

A STUDY OF PARENT-PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF
BEHAVIORAL MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS AND THEIR TREATMENT
IN SELECTED TEXAS PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Ronald Lynn McMichael
December 1976

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation is extended to those who made up the research committee and who supervised this work in its entirety. A special thanks is extended to Dr. Jody L. Stevens for his untiring efforts in the completion of the study.

My acknowledgments would be incomplete if I failed to recognize my wife, Peggy, and our daughters, Manda and Brenna, without whose love, devotion, and encouragement this work would never have been done.

A STUDY OF PARENT-PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF
BEHAVIORAL MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS AND THEIR TREATMENT
IN SELECTED TEXAS PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

An Abstract of a Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Ronald Lynn McMichael
December 1976

McMichael, Ronald Lynn. "A Study of Parent-Principal Perceptions of Behavioral Management Problems and Their Treatment in Selected Texas Public Elementary Schools." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Houston, December, 1976.

Committee Chairman: Dr. Jody L. Stevens

Abstract

Purpose

The purpose of this study was twofold: first, to determine if significant relationships existed between the perceptions that parents and elementary school principals held regarding the frequency that selected behavioral management practices were employed and should have been employed in the public elementary schools; secondly, to determine if significant relationships existed between the perceptions that parents and elementary school principals held regarding selected behavioral management problems which occur in the schools.

Procedures

The randomly selected subjects for this study were fifty-two elementary school principals and three hundred sixty-four parents of elementary school children from twenty-four school districts located in a ten county area along the central Texas gulf coast. Parents and principals were administered the Behavior Management Questionnaire. Four hypotheses were presented which related to each item on Part 1 of the questionnaire while one hypothesis was tested for each item on Part 2 of the questionnaire. The chi square test was applied to the findings, and significant relationships were determined at the .05 level.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were reached:

1. There was no significant difference between the current application of selected behavioral management practices and the perceptions principals held regarding the frequency that these practices should have been employed.
2. In a majority of cases, there was a significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the selected behavioral management techniques were employed and the frequency that, in their opinion, the techniques should have been employed.
3. In a majority of cases, there was no significant difference between the frequency that selected behavioral management practices were employed, as reported by elementary school principals, and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practices were employed.
4. In a majority of cases, there was no significant difference between the perceptions that parents and elementary school principals held regarding the frequency that selected behavioral management practices should have been employed.
5. In a majority of cases, there was no significant difference in the seriousness of selected behavior problems as perceived by parents and by elementary school principals.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are suggested for public school practices and research:

Public School Practice

1. Principals should expand their repertoire of behavioral management practices to include not only those practices that are more traditional in nature but also those practices that are more innovative.
2. A more efficient communication system should be developed between home and school with the precise purpose of informing parents about the nature of behavior problems in the school and the preventative measures that have been taken to avoid problem areas.
3. Parents should be informed of the entire scope of the school's resources that may be put into operation in an

effort to resolve disruptive behavior.

4. A communication system should be established whereby the community may have input relating to the measures that should be taken in an effort to resolve behavior problems.

Research

Further study should be undertaken to examine the causes for the differing parental perceptions related to the practices that principals employ and should employ. Particular emphasis upon community values and moral expectations should be considered fundamental to the research.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction, Background, and Purpose of the Study	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	11
Hypotheses	13
Limitations of the Study	14
Definition of Terms	14
Summary	16
2. Review of Related Literature	17
Historical Background of School Discipline	17
Contemporary Practices in School Discipline	23
Behavior Modification	24
Psychoanalytic Approaches	28
Behavior Modifying Drugs	34
Punitive Measures	38
Summary	47
3. Design of the Study	49
Introduction	49
Procedures	49
Sample	50
Collection of Data	51
Instrumentation	52

Chapter	Page
<i>Analysis of Data</i>	54
<i>Summary</i>	54
4. <i>Organization and Presentation of Data</i>	55
<i>Analysis of Data</i>	55
<i>Part 1: Behavioral Management Technique</i>	
<i>Profile</i>	55
<i>Part 2: Behavior Problems Profile</i>	157
<i>Summary</i>	177
5. <i>Summary of Findings, Conclusions, and</i>	
<i>Recommendations</i>	178
<i>Summary of Findings and Conclusions</i>	178
<i>Conclusion 1</i>	178
<i>Conclusion 2</i>	180
<i>Conclusion 3</i>	183
<i>Conclusion 4</i>	186
<i>Conclusion 5</i>	188
<i>Recommendations</i>	189
<i>Summary</i>	191
<i>Bibliography</i>	192
A. <i>Books</i>	193
B. <i>Periodicals</i>	196
C. <i>Miscellaneous</i>	200
<i>Appendixes</i>	203
A. <i>Instrumentation</i>	204
B. <i>Letters of Permission and Instruction</i>	209
<i>Vita</i>	216

List of Tables

Table	Page
1.1 The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	57
1.2 The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	58
1.3 The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A) and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	59
1.4 The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	60
2.1 The Frequency that the Practice of Telephonine Parents to Pick Up Their Child Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	61
2.2 The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents to Pick Up Their Child Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	62
2.3 The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents to Pick Up Their Child Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	63
2.4 The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents to Pick Up Their Child Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	64
3.1 The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Parent-Teacher Conferences Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	65
3.2 The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Parent-Teacher Conferences Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	66

3.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Parent-Teacher Conferences Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	67
3.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Parent-Teacher Conferences Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	68
4.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Suspending a Student from School Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	69
4.2	The Frequency that the Practice of Suspending a Student from School Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	70
4.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Suspending a Student from School Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	71
4.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Suspending a Student from School Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	72
5.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Expelling a Student from School is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	73
5.2	The Frequency that the Practice of Expelling a Student from School is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	74
5.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Expelling a Student from School Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	75
5.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Expelling a Student from School Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	76
6.1	The Frequency that the Technique of Role Playing Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	77

Table

Page

6.2	The Frequency that the Technique of Role Playing Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	78
6.3	The Frequency that the Technique of Role Playing is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	79
6.4	The Frequency that the Technique of Role Playing Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B) and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B) .	80
7.1	The Frequency that the Technique of Group Counseling Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	81
7.2	The Frequency that the Technique of Group Counseling Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	82
7.3	The Frequency that the Technique of Group Counseling Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	83
7.4	The Frequency that the Technique of Group Counseling Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B) .	84
8.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Behavior Modifying Drugs Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	85
8.2	The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Behavior Modifying Drugs is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	86
8.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Behavior Modifying Drugs Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	87
8.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Behavior Modifying Drugs Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	88
9.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Requesting Parent-Principal Conferences Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	89

Table

Page

9.2	The Frequency that the Practice of Requesting Parent-Principal Conferences Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	90
9.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Requesting Parent-Principal Conferences Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	91
9.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Requesting Parent-Principal Conferences Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	92
10.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Isolating a Student Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	93
10.2	The Frequency that the Practice of Isolating a Student Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	94
10.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Isolating a Student Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	95
10.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Isolating a Student Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	96
11.1	The Frequency that the Technique of Injecting Humor into the Situation Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	97
11.2	The Frequency that the Technique of Injecting Humor into the Situation Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	98
11.3	The Frequency that the Technique of Injecting Humor into the Situation Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	99
11.4	The Frequency that the Technique of Injecting Humor into the Situation Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	100

Table

Page

12.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Praise or Recognition Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	101
12.2	The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Praise or Recognition Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	102
12.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Praise or Recognition Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A).	103
12.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Praise or Recognition Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	104
13.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Establishing a Written Contract Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	105
13.2	The Frequency that the Practice of Establishing a Written Contract Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	106
13.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Establishing a Written Contract Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	107
13.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Establishing a Written Contract Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	108
14.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Administering Corporal Punishment Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	109
14.2	The Frequency that the Practice of Administering Corporal Punishment Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	110
14.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Administering Corporal Punishment Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	111
14.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Administering Corporal Punishment Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	112

Table	Page
15.1 The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Juvenile Authorities is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	113
15.2 The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Juvenile Authorities Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents . . .	114
15.3 The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Juvenile Authorities Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	115
15.4 The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Juvenile Authorities Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	116
16.1 The Frequency that the Practice of Placing a Student in a Crisis Room is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	117
16.2 The Frequency that the Practice of Placing a Student in a Crisis Room Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	118
16.3 The Frequency that the Practice of Placing a Student in a Crisis Room Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A).	119
16.4 The Frequency that the Practice of Placing a Student in a Crisis Room Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	120
17.1 The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to an Alternative School is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals . .	121
17.2 The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to an Alternative School Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	122
17.3 The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to an Alternative School Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	123

17.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to an Alternative School Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	124
18.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to the Guidance Counselor Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals . .	125
18.2	The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to the Guidance Counselor Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	126
18.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to the Guidance Counselor Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	127
18.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to the Guidance Counselor Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	128
19.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Transferring a Child to Another Classroom or to Another Teacher Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	129
19.2	The Frequency that the Practice of Transferring a Child to Another Classroom or to Another Teacher Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	130
19.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Transferring a Child to Another Classroom or to Another Teacher Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	131
19.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Transferring a Child to Another Classroom or to Another Teacher Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	132
20.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Student for Psychological Aid or Evaluation Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals.	133
20.2	The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Student for Psychological Aid or Evaluation Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents . .	134

20.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Student for Psychological Aid or Evaluation Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	135
20.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Student for Psychological Aid or Evaluation Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	136
21.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Child to a Disciplinary Committee Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals . .	137
21.2	The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Child to a Disciplinary Committee Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	138
21.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Child to a Disciplinary Committee Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	139
21.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Child to a Disciplinary Committee Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	140
22.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Using a Special Resource Person Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	141
22.2	The Frequency that the Practice of Using a Special Resource Person Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	142
22.3	The Frequency that the Practice of Using a Special Resource Person Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	143
22.4	The Frequency that the Practice of Using a Special Resource Person Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	144
23.1	The Frequency that the Practice of Verbal Reprimand Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	145

Table	Page
23.2 The Frequency that the Practice of Verbal Reprimand Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	146
23.3 The Frequency that the Practice of Verbal Reprimand Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	147
23.4 The Frequency that the Practice of Verbal Reprimand Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B).	148
24.1 The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Tangible Rewards Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	149
24.2 The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Tangible Rewards Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	150
24.3 The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Tangible Rewards Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	151
24.4 The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Tangible Rewards Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	152
25.1 The Frequency that the Practice of Detention Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals	153
25.2 The Frequency that the Practice of Detention Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents	154
25.3 The Frequency that the Practice of Detention Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)	155
25.4 The Frequency that the Practice of Detention Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)	156
26. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Insubordination or Disrespect as Reported by Parents and Principals	158
27. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Physical Assault on Others as Reported by Parents and Principals	159

Table	Page
28. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Vandalism as Reported by Parents and Principals	160
29. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Truancy as Reported by Parents and Principals	161
30. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Fighting as Reported by Parents and Principals	162
31. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Theft as Reported by Parents and Principals	163
32. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Disobedience as Reported by Parents and Principals	164
33. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Continual Disruptive Classroom Behavior as Reported by Parents and Principals	165
34. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Obscenity, Profanity, or Vulgarity as Reported by Parents and Principals	166
35. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Possessing Dangerous Weapons as Reported by Parents and Principals	167
36. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Behavior Endangering Another or Impinging on Another's Rights as Reported by Parents and Principals	168
37. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Absenteeism as Reported by Parents and Principals	169
38. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Physical or Verbal Intimidation of Other Students as Reported by Parents and Principals	170
39. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Habitual Tardiness as Reported by Parents and Principals	171
40. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Verbal Abuse of Other Students as Reported by Parents and Principals	172
41. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Cheating as Reported by Parents and Principals	173

Table	Page
42. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Misbehavior on the School Bus as Reported by Parents and Principals	174
43. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Lying as Reported by Parents and Principals	175
44. The Seriousness Associated with the Problem of Selling, Possessing, or Distributing Drugs as Reported by Parents and Principals	176
45. A Summary of Calculated Chi Square Values for Items 1-25 as They Relate to the Significant Difference Between the Frequency that the Practice Is Employed and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals . . .	179
46. A Summary of Calculated Chi Square Values for Items 1-25 as They Relate to the Significant Difference Between the Frequency that the Practice Is Employed and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents	181
47. A Summary of Calculated Chi Square Values for Items 1-25 as They Relate to the Significant Difference Between the Frequency that the Practice Is Employed, as Reported by Principals, and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents	183
48. A Summary of Calculated Chi Square Values for Items 1-25 as They Relate to the Significant Difference Between the Frequency that the Practice Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents, and as Reported by Principals	186
49. A Summary of Calculated Chi Square Values for Items 26-44 as They Relate to the Significant Difference Between Parent and Principal Perceptions of the Seriousness of Selected Behavior Management Problems . .	189

Chapter 1

Introduction, Background, and Purpose of the Study

Introduction

Any discussion of discipline is, at best a complex and controversial topic. The subject of discipline in the public schools has been a concern to educators and parents alike from the "hickory stick" days of colonial America to the present. The degree of importance associated with the issue now seems to be much greater than in the past, as is evidenced by the abundance of published writings in this area. Discipline has always been a significant element in the administration of our schools but indications are that we have graduated from the era of dipping pigtaails into inkwells and have gone on to problems with many added dimensions. Robitaille (1968:193) alludes to this point:

Teachers look back nostalgically to the days when a spitball was a serious misdeed. Today, misbehavior in the elementary school takes a much more disturbing form: writing on walls, vandalizing school buildings, destroying books, using vulgar and profane language, fighting in gangs.

He goes on to say that this behavior is not typical of all pupils but that it does appear that a minority of children are exhibiting serious anti-school behavior.

Volumes have been written on the management of classroom behavior. Teachers are saturated with research findings on innovative techniques and practices designed to help with the unruly child. A deaf ear may

often be turned to those who so readily espouse practices designed to facilitate a desirous atmosphere for learning. McNair (1968:185) made suggestions to the teacher such as be yourself, be positive, be business-like, be consistent, plan ahead, know where to go for help, and know what constitutes good discipline. DeRoche (1968:180) posed the idea of "creative discipline" wherein the teacher should develop the sensitivity of pupils, should use originality in coping with behavior, should employ flexibility in dealing with classroom problems, and should provide opportunities for pupils to analyze their behavior.

This is by no means an indictment of these practices and is not to say that psychoanalytic, behavioral modification or strictly punitive approaches are categorically inappropriate, for they are not. Each has its own place in the scheme of classroom control. At their present stage of usage, however, there is a question as to their effectiveness.

The concern over school discipline problems continues to mount, and the extent of this alarm is quite clear. The Seventh Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education (Gallup, 1975) offers some insight into the way the public feels about school discipline. For the sixth time in seven years, a lack of discipline was named as the number one problem with the public schools. About this state of affairs in the schools Gallup has noted:

The findings are disturbing, and suggest that something must be done if the public's confidence and respect for the school is to remain at a high level. Critics will most certainly point to the schools as a breeding ground for crime and violence and future Watergates.

Ample statistics are available to support the contention that behavioral problems among our young are increasing at an alarming rate. Studies by Glidewell and Swallow (1968) and Klein and Lindemann (1964)

reveal that between ten and fifteen per cent of our preschool and elementary school-aged children were found to have had major emotional problems or symptoms of very poor adjustment. The National School Boards Association (The American School Board Journal, January, 1975: 27) reports that one-half of all serious crime in this country is committed by children under the age of eighteen. The problem appears to be one of all ages and of both sexes. The NSBA report goes on to say that crime among teenage girls rose three hundred and eighty-eight (388) per cent during the 1960's, almost twice the rate as that for teenage boys. In dollars, the cost of school violence approaches \$500 million annually with school vandalism alone accounting for approximately \$100 million per year.

A statistical review of violence, crime, and emotional maladjustment among our young does not shed light upon the entire issue, however. A concern to educators and parents alike is not solely the crime and violence but the atmosphere of fear, hostility, and apprehension that has been created in the schools by a small number of ruffians and emotional misfits who seem to prey upon the fears of more submissive children. The statement from parents that "my child is afraid to come to school" has become increasingly common to the school administrator of today. The results of harassment and abuse, not always of a physical nature, can never be measured. One may be reminded of the thought that the child who fears school today may do so for reasons totally different from the reasons that his parents expressed as youngsters.

There can be little doubt that the problems of discipline in our schools are no longer of the "spitball" variety. In order to deal with the behavioral problems of today, the administrator must be some-

one in whom both teachers and parents have a great deal of faith and confidence and someone who can deal with children in a constructive manner. The nature of the problems has changed in recent years and the nature of the child has also been altered. What was a sure thing to work "back then" is no longer so much as an "even bet."

The effective school principal who steps forward to meet the challenge and obligation of motivating children to grow toward responsible behavior through self-discipline, as is posed by Sheviakov and Redl (1956), may do so in a number of ways. Through his influence upon the school and its environment and through his relationship with teachers, pupils, and parents he may set about achieving the desired end.

Statement of the Problem

For the purpose of this study, the principal's efforts to accomplish the control of behavior problems in his school have been viewed from two perspectives: that of the parent and that of the principal himself.

Recognizing that the classroom teacher is often called the "first front" in handling children with problems, this study did not seek to neglect the teacher or to question his degree of importance in this matter. As stated earlier, however, a great deal has already been written with regard to the teacher in his role as a disciplinarian. Rather than proceeding along lines which have already been extensively explored, this study has gone one step further and focused upon the relationship between the principal and the parent.

In matters calling for mutual effort between home and school the principal becomes the figurehead of the school. In the event that the

parent is pleased and satisfied with the school's efforts in dealing with his child, then the principal, in the parent's opinion, is largely responsible. If, however, the parent feels that the school is lax or negligent in its efforts and fails to deal adequately with his child's problems, that charge too must come to rest upon the shoulders of the principal. In either case, the principal is ultimately accountable.

In becoming involved with discipline problems, the principal usually does so after the teacher has reached a decision to call for help. The principal, at this point, is charged with the responsibility of establishing a course of action that must be designed to help the child. Many factors come into play at this time. The principal, by virtue of his position, is able to reduce the gap between the home and the school. He may wish to consult with business, civic, or religious leaders within the community about possible solutions. In the course of all of this he must maintain a hand on the pulse of the community and must be aware of the pressures and expectations that are placed upon its children.

The cooperative effort of parents, principal, and other adults in the community is an important factor in resolving the problems of troubled youth. Cooper (1967:296) reinforces this fact by stating the principal's responsibility in dealing with parents:

The principal's task in working with adults outside of the school to bring about more effective behavior consists of interpreting the school's mission toward this end, learning more about individual and community attitudes and values as they relate to child behavior, and narrowing differences between viewpoints whenever possible. The child who holds a clear understanding of behavioral expectations as set forth by home and school enjoys a degree of security unknown to the child who has to make frequent and drastic conduct adjustments because of the differences in behavioral demands imposed by the two situations.

Webster (1970) contributes to this idea of the importance of parental involvement and comes to a somewhat depressing conclusion. He relates that shifting societal patterns have not only resulted in increasing estrangement and alienation from the school but from the student in his own home. Because of this, as well as other reasons, the school seems to be charged increasingly with the role of "in loco parentis." Thus, while there is a belief in the inherent value of parental involvement in the school there simultaneously seems to be less involvement than before.

The home environment seems to play an increasingly important role in the way children behave. Cutts and Moseley (1957) reported that the home environment was at least a contributing cause to a child's chronic behavior problems. A survey of some 4,270 teachers conducted by the National Education Association in 1955-56 put irresponsible parents first as a cause of difficulty and unsatisfactory home conditions second as the major causes of school behavior problems.

The elementary school principal may bring the parent's attention to the subject of discipline, and thus increase the chance for involvement, in a number of ways. He may act knowingly and purposely in conducting home visits or school conferences, by making addresses to civic or church groups, or simply by inviting a concerned citizen to the school to observe. He may direct school newsletters to be sent to parents and community leaders or he may play an active part in organizing parent groups which are concerned with the issue. All of these methods have a relatively positive connotation.

The misunderstandings which may be caused by poor communication systems or the outright differences between the value systems of parents

and the school (Kaplan, 1971) may cast another element into the picture, however. Continued efforts can never resolve all of the problems encountered between parents and the principal, but an effort must be made to reduce the tensions which arise from the lack of communication in understanding basic issues. Until this happens, the education of a number of children is bound to take place in an atmosphere of hostility and suspicion (Kaplan, 1971). The principal must understand the attitudes and values of parents and community toward behavior and should direct his efforts toward an attempt to reduce the conflicting value systems which confuse the child as he attempts to evaluate and resolve a life style.

- It is in the welfare of the student as well as tomorrow's society for the school to provide opportunities to explore value systems and seek value resolutions which will result in more adequate and congruent student self-concepts (Webster, 1970).

