children Need a Pole to Grow On," Today's Education, January-February 1975.

<sup>27</sup>Gail Slater, "Brought to You By . . .," The Massachusetts Teacher, January-February 1977, pp. 22-29.



the time children finished high school, they would have spent 15,000 hours watching television, as opposed to 11,000 hours in school. "Only sleep," said Slater, "occupies more of a child's spare time."<sup>28</sup>

According to Dorothy H. Cohen, television realism made it difficult for viewers to distinguish between what was seen on television and reality:

. . . A confusion was discovered among adolescents in a study in which questions were asked about the reality of certain television shows and characters. To the question of whether television stories were true or not, these adolescents answered, 'True--because you can see it happening.'

This confusion of reality and fantasy appearing among adolescents must surely concern us when we talk about the effect of television on our children. . . .<sup>29</sup>

The apparent effect of television violence was demonstrated recently when Ronny Zamora, a fifteen year old boy, shot and killed his neighbor with her own gun while attempting to burglarize her home. The boy's lawyer argued that a steady dose of television violence made it impossible for him to tell right from wrong.<sup>30</sup>

Findings associating aggressive behavior in children with television violence were reported by other authors as well. According to Harvard associate professor Aimee Leifer, children do learn what they see. Frequent viewers of televised

---

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

<sup>29</sup>Dorothy H. Cohen, "Television and the Perception of Reality," The National Elementary School Principal, January 1977.

<sup>30</sup>"The Trials of Television," Newsweek, 10 October 1977.

violence are more likely to remain passive bystanders, to real-life violence, and such viewers are likely to over estimate the prevalence of violence in society.<sup>31</sup>

A study reported by the University of Minnesota's Institute of Child Development revealed that: Children do not connect acts of violence with consequences; many children often do not understand the feelings and motives of the characters; and many children do not understand the context in which the violence occurred. The study further implied that a child who does not understand the violence he sees is more likely to be aggressive than if he does understand the scene's consequences.<sup>32</sup>

William Belson concluded, after a six-year investigation, that long-term exposure to violence increases the degree to which boys engage in violence of a serious kind, as well as violence of the less serious kind: swearing and the use of bad language, aggressiveness in sport or play, writing slogans on walls, and breaking windows.<sup>33</sup>

A recent study of three and four year old children, conducted by Jerome and Dorothy Singer of Yale University, indicated that even young children are adversely affected by television violence. According to the Singer study,

---

<sup>31</sup>"Television Violence: A Call to Arms," Science News, v. III, 23 April 1977, p. 261.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid.

<sup>33</sup>As reported in Howard Muson, "Teenager Violence and the Telly," Psychology Today, v. II, No. 10, March 1978, pp. 50-54.

while boys are more affected by action or detective shows, girls are affected by certain situation comedy programs that depict a lot of frenetic activity which elicits yelling, jumping up and down, screaming, crying, and kissing. Excessive viewing of these shows, according to Dr. Jerome Singer, led to a ten to twenty percent increase in the amount of aggression displayed by the study participants; such as pushing, shoving, kicking and fighting.<sup>34</sup>

Based upon evidence contained within the literature, television violence was thought to be closely associated with the aggressive and disruptive behaviors demonstrated by some children and possibly perceived as a contributor to the student discipline problem.

#### The Expansion of Student Rights

Various decisions rendered by the United States Supreme Court which expanded the rights of students were apparently believed to have seriously hampered the efforts of teachers and principals to discipline disruptive or misbehaving students, thereby contributing to the problem of student discipline. Prior to many of the U. S. Supreme Court's decisions which affected the rights of students, school officials had operated under the concept of in loco parentis. This concept had enabled teachers and principals to function as

---

<sup>34</sup>As reported in Ronald Kotulak, "Kids Who Watch TV-- They'd Rather Fight," Chicago Tribune, 9 January 1979, p. 1, Section 1.

stand in parents for students. Regarding this, M. Chester Nolte said:

In colonial days, parents were fully responsible for the upbringing and education of their children, but as the state gradually took over this responsibility there arose a need for an adult to supervise and 'stand in' for the parent. This legal fiction became known in this country by its latin derivative in loco parentis, 'in place of the parent.' The teacher became charged with a parent's rights, duties, and responsibilities, and the norm became that behavior or standard of care which the reasonable parent would provide under the same or similar circumstances.<sup>35</sup>

According to Richard D. Gatti, et al, teachers and principals became established as authorities in matters pertaining to student discipline and were given the right to reasonably demand from the student certain forms of conduct which were deemed necessary. In addition, the teacher had the right to discipline the student, and to specify the type of work performance required. The parent of the child was powerless to interfere in school matters that were reasonable and for the purpose of education. If the teacher committed an act which affronted a parent, the act was valid if it was reasonable and within the scope of the teacher's duty.<sup>36</sup>

Eventually, however, actions taken by teachers and principals acting in loco parentis were challenged by students and parents with decisions rendered in their behalf.

---

<sup>35</sup>M. Chester Nolte, School Law in Action (West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.)

<sup>36</sup>Daniel J. Gatti and Richard D. Gatti, The Teacher and the Law (West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.)

The U. S. Supreme Court's decision in the matter of Gault established due process of law for juveniles relative to criminal charges, thereby guaranteeing them equal protection of the laws under the federal Constitution. Concerning this, David Duffee stated:

The ruling did not address itself to delinquency cases where institutionalization is not a possible outcome, and it left several other issues open. Nevertheless, the four key points of the decision and the general tone of the majority opinion made clear:

- the disciplining of our youth is to be proceeded by an orderly, decision making process.
- youth cannot be forced against their will to participate in the formulation of the decision.
- delinquent youth, like criminal adults, are to be respected as individuals to the extent that they may have a lawyer to plead their case.
- no person ... shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.<sup>37</sup>

The question of due process in relation to suspensions and expulsions from school was settled by the Supreme Court's decision in Goss v. Lopez. On January 22, 1975, the Supreme Court ruled by a narrow majority of five to four that, unless their presence posed a physical threat, students could not be temporarily suspended from school for misconduct, without some attention to due process.<sup>38</sup> Following the Court's ruling, the four dissenting justices found it necessary to warn that

---

<sup>37</sup>David Duffee, "Due Process: Can It Thrive in a Classroom?," Instructor, August-September 1974, pp. 56-58.

<sup>38</sup>Fred M. Hechinger, "Due Process for the Unruly Child," Saturday Review, April 5, 1975.

the future of the public schools might be placed in jeopardy by their colleagues' permissiveness.<sup>39</sup>

Concerning this case, Schimmel and Fisher wrote:

The majority first held that the Constitution protects the students in cases of expulsion from public schools. It further held that the Due Process Clause applies to cases of short suspensions. A suspension for up to ten days is not so minor a punishment that it may be imposed 'in complete disregard of the Due Process Clause,' wrote Justice White. The students in this case were suspended based on charges of misconduct which, if recorded, could damage their later opportunities for higher education and employment.<sup>40</sup>

As a result of the Goss v. Lopez decision, due process for students prior to expulsion or suspension from school became a fact of life.

M. Chester Nolte, in his anticipation of possible problems for school principals posed the following questions:

. . . Does not the Goss v. Lopez decision place an impossible burden on the school principal to stand by a student in the principal's role of in loco parentis, and still live up to the demands of the board of education to control the malcontents so other students will be better off in school? Or should he play the child advocate role to the hilt? . . .<sup>41</sup>

The authority of school officials to control student's freedom of speech and expression was diminished in the Tinker decision. The Tinker case resulted after several high school

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> David Schimmel and Louis Fisher, "Discipline and Due Process in the Schools," Update on Law Related Education, Fall, 1977.

<sup>41</sup> M. Chester Nolte, "The Supreme Court's New Ruling for Due Process," The American School Board Journal, March 1975, pp. 47-49.

and junior high school students planned to express their position to American involvement in Vietnam by wearing black armbands to school. School officials learned of the plan and enacted a new regulation prohibiting the wearing of armbands on school property. The new rule was announced at a school assembly, and that refusal to remove such armbands would result in suspension. Several students wore black armbands to school, refused to remove them, and were suspended. The U. S. Supreme Court, according to Gatti, enjoined the school officials from disciplining the children, saying that First Amendment rights were available to students.<sup>42</sup>

School authority to control the length of male student's hair and to impose dress codes were also diminished by the U. S. Supreme Court's Breen v. Kahl decision. Again, according to Daniel J. Gatti:

. . . Two high school students claimed that a student has a protected right 'to present himself or herself physically to the world in the manner of his or her choice.' The Court agreed, and said that such a right could be impaired by the school only if there is a 'compelling subordinating interest in doing so.' The Court rejected the school's argument that abnormal appearance is distracting, and that such students perform more poorly than 'conforming students.' This case abolished the traditional presumption that the school's rule is Constitutional. It imposed a burden of justification of the rule upon the schools.<sup>43</sup>

The rights of students had been clearly defined by the Supreme Court in the decisions previously discussed.

---

<sup>42</sup>Gatti, The Teacher and the Law, pp. 176-177.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid.

Furthermore, school officials, in the 1975 Court ruling in Wood v. Strickland, were warned of possible liability for damages in abridging the civil liberties of students and that ignorance of these rights was no excuse for their violation.<sup>44</sup>

Many educators probably felt that the decisions rendered by the Supreme Court pertaining to student rights marked the end of their almost total control over the disciplinary process and the beginning of the Supreme Court's gradual encroachment into that process. Others probably believed that the extension of student rights "tied their hands" in handling student disciplinary matters.

According to G. Zimmerman, Jr., many states had a variety of citizen-based advocacy groups, as well as more formal state agencies whose primary functions included both positive actions to promulgate children's rights in institutional settings and the pursuit of remedies where those rights had been violated.<sup>45</sup>

In Chicago, the American Friends Service Committee published a series of statistics concerning suspensions in the Chicago Public Schools along with the rights of students.

---

<sup>44</sup>John P. DeCecco and Arlene K. Richards, "Using Negotiation for Teaching Civil Liberties and Avoiding Liability," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1975.

<sup>45</sup>William G. Zimmerman, Jr., "Human Rights and Administrative Responsibility," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1974, p. 243.



It strongly advocated for alternatives to suspensions that would better benefit students.<sup>46</sup>

In New York, the American Civil Liberties Union created such strong advocacy for student rights that many school administrators chose early retirement rather than meet the various rights stipulations. Concerning this, Edward T. Ladd stated:

Administrators of our public schools face a dilemma today which they've never faced before: how to regulate student behavior without being sued for violating students' rights or, if sued, without being overruled in court. . . .

. . . Being an administrator trying to keep order in school must sometimes seem like being a modern physician trying to practice medicine in a country which has outlawed scapels and hypodermic needles. No wonder that a number of the New York principals are retiring early and blaming their quitting on the New York Civil Liberties Union's Student Rights project.<sup>47</sup>

Concerning his perception of the increased difficulties of managing student behavior for principals, Richard MacFeeley stated:

School administrators must begin to think as lawyers when they consider school discipline procedures.... Persons responsible for disciplining students must be very familiar with the Fourteenth Amendment: If a school district fails to provide procedural due process, it may find itself (including individual staff and board members) faced with law suits for compensatory damages.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup>Chicago Public School Suspension, (Chicago: American Friends Service Committee, Inc., 1976.)

<sup>47</sup>Edward T. Ladd, "Regulating Student Behavior Without Ending Up In Court," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1973..

<sup>48</sup>Richard W. MacFeeley, "The Nuts and Bolts of Procedural Due Process," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1975.

Eighty five percent of the elected officials who participated in a 1975 attitudinal study conducted among Missouri government officials believed that parental pressures and liability laws had forced schools to become too permissive. Parental pressures and teacher liability laws were cited as leading causes of the student discipline problem.<sup>49</sup>

Kenneth A. Erickson believed that the rights of disruptive students to protection under the law outweighed the primary rights of teachers to teach and of students to learn. He also believed that because of the expanded social responsibilities laid on schools and the increasing "rights" of disruptive students, the educational effectiveness of schools was being sabotaged.<sup>50</sup>

The Senate Subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency seemed to have supported Erickson's viewpoint. According to the Subcommittee, young people's knowledge of the juvenile justice system seemed to prevent them from respecting the law.<sup>51</sup>

The expansion of student rights by the U. S. Supreme Court diminished the authority of teachers and principals previously held under the concept of in loco parentis,

---

<sup>49</sup>Ibid.

<sup>50</sup>Kenneth A. Erickson, "Disruptive Youth: How They Waste the Minds of Missions," NASSP Bulletin, February 1976.

<sup>51</sup>"Time to Get Tough on Tough," Senior Scholastic, 7 April 1978, p. 18.

and forced teachers and principals to establish and abide by due process procedures for students prior to their suspension or expulsion from school. The due process procedures were apparently believed to have seriously hampered the efforts of teachers and principals to discipline disruptive or misbehaving students, therefore, contributing to the problem of student discipline.

### The School

One of the chief purposes of discipline in the school, according to Hubert H. Mills, et al, was to provide the development of qualities and habits in each student which made for self-control and good citizenship.<sup>52</sup> Yet, the school as an institution was perceived by many to have contributed to the problem of student discipline.

James S. Coleman, as did Arthur Pearl and Seymour Sarason, criticized the school for failing to provide students with opportunities to learn responsibility. Coleman stated:

Since many homes or neighborhoods no longer provided the kinds of situations that developed responsibility, schools ought to give youth the chance to exercise real responsibility. As adults, they will need to have a well-developed capacity to act responsible when other persons are dependent upon them. They also need to be able to work co-operatively and interdependently with others. Schools, however, are generally not designed in any way for systematic development of responsibility or for interdependent work, except perhaps for certain extracurricular activities. . . .<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup>Hubert H. Mills and Karl R. Douglas, Teaching in High School (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1957), p. 124.

<sup>53</sup>As reported in Harold G. Shane, "The Problem of Youth," Today's Education, September-October 1975.

Arthur Pearl commented:

The youth of today is infantilized because he or she is denied the opportunity to make a contribution to any institution of our society, other than as a client or customer. Youth has been denied an opportunity to be responsible. . . .<sup>54</sup>

Seymour Sarason believed that students were given very few opportunities to practice responsibility in school and that their problems were usually isolated from the classroom. According to a Sarason study, teachers thought about children in precisely the same way that teachers say that school administrators think about teachers: that is, administrators do not discuss matters with teachers; they do not act as if the opinions of teachers are important; they treat teachers like a bunch of children, and so on. Sarason also said:

The rise and militancy of teacher organizations have a complex history, but one of the important factors was the unwillingness of teachers to be governed by a tradition in which they had no part in decisions and plans that affected them. We are witnessing the same development on the part of students in high schools, junior high schools, and needless to say, in our colleges. . . . It is recognized that what is at issue is what life in a school is and could be.<sup>55</sup>

The authoritative, impersonal atmosphere that was said to exist in schools was cited by William G. Zimmerman, Jr., J. Merrell Hansen and Gerald W. Marker as a cause of discipline problems. Zimmerman perceived school governance as

---

<sup>54</sup>Arthur Pearl, "There Is Nothing More Loco Than Loco Parentis," Phi Delta Kappan, June 1972.

<sup>55</sup>Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problems of Change (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971, p. 236.

paternalistic at best, and at worst, highly authoritarian with a self-serving oligarchy. He also felt that absolute administrative authority had led to strong counter demands from pupils, parents, and staff.<sup>56</sup>

Hansen considered schools to be authoritative and rigid and described its approach to discipline as an attempt to create disciples and to promote conformity among students in order to keep the institution going. The school's regulated mandates which possessed no associated values, according to Hansen, were perceived as arbitrary, with artificial standards of behavior which resulted in inconsequential and indifferent behavior.<sup>57</sup>

Gerald W. Marker viewed the school as an authoritative, oppressive institution with captive students being subjected to various forms of manipulation to control their behavior. Among the school's means of manipulating student behavior, thought Marker, were the use of extra-curricular activities, student behavior codes written by students, and the evaluation of student performance.<sup>58</sup>

William C. Miller also viewed the school as a prison-like institution which limited and restricted the liberties of students in its attempt to control their behavior. He

---

<sup>56</sup>William G. Zimmerman, Jr., "Human Rights and Administrative Responsibility," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1974, p. 243.

<sup>57</sup>J. Merrell Hansen, "Discipline: A Whole New Bag," The High School Journal, February 1974.

<sup>58</sup>Gerald W. Marker et al. "Schools, Politics, Rebellion, and Other Youth Interests," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1974.

believed that educators chose to blame their problems on parents and students, rather than to look honestly at the structure of the public school itself as a cause of student rebellion.<sup>59</sup>

Alfred Alschuler et al, cited the rigidity of school rules and regulations as still another cause of student discipline problems. According to Alschuler:

. . .When system causes of behavior are ignored, we often unconsciously collude in victimizing each other in the name of solving the problem. For instance, after a series of serious assaults in the hallways after school, a junior high school principal called an emergency faculty meeting. For 25 minutes, the assistant principal berated the entire faculty for their unprofessional conduct in not standing in the hallways after class to maintain order. To protect students from physical assault, the well-intentioned, highly respected assistant principal had verbally assaulted the teachers, and they felt it.

