INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or “target” for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is “Missing Page(s)”. If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in “sectioning” the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from “photographs” if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of “photographs” may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International
300 North Zeib Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St John's Road. Tyler's Green
High Wycombe. Bucks. England HP10 8HR
LASLEY, Thomas James, II, 1947-
PERCEIVED STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR WITHIN THE
CONTEXT OF CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS: A
PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION STUDY.

The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1978
Education, general

University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© Copyright by
Thomas James Lasley II
1978
Perceived Student Misbehavior Within the Context of Classroom Interactions: A Participant Observation Study

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

by

Thomas J. Lasley II, B.S., M.A.

* * *

The Ohio State University 1978

Reading Committee:

Charles M. Galloway, Ph.D.
William W. Wayson, Ph.D.
C. Ray Williams, Ph.D.
Ojo Arewa, Ph.D.

Approved By:

Charles M. Galloway
Adviser
College of Education
Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge my thanks to the members of my committee for their assistance and contributions in the development of this document: Charles M. Galloway, Ph.D., my committee chairman; William W. Wayson, Ph.D.; C. Ray Williams, Ph.D.; all of the College of Education; Ojo Arewa, Ph.D., of the Department of Anthropology; and to The Ohio State University.

I wish to particularly acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Galloway, who had faith in my abilities and confidence in my decisions. His desire to be a good teacher has made me a better learner; his willingness to "make time" for students enabled many of my ideas to develop and grow.

I wish also to thank Dr. Williams and Dr. Wayson for the many hours of dialogue they contributed as I envisioned and operationalized the study.

I wish to acknowledge the assistance and encouragement of Dr. Arewa. It was his enthusiasm for learning and emphasis on scholarship which caused me to pursue the anthropological perspective.
Finally, I wish to acknowledge the support of my wife, Janet, my parents, relatives and friends. They believed in me even when my self-doubts created unnecessary interpersonal conflict or detachment.

To all, THANKS.
VITA

July 23, 1947. . . . . . . Born, Delaware, Ohio

1969. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . B.S. The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

1972. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . M.A. The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1977 to Present: Educational Consultant to the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, Ohio Department of Education.

1976 to 1977: Research Associate to the Associate Dean of the College of Education, The Ohio State University.

1975 to 1976: Research Associate to the Faculty of Curriculum and Foundations, The Ohio State University.

1969 to 1975: Teacher, Upper Arlington, Ohio
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITA</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan of the Study</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes of Behavior</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Goals</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamesmanship</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to Behavior</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactionalists</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviorists</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interventionists</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Research</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies Focusing Directly</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Classroom Discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies Focusing Indirectly</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Classroom Discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Field Study Methods</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Teachers</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Procedures</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Observations and Interviews</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III. (continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with Teachers</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Data</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants Observed and Interviewed</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping Techniques</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Cool</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relieving Boredom</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging Techniques</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressing</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarting-off</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions Affecting Authority</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitioning</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openings</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closings</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions about Transitioning</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresponding</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faceworking</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping Techniques</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Cool</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relieving Boredom</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging Techniques</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressing</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarting-off</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions Affecting Authority</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitioning</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresponding</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faceworking</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. (continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Teachers</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a Holistic Perspective</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Classroom Authority</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Classroom Awareness</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations Regarding Methodology</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIXES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. SCHEDULE OF INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. EXAMPLE OF A TRANSCRIBED INTERVIEW</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. EXAMPLE OF FIELD NOTE DATA</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. EXAMPLE OF INTERVIEW WITH STUDENT</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1. Participants Included in Field Note Data ............... 72
LIST OF FIGURES

Figures

1. Relationship of Themes for Teacher-Student Interactions . . . . . . 71
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This is an exploratory study focusing on classroom behavior which is labeled misbehavior by teachers and students. The researcher describes those behaviors and examines their reasons or causes. The study also probes the meanings that various classroom participants attribute to perceived misbehavior.

One of the most bothersome problems for teachers is classroom misbehavior (Gallup, 1973, 1977; Cruickshank, Kennedy and Myers, 1974). The neophyte teacher is often threatened by student behaviors which are perceived as preventing a learning atmosphere; veteran teachers are no less vulnerable.

Since the inception of the common school in the nineteenth century, teachers have had responsibility for enculturating students (Tanner and Tanner, 1975). Teachers have not only conducted lessons on formal intellectual skills, they have also monitored student behavior according to standards implicitly established by society. Monitoring behavior and preserving classroom order have necessitated influencing student behavior in both a direct and indirect fashion: directly by
intervening when student behavior has been deemed inappropriate and indirectly through lesson content heavily endowed with fundamental moral precepts (Zais, 1976).

The literature (professional and fictional) contains many examples of teachers correcting student behavior. A short story written by Washington Irving captures the consummate disciplinary skill of one legendary pedagogue.

Ichabod Crane: Silence, children. I observe that Master Yost Van Huten is more than usually industrious with his slate. Come forward, Master Yost, and let us all admire your handiwork.

Yost: Please, teacher, I don't wanna.

Ichabod Crane: You will bring me your slate at once, Master Yost... You would draw a caricature of your teacher, would you, Master Yost? Read aloud what you have written.

Yost: Teacher's mad and I am glad, and I know what'll please him... A bottle of wine to make him shine, and Katrina Van Tassel to tease him.

Ichabod Crane: I have ever borne in mind the golden maxim: "Spare the rod and spoil the child." I would not on any account have Master Yost Van Hoten spoiled. (Irving, 1963, p. 405)

Just as Ichabod Crane was guided by the "golden maxim," many teachers today base their disciplinary techniques on similar aphoristic folklore (Torode, 1970).
Though not all such folklore is negative or deleterious, relying upon it reflects the paucity of empirically generated data that educators possess vis-a-vis classroom disciplinary procedures. The dearth of research is particularly evident in books such as The Study of Teaching and Second Handbook of Research on Teaching; combined, these prodigious publications cite only four studies on classroom discipline.

The current panaceas used by teachers are indicative of past practices. Educators still rely, to a large extent, on maxims reflecting historical truths, or on theories which have been only partially investigated. Consequently, confusion prevails about what will and will not prove effective in the classroom. Some educators propose an indirect approach to classroom discipline by encouraging changes in the curriculum. Van Til (1969, pp. 1-2) suggests, for example, that the better the curricula, the fewer the discipline problems.

Better discipline will prevail when learning experiences relate closely to the present interests and needs of children who see the use of what they are learning. Better discipline will prevail when learning is related to the social realities which surround the child. Better discipline will prevail when we practice what we preach as to respect for personality. Better discipline will prevail as we develop active student participation, creative contributions, social travel, and all else that fosters significant experiences. Better discipline will grow out of a better curriculum in a better society.
Borton (1970, pp. 152-153) also focused on how the curriculum influenced student behavior problems. In *Reach, Touch and Teach* he discussed his attempts to create a curriculum which would reach the students' needs and touch the students as individual human beings. Borton's curriculum was built around the students' self-perceptions and their surrounding culture. He states:

The older teachers who have learned to tongue lash look at these beginners and say, "You can't control a class." "You don't have the guts to stand up to the kids."

That is not the problem. It is not particularly difficult, after all, to look mean for the first six weeks or to learn the razor intonations used in dressing down a class. The problem is that the irrelevant curriculum, which is so obviously failing in the big cities, is closely associated with rigid and harsh discipline.

Popular professional magazines (e.g., *Today's Education*, *Teacher* and *Instructor*) are filled with articles proferring remedies for classroom behavior problems. The articles tend to delineate simplistic principles for preventing or dealing with these problems. Many of the articles are written by teachers who have had a great deal of experience in classrooms and feel they can offer useful tips on classroom management. Unfortunately, what may work for one teacher may prove inappropriate for a colleague.

Most recently a preponderance of publications have been grounded in behaviorism. Skinnerian operant
conditioning requires that an individual initiate a behavior, then experience some consequence (Parke and Heatherington, 1975; Axelrod, 1977). If the initiated behavior is desirable, it is rewarded; if the initiated behavior is undesirable, it is punished or ignored. Skinner (1968) contends that rewarded behavior will reoccur frequently while punished behavior will diminish.

Behaviorism is often translated into six steps (Borton, 1970, p. 161). These steps simplify the elements of behavioristic psychology making it attractive for use in classrooms.

1. They [the teacher] specify the behaviors they do not want--speaking out of turn.
2. They specify the behaviors they do want--permission before moving.
3. They punish the behaviors they do not want with a clearly defined set of punishments--staying after school.
4. They reward the behaviors they do want with clearly understood rewards--moving a seat.
5. They "shape" behavior a little bit at a time--"After this please don't call out"; "In the beginning I do a lot for them."
6. Above all, they maintain a tough-minded consistency.

Principles like the six delineated above place more emphasis on the overt manifestations of behavior than on its covert causes. Katz (1971) cautions teachers using
behavioristic techniques to also be aware of the meanings associated with perceived misbehavior. Katz contends that before implementing modification procedures, teachers should assess the genotype or genesis of the disruptive behavior. In essence, the remedy depends on the cause.

Unfortunately, there have been few attempts to understand the causes of behavior perceived by teachers as misbehavior; the emphasis has been on preventing or stopping such behavior. Research is needed which examines the nuances of behavior labeled as misbehavior and which assesses the understandings teachers and students have with respect to that behavior.

Statement of the Problem

There are many different behaviors exhibited by students in a classroom: some prevent students from learning, others facilitate student learning; some challenge a teacher and necessitate his/her "taking a stand," others are non-threatening and are treated by the teacher as positive. In conventional classrooms (i.e., classrooms not utilizing experimental instructional processes) one may observe three generic categories of student behavior: (1) behavior that is clearly appropriate; (2) behavior that is situationally appropriate or situationally inappropriate; and (3) behavior that is
clearly inappropriate. The category a behavior falls into will depend on the subjective judgments of the teacher and students. A behavior which is situationally inappropriate for one individual may be situationally appropriate for another. Misbehavior is behavior defined as situationally inappropriate or clearly inappropriate by any of the classroom participants. It is postulated that clearly appropriate behavior is not problematic in classrooms since it is usually consonant with the expectations and objectives delineated by the teacher (e.g., students working hard during class or students interacting in a teacher-defined socially acceptable manner).

Clearly inappropriate behavior is behavior the teacher or students state will never be permitted within the classroom setting. Situational behavior is more difficult to define since it varies according to the teacher and the nature of the classroom incident. In general, it is behavior the teacher either rewards (situationally appropriate) or punishes (situationally inappropriate) depending on the circumstances surrounding the incident.

Teachers can usually define behavior categorized as clearly inappropriate, but have more difficulty defining behavior which is situationally inappropriate. A smile, for example, from a student who has just been
disciplined by the teacher may be classified as situationally inappropriate; the teacher may infer that the student is mocking his/her attempt to discipline. On the other hand, a smile from a student who has been industriously working on an assignment would probably be interpreted by the teacher as indicating the student is enjoying the activity. In this case the smile is situationally appropriate. Interviews and questionnaires on misbehavior usually reveal only part of the classroom reality since they focus on behavior which is clearly inappropriate. It is much more difficult for a teacher or student to define, in precise terms, situationally inappropriate behavior given its nuances. Understanding how classroom participants define misbehavior (both situationally inappropriate and clearly inappropriate behavior) necessitates observing the classroom and discussing those interactions with students and teachers.

This study will focus on five questions vis-a-vis misbehavior:

(1) How do teachers and students define misbehavior?

(2) What meanings do teachers attach to misbehavior? And, how do teachers interpret misbehavior?

(3) What are the essential characteristics of misbehavior? How is it manifested in the classroom?

\(^1\)Clearly inappropriate behavior is easier to define for survey or questionnaire purposes.
What meanings do students attach to misbehavior and what purposes do misbehaviors serve?

How do teachers usually respond to misbehavior?

Answering these questions should prove beneficial in two ways. First, it should help teachers achieve a more in-depth understanding of student misbehavior. The teacher who understands the causes of behavior is less likely to fear its manifestations. Unfortunately, many teachers focus attention on the overt actions of students rather than the covert causes for those actions. Combs (1973, p. 1) notes that such a focus tends to produce short-term results.

Behavior, in and of itself, is nothing. It has significance only in terms of its meaning to the behaver and receiver. How a person behaves at any instant is a function of what is going on inside him. . . . Permanent change in behavior is only likely when these causative factors within the individual are changed.

Understanding the causes or reasons for misbehavior should also help teachers utilize more effective disciplinary techniques. In most cases it is not enough to observe student behavior; the teacher must also make decisions regarding its import. The more fully the teacher understands student behavior, the more likely he/she is to respond effectively. An effective response is one which prevents further misbehavior but does not create unnecessary psychological discomfort for the
student. The former can be observed in the actions of the students, the latter must be inferred from student responses.

Assumptions

A number of inferences can be drawn from the preceding discussion; they will be stated as assumptions which guide the study.

First, the reasons or causes for behavior are complex and can be ascertained through careful observations and intensive interviews.

Secondly, most misbehavior is situational, and by definition, such behavior may be tolerated at one time and prohibited at another. The nuances of situational behavior defy examination by conventional research methodologies, methods that often rely heavily on a priori conceptualization (e.g., questionnaires).

Third, although there may be variance, albeit minimal, in the behavioral standard for students which are implicitly established by a community, teachers define misbehavior according to perceptions based on their own apperceptive biases. Teacher perceptions are shaped by the milieu in which the teachers have been encultured.

\[2\]

Misbehavior is a relative concept. When the term misbehavior is used in this study it refers to behavior perceived by any classroom participant as inappropriate.
Fourth, although it is difficult to understand the precise factor(s) causing misbehavior, a researcher can gain insights into some of the causes. To do so necessitates developing an awareness of the complex socio-cultural interactions which occur in the classroom. Such an awareness is achieved through a period of intense observation.

Finally, misbehavior occurs because of a number of social and psychological factors: family background, school environment, peer interactions, teacher behavior, and student self-perception. By understanding the relative importance of these causative factors and their interconnection, teachers can determine a more appropriate response to misbehavior.

Limitations

This investigation relied heavily on perceptual data from teachers. The perceptions of teachers were assessed (through interviews) whenever a series of teacher-student interactions dictated such assessment was necessary. Student perceptions, on the other hand, were inferred through statements the students made during short informal conversations and during the final interview process. Since there were fewer contacts with students than teachers, an equivalent level of trust was not
established, a factor which affected the quality and quantity of student reports.

Conducting a number of interviews with students throughout the study could have created student awareness of the investigation's purpose thus possibly precipitating the phenomenon being observed. The "created" awareness not only would have distorted the results of the investigation, it would have also needlessly disrupted classroom learning processes.

Another limitation to the study was that the observer had to infer which behavior would be classified by classroom participants as misbehavior. The inferences were based on the input of teachers and students during interviews, the observations of behaviors that teachers reprimanded and, finally, the subjective perceptions of the observer.

Finally, the data collected in this study may have rather low power for generalizing to larger populations until the tentative descriptive propositions emerging from the themes are subjected to empirical tests.

Plan of the Study

Although the study evidences parallels with existing research from the social and behavioral sciences, the conceptions and products are unique to this study. The form of reporting the study follows:
Chapter II. The Review of the Literature discusses the literature as it relates to the causes of misbehavior and the way teachers respond to classroom misbehavior.

Chapter III. Methods and Procedures reports the procedures for the study and delineates how the data will be analyzed.

Chapter IV. Analysis and Interpretation of Data reports how the data were inductively categorized and the processes involved in the interpretation of the data.

Chapter V. Summary, Recommendations and Implications reviews the study and makes recommendations concerning future research on classroom misbehavior. The implications of the findings of this study are discussed for preservice and inservice teachers, and teacher-training institutions.

Definition of Terms

Certain terms have specialized meanings within the context of the study. The following terms and definitions are, therefore, provided.

Situational behavior: situational behavior varies according to the teacher and the nature of the classroom incident. In general it is behavior the teacher either rewards or punishes depending on the antecedent classroom events.
Situationally appropriate: behavior permitted on one occasion which may be punished during another classroom interaction.

Situationally inappropriate: behavior which is punished on one occasion which may be permitted during another classroom interaction.

Clearly inappropriate: behavior the teacher or students state will never be permitted within the classroom setting.

Inappropriate behavior: behaviors classified as either clearly or situationally inappropriate.

Power: power can take many forms. In the generic sense, however, it will be defined as the ability of one individual to cause another individual, directly or indirectly, to respond in a particular manner.

Coercive power: the ability to use reward or punishment to change behavior. It is unilateral rather than reciprocal in nature.

Authority: authority relationships are interpersonal encounters in which one person has or is given the right to make selected decisions which affect another person's behavior.
Private behavior: student or teacher behavior which is viewed by very few classroom participants.

Public behavior: student or teacher behavior which is viewed by many classroom participants.

Face: "... face may be defined as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (Goffman, 1967, p. 5).

Ignoring behavior: the behavior which occurs when a student or teacher intentionally ignores the actions of another classroom participant.

Audience: the classroom participants who observe various teacher-student interactions.

Effective desist technique: a desist technique which changes student behavior without causing an unnecessary loss of face to either the student or the teacher.

Off-task behavior: off-task behavior is inferred when a student does not respond to a stimulus intended for the student and initiated by the teacher.

Classroom incident: an incident entails an inappropriate student behavior, and teacher acknowledgement of that behavior.
The review of the literature on misbehavior is presented in three parts. The first section focuses on the probable causes of student misbehavior. The second section discusses the various approaches which can be used to "deal with" such behavior. The third section focuses on the ethnographic or participant-observation studies which have directly or indirectly analyzed classroom disciplinary phenomena.

Classroom discipline is one of the more troublesome problems teachers face in their professional careers. Studies indicate that discipline-related problems are among the most frequent and bothersome confronted by teachers (Cruickshank, Kennedy and Myers, 1974; Gallup, 1973, 1977). The popular literature of education illustrates some of these problems through graphic accounts of student misbehavior and teacher-student conflicts. Elizabeth Eddy's *Walk the White Line*, Estelle Fuchs' *Teachers Talk*, Gerry Rosenfeld's *Shut Those Thick Lips*, and Kevin Ryan's *Don't Smile Until Christmas* are but a few of the many publications vividly describing the behavioral problems associated with classroom instruction.
In addition to books describing classroom misbehavior, there are texts which focus specifically on techniques for disciplining students. These "how to" publications are often less concerned with the actual causes of student behavior than with finding techniques to limit and prevent misbehavior. They exhort an if-a-student-exhibits-X, the-teacher-should-do-Y philosophy (Dreikurs and Cassel, 1974).

The first two sections of this review concentrate on (1) the reasons (causes) for classroom misbehavior, and (2) the techniques delineated in the literature purported as effective in dealing with misbehavior.

Causes of Behavior

Student Goals

Many educators and researchers have focused on understanding the causes or reasons for student misbehavior. Combs (1973, p. 1) for example, notes that students discover myriad ways to upset normal classroom processes and that teachers need to develop an awareness of the reasons for such behavior. He believes educators should focus on the causes of misbehavior rather than concentrating on the behavior itself.

Behavior in and of itself is nothing. . . . How a person behaves at any instant is a function of what is going on inside him--especially his beliefs, feelings, values,
attitudes, personal meanings, purposes and goals. Permanent change in behavior is only likely to occur when these causative factors within the individual are changed. Concentrating on behavior thus puts attention on the wrong dynamic.

Combs believes that behavior is the result of a number of personal meanings and self-perceptions, and changing surface behaviors will not necessarily change those perceptions and meanings. If, however, the teacher can facilitate a change in the students' perceptions, it may subsequently produce behavior changes. The first step to initiating such perceptual change is to understand the reasons for student behavior.

Alfred Adler devotes much of his intellectual energy to examining the goals of human behavior. Adler is less concerned with causes than with the goals of behavior:

Let me observe that if I know the goal of a person I know in a general way what will happen. I am in a position to bring into their proper order each of the successive movements made, to view them in their connections, to correct them and to make, where necessary, the required adaptations for my approximate psychological knowledge of these associations. If I am acquainted only with the causes, know only the reflexes, the reaction times, the ability to repeat such facts, I am aware of nothing that actually takes place in the soul of man (Adler, 1963, p. 3).

Adlerian psychology parallels, in many respects, existential thought and focuses on the meaning people attribute to their existence (Ansbacher and Ansbacher,
1970). Adler (1963) stresses the uniqueness of the individual and his/her creation of a "life style." He notes that the child's life style or "his interpretation of what life is, what he is, and what others are and what his relationships to others mean, is pretty nearly fixed by that age [age four or five], and forms his total attitudes to life in all situations" (p. iv). Also central to Adlerian theory is the notion of "social interest." Social interest is the feeling of cooperation with others, the sense of belonging and participating with others. Adler argues that the individual with insufficient social interest will lack the skills necessary to find a satisfactory solution to his/her problems. Since the individual's goal is the resolution of problems, any means of obtaining that goal will seem logical and intelligent.

Building on Adler's work, Dreikurs and Cassel (1974) place emphasis on Adler's notion of goals. They contend that the teacher should initially determine the student's motive for exhibiting misbehavior (i.e., the goal being sought by the student to resolve a problem). Dreikurs and Cassel assert that there are basically four goals toward which classroom behavior is directed: attention-getting, power-seeking, revenge-seeking, and display of inadequacy.
Attention-getting:

When the child is deprived of the opportunity to gain status through his useful contributions, he usually seeks proof of his status in class through getting attention. He has the faulty logic that only if people pay attention to him does he have a place in the world. (p. 34)

Power-seeking:

The power-seeking child wants to be the boss; he operates on the faulty logic "If you don't let me do what I want, you don't love me," or "I only count when you do what I want you to do." (p. 36)

Revenge-seeking:

The revenge-seeking child is deeply discouraged that he feels that only by hurting others, as he feels hurt by them, can he find his place. He views life itself and other people as grossly unfair. (p. 38)

Display of Inadequacy:

He [the student] may actually feel hopeless or he may assume this position in order to avoid any further situation which might be embarrassing or humiliating to him. With very little self-esteem he feels he must covetously guard what little he has. Thus he uses his inability as a protective shield to appear disabled, or to avoid any test situation in which he might lose. (p. 39)

Dreikurs and Cassel believe that if the goal of student behavior can be recognized, a response appropriate to that goal can be exhibited by the teacher. They contend that teachers can change the goals of all children up to ten years of age.3

3Dreikurs and Cassel assert that teachers are less successful in changing the goals of adolescents because adolescent behavior is more complex than infant and early childhood behavior.
Expectations

Many psychologists and educators believe that some forms of student behavior are caused by teacher expectations--the pygmalion effect. Research has been undertaken on the self-fulfilling prophecy to determine its effect on the behavioral responses of students (Baker and Crist, 1971). Most of that research has focused on cognitive outcomes (i.e., an increase in intelligence or gains in achievement scores). No studies have directly investigated the effect of teacher expectations on student behavior in the classroom. However, the implications of "expectancy" research are relevant to this investigation.