Although a great majority of parents cooperate with the school and encourage it to deal effectively with children's behavior problems, there is a problem with those parents who do not. According to Miller and Miller (1969), parents fall into three categories: (1) those who are willing to help; (2) those who cannot or do not dare; and (3) those who refuse to help. Uncooperativeness is often an indication that something is wrong in the home, and frequently it can be traced to ignorance or to the parents' being absorbed in their own problems (Cutts and Moseley, 1957). A research report by the National Education Association (1957) reported that, of the educators who responded, 4.3 per cent felt that in the majority of cases they received no cooperation from the home, and 1.0 per cent reported that parents hardly ever cooperated. In support of the idea of parental involvement only 8.1 per cent reported that

pupils, as a whole, were exceptionally well-behaved when the parents failed to cooperate with the school. With this in mind, attempts must be made to reduce the distance between parents and schools in an effort to foster increased cooperation between the school and family (Polk and Schafer, 1972).

Of course, parental involvement does not insure that an air of cooperativeness and unified effort will be forthcoming, but the chances for this are greatly improved when the parent feels that he has an opportunity for some form of input into the system. He needs to feel that the school is working with him and for him in resolving his child's problems. This atmosphere can be greatly enhanced by the mutual understanding of common goals and of educational methods, practices, and techniques by which these goals are to be attained.

These various means of attaining the desirable level of behavioral control often lead to principal-parent conflict due to differing attitudes about discipline. The way parents feel that school discipline should be handled may be accredited to the varied sources of information from which they form opinions (Carter, 1964). This conflict may be grounded in several areas, but Ausubel (1961) relates that the school administrator is caught squarely in the growing chasm between educational and psychological theorists on the one hand and the growing tide of public opinion against the formerly fashionable idea of permissiveness on the other.

With regard to the use of punitive measures, parents, in a study by Carter (1964), ranked the use of punitive techniques in home discipline far behind other more moderate methods of maintaining discipline. A majority of parents who responded in this study felt that punitive

measures should not be used in the school under any circumstances. He goes on to say that, according to the results of his study, there needs to be a more complete understanding between home and school.

Corporal punishment and its continued use in the schools of 47 of the 50 states is a most volatile issue relating directly to the school's role. The National Education Association (1972) has assumed a staunch position in opposition to the use of corporal punishment stating that its use is an inefficient and ineffective way to maintain control. Moore (1973) reinforces this position while stating that this form of intense punishment may be ego damaging, may cause feelings of resentment, may develop uneasiness and anxiety, and that adults who employ punitive measures of this nature provide excellent models of aggressiveness for their children.

There is divisiveness on the issue, however. Patterson (1974) found that while a majority of parents and students contended that corporal punishment was ineffective, a majority of teachers and administrators believed that it was effective. Empirical research on the matter is inconclusive however (Patterson, 1975). Although there is a rising tide of organized public effort to force schools to abandon the practice of corporal punishment (Rentschler, 1975), the anti-spanking bills as introduced in state legislatures across the nation have repeatedly gone down in resounding defeat (North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1972).

There are those who prefer the less traumatic application of behavior modification techniques. These techniques basically employ a system of rewards for positive or appropriate behaviors and negative reinforcements for behaviors which are not appropriate. This approach

is commonly referred to as a behavioristic approach and is composed of four basic steps: (1) identification of the behavior problem; (2) identification of appropriate behavior; (3) the use of reward; and (4) the use of extinction procedures to help eliminate inappropriate behavior (Palardy and Mudrey, 1973). Various studies (Wade, 1974 and Burns, 1974) report on the effectiveness of behavior modification techniques and Glasser (1971) substantiates the favorable findings.

A major drawback to this approach, as seen by Palardy and Mudrey, is the fact that it deals solely with surface behavior and although its effectiveness cannot be disputed there is a question as to its value in changing basic attitudes and behaviors.

Palardy and Mudrey much prefer a diagnostic or psychoanalytic approach. This method ideally results in more lasting effects because of its concentration upon the causes of problem behavior. This approach is of a more preventative nature than the punitive and behavioral modification approaches. It focuses upon self-discipline as opposed to a form of discipline which may be imposed from external sources. It stresses the importance of the student's feelings of self-worth and dignity. White (1965) summarizes the merits of this diagnostic model as promoting a warmth of feeling, spontaneity, insight, a high interest in others, and freedom to exercise judgment.

Another most explosive issue in the area of school discipline is the recommended use by students of behavior modifying drugs. The use of Ritalin or other stimulants is a highly controversial matter (Bosco, 1975) and the need for a clearer understanding by school authorities about their responsibilities in this regard is evident.

Purpose of the Study

Administrators seem to be caught squarely in the midst of a growing chasm between home and school. Frequently, it appears that the values and behavioral expectations of the home and school differ greatly. The principal, not really knowing what is expected of him, operates within a state of uncertainty and insecurity. He is often confused about the public's desires and his response to particular disciplinary situations may be characterized as either under-reactionary or over-reactionary.

The purpose of this study was to bring about an awareness of the differences in perception and opinion between parents and principals in regard to school discipline. This awareness is crucial to the establishment of a common ground of understanding between the two.

This study was concerned with the perceptions that elementary school principals held regarding the behavioral management practices that they employed in their schools. Of concern was the determination of the frequency that these selected practices and techniques were employed, as reported by the principals surveyed, and the frequency that, in the opinion of the principals, the various practices should be employed. This study determined if a significant difference existed between the practices that were employed and the practices that principals felt should be employed.

This study identified the perceptions of parents with regard to the frequency that selected behavioral management practices were employed by the principal and elicited their opinions as to how frequently these practices should be employed. The study determined if a significant difference existed between the parents' perception of the frequency that

practices were employed and the frequency that they should be employed.

This study identified the perception of seriousness of various behavior problems as identified by parents and principals. The study determined if significant differences existed in the perceptions that parents and principals possessed in this regard as reported by parents and principals.

Specifically, the purposes of the study were:

1. to determine the frequency that selected behavioral management practices were employed, as reported by principals;
2. to determine how frequently, in the opinion of the school principal, that these practices should be employed;
3. to determine if a significant difference existed between the frequency that various methods were employed and the frequency that principals perceived that they should be employed;
4. to determine the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, selected behavioral management practices were employed;
5. to determine how frequently, in the opinion of parents, that these practices should be employed;
6. to determine if a significant difference existed between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, various methods were employed and the frequency that parents perceive that they should be employed;
7. to determine if a significant difference existed between the frequency that particular methods were employed, as reported by principals, and the perceptions that parents had as to the frequency that they were employed;
8. to determine if a significant difference existed between the frequency that particular methods should be employed, in the opinion

of principals, and the frequency that particular methods should be employed, in the opinion of parents;

9. to determine, from the principal's perception, the seriousness of offenses with which he must deal;
10. to determine, from the parents's perception, the seriousness of offenses with which the principal must deal; and
11. to determine if a significant difference existed between the principal's perception of the seriousness of particular offenses and the parent's perception of the seriousness of particular offenses.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested for each of the items on the Behavior Management Questionnaire.

- H1. There is no significant difference between the frequency that each behavioral management practice was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that each behavioral management practice, in their opinion, should have been employed.
- H2. There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, each behavior management practice was employed by the school principal and in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should have been employed.
- H3. There is no significant difference between the frequency that specific behavior management practices were employed and the frequency that parents perceived that they were employed.
- H4. There is no significant difference between the frequency that principals perceived that specific practices should have been employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, these

practices should have been employed.

- H5. *There is no significant difference in the perceived degree of seriousness of each behavioral problem as reported by principals and by parents.*

Limitations of the Study

A portion of the schools surveyed did not house solely the elementary grades. Because of diversified grade-grouping structures within the various districts, a number of the principals participating dealt with secondary-aged children as well as elementary-aged children. Although the study was designed to elicit factors relating to the elementary schools, the responses of these administrators may have biased, to some degree, the results.

A degree of sampling bias may have been injected by allowing for a stratified sample of the parents to be surveyed. Due to difficulties encountered in drawing a sample population of parents and in order to obtain a representative cross-section of the population, seven parents from each selected school were surveyed. Principals were asked to randomly select seven students from their schools and to distribute questionnaires to the parents of those students.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions applied:

- 1. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - A school having a curriculum offering any combination of grades 1 to 6. Any school not having at least one*

of these grades was not included in this study.

2. *BEHAVIOR PROBLEM - Behavior that is disapproved of by dominant social groups; behavior that is perceived as being actually or potentially damaging to the individual or group, whether physically, mentally, or socially (Good, 1973).*
3. *SCHOOL DISCIPLINE - The characteristic degree and kind of orderliness in a given school or the means by which that order is obtained; the maintenance of conditions conducive to the efficient achievement of the school's functions (Good, 1973).*
4. *SELF-DISCIPLINE - Control of conduct exercised not by an external authority but by the learner who accepts a task as his own, including whatever effort is involved, and controls his activities accordingly (Good, 1973).*
5. *BEHAVIORAL MANAGEMENT PRACTICE - A practice, method, or technique employed in an effort to modify or alter another's behavior; anything done to establish, maintain, or repair order (Sheviakov and Redl, 1956).*
6. *BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION - Techniques for dealing with maladaptive behavior either through classical conditioning or through operant conditioning, as by arranging and managing reinforcement contingencies so that desired behaviors are increased in frequency and undesirable behaviors are decreased in frequency (Good, 1973).*
7. *PSYCHOANALYTIC APPROACH - Emphasizes the importance of understanding in dealing with behavior problems; focus is on improving self-concept and the development of self-discipline through a non-threatening set of learning experiences (Sunshine, 1973). An approach that is preventative in nature and stresses the importance*

of the students feelings of self-worth and dignity (Palardy and Mudrey, 1963).

Summary

Chapter 1 has presented an overview describing the nature and purpose of the study. This included an introduction, a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, a statement of the hypotheses, the limitations of the study, and a definition of terms.

Chapter 2 presents a review of related literature. In Chapter 3 the design of the study is discussed. Chapter 4 is made up of an organization and presentation of the data. The final chapter includes a summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review the significant literature related to behavioral management in the schools. The writings herein cited were selected because of their relevance to the problem under investigation. Inclusion and discussion of all works related to this topic would be an impossibility. An attempt has been made, however, to give some degree of attention to those writings deemed most important in the area. Gnagey (1965:3) summarizes the problem of abundant writings in the area by stating that:

The weight of the educational literature written in the area of discipline in the last ten years could scarcely be hefted by the average elementary school teacher. But complete reprints of every piece of published scientific research on the subject could be carried home by any first grade pupil. Herein lies the problem.

Historical Background of School Discipline

During the period of ancient civilizations there seems to have been a twofold approach to the control of pupil behavior. Intellectual education was carried on in an atmosphere of mild and humane treatment along with an absence of rewards. Moral conformity was produced largely through arbitrary methods. During this time it was generally felt that punishment was ineffective in promoting learning and was

justified only in moral matters. With the turn toward mass education there followed a consequent combination in the same person of the functions of moral control and the teaching of useful knowledge. It therefore became the common view that children must be controlled before they can be taught.

It followed that teachers, on whom rested the responsibility for the student's growth intellectually and morally, should equate the means by which the two elements were to be achieved. Those practices good for the moral development carried over as being good for the intellectual development as well. This state of affairs progressed to the point that the primary function of education seems to have been the exercise of control over children which eventually led to the use of methods which were harsh and repressive.

In the early stages of our present educational system, control referred to authoritative and forceful methods of obtaining obedience to requirements. Various systems of punishment were employed to obtain this obedience, the most generally used being corporal punishment. The infliction of punishment seems to have frequently been arbitrary and oftentimes no effort was made to equate the "crime" with the punishment. Illustrative of this is a passage taken from The New England Magazine (July, 1902:636) which stated:

The teacher told the whole class to write four lines. If, in looking around, he found anyone who had written his lines before the time was over, he thrashed him for writing too fast. If he had written none, he whipped him for laziness. When the copies were done, they all passed in procession with them through a narrow gangway, quite equivalent to running the gauntlet, as the teacher stood ready with a blow upon the utterance of a single word.

Ladd (1973:305) gives some insight into the atmosphere that

existed wherein the public schools were born:

The public schools originated in Puritan Massachusetts, a colony that started out as a private, commercial corporation, controlled by a governor and twelve directors. The colony was ruled by this small group which felt that a higher authority had given them the sole right to correct; govern, punish, pardon and rule. Discipline was simple and swift, and due process of law and opportunity for appeals hardly existed. Humiliating punishments, including corporal punishment, were routine, and brutal ones not out of question.

Toward the opening of the nineteenth century there seems to have been a movement to recognize the failure of force as an effective means of promoting intellectual and moral growth. Emulation, a system of rewards, was promoted as an effective means by which to encourage children to learn. The Boston Public Latin School in its publication The Prize Book (1820:11-13) appears to have been one of the first to have offered tangible rewards for the students who achieved excellence in "general scholarship."

Although the background of our educational system seems divergent in regard to the use of force in the stimulation of learning, there seems to have been a consistent uniformity in the belief that it held a place of reverence in moral matters. No reference can be found prior to 1840 which does not make the assumption that proper teaching required prompt and unquestioned obedience of the child to the teacher's authority. The only dissent from this point of view was in regard to the use of force in stimulating learning. Illustrative of the professional attitude of the period is a statement by Abbot (1832:90).

The first step which the teacher must take, I do not mean in his course in moral education, but before he is prepared to enter upon that course, is to obtain the entire, unqualified submission of his school authority.... The subjection of the governed to the will of one man, in such

a way that the expression of his will must be the final decision of every question, is the only government that will answer in school or in family. A government not of persuasion, not of reasons assigned, not of the will of the majority, but of the will of the one who presides.

The emphasis in these early schools seems not to have been on the positive aspects of education but upon punishment for nonconformity. A tremendous amount of the teacher's time was spent in keeping order and inflicting punishment. The work of instruction assumed a position of secondary importance to such matters as silence, order, and physical posture. Teachers became quite ingenious at developing devices for the control of the classroom. In Horace Mann's Report of the Secretary (1845): 116) he relates a most interesting form of control.

A pupil caught in the act of delinquency is made to take a place on the platform...and there to watch for other delinquents. When he detects anyone of his schoolmates in a violation of any of the rules of the school, he is expected to announce the name of the offender and the offence. If not contradicted or although contradicted, yet if confirmed, he is absolved and returns to his seat, and the new culprit succeeds to the post and to the office of sentinel. Here he is expected to remain until, in his turn, he can obtain his discharge by successfully inculpating another. Such a watchman is usually called a monitor, but his real office is that of spy...If the original culprit does not succeed in detecting a fellow pupil in some offence, he receives a punishment.

The entire educational structure of this period seems to have been predicated upon an outlook that was religious and authoritative. The child was subject to the direction of superiors just as the lives of men had been directed by the divine right of kings. The proper relationship between governor and governed seemed logically to imply similar relationships in education. Control was based upon a morality which was purely authoritative and completely identified with religious belief and practice.

The effort to modify the aforementioned approach to control has been extensive and difficult. Up until the turn of the nineteenth century there had been no indication that the school might be controlled without the use of corporal punishment and other forms of punishment. Page (1838:18) set forth the plight of the teacher with the following theoretical view of the time.

Two things the teacher must always do at once: he must govern and instruct. It is this double attention which makes his life a weary one. He might govern with comparative ease, if his duty ended there. The instruction would be delightful if that could be pursued alone. But they must go together. With respect to the one not a mistake must pass unnoticed. Every error in matter or manner must be set right; and at the same time, the stolen whisper must be heard, the clandestine plaything must be captured, the incipient plot must be discovered, the arch trick must be anticipated, the idler must be watched, the wayward reprov'd and set right, and the stubborn and impudent, the coarse and turbulent must be subdued.

A lapse in the customary methods of control and an approaching demand for readjustment surfaced in Massachusetts in 1837. In that year alone, nearly four hundred schools were broken up for what was regarded as "incompetency" of teachers or insubordination of pupils; "incompetency" here meaning the inability to govern by force or otherwise (Mann, 1847: 70). Mann's report goes on to say that with the introduction of other methods, obedience was more generally secured and the number of schools broken up was reduced to one fourth of that of the previous decade.

Along with the insubordination of the previously mentioned decade and with the decreased effectiveness of customary methods of control there came a reemphasis of the more traditional means of control. This reemphasis of stern discipline met with failure. Liberals and conservatives squared off at one another while asserting the merits of their positions. Mann (1855:306) stated in this regard:

I find one party strenuously maintaining that improvement in our schools can advance only so far and so fast as bodily chastisement recedes, while the other party regard a teacher or parent, divested of his instruments of pain, as a discrowned monarch.

Gradually, the adoption of milder means of control created a more tolerable situation. This achievement did not lead to a general reconstruction of practices in education as a whole, however, for the adoption of the new conception was not widely prevalent.

Beginning in about 1870 conflict arose in public education centered around the issue of religious authority and the demands of social morality based on the implications of political democracy. The separation of church and state came to be a most prominent issue of the time. Those with religious motives sought to perpetuate religious authority as the basis of morality in the schools.

In the two decades that followed there seems to have been a move to restrict the use of authority in the control of pupils. The previously accepted notion of unrestricted authority was now being questioned and was no longer taken for granted (Eby, 1918:8). Advocates of this new point of view quickly pointed to the rapid increase in the crime rate for that period as evidence that the traditionally authoritarian approaches were not promoting honesty and respect for the rights and welfare of others.

At this point in time, the instructional function as it related to control became a prominent factor. There was increasing recognition that behavior was learning and that the separation of the two was an impossibility. A factor which contributed to this theoretical recognition was the newly initiated importance attached to a proper guidance of the unconscious manifestations of experience. In matters of control

it was considered that unconscious response was quite as fundamental to character formation as those affected in conscious reaction (Harris, 1928: 328).

A most fitting summary to this brief outline of the historical basis for discipline in the schools may be captured in a statement by Harris (1928:331):

It seems equally clear that those who hold the general view that a child must be controlled before he can be taught have ignored some of the more recent discoveries relative to the nature of learning. It appears obvious that such a view restricts learning to what goes on between the teacher and pupil, what the child derives by conscious effort or application in the study of the printed page, or what he does consciously in more overt individual enterprise. The great variety of submerged responses which, so it is contended, make up the child's more fundamental inclinations or character are ignored by such a view. It is assumed that learning takes place only through that which the child consciously and actively attends and that the process does not take place except as certain requisite conditions relating to posture, stillness, external mien, and other more or less objective matters have been established.

Contemporary Practices in School Discipline

In an effort to meet the needs of youth and the society in which they live, a number of methods, practices, and techniques have been developed which find current usage in the public schools. Each seems to have its own cult of supporters and, likewise, those who vehemently oppose its application. This study has broadly categorized these practices into four groups; behavior modification, psychoanalytic approaches, the use of behavior modifying drugs, and strictly punitive approaches. Although a number of the techniques employed do not fall neatly and concisely into just one of these categories, most can be so categorized.

Behavior Modification

Since the early 1960's, the application of behavior modification principles in the public schools has developed at an extremely rapid pace. Programs of behavior modification have become widely employed, often as a result of university research projects or because of support from federal agencies like the National Institute of Mental Health. Many projects, however, are being developed independently by teachers and administrators in an effort to deal with problems unique to their particular situation. Behavior modification programs are now found in a wide variety of schools, including urban, suburban, and rural, and involve children of all ages.

Behavior modification is not something that is new, for the techniques employed have always been an integral part of the education process. Schools have used reward (positive reinforcement) and punishment (negative reinforcement) as a means for securing acceptable behavior for centuries. Although systems may vary in the type of reinforcements offered, the desired effects are quite universal. The failure in some instances of behavioral modification programs appears not to be a failure of the programs themselves, but a failure of teachers to consistently employ the integral techniques. Turney (1974:317) comments on the consistency that is employed in programs of this nature by saying:

...the approach to discipline employed by teachers and parents is rarely as important as the consistency with which a particular approach is applied.

Brown (1976:67) defines a behavior modification program as one which precisely and systematically applies basic principles from psychological research to teach desirable behavior or to eradicate undesirable behavior. The entire contemporary application of behavior modification

is based upon principles developed approximately seventy-five years ago by Ivan Pavlov in his famous studies. Scientific researchers since that time have made extensive laboratory and field studies which have broadened our understanding of the learning process in humans. The current approach to behavior management through the use of behavior modification is thus based on a broad foundation of experimental research.

Extensive observation and evaluation of behavior modification techniques have demonstrated that some are more effective in altering classroom behavior than others. Praise, for example, has been shown to be very effective in modifying behavior. Research has shown, however, that although praise comes naturally from most teachers, it is not used enough. It has been found that when teachers ignore disruptive behavior and concentrate instead on praising good behavior, poor behavior usually decreases very shortly. Programs which employ positive forms of teacher reinforcement do change children's behavior reliably and quickly.