One teacher, and only one teacher, suggested that 'a possible cause of running in the hallways after school might be the bus schedule. The buses leave four minutes after school is out. Students have to run. Maybe the bus could wait a few extra minutes.' The assistant principal, always supportive of the system, replied that the buses, 'had to get to the next school on time.' Even this perfectly logical, simple system blame explanation was not truly heard, seen, and explored.<sup>60</sup>

In another situation, the lack of rules implementation was considered a major cause of student discipline problems. The Chicago Teachers Union attributed the discipline problems found in Chicago Public Schools to the lack of

---

<sup>59</sup>William C. Miller, "Public Education and Personal Liberty," *The Educational Forum*, May 1970.

<sup>60</sup>Alfred Alschuler et al, "Social Literacy: A Discipline Game Without Losers," Phi Delta Kappan, April 1977, p. 606.

implementation of board policies on student discipline. According to the teachers union, a lack of rules concerning discipline, existed in more than half of the city's public schools due to lax administrators.<sup>61</sup>

Curricula irrelevance and compulsory school attendance were mentioned by some as possible causes of student discipline problems.

Mario H. Fantini believed that schools taught sterile bodies of knowledge to children who had to grow up to live in a society where the realities had little to do with what they learned in school.<sup>62</sup> Edwin X. Travers stated that high school students frequently felt that most of the curriculum was not relevant to them and often drifted through their subjects either performing in a perfunctory manner or failing.<sup>63</sup> Annabel A. Bixby, upon communicating with former students after a twenty year span, found that a great majority of them expressed the feeling that they had not learned anything of value in school except how to succeed in school.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup>Casey Banas, "Student Discipline Is Ignored: Union," Chicago Tribune, 10 February 1978, p. 3, Section 1.

<sup>62</sup>Mario Fantini and Herald Weinstein, Making Urban Schools Work (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968).

<sup>63</sup>Edwin X. Travers, "How Human Is Your Classroom?," Today's Education, November-December 1975, p. 67.

<sup>64</sup>Annabel A. Bixby, "Do Teachers Make A Difference?," Education Digest, September 1978.

Compulsory school attendance was thought to contribute to the problem of student discipline by forcing schools to operate as holding stations for uninterested students who had no real options and were in school only because society had been unable to create a better way.<sup>65</sup>

Thomas C. Hunt stated:

. . . As a result of compulsory attendance laws, the schools inherited a problem. They were forced to assume the roles of caretaker and custodian. Some children did not want to go to school but the schools were legally ordered to keep them.<sup>66</sup>

B. Frank Brown of the Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education felt that compulsory education, which he referred to as "forced schooling," created a captive audience of students who did not wish to be there. The result, he felt, was that for many students school was a place of confinement where their thinking was anesthetized, and that an uneasy truce existed between students and their teachers.<sup>67</sup>

The United States Office of Education's National Panel on High Schools and Adolescent Education, concluded that the school as an institution was inappropriate for a growing number of students who were too old or too mature to live under routine controls and structures without serious disturbances to them and to the school. Problems relative

---

<sup>65</sup>George H. Gallup, "Eighth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitude Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1976.

<sup>66</sup>Thomas C. Hunt and Elmer U. Clawson, "Dropouts: Then and Now," Education Digest, September 1975, p. 15.

<sup>67</sup>B. Frank Brown, "Forced Schooling," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1973.



to student unrest, frequent racial conflict, drugs, inadequate preparation for work or for higher education, alienation, and lack of motivation were all attributed to the school's failure to meet the needs of all of its students.<sup>68</sup>

Apparently, the school as an institution was perceived by many to have contributed to the current problem of student discipline by failing to provide students with opportunities to learn responsibility; by establishing and maintaining an impersonal and authoritative atmosphere; by maintaining inflexible rules and regulations to govern students; and in some instances, failing to implement pertinent rules and regulations; by perpetrating meaningless curricula; and by maintaining compulsory school attendance.

### The Teacher

Although charged with the responsibility of establishing and maintaining student discipline, teachers were accused of contributing to the student discipline problem by fostering misbehavior in the classroom rather than serving as deterrents to it. Some were considered as inadequately prepared to handle juvenile behavior, disrespectful of student rights, calloused to the needs of students, and disinterested in the plight of schools. Others were accused of permissiveness, or of representing the middle class whose life experiences and

---

<sup>68</sup>As reported in A. Harry Passow, "Reforming America's High Schools," Education Digest, October 1975, p. 2.

expectations differed from those of the students whom they taught.<sup>69</sup>

George Thompson believed that many so-called classroom discipline problems were invented by teachers:

Discipline problems are basically of two orders: real and perceived. A real discipline problem is one that arises because a student is infringing on the real freedoms of the teacher or other members of the class. A perceived discipline problem is one for which the teacher in a very real sense is the cause because he perceives a problem when, in fact, there actually is none. It is my observation that far too many so-called discipline problems are problems only in the teacher's perception of them. . . . The more discipline problems the teacher perceives, the more discipline problems he will have. Of course the teacher can err in either direction--he may have real discipline problems and fail to perceive them or he may perceive discipline problems that do not actually exist.<sup>70</sup>

Instances in which teachers caused discipline problems were cited by Carnot, Hawkins, Eckbreth and Bixby.

Carnot felt that some teachers caused problems by using undesirable types of behavior such as harsh and repeated corporal punishment which broke the child's spirit or made him resentful and defiant. Humiliation and rejection such as sarcasm, belittling, unreasonable disapproval, withdrawal of love and etc., according to Carnot, served to destroy the child's self-esteem and confidence.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup>John Ban, "Teacher Unions Fight Back," *American Educator*, Summer, 1978; George H. Gallup, "The Public Looks at the Public Schools," Today's Education, September-October 1975, p. 18.

<sup>70</sup>George Thompson, "Discipline and the High School Teacher," The Clearing House, May 1976.

<sup>71</sup>Joseph B. Carnot, "Dynamic and Effective School Discipline," The Clearing House, November 1973.

Hawkins and Eckbreth held similar views. Hawkins believed that the overzealous acts of teachers in the use of corporal punishment contributed to increased vandalism, increased absenteeism and further provocation which tended to create resentment and contempt for the teacher.<sup>72</sup> Eckbreth felt that the use of sarcasm served to alienate students quicker than almost anything else.<sup>73</sup>

Former kindergarten students of Annabel Bixby remembered those incidents when teachers either hurt their feelings, humiliated them in front of classmates, or were unfair to them, years after their school experiences.<sup>74</sup>

A survey conducted by the White House Conference on Youth in conjunction with the Future Teachers of America revealed that most high school students failed to perceive teachers as being genuinely concerned or interested in school or students.<sup>75</sup>

Besides creating discipline problems through their perceptions of problems, overzealous actions and purported disinterest in children, some teachers were also believed to create discipline problems by their teaching styles and

---

<sup>72</sup>Vincent J. Hawkins, "The Negativism of Corporal Punishment," The Clearing House, May 1976.

<sup>73</sup>Cathy Eckbreth, "Discipline in the Secondary Classroom," Social Education, February 1978.

<sup>74</sup>Annabel A. Bixby, "Do Teachers Make A Difference," Education Digest, September 1978.

<sup>75</sup>As reported in Carolyn Boiarsky, "Youth Speak Out About Teachers," Today's Education, November 1971.

instructional approaches. Teachers who were unprepared for instruction<sup>76</sup> and who asked children to perform above their academic abilities were mentioned as major contributors to the discipline problem by Hazel Fontein:

The catch for many kinds, I believe, comes in being asked to do something they are unable to do. Thus, children whose reading ability, background experiences and mental agility are inadequate cannot cope with a situation demanding more than they can bring to it. Their obvious reactions to this situation will be logically and understandably--an attempt to remove themselves from it, to escape, if not physically, then mentally (the quiet day dreamers) or to change the situation in any way to make coping possible. It is this latter solution of 'stressed' or 'disstressed' children which, in my opinion, causes most of the discipline problems.<sup>77</sup>

Regarding teaching styles, Carnot felt that the teacher's way of presenting lessons might in itself contribute to problems:

If she doesn't speak clearly or loud enough or if her sentences are full of 'uhs' and 'ums,' fidgeting will occur quickly. Also, little variation in types of lessons can produce boredom and problems. . . .<sup>78</sup>

A two-year study conducted by the Center for Public Representation in Madison, Wisconsin, revealed that 58 percent of the participating teachers and 57 percent of the students thought that boring classes contributed to discipline problems.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup>Eckbreth, "Discipline in Secondary Classroom," p. 12.

<sup>77</sup>Hazel Fontein, "Re: Discipline: An Ounce of Prevention," Social Education, February 1978.

<sup>78</sup>Carnot, "Dynamic School Discipline."

<sup>79</sup>As reported in Robert G. Wegmann, "Classroom Discipline--A Negotiable Item" Today's Education, September-October 1976.

Robert G. Wegmann, in his description of classroom situations where children worked interestedly and seriously in one situation, but disorderly and disruptively in another, attributed the differences in classrooms to the teachers' instructional competencies.<sup>80</sup>

Larry Cuban, in summarizing his opinion relative to discipline and classroom instruction, believed that most students, regardless of background or level of schooling, wanted to do well, be accepted, go along with the rules, and responded favorably to reasonable competent teachers.<sup>81</sup>

Some other factors thought to contribute to the discipline problems of students were teacher permissiveness and teacher failure to maintain high standards.

In a study done at the Ohio State University, Raymond Traub found that the degree of permissiveness practiced by teachers affected the behavior of students in the classroom.<sup>82</sup> Significantly, according to the Tenth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitude Toward Public Schools, parents across the nation found teachers to be too permissive. They showed greatest concern for the lack of respect shown to, or demanded by teachers, and complained that teachers allowed children to do anything they wished, dress anyway they chose,

---

<sup>80</sup>Ibid.

<sup>81</sup>Larry Cuban, "Discipline and American Students," Social Education, February 1978.

<sup>82</sup>Raymond Gordon Traub, "The Effect of Teacher Behavior on Patterns of Student Behavior," (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1968).

pay no attention to school rules, and stay away from school whenever they wanted.<sup>83</sup> One New York parent said:

We were trying to build up kid's respect for the teachers, but now it's broken down pretty bad. The teacher's themselves let the respect die. . . .<sup>84</sup>

According to M. Donald Thomas, teachers all over saw infractions of rules and regulations and ignored them. Their cop-out, Thomas thought, was, "The administration does not support us." He also felt that teachers were unwilling to supervise and to enforce school rules and regulations because they believed that taking personal responsibility in problems was too much of a hassle.<sup>85</sup>

Thomas' viewpoint was supported by Luvern Cunningham, who depicted a junior high school where teachers walked through the corridors ignoring the rowdiness, hoping to make it through the day.<sup>86</sup>

Examples of teacher permissiveness and failure to maintain high standards were demonstrated quite frequently within some Chicago schools: such as the teacher who read a newspaper in class, while the students literally did as

---

<sup>83</sup>George H. Gallup, "Tenth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitude Toward Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1978.

<sup>84</sup>David X. Spencer, "A Harlem Parent Speaks," Today's Education, March-April 1975, p. 68.

<sup>85</sup>M. Donald Thomas, "Let's Talk Sense About Discipline," The Clearing House, March 1977, p. 310.

<sup>86</sup>Cunningham, "Hey Man, You Our Principal?," p. 123-128.

they pleased;<sup>87</sup> or the department of high school physical education teachers who allowed children to dress anyway they chose during class periods and scheduled every tenth week of the school year as free time for students and rest periods for teachers;<sup>88</sup> or the primary teacher who allowed children to run, talk, and play in the classroom during instructional time because, "The children would not obey;" or teachers who allowed children to wear their hats and coats in the classroom all day in room temperatures of 70 degrees and above because it was too much of a hassle to get them to take them off.<sup>89</sup>

One Chicago teacher said:

In the 17 years that I've taught, I've seen a great deal more permissiveness on the part of administrators, on the part of teachers, and on the part of parents. . . . Our biggest problem today is that there is no uniform code of conduct, not in this school, not in this city. What one teacher might consider a serious discipline problem in one situation, another teacher might not consider a serious problem at all. . . .<sup>90</sup>

Robert Wegmann also believed that teachers differed greatly in which rules they invoked, in what way, with which students, and with what results.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup>A Westside Chicago Elementary School Teacher, interview held August 9, 1978.

<sup>88</sup>A Westside Chicago High School Teacher, interview held August 24, 1978.

<sup>89</sup>Observations made by the writer in a near southside elementary school during the 1975 school year.

<sup>90</sup>As reported in Linda Chavez, "Teacher to Teacher," American Educator, Summer, 1978, p. 7.

<sup>91</sup>Wegmann, "Classroom Discipline-Negotiable Item."

Classroom discipline was also perceived to be directly related to teacher beliefs and attitudes. Some believed that the expectations of significant others, such as the teacher, were internalized into self perceptions, and students became the way they were treated.<sup>92</sup> This belief was expressed by E. K. Wickman in 1928<sup>93</sup> and again by Rosenthal and Jacobson in 1968.<sup>94</sup> Who the teacher was as a person was thought to determine the climate and practices that pervaded the classroom.<sup>95</sup>

Similar views were cited as a result of a recent study done at McGill University in Montreal, Canada, with first grade students. This study concluded:

If children are fortunate enough to begin their schooling with an optimistic teacher who expects them to do well and who teaches them the basic skills needed for further academic success, they are likely to perform better than those exposed to a teacher who conveys a discouraging, self-defeating outlook.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup>Anthony S. Mixer and James L. Milson, "Teaching and the Self," The Clearing House, February 1973, p. 345.

<sup>93</sup>E. K. Wickman, Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes (New York: The Commonwealth Funnel Division of Publications, 1928).

<sup>94</sup>As reported in Neil Postman and Charles Weingarten, The School Book (New York: Delacorte Press, 1973), p. 243.

<sup>95</sup>Cuban, "Discipline and American Students."

<sup>96</sup>"Teacher Effect on First Grade Student Cited," Chicago Sun Times, 22 March 1978, p. 59.



Samuel Brodbelt felt that many teachers had no place in the profession because of their negative attitudes and classroom behaviors:

As a supervisor of student teachers and as a parent active in school affairs, I have observed teachers who should not be in the classroom because of obvious psychological disorders which influenced their teaching behavior and created an unfavorable climate of learning. For example, during one 40-minute visit to a class of high-ability third graders, I saw the teacher use negativity and sarcasm 24 times while using verbal praise only five times.

Many young children will suffer permanent learning frustration when confronted by an ego-devaluing teacher. I contend that psychological disorder on the part of the teacher accounts for this kind of poor teaching technique much more often than bad preparation accounts for it.<sup>97</sup>

Statements expressed by some Chicago teachers seemed to reveal a reluctance to deal with discipline problems among some teachers and principals. During a 1975 Chicago Tribune survey of teachers toward the student discipline problem, one teacher said:

Students can freely roam and lounge in the halls at any time of day, which makes staying in the halls to visit with their friends more inviting than attending classes.

We also have many outsiders who are not students in the halls. Many of our incidents involve outsiders. We do supposedly, have people who are to be on hall duty, but they don't go, and nobody in the administration enforces this.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup>Samuel Brodbelt, "Teachers Mental Health: Whose Responsibility?," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1973.

<sup>98</sup>Casey Banas, "Teachers Find Joy--And Frustration--In Their Jobs" Chicago Tribune, 19 January 1975, p. 10, Section 1.

Another commented:

A primary teacher has very little leverage with an older problem child. Every confrontation is keenly watched by some other children, and a teacher's bluff is often called and observed.<sup>99</sup>

Reportedly in 1975, seven out of ten Chicago teachers considered their jobs unsatisfactory.<sup>100</sup>

Seemingly, some teachers through harsh treatment of students, inept styles of teaching, permissiveness, and negative attitudes, tended to create more student discipline problems than they solved.

### The Principal

Some principals were perceived as contributors to the discipline problem because of their autocratic styles of leadership which led to the alienation of students. Others were accused of failure to support teachers in their disciplinary efforts, permissiveness, leniency towards students, and failure to exert leadership.<sup>101</sup>

The school's educational climate, defined by Eugene R. Howard as the aggregate of social and cultural conditions which influenced individual behavior,<sup>102</sup> was thought by some

---

<sup>99</sup>Ibid.

<sup>100</sup>Ibid.

<sup>101</sup>Casey Banas, "How Unruly Sabotage Teaching," Chicago Tribune, 20 January 1975, p. 6, Section 1; "Student Discipline is Ignored: Union," Chicago Tribune, 10 February 1978, p. 3, Section 1; Gerald W. Marker and Howard D. Mehlinger, "Schools, Politics, Rebellion, and Other Youth Interests," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1974.