Baker and Crist note that people tend to view and interact with others in terms of their own needs and values. Thus, teachers may have special sympathy for pupils who are most "like" themselves and be particularly intolerant of pupils who are "different." If teachers predetermine which students are like themselves and which are different, this would affect subsequent teacher-student interactions.⁴

⁴It is this researcher's experience that students who are difficult to handle develop a reputation which precedes them. Indeed, many teachers spend time during the early part of the school year reviewing student files and talking to other teachers about "problem" pupils.
Guskin and Guskin (1970) discuss the role perception plays in teacher-student relationships. They report that many teachers perceive all "good" students to be similar to one another and to possess attributes consonant with qualities inherent in the teacher. "Bad" students, on the other hand, are perceived as possessing particularly negative characteristics and being all like. These rather simplistic characterizations have serious implications for educators, particularly in situations where cultural differences exist between the teacher and the student. When teachers enter a new and somewhat different environment, they react and perceive behavior vis-a-vis their own biases; thus, many student behaviors may be characterized as harmful which are, in fact, innocuous (Rosenfeld, 1970).

The impressions teachers form also affect teacher-student interactions (Guskin and Guskin, 1970). By labelling individuals as either "cold" or "warm" one can affect the type of interactions which take place in the classroom.

Another way of saying this is that negative expectations developed in early phases of a relationship may lead an individual to withdraw from interacting with others, or to distort information which is contradictory to the first impression. This withdrawal and/or distortion results in a continual building up of negative impressions of the other--without any necessary confirmation by the other person. In time, one or both partners in the relationship may have built up, in an artistic (i.e., self-centered and unrealistic) manner, hostile reactions to each other. (p. 28)
Gamesmanship

Berne (1964) takes a somewhat different perspective on the nature of social contacts and the reasons for behavior. He notes that most transactions occurring in interactions (e.g., procedures, rituals and pastimes) are candid and do not involve conflict. "Games," however, are transactions which are basically dishonest with an outcome that has a dramatic quality. Games are characterized by an ulterior quality and a payoff.

Children are taught, in an oblique fashion, how to use games during the educational process. Wayson (1974) uses Berne's concept to examine some of the common games in adult-child relationships:

Delay:

Children learn early that most adults are too busy to follow-through on their demands. For example, mother tells a child to leave the room several times but never does anything to assure that he leaves. The child sits silently or re-enters the room quietly, and after a while the commands cease although the child remains in the room. (pp. 1-2)

Obfuscation:

The child learns early that adults operate with limited information about the world. . . . They neglect checking out the child's description of reality. Utilizing that knowledge, the child can thwart adult authority by introducing information that causes the adult to go off on a tangent from what he set out to do. (p. 2)
Histrionics:

Most adults have many guilt feelings and uncertainties about their relationships with children. They often have to express expectations that are not clear or that seem to be arbitrary. . . . Most adults also want others—even children—to think positively about them and to approve of their decisions. They are ready victims of games that are designed to make them feel hurt, unloved, inadequate, or wrong. (p. 3)

Belligerence:

Here the child assesses the vulnerability of his antagonist and enters into whatever degree of bellicosity seems safe yet promises to divert the adult from his purposes. (p. 4)

Subtle Sabotage:

Once the child learns that the adult will not be deterred, or led away from his purpose or frightened away, he will set about to meet the original expectations. At this point the adult has "won" the game . . . unless he relaxes too early under the delusion that there are no more moves to make. There is one more. At this stage the child will go through the motions of meeting the expectations, but he will perform at minimally acceptable levels. (p. 5)

Herber Foster (1974) also describes some of the games indigenous to inner-city schools (e.g. ribbing, dozens and woofing). He emphasizes that teachers must understand the rhetoric of the social class within which they are working. Students are terribly good at reading teachers. If teachers have fears and insecurities about working in an urban milieu, the students will sense this and take advantage of the teacher. Students play
a lot of testing games on the teacher to see if the teacher knows the "rules."

**Aggression**

Implicit in much of the literature on the causes or goals of student behavior is that it often entails some form of latent, if not manifest, aggression. Aggression is overt behavior involving intent to inflict noxious stimuli or to behave destructively toward another organism (Moyer, 1976; Buss, 1961). The key word in the definition is latent. Moyer (1976) states that "intent implies goal direction, is always a private event and can only be inferred from behavior" (p. 2). Aggressive intent can only be inferred if a destructive behavior persists toward the same or similar stimulus objects at different points in time.

Aggression is a complex phenomenon and there is by no means consensus on its origin; there are, however, two rather polarized schools of thought. Ardrey (1966), Lorenz (1966) and Morris (1967) advocate an instinctual basis for aggressive behavior. They contend that aggression is "just in our genes" and base much of their work on ethological research. Ethologists believe that behavior is encoded on genes and that genes prescribe not only physical traits and behavioral tendencies but behavior itself (see especially Hunt, 1973).
Montagu (1973), Berkowitz (1969), Carrighar (1967) and others contend that the instinctual notion is too simplistic. Montagu, in particular, suggests that all behavior is learned and that it is nonsense to talk about the genetic determinance of human behavior. Allowing for the idiosyncratic contribution of the genes, Montagu believes everything a human being does is learned from other human beings.

Although there are many different types of aggression (Moyer, 1976), irritable and intermale aggression appear to be the most logical focus for this review. Research on other types of aggression (e.g., fear-induced, maternal and predatory) has been conducted with non-human primates or non-primates but has limited utility for generalizing to the causes of classroom behavior.

Moyer (1976) notes that "the tendency to irritable aggression is increased by several antecedent factors, including frustration, deprivation, pain, and various other physiological dysfunctions" (p. 188). Frustration, or the blocking of some goal-directed behavior, may create anger in an individual and increase the probability of an aggressive reaction (Miller, et al., 1969). Moyer (1976) also notes that aggression is "the consequence of frustration and that aggressive behavior always presupposes the existence of frustration" (p. 188).
Berkowitz (1969) demonstrated that frustration may not always lead to aggression. He found that aggression does not occur in response to frustration in situations where inhibitions to aggression are strong or where the individual has learned nonaggressive responses to a frustrating event.

Buss (1961) examines the conditions under which frustration leads to aggression. He delineates three variables which determine whether aggression follows frustration. The first variable is the "strength" of the frustration. "Strength of frustration is ostensibly determined by the strength of the response tendency being blocked, the degree of interference and the number of frustration sequences" (Buss, 1961, p. 20). For example, Berkowitz (1958) discloses that the closer an individual is to a goal, the stronger his/her tendency to reach that goal; thus, if the "blocking" occurs while the individual is close to the goal, his/her response will be more frustrating (and more aggressive) than if the blocking occurs far from the goal.

A second variable is the arbitrariness of the frustration. Pastore (1952) indicated that arbitrary frustrations (i.e., capricious and whimsical blockings by the frustrator) produce more aggression than non-arbitrary frustrations (i.e., justifiable blocking by a frustrator).
A third factor is the tolerance level of the individual. Unfortunately, many children fail to learn to control their emotional reactions to frustrations (Berkowitz, 1962). These children are under-controllers and may be expected to become angry and aggressive as a result of frustration. Over-controllers, on the other hand, tend to remain passive and inhibited under the same circumstances.

Although studies indicate that frustration is one logical antecedent to aggression, conditions of deprivation may also increase the aggressive potential (Moyer, 1976). If an appropriate goal object is unavailable, then the individual is said to be deprived. There are many different types of deprivation: deprivation of food, water, sleep, and social interaction.

Studies done in urban school settings often vividly describe different forms of deprivation. One such study was a participant-observation investigation conducted by Jerry Rosenfeld (1970, p. 20).

I'll tell you something else. A lot of these kids sleep with towels dipped in turpentine around their heads to keep the rats away at night. The rats are hungry, too. You know that mothers sometimes leave crumbs in corners so the rats will go for that and not for the kids who might have gone to bed with food dried on their faces. You can see dozens of kids in this school who have been bitten by rats. . . . You know these are kids who have been on welfare. . . . You see them eating pickles and gum in class all the time.
Although deprivation was not the focus of Rosenfeld's study, it was a significant factor in his attempts to understand the reasons for student behavior.

A second type of aggression is intermale. Much of the aggression between con-specific males is ritualistic in nature. In ritualized aggression relatively little serious wounding takes place (Moyer, 1976).

There are many forms of ritualized aggression. One of the most common is the stare (Johnson, 1976). Ritualized aggression is also manifested in various language forms.

We use language to express everything from sarcasm to obscenities, and even silence can be devastating. Most people have been infuriated more than once by a well placed yawn. Humans also have a wealth of more impersonal rituals to draw from, such as writing nasty letters to the editor, spreading rumors, defacing billboards, and using bumper stickers. (Johnson, 1972, p. 29)

Aggression is usually manifested in one of two behavioral responses: physical aggression or verbal aggression (Buss, 1961). Physical aggression involves an assault against some organism resulting in one of two consequences: first, the source of aversive stimulation is overcome; or, secondly, some form of pain or injury is inflicted upon the other organism.

Verbal aggression is defined by Buss (1961) as a vocal response that delivers a noxious stimuli to another organism. It usually takes the form of rejection or
threat. Rejection statements can be classified in three ways. The first is a dismissal command: "Leave him alone, sit down!" or "I don't want to be with you now, go back to the classroom." The second involves some type of hostile remark: "You bother me!" or "I hate that class." Rejection statements may also entail criticism, derogation or criticism. Criticism attacks the individual indirectly by negatively evaluating his work or behavior. Derogation is more personal and direct. It focuses directly at the individual and implies that the individual is personally aversive. Cursing is the most intense form of verbal aggression according to Buss. Through cursing, the victim is attacked directly with strong, tabooed words.

Threatening statements symbolize and frequently precede an attack. Threats acquire their aggressive connotations by association with aggressive responses.

The recipient learns that threats are noxious stimuli by a process of classical conditioning. The unconditioned stimulus is physical or verbal aggression; the conditional stimulus is the threat "I am going to hit you." (Buss, 1961, p. 21)

Responses to Behavior

Many educators adopt an eclectic approach in dealing with behavior problems. That is, they use a variety of techniques to modify behavior rather than committing themselves to one psychological or theoretical position.
(e.g., behaviorism). Although the behaviorists seem to have been the most successful at "spreading the word," other psychological theories have been advocated as useful for classroom practice. To discuss all of these would be fatuous; it does, however, seem necessary to examine the strategies most prevalent in classrooms today.

**Interactionalists**

The first three approaches to be discussed have been categorized as interactionalists strategies by Wolfgang and Gluckman (1977). In interactionalist theory the teacher constantly interacts with the student and when a student transgresses certain defined boundaries a conflict is created. The teacher reacts to the transgression and either unilaterally or jointly with the student forces a resolution. The proponents of this view include Dreikurs and Cassel (*Discipline Without Tears*, 1972), Eric Berne (*Games People Play*, 1966) and William Glasser (*Schools Without Failures*, 1969).

Dreikurs and Cassel (1974) believe that there are four goals of student misbehavior. The teacher must ascertain which goal the student is attempting to attain, then employ corrective procedures to modify the student's motivation toward that goal. If the goal of a student's behavior is attention-getting, the teacher should ignore
the child who is bidding for attention, show no annoyance and be firm. If the goal of student behavior is power, the teacher should modify the student's power goal by acknowledging that the student already possesses power. Subsequently, the teacher should permit the student to exhibit power in situations where that power can be used more appropriately. Most importantly, the teacher should avoid a power struggle and respect the dignity of the child.

A second interactionalist technique is based on the work of Eric Berne--transactional analysis (TA). TA operates on the premise that every person is born to be a "winner," it offers a positive way of looking at one's self and at others (Kravas and Kravas, 1974).

A salient feature of TA is its division of the individual into three conceptually distinct ego states: the parent, the adult, and the child (Berne, 1964). Basically TA advocates suggest that teachers should be cognizant of the ego state students exhibit during classroom interactions. Teachers should also be aware of their own ego states as they interact with students. In essence, is the teacher or student responding as a parent, child or adult?

The TA approach is concerned basically with the enhancement of communication among individuals. TA seems to show promise for the alleviation of stress situations caused by ineffective exchanges between teachers and students. It is particularly useful in
those sensitive instances of interface where teachers and students perceive situations differently, and where authoritarian directives appear to have harmful consequences. (Kravas & Kravas, 1974, p. 195)

The third technique is William Glasser's (1969) concept of "classroom meetings." The classroom meetings consist of discussions on what is important and relevant to the students and the teacher. When problems arise in the classroom, the teacher uses the classroom meeting as a vehicle for addressing and hopefully resolving the conflict. The class is charged with responsibility for making judgments and arriving at positive solutions to specific classroom problems--particularly behavioral problems. While the discussions are taking place, the teacher usually remains nonjudgmental and offers opinions sparingly. Glasser feels that permitting students to discuss their own problems implicitly gives them a sense of control over their environment.

Behaviorists

Many educators concerned with classroom behavior have relied heavily on the theoretical foundation provided by behaviorist B. F. Skinner. Teachers throughout the country have adopted behavioristic techniques in the hopes of eliciting more positive student behaviors. There has been tremendous controversy over this approach
and the effect of the nonsanguinary debate has often been to polarize the educational community.

Behaviorists assert that each student develops vis-a-vis the conditions of his environment (Wolfgang and Gluckman, 1977). Rational student behavior can be assured by establishing a logical system of conditioning, a system enabling the student to progress toward some predetermined goal. Behavioristic approaches are common in the writings of Albert Bandura (Principles of Behavior Modification, 1969) and James Dobson (Dare to Discipline, 1970).

The most useful and fully investigated behaviorist techniques involve operant conditioning (Axelroad, 1977). Essentially operant conditioning entails increasing the rate of desired operant behavior and decreasing the rate of deviant operant behavior. Operant behaviors are voluntary responses. The rate of occurrence of operant behaviors is influenced by the events following the behavior. Behavior modifiers (or consequences) are used to either increase or decrease the operant behaviors being exhibited by another individual. Behavior can be increased by implementing either positive or negative reinforcement procedures: Positive reinforcement is the consequence of behavior which is presented and increases the future rate of that behavior. Positive reinforcement
is used to increase the rate of desired behavior. Negative reinforcement is the procedure whereby something bad is removed contingent on the emission of a desired behavior. Thus a teacher may promise to reduce homework if the students will simply be quiet.

There are also times when the rate of undesirable student behavior must be decreased. The primary methods for reducing undesirable behavior include reinforcing incompatible behavior, extinction and punishment:

Reinforcing incompatible behavior occurs when the teacher reinforces an incompatible behavior to decrease an undesired one. If a teacher wants the students to stop talking, he/she reinforces their behavior when they are quiet. Extinction involves the withdrawal of the usual reinforcer. Behavior will decrease if the reinforcement for the behavior is withdrawn. Punishment occurs when the events following a behavior (i.e., the consequence) reduce the future rate of occurrence for that behavior. The only way to determine whether a consequence is a punisher is to observe its effect on the behavior it follows.

Non-Interventionists Label

Interactionalism and behaviorism are the primary approaches used by teachers in dealing with classroom behavior. Some educators believe that these approaches
intervene too much and prevent students from developing into self-actualized human beings. Virginia Axline (Play Therapy, 1971) and Thomas Gordon (Teacher Effectiveness Training, 1974) advocate that teachers provide students with an environment within which the students can freely express themselves.

Wolfgang and Gluckman (1977) emphasize that in the non-interventionist approach the teacher develops an environment of acceptance. Most of all the teacher must have "an abiding faith in the child as master of his own destiny. The child is a rational being who is constantly striving to perfect himself outwardly" (p.3).

Supporting Research

Systematic study on the Glasser approach was conducted by Jensen (1973) and by Masters and Laverty (1973). Masters and Laverty found that teachers using the Glasser approach become more student centered and more willing to give students responsibility for their own discipline. In addition, they found that teachers began to question the traditional educational practices utilized to solve classroom problems (e.g., punishment as a technique for dealing with discipline problems).

Jensen (1973) found that after three years of implementation the Glasser approach reduced truancy, student disruptions and fighting. Communication among
The research on behaviorism has been abundant. Unfortunately, most of the research on behavior modification has been conducted using high level desists (LaVoie, 1973; Dlugokinski and Firestone, 1974).

There are two reasons for the preponderance of research on high level desists and the paucity of research on lower level desists. First, lower level desists are not readily reproduced in a laboratory setting. Researchers can deliver punishment (e.g., a paddling) to an individual and observe the results; the effects of a stare are less obvious. Secondly, low level desists necessitate a higher inference level than high level desists. A researcher has to decide: Is the stare directed at Jimmy or Billy? Is the frown meant to stop Johnny's behavior or is the teacher reacting to some other student behavior in the classroom?

LaVoie (1973) has done research on the effectiveness of reasoning (a low level desist) in reducing deviant behavior. He states that reasoning is successful to the extent that it provides legitimate and sufficient information about the unacceptable act. He also concludes that reasoning is directly related to the age and cognitive developmental level of the child and that the use of reasoning would be more effective in reducing deviant
behavior in adolescents than with young children. Sears, Macoby and Levin (1957) have also concluded that reasoning can be more effective than aversive forms of punishment in reducing deviant behavior in adolescents.

Dlugokinski and Firestone (1974) studied the effects of perceived discipline. They described two styles of parental discipline: induction and power-assertion. Induction involves using reasoning to develop an understanding and empathy of the needs of others. The parent using this mode communicates (a) the existence of a rational basis for discipline, (b) the value of respect for rules, and (c) the necessity of self-monitoring. In power-assertion, reasoning is replaced by suggestion, and exhortation by threats of applying punishment; the adult communicates dominance. The investigators found that students from homes where induction was prevalent were more concerned about the needs of others; they were also less self-centered and responded more readily to the "power" of the teacher than they did to the use of reasoning.

Kounin and Gump (1961) investigated the comparative influences of punitive and nonpunitive techniques upon children and found that punitive techniques created more aggression and tension than nonpunitive techniques. They also found that students of punitive teachers were more unsettled, less concerned with learning and school
values, and more confused about misconduct in school. Kounin and Gump concluded that teacher aggression often produces student counteraggression.

Some researchers have investigated the effect punishment procedures have on subsequent student behavior. Thomas, Becker, and Armstrong (1968) and Madsen, Becker, et al. (1968) suggested that punishment may provide positive reinforcement for some types of student behavior. Spencer (1973) also studied this phenomenon and found that teacher verbal disapproval often functions as a positive social reinforcer for an inappropriate student behavior. In fact, teacher disapproval may cause misbehavior to increase. Thus, the best method for dealing with misbehavior may be positive reinforcement of responses incompatible with inappropriate behavior.

Teachers react to hundreds of behaviors each day (Delamont, 1976). Implicit in those reactions are both overt and tacit rewards and punishments. How the teacher reacts and the consistency with which he/she reacts is very important in understanding and dealing with behavior. Arzin (1956) concluded that consistent punishment is more effective than intermittent punishment. Leff (1969) studied this same phenomenon and concluded that consistently punished subjects made fewer errors during a discrimination-learning task than intermittently punished subjects. Parke and Deur (1972) studied ninety
young boys relative to the effectiveness of inconsistent and consistent punishment for suppressing a hitting response. They concluded that consistent punishment resulted in faster inhibition than inconsistent punishment.

Studies Focusing Directly on Classroom Discipline

Very few studies have focused directly on misbehavior in the classroom setting. A study conducted by Kounin (1958) used what Gordon and Jester (1973) term specimen description. In this study, fifty-one student observers collected descriptive accounts of student classroom behavior. They focused on a misbehaving student, the way the teacher corrected the student, and the effect of the correction on the overt behavior of audience pupils. This study was conducted in twenty-six kindergartens in Detroit, Michigan. The observers were trained to record what the misbehaving student and audience pupils were doing prior to the teacher desist. They noted the type of teacher intervention, the student's subsequent reaction and a two-minute record of the behavior of the child nearest the "misbehaver." Four hundred and six incidents were observed and recorded. Three concepts vis-a-vis the handling of misbehavior emerged: clarity, firmness and roughness (Travers, 1973).
Clarity was the amount of information the teacher provided in his/her desist. Firmness was the degree to which the teacher communicated "I mean it" or "Right now!" and roughness was determined by the amount of anger or exasperation in the desist.

Kounin found that clarity resulted in increased student conformity; firmness was associated with better student behavior and roughness led to an increase in disruptive behavior. Kounin's study also demonstrated that teacher desists influence audience pupils as well as the students toward whom the desist was initially directed.

Kounin (1961) conducted a follow-up study with elementary and high school students. He found that the techniques of dealing with misbehavior were not significant determinants of how student's behaved in classrooms, or how successful a teacher was in preventing one student's misbehavior from contaging others.

Licata and Willower (1975) studied brinkmanship (i.e., behavior that challenges the authority system of the school while avoiding its sanctions) in two junior high schools on the East coast. They used two instruments in the study: the semantic differential and the Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) form. The semantic differential was used to assess student judgments concerning specific concepts; acts of student brinkmanship served
as concepts. The PCI was used to determine the pupil control ideology of educators on a continuum from "custodial" to "humanistic."

Licata and Willower (1975, p. 12) found that there is a relationship between student assessment of classroom life and the amount of brinkmanship. The relationship between the two, however, is complex.

For some students, brinkmanship may be an integral part of classroom life and their assessments of both may be interwoven. Others may be sufficiently alienated from school so that the comic relief afforded by brinkmanship is lost on them, eclipsed by their environmental estrangement.

They also found that teachers perceive most acts of brinkmanship as threatening to their position in the school. Students view brinkmanship positively, teachers view it negatively.

While teachers exhibit dysphoria over student brinkmanship, influenced in part by a concern for pupil control, this type of student behavior may have positive consequences for the teacher role. It is quite possible that student brinkmanship acts as a functional equivalent for more serious forms of student misconduct. As such, brinkmanship may serve as a safety valve and, in the long run, foster stability. (p. 12)

Robert Wegmann (1976) did field observations in three high schools. Wegmann looked at the problems of creating and preserving the social reality of the classroom and concluded that the teacher must negotiate his/her way through a surprisingly complex and highly problematic series of interaction sequences. Wegmann
explored the relationship between "face" (in the sense that Goffman uses the term) and authority. In addition he studied the effect of teacher commands, the significance of humor, and the tactic of "explanation" in maintaining discipline.

Wegmann spent approximately 100 hours observing and taking notes in the classes of a dozen teachers. He relied totally on observation procedures; he conducted no interviews with students or teachers to discover the meanings they attributed to the classroom "incidents." Based on the observations, Wegmann discussed the types of problems that tend to be common for all high school classroom teachers. The first problem was the physical location of students. Some students liked to move around; they disliked being forced into a set position. They enjoyed moving to different desks and walking around the room.

One of the problem elements of classroom control is how the teacher defines such activity. He might ignore it; he might inquire as to its purpose; or he might see the student's action as a challenge to his authority, reprimanding or otherwise punishing the student involved. (p. 75)

Another problem or concern for almost all teachers was promptness and attendance.

Teachers are exhorted to watch the "hot list" of students who have cut classes, and to send malefactors to the office. . . . Teachers also vary widely in their attention to tardiness. Students were observed entering classes without late passes. Some were stopped, others were not. (pp. 75-76)
How students leave the room was also a source of conflict. "The teacher's authority often seems to wane at the end of the hour. Students tend to dash out of the room in a disorderly way; teachers may then react both to preserve order and to maintain their sense of 'being in charge'" (p. 76).

Another problem in classrooms was the determination of who may speak. The raise-your-hand-and-be-recognized rule formalizes the concern; however, Wegmann found the rule was neither universally invoked nor universally followed. Wegmann suggested that the raise-your-hand-rule seemed to be invoked only when it was necessary for the maintenance of order.