Brown (1976:68) points out, however, that behavior learned in one setting may not be carried over to another. This seems to reinforce the need for cooperation between home and school, thus enabling the child to be dealt with consistently in both environments.

Although behavior modification advocates promote the idea of ignoring some misbehavior, there are occasions when behavior is of such a nature that it cannot be ignored. Praise or recognition may not be the appropriate response while negative reinforcement may be. Verbal reprimand is a generally accepted method of reinforcement of this type.

The type of reprimand may be varied from a severe, public condemnation of behavior to a mild, privately administered censure. Most reprimands given by teachers generally fall in between these two points

with the vast majority tending toward the former. Gnagey's work (1965) in regard to the "ripple" effect of classroom control techniques provides some support for moderate to mild reprimands. His studies have demonstrated that those teachers who reprimand quietly and privately often obtain more desirable behavior than those who do not. The frequency of the reprimand may also be an influential factor. Becker et al., (1971) noted that as the number of verbal interventions by the teacher increased, so did the number of behavior problems in the classroom.

The technique of modeling, which takes advantage of a child's tendency to imitate, is based on the theory that children will modify their behavior to coincide with that exhibited by models who show various behavior strengths lacking in the child. The implications for school programs to capitalize upon this technique are great and resources for a program of this nature are virtually unlimited. The Eugene Public Schools of Eugene, Oregon (1971) have done some interesting work in this technique. Through a program of "peer group attention" and positive reinforcement, effective changes in individual behavior have been accomplished.

Whitmore (1973) implemented a leadership program at the elementary level with the aim of increasing the social value of constructive classroom behavior and to generate a more positive pupil attitude toward self and school. The aims of this intervention were to reduce the disruptive behavior of some socially powerful students while increasing the rewards for more appropriate models. Participation by students in this program resulted in a notable difference in attitudes and behavior toward the desired goal.

Bandura (1965) has asserted that modeling may represent a more

effective means of establishing new behavior than a positive reinforcement procedure. A behavior pattern acquired through imitation, he has found, is often maintained without need for external reinforcement.

An often criticized technique of behavior modification, that of token reinforcement, has been shown to be very effective. Its effectiveness has been demonstrated with normal children as well as with emotionally disturbed, retarded, brain damaged, hyperactive, autistic, and delinquent children as well (Peterson and Peterson, 1968; Hewett, 1967).

Token reinforcement initially relied upon tangible rewards such as candy, money, toys, etc. Research supports the fact that token rewards often have a remarkable effect on behavior. Wade (1974) decreased inappropriate behaviors of a ten year old boy from a mean of 6.8 times per session to 0.9 times per session within ten days of intervention. Other studies of this nature report similar findings. The trend recently, however, is to make the reward of a social nature, possibly in the form of added recess time, extra classroom privileges, or even possibly a time for special attention from the teacher (Dunaway, 1974). Burns (1974) found that the use of social rewards, such as additional play-time, was quite effective in dealing with elementary students. Substantial reductions in the number of disruptions by these students were noted within fourteen days of intervention. Considerable attention has been given to the nature of these positive reinforcements and it has been found that not all children can be motivated by the usual rewards found in the school system. These children can be motivated, however, through utilization of appropriate procedures (National Institute of Mental Health, 1974).

In summary, behavior modification basically involves strengthening

desirable behavior and weakening undesirable behavior by a systematic use of learning theory and principles of conditioning (National Institute of Mental Health, 1972). It consists of four basic steps which include (a) identification of the behavior problem; (b) identification of appropriate behavior; (c) the use of reward; and (d) use of extinction procedures to help eliminate inappropriate behavior (Palardy and Mudrey, 1973:297). The key is not punishment but reward. A major tenet of this system is the theory that reinforcement learning, both desirable and undesirable, are learned and unlearned by the same process.

Sheviakov and Redl (1956:28) state that the purpose of any disciplinary measure can be geared in two directions, namely: (a) the technique can be planned to influence surface behavior right then and there; or (b) the technique can be charged with the task of influencing basic attitudes. Critics of behavior modification charge that herein lies its weakness. Palardy and Mudrey (1973) feel it is an effort to deal solely with surface behavior and that little, if anything, is done to alter subconscious motivations toward misbehavior. A basic argument against behavior modification is that:

In a democracy, where individuality, freedom of choice, the right to self-determination, and dissent are highly cherished values, it is not "right," or may even be "immoral," to manipulate change, or control another's behavior (Blackham and Silberman, (1971:9).

Psychoanalytic Approaches

Psychoanalytic approaches to behavior management emphasize the importance of teacher attitudes, understanding, empathy, and acceptance of classroom behavior (Davis, 1974:7). Advocates of this approach feel that teachers must understand the motivation and the needs system of children before any modification of their behavior can be undertaken

(Dreikurs, Grunwald, and Pepper, 1971). These authors feel that teachers must understand that all behavior has a purpose and thus indicates a manner in which the child is attempting to deal with his environment.

Snygg (1955:259) alludes to the importance of the teacher's role in assisting in the development of discipline through the use of this method by stating that:

...through love and mutual respect and concern they [teachers] must (1) avoid anything that causes the child to feel that he is an outsider and do everything within reason to help him feel that he is a participant in society with pride in its achievements and a stake in its future; and (2) do more to help the child respect his potentialities and his talents, to discover that he has something to give to the world and that what he does makes a difference.

The importance of the teacher's role in this approach cannot be overemphasized. However, for the teacher who is untrained, this approach may be somewhat misleading. Two things which teachers should keep in mind have to do with ideas about universal misbehavior by a child and about intrusion into student-parent relationships.

Initially, students often exhibit different behavior patterns in different settings. Teachers should keep in mind that disruptive behavior in one setting does not necessarily mean that similar behavior exists in other settings. Studies of the interaction of behavior and environment indicate that disruptive behavior can best be treated in the setting in which it occurs (Walker).

Secondly, teachers should realize that parent-student relationships may be of little or no help in changing classroom behavior. Teachers should be wary of intruding into these relationships for, although knowledge about the child may be gained, the student-teacher relationship may be affected adversely (Carter, 1964).

With these cautions in mind, there are those who remain avidly in favor of and strongly promote the idea of the diagnostic approach to discipline in the public schools (Palardy and Mudrey, 1973).

Psychoanalytic models of discipline are based on analytic models of Man. Such models have been proposed by leading theoreticians, including Freud, Jung, Adler, and Rogers (Sunshine, 1973:12). Alfred Adler's theory of personality is composed of a number of major concepts. A brief presentation of those concepts and their implications for education is in order.

Adler states that Man is motivated by his expectations of the future and that present behavior is largely the result of present strivings toward future goals (Adler, 1930). Misconceptions of those goals or, what Adler describes as fictional goals, may develop in the child's mind for a number of reasons. Adler goes on to say that misbehavior often results because of the holding of these fictional goals. Attempts to modify goals are different from attempts to modify character deficiencies. A character deficiency explanation makes misbehavior easy to explain in terms of laziness or irresponsibility, with the idea in mind that little progress can be made through coercive acts. By taking the approach that the child has adopted fictional goals, Adler says, the teacher can help him discover better goal alternatives.

For psychoanalysts, the ultimate fictional goal is what Maslow (1954) called "self-actualization" and what Goldstein (1939) termed "being." This is striving for superiority which, according to these authors, is innate and is a part of life from birth to death and carries a person from one stage of life to another.

Feelings of inferiority determine how the striving for superiority

will manifest itself. Adler (1930) states that these feelings of inferiority are not abnormal for they are in all of us and ultimately determine the manner in which we strive for superiority. Conflict seems to arise when these inferiorities become exaggerated or distorted and the child can no longer cope with them. The child often acts out to compensate for these feelings of inferiority. Here again, the teacher can be very valuable in helping to dissipate these feelings of inadequacy by encouraging and praising the child.

Adler (1929:31) maintained that men strive for a perfect society through social interests. He felt that social contacts provided an outlet for the strivings for superiority. In striving for the perfect society, man compensates for his personal weaknesses by working for the common good. Dreikurs, Grunwald, and Pepper (1971) state that schools discourage the manifestation of this social interest through the competition which is encouraged between students. The ambition that schools promote, they maintain, does not provide a sense of security for either the children who succeed or those who fail.

The life style that a student selects for himself is based upon the opinions he has about himself, his opinions about others, and the goals which he sets for himself. Implications for educators should be quite obvious here. Efforts to mold more desirable opinions of self and others as well as to set about establishing realistic, rather than fictional, goals is of utmost importance to this model of behavior control.

Another factor upon which Adler writes in a later work (1935) is his idea of the "creative self." According to this principle, Man makes his own personality which is constructed out of his experience and heredity endowment.

Heredity only endows him with certain abilities. Environment only gives him certain impressions. These abilities and impressions, and the manner in which he experiences them--that is to say, the interpretation he makes of these experiences--are the bricks which he uses in his own "creative" way in building up his attitude toward life. It is his individual way of using these bricks, or in other words his attitudes toward life, which determines this relationship to the outside world (Adler, 1933:5).

Dreikurs, Grunwald, and Pepper (1971:17) state that there are four possible goals of misbehavior. These four goals are attention getting, power seeking, revenge seeking and assumed disability. In regard to these goals they state that the child may:

...try to get attention, to put others in his service, since he believes that otherwise he would be lost and worthless. Or he may attempt to prove his power in the belief that only if he can do what he wants and defy adult pressure can he be somebody. Or he may seek revenge: the only means by which he feels significant is to hurt others as he feels hurt by them. Or he may display actual or imagined deficiencies in order to be left alone: as long as nothing is demanded of him, his deficiency, stupidity, or inability may not become obvious; that would mean his utter worthlessness.

According to this philosophy, punishment is viewed as a poor form of discipline since it stresses only what not to do rather than teaching what to do. Punishment is anxiety producing and is often painful, either physically or emotionally. Symonds (1965), in elaborating upon three levels of anxiety which are directly related to the nature of punishment, states that when punishment is so mild that it does not actually hurt, the anxiety too is very mild, indeed so mild as to be hardly recognized. When punishment hurts and recognizable anxiety is evoked, he says, that education function is lost.

Discipline should be imposed internally and should not come from an external authority. Discipline is the means by which individuals are brought to subordinate their goals to the needs of the group and do what

is necessary for the good of all (Snygg, 1955:258). As social acceptance improves so does the child's concept of himself. Through this self-approval and through the experience of dealing with the consequences of his own misbehavior, the child develops a self-imposed or internal form of discipline.

The educational climate should enhance the child's efforts toward inner control. This approach is essentially a form of training wherein the child is expected to adapt to and internalize the rules by which he must live. The primary goal is self-discipline.

In contrast to the purely behavioristic approach, where the forms of behavior, and not the attitudes behind behavior (NEA, 1974), are of importance, the psychoanalytic approach focuses upon causative factors. Davis (1974:8) offers this insight to the basic difference in the two approaches:

Behaviorists believe that disruptive behavior, like all other behavior, is learned as a means of adjustment to environment and that only by offering a choice of good or bad consequences can the disruptive behavior be altered. In general, therefore, behaviorists tend to reject the concept of disruptive behavior as a symptom that should be diagnosed so that its cause may be treated.

White (1965:188) characterized the psychoanalytic approach in the following way:

"It would be fair to say that the mental health movement (psychoanalytic) has rewarded warmth of feeling; spontaneity; insight; a high interest in others; warm parents; freedom to exercise judgment; warm teachers and democratic classrooms. The same movement has been against: being compulsive; competitive striving; intellectualism; being either thing-or-achievement-oriented; being emotionally unresponsive, as well as being angry or passionate; being a loner; not confiding in others; teachers who are curriculum-oriented; the regimentation of school life; group tests; red-tape and vice principals in charge of discipline.

Behavior Modifying Drugs

Those who are unalterably opposed to the use of the more traditional methods of classroom control--suspension, corporal punishment, expulsion--and those who have become disillusioned with the milder forms of solutions to behavior problems, may be quick to embrace this relatively new means for obtaining control. The use of behavior modifying drugs, such as Ritalin (methylphenidate hydrochloride), Dexedrine (dextro-amphetamine), and Cylert (magnesium pemoline) appears to be growing rapidly in this country. Estimates are that between 500,000 and 1,000,000 children, predominantly boys, take daily dosages of these drugs (Schrag and Divoky, 1975:70). In 1970, it was revealed that between five and ten per cent of all children in the public elementary schools of Omaha, Nebraska, were involved in such treatment (Jones, 1973:48). Schrag and Divoky go on to say that, although most of these children are between six and thirteen years of age, whatever their age, it is becoming an increasingly legitimate solution to the problem of classroom misbehavior to medicate these children.

Parents, physicians, and school officials have become increasingly aware of the effectiveness of these drugs. Parents may occasionally request that their child be medicated, or a physician may prescribe this form of medication after examining a child and determining its necessity. It is becoming increasingly common, however, for the school to initiate the process by suggesting the use of drugs.

A typical account might involve the child who will not sit still in school, who lacks motivation, who fights with other children, and whose behavior has become so offensive that he cannot be tolerated in the normal school setting any longer. By this time, the school

principal and counselor have become involved in the child's case and, if the situation permits, a school psychologist may have evaluated the child. Frequently, it is the recommendation of the school that the child be seen by a physician in order to determine if there are physical or neurological involvements. At this point, it seems to depend largely upon the physician's philosophy in regard to the use of these stimulant drugs as to whether the child will be medicated or not (Schrag and Divoky, 1975:73).

The increasingly frequent use of stimulant drugs of this nature has caused the concern of some. Robin and Stanley (1973) reported that three-fourths of the teachers surveyed felt that they had the responsibility to recommend that a doctor be informed if there was a suspicion that the child were hyperkinetic. Of these teachers, an appreciable number mention the possible use of Ritalin when making their referral. Robin and Stanley go on to say that, despite the fact that the overwhelming number of teachers claimed that they knew the purpose for which Ritalin was used, they had little specific and accurate information about the drug. Those with the most experience with Ritalin medicated children were most enthusiastic about its use, but they were as ignorant of its effects as those without personal experience.

Lennard (1970) states that Americans are great believers in the proposition that drugs can cure all ills and solve most problems. This idea could lend itself to what has been termed the promiscuous prescription of stimulant drugs for school children. It is difficult to sort out the scientific research from the promotional efforts of special interest groups, such as drug manufacturing companies. However, since the studies of Bradley (1937), who reported that daily doses of Benzedrine had

caused remarkable changes in the behavior of his patients, there has been little doubt that drugs do effect significant changes in behavior. Bradley's findings which reported the combination of improved school performance and subdued behavior in the youngsters involved in the study, gave rise to the theory of "paradoxical effect." This theory postulated that the amphetamine-type drugs which stimulated adults tended to subdue the behavior of certain children. Although more subsequent research (Grinspoon and Singer, 1973) has proven that this paradoxical effect was not as pronounced as Bradley had assumed, the initial assumption by Bradley has had a great deal of effect on the use of these drugs with children.

Until the early 1960's, there appears to have been little use made of these behavior modifying drugs in the schools. In 1963, however, a group of researchers at Johns Hopkins University (Eisenberg et al., 1963), using Dexedrine and Ritalin, reported positive results in their efforts to effect changes in disturbed and delinquent children. From this research, the two foremost authorities in the field, C. K. Connors and Leon Eisenberg, have emerged.

There seems to have been a rush by physicians and educators in the direction of the use of these drugs. Thomas C. Points, Deputy Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1970), in testimony before a Congressional committee, summarized the favorable attitude exhibited toward this approach by stating that the drugs were safe, effective, and that there was no evidence to indicate that the drugs improve behavior and learning without dulling the child and that they enable the child to sit still and attend to those situations where-in this behavior is most appropriate.

Studies by Conners, Eisenberg, and Barcai (1967) indicated that there was little to support the idea that improved academic performance results from this drug therapy. In their report on learning disabled children, they concluded that the drugs had no effect on intellectual ability although there had been produced a significant improvement in the teacher ratings of behavior. Bosco (1975:490) lends support to this position by reporting:

While there is reason to believe the use of Ritalin for hyperkinetic children may have an effect on social variables, such as teacher's ratings, the studies do not provide a clear understanding of ways in which the drugs affect scholastic variables under different conditions.

Through the late sixties and early seventies the sales campaigns of pharmaceutical companies attempted to support promises which were, to say the least, questionable in regard to these drugs. These sales campaigns pushed not only the drugs but also the ailments that they were supposed to treat. The overriding theme in the sales campaigns was that the MBD (minimal brain dysfunction) child should be treated immediately and that drug therapy could make the difference between keeping the child in his normal class and having him placed elsewhere (CIBA Pharmaceutical Co., 1973). The reports upon which many of these claims were based were poorly controlled and unscientific. In some instances, data were reported incorrectly (Schrag and Divoky, 1975:90). The sales tactics incorporated by some of the companies made claims which could not be supported in fact and which were based upon questionable ethics. One such approach is described in an article by Rapoport (1971). He vividly describes the "cure-all" approach that had been taken by a particular pharmaceutical firm. Ritalin was presented as the assistance that parents and teachers had long needed in attempting to solve behavior prob-

lems. The drug was promoted as a panacea in the control of children with behavior problems and proceeded to elaborate upon the many other advantages afforded by the use of the drug. The ease of diagnosis of children who should be medicated was stressed as the physician who conducted sales meetings with parents reported that "my wife was even able to diagnose one of these kids simply on the basis of what his mother said on the golf course."

Practices of this nature prompted Dr. Daniel X. Freedman (1971) to recommend in a report to a Congressional committee that pharmaceutical companies promote stimulants ethically and only through medical channels.

The political overtones of drug therapy to obtain control of children are monumental. This report has not attempted to speak to that issue but has attempted to relate solely the developmental background for the movement itself through the purportedly scientific research in the field. However, Bosco (1975:489-92) alludes to four implications for education which stem from the issue. First, he says that the use of Ritalin or other stimulants with hyperkinetic children is an issue with explosive potential within many school systems. Secondly, the role of the school's personnel is extremely important in screening and referring hyperkinetic children, yet clear definition of the educator's role is required. Thirdly, teachers and school authorities need to have a clearer understanding about their responsibilities with regard to children who take these stimulant drugs. And lastly, education should be so structured to contribute to the elimination of hyperactivity.

Punitive Measures

Before considering punishment or punitive techniques, we must first consider a definition of punishment. In the context to which this

study has spoken, punishment has been viewed as being substantially a form of retribution. It differs from restitution or a "making it right" approach to solving problems. Although the discussion and citings of related literature may have dealt a great deal with the issue of corporal punishment, this technique is not the sole punitive measure toward which the study was directed. Punitive measures have been viewed as techniques employed when fear of re-experiencing unpleasantness becomes the major reason for a pupil's avoiding the behavior which resulted in the punishment. In the context of this report it has been viewed as Good (1973: 186) has described it:

(1) the art of exercising control through punishment, inflicting pain, or imposing penalties for misbehavior; (2) the rigorous or severe treatment of individuals either to be a lesson to others or to create fear as a deterrent to subsequent misbehavior...

No issue in education has provoked such differences of opinion as has the issue of punishment. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, it has long been an issue upon which citizens have been divided and as current research concludes (Kaplan, 1971), it continues to be a most volatile issue. There are those who hold that it is a most important incentive to learning while others oppose it as not only being "cruel and unusual" but also inhumane (Reitman, Follman, and Ladd, 1972). Indeed, it has been difficult to sort out the scientific research which applies blindly to the issue at hand. In all honesty, the vast wealth of the writing done in this area has been opposed to the administering of punishment as it is herein defined. The basis for that opposition is acutely diverse; some opposed to it on the basis of its assumed detrimental psychological effects while others disapprove because of its demeaning and humiliating nature. It is hoped that the weight of the

writings on either side of the issue have not biased this writing in one direction or the other. Where sound research indicates that such bias on either side of the issue need exist, let it be self-evident.

Those opposed to the use of punishment, especially corporal punishment, seem to base their arguments largely upon three sources of empirical literature. The first of these relates to studies of punishment in connection with child-rearing practices, the second relates to studies of the effects of punishment, and the third are the studies relating inhibiting traits to other personality attributes, such as aggression (Fesbach, 1972:3).

Studies of child-rearing practices, assessing the effects of parental punishment, according to Fesbach and Fesbach (1972) and McCord, McCord, and Howard (1961), have found the degree of parental punitiveness to be positively correlated with various forms of psychopathology, especially delinquency and aggressive behavior. Bell (1968), to some degree, refutes this position by stating that it may often be difficult to determine whether a particular parental method is a cause or a result of the child's behavior. The predominant finding seems to have been, however, that the degree of physical punishment employed by parents is directly related to aggressive behavior on the part of the child and that punishment has had little effect on inhibiting aggressive behavior (Becker, 1964; Eron, Walder, and Lefkowitz, 1971). Eron, Walder, and Lefkowitz (1971:91) state that:

...we anticipated that punishment for aggressive behavior would lead to inhibition of aggression in situations similar to the one in which punishment was originally administered. Findings of field studies contradicted these predictions derived from laboratory research in that increased aggression was routinely found to be associated with increased punishment for this behavior.

