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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Classrooms are a part of every day life for millions of students and teachers. They are a part of every American community: the place where students from six to eighteen years of age spend six to eight hours a day from September to June each year. Teachers also spend this amount of time in classrooms and together these two groups of people create a social system in each and every classroom in every school every year.

THE NATURE OF CLASSROOMS

Classrooms are social systems embedded in other social systems: the school, the school system, the neighborhood, the community, the state, the nation and the world. These other social systems have influence on the classroom as well as being influenced by the classroom participants. (Mehan & Wood, 1975, Cazden, Courtney, Mehan, and Hugh, 1989, Florio-Ruane, 1988) Upon entering a school, students must use the knowledge they have garnered from living in a family and
neighborhood to give new meaning to the type of social system information presented in the classroom. Differences in how and when something is said may be a temporary adjustment for the student or may seriously impair the achievement of the students. (Cazden, 1986) The major vehicle for assisting learning and communicating in classroom is talk. Children entering school meet a use of conversation different from the use of conversation they have used at home. This new conversation demands that they learn new rules for the use of conversation. They must learn that they cannot talk without turn-taking, they learn that the way teacher talks makes a difference about who talks and when. (Farrar, 1981; Green & Harker, 1987, Mehan, 1979, & Shuy, 1988)

Another way to view classrooms is as communicative environments. There is a body of literature which describes how instruction is influenced by how teachers and students communicate and what gets accomplished. (Cazden, 1986; Green, 1983) Students and teachers construct communication by each acting upon and working with their own messages and behaviors combined with those of others to reach communicative goals. (Edwards & Furlong, 1979; Green & Harker, 1982, Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Collins, 1984) Verbal, non-verbal, gestural and visual
messages may be transmitted simultaneously within a
single conversation. (Knott, 1986; Gumperz, 1981; Green,
Weade & Graham, 1988) Classroom communication has a
strong influence on what gets learned in the classroom.
(Puro & Bloome, 1987; Cazden, 1986; Green, 1983) An
understanding of communication taking place between
teacher and student and student and student is necessary
to conclude that students have an effect on what gets
communicated and how communication takes place. Students
should also be considered as "initiators and controllers
of schooling" (Rosenborough, 1985 p. 204 cited in Staton,
1990 p.47) Students actively construct and enact their
own roles in each classroom society. To become integral
participants in the classroom, students must meet the
communication demands of the teacher as well as the other
students and continuously signal their participation in
both contexts. They must signal their student-student
communication in correspondence with teacher-class
communication. The student-student communication can not
be discovered by the teacher or students may be
admonished for inappropriate behaviors. (Bloome &
Theodorou, 1988)

Classrooms are busy, dynamic, interactive and
communicative social systems where instruction and
learning take place. They are organized social systems
where the behavior of the actors change in an organized and systematic way. (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974) Teaching is a phenomenon growing out of these interactions in the classroom. The definition of teaching use for the purpose of this paper is..." helping students make sense of the world around them while helping them gain a knowledge base of different academic disciplines to allow them to find their own functional niche in the adult society of their culture". (Higley, 1991) This perspective challenges previous definitions of teaching. For example, Ravitch and Finn (1987) define teaching as "explaining, questioning, coaching, and cajoling until children understand what adults want them to understand." Classroom interactions consist of interactions between teacher and whole class, teacher and small group, teacher and individual student, student and student as well as the interactions that take place between people and the classroom artifacts, i.e., textbooks, blackboard, A-V equipment and computers. Also included are the interactions that appear between cultural diversity and the expectations of teachers, parents, students and community.

In their 1974 volume The Study of Teaching, Dunkin and Biddle (1974, p.8, p.178) referred to Waller's The Sociology of Teaching (1932), when they discussed the
school as a social system. Waller defined the school as a "...place where people met for the purpose of giving and receiving instruction." The classroom was viewed as "conventionalized settings in which standardized and rule bound interaction takes place between teachers and students." (Waller, 1932) Classroom groups meet at regular times over an extended period of time during which rules evolve for the behavior of teachers and students. Any decision made, at any point in time, has a history and consequences for the future.

Waller (1932, p. 6) used the term "social organism" to illustrate the interdependence of the parts on the whole and the whole on the parts: it is not possible to affect a part of the school without affecting the whole. Mehan (1980, p. 134) suggested "...it is heuristic to think of the classroom as a small community." As a small community, it is influenced by its organization and by the larger society of which it is a part. If these suggestions are accepted, each classroom is a social system with social norms for participation. Students entering these classrooms must become aware of and use these rules for participation in order to become integral and functioning members of that classroom. They must know these rules as well as they know the rules for participation in their families and neighborhoods.
Students enter the classroom with a general knowledge about school and how to participate in school; they know what they are supposed to do. (Heap, 1980; Tannen, 1979) They need to learn specific rules for participation in each classroom to become integral members of that classroom society.

Rules for participation may be labelled the "tacit" dimensions of the classroom. (Cicourel, et al, 1974; Garfinkel, 1967; Mehan & Wood, 1975) The tacit dimensions of the classroom form the implicit background of the social knowledge of the classroom. The tacit dimensions may be defined as the implied expectations and norms for this social knowledge: they are indicated but not verbally or visually expressed. They are neither discussed with students nor are they presented to students in any written form. The actions which express these expectations and norms are carried out without words or speech. The explicit rules of the classroom are displayed in some manner: explained orally, developed between teacher and class by negotiation at the beginning of the school year or set forth in a student handbook. This general display of rules does not inform students how to apply rules to specific situations. The often used rule of "Respect others' property" may illustrate the tacit dimensions of rules. In this rule, the
students need to know the meaning of respect as it applies to the classroom situation. For example, borrowing another's property without permission may be accepted in the peer group but not in the classroom. Another example of this type of rule would be "no name calling or teasing". Both of these activities, while having a common meaning among many adults, may have totally different meanings within a peer group. Students need to know the exact meaning of teasing from adults in authority while those in authority need to have an understanding of students' meaning and acceptance of "teasing and name calling" as it applies and is accepted in the peer group. Appropriate meaning of rules and language must be communicated to the students and adults need to have some understanding of students' language. It may be assumed that the medium of communication is written, verbal or non-verbal language.