Wegmann concluded his discussion of classroom discipline by stating:

There are some very practical lessons to be learned from careful observation of the different ways in which teachers can react to such common phenomena as challenges to their authority. Even the very exploratory research reported here indicates that the judicious use of humor, good judgment in deciding whether to address an individual or a group, and facility in the redefinition of apparent challenges before they become blatant are improving elements in creating a relaxed and friendly classroom atmosphere. Presumably such skills can be consciously learned. (p. 79)

Torode (1970) did a participant-observation study and analyzed some of the subtle ways in which classroom discipline may (or may not) be maintained by the teacher's choice of words. Torode observed two teachers: one of
the teachers dealt successfully with challenges from the pupils, the other was less successful. Torode discussed how breakdowns in relationships occur as a result of the ways in which teachers use language to respond to pupils. He pointed out that social scientists have largely ignored classroom discipline; teachers have been expected to survive on the basis of traditional folklore.

Torode and Wegmann based their work to a great extent on the ideas of Erving Goffman. Torode argued that "Goffman's concept of the presentation of self as it stands is only partially adequate to describe student behavior" (p. 173). He proposed a phenomenological account of teacher's talk. This meant paying close attention to the fine details of behavior (especially language) and then trying to describe those details without imposing the researcher's presuppositions on them.

Torode's work was more theoretical than Wegmann's. Torode's study was conducted in England over a period of six months in 1970. He spent every class period observing a teacher and his students—all boys—and usually was in the boys' company during breaks and lunchtime. He visited all the boys' homes at least once and in some cases twice. He recorded all the conversations he found interesting and then analyzed the data he accumulated over the six months.
Torode concluded that Goffman's dramaturgical standpoint was inadequate for understanding the nature of the teacher's work.

... our concern should be with the talk by which the teacher constitutes his definition of the situation. A definition which may well claim to go beyond merely "presenting a self," and may in particular involve the portrayal of numerous "persons," including or sometimes not including his own self, situated within a "context" posed as a social fact external to them as individuals. ... The role the teacher would appear to be a paradigm case for the application of the theatrical analogy, since the teacher works in a setting where so many of the features of the stage which Goffman employs metaphorically, are literally present, built into the institutional framework. If his standpoint is, as I have argued, inadequate in this context, then its applicability to social action in any setting is seriously in question. The study of classroom interaction, and social interaction in general, I suggest, must shift its attention away from giving descriptions of actions to a closer examination of the speech that constitutes those actions as social for the actors themselves. (p. 192)

Studies Focusing Indirectly on Classroom Discipline

There have been a large number of studies focusing primarily on classroom interactions and indirectly on classroom management and discipline. One of the most in-depth of these was a participant-observer study by Gerry Rosenfeld (1971). Rosenfeld was an educator-anthropologist who taught in Harlem for five years. His concern was with understanding the culture of inner-city students. He felt that his colleagues were focusing too
intensely on the actual behavior of the students. "I knew that behavior could not always be understood by its overt manifestations alone. Things could not be seen in isolation, apart from grosser cultural patterns" (p. 19). Rosenfeld was concerned with the cultural influences which shape behavior. He felt that by understanding the factors shaping the students' responses the teacher could deal more effectively with the exigencies of classroom life.

Eddy (1967) and Moore (1969) conducted studies in which observations were made in nine public schools located in slum neighborhoods. Both researchers examined the relationship between the formal urban educational system and the urban poor. Unfortunately the observational periods in these studies were rather brief: observations ranged from one class period to two days; thus, it was difficult for the researchers to develop a relationship of trust with either teachers or students. Eddy focused part of her attention on "discipline" classes, or classes for students who were inept at school work. Eddy reached the conclusion that the most acute problem for teachers was the culture conflict between the urban school and the children who attend the school.

For many teachers and professionals, the confrontation with the unsuccessful student who does not know the appropriate skills required by the educational system and the public world
beyond it comes as a shock. These students question and threaten values which have been transmitted throughout successive generations of teachers and which are central to those professionally trained in education (p. 129).

Another intensive classroom participant-observation study was conducted by Smith and Geoffrey (1968) in a metropolitan slum community. Geoffrey was a teacher and Smith the observer. Smith was basically concerned with the question of how a middle-class teacher copes with the problems of lower-class youngsters. In *Complexities of an Urban Classroom* they dealt with a number of the problems inherent in the urban classroom. Smith and Geoffrey (as cited by Dreeban, 1973) conclude:

... if a teacher knows that events occurring at one point in time may have unpredictable consequences for events at an unpredictable future time, that if a teacher makes himself aware of what is going on and what informal social relationships obtain among pupils, that if past promises and threats are kept, and that if he establishes rules of the game and routines from classroom activities it is possible to keep pupils engaged in classroom activities over time. (p. 460)

Estelle Fuchs (1969) used interviews in her study of neophyte teachers in inner-city elementary schools and analyzed the data obtained using an anthropological perspective. She met with the novice pedagogues on Saturday mornings throughout the first semester of their teaching. Like Eddy, Moore and Rosefeld, Fuchs focused on the cultural differences between teachers and students.
Cultural conflict in the classroom can present the danger of rejection and victimization of children when those in charge of their education are unable to understand some of the underlying cultural contact and culture conflict problems causing children to engage in certain types of behavior. (p. 27)

Perhaps the most prolific researcher and erudite writer on classroom ethnography has been Jules Henry. Henry (1976, p. 176) discussed the witch-hunt syndrome or the phenomenon of intragroup aggression.

The witch-hunt syndrome is thus stated to be a dynamically interrelated system of feelings and actions made of destructive criticism of others, docility, feelings of vulnerability, fear of internal aggression, confession of evil deeds, and boredom.

Henry's comments on intragroup aggression and boredom are also particularly relevant. On the former he states:

A word is necessary about these classrooms as middle class. The novel *Blackboard Jungle* describes schoolroom behavior for lower-class children. There we see the children against the teacher, a representative of the middle-class. But in the classes I have described we see the children against each other, with the teacher abetting the process. Thus, as the teacher in the middle-class school directs the hostility of the children toward one another and away from himself, he reinforces the competitive dynamics within the middle-class itself. The teacher in lower-class schools, on the other hand, appears to become the organizing stimulus for behavior that integrates the lower class, as the children unite in expressing their hostility toward the teacher. (p. 178)
On boredom Henry observes:

Boredom, which means emotional and intellectual separation from the environment, is an insupportable agony, particularly if the emotional vacuum created by such separation is not filled by gratifying fantasies, or if it is filled by terrifying ones. To fill this vacuum people in our culture will throw themselves into a great variety of even relatively ungratifying activities. Since in this situation, bored children attack almost any novel classroom activity with initial vigor, the witch-hunt syndrome or any modification thereof helps to overcome boredom better to hunt than be bored. (p. 181)

Henry (1963) discussed the problem of misbehavior in an educational system, a system which encourages impulse release. Henry observed one suburban teacher (Mrs. Olan) who claimed to control students by developing a bond of affection and love with the students—unfortunately chaos was often the result. The only thing which kept the social structure of Mrs. Olan's class from completely disintegrating was the presence of love. Henry noted that Mrs. Olan believed her actions in disciplining children were justified:

Love is the path to discipline through permissiveness; and the school is a continuation of family life in which the values of sharing and democracy lead to comfortable living and ultimately to discipline. If you produce a comfortable atmosphere through affectionate sharing," she says, "the children will 'cooperate.'" (p. 310)

The Coleman Study (1961) was also significant because of its emphasis on the value systems and strength of adolescent cultures. Coleman examined how adolescent
subcultures differed in the various suburban, urban, and rural milieus.

Coleman looked at nine high schools, two of which were suburban. Questionnaires and interviews were used to assess student interests. Demographic data and adult reactions were also solicited as part of the research. Although a wide variety of findings were discussed and reported, only two aspects of the Coleman research were deemed relevant to this study. First, Coleman queried students on their interests and activities, one of which was smoking. Coleman reported that 15.2 percent of the boys and 7.6 percent of the girls identified themselves as regular smokers, 17.0 percent of the boys and 15.5 percent of the girls were occasional users. Almost 70 percent of the students in the study indicated that they did not smoke at all. These findings are particularly significant to consider given the problems currently facing many schools with teenage smoking.

Secondly, Coleman found that popularity in adolescent subculture evolved out of the essential characteristics identified with adult society. Adolescent popularity was determined by the adolescent's surrounding milieu. "In a farming culture, the farmer who helps his neighbor in time of need is popular; in a hunting culture, the bravest hunters are popular; among little girls playing dolls, the girl with a fancy doll house is popular"
Popularity or acceptance was, therefore, a relative concept. It was relative to the environment within which the students functioned.

This review of the literature on classroom discipline has (1) examined the various psychological and theoretical notions on causes of misbehavior; (2) reviewed the techniques utilized in the classroom setting to deal with misbehavior; and (3) has examined the results of many ethnographic-like studies conducted in school classrooms. The materials reviewed have led this researcher to conceptualize classroom misbehavior as a complex phenomenon which cannot be understood without a thorough knowledge of the total classroom environment. Such knowledge would include (1) an understanding of the way in which students interact within the classroom and the meanings they attach to those interactions; (2) an understanding of the way in which the teacher responds to student behavior as well as the reasons for those responses; and (3) an understanding of the milieu within which the teacher and the student interact.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Review of Field Study Methods

This research is a field study utilizing a participant-observation technique. The field study approach is characterized by a period of social interaction between a researcher and subjects in the milieu of the latter. This approach (Wolcott, 1976) can be used in studying virtually any aspect of social life. Although it typically is associated with studies in traditional cultures, its utility can be realized in investigating the problems of "developed" societies (McCall and Simmons, 1969). The participant-observation approach is fruitful in developing rather than verifying hypotheses and is particularly advantageous in exploratory investigations.

A qualitative research technique was deemed optimal for this study on the basis that it yields rich data without seriously disrupting the classroom setting. The data obtained result from natural or "real" social interactions, not responses elicited under artificial laboratory conditions. Social scientists (Barker, 1968; Wilson, 1977) contend that it is necessary to study psychological
events in natural settings. Their research demonstrates the influence of the setting on a phenomena as well as the disparate nature of findings when phenomena are studied in both laboratory and field settings. Wilson (1977, p. 247) reinforces this notion when he states, "Ecological psychologists claim that if one hopes to generalize research findings to the everyday world where most human events occur, then the research must be conducted in settings similar to those that the researchers hope to generalize about, where those same forces that will one day act are not interrupted."

In this investigation observations were made and field notes were written on the nature of the interactions in two classroom settings. Structured interviews with both the students and the teachers being observed were conducted. The interviews were considered necessary to elicit from the subjects the meanings they attached to classroom behavior. The observations enabled an analysis of how those meanings were manifested in classroom behavior.

Selection of Teachers

Both classes observed in this study were in junior high schools. Observations were conducted in this setting because early adolescents, at least according to educational folklore, are the most disruptive to normal
classroom processes. The teachers selected were "friends of friends." One of the teachers was a female, pseudonym Sue, who taught a special area class in the inner-city. The other teacher was a male, pseudonym Bill, who taught an academic subject in a suburban school system. Both teachers taught the same grade level. The male had been a teacher for six years; the female had taught five years.

The inner-city school was located near the center of a large metropolitan area. The student population was racially mixed, about one-third of the student body was black. According to the teacher, approximately the same number of students came from broken homes. The school had a total student population of about a thousand students. The school facility was built in the early 1930's and was in excellent condition. The classroom observed usually had about twenty students. Attendance fluctuated a great deal during the seven weeks of observation. Sometimes as many as half the students were absent from class.

The suburban school was located in a relatively middle-class community. The parents held blue-collar jobs and many had moved to the school district from Appalachian areas. Most of the students came from "intact" homes; single-parent families were less prevalent than in the urban school. The student population was predominately white. Black students made up less
than five percent of the total student enrollment. The school building was constructed in the late 1960's and still reflected newness. The classroom facility was quite large and was furnished with new and attractive tables and desks. Attendance was excellent with fewer than two or three of the twenty-eight students in Bill's class ever being absent.

Data Collection

The data were collected during the last two months of the school year, April 22-June 6, 1977. One class for each teacher was observed over a period of seven weeks. The classes observed were selected after a phone conversation with the teachers involved in the study. The teachers were asked to identify a moderately troublesome class. A moderately troublesome class was defined as one the teacher sometimes had difficulty controlling.\(^5\)

It was considered efficacious to view moderately troublesome classes for two reasons: (1) well-behaved, "easy" classes would not have been a very rich source of data, and (2) disruptive, "difficult" classes may have been embarrassing to the teacher. That is, if a

\(^5\)It was assumed, based on the researcher's teaching experience, that teachers would view their classes on a continuum with some being easy to handle and others being difficult to control. A moderately troublesome class fell somewhere on the middle of this hypothetical continuum.
teacher found a class particularly difficult to control, he/she may not wish to have an outsider view his/her daily struggles to maintain order.

Each of the classes selected was visited once the week preceding the formal observation period. Originally, more pre-observations were planned in order to familiarize the students with the observer and to allow the teachers an opportunity to adjust to the presence of an outsider; however, the teachers indicated that observers were commonplace in their schools and both they and the students would be uninhibited as a consequence. During the pre-observation visit, the observer sat unobtrusively in the back of the classroom; no field notes were taken during the class and no interactions with the students were initiated.

When the formal observation period was initiated, each class was observed every time it convened. There was one exception, this due to a conflict in the schedules of the teachers (i.e., both teachers conducted class at the same time of the day on Tuesday). The suburban school was visited four times a week for a period of seven weeks and the urban school was visited twice a week for seven weeks--the latter met only twice a week.

Students in both settings were also observed interacting with at least one other teacher. The purpose of the additional observations was to see what, if any,
changes occurred in the students' behavior when they interacted with a different adult. More of the "extra" observations were made in the urban school since the teacher in the urban setting had difficulty maintaining classroom control. The additional observations were conducted to determine if the students interacted with other teachers in each school in the same manner as they did with the teachers being observed (i.e., Bill and Sue).

The additional observations in the inner-city school were conducted in Mrs. Smith's class; she taught math the period after Sue's art class. The students were accompanied from Sue's room to Mrs. Smith's room after a class in which Sue had experienced severe disciplinary problems. In the suburban school, the additional observations were conducted in Mr. Jones' room. Mr. Jones taught in the room adjoining Bill's. Bill or Mr. Jones frequently combined their groups and taught both classes at the same time since there was no wall separating their rooms. The observations of Mr. Jones were made when he took control of Bill's class for instructional purposes.

Observation Procedures

Observations were conducted from the back of each classroom. The focus of the observations was on student behaviors indirectly or directly defined by the teacher
as off-task. Off-task behavior was inferred when a student did not respond to a stimulus initiated by the teacher (e.g., a class activity or a teacher comment). Not all off-task behavior was inappropriate; some was perceived as quite innocuous by the observer (e.g., a student getting a drink). The observer focused on the class until a student exhibited an off-task behavior which might be defined by the teacher as inappropriate. Inappropriate behavior was determined using information from four sources: (1) interviews with the teachers, (2) informal conversations with students, (3) observations of behavior nonverbally or verbally stopped by the teacher, and (4) the observer's subjective judgments.

When student inappropriate behavior was observed, three aspects of the phenomenon were noted:

(1) The nature of the behavior the student exhibited;

(2) The response of the teacher to the behavior, that is, did the teacher tell the student to sit down, to be quiet, etc.;

(3) The reaction of the student to the teacher after the teacher responded to the inappropriate behavior. That is, was the behavior continued or did the student exhibit an alternative form of inappropriate behavior after the teacher response?
From notes taken during the observations, the researcher wrote extensive field notes (see Appendix C). The field notes included descriptions of the events observed in class and approximate quotes made by the students and teachers.

Selection of Students for Observations and Interviews

Students observed during this research were selected on the basis of the behaviors they exhibited during class. Students who exhibited a significant number of inappropriate behaviors and who were seated near the observer were the primary "targets." They were selected because they could be observed easily and because it was possible to hear their interactions with the teacher and peers. To prevent a student from feeling as though the observer was an audience for his/her behavior, the observer seldom looked directly at students who were engaged in some type of inappropriate behavior. Rather, the observer viewed the students as surreptitiously as possible and listened closely to what was being said by and to the student.

Two students from each field setting were interviewed (see Appendix D). In both settings one of the students was a boy and the other a girl. The students were selected on the basis of the following:
(1) The number of inappropriate behaviors they exhibited during the observational period. (Students were interviewed who had engaged in a large number of inappropriate behaviors.)

(2) The perceived openness of the student. The students interviewed were those who would not be intimidated or inhibited by the interview situation.

The interviews with students took place after the observations had been concluded. The interviews were not taped; instead, notes were taken while talking to the students. The interviews with students were structured, i.e., there was some predetermined direction for the questioning. The ethnographic frame of reference for the study dictated that the interviews proceed inductively. The questions listed below were subject to alteration to permit the interviewer an opportunity to formulate questions responsive to the information emerging from the interview. To establish rapport, the interviews started with questions about the student's school life, home background and favorite pasttimes. When some rapport was established, more specific questions about the

---

The openness of the student was inferred from the student-observer informal conversations.
behaviors exhibited by the student were asked. Each student was given at least one inappropriate behavior to discuss. If the interview was going particularly well, and the student seemed open and at ease, additional inappropriate behaviors were examined. The queries vis-a-vis the student's behavior included:

1. For what purposes did the student exhibit the behavior?
2. Did the student view the behavior as inappropriate or appropriate? Why?
3. How did the student feel when the teacher responded (or did not respond) to that behavior?

Additional questions for student interviews included:

1. What did the student classify as inappropriate behavior?
2. Why did the student think his peers exhibited inappropriate behavior?
3. How did the student feel when the teacher ignored inappropriate behavior?

Only two of the four students were queried on specific inappropriate behaviors during the final interview. Of the two who were not questioned, one was interviewed on a specific incident (see Appendix D) during the course of the study, the other student was not questioned on an incident because of an "in-house" suspension.

The behavior the student had exhibited was only described in enough detail that the student could recall the incident.
These questions served as a common focus for the student interviews. The queries were worded differently in each interview because of student personality differences and the disparate nature of the behavior incidents. Each interview was concluded when it was determined that no new information could be collected through further questioning.

In addition to the structured interviews with students, both teachers gave the observer permission to engage in informal conversations with the students during independent work-study periods. During the study periods the observer walked around the room and talked with students as they engaged in lesson activities. The observer talked to as many students as possible but focused the most attention on pupils who engaged in frequent inappropriate behavior. The observer conducted the informal conversations with approximately one-third of each class. Many of the informal talks did not deal with inappropriate behavior but were conducted to establish rapport with the students rather than gather data. In essence, the conversations were not only a method of collecting information, but also a means of developing a level of trust with the students.

Interviews with Teachers

The teachers were interviewed four times: once before the observations were initiated, twice during
the course of the observations, and again when the observations were completed (see Appendix A). The behaviors discussed in the interviews were only those which had been obvious to and noticed by the teacher. The teachers were not informed of behaviors they did not observe since this might cause the teachers to retaliate against students in subsequent classroom interactions.

The first interview with teachers focused on six questions. The questions in all four interviews were altered or modified to enable the interviewer to develop questions responsive to the information emerging from the interview. The questions were oriented toward gaining some sense of the school milieu within which the teacher functioned and determining how the teacher defined inappropriate behavior. The definition of inappropriate behavior was inductively determined by reviewing questions 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6:

1. How do you feel about teaching in a junior high school?
2. Describe a really well-behaved class. What are the students like?
3. Describe a poorly behaved class. What are the students like?
4. What behaviors do you find most troublesome? Of these, which are the most frequent?
(5) How do you usually handle troublesome problems in the classroom?

(6) How do you think the problems you face compare with those confronting other teachers in this school?

The focus of the middle interviews with teachers was classroom "incidents." An incident entailed (1) an inappropriate student behavior and (2) teacher acknowledgment of that behavior. Acknowledgment meant that the teacher exhibited awareness of the behavior; awareness resulted in a teacher verbal or non-verbal response to the student's behavior. The teachers were asked the following vis-a-vis each incident:

(1) How did you feel when the student exhibited the behavior?

(2) What do you think the student was feeling at the time he/she exhibited the behavior? What do you think was going through the student's mind?

(3) Why did you react to the student the way you did?

The questions for the final interview were general in nature and dealt with inappropriate behavior on a more general, rather than situation-specific, level. The questions constituting the final interview were inductively derived after examining the nature of the data
obtained previously in the study. The questioned included:

(1) What do you think causes most student inappropriate behavior?

(2) What is the cause of the fighting between students at this school?⁹

(3) How do you feel you deal most effectively with inappropriate behavior?

(4) Why do you ignore some classroom inappropriate behavior? How does ignoring affect the students exhibiting that behavior?

The interviews with the teachers were taped and transcribed.

**Analysis of Data**

The data for this study were obtained from three sources. First, from field notes which focused on classroom incidents. Second, from interviews with teachers which were taped and transcribed. Finally, from interviews and informal conversations with students which were written in the form of field notes.

⁹This question was only asked of the teacher in the urban setting. Fighting was not prevalent at the suburban school.
Analysis of the data proceeded in an inductive fashion. Initially, the data were examined and tentative conclusions developed. From the general notes and tentative conclusions, themes or classification schemes were formed. No specific quantitative criteria were established for the amount of data necessary for the creation of a theme. The themes did emerge, however, on the following quasi-quantitative basis.

(1) The behavioral illustrations of the themes were exhibited by more than one classroom participant.

(2) The behavioral illustrations observed were manifested in teacher or student behavior throughout most of the study, they were not isolated to one class period.

The research of the social and behavioral sciences was examined and related to the findings of this study. The research from the social sciences was particularly helpful in explaining some of the phenomena observed in this investigation.

A number of methods (e.g., symbolic interactionism) for interpreting data were examined and a perspective to facilitate understanding of the collected data was adopted. The emphasis during analysis was on the meanings attached to classroom interactions by various classroom participants. The manner in which individuals interpreted a situation was critical to the meaning
they assimilated and affected their subsequent behavior. It was not only the meanings, therefore, but also the behavioral manifestations of those meanings which became the central focus of the themes.
CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This is an exploratory study focusing on classroom behavior which is labeled misbehavior by teachers and students. The emphasis is on describing those behaviors and examining their causes. The study also probes the meanings that various classroom participants attribute to perceived misbehavior and to the behaviors teachers exhibit in response to misbehavior.

The study focused on classroom incidents and attempted to assess the meanings of the participants involved in the incidents (Bogdan and Taylor, 1975). Bogdan and Taylor have indicated that a situation has "meaning only through people's interpretations and definitions of it. Their actions, in turn, stem from this meaning" (p. 14). Students and teachers may and often do attach different meanings to the same classroom incidents. They interpret or perceive the classroom reality differently and those differences manifest themselves in classroom behavioral responses.