It was believed at first that the contradiction was due to lack of control for intensity of punishment in field studies. However, the results with punishment intensity as it related to peer-rated aggression remained the same--the more intense the punishment by parents at home, the higher the aggression as rated by the children's peers at home.

Some evidence on the effects of punishment has come from experiments with animals. Probably the first systematic use of punishment in the form of electric shock in animal experimentation and the beginning of modern studies of animal punishment was done by Yerkes (1911). Other studies by Maier, Glaser, and Klee (1940), Watson (1914), and Skinner (1938) have deduced three things in reference to punishment upon animals. First, punishment inhibits the behavior process when it is administered. Secondly, punishment may actually elicit aversive behavior. Thirdly, there is a spread of the effects of punishment in response to surrounding stimuli and encompasses wider disruptive responses in the animal.

From this, it has been concluded that punishment can be used effectively to prevent a response from being made--to inhibit behavior (Maier, Glaser, and Klee, 1940).

The manner in which the equality of influence of reward and punishment has been assumed is an interesting item in this discussion. Early educational psychologists apparently felt that the two served equally as well in determining behavior. One writer wrote:

Through the fear of punishment both the child and the race have been taught the safe path to follow. Reward and punishment, which have been the unvarying accompaniment of the learning process in its earlier stages, can never be entirely superseded, and they must continue to exercise their selective influence.

The motive force which impels us to action may be the desire to escape punishment as well as to gain reward... the question of punishment in the school is as important as that of reward (Colvin, 1911:59).

Thorndike (1931:45) refutes this position in stating that there is no evidence to support the premise that punishment weakens undesirable response. Tilton (1951:48-52) and Stephens (1951:365-369) disagree with Thorndike on this point, however. They have charged that the punishments with which Thorndike dealt in his studies were so weak that they had no effect upon the individuals involved.

More contemporary studies (Boe and Church, 1966; Parke, 1972) have concluded that punishment not only fails to communicate to the child what is the desired response but its effectiveness is largely dependent upon a vast number of variables. These studies did not, however, deal with physical punishment. It should also be of interest to note that studies on the effects of punishment have been concerned primarily with its effect on undesirable behaviors and have rarely considered the consequences of punishment, such as anxiety.

There are four specific limitations to intense punishment that have been identified through research or the clinical study of children. First, intense punishment tends to be ego damaging, threatening a child's feeling of security and sense of personal worth. Second, it is likely to arouse feelings of resentment and counteraggression. Third, a child may develop a general feeling of uneasiness and anxiety in the presence of a highly punitive parent, causing the child to avoid being in the company of that parent any more than is necessary. Fourth, punitive parents provide aggressive models for their children.

The obvious connection between anxiety and punishment was first described by Mowrer (1939). This fear or anxiety that is associated with punishment has not only the effect of causing an individual to refrain from a particular act but also to cause that individual's anxiety

to spread. Often, as a result of this spread of anxiety, a child's response may be totally unrelated to the issue except in his own mind.

Gnagey (1974:142) states that:

In cases of repeated severe punishment, children may learn to react with fear (anxiety) to the teacher, the classroom, the text, and the subject. Since this reaction may spread to other teacher's classes and subjects, it can be a very high price to pay for deviancy suppression.

Symonds (1956:457) has described three levels of the influence of anxiety. On the first level, when punishment is so mild that it does not actually hurt, the anxiety too is very mild and is hardly recognizable as such. He maintains that, at this level, the anxiety serves principally as a signal to guide behavior. On the second level, when punishment hurts but not too much, the anxiety is the motivating force for (1) inhibition of behavior and (2) withdrawing behavior. On the third level, the punishment is severe and the anxiety produced by it is so intense that it monopolizes the attention. When punishment hurts and recognizable anxiety is evoked, Symonds says, punishment loses its educational function although it may still have value as a means of control.

It has already been pointed out that punishment does not result in a decrease in the strength of what has been learned, but merely in an inhibition of the response which brings about the discomfort. But inhibition of behavior removes it from the possibility of learning, for one learns only when one responds. Punishment, therefore, destroys the possibility of learning (Symonds, 1956:459).

In regard to the inhibition of response through punishment, Cronbach (1963:493) has said:

If one wished merely to suppress unwanted responses during the time pupils are under the teacher's eye, consistent punishment would be expected to do the job. If the aim is to teach pupils to regulate their own conduct so that the teachers' pressure can be removed, punishment will not work. A pupil is likely to do what the teacher wants when she indicates positively what response she wants.

In speaking directly to the effectiveness of corporal punishment, virtually no evidence could be found on the therapeutic value of it. Solomon (1964:239) concluded that punishment was generally effective when intelligently used. The National Education Association in its 1972 Report of the Task Force on Corporal Punishment recommended the elimination of corporal punishment from the schools but made no statement as to its effectiveness. Based upon a thorough review of the literature, empirical evidence is inconclusive on the effectiveness of corporal punishment (Patterson, 1975:36). In that NEA report (1972:7), however, a number of conclusions were reached about the use of corporal punishment as a means of maintaining discipline.

1. Physical punishment is an inefficient way to maintain order; it usually has to be repeated over and over.
2. Physical punishment may increase disruptive behavior.
3. Physical punishment hinders learning.
4. Physical punishment is not suitable for any children, regardless of socioeconomic status.
5. Physical punishment is most often used on students who are physically smaller and weaker than the teacher.
6. Physical punishment is often a symptom of frustration rather than a disciplinary procedure.
7. Infliction of physical punishment is detrimental to the educator.
8. Physical punishment does not develop self-discipline.
9. Physical punishment develops aggressive hostility.
10. Physical punishment teaches that might is right.
11. Physical punishment by educators is not comparable to that inflicted by parents.

12. Students may prefer physical punishment to other alternatives offered to them.
13. Limitations on the way physical punishment is to be used are often regularly ignored.
14. Physical punishment is legal in many places, but its constitutionality is being challenged in several court suits.
15. The availability of physical punishment discourages teachers from seeking more effective means of discipline.
16. The use of physical punishment inclines everyone in the school community to regard students as less than human and the school as dehumanizing.

These opinions seem to have been reached oblivious to the opinions held by a majority of teachers. In 1970, 65.7 per cent of the teachers surveyed favored the use of corporal punishment in the elementary school, while a somewhat smaller number favored its use in the secondary school (NEA, 1970:49). Patterson (1974) reports that the results of a study conducted in Norfolk, Virginia indicated that while a majority of teachers and administrators believed that corporal punishment was effective, a majority of parents and students contended that its use was ineffective.

Schumacher (1974:689) states that the use of pain for punishment is anachronistic because it is inconsistent with current professional standards and with modern concepts of individual human rights. She goes on to say:

When professionally trained people still resort to striking out at a child, then we must ask not whether corporal punishment should be abolished but why corporal punishment is still used.

The American School Board Journal (1973), in a somewhat biased

attempt to justify its position, stated that corporal punishment simply does not work and advocates its immediate elimination from the school setting. Wright (1969:69), on the other hand, in discussing the reasoning of the nineteenth century teacher as it compares to that of today's teacher, states:

For the teachers of either era, indeed for teachers of any decade, corporal punishment has been and continues to be used simply because it works--barring considerations for any educational objectives.

One could proceed endlessly with the reports of published opinions and arguments for and against the use of punishment in the schools and still not be able to resolve the "right and wrong" of the matter. As stated earlier, the vast majority of the writings are opposed to the use of physical punishment as a means of attaining educational objectives (Jones, 1964:149). Wright (1969:71) seems to sum up this position of opposition by stating:

Discipline, in the modern educational sense, can no longer be synonymous with punitive punishment. Corporal punishment may be effective as a means of control, but its educational value is nonexistent.

The resounding defeat of anti-spanking bills in the various state legislatures across the nation is, however, a fact which indicates that everyone is not convinced of the uselessness of corporal punishment (Rentschler, 1975). Although there is evidence that national attempts to prohibit corporal punishment are becoming more organized (Jones, 1973; Bard, 1973) almost all states continue to permit its usage.

In summation, a statement by Horace Mann, made in 1840 in regard to the use of corporal punishment in the schools, seems most appropriate.

Probably on no other subject pertaining to education is there so marked a diversity or rather hostility of opinion as on this; nor on any other, such perseverance, not to

obstinacy, in adhering to opinions once formed (Mann, 1855:306).

Summary

Ausubel (1961:26) relates that the pendulum of public opinion with regard to discipline is swinging further and further away from the formerly fashionable idea of permissiveness. As a result, he relates, a growing estrangement has arisen between the general public, on the one hand, and educational and psychological theorists on the other--with the rank and file school administrator caught squarely in the middle. People are fed up with discipline and trouble in our schools (American School Board Journal, 1974) and are demanding that something be done about it. Yet, in expressing concern about the kinds and degrees of discipline employed in the schools, some parents contend that more severe and restrictive controls are necessary while others advocate more permissive methods (Kaplan, 1971). In speaking to this divergence of opinion, Carter (1964) indicates that, according to his studies, there needs to be a more complete understanding between home and school. Schuster and Stewart (1973) verify this point by emphasizing that only when parents work cooperatively with educators in the area of discipline will students emerge with self-discipline and a sense of responsibility. Mickelson and Hansen (1957:238) support this contention and add that the kind of discipline that the school enforces has a direct bearing on the kinds of moral and spiritual values that students learn to build and accept in their lives.

The urgency of the entire matter has been stated in a letter written by Alice Skelsey and printed in Today's Education (March, 1975). As a retired teacher, Skelsey related the factors which forced her into

retirement. She attributes her dissatisfaction to the failure of children to recognize that some values are not old-fashioned and that courtesy, honesty, respect, punctuality, truthfulness, dependability, and cleanliness are always in order.

This chapter has tendered an overview of the historical background of school discipline as well as a discussion of the more contemporary practices in school discipline. Included among the latter were behavior modification, psychoanalytic approaches, the use of behavior modifying drugs, and the employment of punitive measures.

Chapter 3

Design of the Study

Introduction

This chapter concerns the procedures of the study. It describes the research design, the sample, data collection, the instrument used to gather the necessary data, and the techniques used in collecting the data. Analysis of the data by statistical method is included along with a summary of the chapter.

Procedures

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if significant differences existed between the perceptions that parents and elementary school principals held in regard to behavioral management practices employed in the public schools. The study was also designed to determine if significant differences existed in the perception of these two groups of the seriousness of various behavior problems encountered in the schools.

Preparation for the study began in the fall of 1975, when the initial plans for the study were concluded. During the months that followed, an in-depth review of the literature pertaining to the matter was undertaken. From this review of the literature, an empirical basis for the need of the study was derived.

Parents and principals in the study area were contacted and re-

sponses to a questionnaire were obtained. Those responses were hand-scored, and were analyzed statistically by the use of the chi square technique. The process was facilitated through the use of a computer on the campus of Wharton County Junior College. The results were then examined for significance at the .05 level. Conclusions and recommendations based upon the statistical inferences were drawn and are set forth in tabular form later in this chapter.

Sample

This study was conducted in a geographical area along the central Texas gulf coast. This area was selected because of its immediate interest to the researcher, its accessibility, and on the basis of personal knowledge by the researcher as to the need within the area. The need within this particular locale was determined through personal and professional interviews with practicing school administrators in the area, of which the researcher was one, as well as through personal interviews with parents throughout the area.

A ten county area, generally located within a triangular space between Houston, San Antonio, and Corpus Christi was selected. The ten counties included Calhoun, Colorado, DeWitt, Goliad, Jackson, Karnes, Lavaca, Matagorda, Victoria, and Wharton. Within these counties were located thirty-nine (39) school districts which had a total of one hundred and four (104) elementary schools (Texas Education Agency, 1975). These ten counties and the various school districts located therein comprised the Region 3 Education Service Center area.

The Region 3 Education Service Center was contacted in regard to

the study and agreed to endorse it and to provide the researcher with any available data necessary to the conduct of the study.

All superintendents in Region 3 were contacted by letter (Appendix B) and permission was sought from each of them for their respective districts to participate in the study. Of those contacted, twenty-four (24) or 61.5 per cent agreed to participate. Those districts participating included:

Boling	Industrial
Yorktown	Moulton
Goliad	Columbus
Victoria	Nordheim
Lavaca County Rural	Shiner
Tidehaven	Cuero
Hallettsville	Karnes City
Calhoun County	Bay City
Wharton	Woodsboro
Bloomington	Meyersville
Palacios	Refugio
East Bernard	Mission Valley

The elementary schools within those districts which had agreed to participate were listed, according to district, and were numbered consecutively. Within those districts participating there were seventy-five (75) elementary schools. Fifty-two (52), or exactly fifty per cent of the elementary schools in Region 3, were then selected by the use of a table of random numbers.

Collection of Data

The Behavior Management Questionnaire was sent to the principal of each of those schools selected along with a stamped, self-addressed return envelope which was addressed to the researcher. A cover letter (Appendix B) accompanied each of these questionnaires for the purpose of explanation and to encourage participation.

Each principal was sent seven parent questionnaires and asked to distribute them to seven randomly selected students from his school. The students were to be instructed to carry the questionnaires home to their parents. A cover letter (Appendix B) accompanied each of these questionnaires for the purpose of explanation and to encourage participation. A self-addressed, stamped, return envelope was included with each of these questionnaires and was addressed to the researcher.

Of the fifty-two principal questionnaires distributed, which were distinguished from parent questionnaires only by the word "administrator" at the bottom of the front page, forty-three (43) or 82.7 per cent were completed and returned in usable form. Of the three hundred and sixty-four (364) parent questionnaires distributed, one hundred and eight (108) or 29.7 per cent were returned in usable form.

Instrumentation

The method by which data for this study was collected was through the administration of the Behavior Management Questionnaire (Appendix A). This instrument was developed by the researcher and was a modification of instruments developed at East Texas State University (Freeman, 1974) and at the University of Oklahoma (Dobson, 1966). The instrument consisted of two sections. Part 1, the Behavioral Management Technique Profile, consisted of twenty-five (25) items to which the respondent was to answer A, the frequency that the practice or technique is employed and B, the frequency that, in the opinion of the respondent, the practice should be employed. A four-point evaluation scale was provided.

This portion of the questionnaire was taken from Freeman's work.

The items contained were extracted from suggestions provided to Freeman by Harold Massey, executive secretary of the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals and by a five-member committee of East Texas State University professors and practicing school administrators. This instrument was validated through a pilot study at East Texas State University in the fall of 1974.

Part 1 of the Behavior Management Questionnaire was modified to elicit not only the frequency that the practices and techniques were employed by administrators but to also obtain the frequency that these methods should be employed. Freeman's work was basically a correlation study between various items of demographic data related to responding administrators and the frequency that they reported using the various disciplinary techniques. The demographic data was not relevant to this study and was therefore eliminated.

Part 2 of the Behavior Management Questionnaire, entitled Behavior Problems Profile, consisted of a list of nineteen (19) behavior problems which may occur in the public schools. The respondent was asked to ascertain the seriousness of each of the problems listed by indicating whether the problem was "high," "medium," or "low" in seriousness.

This portion of the Behavior Management Questionnaire was taken from an instrument that was developed and validated by Dobson (1966). Items contained in Part 2 were based upon studies by Wickman (1932), who compiled and validated lists of acts of children perceived by teachers as misbehavior. Dobson's study involved the participation and response of public school teachers in Oklahoma City. The study dealt with the determination of significant differences in responses by teachers of culturally deprived children and the responses of teachers of children

from middle-class neighborhoods.

Analysis of Data

The chi square technique was employed to test for significance at the .05 level. This procedure was used to test each of the hypotheses as it applied to each item of the survey instrument.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the procedures of the study. The statement of the design of the study briefly outlined the chapter. The procedures in formulating the study were reported along with a description of the sample. The procedures for the collection of the data were examined. The survey instrument was discussed along with the manner by which the data were analyzed.

Chapter 4

Organization and Presentation of the Data

Analysis of Data

The purpose of Chapter 4 was to report the extent to which parent and principal perceptions differed in regard to the frequency that the selected behavioral management practices were employed and should have been employed. The chapter was also designed to report the extent to which parent and principal perceptions differed in regard to the seriousness of selected behavior problems.

Forty-three (43) principals responded to the questionnaire along with one hundred and six (106) parents. The responses of principals and parents were totaled by group and were reported in tabular form as each item was discussed. The total responses for the individual items varied somewhat because of the failure of some respondents to react to each item.

The data were subjected to a test of significant relationships by the use of chi square.. The hypotheses were tested and rejected at the .05 level of significance or above.

Part 1: Behavioral Management Technique Profile

On Part 1 of the questionnaire, each group of respondents was to determine (A) the frequency that the selected practices or methods were employed by the building principal and (B) the frequency that this practice or method should have been employed. A four-point evaluation scale was provided. The responses were tabulated and placed into 2 X 4

contingency tables; one table for each of the first four hypotheses.

Hypotheses one, two, three, and four were then tested according to the data in the contingency tables for each of the twenty-five items on Part 1 of the instrument (see Appendix A). All items were subject to three degrees of freedom. A chi square criterion value of 7.82 was determined.

The data were presented in tabular form and were presented in the order that the individual items appeared on the instrument. The tables were identified by a number which corresponded to the item number on the instrument. This designation was followed by a decimal point and another numeral which indicated the number of the particular hypothesis to which the data in that table applied. For the sake of simplicity and ease of understanding, all tables in the report were presented individually on separate pages.

An individual item analysis has been presented in the following pages in which the raw data for the items in Part 1 were presented along with the hypothesis statement that applied to each of those items. The calculated chi square value was determined and has been presented. A statement of rejection or acceptance for each hypothesis statement has been made, based upon the statistical findings.

Chapter 4 has been designed to organize and present the data. Although acceptance or rejection statements were made in regard to each particular item as that item was reported, an in-depth discussion of the findings has been reserved for Chapter 5.

Item 1: The Practice of Telephoning Parents

Table 1.1

*The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents
Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B)
as Reported by Principals*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	8	8.50	21	23.50	14	11.00	0	0.00	43
Pri.B	9	8.50	26	23.50	8	11.00	0	0.00	43
Total	17		47		22		0		86
Chi square = 2.2271 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of telephoning parents is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 1.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 1.2

*The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents
Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B)
as Reported by Parents*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	11	16.75	37	49.28	46	32.03	8	3.94	102
Par.B	23	17.25	63	50.72	19	32.97	0	4.06	105
Total	34		100		65		8		207
Chi square = 30.1735 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of telephoning parents is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 1.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of telephoning parents was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 1.3

*The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents Is Employed,
as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed,
as Reported by Parents (Par.A)*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	8	5.63	21	17.20	14	17.79	0	2.37	43
Par.A	11	13.37	37	40.80	46	42.21	8	5.63	102
Total	19		58		60		8		145
Chi square = 7.12727 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of telephoning parents is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 1.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 1.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	9	9.30	26	25.86	8	7.84	0	0.00	43
Par.B	23	22.70	63	63.14	19	19.16	0	0.00	105
Total	32		89		27		0		148
Chi square = .0188372 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of telephoning parents should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 1.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 2: The Practice of Telephoning Parents to Pick Up Their Child

Table 2.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents to Pick Up Their Child Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	5	4.50	4	6.50	24	25.00	10	7.00	43
Pri.B	4	4.50	9	6.50	26	25.00	4	7.00	43
Total	9		13		50		14		86
Chi square = 4.68562 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of telephoning parents to pick up their child is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 2.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 2.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents to Pick Up Their Child Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	5	8.38	13	22.67	60	53.22	25	18.73	103
Par.B	12	8.62	33	23.33	48	54.78	13	19.27	106
Total	17		46		108		38		209
Chi square = 16.6612 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of telephoning parents to pick up their child is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 2.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of telephoning parents to pick up their child was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 2.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents to Pick Up Their Child Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	5	2.95	4	5.01	24	24.74	10	10.31	43
Par.A	5	7.05	13	11.99	60	59.26	25	24.69	103
Total	10		17		84		35		146
Chi square = 2.36348 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of telephoning parents to pick up their child is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 2.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 2.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Parents to Pick Up Their Child Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	4	4.62	9	12.12	26	21.36	4	4.91	43
Par.B	12	11.38	33	29.88	48	52.64	13	12.09	106
Total	16		42		74		17		149
Chi square = 2.90049 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of telephoning parents to pick up their child should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 2.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed.