Each classroom has been identified as a social system, embedded in other social systems. As a social system, there is a means of communication through some manner of interaction. The primary mode of communication in this particular social system is language. Because language is the primary mode of communication, the theory of sociolinguistics underlies much of this research project. Sociolinguistics has been defined as "...that
part of linguistics which is concerned with language as a social and cultural phenomenon." (Trudgill, 1974, reprinted 1985)

Much of the theory of sociolinguistics is found in the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, psychology and linguistics. Linguistics has been defined as the formal study of grammar. (Gumperz, 1970) Sociolinguists have taken the study of linguistics further to the study of language use and social processes. It was this perspective, rather than linguistics, that was employed in this research project.

Green, (1983) has synthesized the constructs and methodologies of teaching as a linguistic process. These constructs were drawn from the disciplines of linguistics, information processing and cognitive psychology but the working definition for each construct was drawn from the terminology of sociolinguistics and ethnography of communication. The constructs employed in this research project are listed in Table 1. The studies synthesized have helped to develop new constructs and to suggest methodologies to collect and analyze teaching-learning behavior in the natural settings of home, school and community. The constructs will guide the collection of data and analysis related to learning through communicating with others. Data collection
consisted of capturing the verbal interactions between teachers and students then using those interactions as a basis for interviews with the students to gain their perspective of what is taking place in the classroom. The researcher adopting these constructs and a focus from the perspective of the participant observer had available to her a range of cues used by the participants as they convey and interpret meanings of behaviors. Constructs from "differential perceptions exist between students and teachers" to "rules for participation are often explicit" to "communicative competence is reflected in appropriate behavior" helped guide questions used for questioning students on their interpretation of teacher behaviors and rules of the classroom.

Meaning, in instructional events, consists of both academic and social aspects of lessons. As teachers and students interact with one another and classroom artifacts, meanings are constructed. Teachers deliver academic content of lessons and signal cues to students about how to participate in lessons. They signal who can speak, why, when, where, to whom and how, thus creating multi-dimensional activities that have a history and future demands for participation. (Farrar, 1981; Green, Harker & Golden, 1987; Mehan, 1979) Students also contribute to the flow of lessons by signalling their understanding of content for academic lessons and
appropriate social behavior for classroom participation. (Green & Harker, 1988) Viewed from this perspective, students have a multifaceted task in lesson construction. They must extract the nature of the moment, process and interpret accurately the verbal and non-verbal information being presented for both social and academic aspects. Then they must use this information to present accurate academic content information appropriately. In this manner, students are involved in meaning construction. (Green & Harker, 1988)

**TABLE 1**

Constructs on the Classroom as a Socio-communicative Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms are communicative environments.</td>
<td>Relationships between students are assymetrical. Differential perceptions exist between student and teachers. Classrooms are differentiated communicative contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers orchestrate different participation levels.</td>
<td>Demands for participation co-occur with academic demands. Teachers evaluate student's abilities by observing performance during interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contexts are constructed during interactions.</td>
<td>Behavior expectations are constructed as part of interactions. Rules for participation are often implicit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning is context specific</td>
<td>Meaning is signalled both verbally and non-verbally. All instance of behavior are not equal. Meaning is determined by extracted from observed behavior patterns. Contexts contain meaning. Communicative competence is reflected in appropriate behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferencing is required for conversational comprehension</td>
<td>Communication is rule-governed activity. Frames of reference are developed over time. Frame clashes result from different perceptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 in "Lesson Construction and Student Participation", a paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, April 11-15, 1983
Given that the teachers are the persons giving the cues for participation and many of these cues are implicit or tacit, the students are the interpreters of these cues. These cues have a history in that they are cues which teachers have used previously to indicate appropriate behavior to students. (Cochran-Smith, 1984; Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Erikson & Schultz, 1981, Mehan, 1979; Green and Wallat, 1982) New students entering a classroom need to interpret these cues so that they are able to adopt acceptable participation behaviors, become aware of the consequences of behaviors and thus become members of the society of the classroom. The children in elementary school traditionally have had one teacher for all subjects and remain with that teacher for the majority of the time spent in school. This is not true of the children in middle school, junior high and high schools. Children in secondary school need to become aware of the tacit dimensions of many teachers as they travel from teacher to teacher across the school day.

THE NEED FOR THE STUDY

Why study middle schools? Why use the perspective of the student? There is a small body of literature which has suggested that the middle schools of today may
well be seen as mini-high schools, which tend to ignore the rationale of the middle school in the social, intellectual, and emotional developmental aspects of the students. Arnold (1982) suggested that innovation at the middle school is largely confined to organizational change and rhetoric. A lack of commitment to the middle school principles and the inadequacy of teacher education programs present barriers to the success of middle schools. Vars (1983) stated that the three major characteristics of middle schools, i.e., (a) restructuring of self concept, (b) concern for peer acceptance and status, and (c) the diversity of students at this age group, are contradicted by the traditional competitive, group-based and uniform marking systems used in today's middle school. Why have middle schools if the principles of middle school philosophy are denied?

Most of the research that has been done in the middle school has used curriculum, school organizational patterns, child development or the teachers' perspective as a focus. The diversity of the students at the middle school level may be considered a rationale for viewing the middle school from the perspective of the student. Because students are the persons most impacted by the decisions made by adults concerning the curriculum or organizational patterns and other significant adults in
the middle school, a view of the middle school from their perspective may provide information which has not been frequently considered.

