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CHAPTER I

RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The school is one of the major institutions of society which is charged with the responsibility of a specific service function. This function is the process of moral and technical socialization which the school, as a formal organization, provides a student clientele. Due to the complex nature of the school there are numerous counterproductive forces which militate against the achievement of this organizational function. Problems, such as drug abuse, lack of discipline, non-acceptance of authority, and conflict of values are frequently mentioned as having an impact upon the socialization process. One organizational response to the question of how shall the schools deal with problems, such as those cited above, is through the use of official sanctions, e.g., grades or detentions. Implicit in this particular response is the phenomenon of identification, that is, determining upon whom


2 Ibid., p. 984.
the sanctions are to be conferred. In the basic interactional dyad of the teacher and the student it is the teacher who identifies and defines those warranting sanctions. Therefore, it is the teacher with which this research is primarily concerned.

The teacher's identification and definition of a deviant student is the central problem toward which our attention is directed. Frequently, in their recognition of deviant students, teachers are guided by the norms, rules, and regulations of the educational institution or what Kitsuse and Cicourel distinguished as official(formal) rules.\(^3\) Included are those rules as defined by a manual of procedures, such as regulations of the organization that delineate a certain mode of propriety to be followed. If such a rule is broken by a student, then the teacher, guided by this official regulation, identifies the pupil as deviant. However, other factors, in the form of unofficial rules,\(^4\) can be expected to guide the teacher's decisions. For example, a pupil may experience differential treatment on the basis of social class, race or ethnicity. Thus, in order to study the identification and recognition of a deviant we must not only consider the official rules of an organization, but also take into account the tacit


\(^4\)Ibid.
norms. One general research question for consideration is then, What are the criteria that school personnel use to identify and process a student as deviant?

THE CONCEPT OF DEVIANCE

Before embarking on an empirical study concerning the concept of deviance let us first analyze the concept—explore the logical terrain—so to speak. The scope of this inquiry will be twofold. First, from a sociological point of view, the various approaches to deviance that have gained much attention will be investigated. Second, in a philosophical framework, the linguistic attributes of the concept will be analyzed. From this discussion it is hoped that a greater clarity of the concept will be achieved.

Approaches to Deviance

Many of the diverse sociological perspectives of deviance can be generally categorized under two distinct classifications: the normative model and the interactionist model.

The Normative Model

This particular paradigm is characterized by an adherence to normative standards or institutionalized expectations. As chief exponent of this view, Merton treats deviance only in terms of norm-breaking behavior. At the outset of his Epilogue he contends that one function of the sociologist is to discover and to report, "...the human consequences of departing from..."
(certain) values and practices."\(^5\) Included in this construct is the notion that the breaking of an accepted rule serves as a sufficient condition to label that particular behavior as deviant. It is assumed that deviance cannot be defined independently of the act and that certain behavior is always deviant independent of social actions which may define it as deviant.\(^6\)

Those who support the normative approach look to the behavior or the act committed as the key for understanding how a person or persons are defined, classified and reported as deviant. The research interests of this model are generally centered around explaining rates of deviating behavior by accepting the official statistics on deviance as "given" and using them as a point of departure.\(^7\)

The Interactionist Model

The interactionist perspective, in contradistinction to the normative model, views deviance as an outcome of a process of social interaction. This approach is a significant break with the model cited above, which took for granted the assumption that certain


\(^6\) Kitsuse and Cicourel, loc. cit.

things are necessarily, i.e., homogeneously, unchanging and non-
problematically, considered deviant by members of society. Kitsuse
and Cicourel have noted:

...the definition and content of deviant behavior are
viewed as problematic, and the focus of inquiry shifts
from the forms of behavior...to the "societal reactions"
which define various forms of behavior as deviant. The response of other people to the deviant behavior is the
essential element of this approach. It is the sharing of the
label and the experience of being labeled that those people who
have been labeled deviant have in common. The imputation of a
label, therefore, is a sufficient condition for us to consider the
label-bearer as deviant.

Those identified with the interactionist approach to deviance
are distinguished by the importance they assign to social control.
That is, in order to understand and analyze deviance they examine
what other people do about it. Utilizing this perspective for
research considerations the primary interest is in the part various
social organizations play in the process of producing rates of
deviance. This concern would be directed toward a study of the

---

8 Jack Douglas, "Deviance and Respectability: The Social

9 Kitsuse and Cicourel, op. cit., p. 135.

10 Howard Becker, Outsiders (New York: The Free Press, 1963),
pp. 9-10.
definitions and criteria applied by the processing agencies since they constitute an important factor in the production of deviance outcomes. Or, as Schur has stated:

...official statistics tell us a great deal about the operations of official agencies of social control...they accurately depict organizational outcomes which...is an extremely significant aspect of the "production" of deviance.11

Linguistic Analysis of Deviance

When considering the concept of deviance several terms frequently used in ordinary language are brought to mind. For example, we speak of a deviant as being "sick," "not normal" or "pathological" and in need of "treatment." The metaphorical attributes of deviance as illustrated by the locutions cited above coupled with its mixed nature suggests the need for language analysis.

Metaphorical Usage

Two common metaphors utilized when speaking of deviance are the medical and statistical models.

Although the comparison of deviance to an illness is one that is widely made, it is a conception that is under attack.12

11Schur, op. cit., p. 33.

This notion assumes that there is an analogy between a form of deviance and an illness. In other words, it views the presence of deviance as an "illness" state which, through "diagnosis" of the "symptom" and prescribed "treatment," it is hoped that a "healthy" state will be achieved. In some cases, most notably within the realm of what is known as mental illness, the prescribed treatment is some form of "therapy" to bring about social adjust-
ment.

The statistical model of deviance is characterized by a norm or average that is held by a large number of the sample. This norm represents what is typical of that particular group with the possibility of applying it to the entire population. Any movement away from the average or mean is viewed as a deviation. Likewise, some sociological perspectives of deviance view it as a departure from the norm, i.e., those rules widely held by society. Any behavior that is rule-violating is equated with a movement away from the norm and therefore constitutes a deviation from it.

The task here is not to evaluate the appropriateness of the metaphors that are associated with deviance as this will be dealt with in a subsequent chapter. But rather, the above is an attempt to explicate some of the ways about which deviance is conceptualized and the assumptions implicit in such characterizations.
The Mixed Nature of 'Deviance'

'Deviance' may be employed as a mixed term, that is, it may describe as well as assign a value. The descriptive aspect of deviance may be unclear since it is vague enough to include a wide range of behaviors. When the evaluative nature of deviance is considered we usually assume that it has a negative connotation. In other words, when we identify a behavior as deviant it implies that we disapprove or condemn that particular action.

It is precisely the mixed nature of deviance which this study intends to explore. The descriptive characteristics of deviance with regard to a particular form of deviant behavior will be delineated. Research will be directed toward a specific type of behavior which is not ordinarily thought of as a form of deviance, namely, the above average student. This sense of deviance does not imply a negative value but incorporates a positive connotation into the concept.\(^\text{13}\)

**METHODOLOGY**

Those who are involved in the occupation of education direct a good part of this effort toward being what Schur has called "labeling specialists," that is, identifying types of students. If we accept the notion that schooling is characterized

---
\(^{13}\)Jack Katz, in his article, "Deviance, Charisma, and Rule-Defined Behavior," *Social Problems, XX, (Fall, 1972)*, pp. 186-202, chooses to call this state charisma.
by a selection process, then we can understand how labeling is such an inherent part of it. For example, it is frequently the case that students are rated and placed in classes according to their academic achievement. This placement involves a selective process that identifies students for certain kinds of classroom experiences and excludes others. Hawkins and Tiedeman have observed that:

The addition of experts at various gatekeeping positions automatically results in greater discovery of deviance, or traits thought indicative of deviance. Thus highly trained, psychiatrically-oriented school counselors use more tests and rating scales on school children today than ever before, thereby finding more problems in need of correction.\(^{14}\)

Therefore, guided by the interactionist approach to deviance we may assume that the frequency of deviant behavior is actually produced by the actions taken by persons in the organization that define, classify and record certain behaviors as deviant.\(^{15}\) These organizational responses are among the most pertinent examples of how others, namely, the personnel of the organizations, react to deviance.

The position taken in this study is that the interactionist model is the more adequate approach to the concept of deviance. The normative model is too rigidly deterministic since it imposes


\(^{15}\)Kitsuse and Cicourel, loc. cit.
an order from without the interaction. Rather, it may be more fruitful to view the nature of socially organized activity from within the interaction. That is, it is quite misleading to treat deviance as a static condition and it may be more appropriate to view it as an interaction process. As Schur has stated:

> At the heart of the labeling approach is an emphasis on process; deviance is viewed not as a static entity but rather as a continuously shaped and reshaped outcome of dynamic processes of social interaction.

Research Questions

The main areas of interest are the following:

(a) What are the criteria that school personnel use to identify and define an above average student?

A large part of the research is directed toward the "official agents of the organization," that is, the teachers in the school setting. The concern here is to identify the language that is utilized to describe this particular student behavior. An integral part of the examination of the criteria mentioned above include the attempt to determine the norms, regulations or rules that account for this particular categorization of students. In other words, the criteria under scrutiny will encompass what Kitsuse and

---

16 Schur, op. cit., p. 137; Hawkins and Tiedeman, op. cit., p. 2-1.
17 Hawkins and Tiedeman, op. cit., p. 19-1.
18 Schur, op. cit., p. 8.
Cicourel designated as official and unofficial rules as cited previously in this chapter.

(b) How are individuals, who have been defined as above average students, processed by the organization?

The interest here is to explore the application of sanctions, i.e., how they are organized and activated. Sanctioning systems are the attempt to control forms of deviance. These sanctions, whether positive or negative, are directed toward the below average student as well as the above average student. In light of this, the similarities and differences of how some different forms of deviance are processed is investigated.

Methodological Steps

The principal aim of implementing the following research methods in conjunction with the theoretical framework outlined above was to achieve a greater understanding of the educational setting by accurately describing the social interaction among its members. This study was restricted to an elementary school located in the Columbus Public School System of Columbus, Ohio. The scope of the research techniques included three methods: participant observation, questionnaire and teacher interview.

Participant Observation

The theoretical approach taken in this study is one that states "...deviance of outcomes emerge from the continuous inter-
action between the individual's behavior and the response of others...”

Therefore, it was the situation, viz., the actor, reactor and context that was studied. This interaction was examined through observations of classroom situations as a participant observer where the concentration was directed primarily at the language the teacher and others involved employed.

**Questionnaire**

A questionnaire was completed by the teachers in order to provide supplementary material involving their background and attitudes which could have an effect on their classroom practices. Also included was a listing of descriptors that was analyzed according to the significance these teachers gave to the individual items.

**Teacher Interview**

These individual interviews were established as a follow-up of classroom observations. The form used was the guided interview where a list of questions and topics was employed, but at the discretion of the interviewer. In other words, an interview guide or schedule was utilized which required certain items of information, but still allowed the interviewer to modify or rephrase the question according to the situation and the individual

---

19 *ibid.*, p. 162.
being interviewed. 20

It was the intent of the researcher that these three methodological techniques serve as checks to insure the reliability of the responses by the subjects. The extent to which these responses were repeated will add to the validity of the study. A detailed analysis of the data and its significance can be found in Chapter IV of this text.

CONCLUSION

The main thrust of this study takes the position that labeling is problematical, i.e., the label applied to an individual can encompass a wide range of behaviors. In other words, a label may not be as definitive as those who apply it think it is. The vague and ambiguous nature of some labels is apparent in the school setting. For example, two teachers may label a student as above average, but for different reasons. These reasons may be at variance with one another but the end result is still the application of a label. This study seeks to explore this process of labeling by examining how teachers and the formal organization of the school define and identify the above average student.

Subsequent chapters of this work will include the following: Chapter II will deal with the various sociological perspectives of deviance. The strengths and weaknesses of the normative and inter-

---

actionist models will be discussed through an examination of the literature of each perspective. This is done in order to achieve a greater understanding of the appropriateness of one model over the other in the school setting. Chapter III will entail a language analysis of the concept of deviance. The primary of this section is to clarify the linguistic problems involved with the concept of deviance. Here the mixed nature, various uses and metaphorical models will be scrutinized. The empirical analysis is located in Chapter IV. In this chapter the qualitative methods utilized in this study, namely, participant observation, questionnaires and interviews will be discussed. The findings of these research techniques will also be presented in this chapter. It is here that the identification and definition of above average students will be closely examined. Finally, Chapter V will include the conclusions of the study as well as recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER II

AN ANALYSIS OF THE NORMATIVE
AND INTERACTIONIST MODELS OF DEVIANCE

INTRODUCTION

A portion of the preceding chapter dealt with a general over-view of two sociological models of deviance, the normative and interactionist. It will be the task of this chapter to treat these two perspectives in greater detail. Thus, attention will be paid to the distinguishing characteristics of each approach along with citing its major contributors. Also under examination will be the research considerations each model dictates.

From the discussion of these two conflicting views of deviance a position will be taken which delineates the more appropriate perspective for the purposes of this study. This is indeed an important step since it is this particular approach which serves as the theoretical base that initiates and guides the research questions and methodology of this entire work.

THE NORMATIVE MODEL

Implicit in the normative model of deviance is the appeal to norms or rules. One's behavior is guided and prescribed by these norms.
norms and if they are not adhered to then this conduct is identified as an instance of deviance. This conception supports the notion that acts which violate or break certain norms or rules are inherently deviant. The following discussion deals with an examination of the normative model, or more specifically, the structural-functional school.

Structural-Functionalism

Assumptions

Supporters of the structural-functional approach explain deviant behavior through an analysis of the social structure. According to Merton, this social structure contains two important elements. The first consists of culturally defined goals, purposes and interests. The second element of this structure defines, regulates, and controls the acceptable modes of achieving these goals. The social structure permits some individuals and not

---


others to compete for inculcated goals. The former follow the organized set of institutional means; the latter do not. The modes of adaption the latter make to their disjunctive position in the social structure are forms of deviation.

The structural theories contend that more people in certain groups, located in certain positions in, or encountering particular pressures created by the social structure, will engage in deviancy than those in other groups and locations. Bell explained the existence and persistence of deviant activity in terms of its contribution to the ongoing social order. His functional explanation of organized crime in America contended that it served several "useful" purposes. For example, it provided Italian immigrants and their children a ladder of social and political mobility that was otherwise closed to them which would bring them into middle-class life styles. Bell notes that...

The desires satisfied in extra-legal fashion were more than a hunger for the "forbidden fruits" of conventional morality. They also involved, in the complex and ever shifting structure of a group, class, and ethnic stratification, which is the warp and woof of America's "open" society, such as "normal" goals as independence through a business of one's own, and such "moral" aspirations as the desire for social advancement and social prestige. For crime, in the language of the sociologists, has a "functional" role in the society, and the urban racket-the illicit activity organized for continuing profit, rather than individual illegal acts-is one of the queer ladders of social mobility in American...

---

Another example of a functional explanation that seeks to explain deviance is Davis' sociological analysis of prostitution. He argued that prostitution is allowed to endure because it actually protects conventional institutions such as marriage.5

The important factor for the structural-functionalists is the effectiveness of socialization as it operates in conformity to norms.6 These norms are also referred to as institutionalized expectations, i.e., expectations which are shared and recognized as legitimate within a social system. Deviant behavior is viewed as behavior which violates these institutionalized expectations.7 According to Merton conduct that departs significantly from the norms set for people in their social statuses counts as deviant behavior.8 Norms, as Parsons has stated...