<sup>102</sup>Eugene R. Howard, "School Climate Improvement," Education Digest, April 1974.

to be closely associated with the principal's decision-making process.<sup>103</sup> Some school climates were perceived as authoritative and inhumane, and said to have created resentment and hostilities among students. Discipline problems in such climates were thought to have resulted from the rigidity of school rules and the harsh treatment of students by principals and teachers.<sup>104</sup>

One such climate was described by Eileen Breckenridge:

. . . Something was seriously wrong. Our staff was divided into factions. Rumors spread about various teachers. Student attitudes were deteriorating; there were fights on the playground and incidents in the classrooms. Our principal was a former Navy officer who ran a 'tight ship,' You did things his way or left. Many of us on the staff felt that our ideas didn't count much with Mr. Jefferson. Although he had established rapport with the community, and treated children with authority and affection, his autocratic leadership dominated the school. It filtered into our classrooms, out onto the playground and into the staff room. Mr. Jefferson seemed distant and unapproachable. No one dared disagree with him. And so we fretted and complained behind his back, leaned on the kids in the classroom, and gossiped about one another in futile frustration. . . .<sup>105</sup>

William Maynard used the term "closed" to describe what he considered to be the authoritative approach to school discipline and its effect upon students:

---

<sup>103</sup>Alvin W. Holst, "Educational Climate A Prime Responsibility of the School Administrator," The Clearing House, November 1973.

<sup>104</sup>Gerald W. Marker and Howard Mehlinger, "School, Politics, Rebellion, and Other Youth Interests," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1974.

<sup>105</sup>Eileen Breckenridge, "Improving School Climate," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1976.

The force model or 'closed' school is a place where student concerns come after course content and where curriculum changes and school rules are generally developed solely by the administration. Such schools are characterized by feelings of distrust, animosity, frustration, and rage among both staff and students. And these feelings are often directed toward the most immediate representative of authority.

Typically, the closed school staff contributes to student discipline problems. There is a tendency to talk more than listen; force students to meet the needs of the school, not the school meet the needs of students; see pupils not as individuals but as groups (radicals, greasers, etc.); turn off students who display deviant behavior in class performance and dress; lock students into a particular category of ability or aptitude; continue irrelevant curricula; emphasize competition; and establish inappropriate expectations. . . .<sup>106</sup>

Marker and Mehlinger commented:

Due process is not available to students. When students are accused by teachers of violations of school rules, they already stand convicted. There is no presumption of innocence until evidence is heard. No witnesses are called; no opportunity is afforded the student to defend himself. The administration and the teaching faculty of a school form a united front to maintain control, and a principal, even when he suspects the teacher is wrong, is more likely to take the side of the teacher than the student. . . .<sup>107</sup>

Not all students, however, were alienated by strict principals. In a study conducted among 700 students in 19 high schools concerning attitudes toward school authority, Serow and Strike concluded that students accepted and supported a forceful role for school administrators in instances in which rules and regulations were required to protect students from each other. They did not accept administrative

---

<sup>106</sup>William Maynard, "Basic Approaches to Violence and Vandalism," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1978, p. 359.

<sup>107</sup>Marker and Mehlinger, "Schools ... Youth Interests."

intervention in certain areas, such as, acting arbitrarily, or attempting to protect them from outside influences of a moral or political nature such as radical propoganda or questionable reading materials.<sup>108</sup>

Other school climates were considered as chaotic where the principal apparently provided no leadership at all. Concerning one such situation, a teacher commented:

Students are allowed to roam the building. Other people, who do not belong in school, roam our building. Fights are common.

Trying to walk a line of students through the hall is impossible some days. Your lines will be disrupted by roamers coming over to beat up members of your class.<sup>109</sup>

The principal in a similar type situation was described in this manner:

We have a principal who is totally unaware of the problems in our school. He is not in school the majority of the time, and when he does come he locks himself in his office.<sup>110</sup>

In a 1975 study of Chicago public schools, Alderman William Singer concluded that many principals merely sat in their offices and demonstrated very little administrative ability or leadership qualities.<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>108</sup>Robert Serow and Kenneth A. Strike, "Do High School Students Support Administrators' Authority?," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1978.

<sup>109</sup>Casey Banas, "How Unruly Sabotage Teaching," Chicago Tribune, 20 January 1975, p. 6, Section 1.

<sup>110</sup>Ibid.

<sup>111</sup>Casey Banas, "Singer Releases Scathing Reports on City Schools," Chicago Tribune, 22 January 1975.

M. Donald Thomas felt that principals across the nation had become masters at blaming the courts or their central offices for their not taking personal responsibility in the discipline area. He cited excuses given by principals such as, "The superintendent won't let us suspend students," and, "When we discipline offenders, we are put on the carpet." Thomas also felt that some principals refused to become involved because they did not want to spend their Saturdays in court. He believed also that, like parents and teachers, principals, too, expected the discipline problem to be solved by someone else.<sup>112</sup>

Apparently, teachers were highly critical of principals whom they perceived as unsupportive of their disciplinary efforts. One Chicago teacher commented, "Teachers are confronted by students with severe problems, angry parents, and an administration that won't back them up."<sup>113</sup> Another stated:

. . . There is nowhere that a teacher can turn for help. Many principals are either afraid or unwilling to support their teachers when serious situations arise.<sup>114</sup>

In Providence, Rhode Island, a teacher attempting to restrain a sixth-grade student from punching and choking a classmate was said to have whacked the offender on the leg with a blackboard pointer. Reportedly, the principal took

---

<sup>112</sup>Thomas, "Let's Talk Sense About Discipline."

<sup>113</sup>Casey Banas, "The Teachers' Unseen World," Chicago Tribune, 19 January 1975, p. 10, Section 1.

<sup>114</sup>Ibid.

action against the teacher and the assailant went free. According to Providence teachers and union officials, some teachers were not supported by their principals even after being assaulted by students.<sup>115</sup>

Patricia Graham, director of the National Institute of Education, believed that poor discipline situations existed in many schools because of the principal's ineptness in school governance and his lack of visibility in the school.<sup>116</sup>

Daniel L. Duke, in his study that was conducted on the east and west coasts, concluded that principals tended to discount student misbehavior directed at teachers and students, and were more concerned with student problems that were related to "skipping class," "truancy," and "lateness to class."<sup>117</sup>

Seemingly, principals contributed to the student discipline problem by either being too strict with students, or by failing to exhibit leadership or support for teachers in matters of student discipline.

### The Student

Besides being considered as victims of their parents, society, teachers and principals, some students were

---

<sup>115</sup>"Education," editorial, Time, 23 January 1978, p. 74.

<sup>116</sup>"Can't Buy Out School Violence, Congress Told," Chicago Sun Times, editorial, 25 January 1978, p. 5.

<sup>117</sup>Daniel L. Duke, "How Administrators View the Crisis in School Discipline," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1978.

apparently perceived as problem children who caused the current upsurge in student discipline problems. Certain misbehaviors appeared to have stemmed from students who were either maladjusted, in need of attention, uninterested in school, slow or non-learners, influenced by their peers, or aggressive and uncaring.

Ken Ernst believed that certain "games" were played in school each day by students whose intentions were to receive attention, prevent instruction or to disrupt regular classroom routines. He described one such game as "uproar:"

Muriel, an advanced "Uproar" player, is determined to get all authority figures to play "Uproar" or an allied game. Her opening attack included knuckle-cracking, gum popping, finger-tapping, pen-clicking, paper rattling, clock-watching, coughing, whispering, pencil and book dropping, hair combing, dress straightening, pencil-sharpening, paper-tossing, note-passing, turning around, wiggling, coming in late, acting stupid, and trying to sidetrack the lecture.

The child part of Muriel was "bugging" the teacher with a series of small incidents to force him to blow up at her. If Mr. Johnson controlled his temper, she had him at bay and could continue to goad him until he did blow up. Then she would win; she could complain to her friends, other teachers, the principal, and to her parents that he was "unfair" and had picked on her. Her whole aim was to get a game of "Uproar" going. "After all, all I did was drop my pencil, and he yelled at me."<sup>118</sup>

Another such game referred to as "ribbin," was described by Herbert L. Foster as one played by inner-city students to get their way with teachers and administrators:

---

<sup>118</sup>Ken Ernst, Games Students Play (Millbrae, California: Celestial Arts Publisher, 1972).



The following incident involving "ribbin" occurred in a class which was waiting for the bell to end the period. Suddenly two boys started fighting. The teacher broke up the fight and asked what had happened.

One boy said, 'He say I'm clean cause it be Mother's Day.'

'Is that a reason to fight?' the teacher asked.

Later, one youngster explained to the teacher that Mother's Day is the day the welfare check arrives. The intent of the 'rib' was to say that the boy's mother was on welfare and that he was dressed well only because her check had arrived.<sup>119</sup>

Foster indicated that regardless of the vehicle for the rib, the two important aspects of the encounter were that the student doing the ribbin was most likely vying for control of the class and was playing to fellow students to assist in the disruption.<sup>120</sup>

Still another such game played by inner-city students referred to as "woofin" was described by Foster:

Woofin is a vicious verbal attack, which can be a terrifying experience for the middle-class teacher.

The woofin observed in use most often in public schools takes the form of the youngster's making a face and yelling at the teacher. The woofers may also move his or her body in a menacing way to make the woof more threatening.

The woofers may woof for anything from a pass to leave school early to gaining control of the class by frightening the teacher. Or the student may woof on the teacher to get another sandwich at lunch or to get into class without a pass when late.

---

<sup>119</sup>Herbert L. Foster, "Don't Be Put On! Learn About The Games Kids Play," Today's Education, September-October, 1975.

<sup>120</sup>Ibid.

Sometimes, youngsters will work together to run a woofin game. This can happen if youngsters want class disrupted because they did not do their homework, do not want to take a test, do not like the teacher, or for almost any reason.<sup>121</sup>

Carnot believed that some students delighted in teasing, defying or openly antagonizing new teachers, and that others had no desire to learn. Students such as these, he felt, were in a classroom wasting time until they could legally drop out of school, or until they could be passed along far enough to be handed a diploma.<sup>122</sup>

Still other students were perceived to have personal, physical or psychiatric problems which prevented them from responding to a normal classroom situation.<sup>123</sup>

William Wattenberg identified six basic symptoms of emotional disturbances in students: (1) behavior that had a quality of soliciting punishment; (2) misbehavior accompanied by inappropriately intense emotions; (3) behavior that demonstrated a peculiar compulsive or driven quality; (4) misbehavior, which in itself, was inappropriate to the age level or the situation; (5) a consistent pattern in which offenses were followed by intense remorse, which seemed to be quickly forgotten due to additional offenses and further remorse; and (6) preoccupation with probably parental reactions after relatively serious events.<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup>Ibid.

<sup>122</sup>Carnot, "Dynamic School Discipline."

<sup>123</sup>Ibid.

<sup>124</sup>William Wattenberg, "Signs of Emotional Disturbance," Today's Education, March-April 1975, p. 58.

Hyman Eigerman believed that the disruptive behavior demonstrated by socially maladjusted, or emotionally disturbed students violated the rights of others to learn, and advocated for their removal from the classroom.<sup>125</sup> He estimated the percentage of students with troubled behavior patterns to be at least six percent of the student population in disadvantaged schools such as Title I schools, or other schools located in impoverished areas.<sup>126</sup>

Underachievers were also viewed as a source of discipline problems. Fontein believed that their sometimes disruptive antics served in many instances as self defense mechanisms:

. . . Children whose reading ability, background experiences, and mental agility are inadequate cannot cope with a situation demanding more than they can bring to it. Their obvious reaction to this situation will be logically and understandably--an attempt to remove themselves from it, to escape, if not physically, then mentally (the quiet day dreamers), or to change the situation in anyway to make coping possible. It is this latter solution of 'stressed' or 'disstressed' children which, in my opinion, causes most of the discipline problems. If Johnny or Mary can challenge the teacher, he or she becomes a hero, rather than having to submit to public ridicule for stupidity....<sup>127</sup>

Mills and Douglass believed that the low, or under-achiever was easily influenced by others to imitate or even initiate misbehavior:

---

<sup>125</sup>Hyman Eigerman, "Take the Maladjusted Child Out of the Classroom," Educational Digest, March 1974, p. 31.

<sup>126</sup>Ibid.

<sup>127</sup>Fontein, "Re: Discipline: An Ounce of Prevention."

The child of low intelligence is susceptible to the suggestions of other persons without discriminating as to their efficacy. He may also encounter difficulty in seeing the implications of his behavior. The lower his level of intelligence, the less able he is to learn by his own experience or that of others.<sup>128</sup>

Some students were thought to act out in class in order to fit in with others. According to Robert Havighurst, peer group pressures did much to influence the behavior patterns demonstrated in many classrooms: "There are groups in which it is mandatory that anybody who is on the 'in' must be scornful of the school and rebellious toward the teacher... .<sup>129</sup>

Unacceptance by the peer culture was viewed by Frost and Rowe as a strong determinant towards anti-social behavior:

. . . Most delinquents turn out to be children and youths who have not found acceptance among agemates in the 'wheel' or 'average one' peer cultures, and who, when avoided in a number of ways, could not reconcile themselves to being a 'brain' or a 'left out.' A delinquent sub-culture sets up criteria for gaining status that can be met by boys, and less often by girls, who find themselves unable to compete with peers in middle-class dominated institutions such as the school. Affiliation with deviant agemates, then, equips the youngster to retaliate against adults and peers who make him (or her) feel ashamed, inferior, resentful, and hostile.<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup>Hubert H. Mills and Earl R. Douglass, Teaching in High School (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1957), p. 130.

<sup>129</sup>Robert J. Havighurst and Bernice L. Neugarten, Society and Education, 3rd ed. (Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969), p. 185.

<sup>130</sup>Joe L. Frost and G. Thomas Rowland, Curricula for the Seventies (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969), p. 51.

Similarly, Marker and Mehlinger commented:

. . . By compulsory attendance laws or by parental pressure, many students remain in high school today who in earlier times would quit. It has been shown that most rebellious high school youth are found in this group. These students feel no strong attachment to the school's goals. They do not find the curriculum of the school meaningful for the kinds of jobs they know they will fill. Moreover, ostracized by the leading peer groups, they tend to identify more with adult models. These students tend to be contemptuous of leading peer groups and demand to be treated as adults. Teachers and administrators, unable to accept them as adults, find them to be a constant source of tension. . . .<sup>131</sup>

Advocates against compulsory attendance laws believed the abolishment of "forced schooling" to be the only way to lessen the discipline problems encountered by school officials from these students.<sup>132</sup>

Despite its perceived causal factors, complexities, frustrations, and many varied problems, discipline in the classroom was apparently believed to be an absolute essential to learning. Some proof of this belief was seen in the results of a 1970 poll of high school students sponsored by the American College Testing Program, which revealed that the majority of the students interviewed agreed that discipline was desirable, and order in the classroom was necessary to give them the opportunity to learn.<sup>133</sup>

---

<sup>131</sup>Marker and Mehlinger, "Schools...Youth Interests."

<sup>132</sup>B. Frank Brown, "Forced Schooling," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1973.

<sup>133</sup>How Students Rate Their Schools and Teachers, The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1971.

Apparently, students who were considered as mal-adjusted, aggressive, attention seekers, slow or non-learners, were also considered as causes of some classroom discipline problems.

### The Role of the Disciplinarian

The term disciplinarian as used in this study, referred to the function of managing and correcting behaviors in order to produce students who obeyed rules, respected authority, and were considerate of the rights of others.

Although teachers and principals were required to perform the role of disciplinarian jointly, it was evident that perceived role responsibilities tended to differ.

### The Teacher-Disciplinarian

The teacher was identified by some to be the one held responsible for student discipline. George C. Kyte believed that since the student was under the direction of the teacher during the school day, control and discipline were necessarily interwoven with the program of instruction and learning. According to Kyte:

. . . The educational purpose of control are, consequently, the same as those governing instruction. Since the aim is the optimum development of the individual as a member of American democratic society, control must be democratic control or self-control. As applied to the individual pupil, this concept of self-control rests on the teacher's recognition of the worth and dignity of every person.<sup>134</sup>

---

<sup>134</sup>George C. Kyte, The Elementary Teacher At Work (New York: The Dryden Press, 1958).

He perceived the teacher-disciplinarian role to be three-fold:

. . . Essentially, his role is to guide both the individual and the group toward increasingly dependable and effective self-control. This role requires, first, insight into the right conduct of children; sound, competence and disposition to act in accordance with his understanding; and finally, appreciation of the developmental nature of democratic behavior.<sup>135</sup>

Willard Waller perceived the teacher's role in classroom discipline to be that of domination and felt that the teacher's task was to make the student learn by persuasion, if possible, and by force if necessary.<sup>136</sup>

While not in full agreement with the views expressed by Waller, Robert J. Havighurst did believe that the teacher had to keep order in the classroom in order to teach. He considered the role of disciplinarian to be the most difficult aspect of the teacher's function, especially when the teacher objected to the very requirement that he impose discipline.<sup>137</sup>

In describing what he considered to be an effective approach to student discipline, Frank Riessman said:

. . . Effective teachers use different techniques-- there is not just one right approach, although there are many wrong approaches. For example, toughness and brutality are most ineffective. Perhaps the best overall principle is to be consistent. . . . Children want a teacher on whom they can depend. If she tells them to stop chewing gum one day, she cannot permit them to do it the next.

---

<sup>135</sup>Ibid.