The data in this study were organized around themes that emerged during inductive analysis. Each theme was developed to stand by itself and possess a
certain degree of autonomy. In addition, the themes have been woven together to form part of a theoretical whole in relation to the concepts of authority and power.\textsuperscript{10}

The themes have been placed in three categories. The first category deals with the processes by which students cope with the teacher's exercise of power. They include: maintaining cool and relieving boredom. The second category focuses on the methods students use to challenge or usurp the teacher's power. Themes in the second category include smarting-off, aggressing, and confronting. The third set of themes relate directly to interactions affecting authority. The themes in this category are transitioning, nonresponding and face-working. Figure 1 illustrates the relationship of the themes within the categorical groupings.\textsuperscript{11}

**Participants Observed and Interviewed**

A list of the participants' names, their school setting and their role within that setting has been delineated to aid the reader in understanding the data (see Table 1). Pseudonyms have been used to protect the identity of each of the classroom participants.

\textsuperscript{10}These concepts are integrally related to the teachers' interpretation of the classroom situation. The nature of the relationship will be discussed in many of the themes.

\textsuperscript{11}The relationships described in Figure 1 are not intended as "pure," but rather serve as a guide in assisting the reader to assimilate the data.
Functional Authority — Power

INTERACTIONS AFFECTING AUTHORITY

Transitioning  Nonresponding  Faceworking

COPING

Maintaining Cool

Relieving Boredom

CHALLENGING

Smarting-off

Aggressing

Ignoring

implies a direct relationship

-- -- implies an indirect relationship

Figure 1

RELATIONSHIP OF THEMES FOR TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTIONS
TABLE 1
PARTICIPANTS INCLUDED IN FIELD NOTE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonames</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Smith</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jones</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Smith</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although only eleven students' names are listed on Table 1, many additional students were observed and involved in incidents. The field notes often were written without mentioning student names. This was done to protect the anonymity of the participants. In addition, the incidents involving students who were interviewed were utilized more frequently since those students could provide a reason for their behavior. Their explanations proved efficacious in interpreting and "making sense of" the incidents since those students could provide something vis-a-vis the meanings they attributed to the observed behaviors.

Authority

Although authority is central to the way a teacher functions in the classroom, the nature of authority may vary as the school year progresses. At the beginning of the school year the teacher relies on formal authority. Formal authority is the teacher's legal right to take charge of the class, establish rules, and utilize the sanctions inherent in the teaching position (Peabody, 1962). It is the teacher's ability to demand respect by virtue of his/her status or "position."

As the year progresses the teacher's formal authority is often supplemented with an authority based on competence. Functional authority evolves out of the teacher's
subject matter competence and interpersonal expertise (Peabody, 1962). It enables the teacher to influence rather than coerce student behavior. The teacher does not have to use coercive power because the students acknowledge and respond to the teacher's demonstrated classroom competence. The students allow the teacher to exercise influence. In Duncan's (1973) terms, the students give the teacher the right to make selected decisions concerning their classroom life. The influence of functional authority is reciprocal, coercion is unilateral.

Functional authority evolves from the manner in which the teacher and students interact. It emerges as the teacher demonstrates competence and exhibits respect. The students, in turn, respond to the teacher because they feel respected and believe in the teacher's competence.

Power

Closely related to authority is the concept of power. Power is often used when an authority relationship is weakened. Teachers have access to many different

12Peabody noted that of the public service agencies he studied (i.e., police, social work, and education), the authority evolving out of professional competence was most noticeable and important with teachers. Teachers felt that they had to be competent and possess certain classroom management and subject matter skills in order to be effective.
types of social power in the classrooms. French and Raven (1960) describe five types of power which can be used by one individual to exert influence or control over another individual: (1) reward power, the ability to mediate rewards; (2) coercive power, the ability to administer punishment in order to control behavior; (3) referent power, the perception of one individual that another individual has the right to prescribe behavior; (4) expert power, the ability to provide specialized desired knowledge, and (5) legitimate power, the ability to be considered the legitimate leader by followers.

Coercive power is utilized when a teacher fails to influence student behavior through the exercise of his/her classroom authority. The teacher who does not have functional authority, who is not given the right to make classroom decisions by the students, will often attempt to enforce his/her definition of the situation by utilizing coercion. Coercive power usually involves verbal or physical manipulation. Its effect stems from the expectation on the part of the student, that he/she will be punished if he/she fails to conform to the teacher's influence attempt. In general, the less the

13Although teachers may use all five types of power, the focus in this study will be primarily on coercive power.
teacher uses coercive power, the more successful he/she is in defining the classroom situation and in engendering functional authority (Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1971).

Coping Techniques

The first two themes identified in the present study focus on methods the students use to cope with the exigencies of classroom life. Particular emphasis will be given to behavior that students exhibit in relation to the teacher's authority and exercise of power. The coping behaviors exhibited by students are part of a larger behavioral repertoire used to engender self-enhancement and self-satisfaction; the behaviors are not, however, intended to denigrate the teacher. The coping behaviors include maintaining cool and relieving boredom.  

Maintaining Cool

Maintaining cool occurred when a student exhibited a specific behavior in order to be accepted by peers. It was a way of gaining or maintaining social acceptability.

Students want to participate in group activities, to be socially accepted by their peers and to know that

---

14 The categories of coping and challenging are not mutually exclusive. The categories are used as one method of organizing, in a generic sense, the data.
they are valued and accepted (Horrocks, 1969; Parke and Heatherington, 1975). There are myriad ways students can gain social acceptance; the means depend to a large extent on the culture within which the students exist (Coleman, 1961). Thus, students in an inner-city school may be required to exhibit behaviors for acceptance which are quite different from those deemed "cool" by suburban or rural students (Fuchs, 1969). "Coolness" is a relative concept, it is relative to the environment within which the student lives.

Most American adolescents value peer esteem more than adult praise (Bronfenbrenner, 1976). The adolescent who wants to be popular must discover from his or her friends how to act, what to wear, and when to speak in order to be accepted. Inner-city students in the present study revealed that one way to gain acceptability, to maintain cool, was by demonstrating physical strength. A good fighter or, at the very least, a "willing" fighter, was almost always liked.

Jane said that fighting between guys tended to be for the purpose of establishing who was cool. Jane said, "There are many ways a student can become cool. Some students do it by fighting. If you aren't afraid to fight, you're cool. If you win fights, you're even cooler."15

15 It should be noted that data and notations were selected that were representative of a particular theme. There were many other incidents and examples that could have been used to corroborate or substantiate the existence of the phenomenon; it was not deemed necessary, however, to use all available anecdotal incidents.
The students accepted fighting as indigenous and necessary to inner-city existence. Whereas adults define such behavior as inappropriate (Today's Education, 1976), students at Sue's school defined fighting as acceptable—particularly when it occurred outside the classroom.\textsuperscript{16}

There is a lot of fighting at the school and I asked Jerry why he thought the fighting occurred. He indicated that the students were just responding to one another according to the way in which they were raised.\textsuperscript{17}

Another form of maintaining cool at the inner-city school was cigarette smoking. Smoking was perceived by the students as acceptable and appropriate behavior. Although no students were ever observed smoking inside the school, cigarettes were the focus of many student conversations and on numerous occasions students were observed smoking on or near school property. Jane (an urban student) indicated that almost everyone she knew smoked, that a student who did not smoke was "straight," and that straight students were not cool.

After talking to a student I returned to my seat. A girl was sitting near where I kept my notes. I sat down and started talking to her. We talked about school, where she used to live, and, finally, how she liked

\textsuperscript{16}There were explicit institutional rules against fighting on the school property.

\textsuperscript{17}The researcher has reservations about whether this was what Jerry actually believed or if this was what he thought the observer wanted to hear.
this junior high school. She said it was a better place than where she lived out in Utah. I asked her why, "Because the kids aren't as 'straight' here." I asked her what "straight" meant. She hedged on answering the question. Finally, Jerry, a boy I've never seen before, said, "It's somebody who doesn't drink, smoke, or take dope."

Smoking in the urban school was one way students could maintain cool. If a student lacked fighting prowess, was not physically attractive, or did not possess certain other desirable attributes, he/she could always resort to smoking. Smoking was a way of gaining acceptance.

Jane said that 99 percent of the students smoked. This showed that they were cool. I asked, "What if a student is really cool, if he can really fight, does he also have to smoke?" Jane said, "No, he's already cool because of his other abilities. The only ones who have to smoke are the students who are so uncool that smoking makes them a bit cooler. It's one way everyone can be accepted."

Smoking was more situational at the suburban school. That is, whether a student smoked regularly depended on the social situation, and on the clique to which the student belonged. Cigarettes were never observed in a student's pocket, and no student was ever observed smoking near the school. Whereas inner-city students seemed to agree that smoking was omnipresent, the students at the suburban school differed in their perceptions about how frequently it occurred.
I asked Larry how many students smoked. He said about one in ten. I asked him if he ever smoked, and he said that he had. I then asked him why he smoked. "Because I thought it made me big."

I asked Nancy how many of the students smoked. She said that almost everyone did. "Nine out of ten, or seven out of ten sounds about right." Nancy said that she didn't smoke but that most of her friends did. I asked her why they smoked. She responded, "Because it makes them feel bigger."

Conclusions about Maintaining Cool. Maintaining cool occurs when a student exhibits behavior specifically so he/she will be accepted by peers. If teachers are going to deal with adolescent behavior, they must have some understanding of what students view as maintaining cool and be aware of the fact that behavior evolves according to the meanings students attach to the immediate classroom or school circumstances.

Although fighting or smoking may be perceived as inappropriate to the teacher, students may view it as

---

18The differing perceptions of students concerning the number of their peers who smoked in the suburban school was probably due to their respective cliques. Nancy's friends often appeared somewhat disaffiliated with the classroom activities and psychologically absent (e.g., daydreaming) from the teaching-learning process. The values of Larry's clique, on the other hand, seemed more commensurate with the behavioral expectations of the teacher (e.g., obeying rules and showing respect). Larry did not feel that a student had to smoke, ignore assignments or act belligerently in order to be cool.
acceptable behavior. The disparity between what the teacher views as inappropriate and what the students view as appropriate may result in misunderstandings and conflict.¹⁹

**Relieving Boredom**

Relieving boredom occurred when a student felt emotionally or intellectually separated from his/her immediate environment. Relieving boredom was a behavioral response to feelings created when an individual was either bombarded by the same stimuli or when there was a lack of variation in stimuli.

Boredom can usually be inferred from the behavior of classroom participants (McKeachie and Doyle, 1971). When students yawn, stare out the window or doodle, it can usually, though not always, be inferred that they are bored.

Relieving boredom is manifested in one of two behavioral forms: self-stimuli and other-stimuli. Self-stimuli include behaviors primarily inner-directed and not intended for audience individuals.

¹⁹Both school systems had strict rules concerning smoking on school property. Jane (the student who stated that almost all students smoked) was suspended from school for smoking near the end of the study.
Jerry was pounding the table at the beginning of the period. This seemed to be more a self-stimulating activity than an effort to confront the teacher. Sue gestured for Jerry to stop and he complied. Soon afterward he started pounding again. He seemed oblivious to everyone and everything. He seemed to be pounding in order to have something to do rather than to cause trouble. When Sue asked him to stop for a second time, he did so without exhibiting any overt negative feelings.

Jerry exhibited self-stimuli during many of the observational sessions. He seemed lost in the pounding, much the same way a jazz drummer is while playing a percussion instrument. Jerry seldom looked at the teacher to see if she noticed his behavior; rather he "blankly" looked around, or stared glassy-eyed at the window while pounding the table. Jerry did not attempt to bother Sue with his behavior or attract the attention of his classmates. He did not observe the teacher or peers for a reaction. Jerry ignored all other classroom participants.

The students (e.g., Jerry) seemed freer to "lose themselves" in their behavior in Sue's room. They relieved boredom almost without restraint.

According to Sue, demonstrative behavior was permissible because the students could not be expected to exhibit self-control.

Sue: So I'm not saying if I had them at another time, like early in the morning, it would be easier, but some of these kids are on buses and they don't have regular clean-up because half of them leave. It's just a
pretty bad situation. But then all this talking and loud gossiping and some of these kids are just real clowns, getting out of their seats and going here and there. And then there are some EMR kids mixed in, too.

Sue felt it was almost natural for the students to act out feelings. Observations in the other urban classroom, however, did not corroborate Sue's beliefs. The overt behaviors observed in Sue's class were never recorded in the other inner-city classroom. The students modified their behavior when they entered their next class. They still exhibited self-stimuli (e.g., daydreaming), but the relieving was less demonstrative.

I went with the students to their next class. They had Mrs. Smith for math. She had a reputation (according to students) as being tough, but fair. The students were very quiet as they entered Mrs. Smith's class. All but one student were present before the bell rang. Mrs. Smith had a circle on the board and told the class to find the diameter, radius, chord and tangent. Most students got busy, a few were dreamy and did not participate but they were quiet throughout the exercise.

The self-stimuli in Bill's class were usually less obvious and more private than those observed in Sue's. The girls in Bill's class, for example, spent large amounts of time working on "slang" books and disguised the activity by making it appear as though they were really working on homework assignments. The students acted involved by camouflaging their attempts to relieve boredom.
One of the students who took advantage of the project time was seated at table seven. She and her friends are very concerned with their appearance. She looked at a notebook with the names of various students listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Sue</th>
<th>Jim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>cute</td>
<td>cute</td>
<td>ugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>nice</td>
<td>nice</td>
<td>sucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nice</td>
<td>nice</td>
<td>sucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>cute</td>
<td>nice</td>
<td>sucks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She sat on the table and quietly read names and descriptors. "Jim, ugh, sucks, sucks, sucks. Jerry, cute, nice, nice, cute." She did this for almost five minutes. Bill was helping students in other parts of the room and did not notice her behavior.

Bill's students had learned how to "con" the teacher. They had developed an understanding of the behaviors which could be exhibited without eliciting the teacher's attention.\(^\text{20}\) The student self-stimuli were adjusted to the parameters of behavioral appropriateness established by Bill.

Other-stimuli was a second form of relieving. Other-stimuli occurred when one student exhibited a behavior to elicit a response from an audience classroom participant. The most common form of other-stimuli observed was classtalk. Classtalk occurred when one student initiated a conversation with another student.

\(^{20}\text{The understanding was inferred from the covert nature of the behavior exhibited by the students.}\)
The teachers usually prohibited classtalk when (1) they were conducting a lesson or (2) they were administering a test. Bill also prohibited classtalk when the students did not respond to planned classroom assignments. In essence, the teachers treated classtalk as misbehavior when it prevented the students from focusing attention either on the lesson or on the teacher.

The talking reached its apex about halfway through the class period but the students were not defiant. In fact, most teachers would probably be pleased to have their room as quiet as Bill's. Bill, however, felt it was too noisy, "Hey! I'm starting to get irritated with all the talking. (pause) I've talked to you individually about the talking." The class got very quiet and Bill continued with the lesson.

... 

Bill started to explain some material relative to the project that had been assigned. A boy in the third row was talking to a neighbor at the same time Bill was giving directions. "Joe, could I have your attention. You've been gone so you need to pay close attention." The boy looked at him and shook his head affirmatively.

... 

The class got fairly quiet as Bill passed out the quiz. The students started on the quiz as soon as they were given a copy. Bill walked around and monitored the room as the students were taking the quiz. Most students seemed hard at work, the talking which did occur did not seem to relate to the test.

Occasionally the students created other-stimuli and then discovered that no one was attending to the behavior.
When this happened, the student exhibiting the other-stimuli usually discontinued the behavior.

Phil worked on the art assignment except during the middle of the period when he discovered a dead bird and started laughing and looking around. Sue ignored the incident as did most of the students. A couple of students asked Phil what he was kicking; he told them, but the result was not disruptive since the inquiring students quickly lost interest. Phil then sat down and started working again.

When Phil discovered he was not eliciting the attention of his peers he stopped the kicking. His behavior was classified as other-stimuli behavior because he looked to see if he had an audience for his actions. When the kicking was not reinforced, Phil stopped and returned to the assigned activities.

Conclusions about Relieving Boredom. Relieving boredom occurs when a student feels emotionally or intellectually separated from the classroom milieu. It is a behavioral response to boredom. The type and amount of relieving behavior depend on the classroom environment within which the student functions. It would appear that the greater the teacher's expectations for student self-control, the greater the chances that relieving is private rather than public.

Relieving boredom is manifested in self-stimuli and other-stimuli. The latter is usually more disruptive than the former since it involves more than one person. Other-stimuli is observed primarily as classtalk.
Classtalk is situational behavior and is situationally inappropriate when the following are extant: (1) the teacher is talking, (2) the teacher is administering a test, or (3) the students are not working on assignments.

When other-stimuli are exhibited by a student but not reinforced by another classroom participant it diminishes.

**Challenging Techniques**

Students sometimes exhibit behaviors which directly or indirectly challenge the teacher's right to exercise power and/or maintain authority. This section will focus on three techniques students use to challenge and gradually erode the teacher's power: aggressing, smarting-off, and ignoring. The challenges implicitly or explicitly test the teacher's ability to control student behavior and often provide evidence that the teacher's classroom authority can be or has been diminished.

**Aggressing**

Aggressing involved the intent to inflict pain and occurred when one individual intentionally tried to hurt another individual either physically or psychologically.
How and why aggressing and aggressive behavior is expressed is deeply rooted in a culture (Mikesell and Hanson, 1952). A participant from a traditional culture will aggress differently from a participant in a developed society (Chagnon, 1968). Not only will the form of aggressing differ, but the incidence of aggressive acts will also be affected by cultural factors.

Rosenfeld (1971) points out that behavior cannot be isolated from larger cultural patterns. Children in an urban setting may manifest more aggressive behaviors in school, not because they are innately more aggressive, but because such behavior may be necessary for survival. Their aggressive behavior is, therefore, engendered by the environment within which they live.

The student-student aggressing observed in this study was expressed in either real or ritualized behavior.\textsuperscript{21} Real aggressing was an interaction involving the intent to inflict physical pain. Most teachers would label real aggressing as clearly inappropriate behavior (Today's Education, 1976). In the present study, very little real aggressing was observed in either school.

\textsuperscript{21}Student-student aggressing indirectly challenged the teacher's ability to maintain control of the classroom. The students attempted to assert their own definition of the classroom situation (i.e. aggressing) rather than conforming to the one promulgated by the teacher.
The consequences of physical encounters, however, were frequently evidenced in the urban school.

As I walked back to my usual place I noticed that one of the girls had two black eyes—really black. The girl is tall and attractive and seems to want to act tough. I asked her how she got the black eyes. She said she had been in a fight with another girl. "What about?" I asked. She said that she had asked a guy the time and it made his girlfriend mad—thus, the fight.

The real aggressing, the serious attempts to inflict pain, occurred outside the school classroom. Only the effects of real aggressing (as in the above example) were ever observed within the school setting.

Most aggressing within the classrooms was ritual (i.e. ceremonial interactions) rather than real. The ritual aggressing was usually over minor differences and was often accompanied by a significant amount of smiling or laughing. Ritual aggressing appeared to tacitly confirm existing classroom social hierarchies, to reinforce the "pecking order" of the strongest and toughest students. Students who thought they were tough would occasionally ritually assert themselves to insure that no one had forgotten who was "boss." To assert one's self in this manner appeared to be both socially necessary and appropriate.

At that point a fight broke out in the front of the room; when Sue stopped the fight it appeared as though the students were in more of a jousting mood than a fighting one. Even though Sue stood between them, the students half-heartedly slapped at each other.

...
After Sharon left, Jerry stood up, doubled his fist, and walked over to a smaller boy. He nonverbally communicated do-you-wanna-fight? The smaller boy declined. Jerry returned to his seat and the smaller boy doubled his fist indicating he was ready now that Jerry was across the room and back at his seat. Jerry sat down anyway.

The ritualized aggressing was communicated through either visual and verbal signals and carried an implied threat. The signals were exhibited so that recipients were made aware of the sender's intent. A student, for example, who shadow boxed could communicate to everyone that he was tough. The shadow boxing became a public statement of a latent physical ability.

As the students entered the room there were many faked fights. One particularly large seventh grade boy carefully "planted" punches into the air as other students viewed the imaginary bout.

Most of the gestures and much of the talk was reminiscent of stereotypic "tough boys," the girls were less noticeable and tended to be quieter; they seemed more anxious to obey the teacher's rules.

Student-student verbal ritualized aggressing was observed with less frequency than the visual nonverbal threats. One student did report, however, that inter-student verbal aggression was a primary cause of some after-school fights:

Nancy said that she thought there were a lot of fights at the school. Most of the fights tended to be between girls and the reason for the squabbles was name-calling. She said that the worst name somebody could be called was a fag.
Student-teacher aggressing was manifested primarily as sarcasm. Sue experienced more ritualized aggressing (sarcasm) than Bill. Mikesell and Hanson (1952) have indicated that individuals of inferior status use sarcasm as a method of equalizing relationships. The students in Sue's room, therefore, may have used sarcasm to inflict sufficient pain to damage Sue's status and enhance their own. Sarcasm became an agent for facilitating teacher-student equality, a means of destroying the extant superordinate-subordinate classroom hierarchy.

While Sue was leading a discussion the students talked openly to one another. Many students made comments about art. "This art class sucks" and "This activity is stupid" were two of the remarks. Sue ignored the comments since she was still trying to get the students quiet enough to discuss the quiz.

Faust (1977) indicated that sarcastic remarks are usually directed toward an individual's psychological or physical vulnerabilities. When students want to hurt a teacher they criticize the teacher's vulnerabilities. Although vulnerabilities vary from individual to individual, there are some "universals." Jerseld (1955) has

22Henry (1957) studied forms of aggressing in American classrooms and found that students in urban schools are more aggressive towards the teacher (a representative of the middle class) while in suburban schools students exhibit more aggression towards each other. Part of the aggressing Sue experienced, therefore, may have been due to status differences created by the environment within which she taught.
identified one of the universals for teachers as the fear of not having adequate pedagogical competence. Teachers want to know that they are doing a good job and are anxious about their effectiveness in communicating course content. They want students to enjoy the lessons they prepare. Sarcastic remarks directed at a teacher's instructional abilities (e.g. "This activity is stupid" and "This art class sucks") are particularly pernicious because they focus on the teacher's fears of not performing well in the classroom.

**Conclusions about Aggressing.** Aggressing involves the intent to inflict pain and occurs when one individual tries to hurt another individual either physically or psychologically. Most aggressing in the classroom is ritual or ceremonial. The student-student ritual aggressing tacitly confirms classroom social hierarchies and is communicated through visual or verbal signs.

The student-to-teacher ritual aggressing consists primarily of sarcasm. Teachers can control the amount of sarcasm in their rooms by reducing the status differences between the students and themselves. When the students feel inferior, they express sarcasm in order to equalize the relationship.

**Smarting-off**

Smarting-off was a subtle technique for challenging teacher authority. In each case of smarting-off observed
in Sue's classroom, a student disguised a satirical remark in the context of a legitimate response.²³ The intent of smarting-off was to cause a loss of face to the teacher. The student quips were implicitly sardonic and denigrated the teacher, particularly when the teacher ignored smarting-off behavior.

A girl stood in front of the observer and talked to some of the other students. Sue saw her and told her to sit down. The girl said that she was telling the students at the table something. Sue said, "Sit down and do something." Mary responded (while walking back to her desk), "I did something. I put three toothpicks together." Sue stared at her, the girl smiled as she returned to her seat.²⁴

Mary was standing near her table during clean-up. Sue asked her, "Are you all cleaned up?" Mary looked at her arms and said, "No, I'm dirty." Mary seemed to take delight in her retort, smiled and looked around at her friends.