To view the middle school from the perspective of the students is an area that has not been explored in great depth, yet recent works suggests it is an area that will shed some light on the nature of the middle school. (Cusick, 1973; Goodlad, 1984; Elkind, 1976) Several authors have called for the need to begin to be considerate of the students perspective.

For example, Weinstein (1983, p. 289) noted that "Student perceptions and cognition about schooling have rarely been studied for descriptive and mapping purposes. Most typically we have turned to the students to help answer some questions about specific classroom effects within existing frameworks."

Fahs (1987, p.12) also challenged educators to look at the student perspective:

"Educators must begin to pay attention to what students are telling us about themselves and their peers. These students seem to be telling us that they need help in negotiating the social as well as the academic aspects of school-- that the social structure of school must change to meet their developmental needs."

Students today are experiencing more stress at the middle grades than they experienced in earlier times in our society. At this time in their lives, they are more
vulnerable to stress than earlier in their lives. (Eklind, 1986)

Change is threatening for students in transition. To leave the elementary classroom and move to the middle school with its more anonymous setting, new building, new teachers, new roles and curriculum creates anxieties, confusion and fear. Entering middle school can be frightening. Anxieties are also raised related to the increased pressure for academic success. (Bloomer, 1986; Elkind, 1987; Powell, 1986; Wiles & Bondi, 1986)

Bruene and her associates (1985) identified five major tasks facing the elementary school students as they moved from the elementary school to middle school. These factors were:

1) managing shifts in role definition and expectations
2) managing shifts in social networks and group memberships
3) reorganizing personal social support resources
4) reappraising the stress related to uncertain expectations, goals, and abilities.

As has been outlined in the previous paragraphs, to fully understand the concept of today's middle schools, the perspective of the student must be investigated. The primary concern for students as they emerge from childhood into adolescence should be one of providing them with an educational setting which meets their needs
educationally, emotionally and physically. To know if these needs are being met, the students should have opportunities to express their concerns and knowledge about middle school. One way to gather information in these areas is to use the perspective of the students as we investigate middle schools.

The middle school is a relatively recent phenomenon in education in the United States. To understand the rationale for the middle school, an understanding of its history and the history of its predecessor, the junior high may prove helpful.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Students are placed in middle school with little or no orientation to what middle school is -- with little or no orientation to what is expected of them as students. They move from the security of having one teacher to a new environment; one of a new building, new friends, new teachers, and new expectations from a variety of people. If it is accepted that each classroom is a social system as suggested by Waller (1932) and each is a unique social system because the participants change each period, then a series of questions must be asked.
SERIES QUESTIONS

1. How do students come to know the tasks necessary to become active participants in their classrooms?

2. If each classroom is a unique social system, with its own rules and norms for participation, then each classroom can be viewed as making different demands on students because each classroom has a different teacher and a different group of participants. This assumption raises the question of:

3. How do students learn to become active participants in middle school? They need to be able to understand the demands of each classroom as well as the demands placed upon them by the school; they need to be able to interpret correctly the cues sent to them by a variety of teachers some of whom they may not have in the classroom. Because many of the rules are unwritten and interpretive on the part of the students, the students need to know how they influence these teacher cues by their reactions and behaviors in classrooms as well as all other areas of the school, i.e., corridors and cafeteria. This raises the next question:

4. How do students interpret their observations of teacher behaviors to come to know the tacit dimensions of classroom and school?

The tacit dimensions may be those areas which are not explicitly made known to the students. They may be areas of non-verbal communication behaviors which teachers use to cue participation and acceptance of students and student behavior. These cues may be direct eye contact as opposed to scanning the entire class; it may be the use of praise and which students receive praise; it may be the proximity of the teacher to the student or it may be facial expression and tonality. These assumptions raise the following other questions:
1. Do these teacher behaviors, as viewed by the students, cue students to teachers' intent?

2. What aspects of classroom context influence the students' perception and understanding of classroom life? Students now need to understand and know the social norms and expectations of each teacher within the classroom as well as across teachers' classes.

3. How do they come to know these norms and expectations as they move across time during a day, moving from teacher to teacher?

Problems for students may arise in the recognition of teacher nonverbal cues. Gage (1978, cited in Woolfolk & Brooks, 1985, p. 112) stated:

"...the cues available to students are often unstated, inconsistent, incomplete or even misleading. The cues change from class to class, from subject to subject, from teacher to teacher. So pupils need to develop sophisticated techniques for determining what they should do and how well they are doing it."

Most of the research in classrooms has been done in terms of teacher actions influencing students' learning rather than viewing the total picture of the classroom. Because the classroom is an interactive environment in which teachers and students interact with one another and instructional artifacts, this approach limits the use of the student perspective. The approach from the teacher influencing students has been described as uni-directional in that it views classroom management solely as a matter of teachers controlling student behavior. It focuses on the improvement of teacher behaviors to control students' behavior. (Kounin, 1970; Good & Brophy, 1973; Emmer, Evertson. & Anderson, 1979)
If this approach is limited, then a multi-directional approach including the students' perspective should present a truer picture of classroom life.

**PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

This study attempted to describe, from the students' perspective, how they learn the tacit dimensions and social demands of middle school as they move from a self-contained classroom with one teacher to a middle school with a new teacher for each class. Students now need to know and understand the social norms and expectations of each teacher within and across classrooms. How do they learn these norms and expectations as they move across time during the day, moving from teacher to teacher?

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND DESIGN**

This study, using a naturalistic case study design with a limited ethnographic will attempted to provide answers for the following research questions:

1) How do teachers convey their classroom rules and expectations to students?

2) How do students interpret teacher behaviors to come to an understanding of the tacit dimensions of the classroom?

3) What aspects of classroom context influence the students' perception and understanding of classroom life?