<sup>136</sup>Willard Waller, The Sociology of Teaching (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1932).

<sup>137</sup>Robert J. Havighurst and Bernice L. Neugarten, Society and Education, 3rd ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969), p. 185.

. . . The teacher should be straightforward and direct, and should clearly define what is to be done as much as possible. At the same time she should be informal, warm, down-to-earth. Snobbishness and in-direction are major pitfalls. So is cynicism, although naivete is equally dangerous.<sup>138</sup>

Wendell W. Cultice believed that teachers who advocated domination or severe discipline in the classroom were themselves intemperate in their actions and rash in their judgments:

They interpret any misconduct as directed at them personally, regarding it as deliberate, defiant, intolerable, personal insult. It is not unusual to see such a teacher usher an offender to the principal's office demanding that prompt reprisal be administered, in the teacher's presence and according to the teacher's demands. 'Tell him he can't talk back to me,' one will demand. 'What he needs is a good slap in the mouth,' another will insist. 'Make him apologize in front of the class,' another will require. 'He should be kicked out of school and never allowed to return,' another will say. What such a teacher wants is revenge, not correction.<sup>139</sup>

DeYoung and Wynn believed that good discipline resulted from having students who were purposefully engaged in worthwhile learning with a teacher who merited rather than commanded their respect. Discipline which was imposed by threats and force, they felt, not only destroyed rapport between teacher and learner, but also established little basis for continued self-discipline beyond the classroom.<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup>Frank Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962).

<sup>139</sup>Wendell W. Cultice, Positive Discipline for a More Productive Educational Climate (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969), p. 8.

<sup>140</sup>Chris A. DeYoung and Richard Wynn, American Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968).



Some teachers were suspected of sending too many students to the principal for disciplining and of using the principal's office as a dumping station. Wayne L. Herman felt that teachers should handle their own discipline problems and not refer them to the principal unless they were considered serious. He viewed the teacher's keeping of accurate anecdotal records of student behavior and working with parents toward solutions to problems as a key to the teacher-disciplinarian role. The administering of corporal punishment to students by teachers after notification to the principal was also considered by Herman to be a teacher-disciplinarian task.<sup>141</sup>

Herbert H. Mills believed that in classrooms where learners were busily engaged individually or in small groups with challenging learning activities, discipline was unnecessary and good working conditions usually continued to exist even in the absence of the teacher. He also felt that under the above conditions, the attitude of the students toward the teacher was improved.<sup>142</sup>

In discussing her role as a teacher-disciplinarian, Cathy Eckbreth stressed the importance of using the first weeks of the school year to set the tone for the remainder of the year:

---

<sup>141</sup>Wayne L. Herman, The Principal's Guide to Teacher Personnel Problems in the Elementary School (West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1966), p. 105.

<sup>142</sup>Mills and Douglass, Teaching in High School., p. 130.

During the first few weeks of school, you need to take time to explain a few necessary rules of the school and your classroom and then follow them. I don't bore my students with a multitude of don'ts during this period of judgment, but we talk about the need for rules as each situation arises. Most students won't remember a long list of rules,<sup>143</sup> but they will remember rules as they are applied.

The importance of the teacher-disciplinarian's early start in establishing a well-disciplined classroom was also emphasized by Emery Stoops:

In the first minute of the first period of the first day, the teacher must begin by establishing order. Unless she gets class attention, she cannot begin a well-planned lesson or even introduce herself and her Jacks and Jills. When the class comes to order and there is a focus of attention and interest, one of the immediate jobs of the teacher is to establish with her new class some objectives relating to classroom standards. Teachers must never forget, however, that they have final responsibility for the standards. It is their inescapable duty and responsibility to see that student behavior conforms to a standard that makes for maximum classroom learning.<sup>144</sup>

Stoops also expressed an opinion as to why many teacher-disciplinarians failed at their task:

Many teachers list classroom standards as part of their teaching objectives on their first day and feel that the job is done for the semester or year. Thorndike found that most forgetting takes place during the first 24 hours. Jack and Jill may neither understand nor remember. Wise teachers will not expect their students to remember all the classroom standards but will set them forth in writing so that each student has a copy. Such a list should not become the law of Medes and Persians but should be subject to revision

---

<sup>143</sup>Cathy Eckbreth, "Discipline in the Secondary Classroom" Social Education, February 1978.

<sup>144</sup>Emery Stoops and Joyce King Stoops, "Discipline or Disaster?" Phi Delta Kappan Fast Back No. 8., Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation, 1972.

and updating. Even though the list does not need updating, students need review and reinforcing in order to remember the rules and how they are to be applied.<sup>145</sup>

The following list of suggestions was provided by Stoops as a guideline for teacher-disciplinarians:

DO:

1. Know district and school policies and follow them closely.
2. Develop written classroom standards and supply the reasons for them.
3. Explain "why" when you have to deny students' requests.
4. Point out the consequences of poor student behavior. Follow through.
5. Expect students to behave well and praise students for their good behavior.
6. Separate students who behave poorly toward each other.
7. Have well-planned, motivating, and meaningful lessons and teach in an interesting and enthusiastic manner.
8. Ask for help from the principal and counselors in setting and enforcing classroom standards if you need it.
9. Keep accurate anecdotal records on each student's behavior.
10. Permit students to grow toward independence and self-discipline.
11. Remember you are the adult. Children want a teacher-leader, not another class pal.
12. Acknowledge desirable behavior and good work. Reward students in a variety of ways.
13. Seek help from parents.

---

<sup>145</sup>Ibid.

DON'T:

1. Make too many rules, talk too much, or shout at pupils.
2. Try to treat severe emotional problems yourself or get personally involved with your students.
3. Make promises or threats that you may not be able to keep.
4. Show favoritism or tolerate begging for special privileges.
5. Reward undesirable behavior or slipshod work.
6. Say "no" habitually, or before all the evidence is in.
7. Apply rules to all children arbitrarily, but watch for individual and unique differences.
8. Use the principal's office or the home as a discipline dumping-ground.<sup>146</sup>

According to Carl J. Wallen, the major problem faced by the teacher-disciplinarian in achieving effective classroom control was in not possessing an adequate repertoire of procedures for classroom management:

. . . Not only must different procedures be used for different psychological dynamics, procedures must be varied because students are individuals and behave in different ways--what works today, even with one person, may not work tomorrow.<sup>147</sup>

Leslie Chamberlin stated:

Beginning and experienced teachers who remain artless in this area often think of improving a poor disciplinary situation by moving a child to a different location in the classroom or simply telling the child that they 'won't stand for that' in their classrooms. These techniques

---

<sup>146</sup> Ibid.

<sup>147</sup> Carl J. Wallen and LaDonna L. Wallen, Effective Classroom Management (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978).

are usually satisfactory for restoring peace temporarily; however, good teachers know that maintaining a good learning climate is far more complicated.<sup>148</sup>

Suggestions that were intended to improve the teacher's effectiveness in student discipline were presented throughout the literature. The following list is probably typical of most suggestions given:

- A teacher should be fair at all times, especially if he expects similar treatment from the students. Consistency is mandatory.
- A teacher should be understanding, friendly, tolerant and sincere. Efforts to be "one of the gang" will seldom be successful but an atmosphere of mutual respect will.
- A teacher should remember that every student in his class wants to be successful, particularly those with a record of failure. A teacher must always accentuate the positive.
- A teacher should be thoroughly prepared in his assignment at all times.
- A teacher should keep orderly, attractive and cheerful classrooms. These same qualities apply to him, too.
- A teacher should be enthusiastic and courteous and, above all, maintain a sense of humor.

---

<sup>148</sup>Leslie J. Chamberlin and Joseph B. Carnot, Improving School Discipline (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1974), p. 55.

- A teacher should learn to know each and every student in the class, including prior records, his likes and dislikes, his problems, his temperament; anything that will improve communication with the student.
- A teacher should change the routine occasionally; do something exciting with the students now and then; ask them for ideas.
- A teacher should be able to admit to an error and to apologize if he has treated a pupil unjustly.
- A teacher should let students know he cares.
- A teacher should establish a minimum number of rules and even these should be kept as simple as possible.
- A teacher should make sure the punishment fits the misdeed. And a student must be told the reason he is being punished.
- A teacher should be patient.
- A teacher should be thick-skinned.<sup>149</sup>

Finally, in appearing to summarize the responsibilities of teachers in matters of student discipline, Charles H. Madsen, Jr., said:

Of course Johnny is a 'problem child' ... Johnny will continue to be a problem child until someone teaches him different responses ...

It is not easy to deal with the Johnnies. They take time, energy and a disciplined teacher. All the

---

<sup>149</sup>Discipline Crisis in Schools (National School Public Relations Association, 1973), pp. 54-55.

Johnnies do not change for the better or even survive; yet for these children, the school is their only hope.

Who has the responsibility of discipline? -- the teacher.<sup>150</sup>

Teachers were identified as being primarily responsible for student discipline in the classroom; and their success as disciplinarians was closely associated with their acceptance of children, their attitudes about teaching, their knowledge of children, their teaching competencies, and their rapport with students.

### The Principal-Disciplinarian

The principal's role as disciplinarian was apparently viewed to be distinctly different from that of the teacher's. According to Norma Cutts, the principal's tasks were to in-service teachers, and to assure them of support in difficult situations.<sup>151</sup> Others believed his function to be that of climate setting.<sup>152</sup>

The school's climate, defined earlier, was thought to generate from the principal's method of decision making, or lack of decision making. Its influence was thought to affect the classroom atmosphere, the professional climate, and

---

<sup>150</sup>Charles H. Madsen, Jr. and Clifford K. Madsen, Teaching Discipline (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974), p. 17.

<sup>151</sup>Norma E. Cutts and Nicholas Mosely, Teaching the Disorderly Pupil in Elementary and Secondary Schools (New York: Longmans, Greens and Company, 1957).

<sup>152</sup>Alvin W. Holst, "Educational Climate A Prime Responsibility of the School Administrator," The Clearing House, November 1973.

the degree of esprit de corps that existed among teachers.<sup>153</sup>

The relative importance of the school climate to student discipline and its association with the principal were apparently demonstrated in the 1975 Chicago Board of Education's decision to transfer seven principals from their previously "troubled schools" for reasons given by the superintendent as, "For the good of the service, to improve the atmosphere for learning, and to improve the educational program."<sup>154</sup>

Wayne L. Herman felt that in addition to climate setting and displaying support for teachers, the principal's disciplinarian role consisted of establishing school-wide discipline policies, reviewing the anecdotal records of misbehaving students as submitted by teachers, attending parent-teacher conferences regarding student discipline, and deciding discipline cases unresolved by teachers and parent.<sup>155</sup>

The Illinois Principals' Association seemed to have discerned the principal's disciplinarian role to be that of furnishing leadership in establishing a climate for self-discipline through the cooperative efforts of students and

---

<sup>153</sup>Frederick Mosteller and Daniel Moynihan, editors, On Equality of Educational Opportunity (New York: Random House, Inc., 1972), p. 401.

<sup>154</sup>Dave Schneidman, "Principals Rip Redmond On School Transfers," Chicago Tribune, 19 January 1975, p. 24, Section 1.



staff, using available resources to prevent or combat vandalism and violence, supervising the use of corporal punishment by teachers, and causing to be suspended or expelled from school those students guilty of gross disobedience or misconduct in school, on school grounds, or while riding on school buses.<sup>156</sup>

The Education Advisory Committee of the Chicago Commission of Human Relations appeared to have defined the principal-disciplinarian role as: establisher of the school climate, establisher of rules and regulations, disseminator of rules and regulations; orientator of students to suspendable offenses, and provider of due process in suspension or expulsion cases.<sup>157</sup>

Fred and Carol Chernow provided a detailed, comprehensive list of tasks that they perceived the principal-disciplinarian to perform. They are:

1. Work with students having problems.
2. Assist teachers having problems with students and discipline.
3. Contact parents regarding individual students.
4. Formulate policy with administration and teachers.
5. Work with pupil personnel staff on problems.

---

<sup>156</sup>"Constitution of the State of Illinois-Preamble," Illinois Principal, September 1978.

<sup>157</sup>Suspension and Expulsion in Chicago Public Schools (Chicago: Commission on Human Relations, 1976).

6. Meet with parents and community groups.
7. Meet with students and representatives.
8. Prepare reports for superintendent and/or board of education.
9. Conduct social service and agency referrals.
10. Deter vandalism and false alarms, and follow-up investigations.
11. Contact police officials on student problems and building security.
12. Meet with school attorney and/or attend court hearings.
13. Conduct suspension hearings in school.
14. Attend district office suspension hearings.
15. Meet with school custodian to plan preventative procedures.
16. Attend police precinct or department meetings.
17. Personally supervise critical areas of the building.<sup>158</sup>

David W. Swift observed the role played by the principal in matters of student discipline and control to be more crucial in impoverished or disadvantaged areas than in other areas:

In lower-class neighborhoods the immediate problem facing the principal is student control. Children in

---

<sup>158</sup>Fred B. Chernow and Carol Chernow, School Administrator's Guide to Managing People (West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1976).

these areas are least likely to conform to the expectations of the school regarding behavior. The values and the physical conditions of their homes are not conducive to high academic achievement. Many parents are unwilling or unable to pay attention to school affairs. The school is left largely on its own. Consequently, the most immediate task here is maintaining order.<sup>159</sup>

Wayne L. Herman believed that many of the discipline referrals made to the principal by many classroom teachers were unnecessary:

. . . A principal does not have time to talk with children who have committed petty offenses; this is the job of the teacher. Unless the offense is serious, a teacher should make an attempt to deal with the offender himself.<sup>160</sup>

Contrary to Herman's belief, Willard S. Elsbree recognized a certain aspect of the principal-disciplinarian role to be that of individual student guidance:

. . . In a similar category is the principal's responsibility for providing guidance to individual children. This duty is sometimes deemed to be identified with handling disciplinary cases referred to the principal by classroom teachers. The latter interpretation is entirely too narrow. The good principal establishes friendly relations with pupils generally and he strives to exercise a positive influence on them.<sup>161</sup>

---

<sup>159</sup>David W. Swift, "Variations in the Role of the School Administrator," The Elementary School Journal, November, 1974.

<sup>160</sup>Herman, "The Principal's Guide."

<sup>161</sup>Willard S. Elsbree and Harold J. McNally, Elementary School Administration and Supervision, 2nd edition, (New York: American Book Company, 1959).

However perceived, the principal-disciplinarian role was thought to occupy too much of the principal's time and to have a constant effect on his performance.<sup>162</sup>

Seemingly, principal-disciplinarians were thought to be responsible for establishing school climates geared towards the promotion of positive student discipline; assisting in the establishment and enforcement of schoolwide discipline policies and procedures, in-servicing teachers in the student discipline process, supporting and assisting teachers in their efforts to discipline students; supervising teacher use of corporal punishment, counseling misbehaving students, and deciding suspension and expulsion cases.

#### Perceived Solutions to the Problem

The problem of student discipline became a major problem during the past decade. Causes of the problem were thought to have derived from problems within the family structure and society, inhumane schools, inept school personnel, and disinterested students. Solutions offered in the literature to remedy the situation were varied.

Since it was commonly believed that parents had abdicated the responsibility of child rearing to the schools and other social institutions, it was suggested that schools

---

<sup>162</sup>Banas, "Drugs, . . . Plague Chicago Principals."

should play an active role in strengthening and revitalizing the home as the basic unit of our society. Other suggestions included the initiation of school programs to compensate for the lack of parent-child relations, programs which featured parents as teachers and programs which stimulated parental involvement in school affairs.<sup>163</sup> Also suggested were social plans to reshape the socio-technical structure, part-time work schemes to allow for more contact between parents and children, and revision of the welfare system.<sup>164</sup>

The school's authoritative structure was said to alienate students. Suggestions intended to alleviate student alienation included redefining the school's purpose, rules and policy changes, curricula changes, revised student grouping patterns, humanizing the reward and punishment systems, abolishing corporal punishment, revising compulsory attendance laws, establishing programs of in-school suspensions, and others.<sup>165</sup>

---

<sup>163</sup>Georgia Scriven, "Teachers Working With Parents in Schools," Peabody Journal of Education, October 1975; Carol Vukelich, "Parents Are Teachers," The Reading Teacher, February 1978.

<sup>164</sup>Carlotta G. Miles, "Helping Parents Help Their Children," Education Digest, December 1977; Terrel H. Bell, "A More Viable Home-School Partnership," Education Digest, April 1975.

<sup>165</sup>William G. Cunningham and Ray C. Owens, "Social Promotion: Problem or Solution?" NASSP Bulletin, October 1976; Ruth B. Love, "Let's Reward for Success--Not Failure," The Reading Teacher, October 1976; Kent S. Mosley, "A Discipline Alternative," Education Digest, January 1977; Joseph W. Licata, "Student Brinkmanship and School Structure," The Educational Forum, March 1978.