... (imply) the existence of common standards of what is "acceptable," or in some sense approved behavior.9

4 Bell, op. cit., p. 129.
9 Parsons, op. cit., p. 249.
Since a norm may be simply what the members of a social unit think conduct "ought" to be, a deviant act can be defined as behavior which is contrary to a norm or rule.  

Some of the research concerns of those who advocate structural-functionalism deal with seeking explanations of how to account for varying rates of norm-breaking behavior in various groups, social strata and other social systems. Emphasis is on studying the influence of social structural factors on deviant behavior. That is, the research interest is to examine how some social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in the society to engage in conduct that moves away from what is prescribed by specifiable social norms.

**Criticisms**

One of the basic tenets of structural-functionalism is that its proponents view deviance as a behavior departing "from conformity with the normative standards which have come to be set up as the common culture." It seems that the locus of reference of the term "deviant" is to something intrinsic to the behavior itself. This approach takes the position that certain forms of

---


conduct that are objectively and measurably harmful to the community or that violate rational institutionalized expectations are always deviant.\textsuperscript{13}

These beliefs are questionable on several points. First, the view that norms reflect a consensus and common value system is itself tenuous. Norms vary widely within society and social groups and it seems that the normative approach does not take this variance into consideration. Second, the excessive reliance on structural features seems to be unwarranted. Blumer has noted that...

Structural features, such as "culture," "social systems," "social stratification," or "social roles," set conditions for their action but do not determine their action. People—that is, acting units—do not act toward culture, social structure or the like; they act toward situations.\textsuperscript{14}

By disregarding the context in which actions take place the normative approach therefore ignores the fact that there needs to be some individual who recognizes, identifies, labels, or defines an act as deviant. The act in itself may not be deviant, rather it is the interpretation of the act that makes it as such.

Those who see the normative perspective as inadequate consider the social processes of how individuals become deviant


of primary importance. That is, they do not accept the assumption that certain behavior is always deviant independent of the social actions of others. But rather, they view the designation of deviance as a direct result of what other people do and it is this principle of societal reaction that is central to the concept of deviance. It is precisely the perspective that takes into account societal response, viz., the interactionist model, to which we will now turn our attention.

**THE INTERACTIONIST MODEL**

The interactionist model of deviance centers on reactions to behavior by other members of society. The common assertion is that acts can be identified as deviant or criminal only by reference to the character of reaction to them by the public or by the official agents of society. These reactions may be expressed formally by contacting some social control agency in hopes of rendering correction or punishment or the reactions may

---

be informal negative sanctions which would include social exclusion, avoidance of future contacts, verbal reprimands, physical punishment as well as expulsion from the group.¹⁶

The supporters of the interactionist perspective take the position that deviance is created by society,¹⁷ in the sense that the response of society to a specific behavior will dictate whether or not the act is to be considered an instance of deviance. Through this societal reaction the individual will be identified or defined as deviant. Rubington and Weinberg have noted that:

Deviants are persons who are typed socially in a very special sort of way. They are assigned to certain categories and each category carries with it a stock interpretative accounting for any persons subsumed under its rubric.¹⁸

Therefore, according to this approach, mental illness is possible because societal members treat certain behaviors as "mentally ill" and develop systematic ways of recognizing, categorizing and acting upon such behavior.¹⁹ The following section will discuss the interactionist approach in terms of labeling theory.


¹⁷Becker, op. cit., p. 8.

¹⁸Rubington and Weinberg, op. cit., p. 5.

The Labeling Approach

Assumptions

The labeling approach to deviance is basically concerned with the process of labeling an individual as deviant. As early as 1938 Tannenbaum noted that...

The process of making the criminal, therefore, is a process of tagging, defining, identifying, segregating, describing, emphasizing, making conscious and self-conscious: it becomes a way of stimulating, suggesting, emphasizing, and evoking the very traits that are complained of. If the theory of relation of response to stimulus has any meaning, the entire process of dealing with the young delinquent is mischievous in so far as it identifies him to himself or to the environment as a delinquent person.20

More recently Becker has stated:

Social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an "offender." The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label.21

This theory insists that we look at all the people involved in any episode of alleged deviance.

The adherents to the labeling orientation are interested in the consequences for the individual, and the social system, of his acting in a way that is treated as deviant. That is, the

21 Becker, op. cit., p. 9.
concern here is the effect that such a label may have on an individual and society in general. Rules that are such an integral part of the normative model of conceptualizing deviance do not serve the labeling perspective as a guide for behavior. Rather these norms are used as after-the-fact justifications and explanations for behavior which occurs. Schur refers to the phenomenon of appealing to rules after the behavior has been exhibited and the label applied as retrospective interpretation. In this sense, the labeled deviant is accused of having "been that way all along" or there is a review of the past for early "cues" that would aid in justifying the application of the label.

In contrast to normative theories of deviance, the labeling approach does not treat deviance as an objectively given quality of certain acts or actors. Rather, an act or actor is socially defined as deviant through interpretational and interactional processes. Szasz has sarcastically stated:

In the animal kingdom, the rule is, eat or be eaten; in the human kingdom, define or be defined.

---

22 Schur, op. cit., p. 39.


Becker has created the classification illustrated below which categorizes behavior by two dimensions, conforming/rule-breaking and labeled/not labeled. The resulting two-by-two table identifies conforming behavior not labeled deviant (cell c),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deviant label</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(informal and/or formal)</td>
<td>Rule-breaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labeled</td>
<td>Falsely labeled (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Labeled</td>
<td>Conforming (c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rule-breaking behavior that is informally and/or officially labeled (cell b), as well as the possibilities of conforming acts that are falsely labeled deviant (cell a) and rule-breaking not labeled, i.e., hidden deviance (cell d). The important point to bear in

25 Becker, op. cit., p. 3.

26 Becker does not make a distinction between successful and unsuccessful labeling. It would appear that successful labeling of an individual as deviant implies that the label has been accepted by others, i.e., one's social group or those who are the agents of social control, such as law enforcers. If the label is successfully applied, then the individual is usually given the treatment that the label dictates. For example, if one is labeled as mentally ill, then he may be placed in an institution which deals with and treats individuals given that label. But in the case of unsuccessful labeling the label does not "stick." That is, others do not treat the individual according to the label. Therefore, since the response of others is lacking the label cannot be claimed to have been successfully applied.
mind here is that it does not matter if an individual's behavior is conforming or rule-breaking. If the label is successfully applied, then he is considered a deviant. Even though one may be falsely labeled as a deviant the consequences of the successful labeling process are essentially the same as for one who participated in rule-breaking behavior and has also been successfully labeled. That is, both categories will most likely experience the effects of the stigma attached to the negative label. Therefore, it is the contingency of the label that is of importance here rather than the primacy of the norm.

The traditional view has been that the occurrence of deviance leads to social control, and that incidents of deviant conduct warrant that they should be taken care of by some formal organization of society. The labeling approach suggests that social control actually creates deviance. In other words, institutions whose primary task is to incarcerate law breakers in reality enhance their criminality. Therefore, efforts to treat deviators may, depending upon the nature of the setting and the treatment, be highly stigmatizing and may actually reinforce, rather than reduce, deviating behavior. 27

Along these same lines, Becker has observed that...

...labeling places the actor in circumstances which make it harder for him to continue the normal routines of everyday life and thus provoke him to 'abnormal' actions (as when a prison record makes it harder to earn a living at

27 Schur, op. cit., p. 3.
a conventional occupation and so dispose its possessor to move into an illegal one).\textsuperscript{28}

In the educational setting much attention has been focused on the notion that the identity a teacher imputes to a student has important consequences. These consequences are manifested in teacher-student interaction and the development of student careers. The research of Rosenthal and Jacobson on "self-fulfilling prophecies" is the most prominent.\textsuperscript{29} Their work was primarily concerned with positive self-fulfilling prophecies. This theory states that...

1. Teacher believes x about a pupil (e.g., that he is very intelligent).
2. Teacher makes predictions about the pupil.
3. Change in teacher attitude and behavior towards the pupil.
4. Change in pupil self-conception and behavior in line with the teacher's attitude/behavior.
5. Fulfillment of the prediction.\textsuperscript{30}

The labeling perspective supports this theory in the sense that the approach recognizes the fact that the labeled individual will experience some problems as a consequence of being labeled as deviant. In fact, he may engage in further deviance in order to resolve such


The proponents of the labeling approach seek to enlarge the area taken into consideration in the study of deviant phenomena by including in it activities of others as well as the allegedly deviant actor. Therefore, the research interests of those who support this perspective do not include accounting for the rates of deviance in various groups as is done by the adherents to the normative model. Kitsuse has stated:

I propose to shift the focus of theory and research from the forms of deviant behavior to the processes by which persons come to be defined as deviant by others. Such a shift requires that the sociologist view as problematic what he generally assumes as given—namely, that certain forms of behavior are per se deviant and are so defined by the "conventional or conforming members of a group."[^132]

Following this the concern of the labeling approach is basically two-fold: 1.) how different forms of behavior come to be defined as deviant by various groups in society, and 2.) how individuals manifesting such behaviors are organizationally processed to produce rates of deviant behavior. Therefore, in order to explain the rates of deviant behavior the researcher should be concerned specifically with the processes of rate construction. Instead of accepting these rates as indices of the incidence of certain forms of behavior they can be viewed as indices of organizational

[^31]: ibid.

The emphasis of this perspective is placed on the processes involved in labeling and on the social context of an action.

The Labeling Process

The labeling approach is essentially process oriented in the sense that the concern is how one becomes labeled as a deviant. This view of deviance implies a reworking of traditional definitions of deviants. Instead of restricting acts of deviance to rule-breaking behavior as in the normative approach, the labeling perspective emphasizes the processual aspects to deviance. The deviant is seen to be a product of being caught, defined, segregated, labeled, and stigmatized as deviant.

One of the earliest statements of the interactionist approach is Kitsuse's analysis of societal reactions to deviance. He contended that deviance must be defined and analyzed from the point of view of those who interpret and react to behavior as deviant. Accordingly, he conceptualized deviance as a three-stage process:

deviance may be conceived as a process by which the members of a group, community, or society (1) interpret behavior as deviant, (2) define persons who so behave as a certain

33Kitsuse and Cicourel, op. cit., p. 137.

kind of deviant, and (3) accord them the treatment considered appropriate to such deviants.35

Using Kitsuse's above process we could analyze how others react to a particular individual. For example, it could be the case that a certain student in a sixth grade classroom is not conducting himself properly. He has difficulty relating to other students at which times he is belligerent or aggressive toward them. Frequently the quality of his school work is very poor since his reading level is low and he is seldom prepared for class. His teacher, and possibly others, would interpret this behavior as deviant since it appears that his peer relationships and academic progress are instances of unacceptable behavior for an individual in this setting. Next, this student would be defined in terms of a label such as 'troublemaker' or 'below average' or perhaps both. Finally, treatment for his deviant acts may include punishment, psychological counseling, remedial tutoring or other such action deemed appropriate by those who are in authority to make such decisions.

This labeling process opens the door for many of the complexities involved when attempting to analyze behavior that is classified as deviant. Let us now focus on several of these aspects, namely, deviant types and primary and secondary deviance.

35Kitsuse, op. cit., p. 248.
Deviant Acts and Deviant Roles

For some forms of devianace the behavior is more appropriately viewed as a role rather than as a single act. If deviance is seen as acting out roles, explanation becomes an analysis of the processes leading to the assumption of these roles. The concern then is to discover regularized patterned processes instead of the many factors, which can be unique and unrelated, that lead to an individual act. Wood has stated that:

These deviant roles, then, can be seen more easily as integral parts of the social system than as attributes of individuals. The con man (Maurer, 1949), the hustler (Ned Polsky, 1967), the gambler, the racketeer (Gardiner, 1970), the religious cultist (Lofland, 1966), the pusher, and the marijuana-user (H.S. Becker, 1963), for some examples, are clearly actors in systems of economic supply and demand, operators in exchange systems created by moral entrepreneurship and the law, or status-seekers in the countercultures of society.36

Primary and Secondary Deviance

Along these same lines Lemert has made a distinction between a primary act of deviation and secondary deviance, or deviant roles, and identities as shaped by societal definitions and responses. Primary deviance is an initial act of misbehavior, e.g., stealing or violation of sex norms. This behavior may have occurred for any of a variety of reasons but which, in its occurrence, does not entail for the actor any reorganization of his self-defined roles. The occurrence of primary deviation may result in certain

societal reactions which in turn affect the actor. These reactions may include the application of a label and tend to create problems for the actor. His response to being formally or informally labeled as a deviant may involve further deviance which Lemert refers to as secondary deviance. Psychological aberrations, excessive fears, as well as learning to accept the stigma, illustrate the latter type.\(^{37}\) Lemert has noted:

Secondary deviation refers to a special class of socially defined responses which people make to problems created by the societal reaction to their deviance. These problems are essentially moral problems which revolve around stigmatization, punishments, segregation, and social control.\(^{38}\) The secondary deviant is a person whose life and identity are organized around the facts of deviance.

For example, through his elementary school education a student may have only accomplished mediocre academic achievement. Upon entering high school he is labeled as a 'basic' student and assigned to special classes for students of low academic ability. By attending these classes he is effectively segregated from other students and stigmatized by his membership in this particular group. His response to this label may be further deviance illustrated by a non-acceptance of authority, diminishing

\(^{37}\)Ibid., p. 18.

the importance of an education or other actions which reflect his identification with a particular group. Therefore, Lemert's analysis supports the labeling approach to deviance since the emphasis is not on the quality of the behavior per se, but rather the societal reaction that the action elicits.

**Criticisms**

The criticisms of the interactionist perspective generally fall into two categories: 1.) it has not specified exactly what kind of reaction identifies a behavior as deviant, and 2.) it has failed to be consistent. Let us now examine each of these points.

First, some of the criticism leveled at the labeling perspective is related to its basic assumption that acts are identified as deviant by the character of reactions to them. The point at issue here is the subjectiveness of the approach. It seems lacking in the literature of labeling theory is an explicit analysis of what constitutes a societal reaction. For instance, the quality of the reaction may vary depending on the individual. Some may react to a form of behavior in a harsh manner and others mildly. This qualitative difference in responses should make a difference as to how the act is identified, according to the labeling approach. But does it make sense to speak of qualitatively

---

different forms of deviance which are solely dependent on various kinds of individual reactions? A similar criticism is that this perspective is relativistic in the extreme because it rejects the notion that some acts are deviant or criminal in all societies.\textsuperscript{40}

There are those who would take the position that some acts, such as incest, are considered deviant along cross-cultural lines. The labeling theorists would take issue with that assumption on the basis that deviance is not an inherent property of the act, but rather a quality that is conferred upon the act by others.\textsuperscript{41}

The labeling approach is also criticized as being inconsistent due to its ambiguous nature, i.e., it suffers from the process-product ambiguity. Green observed that the process-product ambiguity arises when a term is...

\ldots used at one time to refer exclusively to a certain process or activity (that) may be used, (and) in the same chain of reasoning, to refer to the result or product of that activity.\textsuperscript{42}

Supporters of this perspective state that the labeling of deviance is actually a process, but they also refer to the deviant label as a product of this process. This is a difficulty that has not been recognized nor resolved.

\textsuperscript{40}Ibid., p. 11.