Item 3: The Practice of Recommending Parent-Teacher Conferences

Table 3.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Parent-Teacher Conferences Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	14	16.00	25	23.50	4	3.50	0	0.00	43
Pri.B	18	16.00	22	23.50	3	3.50	0	0.00	43
Total	32		47		7		0		86
Chi square = .834347 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of recommending parent-teacher conferences is employed by elementary principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 3.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 3.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Parent-Teacher Conferences Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	29	42.59	41	39.62	29	18.32	4	2.48	103
Par.B	57	43.41	39	40.38	8	2.52	1	2.52	105
Total	86		80		37		5		208
Chi square = 22.8681 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of recommending parent-teacher conferences is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 3.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of recommending parent-teacher conferences was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 3.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Parent-Teacher Conferences Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	14	12.66	25	19.44	4	9.72	0	1.18	43
Par.A	29	30.34	41	46.56	29	23.28	4	2.82	103
Total	43		66		33		4		146
Chi square = 8.89555 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of recommending parent-teacher conferences is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 3.3, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 3.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Parent-Teacher Conferences Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	18	21.79	22	17.72	3	3.20	0	.29	43
Par.B	57	53.21	39	43.28	8	7.80	1	.71	105
Total	75		61		11		1		148
Chi square = 2.81072 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of recommending parent-teacher conferences should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 3.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 4: The Practice of Suspending a Student from School for a Period of 1, 2, or 3 Days

Table 4.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Suspending a Student from School Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	.50	2	1.50	26	29.50	15	11.50	43
Pri.B	1	.50	1	1.50	33	29.50	8	11.50	43
Total	1		3		59		23		86
Chi square = 4.29428 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of suspending a student from school is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 4.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 4.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Suspending a Student from School Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	2	2.94	6	11.28	57	56.87	36	29.91	101
Par.B	4	3.06	17	11.72	59	31.10	25	31.10	105
Total	6		23		116		61		206
Chi square = 7.87992 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of suspending a student from school is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 4.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of suspending a student from school was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 4.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Suspending a Student from School Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	.60	2	2.39	26	24.78	15	15.23	43
Par.A	2	1.40	6	5.61	57	58.22	36	35.77	101
Total	2		8		83		51		144
Chi square = 1.03162 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of suspending a student from school is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 4.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 4.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Suspending a Student from School Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	1	1.45	1	5.23	33	26.73	8	9.59	43
Par.B	4	3.55	17	12.77	59	65.27	25	23.41	105
Total	5		18		92		33		148
Chi square = 7.46465 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of suspending a student from school should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 4.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 5: The Practice of Expelling a Student for the Remainder of the Semester

Table 5.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Expelling a Student from School Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	0.00	0	1.01	17	20.74	26	21.25	43
Pri.B	0	0.00	2	.99	24	20.56	16	20.75	42
Total	0		2		41		42		85
Chi square = 5.56508 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of expelling a student from school is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 5.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 5.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Expelling a Student from School Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	0	.48	1	4.83	25	28.48	72	64.21	98
Par.B	1	.52	9	5.17	34	30.52	61	68.79	105
Total	1		10		59		133		203
Chi square = 9.45251 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of expelling a student from school is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 5.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of expelling a student from school was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 5.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Expelling a Student from School Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	0.00	0	.30	17	12.81	26	29.89	43
Par.A	0	0.00	1	.70	25	29.19	72	68.11	98
Total	0		1		42		98		141
Chi square = 3.13942 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of expelling a student from school is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 5.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 5.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Expelling a Student from School Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	0	.29	2	3.14	24	16.57	16	22.00	42
Par.B	1	.71	9	7.86	34	41.43	61	55.00	105
Total	1		11		58		77		147
Chi square = 7.9348 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of expelling a student from school should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 5.4, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 6: The Technique of "Role Playing" in which the Child Assumes the Role of One of the Participants Associated with the Behavior Problem

Table 6.1

The Frequency that the Technique of Role Playing Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	1	1.00	9	12.00	18	19.50	14	9.50	42
Pri.B	1	1.00	15	12.00	21	19.50	5	9.50	42
Total	2		24		39		19		84
Chi square = 5.99393 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the technique of role playing is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 6.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 6.2

*The Frequency that the Technique of Role Playing Is Employed
(Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B)
as Reported by Parents*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	4	5.84	9	18.50	30	31.15	49	36.51	92
Par.B	8	6.16	29	19.50	34	32.85	26	38.49	97
Total	12		38		64		75		189
Chi square = 19.044 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the technique of role playing is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the technique should be employed.

According to the data in Table 6.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the technique of role playing was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 6.3

The Frequency that the Technique of Role Playing Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	1	1.57	9	5.64	18	15.04	14	19.75	42
Par.A	4	3.43	9	12.36	30	32.96	49	43.25	92
Total	5		18		48		63		134
Chi square = 6.49154 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the technique of role playing is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the technique is employed.

According to the data in Table 6.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the technique was employed.

Table 6.4

*The Frequency that the Technique of Role Playing Should Be Employed,
as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed,
as Reported by Parents (Par.B)*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	1	2.72	15	13.30	21	16.62	5	9.37	42
Par.B	8	6.28	29	30.71	34	38.38	26	21.63	97
Total	9		44		55		31		139
Chi square = 6.44381 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the technique of role playing should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 6.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 7: The Technique of Group Counseling

Table 7.1

*The Frequency that the Technique of Group Counseling
Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B)
as Reported by Principals*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	7	8.50	17	19.00	13	11.50	6	4.00	43
Pri.B	10	8.50	21	19.00	10	11.50	2	4.00	43
Total	17		38		23		8		86
Chi square = 3.34117 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the technique of group counseling is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 7.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 7.2

*The Frequency that the Technique of Group Counseling
Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B)
as Reported by Parents*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	14	19.46	17	25.16	28	27.54	35	21.84	94
Par.B	27	21.54	36	27.84	30	30.46	11	24.16	104
Total	41		53		58		46		198
Chi square = 23.0778 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the technique of group counseling is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the technique should be employed.

According to the data in Table 7.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the technique of group counseling was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 7.3

*The Frequency that the Technique of Group Counseling Is
Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and
Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	7	6.59	17	10.67	13	12.87	6	12.87	43
Par.A	14	14.41	17	23.33	28	28.13	35	28.13	94
Total	21		34		41		41		137
Chi square = 10.8518 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the technique of group counseling is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 7.3, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the technique was employed.

Table 7.4

The Frequency that the Technique of Group Counseling Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	10	10.82	21	16.67	10	11.70	2	3.80	43
Par.B	27	26.18	36	40.33	30	28.30	11	9.20	104
Total	37		57		40		13		147
Chi square = 3.23268 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the technique of group counseling should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 7.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 8: The Practice of Recommending Behavior Modifying Drugs

Table 8.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Behavior Modifying Drugs Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	.50	6	6.50	23	24.00	14	12.00	43
Pri.B	1	.50	7	6.50	25	24.00	10	12.00	43
Total	1		13		48		24		86
Chi square = 1.82692 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of recommending behavior modifying drugs is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 8.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 8.2

*The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Behavior
Modifying Drugs Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be
Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	5	6.37	17	16.16	31	33.80	43	39.67	96
Par.B	8	6.63	16	16.84	38	35.20	38	41.33	100
Total	13		33		69		81		196
Chi square = 1.66046 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of recommending behavior modifying drugs is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 8.2, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that a significant difference did not exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of recommending behavior modifying drugs was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 8.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Behavior Modifying Drugs Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	1.55	6	7.12	23	16.71	14	17.63	43
Par.A	5	3.45	17	15.88	31	37.30	43	39.37	96
Total	5		23		54		57		139
Chi square = 7.01112 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of recommending behavior modifying drugs is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 8.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 8.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Recommending Behavior Modifying Drugs Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	1	2.71	7	6.92	25	18.94	10	14.43	43
Par.B	8	6.29	16	16.08	38	44.06	38	33.57	100
Total	9		23		63		48		143
Chi square = 6.2557 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of recommending behavior modifying drugs should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 8.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 9: The Practice of Requesting Parent-Principal Conferences

Table 9.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Requesting Parent-Principal Conferences Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	9	10.00	24	25.00	8	7.00	2	1.00	43
Pri.B	11	10.00	26	25.00	6	7.00	0	1.00	43
Total	20		50		14		2		86
Chi square = 2.56571 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of requesting parent-principal conferences is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 9.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 9.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Requesting Parent-Principal Conferences Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	14	22.70	32	37.19	40	30.91	13	8.21	99
Par.B	33	24.30	45	39.81	24	33.09	4	8.79	106
Total	47		77		64		17		205
Chi square = 18.4228 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of requesting parent-principal conferences is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 9.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of requesting parent-principal conferences was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 9.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Requesting Parent-Principal Conferences Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	9	6.96	24	16.96	8	14.54	2	4.54	43
Par.A	14	16.04	32	39.04	40	33.46	13	10.46	99
Total	23		56		48		15		142
Chi square = 11.3032 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of requesting parent-principal conferences is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 9.3, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 9.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Requesting Parent-Principal Conferences Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	11	12.70	26	20.49	6	8.66	0	1.15	43
Par.B	33	31.30	45	50.51	24	21.34	4	2.85	106
Total	44		71		30		4		149
Chi square = 5.17146 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of requesting parent-principal conferences should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 9.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 10: The Practice of Isolating a Student with a Behavior Problem

Table 10.1

*The Frequency that the Practice of Isolating a Student
Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B)
as Reported by Principals*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	6	6.50	17	18.00	11	10.00	9	8.50	43
Pri.B	7	6.50	19	18.00	9	10.00	8	8.50	43
Total	13		36		20		17		86
Chi square = .446858 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of isolating a student with a behavior problem is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 10.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 10.2

*The Frequency that the Practice of Isolating a Student
Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B)
as Reported by Parents*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	10	12.25	21	23.53	35	30.88	34	33.33	100
Par.B	15	12.75	27	24.47	28	32.12	34	34.67	104
Total	25		48		63		68		204
Chi square = 2.45029 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of isolating a student with a behavior problem is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 10.2, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that a significant difference did not exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of isolating a student with a behavior problem was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 10.3

*The Frequency that the Practice of Isolating a Student Is Employed,
as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed,
as Reported by Parents (Par.A)*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	6	4.81	17	11.43	11	13.83	9	12.93	43
Par.A	10	11.19	21	26.57	35	32.17	34	30.07	100
Total	16		38		46		43		143
Chi square = 6.84495 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of isolating a student with a behavior problem is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 10.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 10.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Isolating a Student Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	7	6.44	19	13.46	9	10.82	8	12.29	43
Par.B	15	15.56	27	32.54	28	26.18	34	29.71	104
Total	22		46		37		42		147
Chi square = 5.84616 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of isolating a student with a behavior problem should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 10.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 11: The Technique of Injecting Humor into the Situation

Table 11.1

The Frequency that the Technique of Injecting Humor into the Situation Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	5	5.50	17	17.50	16	14.50	5	5.50	43
Pri.B	6	5.50	18	17.50	13	14.50	6	5.50	43
Total	11		35		29		11		86

Chi square = .520735 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the technique of injecting humor into the situation is employed by the elementary school principal and the frequency that, in his opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 11.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 11.2

The Frequency that the Technique of Injecting Humor into the Situation Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	10	16.09	30	29.74	33	28.77	25	23.40	98
Par.B	23	16.91	31	31.26	26	30.23	23	24.60	103
Total	33		61		59		48		201
Chi square = 5.93073 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the technique of injecting humor into the situation is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the technique should be employed.

According to the data in Table 11.2, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that a significant difference did not exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the technique of injecting humor into the situation was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 11.3

The Frequency that the Technique of Injecting Humor into the Situation Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	5	4.57	17	14.33	16	14.94	5	9.15	43
Par.A	10	10.43	30	32.67	33	34.06	25	20.85	98
Total	15		47		49		30		141

Chi square = 3.58533 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the technique of injecting humor into the situation is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 11.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 11.4

The Frequency that the Technique of Injecting Humor into the Situation Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	6	8.54	18	14.43	13	11.49	6	8.54	43
Par.B	23	20.46	31	34.57	26	27.51	23	20.46	103
Total	29		49		39		29		146

Chi square = 3.67677 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the technique of injecting humor into the situation should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 11.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 12: The Practice of Offering Praise or Recognition to the Child

Table 12.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Praise or Recognition Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	22	24.50	15	13.00	6	5.50	0	0.00	43
Pri.B	27	24.50	11	13.00	5	5.50	0	0.00	43
Total	49		26		11		0		86

Chi square = 1.21651 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of offering praise or recognition is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 12.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 12.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Praise or Recognition Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	39	49.47	34	31.35	21	12.24	2	2.94	96
Par.B	62	51.53	30	32.65	4	12.76	4	3.06	100
Total	101		64		25		6		196

Chi square = 17.64 > (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of offering praise or recognition is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 12.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of offering praise or recognition was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 12.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Praise or Recognition Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	22	18.87	15	15.16	6	8.35	0	.62	43
Par.A	39	42.13	34	33.84	21	18.65	2	1.38	96
Total	61		49		27		2		139
Chi square = 2.60907 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of offering praise or recognition is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 12.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 12.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Praise or Recognition Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	27	26.76	11	12.33	5	2.71	0	1.20	43
Par.B	62	62.24	30	28.67	4	6.29	4	2.80	100
Total	89		41		9		4		143
Chi square = 4.70773 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of offering praise or recognition should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 12.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that the principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 13: The Practice of Establishing a Written Contract, with the Child, for Standards of Behavior

Table 13.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Establishing a Written Contract Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	3.0	9	10.00	18	16.00	15	13.00	42
Pri.B	6	3.0	11	10.00	14	16.00	11	13.00	42
Total	6		20		32		26		84
Chi square = 7.31538 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of establishing a written contract is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 13.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 13.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Establishing a Written Contract Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	9	11.52	10	17.76	19	18.72	58	48.00	96
Par.B	15	12.48	27	19.24	20	20.28	42	52.00	104
Total	24		37		39		100		200
Chi square = 11.595 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of establishing a written contract is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 13.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of establishing a written contract was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 13.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Establishing a Written Contract Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	2.74	9	5.78	18	11.26	15	22.22	42
Par.A	9	6.26	10	13.22	19	25.74	58	50.78	96
Total	9		19		37		73		138
Chi square = 15.6787 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of establishing a written contract is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 13.3, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 13.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Establishing a Written Contract Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	6	6.04	11	10.93	14	9.78	11	15.25	42
Par.B	15	14.96	27	27.07	20	24.22	42	37.75	104
Total	21		38		34		53		146
Chi square = 4.2165 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of establishing a written contract for standards of behavior should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 13.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 14: The Practice of Administering Corporal Punishment

Table 14.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Administering Corporal Punishment Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	6	6.00	19	19.50	18	17.50	0	0.00	43
Pri.B	6	6.00	20	19.50	17	17.50	0	0.00	43
Total	12		39		35		0		86
Chi square = .0542124 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of administering corporal punishment is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 14.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using corporal punishment and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 14.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Administering Corporal Punishment Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	12	16.84	28	27.73	40	36.15	23	22.28	103
Par.B	22	17.16	28	28.27	33	36.85	22	22.72	105
Total	34		56		73		45		208
Chi square = 3.61574 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of administering corporal punishment is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 14.2, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that a significant difference did not exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of administering corporal punishment was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 14.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Administering Corporal Punishment Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	6	5.30	19	13.84	18	17.08	0	6.77	43
Par.A	12	12.70	28	33.16	40	40.92	23	16.23	103
Total	18		47		58		23		146
Chi square = 12.5262 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of administering corporal punishment is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 14.3, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that principals reported using the technique of corporal punishment and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 14.4

*The Frequency that the Practice of Administering Corporal Punishment
Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and
Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	6	8.14	20	13.95	17	14.53	0	6.39	43
Par.B	22	19.86	28	34.05	33	35.47	22	15.61	105
Total	28		48		50		22		148

Chi square = 14.0972 > (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of administering corporal punishment should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 14.4, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 15: The Practice of Telephoning Juvenile Authorities about a
Child with a Behavior Problem

Table 15.1

*The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Juvenile Authorities
Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B)
as Reported by Principals*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	0.00	2	2.50	18	21.50	23	19.00	43
Pri.B	0	0.00	3	2.50	25	21.50	15	19.00	43
Total	0		5		43		38		86
Chi square = 3.02375 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of telephoning juvenile authorities is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 15.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 15.2

*The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Juvenile Authorities
Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B)
as Reported by Parents*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	2	3.38	1	4.83	43	47.31	52	42.48	98
Par.B	5	3.62	9	5.17	55	50.69	36	45.52	105
Total	7		10		98		88		203

Chi square = 11.8369 > (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of telephoning juvenile authorities is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 15.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of telephoning juvenile authorities was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 15.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Juvenile Authorities Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	.61	2	.91	18	18.60	23	22.87	43
Par.A	2	1.39	1	2.09	43	42.40	52	52.13	98
Total	2		3		61		75		141
Chi square = 2.75837 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of telephoning juvenile authorities is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 15.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 15.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Telephoning Juvenile Authorities Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	0	1.45	3	3.49	25	23.24	15	14.82	43
Par.B	5	3.55	9	8.51	55	56.76	36	36.18	105
Total	5		12		80		51		148
Chi square = 2.33362 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of telephoning juvenile authorities should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 15.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 16: The Practice of Placing a Student in a "Crisis" Room or Area

Table 16.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Placing a Student in a Crisis Room Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	1	1.00	4	6.50	15	16.00	23	19.50	43
Pri.B	1	1.00	9	6.50	17	16.00	16	19.50	43
Total	2		13		32		39		86

Chi square = 3.30449 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of placing a student in a crisis room or area is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be used.

According to the data in Table 16.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 16.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Placing a Student in a Crisis Room Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	4	6.67	3	10.49	31	27.17	54	47.67	92
Par.B	10	7.33	19	11.51	26	29.83	46	52.33	101
Total	14		22		57		100		193
Chi square = 14.8991 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of placing a student in a crisis room or area is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 16.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of placing a student in a crisis room or area was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 16.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Placing a Student in a Crisis Room Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	1	1.59	4	2.23	15	14.65	23	24.53	43
Par.A	4	3.41	3	4.77	31	31.35	54	52.47	92
Total	5		7		46		77		135
Chi square = 2.53774 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of placing a student in a crisis room or area is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 16.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 16.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Placing a Student in a Crisis Room Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	1	3.28	9	8.36	17	12.84	16	18.51	43
Par.B	10	7.72	19	19.64	26	30.16	46	43.49	101
Total	11		28		43		62		144

Chi square = 4.74331 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of placing a student in a crisis room or area should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 16.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 17: The Practice of Referring a Child to an Alternative School

Table 17.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to an Alternative School Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	0.00	0	.50	9	12.00	33	29.50	42
Pri.B	0	0.00	1	.50	15	12.00	26	29.50	42
Total	0		1		24		59		84

Chi square = 3.3305 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of referring a child to an alternative school is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 17.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 17.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to an Alternative School Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	1	.98	2	2.95	28	38.90	67	55.16	98
Par.B	1	1.02	4	3.05	51	40.10	45	56.84	101
Total	2		6		79		112		199

Chi square = 11.6417 > (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of referring a child to an alternative school is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 17.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of referring a child to an alternative school was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 17.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to an Alternative School Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	.30	0	.60	9	11.10	33	30.00	42
Par.A	1	.70	2	1.40	28	25.90	67	70.00	98
Total	1		2		37		100		140

Chi square = 2.28185 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of referring a child to an alternative school is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 17.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 17.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to an Alternative School Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	0	.29	1	1.47	15	19.38	26	20.85	42
Par.B	1	.71	4	3.53	51	46.62	45	50.15	101
Total	1		5		66		71		143
Chi square = 3.83023 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of referring a child to an alternative school should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 17.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 18: The Practice of Referring a Child to the Guidance Counselor

Table 18.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to the Guidance Counselor Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	7	8.50	15	15.00	14	14.00	7	5.50	43
Pri.B	10	8.50	15	15.00	14	14.00	4	5.50	43
Total	17		30		28		11		86
Chi square = 1.34759 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of referring a child to the guidance counselor is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 18.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 18.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to the Guidance Counselor is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	11	17.93	25	28.60	34	30.05	25	18.42	95
Par.B	26	19.07	34	30.40	28	31.95	13	19.58	101
Total	37		59		62		38		196
Chi square = 11.6513 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of referring a child to the guidance counselor is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 18.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of referring a child to the guidance counselor was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 18.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to the Guidance Counselor Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	7	5.61	15	12.46	14	14.96	7	9.97	43
Par.A	11	12.39	25	27.54	34	33.04	25	22.03	95
Total	18		40		48		32		138
Chi square = 2.62585 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of referring a child to the guidance counselor is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 18.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 18.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring a Child to the Guidance Counselor Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	10	10.75	15	14.63	14	12.54	4	5.08	43
Par.B	26	25.75	34	34.37	28	29.46	13	11.92	101
Total	36		49		42		17		144
Chi square = .654976 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of referring a child to the guidance counselor should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 18.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 19: The Practice of Transferring a Child to Another Classroom or to Another Teacher