The girl in the preceding examples was playing a verbal game with Sue and Sue's failure to respond implied an inability to verbally compete. Foster (1974) observed a similar phenomenon when, in his book Ribbin', Jivin' and Playin' the Dozens, he noted that teachers

²³Very little smarting-off was observed in Bill's classroom.

²⁴Most students in the class had developed complex toothpick sculptures using forty or fifty toothpicks.
who cannot compete in verbal exchanges with students lose face. Similarly, Sue's habit of repeatedly ignoring acts of smarting-off may have been injurious because of the student perceptions created vis-a-vis Sue's verbal abilities.25

The loss of face for Sue occurred because the students choose not to respond to the implied meaning of Sue's query. In one of the preceding examples Sue asked, "Are you cleaned up?" and the student responded, "No, I'm dirty." The student's response was semantically correct. The response was not, however, interpreted by the teacher as appropriate (i.e. Sue stared at Mary after the comment had been made).26 The student indirectly threatened the teacher's "position" without endangering her own status; she caused a loss of face to the teacher without incurring a punishment.

The students continued to "push" Sue. Sue walked up to the front of the room and looked like she was about to cry. The students got very quiet. Sue picked up a pen and started to write. The students remained quiet while Sue wrote. Sue finally looked up, her face seemed very tense as she asked the students for their attention. . . . At this point Sue said, "We're losing time!" to which Joyce, a girl in the back of the room responded, "Losing it? We've already lost it!"

25 On the basis of teacher-student interactions, the researcher inferred the perceptions of the classroom participants.

26 The stare carried a nonverbal stop-that message.
Conclusions about Smarting-off. Smarting-off engenders a loss of face for the teacher because the satirical verbalization is public. Smarting-off is implicit ridicule disguised as a legitimate response to a teacher query or statement. Teacher nonresponse to smarting-off implies a lack of verbal competence; the students perceive the teacher as being unable to respond rather than unwilling to respond. The loss of student-perceived teacher competence concomitantly erodes the teacher's functional authority.

Ignoring

Ignoring occurred when a student intentionally ignored a directive from a teacher. Student nonresponse was classified as ignoring only when it was intentional. If a student acknowledged verbally or nonverbally a teacher directive, then refused to respond to the directive, it was assumed that the student was ignoring (i.e. challenging) the teacher's right to control classroom behavior.

Ignoring was one way to subvert teacher efforts to control student actions. It meant that students, rather than the teacher, would define the classroom situation.

\(^{27}\)Intentionality was inferred from the student's responses to the teacher.
The students implicitly defined the situation through noncompliance to teacher requests.

The noise level again became sufficiently loud that Sue could not proceed. She walked over and turned off the lights and told the students to put their heads down. Four or five boys refused to put their heads down. . . . Joe said, "Look what it says on the screen." Sue responded, "Joe, put your head down!" Joe ignored the command. Sue repeated the desist. "Joe, put your head down!" Joe looked at Sue and very slowly turned around. He did not, however, put his head down.

Sue asked John to stop pounding the table. At first he was drumming with his fingers. "Stop that John." John continued pounding. Stop! This time Sue used a nonverbal I-mean-it gesture. John stopped using his fingers and started using his whole hand. Stop! Again Sue used a nonverbal desist gesture. Then she walked over and talked to him. John stopped pounding. Sue stood up, walked away, and John started pounding again. Sue turned and looked at him. He hit his hands on the table very slowly. Sue and John stared at one another for a very short time. John slowly hit the table with his hands. Sue turned and walked away. John stopped pounding and started the quiz.28

At the front of the room one of the students was creating quite a racket by dropping his books. The first time he dropped them Sue ignored the incident. The behavior persisted and the books were soon dropped again. Sue looked out of the corner of her eye and gave a rather forceful stop-it glare. The boy was

28Although the focus of this study was not nonverbal behavior, it is important to note that a substantial number of teacher desists were nonverbal in character.
undeterred by the nonverbal desist; he picked up his books as if to drop them a third time. Sue walked over and stood in front of him. He was preparing to drop them again when Sue said, "If you do it again . . . ." (she never finished the threat!). The boy dropped the books very slowly. Sue put her hands on the books and his hands. The boy looked around, then stopped the behavior.

By not being able to actualize desists, Sue failed to create the feeling that she could control classroom behavior. The students appeared to learn that ignoring teacher desists was acceptable, that they did not have to respond to teacher reprimands. The students were controlling, rather than being controlled.

Two boys were walking around looking at other projects (i.e., sculptures) in the room. "Boys, sit down." Both boys ignored Sue's request. Again, "Boys, sit down." The boys reacted the same way the second time—they ignored the desist. Sue got up, walked over to them, and as she approached one of the boys returned to his seat. The other boy remained standing. Sue said, "Jerry, we'll look at the projects at the end of the period." I thought the boy would give Sue a rough time and refuse to be seated but Sue's comment seemed to reduce the tension; the boy accepted her logic and walked back to his seat.

Sue responded to the boys' behavior by treating ignoring as unacceptable. She did not permit ignoring to be defined as appropriate and influenced, rather than coerced, John's behavior by giving him a reason for complying with the directive (i.e. "We'll look at the projects at the end of the period"). The request served as a status equalizer. Sue publicly acknowledged and recognized not only the student's interest in the
project, but also, indirectly, his worth as an individual. The student did not, as a consequence have to challenge Sue to enhance his status. Sue influenced the student's behavior through a request rather than explicitly attempting to control it by exercising power.

Influence relationships have a reciprocal character and are built on respect (Duncan, 1973). In the previous example Sue's request was a gesture of respect, not coercion. Sue respected John enough to make the request, John reciprocated by allowing himself to be influenced.

Sue told the students that class would be held outside. The assignment was to draw an object up close. Sue tried to explain what was to occur. Joe and a few other students didn't listen. She told the class to be quiet. Joe was looking through what appeared to be a yearbook. Sue asked him to put it away. He did not respond. Sue continued, "I know it's interesting, but I want you to listen for a few minutes." Joe closed the book, then partially opened it a few minutes later.

By identifying with the feeling state of the student (i.e. "I know it's interesting"), Sue's request became implicitly less coercive. Sue recognized and respected the student's needs and interests. The student reciprocated by temporarily responding to Sue's request and permitting his behavior to be influenced.  

Wegmann (1976) also observed that teachers use explanation to reduce the feeling that they are arbitrary in making decisions. "By the use of such expressions of sympathy, the teacher simultaneously admits that student conduct is understandable--and directs that it must cease" (p. 77).
Conclusions about Ignoring. Ignoring occurs when a student intentionally disregards a directive from the teacher. Ignoring is a covert method of subverting teacher efforts to exercise control. It enables the students rather than the teacher to define the classroom situation. When ignoring is tolerated (i.e. when the teacher does not cause the student to respond) the students learn that disregarding teacher directives is acceptable and appropriate behavior.

Teachers should respond to ignoring by attempting to exercise influence. Influence is reciprocal in nature and is based on interpersonal respect. An individual allows himself/herself to be influenced by someone he/she respects. Treating students with respect increases the teacher's ability to exercise influence and concomitantly elicit the desired student responses to teacher-initiated requests.

Interactions Affecting Authority

There are some classroom interactions which directly influence the teacher's authority. The teacher's behavior during such interactions and the way in which the teacher uses power partially determines the nature of subsequent teacher-student encounters. The themes discussed in this section focus on interactions affecting the teacher's relationship with students and ability to exercise authority.
Transitioning

Two of the most critical points in a class period are the opening and closing exercises (Wegmann, 1976). The "opening" is important because it is during this time that the teacher's definition of the classroom situation evolves. The closing is significant because it sums up the effect of the interaction and demonstrates what the participants can expect during their next encounter (Goffman, 1967).

Openings. During openings the students observe the teacher's behavior for hints of what to expect during the class period. Specifically: Is the teacher in a good or bad mood? Will the teacher accept goofing around or does he/she expect hard work? The teacher, in turn, searches for cues concerning the students' behavioral goals. Are they restless or docile? Are they going to shape up quickly or will firm action have to be taken to get the class under control?

Bill created and enforced his definition of the classroom situation during an opening by utilizing certain tacit understandings which evolved out of and resulted from past encounters with the students. The understandings were inferred from the manner in which the students responded to Bill's opening cues.
The understandings included Bill's right to determine (1) the amount of classroom noise, (2) the nature of the classroom learning activities, (3) the punishment procedures for students who challenge the tacit rule system, and (4) the procedures on how and when lessons would be initiated (i.e., the amount of talking permitted between the time than the bell rang and the lesson was initiated).

The tacit understandings developed out of Bill's myriad interactions with the students. Because of the way Bill reacted to students during the past encounters, the students developed certain expectations vis-a-vis the present. They expected Bill, not themselves, to define the parameters of classroom behavior. They expected Bill to determine when the class lesson would be initiated. They gave Bill the right to "open" class.

Bill used a word or phrase as a cue to students that the tacit rule system would be instituted. The primary cue word for Bill was "attention." Bill opened class by saying the cue word, waiting for quiet, and then proceeding with the lesson.

After the students were seated Bill said, "Give me your attention." (Pause) "Attention!" He never really raised his voice; rather he spoke softly and calmly. The students got quiet and Bill started the lesson.

The use of the word attention was an explicit reminder of the rules Bill ossified during past encounters.
The students usually accepted Bill's definition of the situation, recognized his right to open class (i.e. acknowledged his authority) and responded to the cue word.

There were, however, occasions when the students tested Bill's authority to open class. The behavior of the students during such "testing" periods consisted of talking, folding papers and looking around. When "testing" occurred Bill reasserted his right to open by using a form of stimulus generalization; he moved from the cue word attention to a synonym for the cue word. He changed the stimulus, but hoped for the same response (i.e., the acceptance of his definition of the classroom situation). The synonym cue word Bill used most frequently was "quiet."

Bill started class by saying, "Attention, your attention please." The class did not respond. Bill said, "O.K., quiet!" The class got quiet. Bill said, "Ah, quiet works. I can't use 'attention' anymore."

On two occasions, the stimulus generalization technique also proved insufficient and Bill was forced to supply a reason for his right to open class. Implicit in the reason was a reminder of the tacit rule system giving Bill the authority to define the parameters of classroom behavior.

Bill asked for quiet so that class could be started. The students didn't get very quiet. Bill said, "Wait a minute; I don't hear quiet. I asked for quiet." (pause) "We have a lot to do today."
Sue's classroom opening procedures also followed a pattern. The students were expected to walk in, pick up a ditto, sit down, and work quietly until Sue exhibited some type of verbal cue requesting everyone's attention.

When the students entered the room they picked up a ditto and started to work. It seemed as though almost everyone participated in this activity. Sue took attendance just as she usually does during this time. Only one boy was abstaining from working on the ditto. Sue evidently noted that his pencil was broken. "John, you can go sharpen your pencil." "Where at?" queried John. Sue responded, "In the library." The rest of the class continued to work.

Unlike Bill, Sue was usually unable to establish control with an opening verbal cue. She utilized coercive techniques to elicit a conforming response from the class.

The students were really "high" at the beginning of class. Sue struggled to get their attention. At one point she started "counting-on" the students: "1, 2, 3, 4." While she did this some of the students counted with her. Sue ignored this at first, then she said, "Students who are counting will get detentions."

Sue had to "count-on" the students twice at the beginning of the period. The students would quiet down while Sue counted, once she stopped counting the noise level would increase. Finally, Sue walked over to the blackboard. (It appeared as though she was going to write down names for detention.) The students were quiet while Sue was poised near the board. Once she moved away, however, the noise level increased.

Sue's openings were based more on power than on authority. The students did not give Sue the right to
open class. Sue was forced to subjugate the students to her power in order to elicit a conforming response. Unfortunately, the use of threats and implied punishments appeared to produce the phenomenon Sue was striving to eliminate and created resistance rather than conformity.

French and Raven (1960) have hypothesized that use of coercion may lead to increased resistance and decreased attraction of the party being coerced towards the individual employing coercion. The students in the above examples resisted Sue's efforts to control their behavior. They only responded to Sue (i.e. became quiet) when punishment seemed imminent. When the possibility of punishment was removed, the students resumed their misbehavior.

Closings. Goffman (1967) asserted that farewells (e.g., classroom closings) sum up the effect of an encounter and indicate what participants may expect the next time they meet. Using Goffman's assertion as a framework, it can be postulated that teachers try to close class so students know what to expect the next time the class convenes. To do this, teachers establish specific procedures for closing class.

Bill usually closed class by requesting that students be quiet. He used the same cue word (attention) to initiate a closing, to elicit quiet, as he did during
the opening. Bill, however, found closings more difficult to actualize than openings; it was never as easy to exercise authority at the end of the class as it was at the beginning.

At the end of class Bill said, "Attention, attention, please!" The noise level of the class did not change. Bill said (much more forcefully than he had before), "I'll start again. I want everyone's attention." The class got quiet.

The students appeared to acknowledge and give Bill the right to determine classroom activities until the class closing. Their behavior then changed, they were less willing to respond to Bill's "closing" requests. As a result, Bill frequently moved from a cue word to the use of coercive power to control student behavior.

Bill walked to the front of the class and said he wanted to make a few closing comments. The noise level for the class immediately rose. Many students were standing up, most talked and Bill responded, "Hey, give me your attention." The talking persisted. Bill became noticeably disturbed and walked over to one boy in the front row of the class, grabbed his head, looked directly at him and said, "I want everyone's attention." This action brought about quiet in the classroom.

Sue usually closed class by announcing clean-up. The students were assigned clean-up tasks to perform during the last five minutes of the period. On a few occasions the students did respond by partially cleaning the room. Usually, however, the students pretended not to hear Sue and carried on with their activities as though Sue had not initiated a closing.
Sue told the students to clean up the room better than they had during the last class. After the cleaning process had begun most students were walking around and not paying attention to Sue or the cleaning.

... 

The students were really acting up at the end of class. Some were walking around, some were talking and still others were goofing around. Sue tried "counting on" the students but that didn't work. She threatened detentions, told individual students to sit down, and finally flipped off the lights and gave the students "ten seconds." She said, "I will not let you go until you are quiet." The class got a little quieter but never absolutely silent. Sue excused them anyway.

The request for quiet in the second example was seemingly imposed to establish who would define the classroom situation, the students or Sue. Sue did not give a reason for her demand, she simply threatened to punish students who did not conform. The students resisted Sue's effort to exercise control (i.e. they became only a little quieter) and responded only to the extent necessary to be excused from class. By resisting Sue's coercive efforts, the students were still able to define the classroom situation. 30

30 Implicitly, the students were establishing the fact that during the next classroom encounter they, not the teacher, would define the classroom situation. Sue's inability to initiate a class closing on this occasion would affect her efforts to actualize subsequent classroom openings and closings.
Conclusions about Transitioning. Two of the most critical points in a class period are the opening and closing exercises. The opening is important because it is during this time that the teacher's definition of the classroom situation evolves. The closing is significant because it sums up the effect of the encounter and demonstrates what the participants can expect during the next interaction.

Teachers initiate an opening with some type of cue word or standard procedure. Implicit in the cue or procedure is a set of understandings which have evolved out of past teacher-student encounters. If the understandings include the fact that the teacher will define the classroom situation, the opening will probably be effective; i.e., the students will respond to the teacher's cue. If the understandings which have emerged do not give the teacher the right to define behavior, the opening will be ignored or challenged.

Class closings sum up the effect of the teacher-student encounter. It is usually more difficult for teachers to exercise authority during a class closing than during an opening. Teachers are often forced to use coercion during a closing in order to enforce their definition of the classroom situation.
Nonresponding

Nonresponding occurred when a teacher chose not to respond to an exhibited student behavior--behavior usually treated as misbehavior. Both teachers who were observed asserted that nonresponding proved effective in preventing some forms of student behavior from being continued or exacerbated.

Sue: Sometimes I think the result (of ignoring behavior) is positive, at other times it is negative. You have to feel the situation out. If I think the situation is potentially explosive I'll ignore it; if I think the students can handle the reprimand, I respond. 31

Bill: I hope I'd ignore anything that I feel would cost the group more time than it would save them. Ah, a particularly explosive kind, I would rather isolate or ignore than confront. Those things which would disrupt only a couple of students and could stay at that level, things that I couldn't deal with at the time. I'd rather go on with the group and allow that to happen, at least as long as there isn't any disruption of the group or any kind of equipment or somebody's property.

The teachers determined whether to exhibit nonresponse on the basis of the amount of classroom conflict.

31 The phrase "of ignoring behavior" was not part of Sue's statement. It was the focus of the question eliciting Sue's response.
occurring during recent student-teacher encounters. Nonresponding gave an angry student a chance to calm down. It provided the student with a cooling-off period. The teachers felt that a response to student misbehavior after substantial recent teacher-student conflict might exacerbate existing student enmity and cause the students to react aggressively. Nonresponse was utilized to avoid trouble, to prevent unnecessary conflict.

Joyce made a number of faces at Bill. None of the faces could be seen by Bill. They appeared to satisfy only Joyce and possibly the girl across the hall. On a couple of occasions Joyce slapped her notebook shut. This behavior was obvious but Bill did not respond. Near the middle of the period Joyce angrily moved her chair back about five feet and then slowly moved it back to its original position. This, too, went unreprimanded. About two-thirds of the way through the period, Joyce's anger seemed to dissipate. Bill called on her once or twice and asked her to help him, which she did.

Nonresponding provided students with an opportunity to vent emotions. It gave students a chance to act out feelings.

---

32 Recent encounters entailed interactions occurring on the day the nonresponding was exhibited.

33 Joyce had been severely reprimanded by Bill earlier in the period on the day this observation was conducted.
Nonresponding was also used to justify subsequent use of coercive power. Intentionally allowing some types of student behavior to occur enabled teachers to create guilt within students for exhibiting that behavior. The guilt caused the students to be angry with themselves rather than the teacher; the students would turn their anger inward rather than outward.

Bill: Every guy in that group is interested in the subject matter. I really, more than anything else, wanted to let them go to the place where I could really lay something heavy on them, then ask them why they did what they did. Ah, I did that in the form of having a couple of them come in after class. I told them they'd have to come after school, but it ended up being for just three minutes to smooth out the wax on the pan that they were cutting up. I just thought it would be better to give 'em a little bit of rope and let 'em go to a point where I could justifiably be angry with them. Or that they would understand they'd gone too far rather than get on their "case" for starting to screw around.

... 

Throughout the last part of the class period the boys at one of the tables spent most of their time playing with the specimens. Bill seemed to notice the activity but did not respond to it. The class was dissecting worms. The boys flipped the worms, stabbed them and dragged them around the table. Finally Bill said, "Larry move to that table." (Bill pointed to a table near the back of the room.) Larry immediately moved but he took no notes or materials with him. He moved without protest or argument.
By allowing students to continue behaviors perceived as misbehavior, Bill justified and legitimatized the subsequent use of coercion not only to himself but also to students. When legitimacy has been established, French and Raven (1960) hypothesized that a coerced "party" exhibits minimal resistance to subsequent coercive attempts by a superordinate. In this study, legitimacy engendered through nonresponse enabled Bill to use coercive power without fearing an adverse reaction from the students. Bill could punish students without creating counteraggression.

The observational data also indicated that nonresponse was used by teachers to prevent behavior from being reinforced. Sue felt that if some student behaviors were ignored, the behaviors would stop because the source of reinforcement (i.e., the teacher's reaction) would be eliminated.

As usual Sue had the students working on a ditto to start the period. After a few minutes had passed Sue said, "O.K. let's go over the answers. Ladies and gentlemen, I need your attention. (pause) Gary, would you see if you can read above the noise." One student was hissing, other students were pounding the tables, and still others were talking and moving around. Sue did not respond to the distractions and tried to focus her attention on Gary.

Sue's nonresponse appeared to adversely affect student behavior. Nonresponse was perceived by students as an overt manifestation of Sue's inability to control.
About halfway through the period I walked around the class and talked to some of the students. I asked one of the students why she "counted-on" Sue last week. The student responded, "Because the teacher wouldn't do anything. She is fun to heckle. She can't control us." All the students at the table seemed to be in agreement with the remarks.

Sue viewed nonresponse as non-reinforcement and felt that by not giving students attention when they misbehaved, inappropriate behaviors would be extinguished. In contrast, the students perceived nonresponse as an indication of Sue's inability to exercise authority and, more importantly, a fear of responding. The students did not see nonresponse as a managerial technique.

I asked John why the students misbehaved in Sue's class. He said that Sue didn't have authority, that she was afraid or scared of kids. He said that because of this fear, the kids tried to make her angry.

**Conclusions about Nonresponse.** Nonresponding occurs when teachers choose not to respond to student behavior they define as misbehavior. It is most appropriate when the emotional involvement of students exhibiting misbehavior is high and when the teacher has engendered functional authority. The level of emotional involvement is determined by the amount of conflict between the teacher and students during recent encounters. The greater the amount of recent conflict, the greater the students' emotional involvement.

Nonresponse is also used as a way of justifying coercive power. It is effective in this regard when
the students perceive their behavior as inappropriate and the teacher is, as a consequence, able to legitimate the use of coercion.

Nonresponse affects teacher authority when the students interpret nonresponding as an indicator of teacher weakness. The teacher's authority is diminished because the students view the teacher as lacking the ability or competence to stop behavior perceived as misbehavior.

**Faceworking**

Faceworking occurs when an individual helps himself/herself or someone else save face. Goffman (1967) asserts that face is the "positive social value an individual effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (p. 5). When an individual is treated the way he/she expects, or better than he/she expects, positive feelings about the encounter are usually the consequence; the individual "feels good." Conversely, when expectations of self are not fulfilled, when face is questioned, an individual may experience distress or anger and, concomitantly, lose face.

Because of the harmful effects associated with losing face, human beings have developed a repertoire of faceworking interactions. When face has been
threatened, facework can be initiated either by the person whose face has been threatened or by the individual employing a threat. Failure to initiate facework procedures by one party induces compensatory effort from the other; in turn, a contribution by one relieves the other of responsibility.

Some teachers are experts at faceworking and know how to help students out of situations which could cause the students a loss of face. They know how to protect the esteem of the student.

I accompanied the students as they changed classes. They had Mrs. Smith the next period. Mrs. Smith has a reputation for being tough but fair. The students were very quiet as they entered her class. All but one student were in attendance before the bell rang. Mrs. Smith had a circle on the board and told them to find the diameter, radius, chord, and tangent. Most students got busy, a few were "dreamy" and did not participate. They were quiet throughout the exercise. As Mrs. Smith changed activities she walked around the room and looked at each student's work. She encouraged the students to help their neighbors. She came to one student who was not working. She said, "John, you need a pencil." Mrs. Smith pointed to a pencil on her desk. The student lethargically got up and retrieved the pencil. She went to another pupil who was not working and said, "Your book is over there." She pointed to her desk. She never raised her voice. The student got the book, opened it, and started working.

John, the student who retrieved the pencil, acted like a tough guy; someone who did what he wanted, when he wanted. The teacher appeared to be aware of John's

---

34 On the day this observation was made John was slouching in his chair with his arms tightly crossed over his chest. He also wore a sweatshirt which read, "FCK--The Only Thing Missing Is You."
self-image and did not threaten his "claims" about himself. Mrs. Smith provided John with an excuse for his inactivity and enabled John to get busy without losing face. Indirectly Mrs. Smith was telling the rest of the class, "John isn't working because he doesn't have a pencil. I have given him one. Now he can get busy."