4) How do students come to know and understand the tasks necessary to become active participants in their classroom?
In order to obtain a fuller understanding of classroom life, a multi-dimensional approach was used. This approach assumes that the students influence teacher behavior as well as teachers influencing student behavior. (Alschuler, 1980; Hunt, 1976) If an understanding of classroom life from both the perspective of the teachers and students is necessary to more fully understand classroom life, then it becomes necessary to incorporate the perspective of the students.

The perspective of the student may be obtained by the use of a participant observer. (Spradley, 1980) Human beings act as ordinary participants in many social situations. Individuals observe how the others act in a given situation and act as they do. For example, upon entering a new social situation, individuals observe how the people act in that situation and follow their example. A participant observer may look like any other person in the situation yet has a dual purpose for being in the situation: s/he wants to engage in the activities of the situation as well as observe the activities, the actions of the people and the physical aspects of the situation while the ordinary participants only want to participate in the situation. The use of a naturalistic case study with a participant observer and student
interviews allowed the perspective of the student to emerge as the researcher participated in the classroom.

This study used a participant observer, using video tapes and audio tapes to collect permanent records of the classroom activities for the first three weeks of school. These were supplemented with field notes to provide a permanent record of researcher activities, impressions and personal thoughts as the study progressed. The student interviews were used to gain the students' interpretation of what was happening in the classrooms. These sources of data provided a rich picture of the organization of the classrooms.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this study and its focus as stated in Chapter One was to investigate and to describe the students' perspective on how they came to know the tacit dimensions of classrooms: the implicit rules and social norms which allowed them to become active participants in their classes in the middle school. In Chapter Two, literature relevant to students' transition from the elementary school to the middle school was reviewed including selected literature from developmental psychology, literature relevant to previous classroom studies that used direct observation, literature on the beginning of school and selected literature from the non-verbal behavior realm.

The review of literature presented was designed to be representative and illustrative rather than comprehensive. It was intended to help describe the concerns in middle school and not to prescribe solutions. Concerns were raised that are of significance to the study of middle schools.
TRANSITION LITERATURE

"Children become students as teachers shape the habits, skills, dispositions and matters which enable them to perform more or less satisfactorily the roles expected in their society". (Brim, cited in Katz, 1979 cited in Fernie, 1988 p.4) This statement describes the theory that schools at all levels are seen as agencies, and the teachers as agents, for the transmission of our adult culture to the next generation. (Fernie, 1988)

Hatch (1984) views becoming a student as becoming an adult by socialization-through-schooling in order to meet the needs of society and the work place. Students learn to conform to time frames for tasks, to follow directions and to be prompt by following the rules for attendance and completion of tasks, all demands of the work world of our society. (Cited in Fernie, 1988) Children also become students by negotiating with teachers the structures of the social systems of their classroom. Each classroom is an individual social system. (Waller, 1932, Trudgill, 1974 reprinted 1985, Mehan, 1979, Green, 1983 a) Children negotiate for roles, obligations and intentions. This process makes becoming a student an active process using the daily face-to-face interaction. This process then becomes socialization to school as
opposed to school being used to socialize students to the adult world: to shape children into prepared and productive citizens.

There is an abundance of literature written about anxieties raised in small children as they leave home to enter kindergarten and there is a great deal written about the anxieties as students leave school. Comparing the school to home in dealing with adult authority indicates how children deal with adult authority in relation to per culture. In the home, the child may be on his own to adopt to the demands of adults. In school, children confront the demands of adults in groups or "teams". (Corsaro, 1988) The children share the frustrations of adult intervention. This process of sharing leads to the formation of community among the students and is usually accomplished very early in the school year. (Corsaro, 1988, Doyle 1986) This group identity, according to Corsaro (1988) becomes the basis for the social identity of the students.

Another factor concerning adult control is the reality of numbers of adults. In the home that authority is parents, in school that authority may be shared by a number of adults having on different levels of authority, i.e. principal, classroom teacher, cafeteria personnel, crossing guard, who may vary interpretations and
enforcement of rules. Children then begin to see that they have varying control over the adult in authority. Children may find that they can negotiate some rules as a group and other rules remain non-negotiable and in control of the adults for implementation and enforcement. (Corsaro, 1988; examples mine)

There is very little written about the student who is moving from the elementary to middle school or junior high. Much of the literature related to this area of research is concerned with the stresses associated with the transition. (Bloomer, 1986; Elkind, 1986; Powell, 1986) As these stresses are investigated, researchers have found fear is one cause that leads to school drop-outs and suicide. (Girl, 1987; National School Safety Center, 1988; Youngs, 1986) Somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000 middle grade students attempt some type of suicide each year, making suicide the eighth leading cause of death for this group. (Smith & Mauceri, 1982) Stress is not the only factor that has been investigated for these students in transition.

The needs of the students was the focus of a study in Canada. A survey design was used to determine the needs of students in transition from the elementary to the middle school. The findings indicated that there are many needs of the student related to new experiences.
building and routines as well as new academic, social, and personal challenges. (Gardner & Carpenter, 1985; Toepfer, 1986) Related to personal challenges is the study done by Haynes, (1990) which examined the relationship between specific self-concept dimensions and school adjustment in three areas: 1) general classroom behavior, 2) group participation and 3) attitude toward authority as assessed by teachers of middle school students.

Haynes (1990) found that children's own concept of their own behavior was the strongest influence on their adjustment to school, on their extent of participation and on their relationship with authority figures. If children viewed themselves as negative, they were likely to perform negatively.

A second finding of Haynes (1990) study was that moral-ethical self-concept concerning the sense of right or wrong influences the ability to make acceptable social choices.