Solutions for the improvement of principal and teacher effectiveness in student discipline included climate setting, the development of positive attitudes, instructional improvement, improved competencies in dealing with problem children, humanizing relationships between teachers and students, demonstration of mutual support between teachers and principals, and others.<sup>166</sup>

The abolishment of compulsory school attendance laws was strongly suggested as a means of eliminating the disinterested student and potential dropout while improving the learning situation for those who wanted to learn.<sup>167</sup>

#### Previous Studies Related to Student Discipline

A number of studies were conducted relative to student discipline, but dealt mainly with teacher attitudes toward the behavior problems of children, and the effects of teacher behavior on patterns of student aggression.

---

<sup>166</sup>Joel F. Henning, "Student Rights and Responsibilities and the Curriculum," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1974; Stanley G. Sanders and Janis S. Yarbrough, "Bringing Order to an Inner-City Middle School," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1976; Earnest R. House, Survival in the Classroom (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978).

<sup>167</sup>Brown, "Forced Schooling."

None, however, dealt with the acceptance or rejection of the role of disciplinarian among both teachers and principals.<sup>168</sup>

A study conducted in 1970 at North Texas State University by Bobby Gene Lumpkins did, however, attempt to determine the relationship between role-preferences of experienced elementary school teachers and their attitudes toward certain behavior problems of children. The relationships studies were: (1) the relationship between age, education, years of teaching experience, most recent grade taught, and teacher role preference; (2) the relationship between the rating of behavior problems by mental hygienists and the rating of teachers who prefer certain roles; and (3) the relationship between the specified demographic data and the attitudes of teachers toward behavior problems of children.

---

<sup>168</sup>E. K. Wickman, Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes, (New York: The Commonwealth Fund Division of Publication, 1928); Russell Lee Dobson, "The Perception and Treatment By Teachers of the Behavioral Problems of Elementary School Children in Culturally Deprived and Middle-Class Neighborhoods," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1966); Raymond Gordon Trabb, "The Effect of Teacher Behavior on Patterns of Student Behavior," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1968); James John Kotleba, "A Comparison of Attitudes of Teachers and Mental Hygienists Toward Behavior Problems of Children In 1975 With Those Reported by E. K. Wickman In 1928," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1976).

Lumpkins concluded that the most frequently preferred roles of teachers were the counselor and referrer roles. Teachers who had more college training, more years of teaching experience, and who taught in the intermediate grade, most frequently preferred the counselor role. Teachers who had less than fifteen semester hours above the bachelor's degree, less than three years of teaching experience, and who taught in the primary grades, most frequently preferred the referrer role. Teachers who preferred different roles also differed in rating the seriousness of certain behavior problems of children. And teacher attitudes toward the seriousness of certain behavior problems were related to the teacher's age and education.

The recommendation offered by Lumpkins was, "Teacher role preference should be considered in selecting teachers who are to work with children with special behavior problems."<sup>169</sup>

### Summary

The purpose of Chapter II was to present a review of the related literature and research pertinent to the student discipline problem, as well as some of the factors perceived to have affected the roles played by teachers and principals in matters of student discipline.

---

<sup>169</sup>Bobby Gene Lumpkins, "The Relationship Between Experienced Elementary School Teachers' Role-Preferences And Their Attitude Toward Behavior Problems of Children," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, North Texas State University, 1970).



The problem of student discipline became a major concern during the past decade. Perceived causes of the problem included inadequate parental supervision, violence portrayed on television, the expansion of student rights, schools which alienated students, teachers and principals who failed to meet the needs of students, and students who were maladjusted or disinterested in learning.

The responsibility of student discipline was designated to teachers and principals. Teachers were identified as being primarily responsible for student discipline in the classroom, and their success as disciplinarians was closely associated with their acceptance of children, their attitudes about teaching, their knowledge of children, their instructional competencies, and their rapport with students.

Principals were identified as being responsible for establishing the school climate geared towards the promotion of positive student discipline, supporting and assisting teachers in their efforts to discipline students, supervising teacher use of corporal punishment, counseling misbehaving students, and deciding suspension and expulsion cases.

Some recognized solutions to the problem of student discipline included revitalizing family life and stimulating parental involvement in the school and its affairs, redefining the school's purpose, changes in rules and policy, curricula changes, abolishment of corporal punishment,

revision of compulsory attendance laws, and improvement of teacher and principal competencies.

A search of the literature also revealed that previous studies had not examined the acceptance or rejection of the disciplinarian role among both teachers and principals.

## CHAPTER III

### INSTRUMENTATION, PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

The purposes of Chapter III are to discuss the sample population used in the study, the instrumentation, the procedures used to administer the instruments, and the methodology used to interpret the data.

#### Sample Population

This study is concerned with the elementary schools in District Eleven of the Chicago Public School System. District Eleven was chosen for study because of its diversified racial and economic composition, as well as, for reasons of high crime rate, large numbers of single-parent families, large numbers of public housing developments, and high annual rates of student suspensions. A total of nineteen schools existed in the district at the time of the study, however, fourteen schools were able to participate. Principals of the fourteen schools, plus an equal number of teachers, one from each school, comprised the sample population. The selection process for teachers consisted of using faculty rosters from all of the participating schools, with the teacher's three-digit classroom number serving as a means of identification. Final selections were made by

using arbitrary starting points and alternating directions on a table of random numbers.

### Instrumentation

The instrumentation used consisted of a two-part Likert type opinionnaire and six personal interview questions. The opinionnaire consisted of a total of twenty propositions. The first ten propositions in part one of the opinionnaire were composed of published statements pertinent to the student discipline problem, and were intended to solicit the respondents' agreement or disagreement relative to causes of the problem. The ten remaining propositions in part two of the opinionnaire were intended to solicit the respondents' agreement or disagreement relative to aspects of the disciplinarian role of teachers and principals. In each case, respondents were asked to select one of five options corresponding to their perceptions regarding the propositions. They were asked to indicate whether they strongly agreed, merely agreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with the propositions. The fifth category in the set of responses was designated "maybe" or "I have no opinion." Weights were used to quantify responses given by the subjects of the study for statistical purposes. A response of "I strongly agree" (SA) was assigned a weight of positive two. The "I agree" (A) response was assigned a weight of positive one, and the "maybe" (M) response corresponded to a weight of zero. On the negative end of the scale,

the "I strongly disagree" (SD) response was assigned a minus two, while the "I disagree" response was assigned a minute one.

The personal interview technique was used to solicit trends or areas of agreement in the opinions of the participants relative to the kinds of programs, policies and procedures needed to alleviate the discipline problem. The personal interview technique was chosen because it afforded the opportunity for indepth questioning in regards to the reactions or opinions given. Views expressed by the interviewees were compared to noticeable aspects of the school climate that existed during the visitation and further analyzed for feelings directed against or in support of the existing situation.

The opinionnaire and personal interview questions were validated by a group of practicing principals and teachers in the Chicago Public School System and field tested in a District Eleven School which did not participate in the actual study.

#### Procedures Used in Administering the Instrumentation

The opinionnaire and personal interview were administered to the principal and one randomly selected teacher in each of the participating schools on an individual basis. A taped interview session was conducted after the opinionnaire had been administered in order to expand upon some of the topics mentioned in the opinionnaire and to solicit some

opinions on how to lessen the student discipline problem. Complete anonymity was afforded to all participants.

### Methodology

The purposes of this study are to determine the extent to which teachers and principals accept the role of disciplinarian, to determine if conflict situations exist within the role perceptions of teachers and principals in matters of student discipline, to determine to what extent teachers and principals agree on the causes of student discipline, and to recommend possible policies, programs, and procedures to aid in the creation of school environments that are conducive to learning.

The research questions derived for the study are as follow:

1. To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among teachers as to the causes of student discipline problems?
2. To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among principals as to the causes of student discipline problems?
3. To what extent is there agreement or disagreement between teachers and principals as to the causes of student discipline problems?
4. To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among teachers as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline?

5. To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among principals as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline?
6. To what extent is there agreement or disagreement between teachers and principals as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline?
7. To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among teachers as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline?
8. To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among principals as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline?
9. To what extent is there agreement or disagreement between teachers and principals as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline?
10. To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among teachers as to the types of policies, programs, and procedures needed to remedy the student discipline problem?
11. To what extent is there agreement or disagreement among principals as to the types of policies, programs, and procedures needed to remedy the student discipline problem?

12. To what extent is there agreement or disagreement between teachers and principals as to the types of policies, programs, and procedures needed to remedy the student discipline problem?

The twelve Null hypotheses formulated from the research questions listed above are as follows:

1. There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems.
2. There is no difference among principals in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems.
3. There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems.
4. There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline.
5. There is no difference among principals in their perceptions as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline.
6. There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline.



7. There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline.
8. There is no difference among principals in their perceptions as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline.
9. There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline.
10. There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions as to the types of policies, programs and procedures needed to remedy the student discipline problem.
11. There is no difference among principals in their perceptions as to the types of policies, programs and procedures needed to remedy the student discipline problem.
12. There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions as to the types of policies, programs and procedures needed to remedy the student discipline problem.

Hypotheses one, two, four, five, seven and eight were tested by having the respondents react to various propositions contained within the opinionnaire by using the responses discussed previously to determine the extent of group agreement or disagreement with the propositions. The

extent to which there is agreement or disagreement among teachers and agreement or disagreement among principals was tested by application of the Chi-Square One-Sample Test, used here as a goodness-of-fit-test. In order to use the Chi-Square test with this size sample, it is necessary to combine the strongly agree and the agree responses, and to combine the disagree and strongly disagree responses.

The rationale for using the Chi-Square to test the goodness-of-fit is that, if there is no agreement among the respondents, their choices will be equally distributed among all possible responses: Strongly agree or agree, maybe, and disagree or strongly disagree. To the extent that they are not equally distributed, we may infer agreement. The Chi-Square statistic is computed for each of the propositions mentioned above. In each case where the probability is less than .05, .01 or .001 of the responses occurring by chance, this is indicated. In general, it may be noted that the larger Chi-Square is, the greater is the agreement within the group. Thus, it is possible to get some indication of those propositions which have greater or lesser agreement by examining the size of Chi-Square statistics, and this will be utilized in discussing the findings.

The extent to which there is agreement or lack of agreement between teachers and principals (Hypotheses three, six, and nine) was tested with the Chi-Square Test for Two Independent Samples. To utilize this test for this size sample, it was also necessary to combine the disagree and

strongly disagree categories so that the expected frequencies in each cell would approximate those indicated by Siegel as being minimal. For each comparison, the Chi-Square statistic is given. For those propositions where the probability is less than .05, .01, or .001 that the two samples (teachers and principals) could represent the same population as far as agreement on the item is concerned, the probability is indicated. Generally, it may be noted that when comparing two samples, the larger Chi-Square is, the less the agreement.

Hypotheses one, two, four, five, seven and eight were either accepted or rejected by obtaining the simple majority of propositions indicating agreement or disagreement.

The acceptance or rejection of Hypotheses three, six and nine was determined by the Chi-Square Test for Two Independent Samples.

Hypotheses ten, eleven and twelve were tested by a series of six personal interview questions. The interview data were used to determine trends or areas of significant agreement in the opinions of the respondents to school policies, programs, and procedures aimed at alleviating the student discipline problem. This was done through an analysis of frequencies of similar reactions or responses to questions by the respondents. A response or reaction mentioned by sixty percent of the respondents was considered agreement. Less than sixty percent agreement was considered as a lack of agreement.

## Summary

The purposes of Chapter III were to discuss the sample population, the instrumentation used in the study, the procedures used to administer the instrumentation, and the methodology used to interpret the data.

The sample population consisted of fourteen principals and fourteen randomly selected teachers from District Eleven of the Chicago Public School System. District Eleven was chosen for study because of various conditions that existed in the district which were thought to contribute to the student discipline problem.

The instrumentation used to collect data consisted of a two part Likert-type opinionnaire and the personal interview technique. The personal interviews were taped and conducted individually after the opinionnaires had been administered. All participants were afforded complete anonymity.

Twelve Null hypotheses were formulated from a series of twelve research questions having to do with the causes of student discipline problems, the roles of principals and teachers in the area of student discipline, and possible policies, programs, and procedures needed to lessen the problem.

Hypotheses one, two, four, five, seven and eight were tested by utilizing the Chi-Square One-Sample Test to determine agreement or disagreement within groups relative to twenty propositions having to do with student discipline.

The hypotheses were either accepted or rejected based upon the majority determined.

Hypotheses three, six, and nine were tested by utilizing the Chi-Square Test for Two Independent Samples.

Hypotheses ten, eleven, and twelve were tested by a series of personal interview questions that were pertinent to seeking solutions or suggestions of solutions aimed at relieving the student discipline problem. The hypotheses were either accepted or rejected, when sixty percent of the respondents either agreed or disagreed on possible solutions to the problem.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE OPINIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEW DATA RELATIVE TO THE STUDENT DISCIPLINE PROBLEM

The purpose of Chapter IV is to present an analysis of the data derived from administering the opinionnaire and personal interview questions regarding the student discipline problem to a sample population of twenty-eight teachers and principals. The opinionnaire and interview questions were geared towards determining answers to the twelve research questions discussed in Chapter III. The Null hypotheses derived from the twelve research questions to be tested and analyzed in this chapter are as follow:

1. There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems.
2. There is no difference among principals in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems.
3. There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems.
4. There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline.

5. There is no difference among principals in their perceptions as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline.
6. There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline.
7. There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions as to the role of the principal in matters of student discipline.
8. There is no difference among principals in their perceptions as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline.
9. There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline.
10. There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions as to the policies, procedures, and programs needed to remedy the student discipline problem.
11. There is no difference among principals in their perceptions as to the types of policies, procedures and programs needed to remedy the student discipline problem.

12. There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions as to the types of policies, procedures, and programs needed to remedy the student discipline problem.

Hypotheses one, two, four, five, seven, and eight were tested by having the respondents react to a series of five propositions to determine the extent of group agreement or disagreement with the propositions. The extent to which there is agreement or disagreement among teachers and principals was determined through application of the Chi-Square One Sample-Test. In order to use the Chi-Square test with a sample population of twenty-eight, it was necessary to combine the strongly disagree with the disagree responses. If no agreement existed among the respondents, their choices would have been equally distributed among all possible responses: strongly agree, agree, maybe, disagree, and strongly disagree. To the extent that they are not equally distributed, we may infer agreement. The Chi-Square statistic is computed for each of the propositions relating to hypotheses one, two, four, five, seven, and eight. In each case where the probability is less than .05, .01, or .001 of the responses occurring by chance, this is indicated; the larger Chi-Square is, the greater the agreement of the group.

The extent to which there is agreement or lack of agreement between the teacher and principal groups was determined by the Chi-Square Test for Two Independent Samples. It was also necessary to combine the strongly disagree responses with the disagree responses for this size population, so that the expected frequencies in each cell would approximate those indicated



by Siegel as being minimal. The Chi-Square statistic is also given for each comparison. For those propositions where the probability is less than .05, .01, or .001 that the two samples (teachers and principals) could represent the same population as far as agreement on any item is concerned, the probability is indicated. The larger Chi-Square is, the less the agreement.

Hypotheses one through nine were either accepted or rejected by obtaining the simple majority of propositions indicating agreement or disagreement.

Hypotheses ten, eleven, and twelve were tested by a series of six personal interview questions. The interview data were used to determine trends or areas of significant agreement in the opinions of the respondents to school policies, procedures, and programs needed to lessen the student discipline problem. This was done through an analysis of frequencies of similar reactions or responses to questions by the respondents. A response or reaction mentioned by sixty percent of the respondents was considered as lack of agreement.

Views expressed by interviewees were compared to their school climate during the time of visitation and further analyzed for personal statements directed against or in support of the existing situation.

## Data Presentation and Analysis

### Hypothesis I

There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems.

The purpose for testing Hypothesis I was twofold: (a) to determine the extent to which teachers agree with published reports concerning the causes of student discipline problems; and (b) to determine the extent of agreement among teachers themselves with respect to the perceived factors. Hypothesis I was measured by teacher reactions to a series of ten propositions which dealt with various aspects pertinent to causes of the student discipline problem. The subject areas covered by the ten propositions ranged from teacher failure in the classroom to lack of support of teachers by principals, from student disenchantment with school to inadequate curricular offerings by schools, and from parental apathy to violence seen on television and in the movies. In each case, respondents were asked to select one of five weighted options corresponding to their perceptions concerning the proposition.

As depicted in the distribution of column one of Table I, there is significant agreement among teachers for propositions 1, 4, 6, 7, and 8 as to the causes of student discipline problems on the students, family or society, and not on the school. By agreeing with proposition 4, the teachers seem to feel that "many" discipline problems are teacher related, therefore possibly agreeing that some teachers are "ill" prepared to discipline students.

There is no significant agreement among teachers for propositions 2, 3, 5, 9, and 10, which place the causes of student discipline problems on the curriculum, teachers, principals, and the present day value that education has for students.

The general impression given by many of the teachers seems to indicate that the lack of parental guidance and other problems associated with home life tend to produce students who are disenchanted with school and rebel against school authorities. During the interview sessions, some teachers admitted having difficulty with discipline in the classroom, and attributed their problems to parents who did not adequately prepare their children for school either academically or socially. The negative behaviors demonstrated by children such as the use of profanity, gossiping, fighting, and rebelliousness against authority, they thought, were all behaviors learned from the home situation.