Mrs. Smith did not treat John's behavior as misbehavior. She responded as though his inactivity was acceptable given his lack of materials. By responding noncommittally, Mrs. Smith enabled John to start work without openly acknowledging that his indolent behavior was wrong. Privately John may have realized that his laziness was inappropriate, but publicly he could use the excuse furnished by Mrs. Smith. In Goffman's terms, Mrs. Smith treated John better than he expected.

Another form of faceworking observed in both classes was interstudent smiling. The smiling was usually exhibited following a teacher desist. It served as a signal from the reprimanded student to other classroom participants indicating, "I'm O.K., I'm not hurt."35

Bill discussed the scoring of the projects at length near the end of the period. The students were all getting restless. When Bill passed their scoring sheets back, the students got very quiet.

35Smiling, as a form of facework, was observed primarily in Bill's class. Smiling in Sue's class appeared to reflect implicit contempt for Sue's inability to respond to student behavior or her inability to effectively actualize desists.
"Polly, I'm about to get angry, put your feet down." Polly had her feet on the chair in front of her. She put her feet down as Bill demanded, she then folded her arms across her chest. The girl next to her nudged her and smiled. Polly returned the smile.

... 

At the end of the period the fan magazine followers were having a friendly conversation and not getting much work done. Bill noticed this and walked over, knelt down beside one of the girls and talked to her for two or three minutes. The other girls at the table were intent on Bill's remarks. When Bill got up and left, the girls looked at one another and smiled.

The smile was a self-preservation technique utilized to prevent a loss of face. It did not challenge the teacher's power; in fact, it was not even intended for the teacher, it was directed toward audience pupils.

The smiling was a safety valve for student emotions. It enabled students to be expressive without creating a disturbance. Licata and Willower (1975) concluded that such behavior may prove efficacious in fostering classroom stability since students are provided with an innocuous means of expressing themselves.

More importantly, smiling did not challenge the teacher's exercise of control, or cause the teacher to lose face. The teacher could integrate the smiling behavior into the learning situation by pretending not to observe the interstudent nonverbal interaction.

**Conclusion about Faceworking.** Faceworking procedures enable a student (or teacher) to save face in a potentially
threatening situation. To know how and when to face-work the teacher must have some understanding of the perceptions students have about themselves and classroom activities. Facework is often manifested in the form of an explanation or excuse: one individual provides another individual with an excuse for exhibiting a certain type of behavior.

Interstudent facework often takes the form of smiling. Smiling is a reaction to the school's authority system and its intent is not to denigrate others, but to maintain self. Smiling is usually semi-private and does not necessitate a teacher reaction. Teacher nonresponse is effective with smiling because the student is trying to save face; he/she is not trying to cause the teacher to lose face. It is a way for the student to extricate his/her self from a potentially pernicious situation and reestablish rapport with peers.

Summary

This study was exploratory and designed to generate data about behavior perceived by classroom participants as misbehavior. Analysis of the data proceeded in an inductive fashion with particular emphasis on the incidents observed during the study. From the incidents, concepts or tentative themes were induced. Primary attention was given to the manner in which the various participants defined classroom events. The literature
in the social and behavioral sciences was examined and
the themes were modified to include the concepts,
models and/or paradigms discussed by other researchers.

Definitions and conclusions for each theme were
delineated. The implications of the themes vis-a-vis
future research and teacher classroom behavior will be
discussed in the next chapter.
A review of the literature revealed the need for additional research on behavior labeled as misbehavior by teachers. Most previous research on misbehavior has been conducted in artificial laboratory settings. Extensive research has shown that the setting in which a phenomenon is observed affects the nature of the findings (Wilson, 1977). The present research was undertaken, therefore, in a setting where behavioral phenomena occur naturally, in the classroom. The data were inductively analyzed to determine how teachers and students defined, perceived, and reacted to misbehavior. The researcher focused on four topics during the investigation:

(1) Identifying the meanings teachers attach to behavior they perceive as misbehavior;
(2) Assessing the nature or character of classroom misbehavior;
(3) Identifying the meanings students attach to the behavior they exhibit;
(4) Assessing the nature or character of teacher responses to behavior treated as misbehavior.
Summary

The study was exploratory and designed to generate data about behavior treated by classroom participants as misbehavior. The data were collected from April 22 to June 6, 1977. The classes observed were in two junior high schools--one was an inner-city school and the other suburban. The teacher in the inner-city school was a female with five years of teaching experience while the suburban school teacher was a male with six years of teaching experience.

Teachers were asked to assess how troublesome student behavior was during each class period. A moderately troublesome class for each teacher was then selected and observed every day it was in session. The students from the moderately troublesome class (in both urban and suburban settings) were observed interacting with at least one other teacher in that setting.

The observer sat in the back of each class during observations.\(^{36}\) The focus of the observations was on student behavior indirectly or directly defined by the teacher as off-task. Off-task behavior was inferred

\(^{36}\)Although technological devices (e.g. tape recorders and videotape machines) are often used to record student-teacher interactions, such equipment was not utilized in this study because of their affect on the classroom reality.
when a student did not respond to a stimulus initiated by the teacher. The observer focused on the class until a student was observed exhibiting off-task behavior which might be classified by the teacher as inappropriate. Inappropriate off-task behavior was determined using four sources of information: (1) interviews with the teachers, (2) informal conversations with students, (3) observations of behavior nonverbally or verbally stopped by the teachers, and (4) the researcher's subjective perceptions.

When inappropriate student behavior was observed, three aspects of the phenomenon were noted:

(1) The nature of the behavior the student exhibited;
(2) The response of the teacher to the behavior;
(3) The reaction of the student to the teacher, or how the student reacted after the teacher responded to the inappropriate behavior.

After each of the observations, extensive field notes were written on the observed phenomena. The field notes included descriptions of the events observed and the verbatim and approximate quotes of the students and/or teachers.

The teachers were interviewed four times: once before the observations were initiated, twice during the course of the observations, and again when the observations were completed. The first interview for each
teacher was oriented toward gaining a better understanding of the school milieu within which the teacher worked. Each teacher was also queried on the types of behavior he/she considered inappropriate. The second and third interviews dealt with classroom "incidents." An incident included (1) an inappropriate student behavior and (2) teacher acknowledgment of that behavior. The questions for the second and third interviews focused on why the teacher felt students exhibited inappropriate behavior and how the teacher felt about such behavior.

The final teacher interviews were general in nature and dealt with inappropriate behavior on a more abstract, rather than incident-specific, level. The questions for the final interview were inductively derived after examining the nature of the data from the study. All interviews with teachers were taped and transcribed.

Informal conversations with students were conducted throughout the study. The conversations were initiated both to gather data and establish rapport with students. At the end of the study two students from each of the field settings were interviewed. In both settings one of the interviewed students was a boy and the other a girl. The students were selected on the following basis:

(1) The number of inappropriate behaviors they exhibited during the observational period. (Students were interviewed who had engaged in a large number of inappropriate behaviors.)
(2) The perceived openness of the students. (The students interviewed were those who would not be intimidated and/or inhibited by the interview situation.)

The informal and final interviews with students were not taped; notes were taken while talking to the students, and the notes were written out following the interviews. Three of the four interviewed students were asked to discuss a behavior he/she had exhibited which was implicitly labeled as inappropriate by the teacher.\(^{37}\) Inappropriateness was inferred from the teacher's response to the student's behavior. The queries utilized to structure the interviews focused on:

1. Why the student exhibited misbehavior;
2. How the student viewed misbehavior and what the student thought caused classroom misbehavior;
3. How the student felt about the teacher's response to misbehavior.

These statements served as a focus for the interviews and were expanded or modified according to the nature of the situation and student-observer rapport.

Analysis of the data proceeded in an inductive fashion. Initially the data were examined and the incidents which appeared most frequently were noted.

\(^{37}\) One of the students was on an "in-house" suspension for smoking on the day of the interview. The suspension became, therefore, the major focus of the interview rather than behaviors the student had exhibited during the study.
From these incidents, concepts or tentative themes were induced. Primary attention was given to the meanings the various participants attached to classroom events. The literature in the social and behavioral sciences was then examined and the themes were modified to include the concepts, models and/or paradigms discussed by other researchers.

Definitions of the themes and conclusions for each theme are delineated below. The conclusions are structured in descriptive propositional-like statements which indicate the nature of the relationship between the various concepts in the themes.

The concepts of authority and power are an integral part of each of the themes and will, therefore, be defined and discussed first.

**Authority.** Authority is central to the way teachers function in the classroom. The teacher starts the year with formal authority but as the year progresses formal authority must be supplemented with functional authority. The latter includes the teacher's professional competence and human relations skills. Functional authority relationships are interpersonal encounters in which one person is given the right to make selected decisions which affect another person's behavior. Functional authority enables the teacher to control student behavior without relying on coercive power. The students give the teacher the right to control and determine classroom
activities.

Power. Although there are many different types of power, the focus of this discussion will be coercive power since it was observed with the most frequency during the duration of the study. Coercive power is used when a teacher fails to influence student behavior through the use of functional or formal authority. Although both teachers used some coercive power, Sue (the urban teacher) used much more than Bill (the suburban teacher). When the teacher uses coercion, he/she attempts to exert direct control over student behavior. Functional authority is implicit, coercive power is explicit.

Coping Techniques

The first two themes focus on how students cope with power in the classroom. A brief summary of the themes and conclusions for each will be discussed.

Maintaining Cool

Students exhibit certain behaviors in order to be accepted by their peers. Maintaining cool behaviors are determined by the culture within which a student lives. Two ways of maintaining cool evidenced in this study were fighting and smoking.
If teachers are going to deal with adolescent behavior, they must have some understanding of what students view as maintaining cool. They must be aware of the fact that behavior evolves according to the meanings students attach to the immediate classroom or school circumstances.

Although fighting or smoking may be perceived as clearly inappropriate to the teacher, students often view it as acceptable behavior. The disparity between what the teacher views as inappropriate and what the students label as appropriate may engender misunderstandings and/or create conflict.

Relieving Boredom

Relieving boredom occurs when a student feels emotionally or intellectually separated from the classroom environment. In response to emotional or intellectual separation, students exhibit certain types of relieving behaviors. Specifically: self-stimuli and other-stimuli. The purpose of self-stimuli is to create pleasure for one's self. Pencil tapping and hand-pounding are common forms of self-stimuli. The purpose of other-stimuli is to attract the attention of audience pupils. Classtalk is the most common manifestation of other-stimuli in classrooms.
(1) Student self-stimuli are primarily inner-directed. The type and amount of such behavior is dependent on the milieu within which the student is functioning. The more permissive a teacher is, the more likely self-stimuli will be exhibited publicly. The amount of self-stimuli students exhibit seems to be influenced by the teacher's expectations for student self-control.

(2) Student other-stimuli is observed primarily as classtalk. Classtalk is situational behavior. It is situationally inappropriate when the following are extant: (a) the teacher is talking, (b) the teacher is administering a test, (c) the teacher feels the class is too noisy, and (d) the teacher feels the students are not working on assignments. Of these, the first occurs most frequently.

(3) Teachers prohibit classtalk because they fear its potential for usurping their classroom authority.

(4) When other-stimuli behavior is exhibited by a student but not reinforced by another classroom participant, it diminishes.

**Challenging Techniques**

The next three themes focus on how students directly or indirectly challenge or erode the teacher's use of power and ability to exercise authority in the classroom.
Aggressing

Aggressing entails the conscious intent of one individual to inflict physical or psychological pain on another individual. Most classroom aggressing is ritualized and manifested in the form of visual or verbal signals. Students exhibit aggressing both toward other students and toward the teacher.

(1) Ritualized aggressing is most frequently observed as sarcasm.

(2) Teachers can control the amount of sarcasm in their rooms by reducing the status differences between the students and themselves. The more inferior the students feel, the more sarcasm or ritualized aggression the students will exhibit toward the teacher.

(3) Students use sarcasm because they are concerned with enhancing status. The sarcastic remarks are directed at the decoder's psychological or physical vulnerabilities. Student-to-teacher sarcasm usually focuses on the teacher's pedagogical competence.

(4) Interstudent ritualized aggressing is communicated through verbal or visual signals and possesses an implied threat. Most threats are never actualized within the classroom but do often implicitly challenge the teacher's definition of the classroom situation.
**Smarting-off**

Smarting-off is a subtle technique for challenging teacher authority. Smarting-off is a satirical remark disguised as a legitimate response to a teacher-initiated statement or query. It is a covert form of aggressing.

1. **Smarting-off** is intended to engender a loss of face for the teacher and concomitantly enhance the status of the student.

2. **Teacher nonresponse to smarting-off** implies a lack of verbal competence. The nonresponse causes students to perceive the teacher as being unable to respond rather than unwilling to respond. The loss of student-perceived teacher competence erodes the teacher's functional authority.

**Ignoring**

Ignoring occurs when a student intentionally disregards a directive initiated by the teacher. The student does not permit the teacher to control his/her behavior. The student, rather than the teacher, defines the classroom situation. The students implicitly define it through noncompliance to the teacher request.

1. **Ignoring** is a method of subverting teacher efforts to exercise control. When ignoring is tolerated
by the teacher the students learn that disregarding
teacher directives is acceptable and appropriate
behavior.

(2) Teachers should respond to ignoring by
attempting to exercise influence. Influence is based on
interpersonal respect and is reciprocal in nature.
respecting students enables the teacher to increase
his/her ability to exercise influence, and, concomitantly,
elicit the desired student response to teacher-initiated
requests.

**Interactions Affecting Authority**

There are some interactions which directly affect
the teacher's ability to exercise and/or maintain
authority. How the teacher responds during such inter­
actions and the way in which the teacher uses power will
influence the nature of subsequent teacher-student
encounters. The themes associated with such classroom
interactions include transitioning, nonresponding and
faceworking.

**Transitioning**

Two of the most critical points in a class period
are the opening and closing exercises. The "opening"
is important because it is during this time that the
teacher's definition of the classroom situation evolves.
The "closing" is significant because it sums up the effect of the encounter and demonstrates what the participants can expect during their next interaction.

(1) Teachers initiate an opening with some type of cue or standard procedure. Implicit in the cue or procedure is a set of understandings which have evolved out of past teacher-student encounters. If the understandings include the fact that the teacher will define the classroom situation, the opening will probably be effective. If the understandings which have emerged do not give the teacher the right to define behavior, the opening will probably be ineffective.

(2) The teacher who has not been able to engender functional authority will attempt to gain control of the class through the overt or covert use of coercion. Excessive use of coercion leads to increased student resistance to the teacher's exercise of power.

(3) Class closings sum up the effect of the encounter. They influence how classroom participants will interact the next time they meet. It is usually more difficult for teachers to preserve their definitions of the situation and maintain authority during a closing than during an opening. Teachers, therefore, use more coercion at the end of class in order to maintain control of student behavior.
Nonresponding

Nonresponding occurs when a teacher intentionally chooses not to respond to a student's behavior. Nonresponse is utilized for three reasons: (1) when the teacher feels that responding to a student's behavior might prove deleterious; (2) when the teacher wants to justify, to the student and himself/herself, the subsequent use of coercive power; (3) when the teacher feels that nonresponse may cause a behavior to abate (or when nonresponse is perceived as non-reinforcement).

(1) Nonresponding is efficacious when the emotional involvement of a student exhibiting a perceived misbehavior is high. The level of emotional involvement is determined by the amount of conflict between the teacher and students during recent encounters. The greater the amount of recent conflict, the greater the student's emotional involvement.

(2) Nonresponding can be effective in legitimizing subsequent use of coercive power. It is effective in this regard when the students, as well as the teacher, perceive the behavior the teacher did not respond to as inappropriate.

(3) Nonresponse affects teacher authority when the students perceive nonresponding as indicative of teacher weakness. The teacher's authority is diminished
because the students feel the teacher lacks the ability or competence to stop misbehavior.

**Faceworking**

Face is the positive social value an individual claims for himself. It is how a person perceives his/her self. Facework occurs when a face is threatened. Facework procedures are employed either by the individual employing a threat or by the individual who is threatened.

1. Faceworking procedures enable a student (or teacher) to save face in a potentially threatening situation. To know how and when to initiate faceworking, however, the teacher must have some understanding of the perceptions students have about themselves. Facework is often manifested in the form of an excuse: One individual provides another individual with an excuse for exhibiting a certain type of behavior.

2. When a student's face has been threatened, the teacher can use an excuse (facework) to prevent the student from incurring a loss of face. The excuse the teacher uses will depend on the needs and self-esteem of the student.

3. Smiling is a relatively private faceworking technique and does not necessitate a teacher reaction. Teacher nonresponding is effective with smiling because
the student is trying to save face; he/she is not trying to cause the teacher to lose face. Smiling is usually exhibited after the teacher has successfully stopped a student behavior. The smile is a way for the student to escape from a potentially pernicious situation and reestablish rapport with peers and the teacher.

Implications for Teachers

Developing a Holistic Perspective

Most teacher preparation programs place primary emphasis on the methods and techniques of teaching with some additional work in educational psychology and the history and philosophy of pedagogy (Combs, 1974). Because of this emphasis, teachers have few field-based opportunities to examine and understand the factors which mold student behavior. To understand student behavior, students must be viewed from a holistic perspective or as "total human beings" (Wolcott, 1976). Behavior cannot be viewed in isolation, it must be understood in terms of a constellation of relevant interconnecting forces. When a student comes to school his behavior is influenced not only by his interactions with teachers and peers, but also by his family background and macro-culture.
Teacher awareness and understanding of the relationship between culture and human behavior is a necessity. Teacher ethnocentricity is minimized by an awareness and recognition of cultural relativism which implies that teachers encourage a fundamental respect for all types of cultural behavior and do not value one life style over another. The teacher from a suburban setting, who enters the urban school must understand that his/her behavior and perceptions have evolved out of his/her set of unique past experiences; that the type of behavior he/she deems acceptable will be determined by the culture within which he/she was raised. Thus, behaviors of urban youth may be perceived by the suburban teacher as threatening (e.g. ritualized aggressing) when in fact the behaviors are simply counterparts of equally innocuous ritualized acts occurring in suburban schools.

The nature of classroom management skills must also be redefined to take into account the reasons for student behavior. Unfortunately, educators have often emphasized modifying rather than understanding the causes of behavior. Although modifying student behavior may, at times, be an appropriate teacher task (e.g. when such behavior prevents learning) it can also thwart behavior which is appropriate to a particular cultural context and create unnecessary student-teacher conflict.
Teachers should be cognizant of the fact that student behaviors which "look" the same may have different causes. Lillian Katz (1972) labeled overt behavior as phenotypic and the causes for overt behavior as genotypic. A teacher who uses one type of desist (e.g., coercive power) to stop all phenotypic behavior may create or exacerbate the student manifested behavior since students may exhibit similar behaviors but have disparate reasons for their actions. A "stop it" to a student who is pounding for self-stimulation may be sufficient. A "stop it" to a student who is acting out aggressive feelings toward the teacher may cause the student to react more aggressively. In essence, teachers need to develop an awareness of behavioral genotypes before they react to phenotypic manifestations.

Although teachers may not always know the precise reasons for student behavior, they can try to understand the effects of culture on behavior. Teachers can develop a sensitivity to the type of behavior idiosyncratic and necessary to a particular milieu, behavior essential to each student's life space.

**Developing Classroom Authority**

To effectively influence student behavior, teachers must develop functional classroom authority. The nature of the teacher's functional authority depends on past student-teacher interactions. The teacher who wants to
earn the right to make selected decisions (to exercise influence) concerning student classroom behavior must interact with students without relying heavily on coercive power. Reliance upon coercion creates a barrier between the teacher and the student. Students will usually avoid coercion by escaping, physically or psychologically, from coercive classroom situations.

When teachers react to students by demonstrating an awareness of student needs, students usually give the teacher the right to control and define the classroom situation. Students give teachers the right to define the parameters of behavior when they feel that the teacher recognizes the problems they as students are facing. That is, if during past encounters the teacher has interacted with students with respect, has demonstrated subject matter expertise, and has provided stimulating classroom activities, the students are likely to acknowledge the teacher's right (authority) to make classroom decisions. Teacher behaviors which engender the respect of students will help the teacher move beyond formal authority. The teacher's competence, interpersonally and academically, is a necessary precursor to the successful evolution of functional authority.
Developing Classroom Awareness

The teacher who has an awareness of the goals of student behavior, who can detect and understand why students exhibit certain types of behaviors, will more likely respond to student behaviors effectively. That is, he/she will be able to modify student behavior without incurring or causing an unnecessary loss of face.

Teachers must be aware of how students react to teacher authority and power. Student coping mechanisms (e.g., relieving boredom) are relatively innocuous and should be expected in most classrooms. Students sometimes respond in the classroom to enhance their own status and do not intend to denigrate others. At other times student behavior is clearly directed toward inflicting a noxious stimuli and producing self-enhancement at the expense of another classroom participant. The teacher should respond differently to the former than the latter. The former may be, and often is, ignored; the latter should be acknowledged and responded to in a manner in which the teacher maintains authority without causing a loss of face.

Adlerians have advocated that educators develop an awareness of the goals of student behavior. They contend that an awareness of student goals enables teachers
to see behavior realistically and in its proper perspective. The behavior becomes relative to the way in which the teacher arranges the classroom learning environment and to the types of past encounters the teacher has had with the students. The teacher who is poorly planned and has few learning activities for students should recognize that students may view relieving behavior as an appropriate response to the unstimulating classroom milieu. When teachers understand the reasons for student behaviors (i.e., the student is attempting to cope with boredom), teachers learn to modify their own behavior as well as the students'. Consequently, when the teacher observes such behavior he/she may try to modify the student's need for relieving boredom by providing more stimulating classroom activities. Responsibility for maintaining a positive learning environment falls on both the students and the teacher. In essence, the teacher must ask what behaviors he/she exhibits which prevent students from engaging in learning activities.

The teacher looks at student behaviors for indicators of his/her own role in engendering those behaviors. The teacher's first question should be "What am I doing to create the phenomena?" rather than "What is wrong with the students?" The teacher views him/her self as an integral part of classroom interactions. The manner in which he/she initiates classroom activities or responds
to student behaviors determines the reactions elicited from students. Teacher awareness entails being cognizant of the role the teacher plays in creating phenomena; awareness is a necessary precursor in determining effective responses to student behavior.

**Recommendations Regarding Methodology**

Participant-observation studies differ from quantitative methods in their emphasis on "openness" to phenomena throughout the investigation (Becker, 1958). The observer enters the field with a paucity of hypotheses concerning the nature of the phenomenon; the direction of the study emerges as the observer develops tentative propositional statements on phenomena and then attempts to support or refute those statements. Because of the myriad internal and external factors involved in any study, most phenomenon necessitate continued and repeated investigation (Campbell and Stanley, 1966). One or even a number of studies does not suffice. A phenomenon must be viewed by utilizing a variety of research methods and theoretical perspectives. The following recommendations regarding methodology are proposed:

1. The research needed must emphasize participation over observation. In-depth participation would enable the researcher to gather more abundant data on the perceptions of students.
(2) Research is needed which provides students with opportunities for self-expression. The opportunities would include interviews with students that are open-ended and have no predetermined direction. Unsolicited comments and reactions from suburban and urban students are needed to assess the nature of student perceptions vis-a-vis classroom life. Solicited comments often reflect too much of an investigator's subjectivity.