Lastly, the charge of inconsistency is directed toward Becker, especially regarding his classification of behavior.\textsuperscript{43} For if deviant behavior is defined in terms of reactions to it, then he cannot speak properly of "secret deviance." That is, behavior which is rule-breaking but not labeled cannot, according to this conception, be considered deviant since the essential element - the societal reaction - is missing. On this basis secret deviance should be excluded. "As it is hidden, it is unlabeled, and as it is unlabeled, it is socially nonexistent."\textsuperscript{44}

Becker responds to this criticism by stating...

...Secret deviance consists of being vulnerable to the commonly used procedure for discovering deviance of a particular kind, of being in a position where it will be easy to make the definition stick.\textsuperscript{45}

Here he speaks of the potentiality of being labeled as deviant. An individual who committed an act that could be labeled as one of deviance may be aware of the consequences involved. He may realize that grounds are present which could, once discovered, define him as a deviant. Also, by introducing the deviant into the social process of labeling he can see himself as doing wrong, even though his social group may assume his innocence.

\textsuperscript{43}See p. 25 of this chapter.


CONCLUSION

The above criticisms, although responded to, are not entirely resolved by reviewing the more current literature in the field. But even with its difficulties the interactionist model of deviance seems to be the more suitable approach for the purposes of this study. This decision was made on the basis that the research considerations are focused primarily on the interaction between the teacher and the student in the classroom setting. Attention is directed at the reaction of the teacher to student conduct and how he/she labels such behavior. The interactionist perspective is a general theory about how a person labels another person and the present study is essentially about how one group of persons, teachers, comes to label another group of persons, students. And teachers do, of course, use terms or labels to talk about students.

It was believed that the normative model was too structured and deterministic to be of any assistance in investigating the research questions of this work. Also, some of its basic tenets, e.g., it assumed a constancy of norms, were troublesome and not readily acceptable. The interactionist model, on the other hand, is process oriented - an attribute that is closely akin to the educational enterprise. Therefore, it seemed that this model of deviance and its research concerns were appropriate to the subject under study.

46 Hargreaves, Hester and Mellor, op. cit., p. 143.
CHAPTER III

A LANGUAGE ANALYSIS OF THE
CONCEPT OF DEVIANCE

INTRODUCTION

The concern in the preceding chapter was to explore the ways in which deviance is characterized by two schools of sociological thought, namely, the normative and interactionist. The task of the present chapter is decidedly different. Here the focus will be analysis of the concept of deviance. This study will include an amplification of the remarks made in Chapter 1.¹

The concept of deviance will be examined in relation to its usage. In other words, the emphasis will be on how the word 'deviance' is used as well as those words which are generally regarded as forms of deviant behavior, such as 'delinquency,' 'mental illness,' or 'drug abuse.' In this sense, deviance is viewed as a "category of categories," i.e., it is a generic concept under which specific behaviors can be subsumed. One of the aims of this chapter will be to investigate the underlying assumptions made when one's conduct is labeled as a form of deviance and some of the basic characteristics of this concept.

¹See Chapter 1, pp. 6-8.
THE METHODOLOGY

The methodological considerations in this particular chapter are restricted to the realm of linguistic analysis. One of the aims of this method is to promote the better use of language by analyzing the basic units of language, viz., words. Wilson contends that...

Words have different uses and different applications: and our job is to analyze the concepts and map out these uses and applications. Implicit in "mapping out these uses and applications" is the task of distinguishing the various uses of the word and the different meanings it bears in different contexts. This close scrutiny of the way words are used will aid in the process of clarifying our concepts and contribute to the better understanding of the logic of our language. More specifically, this study will explicate some of the linguistic problems associated with the concept of deviance.

Utilized in the methodology of language analysis are the more specific techniques of identifying unexamined assumptions, offering cases of examples, pointing out the mixed use of words, evaluating metaphorical usage, and making distinctions particularly among questions of fact, value and concept. Through the utilization

---


of these methods we will attempt to deal with logical problems of language associated with 'deviance.' For as Pratte has stated, the analyst is...

Aiming to reduce or eliminate certain difficulties which seem to stand in the way of understanding or properly appreciating the language of another...⁴

THE ANALYSIS

As previously stated the general purpose of this analysis is to achieve a greater degree of clarity concerning the concept of deviance. More specifically, the approach will be three-fold. First, we will examine various examples of uses of the concept in order to isolate its essential characteristics. Second, the focus will turn to the nature of the concept as we discuss its descriptive and evaluative aspects. Our final step will be the evaluation of some of the metaphors that are associated with the concept of deviance.

Deviance: Examples and Characteristics

One step in clarifying the concept of deviance would be to look at examples in a context where it would be agreed that act X either was or was not an instance of deviance. By doing this we are seeking clarity of the concept by asking and dealing

⁴Pratte, loc. cit.
with the prior question, "What counts as an act of deviance?"5

Imagine that we are walking along the main street of a fairly large city and during our jaunt we observe four situations. In the first, \(X_1\), we see a young adolescent boy in the process of knocking an elderly woman to the ground where he wrestles a purse from her hands. Upon breaking the purse free from her clutches he immediately runs down the street and turns into an alley. Some passers-by are yelling at the boy to stop or calling for help from the police while others are administering aid and comfort to the victim of the purse snatching. As we continue down the avenue we see, \(X_2\), a young woman in her early twenties walking directly in front of us. She stops occasionally admiring the displays in the store windows and then proceeds with her walk again being sure not to bump into anyone or get in their way. She seems to be walking down the street quite unnoticed by those around her. We observe, \(X_3\), another woman about the same age, but who is receiving many perplexed looks for she is walking backward down the street. She also is careful not to disturb anyone and the

5This researcher recognizes the distinction between acts and behavior described by Richard Taylor in his work Action and Purpose (New York: Humanities Press, 1973) as evidenced by the following quote:

In calling certain of man's motions, along with their resultant states, his acts, then, and thus distinguishing them from events that are not acts, such as reflex and spasmodic motions and things resulting from these, we are only, on this view, asserting that such behavior and its consequences did occur and that a certain man is responsible for that behavior and its consequences. (p. 100)

This is not a crucial distinction for the purposes of this study.
people on the street allow her to continue her walk despite her behavior. Next we see, \((x_4)\), a bearded man holding a placard and pacing in front of a business office. The message on his sign indicates to us that he is protesting a certain practice of that company which he deems unfair and prejudiced. As people stroll by this man he is greeted by such comments as, "Hippie-freak!," "Pinko-Communist!," or with silence.

In the above examples we might distinguish among those which would be considered situations of deviant behavior. For example, in our first instance \(x_1\), the adolescent purse-snatcher, we see what can be considered a model case of deviant behavior. It is generally thought that such conduct is unacceptable in the sense that it is an illegal activity and those found guilty of committing this offense are usually penalized in some fashion. Those who participate in such conduct are regarded as criminals, purse-snatchers, juvenile delinquents or other types which denote some form of deviant behavior.

But let us look at this case more closely. We have in this situation the initial activity of taking an article that belongs to someone else, the reaction of those witnessing that action and those making inferences about what took place. Furthermore, the response was one which sought control, that is, attempting to catch the adolescent in order to restrain him or calling for the police. If and acts and behavior are used interchangedly.
he were caught he probably would receive a negative reaction from his captors in the sense that he would be treated as if he had done something wrong. It would seem then that the response of others is an essential part of the concept of deviance for it is this reaction that is responsible for the application of a deviant label. It was the reaction of others in the purse-snatching episode which would have tagged the adolescent as a thief. But if the same behavior were viewed by another sector of society perhaps the reaction would have been quite different. For example, if the boy did escape his pursuers and met his friends who were all members of the same street gang they might view his conduct as quite acceptable and an initiation rite in order to gain admittance to the club. In this context the behavior is reacted to differently. What changes in these examples is not the action, but rather the reaction of others to the act.

From the above discussion it would appear that a model case of deviance would include the essential feature of a societal reaction in which a label is applied and control is sought as expressions of the response. The important point to bear in mind is that deviance is not an intrinsic attribute of an act but is rather a result of the reaction of others to an act. This is why one must not only consider the act, as those who support the normative perspective have done, but also the context in which the act takes place. From the interactionist view, deviance, in general, as opposed to conventionally agreed upon forms of behavior like child
molestation or the illegal use of heroin is a product of public evaluation. The act of injecting heroin into a vein is not inherently deviant, for if a nurse gives a patient drugs under doctor's orders, it is not ordinarily viewed as an act of deviance. It is when it is done in a way that is not publicly defined as proper that it becomes deviant. The act's deviant character lies in the way it is defined by the public.

Our second encounter, X2, is quite different from the previous instance. Here the young woman's behavior is viewed as acceptable by the others around her since there is no attempt to apply a negative label to her. This example has none of the characteristics of X1 and therefore can be considered a contrary case of deviance. Since it lacks the essential feature of a societal reaction it cannot be a description of the concept of deviance.

The final two situations are similar in the sense that they can be considered incidents of deviant behavior since they both elicit a rather negative response. In the first, X3, the young girl's behavior is considered odd by those surrounding her and in X4, the second instance, the bearded man's actions evoke some hostile reactions. But in both these situations a factor is missing that was present in our model case of X1, namely, the social control aspect. In X3 and X4 there is no effort on the part of those in the area to control either of these people. Although their behavior may be viewed as strange or unacceptable by others there is no
movement to act upon it in some organized manner as in \( X_1 \). In other words, the situations of \( X_3 \) and \( X_4 \) could be considered borderline cases since they contain some of the characteristics of the concept of deviance, but not all.

From the explication of the four descriptions presented above we can make several points. The following points also serve the purpose of supporting the interactionist perspective of deviance. This approach is based on the recognition that a special context and societal reaction is a necessary condition for the labeling of deviance and it is that very factor to which the above analysis addresses itself. First, the concept of deviance is not absolute. That is, examination of isolated acts is not appropriate to determine whether or not they can be subsumed under the rubric of deviance. Instead they must be looked at in terms of the entire situation which includes the act, actor and reactor. This brings us to our second point which contends that societal reaction is a necessary part of the concept of deviance.

Let us explore this second point more fully. Granted, the notion of societal reaction is a vague and ambiguous one, but one that cannot be ignored. In one sense society at large constitutes the audience. But more specifically, most reactions can be classified along formal/informal lines. In many cases acts of deviance are formally reacted to by agents of control who implement social action through institutionalized procedures. For example, if one commits an act such as burglary and is caught, he will be
formally charged with the crime and, if convicted, will possibly be imprisoned for some length of time. The audience in this case are the police, the judge, prison warden and guards, i.e., those who are official agents of social control. They are among the most significant of direct reactors since their actions follow established procedures and records are kept of such transactions. Other instances of deviance may be the subject of informal reactions, that is, actions that do not follow institutional patterns. Examples of this may be a teacher's scolding directed to a misbehaving student or the exclusion of a child from a group's play. In these cases there are definite reactions, but they do not contain the conventions of officials or recognized practices.

Another aspect of societal reaction that warrants consideration is that it may be variable in degree. For instance, a reaction may be as inconsequential as a parking ticket or raised eyebrow or as severe as a sentence of life imprisonment.6

---

6 As cited in the previous chapter (see pp. 33-34) one of the major weaknesses of the interactionist perspective is the vagueness in speaking of a 'societal reaction.' These responses vary a great deal and this variance is not adequately accounted for in this approach. There are many variables implicit in a societal reaction that should be taken into consideration. For instance, how many people constitute a societal reaction? In some cases it could be as few as one or it could be many more who partake in the reaction. Often times the strength or degree of significance the reaction has depends upon the authority, prestige or power of the reactor. Certainly a person of authority will have more influence regarding the treatment of the labeled deviant, than an individual who has no power in that particular setting. As mentioned above there is great variability concerning the degree and extent of societal
From the above analysis we might conclude that deviance can generally be defined as an action that usually elicits a negative societal reaction which frequently manifests itself in an attempt to control the deviant in some manner. This definition seems to be characterized by a combination of a descriptive and programmatic definition as delineated by Scheffler. That is, the above is descriptive for its primary function is explanatory in the sense that it claims to "clarify the normal application of terms." With this definition deviance is explained and accounted for in terms of a societal reaction. On the other hand, the definition is programmatic since it also stresses the social control aspect. Scheffler states that...

...the interest of programmatic definitions is moral, that is, they are intended to embody a program of action.

Reactions.

Granted, these are problems with the interactionist model that should be attended to. An accounting of what constitutes a societal reaction and its contingencies has yet to be developed. This may be attributed to the relative newness of the approach. In any case, what we do have with the interactionist perspective is attention directed toward the reactors in a situation and this, at least, is a beginning to a more complete analysis of societal reaction.


8Ibid., p. 22.

9Ibid.
When a definition of deviance is both descriptive and programmatic, it purports to mirror pre-definitional usage but, equally important, it embodies a program of action commonly aimed at setting limits, restrictions, or controls on that form of deviance.

**Deviance: The Mixed Nature of the Concept**

The above discussion dealt with the essential features of the concept of deviance but here our concern will be to delineate the nature of the concept by exploring the kind of word under which it can be classified. This exercise will give us some idea as to the function of the concept of deviance since it will examine the basic uses to which we put this particular verbal sign.

Wilson establishes various categories of word-types such as descriptive, evaluative, and mixed. Descriptive words are those which attempt to give information about the world by describing our experiences. Wilson states:

> Some descriptive words are simple and concrete, like 'elephant,' 'grey,' and 'walking': others are further removed from our direct sense-experience, like 'symmetry,' 'coordination,' and 'unite.\(^1\)\(^1\)

These words serve the function of describing persons, things or actions. The purpose of evaluative words, on the other hand, is different in the sense that these are words that are used to praise, praise, praise.


\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^l\)bid., p. 23.
blame, commend or criticize. They are utilized when we want to do something more than just describe things.\textsuperscript{12} Wilson has noted that:

When I say of something or someone that it or he is 'good,' for instance, I am commending or praising: when I say that it is 'bad' or 'evil' I am criticizing or deprecating it. In the first case I am saying that it is the sort of thing which you ought to choose, in the second that it is the sort of thing which you ought not to choose.\textsuperscript{13}

But many of the words that we deal with in everyday language are not purely descriptive nor evaluative, but rather a mixture of the two. These mixed words not only describe a person, thing or action but also give or deny a value by commending or condemning it. As Wilson contends:

Words like 'steal' and 'murder' are mixtures. 'Steal' means partly 'to take property that legally belongs to another': this is its descriptive meaning. But it also means 'when it is wrong to do so': and this is evaluative. 'Murder' means 'killing when it is wrong to do so,' a similar mixture.\textsuperscript{14}

The concept of deviance is mixed in that it describes an action as well as assigns a value to that action. It is descriptive since it delineates a type of behavior that is viewed as different from the norm. The evaluative aspect of the concept is negative due to the fact that the action is usually stigmatized. In other words, when we identify a behavior as deviant it implies

\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 25-26.
\textsuperscript{14}\textit{Ibid.}
that we disapprove or or condemn that particular action. This interpretation has been reinforced through the writings in sociology of deviance or what Liazos refers to as "nuts, sluts and preverts."\textsuperscript{15} It is those actions which are given a negative response by others that enter the realm of deviancy. The descriptive nature of the concept of deviance may be very ambiguous in that it brings to mind several uses instead of only one. When we speak of deviance it could be in terms of a juvenile delinquent, one who is considered mentally ill, a Skid Row derelict or any number of instances where the conduct is regarded as and categorized under the broad heading of deviant. Although the concept may include a variety of behaviors one thing is certain - that all these actions are attributed with a negative valuation. Those individuals labeled deviant or outsider are the ones toward which much attention is directed through social agencies which wish to control or correct the deviancy.