The media may be seen to feed the students' rebellious attitudes against authority in part by providing them with various forms for expression and, on the other hand, by seeming to suggest that violence and rebellion are tolerated in today's society.

Faced with ill-behaved and ill-mannered students, many teachers apparently see nothing in their preparation programs or in-service training programs that can help them to deal with modern day students.

Based on the evidence, we may conclude then, that the teachers neither agree nor disagree on the causes of the student discipline problem. Hypothesis I is neither accepted nor rejected.

#### Hypothesis II

There is no difference among principals in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems.

Hypothesis II was tested for similar reasons as Hypothesis I and measured in precisely the same manner.

As depicted in the distribution of column two of Table I, there is significant agreement among principals for propositions 1, 4, 7, 8, and 9 as to the causes of student discipline problems. All five propositions agreed upon by the principals place the causes of the student discipline problem on students, their parents, and teachers. For example, the principals appear to agree that the bulk of the problem stems from student frustration and lack of parental guidance. Perhaps it is felt that those students who are not properly prepared and supported in school matters by their parents experience a type of disinterest caused by general academic difficulties which lead to successive failures, and eventually total frustration and disenchantment with school. Also, perhaps student frustration along with continued parental apathy are compounded by teachers who are ill prepared to deal with, or choose not to deal with those students who are in dire need of their guidance and attention.

According to one principal who stated during the interview session, "Discipline is a problem in my school because of

teachers who won't do their jobs, and because of parents who don't care."

There is no significant agreement among principals for propositions 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10. Apparently, the principals as a group seem not to consider curriculum, teacher fear of student or parental reciprocity, lack of principal support for teachers, television and movie violence, or the value placed on education by students to be causes of discipline problems. It is interesting to note, however, that 42.8% of the principals had no opinion on propositions 2, 3, and 5. Evidently they could not decide as to whether present day curricular, teachers who fear student or parental reciprocity or lack of principal support for teachers affected or contributed to the discipline problem. On the other hand, the factors mentioned in propositions 2, 3, and 5 could have been perceived by the principals as causal factors, but were reluctant to admit their perceptions regarding the issues.

We may conclude then, that the principals neither agree nor disagree on the causes of the student discipline problem. Since no simple majority was determined concerning agreement or disagreement among the principals, the hypothesis of no difference among principals in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems is neither accepted nor rejected.

### Hypothesis III

There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems.

The purpose for testing Hypothesis III was to determine the extent of agreement or disagreement between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems. This test was performed by using the Chi-Square Test for Two Independent Samples.

There is essentially agreement between teachers and principals on the ten propositions concerning the causes of student discipline problems as indicated in column 3 of Table 1. The one proposition on which there appears to be disagreement is proposition 9, where principals seem more ready to place responsibility for student discipline on teachers than teachers are willing to accept. However, their difference in opinions is not quite statistically significant at the .05 confidence level. Therefore, the hypothesis of no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems is accepted.

### Hypothesis IV

There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions as to the role of the teacher in matters of student discipline.

The purpose for testing Hypothesis IV was to determine the extent of agreement or disagreement among the teacher respondents relative to the disciplinarian role of teachers, and to acquire some insight as to whether the teachers accepted or rejected the role of disciplinarian.

The hypothesis was tested through a series of five propositions which suggested various teacher responsibilities pertinent to student discipline. Procedures for testing remained the same as for hypotheses I and II. The extent of agreement or disagreement among teachers and principals and between teachers and principals concerning the five propositions is shown in Table 2.

As shown in column 1 of Table 2, the teachers as a group indicated agreement with propositions 3 and 5 which placed the responsibility for classroom discipline on the teacher, and suggested that the teacher should be able to effectively deal with most instances of student misbehavior prior to seeking assistance from others.

The teachers as a group did not indicate agreement concerning propositions 1, 2, and 4, which shifted the responsibility for classroom discipline to the principal and the parents of disruptive students. Thus, as a group, the teachers appeared to accept the role of disciplinarian. On the other hand, some members of the group displayed a great deal of indecisiveness when reacting to propositions 1 and 4. 42% of the teachers registered "no opinion" to the suggestion that misbehaving students should be sent from the classroom, while 50% of the teachers registered "no opinion" to the suggestion that principals and parents should have to deal with disrupting students. Perhaps their reactions of "no opinion" to the two propositions were stimulated by the stress of day to day dealings with disruptive students, as well as general feelings of helplessness

when seeking solutions to the many problems encountered. It might also appear that, although many of the teachers are aware of their professional duties concerning student discipline as directed by boards of education and state statutes, many of them are doubtful as to whether they should be held responsible for student discipline rather than principals or parents. Some of the teachers expressed during the interview sessions that they should be able to send disruptive students to the principal or his designee for disciplining. They seemed to believe that their primary responsibility was to instruct children rather than to discipline them. They also admitted that teaching could not take place without order and control.

Since group agreement was indicated for only two of the five propositions, the hypothesis of no difference among teachers in their perceptions as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline is rejected.

#### Hypothesis V

There is no difference among principals in their perceptions as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline.

The purpose for testing Hypothesis V was to determine the extent of agreement or disagreement among principal respondents as to the role of the teacher in student discipline. The five propositions used to solicit the reactions of teachers were also used to solicit the reactions of principals. The test of the hypothesis remained the same as for Hypothesis IV.



As shown in column 2 of Table 2, the principal group was in agreement on all five propositions at the .05 level. The propositions agreed upon by the principals clearly place the responsibility for classroom discipline upon the shoulders of the teacher, and discourages common practices such as sending disruptive students from the classroom, shifting discipline problems to others, and the use of corporal punishment.

Since a simple majority of agreement was indicated by the principals concerning the propositions which dealt with the teacher's disciplinarian role, the hypothesis of no difference among principals in their perceptions as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline is accepted.

#### Hypothesis VI

There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions as to the role of the teacher in matters concerning student discipline.

The purpose for testing Hypothesis VI was to determine the extent of agreement or disagreement between teachers and principals in their perceptions as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline. Hypothesis VI was tested by the Chi-Square Test for Two Independent Samples.

As indicated in column 3 of Table 2, agreement between teachers and principals existed for three of the five propositions which related to the teacher's role in matters of student discipline. Essentially, teachers and principals agreed upon propositions 1, 3, and 5, with slight disparity. For example, 50% of the teachers disagreed with proposition 1 which

suggested that teachers should be able to send disruptive students from the classroom while 42.8% of them had no opinion on the matter. On the other hand, 78.5% of the principals disagreed with the proposition and only 14.2% had no opinion. The principals tended to be firmer in their opinions regarding the matter.

Both groups expressed strong agreement with proposition 3 which dealt with the teacher's need to handle most instances of classroom misbehavior, and with proposition 5 which dealt with the teacher's need to attempt problem resolutions before seeking assistance from others. However, the teachers and the principals could not agree upon propositions 2 and 4, which dealt with the teacher's responsibility for student discipline. Seemingly, the principals perceived student discipline in the classroom as the teacher's responsibility, whereas, teachers may have perceived it as a responsibility to be shared among teachers, principals and parents.

Since a simple majority of three of the five propositions were agreed upon by the teachers and the principals concerning the teacher's role in student discipline, the hypothesis of no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions as to the role of the teacher in matters pertaining to student discipline is accepted.

### Hypothesis VII

There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline.

The purpose for testing Hypothesis VII was to determine the extent of agreement or disagreement among teacher respondents relative to the disciplinarian role of principals.

The hypothesis was tested through a series of five propositions which suggested various principal responsibilities pertinent to student discipline. Procedures for testing the hypothesis remained the same as for Hypotheses I, II, IV, and V. The extent of agreement or disagreement among teachers and principals concerning the five propositions is shown in Table 3.

As depicted in column one of Table 3, the teachers were in agreement at the .05 confidence level with propositions 6, 8, 9, and 10 which related to the disciplinarian role of the principal:

6. That serious student behavior problems such as fighting, use of profanity, alcohol and drugs should be dealt with by the principal.
8. That the principal should be highly visible in the school in order to prevent some discipline problems from occurring.
9. That principals should address themselves to student discipline problems only after teachers have dealt with them unsuccessfully, and have requested their assistance.

10. That the principal creates the discipline climate in the school by establishing general rules, regulations and procedures and enforcing them.

Apparently, principals are perceived by some teachers in regard to their role as disciplinarian as climate setters, establishers of rules and regulations, enforcers of rules and regulations, supporters of teachers, and handlers of serious discipline problems. Many principals were criticized by teachers during the interviews concerning the above points.

Interestingly enough, it appears that the teachers were more certain about the principal's disciplinarian role than they were of their own, as evidenced by the relative low percentage of teachers who expressed having "no opinion" to the propositions.

The teacher failed to reach agreement on proposition 7, and by doing so, seemed to indicate that they were unsure about the area of student discipline being as important to the principal's function as his administrative and supervisory duties were.

Since a simple majority of agreement was reached by the teachers concerning the five propositions, the hypothesis of no difference among teachers in their perceptions as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline is accepted.

## Hypothesis VIII

There is no difference among principals in their perceptions as to the role of the principal in matters of student discipline.

The purpose for testing Hypothesis VIII was to determine extent of agreement or disagreement among principals concerning the disciplinarian role of the principal, and to gain insight as to whether the principals accepted or rejected the role of disciplinarian. The five propositions used to solicit the opinions of the teacher group relative to the principal's discipline functions were also used to solicit the opinions of the principals. Procedures for testing the hypothesis remained the same as for Hypothesis VII.

As depicted in column 2 of Table 3, agreement was evidenced among the principals for four of the five propositions at the .05 confidence level. Based on the group's perceptions, the disciplinarian role of the principal included that of handling serious discipline problems, being visible within the building in order to prevent some problems from occurring, supporting teachers in their efforts to discipline students, and establishing school rules and regulations, and enforcing them. By agreeing with proposition 7, the principals expressed their general acceptance of the disciplinarian role.

The principals failed to agree on proposition 9. 50% of the group strongly disagreed with the proposition while 42.8% of them agreed. Perhaps the 42.8% of the principals who agreed with the proposition perceived themselves as being supporters of teachers, while the 50% who disagreed perceived themselves

to be responsible for the total picture of student discipline in the school and not merely supporters of teachers. The principals also seemed fairly certain of their feelings as evidenced by the low percentage of them who expressed "I have no opinion" to the propositions.

Since a simple majority of agreement was reached by the principals concerning the five propositions, the hypothesis of no *difference* among principals in their perceptions of the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline is accepted.

#### Hypothesis IX

There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions as to the role of the principal in matters pertaining to student discipline.

The purpose for testing Hypothesis IX was to determine the extent of agreement or disagreement between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the principal's disciplinary role. The hypothesis was tested by using the Chi-Square Test for Two Independent Samples.

Essentially, agreement was evidenced by the teachers and the principals for propositions 6, 8, and 10, as indicated in column 3 of Table 3. Generally, both groups seemed to perceive the principal's disciplinary role as that of establishing and enforcing school rules and regulations, being visible in the school so as to prevent certain problems from occurring, and handling the more serious problems such as fighting, the use of drugs, alcohol and profanity.

The teachers and principals failed to agree on propositions 7 and 9. Proposition 7 suggested that the principal did not have the time to actively involve himself in the handling of discipline problems due to his administrative and supervisory duties. However, this notion was almost completely rejected by the principals. On the other hand, 42.8% of the teachers agreed with the notion while 50% of them rejected it.

Proposition 9 had to do with the principal's involvement with discipline problems upon the request of the teacher, and was agreed upon by 79% of the teachers while 50% of the principals disagreed. Perhaps at this point, the teachers were expressing their need for the principal's support in matters of student discipline, while accepting initial responsibility for the resolution of problems. On the other hand, the principals were perhaps expressing their acceptance of the responsibility for total school discipline.

Both groups seemed to perceive the principal's role in student discipline as being key to the establishment of the total school atmosphere. They seemed to expect the principal to set the tone for discipline in the school by establishing and enforcing rules and regulations, handling the serious problems, supporting teachers in problem resolution, and by being visible so as to prevent some problems from occurring.

Since three of the five propositions were agreed upon by both teachers and principals, the hypothesis of no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the role of the principal in matters of student discipline is accepted.

TABLE 1

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL RESPONSES TO TEN PROPOSITIONS  
CONCERNING THE CAUSES OF THE STUDENT DISCIPLINE

Propositions	PROBLEM										Comparisons	
	1					2						3
	Teacher					Principal						
1. Some discipline problems are caused by the academically frustrated student of ever succeeding.	SA	A	M	D	SD	SA	A	M	D	SD		
	6	6	2	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	$X^2=2.154$	
	12	2		0		14	0		0			
	$X^2=13.048$			**		$X^2=28.000$			***	0		
2. Present day curricular offerings are meaningless and uninteresting to many students and are a leading cause of many school discipline problems.	2	0	6	6	0	5	0	6	0	3		
	2	6	6			5	6			3	$X^2=2.286$	
	$X^2=2.286$					$X^2=0.500$						
3. Many teachers are hesitant to discipline misbehaving students because they fear being attacked, or of having their cars or other properties damaged.	3	3	6	1	1	1	3	6	3	1		
	6	6		2		4	6		4			
	$X^2=2.286$					$X^2=0.571$					$X^2=1.067$	
4. Many problems of students discipline develop because teachers, for the most part, are ill-prepared, or do not feel responsible to deal with many situations involving student discipline that face them in the classroom or among their students.	5	6	1	2	0	3	7	3	1	0		
	11	1		2		10	3		1		$X^2=1.381$	
	$X^2=13.000$			**		$X^2=9.571$			**			
5. Student discipline is a problem in some cases because principals do not give teachers the support they need.	1	6	4	3	0	0	6	6	1	1		
	7	4		3		6	6		2		$X^2=.677$	
	$X^2=1.857$					$X^2=2.286$						

\*p &lt; .05

\*\*p &lt; .01

\*\*\*p &lt; .001

 $X^2 \geq 5.99$  $X^2 \geq 9.21$  $X^2 \geq 13.82$



TABLE 1 (Continued)

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL RESPONSES TO TEN PROPOSITIONS  
CONCERNING THE CAUSES OF THE STUDENT DISCIPLINE

Propositions	1					2					Comparisons
	Teacher					Principal					
6. Violence seen on television and in the movies contributes greatly to the misbehavior of some students while in school.	SA	A	M	D	SD	SA	A	M	D	SD	$X^2=1.091$
	2	6	6	0	0	3	5	5	1	0	
	8	6			0	8	5			1	
	$X^2=7.429^*$					$X^2=5.286$					
7. A breakdown structure and the lack of parental guidance and teaching in the home are basic causes of student misbehavior in school.	10	3	1	0	0	6	7	1	0	0	$X^2=0$
	13	1			0	13	1			0	
	$X^2=22.429^{***}$					$X^2=22.429^{***}$					
8. Many of today's students are less serious about school and have negative attitudes towards authority.	4	10	0	0	0	5	6	0	3	0	$X^2=3.360$
	14	0			0	11	0			3	
	$X^2=28.00^{***}$					$X^2=13.857^{***}$					
9. Many student discipline problems occur in the classroom because teachers basically feel that student discipline problems should be handled by the principal or his designee (assistant principal or other freed personnel).	2	3	3	4	2	2	8	2	2	0	$X^2=3.867$
	5	3			6	10	2			2	
	$X^2=1.000$					$X^2=9.143^*$					
10. The value of a high school diploma or college degree no longer has the importance once held and is reflected in current student behavior.	0	4	2	6	2	0	4	2	6	2	$X^2=0$
	4	2			8	4	2			8	
	$X^2=4.00$					$X^2=4.00$					

\*p &lt; .05

\*\*p &lt; .01

\*\*\*p &lt; .001

 $X^2 \geq 5.99$  $X^2 \geq 9.21$  $X^2 \geq 13.82$

TABLE 2

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL RESPONSES TO FIVE PROPOSITIONS  
CONCERNING THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER IN MATTERS  
OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE

Propositions	1					2					3
	Teacher					Principal					
1. Teachers should not have to tolerate any form of student disruption in the classroom. Students who interfere with the instructional program should be sent from the room.	SA	A	M	D	SD	SA	A	M	D	SD	$X^2=2.889$
	0	1	6	7	0	0	1	2	10	1	
	1		6		7	1		2		11	
	$X^2=4.429$					$X^2=13.000^{**}$					
2. Instructional preparation presentation and student evaluation are taxing enough. Teachers should not be held responsible for student discipline also.	0	1	6	6	1	0	0	0	8	6	$X^2=9.333^*$
	1		6		7	0		0		14	
	$X^2=4.429$					$X^2=28.00^{***}$					
3. Teachers should be able to effectively deal with most instances of classroom misbehavior.	6	7	1	0	0	6	7	1	0	0	$X^2=0$
	13		1		0	13		1		0	
	$X^2=22.429^{***}$					$X^2=22.429$					
4. Since teachers are not permitted to use corporal punishment, discipline problems should be dealt with by the principal or the parents of the students.	1	1	7	4	1	0	0	1	8	5	$X^2=10.056^{**}$
	2		7		5	0		1		13	
	$X^2=2.714$					$X^2=22.429^{***}$					
5. Teachers should make every attempt to solve classroom behavior problems prior to seeking assistance.	10	4	0	0	0	10	4	0	0	0	$X^2=0$
	14		0		0	14		0		0	
	$X^2=28.000^{***}$					$X^2=28.000^{***}$					

\*p &lt; .05

\*\*p &lt; .01

\*\*\*p &lt; .001

 $X^2 \geq 5.99$  $X^2 \geq 9.21$  $X^2 \geq 13.82$

TABLE 3

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL RESPONSES TO FIVE PROPOSITIONS  
CONCERNING THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN MATTERS  
OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE

Propositions	1					2					Comparisons
	Teacher					Principal					
	SA	A	M	D	SD	SA	A	M	D	SD	
6. Serious student behavior problems such as fighting, use of profanity, alcohol and drugs should be dealt with by the principal.	6	6	2	0	0	4	8	2	0	0	$X^2=0$
	12	2		0		12	2		0		
	$X^2=17.714$ ***					$X^2=17.714$ ***					
7. The need for curriculum development and general administrative duties prevent the principal from taking an active role in dealing with student discipline.	1	5	1	5	2	1	0	1	10	2	$X^2=4.887$
	6	1		7		1	1		12		
	$X^2=4.429$					$X^2=17.286$ ***					
8. The principal should be highly visible in the school in order to prevent some discipline problems from occurring.	8	5	0	1	0	6	8	0	0	0	$X^2=.537$
	13	0		1		14	0		0		
	$X^2=19.071$ ***					$X^2=28.000$ ***					
9. Principals should address themselves to student discipline problems only after teachers have dealt with them unsuccessfully, and have requested assistance.	6	5	0	3	0	2	4	1	6	1	$X^2=4.071$
	11	0		3		6	1		7		
	$X^2=11.357$ **					$X^2=4.429$					
10. The principal creates the discipline climate in the school by establishing general rules, regulations and procedures, and enforcing them.	9	5	0	0	0	5	7	2	0	0	$X^2=2.077$
	14	0		0		12	2		0		
	$X^2=28.000$ ***					$X^2=17.714$ ***					

\*p < .05                      \*\*p < .01                      \*\*\*p < .001

$X^2 \geq 5.99$                        $X^2 \geq 9.21$                        $X^2 \geq 13.82$

### Hypothesis X

There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions as to the types of policies, procedures and programs needed to remedy the student discipline problem.