(3) Some ethnographic research on perceived misbehavior should be conducted focusing on student-teacher interactions in only one setting. Such research would yield in-depth data on a small number of subjects not available from studies conducted in multiple observational settings.

(4) Some additional research should focus on one group of students interacting with a number of different teachers. The variety of student-teacher interactional patterns would reveal how reality is defined differentially by various classroom participants in the same milieu. Specifically: (1) How and why do students modify their behavior as they interact with different teachers?
Recommendations Regarding Further Research

The following problem areas are offered as a guide to further research. Problem areas and tentative recommendations are defined for each of the thematic groupings.

Coping:

(1) The disparity between what students view as maintaining cool and teachers view as inappropriate behavior creates misunderstandings. Classroom misunderstandings can be reduced by having teachers examine the factors extant in student subcultures which reinforce student behavior.

(2) Other-stimuli is a reaction to boredom, is manifested primarily as classtalk, and is disruptive because it involves more than one classroom participant. Teachers can reduce situationally inappropriate other-stimuli by creating an exciting learning atmosphere, an atmosphere in which students want to focus on teacher-initiated ideas and activities.

Challenging:

(1) Student sarcasm, as a form aggressing against the teacher, is directed at teacher psychological or physiological vulnerabilities and causes teachers to lose classroom status. Student sarcasm can be reduced
through teacher-initiated interactions which equalize the student-teacher relationship and reduce the superordinate-subordinate hierarchy. The emerging relationship should be based on mutual respect.

(2) Smarting-off engenders a loss of face for the teacher. Teachers can prevent a loss of face by verbally or nonverbally acknowledging the smarting-off while still ignoring the implicit ridicule. The teacher responds to the surface meaning rather than the implied meaning of student comments.

(3) Student ignoring is a covert method of subverting teacher efforts to exercise control and prevents the teacher from defining the classroom situation. The teacher should not tolerate ignoring behavior and should respond to ignoring by attempting to exercise influence. Treating students with respect increases the teacher's ability to exercise influence and concomitantly elicit the desired student responses to teacher-initiated requests.

Interactions Affecting Authority:

(1) The teacher who fails to engender functional authority will be unable to successfully initiate a transitional opening or closing. Functional authority evolves from the demonstrated competence of the teacher. The teacher who prepares meaningful or motivating
activities and knows how to interact with students will be perceived by students as competent. The competent teacher, by definition, engenders functional authority.

(2) Nonresponding is perceived by students as an indication of teacher weakness and diminishes teacher authority. Nonresponse does not result in diminished authority when the teacher can demonstrate that the nonresponse was intentional. That is, when the teacher either exhibits nonresponse to prevent a student from incurring a loss of face or to justify the subsequent use of coercive power.

(3) Teachers who do not understand student needs are unable to engender functional authority and cannot utilize faceworking procedures. Faceworking is usually manifested through some type of excuse wherein one individual provides another individual with a reason for exhibiting a certain type of behavior. The excuse the teacher uses in faceworking cannot be employed effectively without some understanding of student needs and perceptions.
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APPENDIX A

SCHEDULE OF TEACHER AND STUDENT INTERVIEWS
Sue (Urban Teacher)

Interview #1 ......................... April 21, 1977
Interview #2 ......................... May 6, 1977
Interview #3 ......................... May 20, 1977
Interview #4 ......................... June 4, 1977

Jane (Urban Student)

Culminating Interview ............. June 3, 1977

Steve (Urban Student)

Culminating Interview ............. June 3, 1977

Bill (Suburban Teacher)

Interview #1 ......................... April 22, 1977
Interview #2 ......................... May 9, 1977
Interview #3 ......................... May 23, 1977
Interview #4 ......................... June 8, 1977

Nancy (Suburban Student)

Culminating Interview ............. June 6, 1977

Larry (Suburban Student)

Culminating Interview ............. June 7, 1977
APPENDIX B

EXAMPLE OF A TRANSCRIBED INTERVIEW
This is the transcription for the first interview with the urban teacher. It is a verbatim transcript of the dialogue between the researcher and the teacher. It typifies the inductive format used for querying subjects during all interview sessions.

Interview #1
April 21, 1977
Sue - Urban Teacher

Researcher Question: How do you feel about teaching at _____________? How would you compare this school to other schools you have heard of?
Answer: I'd say it's kind of the middle, at the middle level from what I hear from other teachers. A teacher over at _____________ says she is just climbing the walls, she's had it. She's been there for six years, she can't even use clay. She can't use this and she can't use that because of student behavior. I hear about other schools like _____________. I see their work and I know they're on a level where they just come in the room and they work. I can see by their work and I've talked to the other art teacher there. So I ... I feel ... I'm pretty happy.
R.Q.: If you took all the __________ junior high schools and put them on a list, where would __________ stand?

A.: Somewhere in the middle--behavior wise. If we're talking about discipline problems, it'd be somewhere in the middle.

R.Q.: If it was possible for you to move to a different school where would you move? Would you move? Would it be to a different area of town?

A.: It doesn't make that much difference--the area of town. Geography wise I wouldn't mind spending any more time going there. There was one school I visited one time when we had a water break. The population was pretty much like this school: Appalachian-type. It was pretty much the same. About the same, maybe a little bit better. I wouldn't mind teaching somewhere else if it was rather similar to this, but I'm so used to this, it took me two years to get used to what I have now.

R.Q.: So you feel fairly comfortable?

A.: I do feel comfortable. There are a few things that come up that still shock me.

R.Q.: Like . . . . What would those kinds of things be?

A.: Ah . . . I guess the fights still shock me when I see somebody go at somebody tooth and nail.
R.Q.: How often does that happen?

A.: Doesn't happen that often that I see it. Maybe. . . . Last year it happened more often because I was new and they knew they could do it. But this year, oh, maybe only that one time, the one I was talkin' to you about before, C_______ and S_______.

R.Q.: Now which two . . . C_______ is no longer here?

A.: C_______ is no longer here. She used to sit over here. Matter of fact, C_______ used to sit over here. That's why I moved him over there. Because she was over here. She had a chair and was starting to beat him over the head with it. Before I intervened it was. . . .

R.Q.: What did he do?

A.: Oh, he was grabbin' at her and just fists and . . . Mean. . . .

R.Q.: Was she a lot bigger than he was?

A.: No, ah, they were about the same size. That's just one incident; that's the only one I can remember this year that's happened that way. And then sometimes, also, how mean they are to each other. "I gonna knock you up the side of the head"--that's their favorite. "Beat your butt." They say it in a way that you really think somebody is going to get it.
R.Q.: One thing I noticed was the number of students who entered the room with their fists... kids throwing punches in the air. And they wanted... I don't know if that is typical. I don't know if it was for my benefit. Particularly as they got to the back of the room. One boy, the heavy-set boy--a big robust kid, you might even classify him as fat, came in and I didn't notice him do it until he got to the back of the room.

A.: I can't imagine him doing that. He is so calm. Who usually does that is J__J__. J__ J__ usually sits... I had him sit there but I had him sittin' over here. J__ is a little kid. He's a little black kid who sits right here. And, ah... who's the other kid? Ah, M__ another small kid who sits over here, they both sit over here.

R.Q.: What about the boy who sits on this side of the table?

A.: Oh, I know that was T___. That was T____, tall and muscular and more mature looking. T____, I moved him back here, too. I've moved him so many times that... Yea, that's T___ and sometimes he does work and sometimes he doesn’t.

R.Q.: I tried to get some sense of the kids who would be interesting to watch and I thought he would be one who would be interesting to watch.

A.: Yea, he is sometimes.
R.Q.: He worked on the mug almost the whole period?
A.: He has missed a few weeks, I think. A couple times any way. Let me look. Yeh, he misses on Tuesday and comes in on Wednesday. I can see this kind of a pattern. But see he didn't do his paper. See that "0" there? He doesn't work on papers too much. He's absent a lot and when he does come he very rarely does the paper work.

Q.: What is your best class?
R.Q.: Best class? Behavior-wise? I've got several that I think are O.K.

R.Q.: Make it anyway you wish. It can be academic or...

A.: O.K., like my favorite class... Maybe the one I see on Thursday/Friday sixth period or Monday, 9th period.

R.Q.: Can you give me a reason why they are good?
A.: O.K. Those two classes I just named to you are a little less mature, I'd say, than than these kids. The class you watched. And, it's almost as if you can bully them into doing things. You know I hate to look at myself as a bully but when they come in they will take orders, they will... They know they've gotta get a paper and if you say anything to 'em they go "Oh yea!" They... every one of those kinds gets their paper in. They worry if you don't ask for the papers.
They'll really hand them in and sit down and do their work and sit at their seats. They don't get up. It's not too loud and they are always interested in what we are doing. It's like maybe they haven't had some of the experiences some of these kinds have had . . . at home or school where they went or whatever. They haven't had the media, they haven't worked with clay, they haven't worked with paint . . . . It's all new to them. They are much more willing to work.

R.Q.: In general, what are the backgrounds of most of these kids?

A.: All my classes?

R.Q.: Yes. . . . One parent families?

A.: A lot of them, I'd say, are . . . and ah . . . they get very upset if you say anything against their mother. Generally that's the only parent they have. . . .

R.Q.: So they are very attached to their mother?

A.: I think they probably are even though they joke around and try to get away with things. They are pretty attached to home. Lower income, I'd say. . . . Not many of them have much art background. When you get into some of these other schools they have had private lessons, they've gotten in other things and. . . . I doubt if any of these kids have been to an art gallery unless their sixth grade teacher took them.
R.Q.: What percentage of the kids come from one-parent families?

A.: A guess? I'd say maybe a third. I'm just guessing. I've never really checked that out. That may not be.

R.Q.: Do the mothers tend to work?

A.: A lot of them do and a lot of the ones I've called. . . . But the thing is, that's not exactly an overall . . . that's not exactly a random number. Because the ones that I call are the kids that are in trouble. So maybe they have parents that work more and that's why they get in trouble. I don't know, but I know that the ones I call I have to call at a special time because they work in the evening or they work in the day.

R.Q.: How responsive are the parents?

A.: I've found they always seem to care. I've found very few parents who give me a hard way to go. When I say "Ah, so and so was doing something today, really disturbing class or didn't turn in his paper," they say they'll talk to the child and I've even had some parent come here to school. They seem to want, the parents seem to want the children to do better.

R.Q.: Have you had a lot of conferences with the parents here at school?
A.: Just a few. It's difficult to get the parents to come to school. The conferences I've had, in general, have been with other teachers about one student.

R.Q.: Where a number of teachers are having problems with the same kid?

A.: Yes!

R.Q.: How do the parents view Mr. G______?

A.: Gee, I don't know.

R.Q.: How do the kids view Mr. G______?

A.: Well, there's a saying around school. This one girl told me, "Well, if you get sent to Mr. B______ you get whacked to death. If you get sent to Mr. G______ you get talked to death." I'm not so sure they see him as a tough disciplinarian. They know that he means business but I think sometimes they think they are going to get away with things.

R.Q.: So . . . Mr. B______ is perceived as the . . .

A.: Yea, well, he's that way because he's here more. He's here more than Mr. G______. Mr. G______ isn't consistently here.

R.Q.: What is your worst class?

A.: I'd say the one I just had.

R.Q.: What makes that class bad?

A.: I don't know. I talk to other teachers about them too. They just can't seem to get their minds on their business. Just loud gossip, yelling across the
room,"Someone belted so and so, did you hear about that?"
As soon as I get that quieted down there is another one.
I even . . . I had to reseat them all.

R.Q.: What age are these kids?
A.: Seventh graders. It is just constant. I even
told them today, I said about half-way through. . . .

R.Q.: Do you have them for two periods?
At the end of the day too . . . So I'm not saying if I
had them at another time, like early in the morning or
split periods, it would be easier but . . . . And then
they call buses . . . and some of these kids are on
buses and then they don't have regular clean-up because
half of them leave. It's just a pretty bad situation.
But then all this talking and this loud gossiping and
. . . some of these kids are just real clowns getting
out of their seats and going here and there and then
. . . there are some EMR kids mixed in these, too.

R.Q.: I'd like to know some of the things they do.
One of the things you said was yelling across the room.
A.: Gee, that gets to me. It really does!
R.Q.: What . . . . They call one another names?
A.: Ya, "Your mother this." That sort of thing.
Which is really bad. Sometimes it's "Did you see?" or
"So and so is going to have a fight after school! P-
there." It's this kind of stuff. It has nothing to
do with their lesson. That's what gets me. If they were yelling "This toothpick goes this way!"

R.Q.: When that happens how do you usually respond? Let's say, if you have really had it?

A.: If I've had it, like today, I've had it, I just . . . I told the class I want everyone's attention. In general I can do that because they know I'm going to give them seconds after the bell if they don't shut up. See my seconds over there? Five? That was another class. I said I want your attention. Then I start counting and I get to about three 'cause they know if I get to five I'm going to write five on the board and they have to stay after the bell for five seconds. All of them! So they get quiet. So I tell 'em I've had it with the noise now and I don't think you know what you're doin' anymore 'cause your minds are very definitely not on your work. So let's have three minutes of utter silence and get your minds back on your work and we'll see how it goes from there. They, they were quiet for three minutes. Then they really got their minds on their work and it got a lot better. That's what I do when I really get fed up.

R.Q.: I'm fascinated by the five seconds.

A.: Oh?

R.Q.: What is that? Why do they just hate to think of five seconds?
A.: I don't know . . . I don't know. It's like a detention after school if I make them wait five seconds. I don't know why it works, but it does.

R.Q.: Doesn't that strike you as rather interesting? I mean five seconds is nothing!

A.: I know. It's just the fact that it's imposed on them I think. And they'll even say to each other if I'm getting close to five, "Hey, shut up. She's getting close to five seconds! Be quiet." And they'll really settle down. I think it has something to do with that counting. I count out loud. I used to say, "I want your attention and then I'd wait five seconds and then I'd go over and write it. But that doesn't work near as well as "I want your attention . . . 1 . . . 2 . . . 3." It's odd but my sister used to use that on her kids when they were real little. She'd say, I want you in this room and she'd start counting and they'd come. Because it's something like a deadline, they had to meet that deadline or something . . . I don't know.

R.Q.: Did you learn that from her or did she tell you . . . how did you learn it?

A.: I heard it from this other teacher. She said, "I used to write seconds on the board if they made me wait five seconds to start the lesson or do whatever I was going to do with 'em, then they had to wait five seconds." Well, I started that, but when I started
counting, it got even better, a quicker response. I tell the eighth graders, if I ever had to use it on eighth or ninth graders . . . I tell 'em I'm going to do to them exactly what I do to seventh graders. I'm going to start counting. They get real embarrassed. You know?

R.Q.: Other than the talking, what are a couple of other things that really bother you?

A.: Getting up out of their seats and wandering around lookin' at what other people are doing. There's just about three kids that do that. I'll generally just go over and talk with them and tell 'em they have to get over to their seats now . . . or I say "What if everyone gets out of their seat--we'd have mass confusion." It's hard to deal with that.

R.Q.: If they don't work on an art project. . . . I noticed yesterday a couple of them came up to the front and got magazines or books. Is that an option?

A.: Yes, that's generally an option if we're using some kind of messy stuff, like clay. Ah, because I can't have too many messy things out. A lot of things I have are messy, so that's one thing they know that they can do. They know they can do a drawing or they can work on their homework if they just want to get a zero. . . .

R.Q.: What if they read a magazine?

A.: I tell 'em if they are just readin' a magazine that's a zero. But if they are drawing or they're doing
something creative, at least, you know. . . . Even if they have one day or something like that from the regular schedule, it's O.K. but if they do it all the time, I start getting on them about it. "Hey, you haven't done this project; have you tried?" I'll point out my sign there (she points to sign on wall) and this kind of stuff.

R.Q.: How effective are the zeros?
A.: I just don't have to use them that often. I don't know, really know, how effective they are. Maybe they just have one off-day and they don't work and I tell 'em they get a zero and some of them don't care. It's just so. . . . I hardly ever had to use it. Just maybe once a week or even less than that. Just one kid a week or two a week.

R.Q.: Besides the counting, what other techniques for disciplining do you have?
A.: Sometimes I'll just stand there and wait. I'll just tell 'em I want their attention and stand there. That's generally the older kids.

R.Q.: The seconds is the most effective. . . .
A.: It is the most effective. . . . It is the best.
R.Q.: And that's with all the classes or just the last period?
A.: All classes.
R.Q.: The standing?
A.: The standing and waiting and just looking around at people and give 'em the hairy eye ball. That will work with eighth and ninth graders, sometimes, if they're not real involved. But if they're real involved with cleaning or doing something, then they don't notice me. You know what I used to do? It didn't work, it was just awful. I don't know why I ever did it but I had this metal dustpan and I'd slam it down on the table. And that would just shake everybody up. They would stop immediately what they were doing and look, but it was like, like, and then they would all start to laugh. It just created another disturbance. But, I was at a loss then, that was before I learned about the seconds thing. . . . I even broke . . . I brought my hand down one time and broke the pan so I figured it was time to stop.

R.Q.: The waiting, the five seconds, is there anything else?

A.: Sometimes if it's not real bad, if just a few kids are talking and everyone else is listening, I'll call out a few names. "So and so I'd like your attention also" or "Give me your full attention" or "So and so I don't think you have eyes in the back of your head. Turn around." That kind of thing.

R.Q.: I noticed the other day you walked around the room. Is that pretty typical?
A.: I never sit at my desk. I never sit there.
R.Q.: You're always walking around?
A.: I generally avoid the middle of the room. 'Cause that means I always have my back to somebody.
R.Q.: So you usually walk?
A.: Unless somebody calls me. Like I'm over here and somebody calls me. I'll walk through the middle and get there real fast.
R.Q.: How did you learn that?
A.: From experience. Gettin' wads of clay thrown at me and stuff.
R.Q.: Is that right?
A.: Yea, the first year I was here it happened. They even ... when we were doing toothpick sculptures last year they'd have glue on the end of the toothpick and I even have a blouse that still has glue on it from somebody going like that (hand-throwing motion). ... Threw it at me.
R.Q.: What did they do?
A.: I don't know. I don't know how they do it. I guess they just flicked it at me like this or something and it stuck on my blouse.
R.Q.: That was when you were in the middle of the room?
A.: I guess so. It must, 'cause if I was out on the outside it wouldn't have happened. They do this
like that if they think they can get away with it. If they think they won't get caught. I just have learned never to turn my back. I still . . . I still don't . . . I can turn my back on them. I know generally what they are doing or that they are working hard at something. Then maybe I'll work with something up here like putting some things away or scrapping something, or doing something that they don't do.

R.Q.: I'm trying to think back to yesterday as to whether or not I saw you walking with your back never turned to the class.

A.: Oh, well, observe the next time and see if I do. I probably won't think about it. Anyways, so . . . I might have. I mean when somebody . . . like, if I'm standing over here and somebody right across the room raises their hand and goes, "Miss ____." I'll go across if I think it is safe. If it's not, I'll come around.

R.Q.: This year has anything like that happened to you so far? Like throwing paper wads or throwing?

A.: One time. One time I was helping a student or involved with something and somebody hit me in the head with a tiny wad of clay.

R.Q.: This year?

A.: Yes! That happened not too long ago because we were working on clay so . . .
R.Q.: How did you react to that? When that happened.

A.: Well, it kind of startled me because it hadn't happened for such a long, long time. But I knew I wasn't going to catch the person. 'Cause there is no way. And it wasn't like everyone is going, "So and so did it," you know, so I just ignored it. Because I thought if I did anything it would make a big fuss and then they would say, "Oh, you're accusing me" and I had no basis so I just . . . I thought I'm not going to give anybody the joy of making a scene.

R.Q.: How did you handle it last year?

A.: Last year. I got real mad . . . yelled and screamed.

R.Q.: Did you find out who did it?

A.: Ah, . . . well, last year I remember looking right at this girl when she was throwing something at me. She was real mad because so and so had done something to her and she was taking it out on anybody and I just happened to be the nearest one. So she started throwing at me. I think I just took her out in the hall or something like. . . . I remember being really surprised.

R.Q.: Let me summarize that. This year when it happened you, you felt it was more appropriate to ignore it than to try to find out who did it. Just because it would have created. . . .
A.: It would have created more of a disturbance in the room. It really didn't hurt me that bad and everyone else was working. It was just this one little kid... whoever he was that did it.

R.Q.: Did you think you knew who did it?

A.: I thought I knew who did it. 'Cause from the direction it came from. You know, but I didn't want to take the chance.

R.Q.: And nothing after that?

A.: Nothing has ever happened after that.

R.Q.: That's interesting!

A.: 'Cause from then on I kept my eyes on everything that was going on in the class. I did not give anyone else a chance.

R.Q.: How long ago was that?

A.: It must have been about three weeks ago. And see, that's when the behavior was generally really bad because of coming back from vacation. It was hairy for the first two or three weeks after that.

R.Q.: The kids were just really high... .

A.: Yeh! Just real high. Wouldn't settle down. Didn't want to be back in school.

R.Q.: Can you stand kids out in the hall?

A.: No! It's against the rules here. Only thing you can do is send 'em to the office.

R.Q.: What kinds of things might a kid do to get sent to the office?
A.: Well, like a bad fight. Like these two got into or if they're a constant disturbance and I've already given them detention and I've already stood 'em up here by the door to separate them from somebody, or if their talkin' back there and then they start flickin' the lights or something like that. Just a constant look-at-me behavior.

R.Q.: What about the girl who sits up front in that class--looks like a very mature girl but I didn't get close enough to her.

A.: Maybe she's one of my helpers. She's probably one of my helpers.

R.Q.: I noticed. . . .

A.: She wasn't working on what the other students were doing?

R.Q.: Right!

A.: She was a helper who didn't have anything to do that period. . . . But she helps me with making clay balls. With things like that that I just don't want to spend the time on. They like to do. . . .

R.Q.: Is that like a ninth grade student?

A.: Let me look at my schedule and I can see who that was. I forget.

R.Q.: She was kind of an attractive girl. . . .

A.: That's V____ and she's an eighth grader I had here last year. I noticed that she was in art and she
liked to be here so. . . . She signs out certain materials that I know people like to steal. Like little Exacto knives and stuff like that.

R.Q.: How careful do you have to be with materials?
A.: Only certain things. Only certain things like knives, colored pencils. . . .

R.Q.: Exacto knives that you cut balsa wood with?
A.: Yea, it's those little knives. They have those little blades that come out. Last year you know what they liked to steal? Little bottles of ink. Because they liked to do tattoos on their arms or they used to just take them and throw them at the. . . . There was one, like at the boys' locker room, somebody got one of my bottles of ink and smashed it on the floor down there and made a big black mess.

R.Q.: What was the result of that?
A.: Well, so then, you know where I keep my ink now? I have it in my desk there and they have to sign out with me for it. I don't even give it to my art helpers. That's the one thing.

R.Q.: Was that because of that incident?
A.: Yes, I noticed if I put them out people would steal 'em.