In fact, there are cases where organizations have exploited the negative aspect of the concept of deviance in order to gain popular approval of its function. According to Becker, one such instance of a "moral entrepreneur" was the former commissioner of the Bureau of Narcotics.\textsuperscript{16} This particular official led his


Bureau on a moral crusade against the use of marijuana. The culmination of this moral enterprise, as Becker sees it, was a publicity campaign that persuaded first the general public and then Congress that marijuana use was a vicious habit that should be outlawed and severely penalized. A campaign of this type relies heavily on heightening the evaluative nature of this form of deviance so that the general public will learn to deprecate such actions.

The area of neglect seems to be that deviant behavior which can be labeled with a positive connotation, i.e., actions which depart from the norm, but in a socially acceptable or approved fashion. Those students that are designated as honor, gifted, or above average are those that are deviant in a manner of speaking, but deviant in a positive nature. In other words, these are acts which are deviant in a descriptive sense but lack the evaluative aspect that is usually associated with the concept of deviance, viz., negative. Thomas Szasz recognized this situation when he wrote *The Manufacture of Madness*:

However much sociologists insist that the term "deviant" does not diminish the worth of the person or group so categorized, the implication of inferiority adheres to the word. Indeed, sociologists are not wholly exempt from blame: they describe addicts and homosexuals as deviants, but never Olympic champions or Nobel Prize winners. In fact, the term is rarely applied to people with admired characteristics, such as great wealth, superior skills, or fame - whereas it is often applied to those with despised characteristics, such as poverty, lack of marketable skills, or infamy.17

---

Along these same lines Szasz noted that...

When a person does something bad, like shoot the President, it is immediately assumed that he might be mad - madness being thought of as a "disease" that might somehow "explain" why he did it. When a person does something good, like discover a cure for a hitherto incurable disease, no similar assumption is made.\(^{18}\)

Coser also recognizes that a departure from the norms may, in fact, be preferred and permitted. He cites that there is tolerance of deviance for special role incumbents such as the "star."\(^{19}\)

Schur suggests that those who support the interactionist perspective should also consider positive labeling as well as negative labeling as part of their theory.\(^{20}\) By positive labeling he meant the kind of societal response which helps to insulate the individual from commitment to socially unacceptable roles. Katz offers an interpretation of behavior which encompasses the positive and negative valuation. These actions, which are outside the realm of the ordinary, were viewed favorably or unfavorably, with the former


labeled as charisma and the latter deviance. The concepts of deviance as inferior ability and charisma as superior ability can be used to identify competencies and incompetencies and talents and character defects. Katz has stated:

The deviant is someone who is thought by another, or thinks himself relative to another, to be of inferior capacity, ability, competence, etc.; the charismatic individual is someone of relatively superior capacity.

What the above authors allude to is the expansion of the concept of deviance from a restriction itself to a negative nature, to also include a positive interpretation. It is the inclusion of this positive aspect with which this study is primarily concerned. The emphasis here will be on those individuals who exceed the minimum requirements or expectations. Within the school setting we will focus upon the students who are considered above average and what, specifically, gives them that quality.

Deviance and Metaphorical Usage

The Nature and Evaluation of Metaphors

Metaphors are very helpful in a number of ways. Black has observed that...

Metaphor plugs the gaps in the literary vocabulary...So


viewed, metaphor is a species of catachresis, which I shall define as the use of a word in some new sense in order to remedy a gap in the vocabulary; catachresis is the putting of new senses into old words.23

They can be used to explain the unfamiliar in terms of the familiar. That is, a metaphor treats a new concept as though it were the other, more familiar concept and we are using knowledge that has already been learned to learn about something that is new to us.

Green contends that:

The main virtue of a metaphor is that it calls to our attention certain similarities between two things. It carries the mind over from one thing to another by calling attention to resemblances.24

A metaphor can be considered an implicit comparison in the sense that it suggests an important analogy between two things, "without saying explicitly in what the analogy consists."25 It is the nature of the metaphorical statement to point to the analogies, similarities and parallels that seem to exist.26

A drawback to metaphorical usage is that it can erroneously be taken as a literal interpretation. Metaphors aren't intended to express the literal meaning of the term used but there is the


25 Scheffler, op. cit., p. 48.

26 Ibid., p. 47.
tendency to think of the things compared as though they were the same.\textsuperscript{27} This imposes an unintended extension of meaning upon the focal word.\textsuperscript{28} Scheffler points out that metaphors may have practical consequences since they may function as a means to channel action "by purporting to indicate that some important analogy may be found within the relevant subject matter."\textsuperscript{29} One way to avoid this difficulty is through analysis of metaphorical statements. This evaluation can begin by first making the metaphor explicit, i.e., scrutinizing it until we find and identify the analogy. We examine the characteristics that the two things share and their similarities. Our next step is to investigate the point where the analogy breaks down or the point where the analogy no longer "fits." At this point we are seeking those features the two concepts do not share, i.e., where the analogy can no longer be applied in the same way to the two terms under discussion. By utilizing this procedure we can analyze metaphors in order to clarify our language and expose the underlying assumptions that serve as a basis for metaphorical statements.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{27}Green, loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{28}Black, op. cit., p. 39.
\textsuperscript{29}Scheffler, op. cit., p. 48.
\textsuperscript{30}Ibid.
An example of metaphorical language would be the manufacturing metaphor of education. Administrators point out the number of degrees produced by their institutions and students frequently speak of assembly line education. The analogy in this particular metaphor is between the educational process and the workings of a factory and there are some striking parallels between these two concepts. For instance, a similarity can be drawn between the raw material with which a factory begins and the finished product and the primary grade student and the individual who completes his education, respectively. In both of these cases there was a beginning point, then a certain procedure was followed with the end result a product that is designed for some purpose in society. The demands of society are considered since a manufactured product should be functional. That is why marketable goods, such as electric can openers, are produced rather than obsolete items, e.g., spinning wheels, which are no longer in demand. Likewise, in the school setting specific occupational goals are stressed, whether it be through vocational education or college preparation, rather than encouraging students to engage in such outmoded careers as blacksmithing or cooperage. We could also make some parallels between the two processes themselves. Both involve a lockstep procedure whereby various sequential stages cannot be skipped, but must be completed before going on to the next stage.
The above are some characteristics that the manufacturing and educational processes share in common. There is a point where the analogy breaks down and the features between the two are no longer shared. In the factory the raw material is expressly modified by the worker who has almost complete control to determine what will happen to the material. In the educational process the student and teacher interact with one another, an aspect that is absent in the factory process. In the school the nature of the student is important but in the context of a factory this factor is not considered to the extent that any meaningful interaction takes place between the material and worker. The preceding discussion served to explicate how metaphorical language is used and analyzed.

The following is an analysis of two metaphors that are commonly related to the study of deviance. The first examines how deviance is characterized through a statistical metaphor. The second example is the medical model which explores the metaphorical language associated with the analogy between illness and deviance.

The Statistical Model

From a statistician's perspective deviance is any movement away from the mean or average. This movement can be negative, below the mean, or positive, above the mean. The implication of this model is that deviance can be inclusive of negative and positive value and is dependent upon the distance and direction of the
departure from the mean. Becker has given the following explanation of this metaphor:

The simplest view of deviance is essentially statistical, defining as deviant anything that varies too widely from the average. When a statistician analyzes the results of an agricultural experiment, he describes the stalk of corn that is exceptionally tall and the stalk that is exceptionally short as deviations from the mean or average. Similarly one can describe anything that differs from what is most common as a deviation. In this view, to be left-handed or redheaded is deviant, because most people are right-handed and brownette...But it is too simple a solution. Hunting with such a definition, we return with a mixed-bag - people who are excessively fat or thin, murderers, redheads, homosexuals, and traffic violators. The mixture contains some ordinarily thought of as deviants and others who have broken no rule at all.31

The analogy is drawn between a set of scores in which the average, for example, is 75 and a norm of behavior such as the expectation in a school setting that students should hand in their work on time. A statistical deviation is any score that is not 75 - a score above this mean is a positive deviation and below would be considered a negative deviation. Some sociologists have applied this statistical model to a social setting. Using the example given above, if a student fails to meet the expectation of completing his assignments within a certain time period then he is considered deviant in a negative sense for his behavior is falling below the expected norm. Those who advocate the normative view of sociology utilize this statistical model to define their conceptualization of deviance as evidenced by Merton's statement:

31 Becker, op. cit., p. 12.
Deviant behavior refers to conduct that departs significantly from the norms set for people in their social statuses.\(^{32}\) Although much attention is given to those who deviate below the expected behavior norms it seems that utilizing the model cited above, we can also consider those whose performances achieve a positive status. That is, the student who not only hands his work in on time but, in addition, completes extra assignments is one whose behavior in actuality is above expectations and therefore within the positive realm.

This sense of the statistical model is tied to a quantitative interpretation of a norm. That is, a norm is what most people do since it is synonymous with average and falls midway between extremes. Therefore, to be deviant one's behavior must be outside of the vague range of normal and fall either above or below. This description may be adequate for some cases, but not for all. Norms can also be explained in a qualitative sense in that they can describe what behavior should be in terms of acceptable and non-acceptable conduct. This account also recognizes the existence of norms that are generally accepted by a large sector of society, but the quantitative aspect of exceeding that typical trait is not present. This prescriptive dimension directs participants to act in a particular way, spelling out the forms of behavior to which

group members must conform. In this instance the only departure is conduct that is not considered proper or that is non-acceptable. These proscriptive norms are those which direct the members of a social structure avoid, abstain, and reject all forms of behavior associated with it. For example, we could state with some certainty that an act of murder is regarded as non-acceptable behavior by a majority of society. On the other hand, acceptable conduct in this case would be not to commit murder. But it would be difficult for us to speak of someone who exceeded this particular standard of behavior by allowing people to live since this notion is already implicit in the norm. This dichotomy between acceptable/non-acceptable behavior may not be applicable or appropriate for all instances, but it is another way norms are explained as well as the quantitative interpretation.

The Medical Model

The medical model elaborated here is sometimes referred to as the sickness or treatment model, which was derived from the well-established and frequently successful science and practice of medicine in cases of physical sickness. This metaphor assumes

---


an analogy between deviance and sickness. Becker contends that...

Some sociologists also use a model of deviance based essentially on the medical notions of health and disease. They look at society, or some part of society, and ask whether there are any processes going on in it which tend to reduce its stability, thus lessening its chance for survival. They label such processes as deviant or identify them as symptoms of social disorganization. They discriminate between those features of society which promote stability...or those which disrupt stability...35

With physical disability there is usually some observable bodily condition and treatment that involves doing something quite specific to the individual. According to Wood this biological sickness model appears to have six principal elements.

1. There is an underlying pathogenic condition in the sick person which can usually be diagnosed by a syndrome of physical symptoms such as fever and rashes.
2. An effective or ameliorative treatment is known for many types of cases.
3. Treatment involves doing something to the individual: administering drugs, surgery, etc.
4. The disease condition may get worse, leave permanent damage, or take an inordinately long time for return to a healthy condition without the treatment.
5. In most cases the treatment has little or no harmful side effects.
6. ...it is generally preferable to treat a well person erroneously diagnosed as sick than to leave a sick person untreated.36

These factors of physical sickness have frequently been applied to forms of deviant behavior since the analogy between a bodily sickness and deviance is commonly made. Social pathology was an effort to

35 Becker, op. cit., p. 7.
apply a biological or medical model to the analysis of societal problems. This notion rested on the idea that societies may develop abnormally and that they could be diagnosed in terms of some criterion of normality or health.  

The most common form of deviance that has been placed within the confines of this medical model is that of mental illness. This metaphor originated in sixteenth century Europe when "mental illness" was first used to describe behavioral disorders for persons whose symptoms made them appear "as if sick." Therefore, persons whose conduct could be accounted for by natural causes were to be regarded not as evil, but *comas enfermas* - "as if sick" and physicians, rather than priests, were charged with the responsibility of cure. Over a period of time the "as if" which designated figurative usage disappeared and the metaphor seems to have become literal or real.

The referent for the symbol "illness" or for its cognate "disease" was discomfort of some kind, such as fever, chill, aches, pain and so on. The word disease was originally equivalent to discomfort, or "not at ease" (*dis + ease*). Assigning persons to the

---


class "ill" carries the meaning of objective signs and symptoms of a recognized or named disease in addition to subjectively experienced discomfort.

This concept of illness, whether it was referring to a bodily or mental sickness, implied a deviation from a clearly defined norm. Persons who are labeled mentally ill are not regarded as merely sick, but are regarded as a special class of beings, to be feared or scorned, sometimes to be pitied, but nearly always to be stigmatized. Characterizations of mental illness as deviant behavior have focused on the set of attitudes America has inherited from its roots in Western civilization. The mentally ill have always been regarded primarily as deviant. Both confinement of such persons in jails, work-houses and alms-houses, and banishment from local communities represented rejection. The Joint Commission for Mental Health has noted that social rejection is still in existence in the form of primitive custodial hospitals "that seem to have no defenders but endure despite all attacks."^39

The mental health movement which attempted to reduce the stigma of mental illness by saying it was just like any other sickness, contributes to the influence of the sickness model. By treating mental illness as if it were a physical sickness many

unwarranted assumptions are accepted. Szasz has noted:

...what is intended by the proponents of this view is to create the idea in the popular mind that mental illness is some sort of disease entity, like an infection or a malignancy. If this were true, one could catch or get a "mental illness," one might have or harbor it, one might transmit it to others, and finally one could get rid of it. 40

The above locutions appear out of place when speaking of mental disorders since it is not appropriate to refer to them in terms of contagion or infection.

The belief is that "treatment" of the individual will "cure" the "patient" of his "abnormal" behavior. The term "treatment" was applied to social programs such as the provision of religious education, vocational training, and recreational activities in American reformatories after the middle of the nineteenth century. Beginning around 1930, and holding its position of dominance among professional agents of social control and academicians well into the 1960's was the notion that the deviant was essentially psychologically sick and should be treated as such. 41 Therapy became the control strategy utilized by the professionals for alcoholics, homosexuals, and addicts. These forms of deviant behavior were described, as was delinquency, as symptoms of mental


41 Wood, op. cit., pp. 140-141.
illness. This perspective was reflected in the literature of the
time and gained wide acceptance. These notions are changing
as evidenced by the unanimous vote of the American Psychiatric
Association's board of trustees at their December, 1973 meeting to
exclude homosexuality from the category of mental illness.

Criticisms of the Medical Model

The medical metaphor discussed above can be critically evalu­
ated on two points. First, this metaphor does not seem suitable to
explain deviant behavior. As cited previously, implicit in the
medical model of deviance is the ordinary language usage that rein­
forces the analogy between a state of sickness and deviance. Basical­
ly the parallel between the two is that the presence of deviance
is an "illness" state which, through "diagnosis" of the "symptom"
and prescribed "treatment," it is hoped that a "healthy," or non­
deviant, state will be achieved. There is also the notion of
"contagion" attributed to deviance, i.e., deviancy can be "caught"
through affiliation with certain values with which one eventually
identifies, much the same way one can contract a communicable
disease. Of course, deviance can not be transmitted in the same
manner as a biological sickness, nor can its causes be as easily
diagnosed or treatment prescribed to relieve the affliction as in

---

42 Examples of this literature are: August Aichhorn, *Wayward Youths* (New York: Viking Press, 1935); and, William Healy and August Bronner, *New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1936).
a sickness state. It appears that deviance entails a multiplicity of variables that must be taken into consideration and the medical model is inappropriate for dealing with social behavior. Also, a literature that utilizes medical or quasi-medical terminology to describe processes held to be non-medical in nature confuses issues and mystifies more than it illuminates.