The purpose for testing Hypothesis X was to determine the extent to which teachers agree among themselves concerning necessary policies, procedures, and programs needed to lessen the student discipline problem. The hypothesis was tested by having the teachers respond to the interview question of: "What can be done in the schools by teachers and principals to lessen the problem of student discipline?" Similar suggestions or opinions given by 60% of the teachers were considered as agreement.

The teachers gave several opinions on how to alleviate the problem, as depicted in Table 4. However, in no single case did 60% of them express similar opinions. 50% of the teachers seem to feel that the best approach to student control is to "establish and enforce rules and regulations on a consistent basis." For example, several of the teachers seemed to believe that their colleagues added to the problem by dealing with similar cases in different ways. One teacher complained that she did not approve of gum chewing in her classroom, and when her students witnessed it being done by others, it became a problem for her. Another teacher complained of the amount of profanity used by some students in another classroom and commented, "They could not get away with that in my classroom."

Another 21.4% of the teachers believed that the best solution to the problem was to establish programs aimed at "lessening tensions between teachers and administrators." Evidently, some of the teachers felt intimidated by principals who are direct in their criticisms concerning the handling of discipline problems. One teacher commented, "He makes me nervous. I know that I am having problems, and it seems that every time I look up, he's there criticizing and making suggestions."

The importance of the principal's support for teachers in their efforts to discipline students was emphasized very strongly by two of the teachers during the interview sessions. The first teacher mentioned that the principal in her school had "permitted" student discipline to become a serious problem by not supporting his teachers: "To send a student to the office is pointless," said the teacher, "because the principal sends them back to the classroom and does nothing." The second teacher indicated that her principal did not enforce the rules of the school as they pertained to student discipline, and did not believe in suspensions of any kind.

Other suggestions offered by the teachers to improve student discipline ranged from involving parents in the formation of rules and regulations to changing the curriculum, and from improving staff relations to pairing teachers with their students on the basis of personality.

Basically, the teachers as a whole expressed attitudes of helplessness while attempting to respond to the interview question. However, in two specific cases the teachers projected strong self confidence while offering suggestions. According to both teachers, in the final analysis rules and regulations that govern student discipline should be established by the principal. However, it is up to the individual classroom teacher to handle discipline problems that occur in the room without even expecting help from anyone.

Since there were no instances in which 60% of the teachers agreed to any one solution offered, the hypothesis of no difference among teachers in their perceptions as to the types of policies, procedures, and programs needed to alleviate the student discipline problem is rejected.

#### Hypothesis XI

There is no difference among principals in their perceptions as to the types of policies, procedures, and programs needed to remedy the student discipline problem.

The purpose for testing Hypothesis XI was to determine the extent to which principals agree among themselves concerning necessary policies, procedures, and programs needed to alleviate the student discipline problem. The hypothesis was tested the same as Hypothesis X.

Principals were asked the same interview question as the teachers. The suggestions given by principals were similar to the suggestions given by teachers as depicted in Table 5. However, again in no single instance did 60% of the principals agree.

50% of the principals suggested that school rules and regulations regarding student behavior should be established and enforced on a consistent basis. During the interview sessions, some of the principals commented that some teachers were not consistent in their approaches to handling misbehaving students, nor were they consistent in establishing classroom routines as well.

Programs to weed out teacher incompetence and unionism were suggested by one principal as the best possible way to solve the discipline problem. "Teachers who evidence problems with student discipline," said the principal, "also will evidence problems in other teaching areas." The principal also felt that too many "incompetent teachers" were protected in their positions by their union.

The suggestions given by the principals were seemingly based on principal action or initiation, perhaps reaffirming their feelings of total responsibility for school discipline.

Since there were no instances in which 60% of the principals agreed to any one suggestion offered, the hypothesis of no difference among principals in their perceptions of the types of policies, procedures and programs needed to remedy the student discipline problem is rejected.

## Hypothesis XII

There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions as to the types of policies, procedures and programs needed to remedy the student discipline problem.

The purpose for testing Hypothesis XII was to determine the extent to which teachers and principals agree to the types of policies, procedures, and programs needed to remedy the student discipline problem. The hypothesis was tested by comparing the suggestions given by both groups to the interview question: "What can be done in the schools by teachers and principals to lessen the student discipline problem?" The suggestions given by the teachers were compared with the suggestions given by the principals to determine what suggestions were mentioned in common, as well as what suggestions were mentioned by 60% of either group. Suggestions mentioned in common by 60% of both groups were considered as agreement.

As shown in Tables 4 and 5, eleven suggestions were mentioned in common by both groups, though not mentioned by 60% of either group.

Since the suggestions mentioned in common by both groups were fewer than 60%, and fewer than 60% of either group agreed with either suggestion, the hypothesis of no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the types of policies, procedures, and programs needed to remedy the student discipline problem is rejected.



TABLE 4

TEACHERS RESPONSES TO POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND PROGRAMS  
NEEDED TO REMEDY THE PROBLEM  
OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE

Responses	Percentage of Agreement
1. Establish rules and regulations on a consistent basis.	50%
2. Implement extra curricular activities	.07%
3. Pair teachers and students in the classroom on the basis of personality.	.07%
4. Lessen tensions between teachers and administrators.	.07%
5. Involve students in the formation of school rules and regulations.	14.2%
6. Establish goals jointly by principal, teachers, students and parents.	.07%
7. Reconstruct the curriculum.	.07%
8. Develop effective communications between teachers and administration.	.07%
9. Involve parents in rules formation.	14.2%
10. Establish better school organization and cooperation among staff.	.07%
11. Develop programs to meet the needs of emotionally disturbed students that do not necessitate the staffing procedures required by special education.	.07%

TABLE 5

PRINCIPAL RESPONSES TO POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND PROGRAMS  
NEEDED TO REMEDY THE PROBLEM  
OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE

Responses	Percentage of Agreement
1. Establish effective communications between teachers and administrators	.07%
2. Establish wholesome school climate	.07%
3. Establish teacher and principal unity	.07%
4. Build positive self images among students	.07%
5. Establish and enforce rules and regulations on a consistent basis	50%
6. Develop positive organizational patterns	.07%
7. Teachers and principals should become more professional and cooperative	14.2%
8. Build teacher morale	.07%
9. Weed out incompetence	.07%
10. Deemphasize unionism	.07%
11. Involve students in formulation of rules and regulations	.07%

## Summary

The purpose of Chapter IV was to present and analyze the data derived from the study. Twelve hypotheses were tested to determine the extent of agreement or disagreement that existed in perceptions among teachers, among principals, and between teachers and principals in regard to causes of the student discipline problem, the roles of the teacher and principal disciplinarian, and the opinions of both groups relative to possible policies, procedures, and programs needed to alleviate the student discipline problem.

Hypotheses I and II which pertained to teacher and principal perceptions of the causes of the student discipline problem were neither accepted nor rejected based upon the failure of both groups to demonstrate agreement or disagreement among themselves concerning the matter.

Hypothesis III was accepted based on the conclusion that teachers and principals essentially agree to the causes of student discipline problems; that is, although not agreeing among themselves as to the causes of problems, they tend to identify the same causal factors as a group.

Hypothesis IV was rejected based on the evidence that teachers do not agree as to what the disciplinarian role of the teacher is. Hypothesis V was accepted in that principals appear to agree as to what the role of the teacher disciplinarian is; and Hypothesis VI was accepted in that teachers and principals seem to agree on certain aspects of the teacher disciplinarian role.

Hypotheses VII, VIII, and IX were accepted as the accumulated evidence appeared to indicate agreement on the disciplinarian role of the principal by the teachers, agreement on the disciplinarian role of the principal by principals, with no difference in perceptions between the two groups regarding the matter.

Hypotheses X, XI, and XII were rejected in that the data derived indicated that teachers do not agree on the solutions needed to remedy the discipline problem; principals do not agree on the solutions needed to remedy the discipline problem, and there seemed to be no agreement between the two groups regarding the matter.

## CHAPTER V

### OVERVIEW, SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of Chapter V are to present an overview of the study, a summary of data analysis, a conclusion of the findings, recommendations for problem solving, and implications for further study.

#### Overview

This study was conducted in District Eleven of the Chicago Public School System among a sample population of twenty eight teachers and principals.

The purposes of the study were to determine the extent to which teachers and principals agree on the causes of student discipline problems, to determine the extent to which teachers and principals accept the role of disciplinarian, to determine if conflict situations exist within the role perceptions of teachers and principals in matters of student discipline, and to recommend possible policies, procedures, and programs to aid in the creation of school environments that are conducive to learning.

To make the above determinations, twelve Null hypotheses were tested with data collected via an opinionnaire and personal interview questions. The opinionnaire and taped interviews were administered to each teacher and principal participant on an in-

dividual basis. A summary of the data derived from the opinionnaire and interviews follow:

### Summary of Findings

#### Hypotheses I, II, and III

Hypotheses I, II, and III were tested to determine the extent to which teachers and principals agree on the causes of student discipline problems. These hypotheses assumed that teachers and principals who agree on causes of problems, may agree on means of problem solving.

#### Hypothesis I

There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems.

Based on the accumulated data derived from the opinionnaire and interviews, hypothesis I was neither accepted nor rejected. While teachers agreed on some causes of student discipline problems, they disagreed on others.

#### Hypothesis II

There is no difference among principals in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems.

Hypothesis II was neither accepted nor rejected. While principals agreed on some causes of student discipline problems, they disagreed on others.

### Hypothesis III

There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the causes of student discipline problems.

Based on the comparison of data derived for hypotheses I and II, Hypothesis III was accepted. Although not agreeing among themselves, teachers and principals identified similar factors that they considered as causes of discipline problems.

### Hypotheses IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX

Hypotheses IV through IX were tested to determine the extent to which teachers and principals agree on the teacher's and the principal's disciplinarian role. The hypotheses assumed that teachers and principals who agree on role definition and function may also agree on means of problem solving.

### Hypothesis IV

There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions of the role of the teacher in matters of student discipline.

In light of the data presented, hypothesis IV was rejected. The teachers did not agree on the role of the teacher in matters of student discipline.

### Hypothesis V

There is no difference among principals in their perceptions of the role of the teacher in matters of student discipline.

Based on the accumulated data, hypothesis V was accepted. Apparently the principals placed the responsibility for classroom

discipline on teachers and expected them to fulfill their responsibilities.

#### Hypothesis VI

There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the role of the teacher in matters of student discipline.

Hypothesis VI was accepted based on the conclusion that teachers and principals agree on certain aspects of the teacher's role in student discipline.

#### Hypothesis VII

There is no difference among teachers in their perceptions of the role of the principal in matters of student discipline.

In light of the data derived, hypothesis VII was accepted. Teachers tended to view the principal's role in student discipline as climate setting, establishing rules and regulations, supporting teachers, and enforcing rules and regulations.

#### Hypothesis VIII

There is no difference among principals in their perceptions of the role of the principal in matters of student discipline.

Hypothesis VIII was accepted. The principals agreed that their role in student discipline consisted of establishing and enforcing rules and regulations, handling the more serious discipline problems, supporting teachers in their efforts to discipline students, and being visible to students in order to prevent other problems from occurring.



### Hypothesis IX

There is no difference between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the role of the principal in matters of student discipline.

Based on the comparison of data derived for hypotheses VI and VIII, hypothesis IX was accepted. The principal's role in student discipline was agreed upon by both teachers and principals.

### Hypotheses X, XI, XII

Hypotheses X, XI, and XII assumed that teachers and principals who agree on problem solutions may work cooperatively towards achieving those solutions. In light of the accumulated data, hypotheses X, XI, and XII were rejected.

### Conclusions

This paper analyzed the critical problem of how elementary teachers and principals in one Chicago Public School district viewed the role of disciplinarian and its accompanying functions. Data analysis was done based on information derived from a Likert-type opinionnaire and personal interviews from which a number of conclusions can be drawn:

- (1) Teachers did not agree on the causes of discipline problems, nor did they disagree. They identified factors in the home and society as leading causes of problems. They did not associate the causes of discipline problems with teachers, principals, or any other school related variables.

- (2) Principals did not agree on the causes of discipline problems, nor did they disagree. Causes of discipline problems were perceived by principals similarly as by teachers.
- (3) Teachers and principals agreed on the causes of discipline problems. Though not agreeing among themselves, they identified similar variables as causal factors.
- (4) Although accepting the role of disciplinarian, teachers did not agree on the teacher's responsibility for student discipline.
- (5) Principals agreed as to the teacher's role in student discipline.
- (6) Teachers and principals agreed on certain aspects of the teacher's role in student discipline.
- (7) Teachers agreed on the role of the principal in student discipline.
- (8) Principals accepted the role of disciplinarian, and agreed on the functions performed by the principal.
- (9) Teachers and principals agreed on the role of the principal in matters of student discipline.
- (10) Teachers did not agree as to what policies, procedures, and programs are needed to alleviate the student discipline problem.

- (11) Principals did not agree as to what policies, procedures, and programs are needed to alleviate the student discipline problem.
- (12) Teachers and principals did not agree as to what policies, procedures, and programs are needed to alleviate the problem of student discipline.

### Recommendations

An analysis of the results of the opinionnaire and interview questions would justify the following recommendations:

- (1) Teacher responsibilities for classroom discipline should be enumerated in the form of a job description and discussed with district teachers by each building principal, followed by informal discussions.
- (2) Staff development programs geared towards the identification of all possible causes of student discipline problems should be implemented in the district on an ongoing basis.
- (3) Competence in classroom discipline should be made an intricate component of teacher efficiency ratings.
- (4) School committees should be formed in each of the schools in the district to study community problems that could possibly affect school discipline. Factors such as gang activity, drug usage, family disorganization, and the extent of parental involvement in the

school should be considered. School faculties should be made aware of all existing factors, and strategies developed to combat them.

- (5) Rules and regulations established within the schools to govern student behavior should be based on needs relative to potential problems. Students, teachers, and parents should be involved in the development of such rules and regulations.

#### Implications for Further Study

- (1) Similar research should be done in other Chicago school districts to determine if commonalities exist in conclusions.
- (2) Research might be conducted in smaller school systems in order to gain better insight into teacher and principal perceptions regarding the problem of student discipline.

## OPINIONNAIRE

## Background Information

You have been selected at random to participate in a district survey concerning your profession. The survey is intended to gather information aimed at the enhancement of classroom effectiveness; and to supply information for a doctoral dissertation. Your participation is voluntary and has been approved by your principal and your district superintendent. Should you decide to participate, complete anonymity will be given to you and your school.

\* \* \* \* \*

Please check the space next to the best description of you or your present position.