Table 19.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Transferring a Child to Another Classroom or to Another Teacher Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	2	2.00	3	3.50	23	24.50	15	13.00	43
Pri.B	2	2.00	4	3.50	26	13.00	11	13.00	43
Total	4		7		49		26		86

Chi square = .941915 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of transferring a child to another classroom or to another teacher is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 19.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 19.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Transferring a Child to Another Classroom or to Another Teacher Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	2	5.85	8	15.12	56	55.61	34	23.41	100
Par.B	10	6.15	23	15.88	58	58.39	14	24.59	105
Total	12		31		114		48		205

Chi square = 20.85 > (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of transferring a child to another classroom or to another teacher is employed by elementary principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 19.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of transferring a child to another classroom or to another teacher was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 19.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Transferring a Child to Another Classroom or to Another Teacher Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	2	1.20	3	3.31	23	23.76	15	14.73	43
Par.A	2	2.80	8	7.69	56	55.24	34	34.27	100
Total	4		11		79		49		143
Chi square = .837701 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of transferring a child to another classroom or to another teacher is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 19.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 19.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Transferring a Child to Another Classroom or to Another Teacher Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	2	3.49	4	7.84	26	24.41	11	7.26	43
Par.B	10	8.51	23	19.16	58	59.59	14	17.74	105
Total	12		27		84		25		148
Chi square = 6.4053 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of transferring a child to another classroom or to another teacher should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 19.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 20: The Practice of Referring the Student for Psychological Aid or Evaluation

Table 20.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Student for Psychological Aid or Evaluation Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	1	2.00	24	25.00	17	15.50	1	.50	43
Pri.B	3	2.00	26	25.00	14	15.00	0	.50	43
Total	4		50		31		1		86

Chi square = 2.37032 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of referring the student for psychological aid or evaluation is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 20.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 20.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Student for Psychological Aid or Evaluation Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	12	15.28	25	33.51	47	41.40	19	12.81	103
Par.B	19	15.72	43	34.49	37	42.60	7	13.19	106
Total	31		68		84		26		209

Chi square = 13.0339 > (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of referring the student for psychological aid or evaluation is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 20.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of referring the student for psychological aid or evaluation was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 20.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Student for Psychological Aid or Evaluation Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	1	3.83	24	14.43	17	18.85	1	5.89	43
Par.A	12	9.17	25	34.57	47	45.15	19	14.11	103
Total	13		49		64		20		146
Chi square = 17.9676 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of referring the student for psychological aid or evaluation is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 20.3, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 20.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Student for Psychological Aid or Evaluation Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	3	6.35	26	19.91	14	14.72	0	2.02	43
Par.B	19	15.65	43	49.09	37	36.28	7	4.98	106
Total	22		69		51		7		149
Chi square = 7.98775 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of referring the student for psychological aid or evaluation should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 20.4, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 21: The Practice of Referring the Child to a Disciplinary Committee

Table 21.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Child to a Disciplinary Committee Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	.50	1	.50	5	8.50	36	32.50	42
Pri.B	1	.50	0	.50	12	8.50	29	32.50	42
Total	1		1		17		65		84
Chi square = 5.63619 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of referring the child to a disciplinary committee is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 21.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 21.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Child to a Disciplinary Committee Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	1	1.43	2	11.41	18	25.19	75	57.98	96
Par.B	2	1.57	22	12.59	35	27.81	47	64.02	106
Total	3		24		53		122		202
Chi square = 28.4538 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of referring the child to a disciplinary committee is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 21.1, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of referring the child to a disciplinary committee was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 21.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Child to a Disciplinary Committee Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	0	.30	1	.91	5	7.00	36	33.78	42
Par.A	1	.70	2	2.09	18	16.00	75	77.22	96
Total	1		3		23		111		138
Chi square = 1.48005 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of referring the child to a disciplinary committee is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 21.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 21.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Referring the Child to a Disciplinary Committee Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	1	.85	0	6.24	12	13.34	29	21.57	42
Par.B	2	2.15	22	15.76	35	33.66	47	54.43	106
Total	3		22		47		76		148
Chi square = 12.5167 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of referring the child to a disciplinary committee should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 21.4, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 22: The Practice of Using a Special Resource Person such as a "Crisis" Teacher to Help Students with Behavior Problems

Table 22.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Using a Special Resource Person Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	1	1.00	5	7.00	9	12.00	26	21.00	41
Pri.B	1	1.00	9	7.00	15	12.00	16	21.00	41
Total	2		14		24		42		82
Chi square = 5.02381 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of using a special resource person to help students with behavior problems is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 22.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 22.2

The Frequency that the Practice of Using a Special Resource Person Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B) as Reported by Parents

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	7	13.92	17	28.32	32	28.32	40	25.44	96
Par.B	22	15.08	42	30.68	27	30.68	13	27.56	104
Total	29		59		59		53		200
Chi square = 32.2619 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of using a special resource person to help students with behavior problems is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 22.2, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of using a special resource person was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 22.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Using a Special Resource Person Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	1	2.39	5	6.58	9	12.27	26	19.75	41
Par.A	7	5.61	17	15.42	32	28.73	40	46.25	96
Total	8		22		41		66		137
Chi square = 5.76673 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of using a special resource person to help students with behavior problems is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 22.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 22.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Using a Special Resource Person Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	1	6.50	9	14.42	15	11.88	16	8.20	41
Par.B	22	16.50	42	36.58	27	30.12	13	20.80	104
Total	23		51		42		29		145
Chi square = 20.8245 > (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of using a special resource person to help students with behavior problems should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 22.4, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 23: The Practice of Verbal Reprimand

Table 23.1

*The Frequency that the Practice of Verbal Reprimand
Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B)
as Reported by Principals*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	21	19.50	17	18.00	3	4.00	2	1.50	43
Pri.B	18	19.50	19	18.00	5	4.00	1	1.50	43
Total	39		36		8		3		86

Chi square = 1.17521 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of verbal reprimand is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 23.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 23.2

*The Frequency that the Practice of Verbal Reprimand
Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B)
as Reported by Parents*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	59	55.24	27	30.56	14	13.93	5	5.47	105
Par.B	52	55.76	34	30.64	14	14.07	6	5.53	106
Total	111		61		28		11		211
Chi square = 1.33092 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of verbal reprimand is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 23.2, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that a significant difference did not exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of verbal reprimand was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 23.3

*The Frequency that the Practice of Verbal Reprimand Is Employed,
as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed
as Reported by Parents (Par.A)*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	21	23.24	17	12.78	3	4.94	2	2.03	43
Par.A	59	56.76	27	31.22	14	12.06	5	4.97	105
Total	80		44		17		7		148
Chi square = 3.33911 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of verbal reprimand is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 23.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 23.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Verbal Reprimand Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	18	20.20	19	15.30	5	5.48	1	2.02	43
Par.B	52	49.80	34	37.70	14	13.52	6	4.98	106
Total	70		53		19		7		149

Chi square = 2.38251 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of verbal reprimand should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 23.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that a significant difference did not exist between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 24: The Practice of Offering Tangible Rewards, such as Candy, Toys, Etc. to Reinforce Positive Behavior

Table 24.1

- The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Tangible Rewards Is Employed (Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B) as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	3	3.00	6	7.50	8	9.00	26	23.50	43
Pri.B	3	3.00	9	7.50	10	9.00	21	23.50	43
Total	6		15		18		47		86

Chi square = 1.35414 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of offering tangible rewards is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 24.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 24.2

*The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Tangible Rewards
Is Employed (Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B)
as Reported by Parents*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	6	5.86	17	16.10	24	23.91	54	55.14	101
Par.B	6	6.14	16	16.90	25	25.09	59	57.86	106
Total	12		33		49		113		207
Chi square = .151266 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of offering tangible rewards is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 24.2, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that a significant difference did not exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of offering tangible rewards was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 24.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Tangible Rewards Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	3	2.69	6	6.87	8	9.56	26	23.89	43
Par.A	6	6.31	17	16.13	24	22.44	54	56.11	101
Total	9		23		32		80		144
Chi square = .835264 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of offering tangible rewards is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 24.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 24.4

The Frequency that the Practice of Offering Tangible Rewards Should Be Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.B)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	3	2.60	9	7.21	10	10.10	21	23.09	43
Par.B	6	6.40	16	17.79	25	24.90	59	56.91	106
Total	9		25		35		80		149
Chi square = .975358 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of offering tangible rewards should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 24.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that a significant difference did not exist between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Item 25: Detention-The Practice of Detaining a Child in the Morning,
at Noon, or After School

Table 25.1

The Frequency that the Practice of Detention Is Employed
(Pri.A) and Should Be Employed (Pri.B)
as Reported by Principals

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	6	6.00	16	15.50	14	15.00	7	6.50	43
Pri.B	6	6.00	15	15.50	16	15.00	6	6.50	43
Total	12		31		30		13		86
Chi square = .242514 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of detention is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should be employed.

According to the data in Table 25.1, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that they felt that they should have used it.

Table 25.2

*The Frequency that the Practice of Detention Is Employed
(Par.A) and Should Be Employed (Par.B)
as Reported by Parents*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Par.A	26	24.76	25	32.19	34	31.70	19	15.35	104
Par.B	24	25.24	40	32.81	30	32.30	12	15.65	106
Total	50		65		64		31		210

Chi square = 5.35363 < (.05)

df=3

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of detention is employed by elementary school principals and, in the opinion of parents, the frequency that the practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 25.2, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that a significant difference did not exist between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice of detention was employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Table 25.3

The Frequency that the Practice of Detention Is Employed, as Reported by Principals (Pri.A), and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents (Par.A)

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.A	6	9.36	16	11.99	14	14.04	7	7.61	43
Par.A	26	22.64	25	29.01	34	33.96	19	18.39	104
Total	32		41		48		26		147
Chi square = 3.6657 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency that the practice of detention is employed by elementary school principals and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practice is employed.

According to the data in Table 25.3, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between the frequency that principals reported using this technique and the frequency that parents felt that the practice was employed.

Table 25.4

*The Frequency that the Practice of Detention Should Be Employed,
as Reported by Principals (Pri.B), and Should Be Employed,
as Reported by Parents (Par.B)*

Resp.	Frequently		Often		Seldom		Never		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Pri.B	6	8.66	15	15.87	16	13.28	6	5.19	43
Par.B	24	21.34	40	39.12	30	32.72	12	12.81	106
Total	30		55		46		18		149
Chi square = 2.17592 < (.05)									df=3

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency that elementary school principals perceive that the practice of detention should be employed and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, this practice should be employed.

According to the data in Table 25.4, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that a significant difference did not exist between the frequency that principals felt that this practice should have been employed and the frequency that parents felt that it should have been employed.

Part 2: Behavior Problems Profile

On Part 2 of the Behavior Management Questionnaire [see Appendix A], the respondents were to ascertain the seriousness of nineteen selected behavioral management problems. A three-point evaluation scale was provided by which the respondents were to indicate their perceptions of the seriousness of the behavior problems as being "high," "medium," or "low." The raw data were collected and tabulated for each of the respondent groups, parents and principals, and were recorded in 2 X 3 contingency tables for each item on this part of the questionnaire.

The chi square test for significance was applied to the data which had been collected on each item. A criterion value of 5.99 was determined for two degrees of freedom at the .05 level. Hypothesis Five was tested for each of the items contained in this portion of the questionnaire.

The tables containing the data for each item were identified by number and were arranged in the order that the items appeared on the instrument. The table for each individual item was presented on a separate page in order to facilitate ease of understanding.

As the raw data for the nineteen items on Part 2 were presented, an individual item analysis was made. The hypothesis statement, as it applied to each item, has been presented along with the actual calculated chi square value as it was determined. A statement of acceptance or rejection for Hypothesis Five has been made, based upon the statistical findings.

An in-depth discussion of the findings has been reserved for Chapter Five of this report.

Item 26: Insubordination or Disrespect

Table 26

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Insubordination or Disrespect
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	45	43.10	33	32.32	24	26.58	102
Principals	15	16.90	12	12.68	13	10.42	40
Total	60		45		37		142
Chi square = 1.23535 < (.05)							df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of insubordination or disrespect as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 26, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of this problem.

Item 27: Physical Assault on Others

Table 27

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Physical Assault on Others
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	49	47.92	16	15.74	38	39.34	103
Principals	18	19.08	6	6.26	17	15.66	41
Total	67		22		55		144
Chi square = .260828 < (.05)							df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of physical assault on others as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 27, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of this problem.

Item 28: Vandalism

Table 28

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Vandalism
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	46	43.57	20	20.00	34	36.43	100
Principals	15	17.43	8	8.00	17	14.57	40
Total	61		28		51		140
Chi square = 1.04044 < (.05)							df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of vandalism as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 28, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of the problem of vandalism.

Item 29: Truancy

Table 29

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Truancy
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	26	21.92	34	33.94	39	43.14	99
Principals	5	9.08	14	14.06	22	17.86	41
Total	31		48		61		140

Chi square = 3.94543 < (.05)

df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of truancy as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 29, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of the problem of truancy.

Item 30: Fighting

Table 30

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Fighting
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	31	24.97	40	46.36	31	30.67	102
Principals	4	10.04	25	18.64	12	12.33	41
Total	35		65		43		143
Chi square = 8.14695 > (.05)							df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of the seriousness of the problem of fighting as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 30, the hypothesis was rejected and it was determined that a significant difference did exist between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of the problem of fighting.

Item 31: Theft

Table 31
The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Theft
as Reported by Parents and Principals

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	58	53.72	21	20.77	27	31.51	106
Principals	17	21.28	8	8.23	17	12.49	42
Total	75		29		44		148

Chi square = 3.49073 < (.05)

df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of theft as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 31, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of the problem of theft.

Item 32: Disobedience

Table 32

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Disobedience
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	36	36.38	45	39.23	20	26.39	101
Principals	14	14.44	12	16.46	15	10.11	41
Total	50		57		35		142
Chi square = 5.04885 < (.05)							df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of disobedience as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 32, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of the problem of disobedience.

Item 33: Continual Disruptive Classroom Behavior

Table 33

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Continual Disruptive Classroom Behavior
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	34	36.38	43	39.23	25	26.39	102
Principals	17	14.62	12	15.77	12	10.61	41
Total	51		55		37		143
Chi square = 2.06101 < (.05)							df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of continual disruptive classroom behavior as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 33, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of the problem of continual disruptive classroom behavior.

Item 34: Profanity, Obscenity, or Vulgarity

Table 34

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Obscenity, Profanity, or Vulgarity
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	47	42.32	25	28.69	32	32.99	104
Principals	12	16.68	15	11.31	14	13.01	41
Total	59		40		46		145
Chi square = 3.61648 < (.05)							df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of obscenity, profanity, or vulgarity as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 34, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of this problem.

Item 35: Possessing Dangerous Weapons

Table 35

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Possessing Dangerous Weapons
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	47	48.17	4	3.54	51	50.29	102
Principals	21	19.83	1	1.46	20	20.71	42
Total	68		5		71		144

Chi square = .334452 < (.05)

df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of possessing dangerous weapons as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 35, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of the problem of possessing dangerous weapons.

Item 36: Behavior Endangering Another or Impinging on Another's Rights

Table 36

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Behavior Endangering Another or
Impinging on Another's Rights
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	48	46.36	13	13.55	41	42.08	102
Principals	17	18.64	6	5.45	18	16.92	41
Total	65		19		59		143
Chi square = .37735 < (.05)							df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of behavior endangering another or impinging on another's rights as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 36, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of this problem.

Item 37: Absenteeism

Table 37

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Absenteeism
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	17	15.11	42	41.74	36	38.14	95
Principals	4	5.89	16	16.26	17	14.86	37
Total	21		58		53		132

Chi square = 1.27553 < (.05)

df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of absenteeism as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 37, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of the problem of absenteeism.

Item 38: Physical or Verbal Intimidation of Other Students

Table 38

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Physical or Verbal Intimidation of Other Students
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	38	36.48	38	33.62	27	32.90	103
Principals	13	14.52	9	13.38	19	13.10	41
Total	51		47		46		144
Chi square = 5.94801 < (.05)							df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of physical or verbal intimidation of other students as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 38, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of this problem.

Item 39: Habitual Tardiness

Table 39

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Habitual Tardiness
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	13	10.74	37	39.40	51	50.86	101
Principals	2	4.26	18	15.60	20	20.14	40
Total	15		55		71		141

Chi square = 2.18426 < (.05)

df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of habitual tardiness as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 39, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of this problem.

Item 40: Verbal Abuse of Other Students

Table 40

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Verbal Abuse of Other Students
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	30	26.47	43	42.20	30	34.33	103
Principals	7	10.53	16	16.80	18	13.67	41
Total	37		59		48		144
Chi square = 3.63209 < (.05)							df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of verbal abuse of other students as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 40, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of this problem.

Item 41: Cheating

Table 41

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Cheating
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	30	26.47	44	46.49	29	30.04	103
Principals	7	10.53	21	18.51	13	11.96	41
Total	37		65		42		144
Chi square = 2.25449 < (.05)							df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of cheating as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 41, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of the problem of cheating.

Item 42: Misbehavior on School Bus

Table 42

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Misbehavior on the School Bus
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	29	28.01	44	43.10	29	30.89	102
Principals	10	10.99	16	16.90	14	12.11	40
Total	39		60		43		142

Chi square = .599499 < (.05)

df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of misbehavior on the school bus as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 42, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of this problem.

Item 43: Lying

Table 43

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Lying
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	37	32.01	40	44.10	24	24.89	101
Principals	8	12.99	22	17.90	11	10.11	41
Total	45		62		35		142
Chi square = 4.12819 < (.05)							df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of lying as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 43, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of the problem of lying.

Item 44: Selling, Possessing, or Distributing Drugs

Table 44

*The Seriousness Associated with
the Problem of Selling, Possessing, or Distributing Drugs
as Reported by Parents and Principals*

Response	High		Medium		Low		Total
	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	(O)	(E)	
Parents	48	49.93	9	6.42	45	45.65	102
Principals	22	20.07	0	2.58	19	18.35	41
Total	70		9		64		143

Chi square = 3.91018 < (.05)

df=2

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perception of seriousness of the problem of selling, possessing, or distributing drugs as reported by parents and by elementary school principals.

According to the data in Table 44, the hypothesis was accepted and it was determined that no significant difference existed between parent and principal perceptions of the seriousness of this problem.

Summary

Chapter Four presented the accumulated data and analyzed that data statistically. The data were presented in tabular form. For Part 1 of the questionnaire, the responses for each item were tabulated and presented in four tables, one for each of the first four hypotheses. For Part 2 of the questionnaire, the responses were tabulated and presented in one table. The items on Part 2 dealt solely with Hypothesis Five.

Chi square calculations were made and reported on each item. A hypothesis statement was made as it pertained to each item and acceptance or rejection of that hypothesis was made on the basis of the statistical findings.

Chapter Five will present an in-depth discussion of the findings. Those findings will be summarized and the conclusions of the study will be reported. Recommendations relative to the study will also be made.

Chapter 5

Summary of Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Purpose

The purpose of this chapter was to review the findings of the study based on the statistical analysis of the data and to reach conclusions on the basis of that data. Supportive data for the conclusions were to be summarized and presented.

With the conclusions of the study in mind, and with the initial purpose of the study at hand, recommendations were to be made on the basis of the findings.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

Further examination of the statistical results of the study were deemed appropriate in an effort to formulate conclusions as they pertained to each of the hypotheses. The data were reorganized and presented in a manner to substantiate the conclusions reached.

Conclusion 1

There was no significant difference between the current application of selected behavioral management practices and the perceptions that principals held regarding the frequency that these practices should have been employed.

In one hundred per cent of the cases where Hypothesis 1 was tested,

it was accepted (see Table 45).