The third significant finding dealt with students' attitudes toward authority. Children's self-concept should reflect self-worth and adequacy as a person. This finding emphasizes the need to have a strong link between school and family if children are to maintain acceptable academic and social levels at school. (Haynes, 1990)
Work examining the transition period and early adolescents' adjustment to the transition has been done in the light of the organizational patterns. Blyth, Simmons and Carlton-Ford (1983) focused on two organizational patterns. In their study, Pattern A was a transition from a sixth grade to a three year junior high with a second transition from ninth grade to a three year high school. Pattern B has only one transition; from eighth grade to the four year high school. Their longitudinal study indicated that the transition into seventh grade, Pattern A, showed some disadvantages. Girls appeared to be placed at-risk in areas of self-esteem and both boys and girls appeared to be at-risk in terms of academic success. They found that these students were more likely to feel anonymous and less likely to participate in extra-curricular activities. When the two times of transition were compared, delaying the transition until the ninth grade, after most of the emotional and physical changes of the early adolescent were complete, seemed to reduce the difficulty of the transition and the time it took to recover from the transition.

In another study which investigated the transition period of middle-class to upper-class students, Nottelmann (1987, p.447) found that "The growing
-- in the transitional period between childhood and adolescence -- is relatively free from disturbance."
This study included two transition and two non-transition groups. The transition groups changed schools between May 1 and November 2 from either fifth grade to middle school or from sixth grade to junior high. The non-transition groups were promoted from grade five to grade six or from grade six to grade seven and did not change schools. This study showed adolescence turmoil as an exception rather than the rule.

The Junior High Transition Study (Mitman, et al., 1982) investigated the transition period from the students' perspective. This study investigated students' concerns and feelings concerning their elementary and junior high experiences, explored the ways that students participated in instructional settings and presented students' descriptions as well as parents' views of the junior high. The study used a Student Opinion Survey at the end of sixth grade and again at the end of seventh grade. The SOS measured attitudes toward school and rated school concepts. A comparison of the sixth grade responses and the seventh grade responses indicated that the students were less satisfied at the end of seventh grade than they were at the end of sixth grade.
The Transition Study also used a Concerns Questionnaire to gather data about students' feelings towards transition. The answers were categorized according to "past" and "today" in referring to how they felt about the questions. This questionnaire was issued during the fifth week of seventh grade. Results indicated that most of the students did not have a great concern about the items listed in the survey; students expressed more concern about academic work and less concern related to the social issues of junior high. As the "past" and "today" responses were analyzed, the scores show a significant decrease in concerns from "past" to "today." This suggested that students felt that they had adjusted to transition problems within the first five weeks of school.

The literature reviewed in this section indicated many needs during transition: 1) that the organizational pattern may place students at risk; 2) that students' positive attitudes declined; and 3) that students adjusted to transition within the first five weeks of school.

Students at this time in their lives are undergoing many developmental, emotional, and social changes. These changes are influences on their lives now and in their future.
DEVELOPMENTAL LITERATURE

Early adolescents and their development was recognized as a social stage in the life span around 1900. This was largely due to the work of G. Stanley Hall and the growth of the high school. The clearest boundary marker of the stage is the transition from primary to secondary school, usually at the sixth or seventh grade level. (Elder, in Dragastin & Elder [ed.], 1975)

Developmental literature has given much attention to the biological timetable of human development with little attention given to the social or historical timetable. The life cycle may be viewed from three dimensions of time: life time which is the chronological age; historical time which is the time in history, and the social time which is the age and age expectations which shape the life cycle. (Neugarten & Datan, 1973)

Neugarten has continued to expand the notion that biological maturation heavily influences childhood development but she believes that chronological age is an unreliable indicator of what people will be like at different stages of life. Changing times and different social expectations effect how groups of people born during the same time period move through the course of
life. Values and expectations are shaped by the time period in which we live.

The social environment can influence decisions and expectations. She used the term social clocks as time when people are expected and expect to accomplish some major tasks of life. Social clocks guide our lives and those in sync with their social clocks experience less stress. (Neugarten, B. 1976) Viewing the pre-adolescent in this light, the researcher illustrated the changes that have been observed in this age group.

The pre-adolescent of the 1950's and 1960's was not influenced in the same ways as the pre-adolescent of the 1970's and 1980's has been. The advancement of television and its capabilities of bringing the world into one's living room cannot be dismissed as an influence on today's world. Through the use of the television, adolescents have been exposed to a world much wider than their own community. They have been exposed to the world of politics, drugs and international problems; knowledge which was not as readily available to earlier generations of adolescents.

Many of the early adolescent researchers based their insights about adolescents in the larger life long theories of human development. While these theories may serve as guidelines, they do not specifically address
todays' early adolescent, the 10-14 year old age group. The social era of the development of these theories do not reflect the complex multifaceted world of today's young person. (Lerner, 1985; Lerner and Foch, 1987; Santrock, 1987)

More recent theoretical models incorporate the interaction between the pre-adolescent and their environment as a developmental factor. Brooks-Gunn and Peterson (1983) focused their research on the biological-psychosocial aspects of the young adolescent. Based on this work, Lerner and Fuch (1987) addressed the relationship between biological, psychological and social aspects. Their findings indicated that the individual physical and behavior characteristics elicit different responses from people they interact with than responses elicited from other groups of people interacting with each other; i.e. adults interacting with adults. The reactions and responses of others give feedback to the adolescent and influence their development.

Adolescent behaviors and the reaction of other people create an interactional influence on the adolescent development by influencing social context. The influence may occur in three ways:
1) the adolescent becomes the stimulus which causes different reactions from others.

2) the adolescent processes the information gained from others and the manner in which the information is processed influences development.

3) adolescents are able to choose activities in which they wish to be participants, thus shape and select their environments and ultimately influence development.