Position:

<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/> F.T.B.	<input type="checkbox"/> Certified
<input type="checkbox"/> Principal	<input type="checkbox"/> K-6	<input type="checkbox"/> K-8

Sex:

<input type="checkbox"/> Female	<input type="checkbox"/> Male
---------------------------------	-------------------------------

Number of years in present position:

<input type="checkbox"/> 1-5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6-10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11-15	<input type="checkbox"/> 16-20
------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

The following statements are suggested as probable causes of student discipline problems. Please circle the response following each statement that best reflects the extent of your agreement or disagreement with the statement:

SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; M = Maybe; D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree

Part I

1. Some discipline problems are caused by the academically frustrated student who has lost all hope of ever succeeding.  
SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD
  
2. Present day curricular offerings are meaningless and uninteresting to many students and is a leading cause of many school discipline problems.  
SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD
  
3. Many teachers are hesitant to discipline misbehaving students because they fear being attacked, or of having their cars or other properties damaged.  
SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD
  
4. Many problems of student discipline develop because teachers, for the most part, are ill prepared, or do not feel responsible to deal with many situations involving student discipline that face them in the classroom or among their students.  
SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD
  
5. Student discipline is a problem in some cases because principals do not give teachers the support that they need.  
SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD
  
6. Violence seen on television and in the movies contributes greatly to the misbehavior of some students while in school.  
SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

7. A breakdown in the family structure and the lack of parental guidance and teaching in the home is a basic cause of student misbehavior in school.

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

8. Many of today's students are less serious about school and have negative attitudes towards authority.

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

9. Many student discipline problems occur in the classroom because teachers basically feel that student discipline problems should be handled by the principal or his designee (assistant principal or other freed personnel).

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

10. The value of a high school diploma or a college degree no longer has the importance once held and is reflected in current student behavior.

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

### Part II

As done in Part I of this opinionnaire, please circle the response following the statement that best reflects the extent of your agreement or disagreement with the statements below:

1. Teachers should not have to tolerate any form of student disruption in the classroom. Students who interfere with the instructional program should be sent from the room.

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

2. Instructional preparation, presentation and student evaluation is taxing enough. Teachers should not be held responsible for student discipline also.

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

3. Teachers should be able to effectively deal with most instances of classroom misbehavior.

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

4. Since teachers are not permitted to use corporal punishment, discipline problems should be dealt with by the principal or the parents of the students.

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

5. Teachers should make every attempt to solve classroom behavior problems prior to seeking assistance.

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

6. Serious student behavior problems such as fighting, use of profanity, alcohol and drugs should be dealt with by the principal.

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

7. The need for curriculum development and general administrative duties prevents the principal from taking an active role in dealing with student discipline.

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

8. The principal should be highly visible in the school in order to prevent some discipline problems from occurring.

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

9. Principals should address themselves to student discipline problems only after teachers have dealt with them unsuccessfully, and have requested their assistance.

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD

10. The principal creates the discipline climate in the school by establishing general rules, regulations and procedures, and enforcing them.

SA                      A                      M                      D                      SD



## INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Should students' discipline problems be handled by the teacher, the principal or the principal's designee, such as the assistant principal or other freed personnel?
2. Is the teacher's prime function in the classroom to discipline children or to teach them?
3. Should teachers be expected to control students' behavior when so many students lack parental guidance?
4. What do you see to be the role of the teacher in adjusting student behavior?
5. What do you see to be the role of the principal in adjusting student behavior?
6. What can be done in the school by teachers and principals to lessen the student discipline problem?

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABC of School Violence. Time, 23 January 1978.
- Alschuler, Alfred et al. "Social Literacy: A Discipline Game Without Losers." Phi Delta Kappan, April 1977.
- Ban, John. "Teacher Unions Fight Back." American Educator, Summer, 1978.
- Banas, Casey. "Drugs, Discipline Problems Plague Chicago Principals." Chicago Tribune, 6 January 1976.
- Banas, Casey. "How Unruly Sabotage Teaching." Chicago Tribune, 20 January 1975, sec. 1, p. 6.
- Banas, Casey. "Singer Released Scathing Reports on City Schools." Chicago Tribune, 22 January 1975.
- Banas, Casey. "Student Discipline Is Ignored: Union." Chicago Tribune, 10 February 1978, sec. 4, p. 3.
- Banas, Casey. "Teachers Find Joy--And Frustration--In Their Jobs." Chicago Tribune, 19 January 1975, sec. 1, p. 10.
- Banas, Casey. "Teacher Survey of Public Schools." Chicago Tribune, 22 January 1975.
- Banas, Casey. "The Teachers' Unseen World." Chicago Tribune, 19 January 1975, sec. 1, p. 10.
- Bayh, Birch. "Seeking Solutions to School Violence and Vandalism." Phi Delta Kappan, January 1978.
- Bell, Terrell H. "A More Viable Home-School Partnership." Education Digest, April 1975.
- Bioarsky, Carolyn. "Youth Speak Out About Teachers." Today's Education, November 1971.
- Bixby, Annabel A. "Do Teachers Make A Difference?." Education Digest, September 1978.
- Breckenridge, Eileen. "Improving School Climate." Phi Delta Kappan, December 1976.

- Brodbelt, Samuel. "Teachers Mental Health: Whose Responsibility?." Phi Delta Kappan, December 1973.
- Brown, Frank B. "Forced Schooling." Phi Delta Kappan, January 1973.
- "Can't Buy Out School Violence, Congress Told." Chicago Sun Times, editorial, 25 January 1978, p. 5.
- Carnot, Joseph B. "Dynamic and Effective School Discipline." The Clearing House, November 1973.
- Chamberlin, Leslie J. and Carnot, Joseph B. Improving School Discipline. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.
- Chavez, Linda. "Teacher to Teacher." American Educator, Summer, 1978.
- Chernow, Fred B. and Chernow, Carol. School Administrator's Guide to Managing People. West Nyack, New Y.rk: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1976.
- Chicago Public School Suspension. Chicago: American Friends Service Committee, Inc., 1976.
- Cohen, Dorothy H. "Television and the Perception of Reality." The National Elementary School Principal, January, 1977.
- Cole, Robert W. "Black Moses: Jesse Jackson's Push for Excellence." Phi Delta Kappan, January 1977.
- Constitution of the State of Illinois--Preamble." Illinois Principal, September 1978.
- Conyers, Mary G. "Comparing School Success of Students from Conventional and Broken Homes." Phi Delta Kappan, April 1977.
- Cross, Dorothy W. "Improving the Quality of Family Life." Childhood Education, November-December 1977.
- Cuban, Larry. "Discipline and American Students." Social Education, February 1978.
- Cultice, Wendell W. Positive Discipline for a More Productive Educational Climate. Engelwood Cliffs, N. J., 1969.
- Cunningham, Luvern L. "Hey Man, You Our Principal?." Phi Delta Kappan, November 1969.

- Cunningham, William G. and Owens, Ray C. "Social Promotion: Problem or Solution?." NASSP Bulletin, October 1976.
- Cutts, Norma E. and Mosely, Nicholas. Teaching the Disorderly Pupil in Elementary and Secondary Schools. New York: Longmans, Greens and Company, 1957.
- DeCecco, John P. and Richards, Arlene K. "Using Negotiation for Teaching Civil Liberties and Avoiding Liability." Phi Delta Kappan, September 1975.
- DeYoung, Chris A. and Wynn, Richard. American Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968.
- Discipline Crisis in Schools. National School Public Relations Association, 1973.
- Dobson, Russell Lee. "The Perception and Treatment By Teachers of the Behavioral Problems of Elementary School Children in Culturally Deprived and Middle-Class Neighborhoods." Ed.D. dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1966.
- Duffee, David. "Due Process: Can It Thrive in a Classroom?." Instructor, August-September 1974.
- Duke, Daniel L. "how Administrators View the Crisis in School Discipline." Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1978.
- Eckbreth, Cathy. "Discipline in the Secondary Classroom." Social Education, February 1978.
- Eigerman, Hyman. "Take the Maladjusted Child Out of the Classroom." Educational Digest, March 1974.
- Elsbree, Willard S. and McNally, Harold J. Elementary School Administration and Supervision, 2nd ed. New York: American Book Company, 1959.
- Erickson, Kenneth A. "Disruptive Youth: How They Waste the Minds of Missions." NASSP Bulletin, February 1976.
- Ernst, Ken. Games Students Play. Millbrae, California: Celestial Arts Publisher, 1972.
- Fantini, Mario and Weinstein, Herald. Making Urban Schools Work. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Fontein, Hazel. "Re: Discipline: An Ounce of Prevention." Social Education, February 1978.

- Foster, Herbert L. "Don't Be Put On! Learn About The Games Kids Play." Today's Education, September-October 1975.
- Frost, Joe L. and Rowland, G. Thomas. Curricula for the Seventies. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1969.
- Gatti, Daniel J. and Gatti, Richard D. The Teacher and the Law. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.
- Gallup, George H. "The Public Looks at the Public Schools." Today's Education, September-October 1975.
- Gallup, George H. "Eighth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitude Toward the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, October 1976.
- Gallup, George H. "The Tenth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitude Toward the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, September 1978.
- Gallup, George H. "The Eleventh Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitude Toward the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, September 1979.
- Gross, Ronald and Gross, Beatrice. Radical School Reform. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969.
- Hansen, J. Merrell. "Discipline: A Whole New Bag." The High School Journal, February 1974.
- Havighurst, Robert J. and Heugarten, Bernice L. Society and Education, 3rd ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.
- Hawkins, Vincent J. "The Negativism of Corporal Punishment." The Clearing House, May 1976.
- Hechinger, Fred M. "Due Process for the Unruly Child." Saturday Review, April 5, 1975.
- Henning, Joel F. "Student Rights and Responsibilities and the Curriculum." Phi Delta Kappan, December 1974.
- Herman, Wayne L. The Principal's Guide to Teacher Personnel Problems in the Elementary School. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1966.
- Holst, Alvin W. "Educational Climate A Prime Responsibility of the School Administrator." The Clearing House, November 1973.

- House, Earnest R. Survival in the Classroom. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.
- How Students Rate Their Schools and Teachers. The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1971.
- Howard, Eugene R. "School Climate Improvement." Education Digest, April 1974.
- Hunt, Thomas C. and Clawson, Elmer V. "Dropouts: Then and Now." Education Digest, September 1975.
- Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.
- Kotleba, James John. "A Comparison of Attitudes of Teachers and Mental Hygienists Toward Behavior Problems of Children in 1975 with Those Reported by E. K. Wickman In 1928." Ed.D. dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1976.
- Kotulak, Ronald. "Kids Who Watch TV--They'd Rather Fight." Chicago Tribune, 9 January 1979, sec. 1, p. 1.
- Kyte, George C. The Elementary Teacher At Work. New York: The Dryden Press, 1958.
- Ladd, Edward T. "Regulating Student Behavior Without Ending Up In Court." Phi Delta Kappan, January 1973.
- Lambert, Edward C. "An Attitudinal Study of Missouri State Leaders Toward the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, December 1975.
- LEAA Newsletter, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., May 1975.
- Licata, Joseph W. "Student Brinkmanship and School Structure." The Educational Forum, March 1978.
- Love, Ruth B. "Let's Reward for Success--Not Failure." The Reading Teacher, October 1976.
- Lumpkins, Bobby Gene. "The Relationship Between Experienced Elementary School Teachers' Role-Preferences And Their Attitude Toward Behavior Problems of Children." Ed.D. dissertation, North Texas State University, 1970.

- MacFeeley, Richard W. "The Nuts and Bolts of Procedural Due Process." Phi Delta Kappan, January 1975.
- Madsen, Charles H., Jr. and Madsen, Clifford K. Teaching Discipline. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974.
- Marker, Gerald W. et al. "Schools, Politics, Rebellion, and Other Youth Interests." Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1974.
- Maynard, William. "Basic Approaches to Violence and Vandalism." Phi Delta Kappan, January 1978.
- Miles, Carlotta G. "Helping Parents Help Their Children," Education Digest, December 1977.
- Miller, William C. "Public Education and Personal Liberty." The Educational Forum, May 1970.
- Mills, Hubert H. and Douglas, Karl R. Teaching in High School. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1957.
- Mixer, Anthony S. and Milson, James L. "Teaching and the Self." The Clearing House, February 1973.
- Mosley, Kent S. "A Discipline Alternative." Education Digest, January 1977.
- Mosteller, Frederick and Moynihan, Daniel. On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House, Inc., 1972.
- Muson, Howard. "Teenager Violence and the Telly." Psychology Today, v. 2, No. 10, March 1978.
- Nolte, M. Chester. School Law in Action. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.
- Nolte, M. Chester. "The Supreme Court's New Ruling for Due Process." The American School Board Journal, March, 1975.
- Neill, Shirley Boes. "Violence and Vandalism: Dimensions and Correctives." Phi Delta Kappan, November 1969.
- Neill, Shirley Boes. "Violence and Vandalism: Dimensions and Correctives." Phi Delta Kappan, January 1978.
- Observations made by writer in a near southside elementary school, 1975.

- Passow, Harry. "Reforming America's High Schools." Education Digest, October 1975.
- Pearl, Arthur. "There Is Nothing More Loco Than Loco Parent" Phi Delta Kappan, June 1972.
- Postman, Neil and Weingarten, Charles. The School Book. New York: Delacorte Press, 1973.
- Riessman, Frank. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Board of Education. Sections 6-12; 6-13, Revised, 1964.
- Sanders, Stanley G. and Yarbrough, Janis S. "Bringing Order to an Inner-City Middle School." Phi Delta Kappan, December 1976.
- Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problems of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Schimmel, David and Fisher, Louis. "Discipline and Due Process in the Schools." Update on Law Related Education, Fall, 1977.
- Schimmel, David and Fisher, Louis. "Discipline and Due Process in the Schools." The Education Digest, January 1978.
- Schneidman, Dave. "Principals Rip Redmond On School Transfers." Chicago Tribune, 19 January 1975, sec. 1, p. 24.
- The School Code of Illinois. compiled by N. E. Hutson, Circular Series A., No. 265, 1969.
- Scriven, Georgia. "Teachers Working with Parents in Schools." Peabody Journal of Education, October 1975.
- Serow, Robert and Strike, Kenneth A. "Do High School Students Support Administrators' Authority?" Phi Delta Kappan, September 1978.
- Shane, Harold G. "Children Need A Pole to Grow On." Today's Education, January-February 1975.
- Shane, Harold G. "The Problem of Youth." Today's Education, September-October, 1975.
- Siegel, Signey. Nonparametric Statistics: For the Behavioral Sciences. McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1956.



- Slater, Gail. "Brought To You By ...." The Massachusetts Teacher, January-February 1977.
- Slater, Jack. "Death of a High School." Phi Delta Kappan, December 1974.
- Spencer, David X. "A Harlem Parent Speaks." Today's Education, March-April 1975.
- Stoops, Emery and Stoops, Joyce King. "Discipline or Disaster?." Phi Delta Kappan Fast Back No. 8., Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation, 1972.
- Suspension and Expulsion in Chicago Public Schools. Chicago: Commission on Human Relations, 1976.
- Swift, David W. "Variations in the Role of the School Administrator." The Elementary School Journal, November 1974.
- "Teacher Effect on First Grade Student Cited." Chicago Sun Times, 22 March 1978, p. 59.
- "Teacher Opinion Poll." Today's Education, September-October 1975.
- "Television Violence: A Call to Arms." Science News, v. 3, 23 April 1977.
- Thomas, M. Donald. "Let's Talk Sense About Discipline." The Clearing House, May 1977.
- Thompson, George. "Discipline and the High School Teacher." The Clearing House, May 1976.
- "Time to Get Tough on Toughs." Senior Scholastic, 7 April 1978.
- Travers, Edwin X. "How Human Is Your Classroom?." Today's Education, November-December, 1975.
- "The Trials of Television." Newsweek, 10 October 1977.
- Traub, Raymond Gordon. "The Effect of Teacher Behavior on Patterns of Student Behavior." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1968.
- Violent Schools--Safe Schools. The National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., December 1977.

- Vukelich, Carol. "Parents Are Teachers." The Reading Teacher, February 1978.
- Wallen, Carl J. and Wallen, LaDonna L. Effective Classroom Management. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.
- Waller, William. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1932.
- Wattenberg, William. "Signs of Emotional Disturbance." Today's Education, March-April 1975.
- Wegmann, Robert G. "Classroom Discipline--A Negotiable Item." Today's Education, September-October 1976.
- Westside Chicago High School Teacher. Interview, 9 August 1978.
- Wickman, E. K. Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes. New York: The Commonwealth Fund Division of Publication, 1928.
- Zimmerman, William G., Jr. "Human Rights and Administrative Responsibility." Phi Delta Kappan, December 1974.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Floyd Malone Banks has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Melvin P. Heller, Director  
Professor, Administration and  
Supervision and Chairman, Department  
of Administration and Supervision,  
Loyola

Dr. Phillip Carlin  
Associate Professor, Administration  
and Supervision, Loyola

Dr. Robert Monks  
Associate Professor, Administration  
and Supervision, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

May 19, 1980  
Date

M. P. Heller  
Director's Signature