Second, there has been a movement to dislodge the behavior associated with mental illness from the arena of sickness and disease. Szasz, Goffman and Scheff have argued that mental illness is best regarded as a myth. It is to suggest that the phenomena now called mental illnesses be looked at afresh and more simply, that they be regarded as the expressions of man's struggle with the problem of how he should live. In considering Szasz's argument that we regard deviant conduct as "problems in living," the connotations and concurrent implications for action of the predicate in the statement, "He is mentally ill" are dramatically different from the connotation of the predicate in, "He has problems in living." This position takes the mental health profession to task for applying stigmatizing labels, e.g., psychiatric diagnoses, to


45 Sarbin, op. cit., p. 11.
persons whose behavior annoys or offends others.  

This last point coincides with the interactionist perspective of deviance since the search for valid diagnoses of psychological diseases is being de-emphasized and the trend is now toward the study of the social interactional dimensions of life styles. Also, there is the recognition that the observer, i.e., the diagnostician, is actually a part of the sociopsychological occurrences that are present between him and the subject.

CONCLUSION

It is hoped that the above discussion has helped clarify the concept of deviance. The examination of its essential characteristics, the mixed nature of the concept and the metaphors with which it is associated was necessary in order to contribute to the greater awareness of the logic of the concept. It is believed that this linguistic analysis of deviance has served the function of illuminating the fundamental assumptions of the concept and therefore increased our understanding of it.


CHAPTER IV

AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF THE PROCESS OF LABELING ABOVE AVERAGE STUDENTS

INTRODUCTION

In the preceding chapters attention has been focused upon the various sociological approaches to deviance and a linguistic analysis of this particular concept. The primary concern of the present chapter is to empirically analyze the interactions between teachers and those students labeled as above average. This research consideration is based on the contention that being identified as above average is a form of deviance similar to that of being labeled as below average or a trouble maker. This similarity is manifested in the process by which a variety of behaviors in contexts are given the official and unofficial meaning that is the basis for assigning a special status in society. From previous discussions it has been asserted that the interactionist perspective of deviance is the most suitable when dealing with the school setting since it is here that societal reactions play an important role in the functioning of this institution.¹ By using this interactionist approach attention is mainly directed to the agents of

¹See Chapter 1, pp. 8-10.
social control, i.e., the teachers within the school, who define and do something about a certain kind of behavior.

When one has determined what to study, in this case the process involved in defining students as above average, then one is confronted with the problem of how to study it. It is contended here that the techniques of qualitative or field research are the most appropriate methodologies. These research strategies attempt to embrace as many aspects of the total situation as possible. Those who work within this tradition assert that the social scientist cannot understand human behavior without understanding the framework within which the subjects interpret their thoughts, feelings and actions. Therefore, field research, viz., observations, questionnaires, and interviews, were employed to analyze the social setting under study. The next section will discuss the area of field research in a general manner followed by a treatment of the specific methods utilized in this study. The concluding portion will serve to present the findings of the research.

METHODOLOGY

Field Research

Characteristics

Field research is characterized by an investigator who shares the daily life with participants and systematically works to understand their feelings and reactions. It is usually the case that the researcher has no part in structuring the situation.
That is, with this type of methodology there is no research design adhered to where one establishes a control group and an experimental group and comparisons are made after a treatment is administered to the latter. Rather, the field worker typically enters a social setting and gathers his/her data over an extended period of time in a variety of situations and uses several techniques e.g., questionnaires, interviews, and observations. The reason for using a variety of procedures are twofold: first, they serve as ways of getting at the questions he/she is interested in; and second, all of these aid in reducing the danger of bias.\(^2\) Therefore, the researcher can draw upon and compare diverse sources. Along these lines the investigator may be interested in what a subject says in response to his/her questions, what the person says to other people, what the person says in various situations, what he says at various times, what he actually does, various non-verbal signals about the matter, or what those who are significant to the person, feel, say and do about the matter.\(^3\)

A major tool of field research is observation. The investigator wishes to study his/her subjects in their milieu since it can greatly influence human behavior. Those who engage in this

---


brand of research believe that any plan to take the actors out of the natural setting may negate those forces and obscure its understanding. Becker has stated that the observer...

...gathers data by participating in the daily life of the group or organization he studies. He watches the people he is studying to see what situations they ordinarily meet and how they behave in them. He enters into conversations with some or all of the participants in these situations and discovers their interpretations of the events he has observed.5

The degree of participation by the investigator may vary depending upon the nature of the study and his/her preferences or orientation to the setting. For example, the researcher can act as an observer in the sense that he/she is physically present at the event, but does not really participate in it. In this instance his/her main function is to observe and to abstain from participation so as not to affect the phenomenon being studied. In another way the researcher does become an actual participant in an event or gathering, but his/her participation is determined by his/her research interests. Finally, there are the times when the researcher participates and he/she temporarily abdicates his/her study role and becomes a real participant. In one study a combination of these approaches may be utilized or the investigator may decide to strictly adhere to only one. To whatever degree the field researcher intends to participate the major point is that it

4 ibid., p. 11.
5 Becker, op. cit., p. 25.
necessitates that he/she orient his/her actions to be explicitly aware to look, to listen, and to ask, "what's happening?"\(^6\)

By observing one can pay attention to the physical movements of individuals in the setting and also listen to their verbal activities. But this may not be sufficient. Included in field research is the activity of asking. Lofland asserts that...

Like other normal human beings, the observer is free - indeed expected - to carry on conversations with people in the setting.\(^7\)

A field researcher may spend much time and effort in collecting statements and descriptions of events from members within the setting he/she is studying. These observations reflect the position the member holds in a group and serve as indicators of this particular perspective. The tools of questionnaires and interviews are probably the most useful in gathering this kind of information. However these two techniques are implemented, it is important to bear in mind that the field researcher considers the interpretations by his subjects to have first importance.

**Weaknesses**

As with any research method the investigator's primary interest rests with the question of the reliability and validity of the data he/she has collected. That is, the concern is to


\(^{7}\) Ibid.
what extent does the information gathered accurately reflect the situation being studied. This is especially the case in field research since the data gathering instrument, namely, the human observer, has the potential hazard of being variable over the course of his/her observations. In the case of questionnaires and interviews there is the question of the degree to which the responses obtained can be repeated. Also, if the presence of an observer is known to those under study this could cause error by changing the behavior of the subjects in some way which would serve to contaminate the results.

One way to guard against these dangers is to adopt a multi-method approach in which two or more independent measurement processes are utilized. If this procedure is followed then the uncertainty of a confirmed proposition is greatly reduced. Webb, et al., described this method as triangulation:

"...the process of triangulating all the different data may provide a test of his (the researcher's) assumptions and reveal the presence and extent of error."  

It is believed that this multiple operationalism functions as a protection against error that may be present due to the nature of the method. Triangulation combines a series of different measures, each with its own weaknesses, which serve as a check on each other.

---

9 Ibid., p. 181.
It is contended that if a proposition can survive the confrontation of several methods of testing, then "...it contains a degree of validity unattainable by one tested within the more constricted framework of a single method."\textsuperscript{10}

Techniques Utilized For This Study

The Setting

The research site was an elementary school (Kindergarten-Sixth Grade) located in Columbus, Ohio and under the jurisdiction of the Columbus Public Schools. This particular school is involved in the Arts IMPACT Program which attempts to establish a curriculum based in the arts. Due to this program a team of five special teachers, in dance, art, dramatics, vocal music and instrumental music serve the school on a half-time basis. The school serves an area predominantly composed of middle and lower class black families. Twenty-two teachers were involved in the study, although the degree of participation was variable. All teachers agreed to be observed, while three declined to be interviewed and six questionnaires were not returned. In the final analysis nineteen interviews were conducted, sixteen questionnaires were completed and forty-nine classroom observations were made varying in time from 10 minutes to 51 minutes. Of the nineteen subjects interviewed it was learned that five had been teaching less than five

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., p. 174.
years, four had taught between six to ten years, six have been teaching in the eleven to fifteen year range and four have had more than fifteen years of teaching experience. Through interviews it was also discovered that eight of the subjects held Masters degrees, while the rest had attained a Bachelors degree.

The selection of this site was based on the researcher's previous experience as a fifth and sixth grade teacher at this school for three years. The principal of the school was contacted and an explanation of the research project was given. Also, a research proposal was submitted to the Department of Evaluation, Research and Planning of the Columbus Public Schools for examination and was approved. This study took place in the spring of 1975 from April 8th until June 12th with the researcher conducting classroom observations two days per week and interviewing teachers after school.

As mentioned above entrance was gained to this research site by capitalizing upon the researcher's experience at the school and renewing acquaintances with the staff and students of this school. As Lofland states:

Upon becoming interested in a particular setting or a particular type of setting, professional sociologists typically seem to begin not by going directly to the people of the setting - if they know no one there. Rather, they cast about among their friends, acquaintances, colleagues, and the like, for one or more persons who are either already members or are already favorably regarded by members in the setting of interest. That is, there is an attempt to use pre-existing relations of trust as a route to the setting,
rather than "going in cold."\textsuperscript{11}

During several years of absence from the research site the investigator remained close friends with several of the teachers there and had attended several special programs at the school. While having prior ties with a site is an advantage in order to gain entrance for research purposes it does present one with the problem of biased views. That is, if one had previously established good relations while a teacher at the school and had felt a personal affiliation with the members of the faculty, then it is possible that this may contribute to the contamination of the data collected. In light of this, it would seem that the researcher would seek to establish the role of a social investigator rather than a friend or helper. But this also presents difficulties for the field researcher does not wish to alienate his/her subjects by appearing too distant or aloof. In fact, Goode and Hatt suggest that a state of rapport should be developed between the researcher and subject so that the latter will actively seek to help the researcher to obtain necessary information.\textsuperscript{12}

Along these same lines, Lofland advises an "exchange of services" which means that the researcher perform some services in the setting in order to maintain the role and increase one's

\textsuperscript{11} Lofland, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 95.

acceptability to the participants. To establish rapport with the subjects and make the presence of the researcher more acceptable two major tasks were performed. First, a written and verbal explanation of the research project was given to the teachers with the intention that they would accept the research goals of the study. Second, a portion of each day spent at the school was devoted to volunteer work with students which took the form of individualized instruction or supervising the completion of a project or homework assignment.

After entrance to the setting was accomplished the next objective was the actual research process. The following sections will deal with this process in detail especially with reference to the various instruments utilized.

Participant Observation

Observing teachers in the setting was considered important for the purposes of this study in order to examine their interactions with other individuals, especially students. This technique allows the researcher to gather data of the daily life of the group or organization he/she is studying. This is accomplished by watching the subjects of the study and observing what situations they ordinarily meet and how they behave in them. Using such a

---

13 Lofland, op. cit., p. 97.
14 Becker, loc. cit.
technique in this study gave the opportunity to observe the participants in the act and also permitted the identification of individual actors for study with other methods, viz., the interview and questionnaire, and for follow-up observations. In subsequent conversations the subjects related their interpretations of the events that were observed.

For this particular study an observation sheet was utilized (See Appendix A). This format was thought to be appropriate for the purposes of the study since it had separate spaces for observational notes, theoretical notes and methodological notes that were filled for each individual observation.\(^\text{15}\) The amount of notes written in each section varied due to what events were being observed, the length of time at each site, the degree of activity, and other such factors. Observational notes are the statements written about the events experienced through listening and watching. Schatzman and Strauss describe these notes as...

\[\ldots\text{the Who, What, When, Where, and How of human activity. It tells who said or did what, under stated circumstances.}\]

An example of such note taking was done on June 3, 1975 during a class with the art teacher.

Watching a film that students made of their pictures about a story they've read - they're synchronizing a tape record-


\[^{16}\text{Ibid., p. 100.}\]
ing of the story with the film - "this is really going to be professional" - affectionately places his hands on a student's shoulders - "that's much better" - "perfect" - "beautiful"

On the other hand, theoretical notes attempt to derive meaning from the observations made. This is where one can infer or interpret the events that are recorded. This is also a place where hypotheses are formulated and questions generated. A sample of a theoretical note from this study is below:

Making public the good actions of others - showing the audience (class) how something should be done - responses of other students important as well as teacher.

Finally, methodological notes serve the function of a memory device to the researcher. It is here where one can write reminders to oneself, give instructions or critique one's own strategies.17

The statement below represents a methodological note made on May 13, 1975 during a classroom observation.

I had to walk across the entire room to find a place to sit down and this may have inhibited (name of teacher) - she doesn't appear to be as natural as she should be - maybe ask teachers on observation schedule to have place ready for me.

These forms were used exclusively for classroom visitations. Any observations made in more informal situations such as recess duty, during volunteer work, in the teachers' lounge, the hallways, etc., were written on separate sheets of paper and placed in a folder.

This format was useful since it provided an organization for classroom visits and yet gave the needed flexibility. It was

17 Ibid., p. 101.
discovered after a series of visitations that the observational notes were rather extensive while the theoretical and methodological notes were usually at a minimum level.

Interview

Interviews were conducted after the school day so as not to interfere with the normal routine of school and also to allow the teacher being interviewed to relax and share his or her insights with the researcher. All except one of these interviews were tape recorded and later transcribed.

Field researchers generally make a distinction between structured and unstructured interviews. In the case of the former all the questions are decided precisely beforehand, whereas in the latter, the subject of the interview is left in broad terms and the researcher may elicit the information any way he chooses. It was decided to employ the unstructured interview style since this type would be useful where reasons, experiences, motives and feelings are involved.\(^\text{18}\) Also, open-ended questions were used in order to give the respondents complete freedom in answering questions. Stacey contends that this type of question is beneficial where a process is being explored.\(^\text{19}\) Closed-ended questions, on the other hand, rely on a pre-determined number of ways, e.g.,


\(^\text{19}\) Ibid., p. 80.
"no," "yes," or "no opinion," in which the interviewee must respond. It was believed that closed-ended questions were not appropriate for the purposes of this research since, due to the nature of the subject under study, alternate replies were not adequate, too limited in number nor clear cut.

The focused or guided interview format, which is a more formal variation of the unstructured interview, was implemented. In this way the researcher had a list of topics to be covered or an interview guide. This interview guide (See Appendix B) permitted the researcher to rephrase the questions based upon previous observations, but it also required certain items of information about each respondent. The scope of the interview depended largely upon the teacher. Some of the respondents felt quite comfortable in this situation others did not, therefore, certain interviews were longer and more informative than others. In many cases the questions served to confirm impressions that were felt during classroom observations. That is, follow-up questions were asked about specific events or students that had been observed previously.

Questionnaire

A questionnaire (See Appendix C) was distributed to the subjects with a final return rate of 73%. The main purpose of this

---

20 Goode and Hatt, op. cit., p. 186.
questionnaire was to serve as a check upon the other two methods. While observations were made and interviews conducted certain characteristics were discovered that the subjects used when identifying above average and below average students. These characteristics, along with several additional ones were included in the checklists on the final two pages of the questionnaire. This technique helped determine the degree to which the teachers were consistent in employing the various characteristics.

Once again, it is held that these methods were believed to be the most suitable for collecting information concerning the process of labeling students as above average. Let us now turn to the results of these techniques.