R.Q.: So they sign those out? V____ signs out stuff like Exacto knives?
A.: Colored pencils, mat knives. Like mat knives they use to cut cardboard with and needles also. Anything sharp like that. Sign out and sign back in. Works pretty well.

R.Q.: The other things like those wooden things that you had them carving with . . .

A.: They come back pretty much. Sometimes they get broken but they are old and some of 'em are breaking now anyway. And at first, when I just started doing the clay I had the person who was in charge of supplies . . . You noticed I had one person for supplies and one for floors, one for tables and chairs, and one for sink? And they each change each six weeks. And the person who was in charge of the supplies would count those things at the beginning and end of the period. But I don't have to do that anymore 'cause they know . . . what can they use those things for anyway? So I just let it go. I've just lost one or two but that's probably 'cause of breakage.

R.Q.: If a kid misbehaves, shouts across the room, or something like that, what do you think is going on inside that particular kid's head?

A.: I don't think they mean to create a disturbance. Just that this is the uppermost thing in their mind at the time and it just comes out. They've been doing this, whatever it is, sculpture or their clay,
for long enough and say, "Let's make time pass a little faster and do this or that." Matter of fact, I even talked to somebody about that today. "Is it really necessary that you have to talk to so and so about . . . " I can't remember what it was. You know, it makes the time go faster.

R.Q.: It's a way of passing the time?
A.: Yea, it's a way of passing the time but it's so disturbing to me. I wonder about how disturbing it is to other students but I have heard about the students who come in here to work extra and, of course, they're your upper levels. They'll tell me, "It sure is nice to be in here when nobody is talking. It sure is nice to be in here when it's quiet. I can really get more done." Things like that.

R.Q.: Are there any other reasons why a kid does that?
A.: The loudness generally happens the eighth and ninth period. I generally don't think they're doing it to be mean or anything like that.

R.Q.: During what activities do you notice it the least? During what activities or during what parts of the day do you notice it the least?
A.: Ah, I'm trying to just think of my seventh grade classes. The one seventh grade class in the morning, the one that you see. I don't think it happens
less, but maybe it disturbs me less. I'm not as fresh eighth and ninth periods.

R.Q.: I can tell you I didn't notice it very much.
A.: It was a rare day when you came in. It was just a rare day.

R.Q.: I noticed talking underneath the breath, in a couple of cases. It was to themselves.
A.: Um-hum, sometimes they'll just talk to themselves. What was your question again? Let me get this straight.

R.Q.: During what parts of the day or during what activities do they do it the least?
A.: Clay is probably their favorite activity of all. Clay . . . there is less noise, general loudness, when they are working with clay. Because a lot of these other things, they're paper projects or flat things . . . I just don't think they get turned on as much. Here, the clay project, it's something they are going to use for something. I can make a mug or I can put this little bug on my mantle at home or something like that. So that's why I did more clay this year.

R.Q.: 'Cause?
A.: Because they enjoy that so much, and they love to have these things to take home.

R.Q.: What are some other favorite activities of theirs?
A.: Anything three-dimensional. Even this toothpick thing that some of them are doing now. They really get into that.

R.Q.: What is that?

A.: Toothpick sculpture is where you have a piece of corrugated cardboard at the base. You can either stick the toothpicks in to build 'em up or you can glue them down and build them up in different ways: pyramids or different cubes. Some kids start out with a two-dimensional design and build up from that or . . .

R.Q.: Do you provide them with the toothpicks?

A.: I provide them with everything.

R.Q.: Are you given sufficient supplies? Is that much of a problem?

A.: Ah, it's not too much of a problem, no. I get money for almost everything. Sometimes I'll chip in a few bucks for this, that or the other thing.

R.Q.: But most of the time you get enough from . . .

A.: And if an item is not in the warehouse supply, generally there's an extra fund you can go to.

R.Q.: How do the problems you have compare with the problems other teachers talk about?

A.: Well, the first year I thought I was the only one who had the bad problems I had. Maybe it was because I was one of the few new teachers last year. And . . . but I don't know. I'd say I generally have
more problems than other teachers in the school. Just because of the situation. I'm not saying ... I have the same kids obviously but I have all the situations that can build up into the kinds of problems I have. Number one, it is a lab course where they have to get up and walk around. Number two, seventh graders have to take art and they don't want to a lot of time. Of course other teachers have that too but they don't have double periods at the end of the day, seeing them only once a week. You can see where there would be more I think. More opportunities for problems to happen. It's even hard for me to keep track of detentions and things like that. I've gotten so I write 'em on the board. And, I call for them during the day if they don't come. Like during the lunch period.

R.Q.: How good are they at remembering?

A.: They don't remember it, they hardly ever remember to come in for detention unless I remind them.

R.Q.: How does that go? You call them?

A.: I make up a little slip, it's called a pupil request. I make it up at the beginning of the day and I find out when they have lunch period. I call for them the period before they have lunch. They come down here and serve their 10 minutes and go on to their lunch. If they don't come down I refer it to the office downstairs.
R.Q.: And then what happens?
A.: Well, it's generally only the hard-core kids that would not come when you send for 'em. I'll get a form back that says, "So and so one whack" or something like that. Because they're generally the ones that cause trouble and have a record down there.

R.Q.: Does he have... You go first time, one whack? Second time, two whacks?
A.: I don't really know what his criteria are.
R.Q.: But you get a slip telling what punishment they received?
A.: Yeh! I'll show you the discipline things we send out.

R.Q.: Does one of these go to the parents?
A.: I don't think one goes to the parents. They have different files down there where it goes to: principal's copy, guidance office. They can put it in their records.

R.Q.: The kids' records?
A.: Although I've never seen one, now that I think about it. I've never seen any in with their records.

R.Q.: How helpful is the guidance counselor? The extra personnel in dealing with...
A.: I'm not so sure. They have so many other things, like the guidance people have testing and so on and they have... I know she has groups.
R.Q.: Groups? Groups where they talk out their problems or...

A.: It's hard to measure the success of those. They usually only meet a half of year, cause the first half of the year she's busy with other things. Just individual guidance and so on.

R.Q.: What has to happen for a kid to get into that?

A.: We... She'll come up in the middle of the year. She'll ask us for kids we think need some kind of help, some kind of guidance and we'll refer them to her.

R.Q.: Have you had kids in there? In those groups? Does she ever give you any feedback?

A.: She doesn't. I don't think she has time. I got the idea she doesn't have time to do that.

R.Q.: So you don't get much feedback from her then?

A.: No. Unless I ask her about a certain student. Sometimes if I see her I'll ask her how so and so is doing. I'll tell you one person who helps. I've gotten feedback from him. It's the home-community agent, Mr. B____. He works with the kids that are chronic truant people and chronic behavior problems. Sometimes he'll work with them and he'll have them come and help him on certain projects, but it's to get them a little more interested in school.
R.Q.: Now is he hired by the school?

A.: Yah, he was a vice-principal here last year and our home-community agent retired so he took his place. He seems like he's doing a good job and he'll send reports to us every once in a while on certain kids. You know? Why they are having a hard time right now or so and so's mother is an alcoholic. I was just over there at the house.

R.Q.: If you find out Joey's mother is an alcoholic, Joey's mother does this or Joey's father . . . do you tend to "absorb" more behavior from that child? Tolerate would be a better term.

A.: Yah, I probably would. Matter of fact, there was a kid, his name was B____ and . . . I don't know. I guess I would tolerate a little more or else maybe I wouldn't jump on him right away. Or, maybe I'd handle it a little differently like take him out in the hall and talk to him before I'd give him a detention or something like that.

R.Q.: How do you think the kids view you?

A.: Well, I guess right off the bat they'd say Mrs. Meany or something like that, like they do everyone. But I think that if it got a little bit deeper they'd think I care. I've told a few kids (my art helpers) that I don't think I'm gonna be here next year and they go, "Oh, what are you gonna do?" It's not like, Oh, we're glad you're leaving.
R.Q.: They seem concerned?

A.: Yah, they seem concerned. Of course, those are my art helpers, but I don't really think that many kids think that I'm nasty. They'll just classify me with the other teachers--"Well, she has to do her job."

R.Q.: Is there a teacher here at this school who is viewed as a real tough?

A.: Yes!

R.Q.: How do the kids basically view him?

A.: They just tell me they hate him. They just say, "Oh, he is going to get creamed at the end of the year. We are all going to throw eggs at him." He is a real stickler for the rules. He's got a lot of kids suspended because they'll just get so mad at him that they'll curse him. And he has this program. It's an individualized program. You just have to be quiet in his room so that everyone can work at their own speed. I can see his point but I don't know why, he comes across as being Mr. Horrible.

R.Q.: But he does?

A.: But he does. He's a real stickler, he gives detentions and he's very consistent; he won't let anybody get off with anything. . . . I do tend to give in some. . . .

R.Q.: You feel that you demonstrate compassion at certain points?
A.: Yah, at a certain point I'll say well, "OK, I'll give you a detention but you help out here like... L_____ was driving me crazy today and I assigned him a detention but then he was helping me out with some other stuff and I said, "On effort, you get a point for that" and he said, "How 'bout letting me off detention?" "Well, OK, this time." Every once in a while I'll give in.

R.Q.: How do you feel about that?

A.: Sometimes I get mad at myself. Ah, I shouldn't have given in but it's hard to be absolutely right down the line. I don't think I've given too much, I think they basically know that I mean what I say.

R.Q.: What do you think is the biggest difference between this year and last year in the way you approach the kids?

A.: Just one way?

R.Q.: It can be a number of things. Just what comes to your mind?

A.: Well, I think this year I don't care so much if they like me. I'm here to do my job and I don't care so much if they adore me as being Miss Wonderful.

R.Q.: Last year?

A.: Last year I really wanted them to like me and I think that's what a lot of it is with first-year teachers. They just think, Oh, I'm just going to be
Miss Super Teacher and everyone is going to love me and all this. It doesn't work.

R.Q.: So one thing would be getting over that need, desire or whatever.

A.: Yah, I had this need to be wanted. I think I'm wanted just as much being me.

R.Q.: Anything else besides that?

A.: Well, I find that I just don't trust people as much. And, so fewer things happen, fewer things get stolen, fewer things happen.

R.Q.: You tend to be a little bit more cautious?

A.: Yah! And it's even gotten to be sometimes to where I can kinda joke around about things. I don't think I'm quite as serious as I was last year about. . . . They have to know this, this and this. You know? They just have to know all this garbage. I'm just not quite so serious about it.

R.Q.: What you're doing is anticipating problems. By anticipating them you prevent them from happening in a lot of cases.

A.: Oh yah!

R.Q.: The giving out of supplies and not having them returned; the signing them out, seems to me, to be a way to prevent that.

A.: Yah! I've got a lot of preventive measures this year. I have art helpers this year. I didn't have art helpers last year to help me with things either.
R.Q.: Was that your idea to have the art helpers?

A.: Yah, but last year I just didn't think I could do it because I didn't know the kids well enough to know who to trust at all. So I did a lot of grubby work myself, like going out and dumpin the plaster outside and getting the clay balls and stuff.
APPENDIX C
EXAMPLES OF FIELD NOTE DATA FOR BOTH URBAN AND SUBURBAN TEACHERS
The students were still at an assembly when I arrived. Sue talked about the mechanics of keeping things in order. She said that she has learned where to put things in order to prevent trouble from occurring.

"If I leave this stick out, somebody will use it for poking. I'll just put it over here." She did this with materials and with the various student art projects.

She talked about a couple of students I might be interested in interviewing--D____ and T____. T____ wasn't in class yesterday. Sue said he often proves difficult. He's a small white boy who Sue said refused to move once last week when she told him to. (O.C. Usually it seems as though Sue ignores these confrontations if it appears as though she is not to be the victor. She just walks away from the student and leaves him alone.)

She isn't sure whether she is too tough or too lenient. She indicated during one conversation that she often feels uneasy if she permits the students to get away with certain behaviors. On the other hand, she

---

1O.C. is an abbreviation for observer comment. It is used to describe the specific feelings, interpretation or preconceptions of the researcher.
spoke with pride when she reported an incident where her student teacher had lost control but she stepped in to restore order.

The students came into the room at 9:53. They picked up dittos and seemed to get to work rather quickly. During the class today Sue had the students work on three dittos. The major problems occurred during the time when the students weren't working on dittos. After the students finished the first ditto she asked various students to read the questions and provide an answer. There was a great deal of noise during this time. "Table 4 are you listening?" The response, in unison by the students at Table 4, "Yes."

When Sue started to collect papers she asked that they be turned in quickly. To insure that this occurred she counted 1 . . . 2 . . . 3 until she reached 10. By the time she counted to 10 she had all of the papers (O.C. I need to ask Sue about this procedure. Why does she do it? What happens if the students turn in papers slowly?)

D____ turned his back to the teacher during the "question" period on one of the dittos. Sue wanted to discuss the items, D____ did not want to. "D____, can I have your attention?" "No!" was the response. The no was said moderately loud and I don't think Sue heard it. She started to count 1 . . . 2 . . . but got no further,
the students quieted down quickly. D____ turned around and gave her his attention.

One of the most interesting incidents of the day occurred when Sue asked T_____ to stop pounding on the table. At first he was drumming with his fingers. "Stop that, T_____." T_____ continued pounding. "Stop!" (This time Sue used nonverbal I-mean-it gestures.) T_____ stopped using his fingers and started using his whole hand. "Stop!" (Again Sue used a number of nonverbal desist gestures.) Finally, Sue walked over and talked to him. T_____ stopped pounding. Sue stood up, walked away, T_____ started again. Sue turned and looked at him. He hit his hand on the table very slowly. They stared at one another for a very short time, T_____ slowly hitting the table with his hands. Sue then walked away and T_____ stopped pounding and started on the quiz.

(O.C. T_____ might be a very interesting student to interview. I'll check with Sue on this.)

T_____ was involved in another confrontation with Sue later in the period. This was right after he had been called out of the room to talk to the vice-principal. This was inferred on the basis of the request for T_____. It was made by a student who entered the room with a slip of paper, handed it to Sue, walked out, and looking at T_____ said "You are in trouble, boy." T_____ soon returned and Sue was trying to get everyone's attention.
She said, "Pencil pounders stop" whereupon T____ started pounding his pencil as hard as he could. Sue waited. T____ continued and Sue said, "Jaw waggars, stop wagging." T____ wagged his jaw as hard as he could. Sue again waited. It finally did get quieter and the lesson was continued.

D____ refused to do the third ditto when it was first passed out. Sue was not aware of this incident as she never looked at D____ during the period of time he displayed his disgust with the assignment. A student handed out the ditto, D____ refused to take one. The student then placed one on D____'s desk. D____ picked it up and threw it on the floor. He looked at Sue, arms crossed on chest, feet stretched out in front of him; still Sue did not notice him. D____ looked around, glanced at the paper on the floor, picked it up and looked at it rather carefully. Finally he leaned forward, put the paper on a chair in front of him and started working. At this point Sue noticed him. She walked over, looked at his paper and gave him a confirming glance.

Near the end of the period a boy in the front of the room was pounding on the table. Sue looked at him. (O.C. She may also have said something, I couldn't hear.) The boy smiled and then stopped.
Behavior tends to stop when Sue ignores it. This is particularly true of incidents in which Sue has utilized a desist technique of some type. If she has told a student to stop, the behavior is more likely to stop if she ignores it than if she continues to use mild desist measures. I've never seen her give a detention so I don't know what its effect would be. It would also prove effective. As it now stands, there is almost a continuous barrage of challenges to the rules and requests Sue makes. A "stop it" is responded to with an implicit "make me." That is, the student defies the commands of the teacher, forcing Sue to either back down or use a stronger desist. The latter occurs more than the former in Sue's case.

Like Bill's class, most of Sue's problems occur when she's giving directions or leading a discussion. Once an activity is started her problems lessen significantly. She appears to be well planned.

Most of the troublesome interactions for Sue entail challenges to her authority. For Sue, intragroup conflicts appear minimal. Most of the more disruptive problems occur as a result of negative interactions between Sue and a particular student.)
Bill started class by introducing me. He said that my name was Tom and that I was a student from Ohio State. The students gave me the typical uneasy glances that one must endure while being introduced. All but one table ignored by presence during class.

Then Bill asked everyone to be quiet and he prepared to start the lesson. One boy was tilting back on his chair. Bill nonverbally motioned for him to sit correctly. The boy ignored the command and Bill said, "Isn't my non-verbal enough." The boy put the chair on all fours and then slouched. Bill noticed the slouching and said, "I don't know which is worse, tilting back or slouching." The boy remained slouched. Bill started the lesson. The boy sat up straight.

Although most of the class was attentive while Bill read, some girls in the back of the room talked through much of the lesson. They also used a lot of primping gestures (e.g., combing hair, tilting head, etc.).

One student in the front of the room who sat near Bill waited for Bill to turn his head, then he threw a paper wad toward the wastebasket. He missed! He got up, walked over, picked up the paper and dunked it. Bill
ignored this activity. He didn't even seem to be conscious of what was taking place.

Another student at the same table faked throwing objects. He did this for about a minute. Finally Bill reached over and touched him on the back with his finger. The boy stopped the gesture, looked across the table and smiled. Bill went back to the lesson. He tapped the boy on the back while talking.

(O.C. Bill appears to be well planned. He had the activity or lesson ready to go at the start of the period and he did not waste time trying to think up activities.)

During the course of the lesson the noise level increased from the various conversations going on around the room. Bill asked for complete silence. The class did get quiet and Bill thanked them.

While the lesson was going on two girls got up and sharpened their pencils. These girls seemed very aware of the observer. They cast furtive glances, giggled to one another, then looked at the observer. (They do a lot of whispering.) Again, Bill seemed oblivious to the "sharpening" process. Each girl walked up and sharpened her pencil. Then returned to her seat without being questioned by Bill.

Bill stopped the lesson for a few minutes to discuss some questions relative to the course content. The
content dealt with species and organisms. As he was asking the questions he walked around the room. A number of students responded spontaneously without raising their hands. Bill permitted this to a point and then invoked the raise-your-hand rule. The student who was told to raise his hand did so. Bill then called on him and his response was accepted. Bill walked up to the front of the room and continued the lesson.

Bill read some more and then again tried to initiate questions for discussion. The class got somewhat noisy and Bill said, "O.K., I'm going to stand up and turn around and when I'm facing you again I want you quiet." The class seemed uneasy about this. Bill stood and turned; he too seemed uncomfortable. (O.C. I felt as though this was not a typical behavior on his part.) After he had finished the turn he sat down, the class was quieter.

A boy who was at one of the front tables started to pretend that he was fishing. He looked as though he was imitating a fisherman standing on the bank of a river casting for fish. He did this several times, smiling at the boy across the table and glimpsing at Bill to see if his behavior should be stopped. The boy across from his started to fake throwing objects again. Bill discovered his behavior and tapped him, for a second time, on the back. This brought a small smile
to the boy's face. This was the same boy who was caught throwing *imaginary* objects earlier.

(O.C. It seemed as though most of the misbehavior today was out of boredom. The students were not, in general, testing the norms established by Bill; rather they were exhibiting behavior which would provide a more stimulating environment. This particular lesson seemed rather slow in pace. Bill was reading to the students; the students may have created activities they perceived as being more exciting.)
APPENDIX D

EXAMPLE OF AN INFORMAL CONVERSATION AND INTERVIEW WITH A STUDENT
Informal Conversation
May 16, 1977

Note: The following informal conversation with Nancy focuses on a behavioral "incident." The discussion took place immediately after the class period in which the incident occurred. Nancy was queried on the incident during the course of the study rather than during the final interview process.

When the period was over I asked Bill if I could talk to Nancy. Since Nancy seemed so disturbed I thought she might have some interesting things to say.

I got Nancy out of her next class and we went to the library to talk. I asked Nancy how she felt during class today. "Angry," she replied. "I wasn't talking. Mr. R (Bill) was unfair." (O.C. Nancy volunteered very little information. I asked her a large number of questions but I elicited very short responses.) Nancy acknowledged that she was guilty of the first talking offense, it was the second one she questioned.

I asked Nancy what she thought caused students to misbehave. Her response, "Misbehavior is caused by boredom." I questioned her about misbehavior in Bill's class. "Mr. R. doesn't do very exciting things in class." We discussed this for a few minutes. I asked Nancy what she wrote during class. "Nothing!" she responded. I continued, "If you do write notes what
do they contain? "Our notes back and forth tell how boring class is." I asked Nancy if she would mind if I read some of the notes and she indicated that she would not.

(O.C. Students are unfair when teachers are unfair. This is Nancy's sense of the ethic governing behavior at the school. It is a if-you're-fair-to-me-I'll-be-fair-to-you philosophy. Nancy does not see herself as unfair, she views her behavior as appropriate and proper. It may be interesting to pursue this reasoning utilizing particular classroom incidents. It may be that students determine that some behaviors are fair through simple rationalization. They justify their actions given the larger school setting. They are forced to be in school; that is perceived as unfair. Therefore, all of their behavior is a fair response to the teachers.)
I started the interview out by asking Nancy what some of her favorite activities were and what she did when she wasn't at school. Nancy responded that she often went to Sue's house or sat and watched television. When she first got home she said she would do her homework.

I asked her how she felt about school this year. She said it was so-so. She said she wasn't real enthused about the teachers she had. "The teachers are boring. Mr. S_____ doesn't do anything; he just reads to us."

The teachers Nancy liked did much more with the planned activities and they were more interesting. Nancy said that gym was her favorite subject because the teacher planned a lot of fun things.

I asked Nancy how many of the students smoked. She said that almost everyone did. "Nine out of ten or seven out of ten sounds about right." Nancy said that she didn't smoke but that most of her friends did. "Why do they smoke?" I asked. Nancy responded, "Because it makes them feel bigger."

The next question I asked dealt with why she thought students misbehaved at school. Nancy said that it was usually because the students don't like the teacher.
They don't like the way the teacher acts toward the students. Another reason was that the students think the teacher's class is boring. That's why they misbehave so much in Mr. S's class. Finally some kids have a "problem." They are hyperactive or something and they just can't behave.

I asked Nancy if she ever misbehaved intentionally. She said that she had. "Last week Mr. S yelled at a couple of boys in class who had been talking. When that happened my friend and I started talking." I asked Nancy what happened then. "Well, Mr. S told my friend to move. I thought it was funny when he got angry." (O.C. It was implied that Mr. S could not handle the class.)

Nancy said that the most common misbehavior seemed to be talking during class. Another common problem was when students throw things. I asked Nancy how teachers usually responded to these misbehaviors. She said that the teachers tell the talkers to shut up and they tell the throwers to go to the office.

I asked Nancy if she had ever been sent to the office. "Yes, for talking in Mr. S's class."

Jane said that she talked the most in Mr. S's class. I said, "Why do you talk in his class and why do students misbehave there?" Nancy responded, "Because he just doesn't plan well."
I asked Nancy to tell me what a "cool" student was like. She said it was someone you could be friends with. It was also someone who wouldn't tell on anybody; they wouldn't "narc" on you. They don't pick on kids. The most uncool thing you could do was to tell on somebody.

Nancy said that she thought there were a lot of fights at the school. Most of the fights tended to be between girls and the reason for most squabbles was name-calling. She said that the worst name somebody could be called was a "fag."

Nancy said that some teachers ignored her misbehavior. I said, "What do you do then?" She indicated that her response was dependent on who the teacher was. For some teachers she talked louder; for others she would be quieter.