Because of sociological and developmental characteristics, this age group has become an area where more concern and attention has been given. Ten years ago this age group went unnoticed. The stress and emotional turbulence experienced by adolescents a decade ago is now being felt by the 10 - 15 year old today, the group now identified as the pre-adolescent. (Thornburg, 1980)

Maturation for children and adolescents is occurring much earlier than in previous decades. Today's 10-15 year old is subject to impulses, behaviors and desires not encountered previously by this age group. Much of this is due to social processes. Children today are involved in a larger range of social contact through peers, media, and diversity of family structures. Given the limitations of other theorists, Thornburg (1980, p.217) has accepted as outdated but viable, Havighurst's (1952) concept of "developmental tasks" for the adolescent of today. These "developmental tasks" are:
1) becoming aware of increased physical changes
2) organizing knowledge and concepts into problem-solving strategies
3) learning new social and sex roles
4) recognizing one's own awareness with stereotypes
5) developing friendships with others
6) gaining a sense of independence
7) developing a sense of morality and values.

Viewing these tasks, one readily is able to see a source of stress and frustration for the adolescent.

The Swiss psychologist, Jean Piaget, introduced his theory of cognitive development in the 1920's. According to his theory, children at age 12+ are entering the formal operational stage and should be ready for abstract, logical thinking. Some children in the pre-adolescence stage are in Piaget's concrete operations stage. In this concrete operations stage, children develop the ability to think logically about the here and now but not about abstractions. In the formal operations stage, the child should be able to think logically and abstractly. The limitations of Piaget's theory lay in the fact that he did not clearly define the types of transitional thought process between concrete and formal operations. New brain research in brain growth or the lack of it at this stage has suggested that Piaget's
model is too simplified, vague or limited to explain the thought processes which are present in the early adolescent growth period. (Epstein, 1974 & 1978; Toepfer, 1979)

According to James (1980, p. 245), "A special kind of thinking is required to fully comprehend the uniqueness of early adolescence." James referred to Janusian thinking when discussing understanding the early adolescent. This reference comes from the Roman god with two faces who was the god of beginnings and endings. The observer of the early adolescent must be able to consider the pre and post development of the early adolescent in order to understand the early adolescent. (James, 1980)

The adolescent observed in Erikson's personality development theory, is in the stage of identity vs. role confusion. Erikson (1963, p. 10) stated of this stage: "...in no other stage of the life cycle, are the promises of finding oneself and the threat of losing oneself so closely allied." According to Erikson, personality development is a psychosocial process reflecting social process and a social process reflecting psychosocial means. These processes meet crisis in adolescence but have grown throughout childhood and will emerge in later years. This means that there is a creation of sameness, a unity of personality which is felt by the person and
observed by others. In adolescence, this crisis is not resolved as easily as the crisis of the earlier stages of personality development. Past and future experiences will influence this development. The early adolescent is searching for identity in a society in flux with sex role identification models, changing cultural values and the onset landslide of puberty and all its sensations. These are reasons for turbulent emotions and flexibility of self-concept.

Reviewing these two selected bodies of literature attempted to illustrate the need to look at the students and their stages of development when viewing classrooms to discover what goes on in classrooms. Given, as stated previously, that classrooms are societies embedded in other societies the nature of each classroom will be impacted by the influences of the other societies. Also having an impact will be the fact that children develop, intellectually and physically, each at his/her rate of development. Because this fact has now been clarified by much of the cognitive psychology, educators must now begin to acknowledge this knowledge when planning classroom instruction and interaction. Classroom planning can no longer be accomplished based on chronological age of children but must consider all the aspects of development. To accomplish a fuller
understanding of the nature of classrooms, a research method must be developed to gather information and analyze that information which cannot be obtained using an observation instrument which relies upon direct observation of teacher and/or student behavior and recording the number of times a given behavior occurs in a given time. Much of the previous literature has been conducted with direct observation and observation using observational systems. If these systems depend upon observable behaviors only, then a method must be found to record the tacit dimensions of the classroom.

**LITERATURE ON OBSERVATIONAL STUDIES**

There has been a voluminous body of work completed in classrooms using observational systems. Much of the research that has been done on teaching has used one of the many observational systems. A number of issues are raised as the review of observational systems is undertaken. Among the issues are those relating to the instrument used, the linearity of classroom events, and the context of the events.

Medley and Mitzel (1963, p. 248), in *The First Handbook Of The Research on Teaching* synthesized the observational studies done prior to 1963 and suggested "...examination of the studies reveal many deficiencies in design and analysis resulting from the well-known lag
between precept and practice." (p.248) This may be considered the first call for research on the study of life in classrooms and suggests that the most appropriate approach would be direct systematic observation combined with modern statistical techniques. This first call for the study of classroom life had as its methodology direction the direct systematic observation approach with the use of powerful statistics for the study of teaching.

Rosenshine and Furst (1973, p.22), in The Second Handbook of Research on Teaching issued the second call for programmatic research to examine teacher effectiveness. These authors argued that the knowledge gathered by some 120 instruments since Medley & Mitzel's first call (1963) was "...chaotic, unorganized and self-serving." (p.22). They suggested, building on the work of Gage, a descriptive - correlational - experimental loop design to study teacher effectiveness. This call resulted in the teacher effectiveness research using the process-product paradigm with observable teaching behaviors which had been defined as desirable teaching behaviors as variables correlated with student achievement as measured by standardized tests. This resulted in attempts to identify generalized laws of effective teaching which further resulted in the consideration of how teaching behaviors influence what is
learned in the classroom. These laws were, as a result of the methods used to gather data, based only on observable behavior and failed to record the non-verbal, non-stated classroom norms resulting from numerous classroom interactions which indicated appropriate student classroom behavior.