**FINDINGS**

The interactionist perspective involves a social language of labels and social reactions and it is precisely these aspects to which this portion of the study is addressed. The primary research concern is the process by which students are defined as above average within the school setting. We will now look at this process, i.e., the interpretations and reactions, by examining the data. These data were collected from teachers since it is they who are the agents of the institution and it is they who define and do something about a certain kind of behavior. The following sections are typifications of the information collected at the research site through observations, interviews and
questionnaires. Some data may appear very specific in nature but in studying social relations it is sometimes the "minute and particular" rather than the gross and general" which are important.²¹

We will first deal with the definition of the above average student. That is, we will explore what kinds of behavior the subjects define and interpret as above average. Second, we will examine how reactions are manifested by the teachers, through the utilization of reward systems or non-verbal behavior, the formal organization of the school, through school records, recognition assemblies and special programs, and finally responses from other students.²²

Definition and Interpretation of Behavior as Above Average

Through the use of the research methods implemented for this study it was learned that the teachers identified a variety of behaviors that they chose to define as above average. The descriptions that were given most frequently by the respondents in the questionnaires under items #4 and #5 were:

"Smart, sharp, intelligent, motivated."
"Highly motivated."
"Open, free, interested, eager."
"Bright, alert, attentive, generally from 'good homes'."
"Sharp, bright"
"Gets along in most situations, doesn't need prodding."
"Good, smart, creative, bright."


²² For some of the interview material cited on the following pages "I" will indicate Interviewer and "S" will indicate Subject.
Throughout the interviews above average students were characterized by teachers in terms of creativity, ability to concentrate, academic excellence, motivation, leadership roles, and appearance. Let us now direct our attention toward these areas.

**Creativity**

There is evidence to claim that the teachers believed the above average student is usually a creative student. First, this attribute was an item on the checklist to which all the respondents gave summary agreement.\(^{23}\) Second, the comments below suggest that creativity is part of being above average. In a response to the question, "Can you tell me about some of the students you consider above average, that is, why do you consider them above average?", the art teacher stated:

First, I think they're talented. They hear a different drummer. They have a certain knack in that they know where to put things and go much further with it than other kids. Some of it is innate but they get it at home too. Art can be taught. It seems above average kids get down to work right away. They come up with thoughts that are original and don't need as much stimulus as other students. They usually solve the problem and keep going further with it. It seems below average kids need ideas in order to get started. Many times the above average student will surprise me - but a lot depends on the medium. They just seem to strive harder.

Of course, we must take into consideration that the art teacher's primary interest is toward encouraging and cultivating creativity,

\(^{23}\)The results of the questionnaire checklist can be found in Tables 1 and 2 on the following pages.
### TABLE 1

**RESULTS OF THE "ABOVE AVERAGE" STUDENTS USUALLY... CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>work ahead the rest of the class</td>
<td>7-44</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are creative</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a good sense of humor</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>11-69</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are clean</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete their work on time</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>7-44</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use their imaginations</td>
<td>7-44</td>
<td>7-44</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dress neatly</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are introverted</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come from a stable home</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>10-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look alert</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>11-69</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help other students</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>10-63</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help the teacher</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>12-75</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are given class recognition</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>9-56</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reads well</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>10-63</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excels in other subjects</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td>9-56</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are absent minded</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>2-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are not careful in appearance</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>6-38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1-Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>does poorly in other subjects</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comes from a broken home</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>9-56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot follow directions</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>12-75</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disrupts class</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are seldom prepared</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insult other students</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are always prepared for work</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>9-56</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are frequently absent</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are respected by fellow classmates</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>11-69</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are athletically inclined</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are frequently tardy</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>9-56</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have sloppy handwriting</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have good attendance</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>12-75</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are talkative</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>9-56</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are seldom, if ever, tardy</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate well in class</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are quiet</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have neat handwriting</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are nice looking</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>9-56</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are introverted</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do well in the arts</td>
<td>7-44</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not answer questions</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>10-63</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The first number in the table indicates frequency of responses, the second number, located after the hyphen(−), indicates percentage.
TABLE 2
RESULTS OF THE "BELOW AVERAGE" STUDENTS
USUALLY...CHECKLIST*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>are always prepared for class</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>9-56</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are frequently absent</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are respected by fellow classmates</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>5-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are athletically inclined</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>9-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are frequently tardy</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>8-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have sloppy handwriting</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>10-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have good attendance</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>3-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are talkative</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-63</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are seldom, if ever, tardy</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>10-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate well in class</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>10-63</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are quiet</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>7-44</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>5-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have neat handwriting</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>8-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are nice looking</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>10-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are introverted</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do well in the arts</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not answer questions</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work ahead the rest of the class</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2-Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>2-13</th>
<th>4-25</th>
<th>2-13</th>
<th>3-19</th>
<th>5-31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>are creative</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a good sense of humor</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are clean</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>9-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete their work on time</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>8-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use their imaginations</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>11-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dress neatly</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>2-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are introverted</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>12-75</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come from a stable home</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>7-44</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>4-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look alert</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>10-63</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help other students</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help the teacher</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>8-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are given class recognition</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reads well</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>11-69</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excels in other subjects</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are absent minded</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>12-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are not careful in appearance</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>7-44</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does poorly in other subjects</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comes from a broken home</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot follow directions</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disrupts class</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>8-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are seldom prepared for work</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>10-63</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>3-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insult other students</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>6-38</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The first number in the table indicates frequency of responses, the second number, located after the hyphen(-), indicates percentage.*
but this trait was also commented upon by several other teachers below.

I: This is it purely on academic lines that you consider kids above average?

S: There are other areas that some of them I'm sure are outstanding also. I have a little girl who is quite far beyond the others as an artist. And the way she draws people and the things that she sees, her perspective in drawing. She isn't a copy type of artist either - she has her own ideas.

* * * * *

I: What about the areas outside of the academic subjects, say socially or in terms of the arts? What types of things do you consider extra special?

S: I have one little girl who's a 3rd grader that if she knows ahead of time that we'll be going to have art she'll come in with a sketch already made. Or a small model made of what she'll be doing for that day. It's that extra effort that the art teacher has had a great deal of difficulty in getting kids to do. Good organization, some feeling for design, some feeling for perspective. In dance some creative things by the boys has been absolutely gorgeous because of the way they moved, their direction, use of space.

This awareness of the creative process may be due to the presence of the Arts IMPACT Program at this school. Perhaps the teachers recognize it to a greater degree since their students have more opportunities to work in the various art areas by the very nature of the program. Whereas in other schools the arts are not as prevalent.

Ability to Concentrate

A student who has the ability to concentrate was defined by many teachers as one who is considered above average. Teachers spoke of this ability in three respects. First, students who can
concentrate have the capacity to confront a problem and solve it.

They're able to focus their attention upon whatever the problem is easily. And they're not easily distracted by other things that go on immediately around them. I think that's one thing - they seem to have an attention span that permits them to stay with or on a problem whatever it is until it's finished. And they seem to have the thinking skills that allow them to think logically from beginning to end. It appears that way at any rate, but it's pretty hard to tell about that. But it seems they can go step by step through whatever the problem is. And sometimes it's an organizational ability. They're able to organize whatever it is they're doing so that they can tackle the problem.

Another way students are able to exhibit their powers of concentration is through their body movements as evidenced by the following comments made by the dance teacher after she was asked, "Can you tell me about some of the students you consider above average? What things do they do?"

Well, they have a capacity to concentrate. And you find that many of the children who are further in other areas are further in dance. And there are students that get rewards and satisfaction from dance. They're able to make finer discriminations in their motor coordination. The most immature dancer I see is the kid who comes in and can only run around in circles and that's usually how the kindergarten comes in. Now there are still kids in sixth grade who do that too. It's the same as learning a language, increasing the vocabulary. Of course some students have a natural facility for movement, but I think it's almost more important that you have a certain standard of concentration. Because I've seen people who particularly don't have this facility of movement who are able to convey their strong feelings because they have this concentration.

This was noted in an observation of a dance class where this same teacher complimented several students on a dance they did together by stating, "You were really concentrating on each other." Finally, for some teachers attention span seemed to be the important factor.
They have a longer attention span. Often times I think you can tell this by looking at the child. At least when I look in my class, especially this year.

* * * * * *

...mostly just by the kind of attention they pay. It seems to me that most kids that aren't with you at all don't seem to have much skill when it comes to performing or singing or composing or whatever. The ones that seem to have the skills are with you at least part of the time.

It also should be noted that all the teachers who responded to the checklist on the questionnaire form agreed that a student's ability to follow directions, which can be related to paying attention, was characteristic of above average students.

**Academic Excellence**

From the results of the checklist, especially the items concerning the capacity to read well and excel in other subjects, a majority of the respondents believed that academic achievement is a trait usually identified with above average students. For instance, when asked to give specific examples of above average students three teachers volunteered the following information.

I have two 2nd grade children that are reading 2 years above grade level. One is very immature and needs some settling down and the other is like a little old lady, and at 8, she has more common sense than I'll ever have.

* * * * * *

I have one child who seems to be above average than the rest of the children. And it's his language ability - I suppose it's largely his ability to read and to question and he discusses a number of things. And he asks the sort of questions that many other children don't ask. Just the other day a child said she went fishing and he
wanted to know if she was fishing in salt water or fresh water. But he asks that sort of question that indicates that somebody has been reading to him or he's had experiences that the other children haven't had. And he can read anything.

This was confirmed through observations. For instance, one teacher remarked in the teachers' lounge that several of her students read for an hour out in the hall. Her reaction was, "I couldn't believe it!", giving the impression that it was exceptional behavior and something that was highly regarded. On another occasion the music teacher was commenting upon a particular kindergarten student describing him as "outgoing" and "active" and that he could read also. During one observation this characteristic became quite apparent due to the fact that the teacher wrote a "best readers" list on the board.

Although the responses above were common among the teachers there were those who did not choose to restrict above average students to purely academic lines.

Like in seven years there are going to be some kids that are just all-around gifted no matter what area you put them into. Most children have a specific area that they excel in. I guess if they achieve beyond what I would expect at their general age.

* * * * *

These kids are usually really excited about things. They are many-faceted children. Also when I teach and really make mistakes some children never get mad and I think they're above average too. They make me feel good.
Motivation

The factor of motivation seemed to play an important part in labeling students as above average. Motivated students were characterized by teachers as students who took the initiative and followed through on the completion of their work. As one teacher expressed it:

I suppose probably they're highly motivated children. I think of one class in particular that will always stand out in my mind as children that were just exceptional - I mean the whole class was made up of exceptional children, and that's probably a word I use to identify with these children. They could just take any thing that you might want to give them and I can remember they would get themselves into committees and they could work and they would plan and they would execute something and with very little teacher direction. They liked to put on shows and every Friday afternoon they would devise some television game they would use. They just would run themselves and this particular group would plan. And this is one of the things an exceptional child can do is that they can see through something, that is, plan it, execute it and finish it and have a finished product.

Leadership Roles

Only one subject of this study, as expressed in interviews, identified above average students with respect to a role as a leader.

I think a gifted student is one who gets along with others is probably a leader. One who won't stand out like a sore thumb because he's bright but will adjust. Can adjust his life and character to get along well with his peer group regardless of differences. A really well-rounded person is, in my judgment, above average. I have good students but I don't consider them gifted not because of a lack of the academics and even the arts - it's the social relations with peers that they lack. A lot of times they won't have anything to do with a certain child.
This is interesting since 3/4 of the teachers who completed the checklist agreed that above average students generally help other students and are respected by fellow classmates.

Appearance

Half or more of the respondents to the questionnaire agreed that above average students usually can be identified through their appearance. That is, these students are characterized as ones who are clean, dress neatly, look alert, are careful in appearance and are nice looking. It is interesting to note that these definitions were not reflected in the interviews. Only one teacher offered any comment about the relation of appearance to students regarded as above average.

...I think you can tell somethings just by looking at the child, his appearance, the brightness of his eyes - that sounds really trite, but I think you can tell by the brightness of his eyes. Of course, that leads into his family background, if he’s well-dressed, there is money at home and they have done more things, whereas a poorer child has not had the opportunity.

The above section outlined the six types of behaviors that teachers most frequently interpreted as characteristic of above average students, namely, creativity, ability to concentrate, academic excellence, motivation, leadership roles, and appearance. We will now turn to specific reactions to above average students by the teachers, the formal organization of the school and other students.
Reactions of Individual Teachers

The reactions that teachers make to a student's behavior gives that individual an indication of how he is regarded by that teacher. These reactions can be informal in the sense that they are verbal or non-verbal types of communication that are part of the daily interactions that take place between teachers and their students. Or they may be more formalized and are expressed through a system of rewards and prizes that is employed in the classroom. We will now present some of the data collected that explore these reactions.

Verbal Reactions

Many of the verbal responses observed or elicited through interviews contained evaluations of the student's behavior as either good or excellent. Very frequently these responses also included some kind of statement about how the teacher felt personally about the student's conduct, such as, it made them proud or they liked what he was doing. The following are answers to the question, "When you see a child that you think is above average, what kinds of words do you use to describe him?" and illustrate the points made above.

I tell him that he's very good, and I like the way he's working or what he's done. If the student hands in a good paper I usually put a happy face on it or if it's very good I write "very good." I usually just tell them if they've done a very good job.

***
It depends what you mean by above average. If I think a kid is working hard the thing I'll say is that I'm proud of him and that he should be proud of himself.

* * * * * *

You've really done well or I'm really proud of you. If it's someone who's a little out of the ordinary I'll say I'm really proud of you, you've done a beautiful job, I'm pleased with you." Say if it's a child who's behaving well I'll say, "I'm so pleased with you."

* * * * * *

Well, I think more than anything I use whatever the vernacular happens to be. I know it's probably changed over the years and I think I'm more apt to say something like "It's great" or "super" or a big fat "wow."

These responses were in evidence through classroom observation. Many teachers in the setting expressed approval by such words as "perfect," "beautiful" or "good." It seems some of these verbal cues were used as words of encouragement to deep the students working. Again, by these visitations personal statements about the teachers' feelings toward a student's behavior were frequent, such as, "I like that - good," "That's something that has been needed to be done for a long time," or "I like the way he's playing his part."

Non-Verbal Reactions

Teachers also react non-verbally to students, although they may not always be aware of this category of communication. Since most respondents hesitated when asked about their non-verbal behavior it seems that they had to think about the things they do non-
verbally and they may not be very conscious of it. The most common thing they did to show approval were pats on the head or a hand on a student's shoulder. Some responses to the question, "What kind of non-verbal cues do you use to show your approval?", were:

The kids say that I bend down a lot and usually try to get at eye-level - I also use my hands quite often. I grab the students' shoulders or put my hand on their head. I use visual things to stimulate them also.

* * * * * *

Patting on the back or just catching their eye and that kind of thing. As soon as you recognize that they're doing a good job and that you're pleased with them.

* * * * * *

I guess I do. And I guess the kids know I do - I think they can tell how I feel about the kids. Usually my smile. I know lots of times when they get up close they can tell from my eyes or my mouth.

* * * * * *

Oh, sometimes I pat them on the back or put my hand on their back and say, "Gee, that was great," or something like that. No, I don't believe I'm-oh, I might show pleasure in my face or clap my hands together and say, "Oh, good!"

These claims of non-verbal behavior were borne out by room observations. Teachers commonly patted students on the shoulder or put their arm around a pupil as a positive reaction to their behavior. In one case where the art teacher and some students had been working on a film together he affectionately placed his hands on their shoulders while remarking how professional it was going to look.
Rewards/Prizes

The teachers at this particular school generally had no established system of rewards or prizes that they used on a regular basis. But several teachers did use grades as a reward. For instance, one subject remarked that she considered the use of a "happy face" on students' papers served as a reward. In a similar instance, when asked if she used any system of rewards or prizes in her classroom, another teacher replied:

S: I use conduct grades which serves as an award.