Table 45

*A Summary of Calculated Chi Square Values for Items 1-25
as They Relate to the Significant Difference Between the
Frequency that the Practice Is Employed and Should Be
Employed, as Reported by Principals*

<u>Item</u>	<u>x²</u>
1. Telephoning Parents	2.2271
2. Telephoning Parents to Pick Up Child	4.68562
3. Parent-Teacher Conferences	.834347
4. Suspension	4.29428
5. Expulsion	5.56508
6. Role Playing	5.99393
7. Group Counseling	3.34177
8. Behavior Modifying Drugs	1.82692
9. Parent-Principal Conferences	2.56571
10. Isolating a Student	.446858
11. Injecting Humor	.520735
12. Offering Praise or Recognition	1.21651
13. Written Contracts	7.31538
14. Corporal Punishment	.0542124
15. Telephoning Juvenile Authorities	3.02375
16. "Crisis" Room	3.30449
17. Alternative School	3.3305
18. Guidance Counselor	1.34759
19. Another Classroom or Another Teacher	.941915
20. Psychological Aid or Evaluation	2.37032
21. Disciplinary Committee	5.63619
22. Special Resource Person	5.02381
23. Verbal Reprimand	1.17521
24. Tangible Rewards	1.35414
25. Detention	.242514

df=3

Although the questionnaire was not designed to elicit opinions as to the effectiveness of various methods or practices, principals were very much in accord as to the frequency that these methods should have been employed. This would indicate that principals were currently employing the means that they found effective to such a degree as they

deemed appropriate. Extraneous forces were apparently not being applied in an effort to force principals to carry out particular measures which the principals felt should not have been applied so frequently. This would lend support to the fact that principals were employing the means that they felt should have been employed and that those means were being applied as a result of their free judgment.

Conclusion 2

In a majority of cases, there was a significant difference between the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the selected behavioral management techniques were employed and the frequency that, in their opinion, the various techniques should have been employed.

In eighteen of twenty-five cases (see Table 26), or seventy-two per cent, parents held significantly differing opinions about what they felt was being done in the schools in the employment of behavioral management practices and what they felt should be done in this regard.

Parents were in agreement on what they perceived that the principals were doing and on what should have been done in the recommended use of behavior modifying drugs, isolating students, injecting humor into the discipline situation, the use of corporal punishment, the use of verbal reprimand, the offering of tangible rewards, and the use of detention.

In the case of the recommended use of behavior modifying drugs, seventy-seven per cent of the parents felt that it was seldom or never done. Seventy-six per cent of the parents felt that it should seldom or never be done.

There was no significant difference in the frequency that parents perceived that isolation was employed and the frequency that they

felt that it should have been employed. Sixty-nine per cent of the parents felt that it was seldom or never used while sixty per cent felt that it should seldom or never be used.

Table 46

A Summary of Calculated Chi Square Values for Items 1-25 as They Relate to the Significant Difference Between the Frequency that the Practice Is Employed and Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents

<u>Item</u>	χ^2
1. Telephoning Parents	*30.1735
2. Telephoning Parents to Pick Up Child	*16.6612
3. Parent-Teacher Conferences	*22.8681
4. Suspension	* 7.87992
5. Expulsion	* 9.45251
6. Role Playing	*19.044
7. Group Counseling	*23.0778
8. Behavior Modifying Drugs	1.66046
9. Parent-Principal Conferences	*18.4228
10. Isolating a Student	2.45029
11. Injecting Humor	5.93073
12. Offering Praise or Recognition	*17.64
13. Written Contracts	*11.595
14. Corporal Punishment	3.61574
15. Telephoning Juvenile Authorities	*11.8369
16. "Crisis" Room	*14.8991
17. Alternative School	*11.6417
18. Guidance Counselor	*11.6513
19. Another Classroom or Another Teacher	*20.85
20. Psychological Aid or Evaluation	*13.0339
21. Disciplinary Committee	*28.4538
22. Special Resource Person	*32.2619
23. Verbal Reprimand	1.33092
24. Tangible Rewards	.151266
25. Detention	5.35363

*denotes significance

df=3

The technique of injecting humor into the situation was another instance wherein parents did not differ in their perceptions of what was done and what should have been done. Only ten per cent of the parents

felt that this was done frequently, while twenty-two per cent agreed that it should have been done frequently.

The issue of corporal punishment showed no significant difference in the perceptions that parents held as to the frequency of its use and the frequency that, in their opinion, it should have been used. Subsequent discussion of this item will reflect upon this observation. Sixty-six per cent of the parents felt that this practice was employed often or seldom, while twelve per cent felt that it was used frequently. Twenty-two per cent felt that it was never used. It was of interest to note that twenty-one per cent of the parents felt that it should be used frequently, while exactly the same number felt that it should never be used.

Eighty-two per cent of the parents felt that verbal reprimand was practiced frequently or often. Eighty-one per cent of the parents felt that it should be used frequently or often.

With regard to the practice of offering tangible rewards, fifty-three per cent of the parents felt that it was never done, while fifty-six per cent agreed that it should never have been done.

Parents were equally divided on the frequency that detention was employed and should have been employed. There was no preponderance of responses in any of the four frequency categories.

It has been made obvious by the results of testing Hypothesis 2 that parents, in a large majority of cases, did not agree with what they thought that the principals were doing with regard to behavioral management. Whether the parents had an accurate perception of the frequency that the selected practices were employed is another matter. The important feature here was that parents, in seventy-two per cent of the cases,

held significantly differing opinions about what they felt was actually being done and what they felt should have been done.

Conclusion 3

In a majority of cases, there was no significant difference between the frequency that selected behavioral management practices were employed, as reported by elementary school principals, and the frequency that, in the opinion of parents, the practices were employed.

Table 47

A Summary of Calculated Chi Square Values for Items 1-25
as They Relate to the Significant Difference Between the
Frequency that the Practice Is Employed, as Reported by Principals,
and Is Employed, as Reported by Parents

<u>Item</u>	χ^2
1. Telephoning Parents	7.12272
2. Telephoning Parents to Pick Up Child	2.36348
3. Parent-Teacher Conferences	* 8.89555
4. Suspension	1.03162
5. Expulsion	3.13942
6. Role Playing	6.49154
7. Group Counseling	*10.8518
8. Behavior Modifying Drugs	7.01112
9. Parent-Principal Conferences	*11.3032
10. Isolating a Student	6.84495
11. Injecting Humor	3.58533
12. Offering Praise or Recognition	2.60907
13. Written Contracts	*15.6787
14. Corporal Punishment	*12.5262
15. Telephoning Juvenile Authorities	2.75837
16. "Crisis" Room	2.53774
17. Alternative School	2.28185
18. Guidance Counselor	2.62585
19. Another Classroom or Another Teacher	.837701
20. Psychological Aid or Evaluation	*17.9676
21. Disciplinary Committee	1.48005
22. Special Resource Person	5.76673
23. Verbal Reprimand	3.33911
24. Tangible Rewards	.835264
25. Detention	3.6657

*denotes significance

df=3

In seventy-six per cent of the cases, there was no significant difference in the frequency that selected behavioral management practices were employed, as reported by principals, and the frequency that parents felt that the practices were employed (see Table 47). Significant differences did exist with regard to the use of recommending parent-teacher conferences, group counseling, recommending parent-principal conferences, the establishment of written contracts, corporal punishment, and the practice of referring a child for psychological aid or evaluation.

In regard to the recommendation for parent-teacher conferences, thirty-three per cent of the principals reported that they employed this method frequently, fifty-eight per cent replied that they used it often, nine per cent said they seldom used it, and none reported never using it at all. Twenty-eight per cent of the parents felt that the practice was used frequently, forty per cent felt that it was often used, twenty-eight per cent reported it as seldom used, and four per cent reported that it was never used.

The technique of group counseling was reported by sixteen per cent of the principals as being used frequently, while fifteen per cent of the parents responded similarly. Forty per cent of the principals reported using the technique often, while only eighteen per cent of the parents felt that it was used often. Thirty per cent of the principals and parents said that the practice was seldom used. Group counseling was never used by fourteen per cent of the principals and thirty-seven per cent of the parents felt that it was never used.

Parents felt that parent-principal conferences were never requested in thirteen per cent of their replies; principals reported never using this technique less than five per cent of the time. Parents in

forty per cent of the cases felt that the practice was seldom used; principals reported the seldom use of parent-principal conferences less than nineteen per cent of the time. Seventy-seven per cent of the principals felt that they used the technique either frequently or often, while only forty-six per cent of the parents felt the same way.

The use of written contracts in the establishment of acceptable modes of behavior was the next item wherein a significant difference in parent and principal responses occurred. No principals used this method frequently, while nine per cent of the parents felt that they did. Twenty-one per cent of the principals often used this; ten per cent of the parents felt that it was often used. Forty-three per cent of the principals reported seldom use of it and twenty per cent of the parents replied similarly. Thirty-six per cent of the principals reported never using this method and over sixty per cent of the parents felt that it was never used.

The most striking figure in regard to the use of corporal punishment was that no principals reported never using it, while twenty-two per cent of the parents thought that it was never used. Forty-two per cent of the principals reported its use as seldom, while thirty-nine per cent of the parents responded similarly. Approximately the same percentage of principals and parents felt that it was frequently or often used.

The final item on which significantly differing perceptions of the frequency of use occurred was in the use of referral for psychological aid or evaluation. One principal in forty-three reported never referring a child, while eighteen per cent of the parents felt that it was never done. Ninety-five per cent of the principal responses fell into the often or seldom categories. Only seventy per cent of the parents responded in

similar fashion.

Conclusion 4

In a majority of cases, there was no significant difference between the perceptions that parents and principals held regarding the frequency that selected behavior management practices should have been employed (see Table 48).

Table 48

A Summary of Calculated Chi Square Values for Items 1-25 as They Relate to the Significant Difference Between the Frequency that the Practice Should Be Employed, as Reported by Parents, and as Reported by Principals

<u>Item</u>	χ^2
1. Telephoning Parents	.0188372
2. Telephonine Parents to Pick Up Child	2.90049
3. Parent-Teacher Conferences	2.81072
4. Suspension	7.46465
5. Expulsion	* 7.9348
6. Role Playing	6.44381
7. Group Counseling	3.23268
8. Behavior Modifying Drugs	6.2557
9. Parent-Principal Conferences	5.17146
10. Isolating a Student	5.84616
11. Injecting Humor	3.67677
12. Offering Praise or Recognition	4.70773
13. Written Contracts	4.2165
14. Corporal Punishment	*14.0972
15. Telephoning Juvenile Authorities	2.33362
16. "Crisis" Room	4.74331
17. Alternative School	3.83023
18. Guidance Counselor	.654976
19. Another Classroom or Another Teacher	6.4053
20. Psychological Aid or Evaluation	* 7.98775
21. Disciplinary Committee	*12.5167
22. Special Resource Person	*20.8245
23. Verbal Reprimand	2.38251
24. Tangible Rewards	.975358
25. Detention	2.17592

*denotes significance

df=3

On eighty per cent of the items on Part 1 of the Behavior Management Questionnaire which dealt with parent and principal responses about the practices which should be employed, there was no significant difference in the manner in which parents and principals responded. There was a significantly different response on the items which dealt with pupil expulsion, corporal punishment, the referral of pupils for psychological aid or evaluation, the use of disciplinary committees, and the use of special resource persons in dealing with discipline problems.

With regard to the expulsion of a pupil for the remainder of a semester, the most diverse response appeared to be that parents, in fifty-eight per cent of the cases, replied that it should never be done. Only thirty-eight per cent of the principals replied in similar fashion. The remainder of the responses were distributed relatively equally.

The item relating to the use of corporal punishment again drew a significant difference of opinion. Almost twenty-one per cent of the parents felt that corporal punishment should never be used; none of the responding principals felt the same way. It was of interest to note that exactly the same number of parents who felt that it should never be used replied that it should be used frequently.

Almost seven per cent of the parents replied that principals should never refer a child for psychological aid or evaluation; none of the principals responded similarly. Although parents and principals appeared to be in relative agreement on the frequent or seldom use of this type of referral, a discrepancy did appear in the responses in the "often" category. Here, sixty per cent of the principals responded while only slightly more than forty per cent of the parents responded in like fashion.

The item related to the practice of referring a child to a disci-

plinary committee drew differing opinions as to the desired frequency of use. Almost twenty-one per cent of the parents felt that this practice should be employed either frequently or often. One principal, or two per cent, responded the same way. Sixty-nine per cent of the principals felt that this should never be done, while only forty-four per cent of the parents felt likewise.

The last item on which there was disagreement was the frequency that principals should make use of special resource persons, such as "crisis" teachers, in an effort to help students with behavior problems. Principals felt that this should be done frequently or often in twenty-four per cent of the responses; sixty-three per cent of the parents felt that it should be employed that frequently.

Conclusion 5

In a majority of cases, there is no significant difference in the seriousness of selected behavior problems, as perceived by parents and by elementary school principals.

In only five per cent of the instances mentioned did a significant difference of opinion occur (see Table 49). In that case, which had to do with fighting, thirty per cent of the parents rated this problem as high in seriousness, while less than ten per cent of the principals rated this problem as being high in seriousness. Approximately thirty per cent of both parents and principals rated this problem as being low in seriousness, while thirty-nine per cent of the parents and sixty-one per cent of the principals felt that it was of medium seriousness. Parent responses seemed to have a more evenly distributed tendency.

The results of Part 2 of the Behavior Management Questionnaire would lead one to believe that parents and principals perceived problems

in much the same way. The value systems between home and school did not appear to be opposed to one another in this context.

Table 49

A Summary of Calculated Chi Square Values for Items 26-44
as They Relate to the Significant Difference Between
Parent and Principal Perceptions of the Seriousness of
Selected Behavior Management Problems

<u>Item</u>	χ^2
26. Insubordination or Disrespect	1.23535
27. Physical Assault on Others	.260828
28. Vandalism	1.04044
29. Truancy	3.94543
30. Fighting	*8.14695
31. Theft	3.49073
32. Disobedience	5.04885
33. Disruptive Classroom Behavior	2.06101
34. Obscenity, Profanity, Vulgarly	3.61648
35. Possessing Dangerous Weapons	.334452
36. Behavior Endangering Another	.37735
37. Absenteeism	1.27553
38. Physical or Verbal Intimidation	5.94801
39. Tardiness	2.18426
40. Verbal Abuse of Students	3.63209
41. Cheating	2.25449
42. Misbehavior on School Bus	.599499
43. Lying	4.12819
44. Selling, Possessing, or Distributing Drugs	3.91018

*denotes significance

df=2

Recommendations

The data obtained in this study provided information concerning the extent to which parents and principals were in agreement on the use of various types of behavioral management techniques. The results of the study have pointed out that principals are self-assured, and that the practices and methods that they employed were the practices and methods

that should have been employed. Parents, however, appeared to be very dissatisfied with what principals were doing in this regard as opposed to what parents felt that principals should have been doing. Parents, in most cases, had an adequate understanding of the frequency that practices were employed, as pointed out by the results of Hypothesis Three, yet their opinions differed with those of the principals as to how frequently the various measures were employed and should have been employed. Parents and principals were, for the most part, agreed on the frequency that the various practices should have been employed.

The purpose of this study was to determine where those differences of perception occurred, with the primary objective of the study being to improve the understanding between home and school. That purpose was achieved, and with the objective of the study in mind, the following recommendations were suggested for public school practices and research:

Public School Practice

1. Principals should expand their repertoire of behavioral management practices to include not only those practices that are more traditional in nature but also those practices that are more innovative.
2. A more efficient communication system should be developed between home and school with the precise purpose of informing parents about the nature of behavior problems in the school and the preventative measures that have been taken to avoid problem areas.
3. Parents should be informed of the entire scope of the school's resources that may be put into operation in an effort to resolve disruptive behavior.
4. A communication system should be established whereby the com-

community may have input relating to the measures that should be undertaken in an effort to resolve behavior problems.

Research

Further study should be undertaken to examine the causes for the differing parental perceptions related to the practices that principals employ and should employ. Particular emphasis upon community values and moral expectations should be considered fundamental to the research.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to determine conclusions and to make recommendations on the basis of the findings. Five conclusions were reached and supportive data for each of them were presented. Recommendations for public school practice and further research were made in accordance with the conclusions that were formulated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Abbot, J. School government. In American annals of education (Vol. 2). London: 1832.
- Adler, A. The science of living. New York: Greenberg, 1929.
- . Individual psychology. In C. Murchison (Ed.), Psychologies of 1930. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University Press, 1930.
- Bandura, A. Behavioral modification through modeling procedures. In L. Krasner & L. Ullmann (Eds.), Research in behavior modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.
- Becker, W.C. Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In M.L. Hoffman and L.W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
- Becker, W.C., Thomas, D.R., & Carnine, D. Reducing behavior problems: an operant conditioning guide for teachers. In W. Becker (Ed.), An empirical basis for change in education. Chicago: Science Research Association, 1971.
- Blackham, G., & Silberman, A. Modification of child behavior. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1971.
- Brown, D.N. Changing student behavior: a new approach to discipline. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Publishers, 1971.
- Clarizio, H.F., & Vellon, S.L. Learning theory approaches to classroom management: rationale and intervention techniques. In H. Clarizio, R. Craig, and W. Mehrens (Eds.), Contemporary issues in educational psychology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.
- Colvin, S.S. The learning process. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1911.
- Cooper, J.E. Elementary school principalship. Columbus, Ohio: Chas. E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1967.
- Cronbach, L.J. Educational psychology. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1963.
- Cutts, N.E., & Moseley, N. Teaching the disorderly pupil. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc., 1957.

- DeRoche, E.F. Creative discipline. In Selected articles for elementary school principals. Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, 1968.
- Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, R.B., & Pepper, F.C. Maintaining sanity in the classroom: illustrated teaching techniques. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Fesbach, N.D., & Fesbach, S. Children's aggression. In National Association for the Education of Young Children (Ed.), The young child - reviews of research (Vol. 2). Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1972.
- Gnagey, W.J. Discipline: a maintenance of a learning environment. In S. Meihof (Ed.), The student and the learning environment. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1974.
- Goldstein, D. The organism. New York: American Book Co., 1939.
- Good, C.V. (Ed.). Dictionary of education. 3d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1973.
- Harmon, F.W. Classroom control: a teacher's dilemma. In Selected articles for elementary school principals. Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, 1968.
- Harris, E.P. Changing conceptions of school discipline. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1928.
- Hurwitz, H.L. The principal, school discipline, and the law. Brooklyn, N.Y.: Council of Administrators and Supervisors of the City of New York, 1974.
- Kaplan, L. Education and mental health. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- MacKenzie, W.I. Discipline in an educational setting. In L. Stenhouse (Ed.), Discipline in the schools. New York: Pergamon Press, 1967.
- Mann, H. Lecture 7, On school punishment. In Lectures on education. Boston: Ide and Dutton, 1855.
- _____. Report of the secretary. Boston: State Board of Education, 1845.
- _____. Report of the secretary. Boston: State Board of Education, 1847.
- Maslow, A.H. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

- McNair, C.B. What an elementary school principal thinks about discipline. In Selected articles for elementary school principals. Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, 1968.
- Mickelson, P.R., & Hansen, K.H. Elementary school administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1957.
- Miller, R.W., & Miller, J.L. Dealing with behavioral problems in the elementary school. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Co., 1969.
- Miller, V. The public administration of American school systems. New York: MacMillan Co., 1972.
- National Education Association. Discipline and learning: an inquiry into student-teacher relationships. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1975.
- Page, D.P. Mutual duties of parents and teachers. In Lectures. Boston, American Institute of Instruction, 1838.
- Parke, R.D. The role of punishment in the socialization process. In R.A. Hoppe, G.A. Milton, & E.C. Simmel (Eds.), Early experiences and the processes of socialization. New York: Academic Press, 1970.
- Polk, K., & Schafer, W.E. Schools and delinquency. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1972.
- Redl, F., & Wattenberg, W.W. Mental hygiene in teaching. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1951.
- Robitaille, J.P. Improving pupil behavior. In Selected articles for elementary school principals. Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, 1968.
- Rogers, D. Mental hygiene in elementary education. Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1957.
- Schrag, P., & Divoky, D. The myth of the hyperactive child and other means of child control. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975.
- Sheviakov, G.V., & Redl, F. Discipline for today's children and youth. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1956.
- Shuster, A.H., & Stewart, D.H. The principal and the autonomous elementary school. Columbus, Ohio: C.E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1973.
- Skinner, B.F. The behavior of organisms. New York: Appleton, 1938.
- Stephens, J.M. Educational psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1951.

Texas Education Agency. Texas public school directory, 1975-76.
Austin, Tex.: TEA, 1975.

Thorndike, E.L. Human learning. New York: The Century Co., 1931.

Tilton, J.W. An educational psychology of learning. New York:
The MacMillan Co., 1951.

Watson, J.B. Behavior: an introduction to comparative psychology.
New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1914.

White, W.F. Psychosocial principles applied to classroom teaching.
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.

Wickman, E.K. Children's behavior and teachers' attitudes.
New York: The commonwealth Fund, 1932.

Woody, R.H. Behavioral problem children in the schools. New York:
Appleton-Century Crofts, 1969.

Yerkes, R.M. The dancing mouse. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1911.

B. PERIODICALS

Abbot, M.L. Turmoil in Houston schools. The Houston Chronicle,
February 22, 1976, pp 1+.

Adler, A. The fundamental views of individual psychology. International Journal of Individual Psychology, 1935, 1, 5-8.