1974 saw the publication of Dunkin and Biddle's (1974) volume *The Study of Teaching* in which the authors examined some 500 studies of classroom teaching. These studies were both observational and systematic. The conclusion of these authors was that through these 500 studies a great variety of topics had been investigated - these topics included the classroom as a social system, classroom climate, managerial and control aspects, knowledge and intellect, logic and linguistics, and sequential patterns of classroom behavior. The authors maintain that to this point in time what had been developed was a set of concepts describing the processes of teaching and a set of instruments for measuring those concepts. Many view this third call for research on teaching as an exposing of the sham of the oversimplistic models of teaching that appeared to be based on commitments about what was effective practice. (Dunkin and Biddle, p.52, 1974)
Dunkin and Biddle recognized the positive outcomes of these studies yet at the same time described some of the problems with this research. They identified four areas where problems existed. The first area was the lack of consistency in the findings. Some of the studies showed one set of factors to be related to teacher effectiveness where other studies contradicted these factors. The second area they discovered was the choice of criterion variables used to validate teaching processes. These variables were most often standardized achievement tests which often are not an accurate measure of what was taught in the lesson taught or an accurate measure of the particular classroom outcome for the activity being measured. The third area where these authors found a weakness was in the area of commitment, philosophy or experience which was the basis of the study. Many of the findings from this group reflected these beliefs. The fourth and last area was found in the model for interpreting the research. They found that the variable overlapped in meaning; many of the variables occurred at the same time; some variables were causative, while others were much more complex than what had been conceptualized as the process of teaching at the time of the research. Their conclusion was
"... in the long run we need to know not only what teaching processes occur, when they are likely to appear, with what other processes they co-occur, and what they produce in pupils when present or absent, but also we need to know why." (p. 410)

Dunkin and Biddle, like their predecessors Roshenshine and Furst (1973), called for empirically based theories of teaching but unlike their predecessors, suggested a variety of models for studying teaching. Their suggestions included the trait model, the interaction model, the social system model and the curriculum model. They further suggested:

"None of these models, then, is adequate by itself to accommodate the events of teaching. Each has some attractive feature. The trait and curriculum models offer simplicity of conceptualization and the prospect of providing clear prescriptions for the improvement of teaching. The interaction model focuses our attention on the details of teacher interaction with individual pupils. The social system model reminds us that the teacher must also manage the classroom group. Theories of teaching that utilize but one of these models are not likely to accommodate more than a portion of the events of teaching." (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974, pp. 415-416)

Evertson and Green in their chapter "Observational as Inquiry and Method" in The Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd. edition, 1986) argued that the variety of observational systems used and reported as chaotic by Rosenshine & Furst have potential strength. Observations made, using a variety of representative systems provided diversity to the study of teaching. They argued that the observations must be systematic, deliberate, and question
specific thus providing diversity and a variety of options for studying teaching.

They further argued that the variety of studies "...demonstrate the richness of information and the complementarily of views that can be obtained by systematically building on different approaches."

(Everston and Green, 1986, p. 165) No single approach or system captures the whole of what happens in classrooms, therefore there is a need for an approach that permits the capture of multiple perspectives of classroom life e.g. the teacher perspective, the student perspective, teacher-student interactions, as well as the curriculum and organizational perspectives.

Studies using direct observation with coding systems have flourished since N.A. Flanders developed his instrument for observing classroom behavior: Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories. Although his instrument was not substantially different from earlier models, he added two categories which allowed coding for pupil verbal behavior. (Flanders and Amidon, 1981)

Modifications of FIAC have been made to make distinctions in teacher behaviors as well as a broader set of categories for coding student behavior. Amidon and Hunter (1967) modified FIAC to distinguish between narrow and broad teacher questions. Their basis for
modification was that narrow questions would elicit predictable responses while broad questions would elicit open-ended responses. Amidon and Hough (1967) set out 13 categories which allowed a distinction between managerial and substantive talk as well as a method to code teacher vs. student talk, initiation vs. response. This system was revised and the fourth revision "Observational System for Instructional Analysis" was grounded in the theory that systematic observation should involve more than verbal communication and should provide the fullest possible description of the use of the human and temporal resources to describe the instructional activities of the classroom. (Hough, Duncan and Bolland, 1980)

Most of the studies using these category-type observational systems reported findings of direct or indirect teacher influence. As Duncan and Biddle (1974) reviewed these studies, they found that the results in terms of student responses and teacher indirection appeared to be contradictory. In the studies that attempted to show a relationship between teacher indirection and pupil achievement, the findings illustrated that teacher indirection varied with the intelligence level of the student. Studies from the field studies as well as experimental studies indicated that indirection was and was not associated with
student achievement and student attitudes yet appeared to suggest that there is a relationship, if not a causal effect, between teacher indirecdness and student achievement. Where there was an effect on student achievement, it was very small. (Duncan and Biddle, 1974)

Considering all the limitations of the various observational instruments, relationships between teacher-coded behavior and student response were supported in some studies and denied in others. Reasons for these inconsistencies may have been due to the instrument used, that classroom events are not linear, or that classroom events are contextually bound. Events in classrooms have a history and are governed by classroom participation norms and rules whose patterns cannot be retrieved because it is not possible to code how teachers cued behaviors. The predetermined categories presupposed what was important in teacher classroom behaviors. These categories also limited descriptions of classrooms to the behaviors included in the categories thus allowing much of what happened in classrooms to go unrecorded and classroom descriptions failed to portray the richness of classroom life.

LITERATURE ON CONTEXTUALLY BOUND RULES

There is a body of literature which has indicated that classroom rules are contextually bound. Classroom
observers need to know the history of the rules to determine if the rules are for the observation or situation specific, i.e., the rules are being applied to specific classroom situations. Students who are adhering to rules may be adhering to those rules set up prior to the observation and therefore may be adhering to rules for the observation or they may be adhering to the rules that have evolved over time for that specific classroom situation. Classroom events have histories and the processes of classrooms unfold over time. Therefore the early time of the year is an important time for the establishment of procedures, rules, structures, and experiences. It is therefore important for the observer to be present at the beginning of school.