I: You mean a conduct report?

S: Yes, I always try to be as positive as I can. It has on it a behavior rating as well as a rating of completes work and they're separated. Those who get all their work done satisfactorily and who have an "A" in conduct will choose whatever game they wish to play. I don't give prizes so much. I tried candy but that doesn't work with the older ones because if someone doesn't give them candy they'll just run out and get a whole bagful themselves.

It was more frequently the case that teachers didn't use rewards on a constant basis. For example, in response to the same question above two teachers gave the following views.

I haven't used them too much lately. I usually start out in the fall with instantaneous use of candy or trading stamps and those kinds of things. I try to phase them out as quickly as I can.

* * * * * *

No. Not really. When this thing first started I had a 1st grade and I tried to do something like that. But it takes a consistency to do that and I'm not that consistent of a person. I could see where it would work. I used to punch a hole in a card or something if they did something good
and at the end give them something. I wouldn't say that that's a pattern of my teaching procedure, but I've done it occasionally. Especially with students that didn't come to class, in reading, this would help them to get to class on time.

Along these lines, it was observed that students in one classroom who sat quietly were rewarded by participating in outside play. In another room two students who completed a math game successfully received five extra minutes of recess.

The observations and comments cited above give one an insight into some of the frequent reactions teachers exhibit toward above average students. We will now direct our attention toward the formal organization of the school and discuss methods by which it processes students who are considered above average.

Reactions of the Formal Organization

In the following section we will examine several ways in which the above average students are identified and processed by the formal organization of the school. Of course, teachers are the agents of this organization, but these reactions differ from the previous individual responses in the sense that they are established institutional procedures rather than activities that are done on an individual basis. The areas that will be discussed are school records, school recognition ceremonies, and a special system-wide program. These topics are under consideration since they play an important role in identifying above average students and, in some cases, that is their primary purpose.
School Records

Although it is required by the Board of Education that all teachers complete portions of a cumulative folder for each student, there were some indications that they had mixed feelings about this task. Some teachers wrote a variety of comments about students they felt were above average, as evidenced by the response below to the question, "These students who are above average, what kinds of things do you write in their school records?"

I can remember writing something like this was a highly motivated child, he did excellent work. Probably said read widely and exceptionally well. Most of these children are very pleasant too and I would comment that this was a very pleasant child. And I can remember writing to parents that this child was a joy to have in class, so easy to work with and so acceptable to anything that I might want to do. That's probably a characteristic of the type of child I'm thinking of is that they are a pleasant child and easy to get along with.

But more generally it was the case that teachers would enter a student's grades in the school records but did not write too many personal comments. And if any were written they were only those that were of a positive nature. For instance, in response to the same question above some comments were...

I don't at all. If I were going to write anything I'd make sure it was positive.

* * * * * * *

I wouldn't write anything in their cumulative folders. Although I'm not sure if I have anyone above average scholastically - except for those two little 2nd graders, I think their reading level will show and they won't have to count on me for that. Their reading scores alone will show that they're outstanding. As far as art, music, or dance goes I might put a comment in.
Some reasons given for this hesitancy to write comments in school records were in some cases the teachers believed that they might make an error in judgment. For example,

I usually put down things like making rapid progress, I hate to write it down and say this is it, because I could be wrong.

** * * * * *

S: School records tend to be almost strictly academic and in that respect grades alone stand. I usually don't put too many comments in my school records and I don't read them until way late.

I: Because you don't want to be prejudiced?

S: Yes, because I have found they're not reliable. I had a case that was dead wrong. The student was tested and re-tested as EMR(educable mentally retarded)- on his way out the door - and right now he's an outstanding athlete and gets A's and B's and completes his work. I think it's just a case that he doesn't test well. But he could do well in class and was an all-around athlete, very good in sports and he certainly isn't between 70 and 80 I.Q. in intelligence either which shows up on his tests. I take each kid I get as new as though no one has ever had him before and I try to treat each child that way.

One teacher explains his lack of comments in records by saying...

I guess you have to be more careful than you used to be because the parents can look at the records.

Other respondents seemed to avoid writing comments in a permanent record. They preferred a form that was used by this particular school in which a teacher would complete a checklist for each student that would be received by that student's teacher for the following year. This preference was illustrated by the response below.

I: Do you write anything in the official school records to denote this?(the characteristics of above average students)
S: Probably not directly on their records. We have a form that is attached to the record that goes to the next teacher and on that we say something. We really don't put very much in the records.

I: Do you think this is necessary?

S: Well, in some way there has to be an indication of the learning abilities of the children for the sake of the teacher. I never like to write very much that was permanent. And I don't put very much in the record since we have this other format and it's a good way out for me because I feel freer to talk just to the next teacher. And it will be just something for her to start from and it won't be something that will be definitely in the record. It's kind of an insert and so it's finished when she's finished with it. And then at the end of the year whatever she feels she'll indicate in the same way for the next teacher.

I: Is it a checklist?

S: Sort of, it's also a place for comments. Well, it's a checklist insofar as it asks whether you think the student is average, above average or below average in ability and there are some similar three checks for behavior and then there's a place for writing comments.

From these comments it seems that there is a great deal of questioning as to the reliability of school records as well as a serious effort to avoid writing negative impressions or any comments at all. It was generally the case that all teachers complied with the minimum requirement of entering grades and results of standardized achievement tests, but the extent to which personal comments were entered varied greatly.
School Recognition Ceremonies

There was some variance with regard to attitudes concerning formal ceremonies established by the school to recognize those students who were above average. At this particular school an awards assembly was discontinued several years ago. Generally most teachers believed its elimination was a good idea, while to a lesser degree others felt such a ceremony should be allowed to continue. The teachers who supported the ceremony usually spoke only in terms of recognizing academic achievement or a more general category of effort as cited below.

I: What types of things does the school do for the above average child? Any awards?

S: Not really, we don't have the scholarship awards. We were all pretty much in favor of doing away with those because it didn't mean the same thing throughout the school. It would mean something to one teacher in one grade and to another something completely different. If we had an honor roll, a point system or something like that - really cut and dry - like they have in high school.

I: Do you think it's a good idea to have student achievement awards?

S: Oh yes, it's something to strive for. I think anything like that singles you out because they say, "We know she's there, she got all A's and B's," that's a pat on the back.

* * * * * *

I: Do you think the school should give some kind of award for above average students?

S: I really haven't given it much thought. I'm not against it. I think it's nice that the students get some recognition for their effort. When they get a
job - like a salesman - they have to try to be the best they can be. I think school, in one sense, is to get you prepared for life. If the rest of the teachers didn't want it I wouldn't fight for it. But I'm not against it.

On the other hand, there were those respondents who believed that formal recognition of these students was not necessary either because they were too young, this may cause a negative reaction from other students or because it was felt that the present grading system was inherently unfair. These reasons are reflected below.

I: Does the school do anything to recognize these above average students?

S: No.

I: Do you think something should be done?

S: Well, I don't know whether they need formal recognition. At that age (1st grade) I'm not sure it matters. I think they need every kind of encouragement - personal and individual encouragement as they're working. I don't particularly care for a special night. I really don't as a matter of fact - I don't even like that. But I do believe children should be encouraged and their parents should know and together you should talk with them and their parents about what they're doing and find things that they're doing.

* * * * *

I: Do you think having a recognition ceremony like that is a good idea?

S: No, not really.

I: Why not?

S: I just don't like to point out that this child is really great because that's just the way this child is and no matter under what circumstances probably, now this may not be true, that this child would conform. And I don't like it that this is thrown in the
face of someone else that this child is so great. I think a child who didn't perform would get pretty sick of that child. Some of these children have to adjust socially and sometimes if they are really exceptional other children might take exception to them and say they're teacher's pet. And I don't know if I would, publicly at least, point them out too often. But we don't give too much honor to the academically superior student. I really don't know if that kind of recognition would motivate someone else to do that. I don't believe it would. I think children like that have their own built-in set of rewards. And maybe that's enough for them.

* * * * * *

I: Does the school have an awards assembly for the kids?

S: Not anymore. They only recognize the drama club, the safety patrol - that kind of thing. We've tried for years to get rid of the achievement assembly.

I: Don't you like them?

S: No.

I: Why not?

S: It's always the same people doing the same thing and often times they're not the best representative from each classroom. It's kind of unfair. I don't like grades to start with. Too many kids that get A's get them without having to work for them. And I just don't think it's fair.

I: Then you don't feel that there's any great loss?

S: I think the kids that are doing very, very well are doing their best and feel good about themselves inside. They know they're doing it and they really don't need that kind of thing.

It is interesting to note that several teachers believed that the above average student did not need any formal recognition of achievement. Although it should also be noted that these remarks were
restricted to academic achievement and only the following respondent
of those interviewed volunteered the comment that sought to broaden
the areas in which a student can achieve.

I:  Do you think some type of ceremony should be given
for the above average students?

S:  I think something should be done - it doesn't have
to be an assembly. There should be something perhaps
more informal for the child who creates as well as
the one who does well in reading.

System-Wide Programs

When asked about whether there is anything the school system
does to recognize the above average student the teachers either
responded negatively or offered very vague notions of an essay
contest or spelling bee competition. Only one teacher of those
interviewed was familiar with a special program that was in the
process of being implemented system-wide. She said...

The only thing that I know is that they are organizing
classes for gifted students which you could say, in a sense,
is a reward. And I think they'd be willing to pay more atten-
tion to those who are above average rather than focusing on
those that are below average.

It's apparent that all the teachers at this school, save for one,
were not aware of this program.

Officially called the Columbus Program for the Gifted/Talented
Student, it seeks to identify those students that fit the following
definition:

Gifted and talented children are those, identified by profes-
sionally qualified persons, who have outstanding abilities
and are capable of high performance. These are children who
require enriched educational programs and/or services beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize their contribution to self and society. Children capable of high performance include those with demonstrated achievement and/or potential ability in any of the following areas, singly or in combination:

1. general intellectual ability
2. specific academic aptitude (in one subject area, such as science or mathematics)
3. creative or productive thinking (such as creative writing)
4. leadership
5. visual and performing arts (such as music, fine arts or dramas)

The formal identification process was through teacher/principal recommendations and standardized achievement test scores. Teachers and/or principals were requested to complete a form (See Appendix D) that listed identity criteria for gifted/talented children, requested test scores with regard to academic aptitude and I.Q. and other pertinent information about the candidates.

It must be pointed out that more than one-third of this screening instrument was devoted to gaining information concerning a candidate's academic or mental capabilities. Although other characteristics were listed it seemed this trait was heavily stressed in the identification process. Secondly, no mention was made in the form of a student's appearance as a criteria for gifted/talented. The absence of this characteristic in the form is noted with interest since it appeared to have a degree of importance for the teachers of the study which was reflected in several interviews and the checklist of the questionnaire. But all of the characteristics that teachers referred to most frequently as associated with above
average students, namely, creativity, ability to concentrate, academic excellence, motivation, and leadership roles, were present in the screening instrument established by the Columbus Public Schools.

Reactions of Other Students

Reactions of students to other students can be spontaneous or they can be elicited by teachers making the actions of an actor public. Several teachers gave examples of the former case when they were asked to answer the question, "What kinds of things do the kids do to respond to each other?"

I think the other children's reaction to the high achiever - I think the older children tend to observe the progress of the children and make remarks about it. They will either say it to me or like we have a student who's been working real hard to try to get this reward. And when she finally made it one boy exclaimed, "You made it!" And those kinds of things that they react to. I was tickled when I put her name up on the board and she knew I was glad - but I'm sure that his recognition meant a lot to her than mine did.

* * * * *

I don't know whether they talk about progress that somebody else has made but they'll bring up some nice artwork that somebody else has done and if they get a certain job done they'll be very quick to identify who was doing this and who wasn't doing something else. So they're aware of what somebody else does, and what everybody else is doing.

When asked about making the achievement of above average students public to the rest of the class, teachers frequently qualified their answers saying that it was dependent upon the situation. In most cases, making these things public were used as devices to motivate
students as evidenced by the following two conversations.

I: Do you usually make it public to other students?

S: No, not really. Not if the child is one who the other children identify as one who always does well. But if there's someone who isn't always in the habit of doing outstanding work and I think that would help that child motivate them then I would publicly say that "so-and-so" did a really great job. For a child that's really an outstanding child and the rest of the students are aware of that I don't usually tell them because I think that turns to -- I mean, kids say that he can do that or there she is again. Building that child up, you know, there's nothing he can't do. No, I don't really. As I think over the past I probably tend not to say that an outstanding student - I never really did praise him unduly in class.

***

I: If a child does a good gob do you usually make it public?

S: If it's a very good student who always does good work or almost always usually I don't make it public. Often if it's a slower child who has done a very good job for the first time I will make a big to-do about that and show it to the whole class. And I'll say what a good job this child has done.

I: Do you notice if the other children respond to this?

S: I guess when the slower child is being praised they all seem to feel very happy for him. And I've noticed that they think this is really neat and that's a big deal for them. I guess it's the expression on the face. They don't really say anything, but you can tell. And they always pay attention to what I'm saying when I'm praising the child in front of the group.

For other teachers there was a definite fluctuation expressed about classroom recognition of above average students.

I: When you see a child who's doing a good job, do you usually make it public?
S: It depends upon the situation. Sometimes yes, for some children that's very important. But sometimes, I can think of instances where it was just a matter of telling that child privately that they were doing a good job and I was really proud. In most cases, yes, I think I do make it public.

It was quite often the situation that teachers remarked how they actively elicited responses from other students. This was done to establish a model for the rest of the class, as in this instance.

Sometimes I will hold up somebody's work and say, "Look at this," or "I know someone has been working very hard here."

And sometimes it was done to build class unity or to encourage a sense or responsibility.

I: Do you usually make it public? Like in front of the classroom?

S: Usually. And I do it for a purpose, because I try to get them to interact as much as possible with each other. Bringing them in the total picture - the whole unit as one without me being up here in the middle of the working unit.

* * * * * * *

Another thing I do is to use the other children often. To approve and to show approval - to kind of give them the idea that they are responsible for what everybody else does. So if something happens that is out of the ordinary or extra special good with a particular child whether it's a bright child or slow child I try to get other kids involved to praise them or clap their hands.

It appears from the discussion above that reactions of others can occur spontaneously or they can be actively sought for a variety of reasons. It was also noted that making public the actions of a student who has done something above average many times depends upon the individual involved and the situation at hand.
SUMMARY

Through the present chapter it is hoped that an insight has been achieved into not only the reactions and interpretations of teachers regarding the labeling of students as above average, but of also the methodology utilized for this study. It is asserted that the field research methods used were the most appropriate for the purposes of this study since it was the dyadic interaction between the teacher and the student that was our primary concern for analysis. Related to this was the consideration of the formal organization of the school. Let us now direct our attention toward a further analysis of the findings presented in this and the preceding chapters.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

Interest in this study grew out of extensive reading in the area of the sociology of deviance. A large portion of this literature is devoted to those who are law breakers or follow a life-style that is not considered acceptable by a majority of society. In the arena of the school setting it is the juvenile delinquents, troublemakers, drop-outs and other such students that are cause for concern among educators. Much attention is directed to the problems encountered by individual teachers and the organization of the school when dealing with these individuals. That is, there is much material that addresses the problems involved in controlling these students through diagnosis and treatment of their difficulties, but prior to these steps teachers, as agents of the institution, must identify or define these students. It was this process that the present study sought to explore, i.e., the labeling process. The application of the label "above average" was studied for it was contended that the process of being labeled as above average was similar to that of being given a label more commonly associated with deviancy. Therefore, the major research consideration was
examining the process by which students were labeled as above average.