American School Board Journal. Beating school children: a practice that
doesn't improve their behavior or their learning. June, 1973, 160,
19-21.

_____. People are fed up with school discipline. November 1974,
161, 12-13.

_____. Violence in the schools: now some solutions. January 1975,
162, 27-37.

Ausubel, D.P. A new look at classroom discipline. Phi Delta Kappan,
October 1961, 43, 25-30.

Bard, B. The shocking facts about corporal punishment in the schools.
Parents' Magazine, 1973, 48, 44-45+.

Bell, R.Q. A re-interpretation of the direction of efforts in studies
of socialization. Psychological Review, 1968, 75, 81-95.

Bosco, J. Behavior modification drugs and the schools: the case of
ritalin. Phi Delta Kappan, March 1975, 56, 489-492.

- Boyd, J.D., & Rolland, A.B. Behavioral analysis: the principal and discipline. The Clearing House, 1974, 48, 420-425.
- Bradley, C. The behavior of children receiving benzedrine. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1937, 94, 577-585.
- Brenton, M. Broken promises in the promised land. Today's Education, January 1976, 64, 47-52.
- Brown, B.S. Behavior modification: what is it--and isn't. Today's Education, January 1976, 64, 67-69.
- Carter, M.L. Parents' attitudes and school discipline. Education, October 1964, 112-116.
- Conners, C.K., Eisenberg, L., & Barcai, A. Effect of dextroamphetamine on children: studies on subjects with learning disabilities and school behavior problems. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1967, 28, 478-485.
- Dunaway, J. How to cut discipline problems in half. Today's Education, September 1974, 63, 75-77.
- Eisenberg, L., Lackman, R., Molling, P.A., Lockner, A., Mizelle, J.D., & Conners, C.K. A psychopharmacologic experiment in a training school for boys. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1963, 33, 431-446.
- Eron, L., Walder, L.O., & Lefkowitz, M.M. Learning of aggression in children. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 61-73.
- Gallup, G.H. Sixth annual Gallup poll of public attitudes toward education. Phi Delta Kappan, September 1974, 56, 20-32.
- _____. Seventh annual Gallup poll of public attitudes toward education. Phi Delta Kappan, December 1975, 57, 227-241.
- Glasser, W. Roles, goals, and failure. Today's Education, October 1971, 20-21.
- Goldstein, W. Discipline: for someone else's kid. Clearing House, April 1973, 455-458.
- Grealy, J.I. School violence: what can be done about it? American School and University, June 1975, 47, 25-27.
- Grinspoon, L., & Singer, S.B. Amphetamines in the treatment of hyperkinetic children. Harvard Educational Review, November 1973, 43, 520.
- Hewett, F. Educational engineering with emotionally disturbed children. Exceptional Child, 1967, 33, 459-467.

- Jones, M.V. The legal status of corporal punishment in the public schools. California Journal of Educational Research, May 1964, 15, 149.
- Klein, D.C., & Lindemann, E. Approaches to preschool screening. Journal of School Health, October 1964, 34, 365-373.
- Ladd, E.T. Regulating student behavior without ending up in court. Phi Delta Kappan, January 1973, 55, 305.
- Lennard, H.L. Hazards implicit in prescribing psychoactive drugs. Science, July 1970, 169, 438-441.
- Lindsey, B.I., & Cunningham, J.W. Behavior modification: some doubts and dangers. Phi Delta Kappan, May 1972, 42, 232-236.
- Maier, N.R.F., Glaser, N.M., & Klee, J.B. Studies of abnormal behavior in the rat: the development of behavior fixation through frustration. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1940, 26, 521-546.
- Marshall, H. The effect of punishment on children: a review of the literature and a suggested hypothesis. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1965, 106, 108-133.
- McCord, W., McCord, J., & Howard, A. Familial correlates of aggression in non-delinquent male children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 72-93.
- Morse, W.C. The crisis-intervention teacher. Today's Education, March 1975, 64, 62-63.
- _____. The crisis teacher. Today's Education, September 1972, 61, 52-54.
- Mowrer, O.H. A stimulus-response analysis of anxiety and its role as a reinforcing agent. Psychological Review, 1939, 46, 553-565.
- National Institute of Mental Health. Behavior modification. Today's Education, September 1972, 61, 54-55.
- Nation's Schools. Corporal punishment OK if used sparingly. May 1971, 87, 39.
- New England Magazine. The Boston schools one hundred years ago. July 1902, 636.
- Palardy, J.M., & Mudrey, J.E. Discipline: four approaches. Elementary School Journal, March 1973, 73, 297-305.
- Patterson, J.L. And the beat goes on... National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, January 1975, 59, 36-40.

- Patterson, J.L. How popular is the paddle? Phi Delta Kappan, June 1974, 55, 707.
- Patterson, R.F., & Peterson, L.R. The use of positive reinforcement in the control of self-destructive behavior in a retarded boy. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1968, 6, 351-360.
- Rapaport, R. To keep the kid quiet? Los Angeles Times WEST Magazine, April 25, 1971, 20-22.
- Rentschler, D.R. Applying the hand of wisdom to the seat of learning: the 1974 legislative response in North Carolina. The High School Journal, May 1975, 58, 361-380.
- Robin, S.S., & Bosco, J.J. Ritalin for school children: the teacher's perspective. The Journal of School Health, 1973, 43, 624-628.
- Sack, R.T., & Sack, K.S. Attitudes of teachers and mental hygienists about behavior problems of children. Psychology in the Schools, October 1974, 11, 445-448.
- Schumacher, C.T. Exit corporal punishment. Educational Leadership, May 1974, 31, 688-690.
- Skelsey, A. For women who work. Today's Education, March 1975, 64, 24-28.
- Snider, S.J., & Murphy, W.C. Discipline--what can it teach? The Elementary School Journal, February 1975, 75, 299-303.
- Snygg, D. Discipline. Childhood Education, February 1955, 31, 258-259.
- Solomon, R.L. Punishment. American Psychologist, 1964, 19, 239-253.
- Symonds, P.M. What education has to learn from psychology. Teachers College Record, April 1956, 57, 449-462.
- Sybouts, W. School discipline and home background. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 45, 683-686.
- Turney, D. Discipline: a view from the bridge. Contemporary Education, 1974, 45, 317.
- White, M. Little red schoolhouse and little white clinic. Teachers College Record, 1965, 67, 188-200.
- Willower, D.J., & Jones, R.G. When pupil control becomes an institutional theme. Phi Delta Kappan, November 1963, 45, 107-109.
- Wright, R.B. Discipline or corporal punishment. Education, September 1969, 90, 69-71.

C. MISCELLANEOUS

- Boe, E.E., & Church, R.M. The permanent effect of punishment during extinction. A paper presented to the Eastern Psychological Association, New York, April 1966.
- Boston Public Latin School. The prize book, no. 1. Boston: Boston Public Latin School, 1820.
- Bower, E.M. Primary prevention of mental and emotional disorders: a frame of reference. In N. Lambert (Ed.), The protection and promotion of mental health in schools (U.S. Dept. of Hew, Public Health Bulletin No. 1226). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974.
- Burns, J.P. The use of a DRL schedule of reinforcement to reduce student misbehavior in two elementary classrooms. An unpublished paper. 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 102 785)
- Canadian Teachers' Federation. School discipline: bibliographies in education, No. 27. Ottawa, Ont.: Canadian Teachers' Federation, March 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 064 771)
- Davis, J.E. Coping with disruptive behavior. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1974.
- Dobson, R.L. The perception and treatment by teachers of the behavioral problems of elementary school children in culturally deprived and middle-class neighborhoods. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1966.
- Eby, F. Education in Texas. (The University of Texas Bulletin No. 1824). Austin, Texas: University of Texas, 1918.
- Eugene Public Schools, Oregon. A positive reinforcement program for learning good behavior. Eugene, Ore.: Eugene Public Schools, 1971.
- Feshbach, N.D. The effects of violence in childhood. A paper presented at the 80th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Assoc., Honolulu, Hawaii, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 070 526)
- Fraser, D.W. Classroom discipline - a learning package. Western Washington State College, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 100 930)
- Freedman, D.X. et al. Report of the conference on the use of stimulant drugs in the treatment of behaviorally disturbed young school children. Washington, D.C.: Office of Child Development and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Department of HEW, 1971.
- Freeman, M.A.L., Jr. A study of disciplinary techniques and practices used by assistant principals in selected secondary schools in Texas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State Univ., 1975.

- Gecas, V., & Nye, F.I. Sex and class differences in parent child interactions: a test of Hohn's hypothesis. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Family Relations, St. Louis, Missouri, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 101 265)
- Glidewell, J.C., & Swallow, C.S. The prevalence of maladjustment in elementary schools. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1968.
- Gnagey, W.J. Controlling classroom misbehavior. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965.
- _____. Controlling classroom behavior. (Phi Delta Kappan Abstract, Acc. #0742). Bloomington, Ind.: American Educational Research, 1965.
- Howard, E.R., & Jenkins, J.M. Improving discipline in the secondary school. Denver, Colorado: CFK, Ltd., 1970.
- Human Resources Research Organization, Dotham, Alabama. Comprehensive services for children; third year evaluation report. Dotham city schools Title 3 project. Washington, D.C.: Department of HEW, 1974.
- Johnson, D.V. Student disciplinary codes - what makes them tick. A paper presented at the 57th Annual Conference of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Dallas, Texas, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 078 579)
- Jones, J.W. Discipline crisis in the schools: the problems, causes, and search for solutions. Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Association, 1973.
- Lagenbach, M., & Letchworth, G.A. Disciplinary techniques: repertoires and relationships. A paper presented at the annual meeting, AERA, New York, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 049 178)
- LaRoe, C. Success through records. Huntington Beach, Calif.: Ocean View Elementary School District, 1974.
- CIBA Pharmaceutical Co. Minimal brain dysfunction (MBD): guidelines to diagnosis/giidelines to treatment. Summit, N.J.: CIBA, 1973.
- Moore, S.G. Discipline in childrearing. University of Minnesota, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 095 993)
- National Education Association. Report of the task force on corporal punishment. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1972.
- _____. Discipline in the schools (Research Bulletin 35). Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1957.
- _____. Discipline in the classroom (Rev. ed.). Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1974.

National Education Association. Corporal punishment: teacher opinion (Research Bulletin 48). Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1970.

National Institute of Mental Health. Helping schools help children (Research Report No. 2). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

National Urban League, Inc. The problem of discipline/control and security in our schools (Position Paper No. 1). Washington, D.C.: NULI, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 069 827)

North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction. An approach to discipline in the desegregated school. North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 099 991)

Points, T.C. Testimony before Congressional Subcommittee on Government Operations, 1970.

Reitman, A., Follman, J., & Ladd, E.T. Corporal punishment in the public schools. The use of force in controlling student behavior. New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1972.

Sanford, N. Ego process in learning. In N. Lambert (Ed.), The protection and promotion of mental health in schools (Public Health Bulletin No. 1226). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Starkey, J., Starkey, R., & Leavitt, S.J. Discipline: are older teachers more liberal than others? Northern Illinois University, 1972.

Sunshine, P.M. Approaches to school discipline: a selected review of the literature. Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education, 1973.

Wade, D. Acquisition of appropriate social behaviors in a fourth grade student through the use of positive reinforcement and response cost. A paper, University of Vermont, 1974.

Walker, H.M. General maintenance of classroom treatment effects. A paper, Oregon University Department of Psychology. NPD.

Webster, G. Project ideals: personal development. Miami: Florida Educational and Research Development Council, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 077 847)

Whitmore, J.R. A leadership program designed to improve the attitudes and behavior of black elementary students: an action - research project. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1973.

Appendixes

Appendix A: Instrumentation

BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Part 1. Behavioral Management Technique Profile

Instructions for Part 1.

1. Read each statement carefully.
2. For each statement, answer the following two questions:
 - A. How frequently is this technique employed by the principal in your school in dealing with behavior problems?
 - B. How frequently, in your opinion, should this technique be employed by elementary principals?
3. Select only one number from the evaluation scale given below as your response to question A. and one number as your response to question B.

Evaluation Scale

1. Frequently--a regularly employed practice that is used as a primary method of dealing with behavior problems.
2. Often-----a practice that is used occasionally, as a particular situation warrants it, but is not a regularly employed practice that is used as a primary technique in handling behavior problems.
3. Seldom-----a practice that may be used, but its usage is rare, being employed only in exceptional situations.
4. Never-----a practice that is never used, under any circumstances.

<u>Item</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>
1. The practice of telephoning parents.	_____	_____
2. The practice of telephoning parents to pick up their child.	_____	_____
3. The practice of recommending parent-teacher conferences.	_____	_____
4. The practice of suspending a student from school for a period of 1, 2, or 3 days.	_____	_____
5. The practice of expelling a student for the remainder of the semester.	_____	_____

	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>
6. The technique of "role playing" in which the child assumes the role of one of the participants associated with the behavior problem.	_____	_____
7. The technique of group counseling.	_____	_____
8. The practice of recommending behavior modifying drugs.	_____	_____
9. The practice of requesting parent-principal conferences.	_____	_____
10. The practice of isolating a student with a behavior problem.	_____	_____
11. The technique of injecting humor into the situation.	_____	_____
12. The practice of offering praise or recognition to the child.	_____	_____
13. The practice of establishing a written contract, with the child, for standards of behavior.	_____	_____
14. The practice of administering corporal punishment.	_____	_____
15. The practice of telephoning juvenile authorities about a child with a behavior problem.	_____	_____
16. The practice of placing a student in a "crisis" room or area.	_____	_____
17. The practice of referring a child to an alternative school.	_____	_____
18. The practice of referring a child to the guidance counselor.	_____	_____
19. The practice of transferring a child to another classroom or to another teacher.	_____	_____

	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>
20. The practice of referring the student for psychological aid or evaluation.	_____	_____
21. The practice of referring the child to a disciplinary committee.	_____	_____
22. The practice of using a special resource person such as a "crisis" teacher to help students with behavior problems.	_____	_____
23. The practice of verbal reprimand.	_____	_____
24. The practice of offering tangible rewards, such as candy, toys, etc. to reinforce positive behavior.	_____	_____
25. Detention-The practice of detaining a child in the morning, at noon, or after school.	_____	_____

Part 2. Behavior Problems Profile

Instructions for Part 2.

In the column headed "Seriousness," please check each behavior problem as being "High," "Medium," or "Low" in seriousness.

SERIOUSNESS

<u>High</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Low</u>	
_____	_____	_____	Insubordination or disrespect
_____	_____	_____	Physical assault on others
_____	_____	_____	Vandalism
_____	_____	_____	Truancy
_____	_____	_____	Fighting
_____	_____	_____	Theft
_____	_____	_____	Disobedience
_____	_____	_____	Continual disruptive classroom behavior
_____	_____	_____	Profanity, obscenity, or vulgarity
_____	_____	_____	Possessing dangerous weapons
_____	_____	_____	Behavior endangering another or impinging on another's rights
_____	_____	_____	Absenteeism
_____	_____	_____	Intimidation
_____	_____	_____	Habitual tardiness
_____	_____	_____	Verbal abuse
_____	_____	_____	Cheating
_____	_____	_____	Misbehavior of school bus
_____	_____	_____	Lying
_____	_____	_____	Selling, possessing, or distributing drugs

Appendix B: Letters of Permission and Instruction

Dear Superintendent:

As a doctoral candidate at the University of Houston, I am engaged in a research project which deals with behavioral management problems, or discipline problems, in the public elementary schools. Being a practicing school administrator myself, I realize that the nature and severity of behavior problems in our schools have changed a great deal in recent years. It appears to be quite obvious that the methods and practices that we presently employ in dealing with these problems result in varying degrees of success. It is also apparent that we as professionals are somewhat diversified in our approaches to the handling of these problems.

Parents, as well, have repeatedly expressed concern over the discipline in our schools. Last year, for example, the Seventh Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education revealed that, for the sixth time in seven years, the public felt that discipline in the schools was the number one problem facing education.

This study will attempt to determine the frequency that selected behavioral management practices are employed by elementary school principals and how frequently, in the opinion of parents, these practices are employed. It shall also attempt to determine, from both parents and administrators, the frequency that these practices should be employed as well as the perceptions of the degree of seriousness of specific problems. The ultimate purpose of the study is to establish a better understanding between parents and the schools.

This study will be limited to the school districts which are served by the Region III Education Service Center in Victoria, Texas. The results, therefore, will not reveal nationwide or even statewide trends but will have particular relevance to our schools locally. The study, I might add, is being conducted with the cooperation of Region III.

I would like to ask for your permission to distribute one questionnaire to each elementary principal in your district and to seven parents of students from each of those schools. Every effort will be made to minimize any disruptive influence that is caused by this distribution. The questionnaires will be returned, by mail, directly to me.

A complete report of the study will be given to the Region III Education Service Center upon completion of the

project. A summary of the findings will be made available, at no cost, to each district that participates.

No attempt will be made to identify responding parents or principals and the only reference to your district in the final report will be to acknowledge my appreciation to you and to your district for your cooperation.

If you agree to let your district participate in this study, please indicate on the attached page and return your response to me in the enclosed envelope.

Any suggestions or comments that you might wish to make would certainly be appreciated.

Sincerely,

R.L. McMichael
Principal
Canton St. Elem. School
Wharton, Texas
Doctoral Candidate
University of Houston

I, _____, Superintendent
of Schools of the _____ School District
do agree to allow this school district's participation in the
study of behavioral management practices being conducted
through the University of Houston by Mr. R.L. McMichael.

(signature)

Comments:

Dear Principal,

As a doctoral candidate at the University of Houston, I am engaged in a research project which deals with behavioral management problems, or discipline problems, in the public elementary schools. Being a practicing school administrator myself, I realize that the nature and severity of behavior problems in our schools have changed a great deal in recent years. It appears to be quite obvious that the methods and practices that we presently employ in dealing with these problems result in varying degrees of success. It is also apparent that we, as professionals, are somewhat diversified in our approaches to the handling of these problems.

Parents, as well, have repeatedly expressed concern over the discipline in our schools. Last year, for example, the Seventh Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education revealed that, for the sixth time in seven years, discipline in the schools was the number one problem facing education.

This study will attempt to determine the frequency that selected behavioral management practices are employed by elementary school principals and how frequently, in the opinion of parents, these practices are employed. It shall also attempt to determine, from both parents and administrators, the frequency that these practices should be employed. The ultimate purpose of the study is to establish a better understanding between parents and schools.

I am limiting my study to school districts which are served by the Region III Education Service Center in Victoria, Texas. The results, therefore, will not reveal nationwide or even statewide trends but will have particular relevance to our schools locally.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided. I also ask that you randomly select seven of your elementary students and send one of the envelopes addressed "Parents" home with each of them. These envelopes contain a questionnaire that is identical to the one that I have asked that you complete. Every effort has been made to reduce any inconvenience that this may create for you. The parent questionnaire will be returned directly to me, thus eliminating any further imposition on your time.

No effort will be made to identify those who return the questionnaires. A summary of the results of the study will, however, be made available, at no cost, to each district whose superintendent has agreed to allow participation. I have already received a statement from your superintendent giving his permission for your district to participate in the study. Now I need your cooperation in gathering the needed data.

Thank you for your cooperation. Any comments or suggestions that you might wish to make would certainly be appreciated.

Sincerely,

R. L. McMichael
Principal
Canton St. Elem. School
Wharton, Texas
Doctoral Candidate
University of Houston

Dear Parent,

As a doctoral candidate at the University of Houston, I am engaged in a research project which deals with behavioral management problems, or discipline problems, in the public elementary schools. As a practicing school administrator as well as being a parent myself, I realize that the nature and severity of behavior problems in our schools have changed a great deal in recent years. It appears to be quite obvious that the methods and practices used by the schools in an effort to deal with these problems result in varying degrees of success. It is also apparent that there is a great deal of diversity in the ways in which problems are handled by the school administrators.

Parents have repeatedly expressed their concern over the discipline in our schools. Last year, for example, the Seventh Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education revealed that, for the sixth time in seven years, the public felt that discipline in the schools was the number one problem facing education.

This project will attempt to determine the frequency that selected behavioral management practices are employed by elementary school principals and how frequently, in the opinion of parents, these practices are employed. It will also attempt to determine, from both parents and administrators, the frequency that these practices should be employed. The ultimate purpose of the study is to establish a better understanding between parents and the schools.

This study is not a nationwide or statewide study. It will be limited to a ten county area along the central Texas gulf coast. The results, therefore, will have particular relevance to your schools locally.

You may help in conducting the study by responding to the attached questionnaire. After you have done so, you may return it directly to me by placing it in the enclosed envelope and mailing it.

Sincerely,

R.L. McMichael
Principal
Canton St. Elem. School
Wharton, Texas
Doctoral Candidate
University of Houston