The theoretical basis of the study was limited to the adherence of the interactionist perspective of deviance rather than the normative model. These were the two basic categories that were discussed. Although there are other perspectives that could have been considered it was believed that these two general models embraced the basic tenets of several theories. They seemed to be appropriate for discussions regarding how the schools and the people in them operate. Along these lines, an examination of the concept of deviance was made in order to analyze the language usage and give an insight into some of its problems.

Empirically the limits of this study were two-fold. First, the methodology was restricted to that of field research techniques. It was held that these techniques would be the most suitable for exploring the interactional process. Second, the research site was limited to one elementary school. This school was chosen on the basis of pre-existing relationships the researcher has with its personnel. Of course, this severely confines the degree of the generalizations one can make from the results of the study. This limitation was difficult to evade due to the amount of time allocated for this portion of the study. The data were collected on the assumption that they would demonstrate certain patterns of human behavior and they were sorted out to see if they indeed
did yield any patterns.

Subsequent sections will include a summary of previous chapters, a discussion of the major findings, conclusions reached as a result of the research and recommendations for further study.

**SUMMARY**

Chapter I was an introduction to the topic under study. This included a brief examination of the concept of deviance and the methodology that was utilized. Also in this chapter research questions were stated. It is explicitly stated here that the criteria used by teachers to identify and define above average students will be explored, as well as the way in which these students are processed by the organization of the school.

Chapter II described two general sociological approaches to deviance, namely, the normative and the interactionist. Each of these models was dealt with in terms of their assumptions and their weaknesses.

Chapter III investigated the concept of deviance by using the techniques of linguistic analysis. This chapter included a discussion of cases of deviance, its mixed usage and some of the metaphors associated with the concept.

Chapter IV, on the hand, gave a detailed explanation of the field research methods utilized in this study, i.e., participant observation, interview and questionnaire. Also in this chapter
are the research findings in which the results of the techniques are presented. In this portion, Chapter IV traced the criteria used by teachers to define students characterized as above average. We also explored the reactions to above average students as expressed by individual teachers, the formal organization of the school and other students.

MAJOR FINDINGS

1. Teachers identify and define above average students in terms of six criteria: creativity, ability to concentrate, academic excellence, motivation, leadership roles and appearance. It must be remembered that in many cases these criteria were used differently by individual respondents, but generally above average students were characterized according to these six traits.

2. Teachers do not usually write comments in students' cumulative school records. That is, the required amount of information is written, e.g., final grades and standardized test scores, but personal comments are kept at a minimum. If a statement is entered it is usually positive in nature, rather than a negative comment. The reasons given for this were that teachers believed they might make an error in judgment regarding a student's capabilities, school records have been viewed as unreliable in the past and parental access to these folders made teachers wary of writing comments in order to avoid any repercussions.
3. Reactions by individual teachers to above average students involved verbal responses, non-verbal responses and occasionally the employing of a system of rewards or prizes. But frequently teachers did not utilize any type of rewards or prizes on a consistent basis.

4. Reactions to above average students by other pupils were sometimes actively elicited by teachers and frequently occurred spontaneously.

5. At this particular research site no recognition of above average students was made through any formal ceremony. Generally most teachers were content with this arrangement.

6. The Columbus Public Schools had a program for gifted/talented students with which many teachers were not familiar.

7. The criteria that this special program used were very similar to those identified by the teachers except for one, namely, appearance.

8. A major portion of the screening instrument used to identify students for this gifted/talented program was devoted to academic ability.

9. There are many problems when dealing with the concept of deviance and the language associated with it. First, the descriptive usage of deviance is very ambiguous, but the evaluative nature, in most cases, is always negative. Second, the metaphors associated with deviance, namely, the statistical and medical, are
frequent causes of confusion. That is, much of the metaphorical language identified with these models is incorrectly interpreted as literal which is inappropriate.

CONCLUSIONS

When identifying above average students academic achievement is heavily stressed. This was true with regard to individual teachers and the school system. This is the case due to the availability of achievement test scores, I.Q. ratings and grades given on report cards. More information is accessible in relation to academic ability rather than any of the other criteria cited such as, creativity, motivation, ability to concentrate, leadership roles or appearance. Therefore, it's easier for teachers to define a student as above average by citing test results which indicate the student's ability ranking.

A second conclusion is that there are a variety of behaviors that are identified as above average in the context of the school setting. That is, when teachers identify a student as above average they are employing an ambiguous and vague usage that needs further examination.

Third, it can be concluded that a discrepancy exists between what teachers and the formal organization of the school describe as above average. This was noted in the findings where teachers included in their identification of above average students the criteria of appearance, but the school system failed to do so.
Therefore, there is a difference between what criteria the school officially and the teachers, as agents of the school, consider characteristics of above average students.

A final conclusion reached is that teachers regard the appearance of a student an important factor in identifying him or her as above average. This criterion was obvious in the results of the checklist, but was not reflected in the interviews as noted in the previous chapter. It is apparent that teachers believe that they can determine a student's ability from his or her appearance.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY**

The first recommendation for further research is that a more extensive study be undertaken. As mentioned previously the conclusions reached as a result of the research cannot be considered definitive due to the small sample size and restriction to a single research site. Increasing the number of participants in the study would aid in establishing the conclusiveness of the findings. Also, a comparative study could be done between grade levels. This research was restricted to an elementary school and it is quite possible that these findings would not be the same in a secondary school setting. There could be distinct differences between the labeling of above average students on elementary and high school levels for a variety of reasons. Chief among these are that formal recognition ceremonies are generally more common
and standardized on the secondary level as evidenced by the National Honor Society. Another comparative approach could be implemented along socio-economic lines. The research site of this particular study was located in a middle and lower class area. Different socio-economic areas could be studied to determine if there are any differences between teachers of those schools and how they identify above average students.

Another recommendation is that an increased amount of time should be spent at the research site. Ideally, observations should be made on a daily basis over an extended period of time. Since there was a definite time limit it could be the case that this researcher was not able to observe important events or enter into conversations with individuals regarding them.

Originally this study was to explore the similarities between the processing of above average students and those pupils who are more commonly considered deviant. This was not fully accomplished since an examination of the labeling process was emphasized rather than establishing being labeled as above average as a form of deviance. Along these same lines, the checklist found in the questionnaire was not scrutinized to its fullest extent. The results of this checklist were used to verify or question the material collected from observations or interviews. A more extensive comparative study could be made from the results located in Tables 1 and 2.
The final recommendation is that an examination of school records would serve as a means of checking the comments made by the subjects in interviews. This would help to bring to bear any inconsistencies between what respondents say they do and what is actually done. Also the record-making process must be regarded as problematic since people actively decide to record some aspects of an individual's behavior and ignore others. This is an area that warrants further exploration.

It appears that this study raised more questions than it answered. It is hoped that the above recommendations will function as ways in which these questions can be investigated.


Hawkins, Richard and Tiedeman, Gary. The Creation of Deviance: Interpersonal and Organizational Determinants. (working draft)
Healy, William and Bronner, August. *New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1936.


APPENDIX A

OBSERVATION SHEET
Teacher's Name ___________________ Grade ___________________

Date ___________________ Time ___________________

Observational Notes

Theoretical Notes

Methodological Notes
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
1. How many years have you been teaching at (name of school)?
2. What grade levels have you taught?
3. What was the last degree you received and when?
4. How many years have you been teaching?
5. What kinds of words do you use when a student does an excellent job?
6. Do you usually make it public?
7. Can you tell me about some of the students you consider above average?
8. Can you tell me about some of the students you consider below average?
9. What kind of entries do make in the school records of above average students?
10. What kinds of things do you do for the above average student in the classroom? Any rewards or prizes?
11. What kinds of things does the school do for the above average student?
12. Can you explain the ceremony? Do you think it was a good idea?
13. Does the school system do anything for the above average student?
14. Do you believe that you have any students that above average but don't exhibit it in the classroom? Why do you think that is so?
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE & CHECKLIST
QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

1. Please check the appropriate category.

1. What was your age on your last birthday?

   _21-25__ _26-30__ _31-35__ _36-40__ _41-45__ _46-50__ _51-55__ _56-60__

2. How many years have you been teaching?

   _0-5__ _6-10__ _11-15__ _16-20__ _21-25__ _26-30__

3. What was the last degree you received?

   _B.A._ _M.A._ _Other__ _B.S._ _M.S._

4. In what year?__________

5. Mark the grades you have taught by indicating the number of years of experience you have at each grade level including this school year. If your teaching experience is not applicable to this list, that is, if you were and/or are a specialist, please state this in the "other" blank.

   _1st__ _5th__ _9th__ _2nd__ _6th__ _10th__ _3rd__ _7th__ _11th__ _4th__ _8th__ _12th__

Other ---
11. Please answer the following questions as fully as possible. If more space is needed feel free to use the back of this page.

1. In your judgment, what do you consider to be the main task of teaching?

2. If you say that certain students are "below average," what do you think is the one main thing about such students that influences your decision about them?

3. What are some words you use to describe "below average" students?

4. If you say that certain students are "above average," what do you think is the one main thing about such students that influences your decision about them?

5. What are some words you use to describe "above average" students?

6. What synonyms can you think of for "below average" students?

7. What synonyms can you think of for "above average" students?

8. What do you think is the purpose of education? For instance, is it primarily a selection process, an equalization process or do you think it serves some other function?
III. By using the numerals 1 through 5 as designated below please circle the number which you feel most accurately reflects your views.

1 = strongly agree  
2 = agree  
3 = disagree  
4 = strongly disagree  
5 = no opinion

"Above average" students usually...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>work ahead the rest of the class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are creative.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a good sense of humor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are clean.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete their work on time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use their imaginations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dress neatly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are introverted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come from a stable home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look alert.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help other students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help the teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are given class recognition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reads well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excels in other subjects.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are absent minded.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are not careful in appearance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does poorly in other subjects.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comes from a broken home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot follow directions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disrupts class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are seldom prepared for work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insult other students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are always prepared for work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are frequently absent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are respected by fellow classmates.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are frequently tardy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have sloppy handwriting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have good attendance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are talkative.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are seldom, if ever, tardy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate well in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are quiet.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have neat handwriting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are nice looking.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are introverted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do well in the arts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not answer questions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Using the same procedure from the preceding page please respond to statements below.

"Below average" students usually...

are always prepared for class.  1 2 3 4 5
are frequently absent.  1 2 3 4 5
are respected by fellow classmates.  1 2 3 4 5
are athletically inclined.  1 2 3 4 5
are frequently tardy.  1 2 3 4 5
have sloppy handwriting.  1 2 3 4 5
have good attendance.  1 2 3 4 5
are talkative.  1 2 3 4 5
are seldom, if ever, tardy.  1 2 3 4 5
participate well in class.  1 2 3 4 5
are quiet.  1 2 3 4 5
have neat handwriting.  1 2 3 4 5
are nice looking.  1 2 3 4 5
are introverted.  1 2 3 4 5
do well in the arts.  1 2 3 4 5
does not answer questions.  1 2 3 4 5
work ahead the rest of the class.  1 2 3 4 5
are creative.  1 2 3 4 5
have a good sense of humor.  1 2 3 4 5
are clean.  1 2 3 4 5
complete their work on time.  1 2 3 4 5
use their imaginations.  1 2 3 4 5
dress neatly.  1 2 3 4 5
are introverted.  1 2 3 4 5
come from a stable home.  1 2 3 4 5
look alert.  1 2 3 4 5
help other students.  1 2 3 4 5
help the teacher.  1 2 3 4 5
are given class recognition.  1 2 3 4 5
reads well.  1 2 3 4 5
excels in other subjects.  1 2 3 4 5
are absent minded.  1 2 3 4 5
are not careful in appearance.  1 2 3 4 5
does not answer questions.  1 2 3 4 5
comes from a broken home.  1 2 3 4 5
cannot follow directions.  1 2 3 4 5
disrupts class.  1 2 3 4 5
are seldom prepared for work.  1 2 3 4 5
insult other students.  1 2 3 4 5
APPENDIX D

SCREENING INSTRUMENT FOR THE

COLUMBUS PROGRAM FOR THE GIFTED/TALENTED STUDENT
COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCREENING INSTRUMENT TO IDENTIFY GIFTED/TALENTED STUDENTS

Please return to:
Jeanne Hilson
Sixth Ave. Instructional Center
Phone: 294-4671

Please fill in information below. (Use additional forms if needed.)
PART I and PART II may or may not contain the same names.
PART III will give helpful information in program planning.

PART I
CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTED/TALENTED STUDENTS

If a student can be described by seven or more of the following statements, most of the time, put the number of each characteristic which applies to him after his name.

1. Has quick mastery and recall of factual information about a variety of topics.
2. Has unusually advanced vocabulary for his age.
3. Reads a great deal on his own (above grade level).
4. Shows unusual insights into cause-effect relationships; asks many provocative questions to discover the how and why of things.
5. Prefers to work independently; self directed.
6. Is quite concerned with right and wrong; often passes "adult-like" judgments on events, people, and things.
7. Becomes truly involved in certain topics; is persistent in seeking task completion.
8. Displays much curiosity about many things.
9. Offers a large number of unique, clever ideas or solutions to problems.
10. Displays intellectual playfulness; imagines; manipulates ideas.
11. Is sensitive to beauty; his artistic expression is unique and meaningful; a keen awareness is displayed of detail observed in his environment. (Comment in Part III)
12. Displays a keen sense of humor.
13. Has exceptional musical ability. (Comment in Part III)
14. Is self confident and seems to enjoy being with peer-age group as well as adults.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
STUDENT NAMES
CHARACTERISTIC NUMBERS
PART II

COLUMBUS TESTING PROFILE INFORMATION

List below the names of students whose T-Band scores appear in ANY PART of the 7th, 8th, 9th stanines in the ACADEMIC ATTITUDE section of the Columbus Testing Profile.

STUDENT NAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List below the names of students whose T-Band scores appear ENTIRELY in the 7th, 8th, 9th stanines of the READING ACHIEVEMENT section of the Columbus Testing Profile.

STUDENT NAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List below the names of students whose T-Band scores appear ENTIRELY in the 7th, 8th, 9th stanines of the ARITHMETIC ACHIEVEMENT part of the Columbus Testing Profile.

STUDENT NAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**************

INFORMATION FOUND IN PERMANENT RECORD FOLDER

List ALL individual I.Q. test data if the I.Q. Score is 125 or above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Names</th>
<th>Test Names</th>
<th>Test Dates</th>
<th>I.Q. Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Names</th>
<th>Test Names</th>
<th>Test Dates</th>
<th>I.Q. Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Names</th>
<th>Test Names</th>
<th>Test Dates</th>
<th>I.Q. Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Names</th>
<th>Test Names</th>
<th>Test Dates</th>
<th>I.Q. Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Names</th>
<th>Test Names</th>
<th>Test Dates</th>
<th>I.Q. Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III

PLEASE ADD INFORMATION ON ALL STUDENTS LISTED IN PART I AND PART II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT NAMES</th>
<th>SPECIAL INTERESTS</th>
<th>SPECIAL STRENGTHS</th>
<th>PERSONALITY TRAITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of Teacher ___________________________ Signature of Principal ___________________________

Grade Level or Subject ___________________________ School ___________________________

Date ___________________________