Teachers' behaviors signal transition periods from one segment of a lesson or from one type of activity to another. Many times this is illustrated by the body posture of the teacher as she bends from the waist to give instruction and is then interrupted and thus changes posture, whereupon the students move away from attention and are reprimanded. (Shultz and Florio, 1979) Each classroom context makes different interactional demands on the students.

Not all rules are enacted at all times; contexts and phases of a class session have rules tied to them. In
order to understand classroom order, an understanding of classroom contexts is necessary. There is a need to understand how the context of individual classrooms are enacted by teachers and students. Teachers have special rules for events across the day. (Doyle, 1986)

Rules for classroom participation are established jointly by teachers and students. Students influence teacher behavior as well as teachers influencing students' behavior. (Mehan, 1979) Competent students are those who are able to carry out their own agenda while at the same time attending to the instructional agenda of the teacher. (Mehan, 1980)

Chandler (1982) defined competent students as those who have mastered intellectually, emotionally, and physically, the various competencies required for effective interaction with the socially prescribed, self-selected and self-developed environments they will encounter in the future.

Erikson and Shultz (1981) termed this interaction of teachers and students activities as jointly constituted activities. Order is achieved with the students and depends upon their willingness to follow along with an unfolding event. Mehan and Wood (1975) used the term mutually constituting to describe this mutual construction of the classroom environment. Their study
suggested that to fully understand the classroom and its activities, the use of the student perspective is warranted. The use of the student perspective was encouraged as well as observers being in the classroom from the beginning of school.

LITERATURE ON THE BEGINNING OF SCHOOL

Much of the literature for this area of concern has been embedded in teacher effectiveness studies and classroom management studies. The importance of defining rules for classrooms early in the year has been discussed by many authors. Doyle (1986) in his chapter in *The Handbook Of Research On Teaching* synthesized the research on classroom order. He quoted Bagley (1907, p. 22) "... that the only way absolutely to insure a school against waste is to make the very first day thoroughly rigorous in all details." This suggested that the rules for participation and appropriate behavior are established early in the year.

Emmer, Everston and Anderson (1980) studied third grade teachers and their classrooms during the first three weeks of school to learn the principles of organization and management in relationship to setting up an effective classroom management for the remainder of the year. They found that the more effective managers had more complete systems of rules and procedures than
did the less effective managers. They were more explicit about what were desirable behaviors, more consistent in monitoring student behavior and used rules and procedures in feedback to the students. They communicated step-by-step progression and were clear in presenting all information. Evertson and Emmer (1982) followed this study with a similar one in seventh and eighth grades. The results were similar although the researchers expected to find different strategies and procedures.

More effective managers teach the rules to the students. Brooks (1985) discussed how the experienced teacher in his study taught the rules to her students as opposed to the inexperienced teacher telling her students the rules. Teaching the rules consisted of:

1) providing each student with a printed set of rules;
2) a sequence of rules applied to her classroom;
3) included examples of the rules with questions and answers from the students for clarification;
4) rationales for the rules; and,
5) consequences for infractions of the rules.

These strategies were suggested as good strategies for effective and continued classroom management. (Brooks, 1985; Good and Brophy, 1984)

The need for the rules and procedures to be concrete, explicit and functional was also emphasized by
Shultz and Florio (1979). Their work expressly addressed this necessity in the early grades and at the beginning of school. Doyle's (1984) study with junior high students during seatwork time illustrated the need for the establishment of an active system that is nurtured by the teacher. This work focused on the curriculum work rather than the public correction of disruptive behavior. This theme of early establishment of rules and activities is carried through all the research for effective management at the beginning of the school year. Many researchers have shown that to fully understand the classroom activities, the students' perspective needs to be investigated.

**LITERATURE ON THE STUDENT PERSPECTIVE**

The literature from this perspective has shown a substantial increase as the interest in how students' perceive classrooms has increased.

In two studies, Tenebaum (1941) and Sr. Josephina (1956) studied students' attitudes of school in high school and elementary school respectively. Both studies dealt with the students' feelings toward school and teachers. The Tenebaum study found that students accepted school as an institution of society and even if they were unhappy in school, they perceived the school as good. The school is a receiver of attitudes and not the
creator of attitudes. The child enters school with preconceived notions of what school is and thinks s/he gets from the school what the school has to give and what society expects. Sr. Josephina concluded in her study that when teachers realize that students like them as persons, classroom climate improves and students show increased interest in subject matter. Both of these early studies used a survey questionnaire to obtain the perspective of the students.

Many studies have shown that the organization of the classroom is multi-dimensional with teachers and students jointly responsible for the direction of the classroom activity. (Jackson, 1968; Mehan and Wood, 1975; Saranson, 1971; Shantz, 1975; Smith, 1968) These studies suggested that students are active participants of learning and active interpreters of classroom action and reality, not just passive recipients of instruction. Teacher and students are directly responsible for the direction of an activity. This multi-dimensional approach recognizes that activity in the classroom does not always originate with the teacher but that students operate on the environment as much as the environment acts on them; students then structure and modify their world just as they are structured and modified by it. Students make judgements about their abilities and performance as well
as appropriate classroom behavior based in part on teacher actions and reactions. (Woolfolk and Brooks, 1985; Mehan and Wood, 1975)

John Goodlad (1984) has also stated the need for the student perspective. He discussed the fact the students may be a rather reliable indicator of classroom dynamics which are not readily observed or sensed by outside observers. Students are at the heart of the process and undoubtedly have insight as to what is happening. This rich source on intimate experience in seeking to know what goes on in classrooms has often been overlooked.

Cusick (1973) and Elkind (1976) have also urged researchers to use the perspective of the students. They contended that to see and understand the students' world, a concentrated effort must be made to see the world and understand it as the students view it. Elkind went further with his contention stating that to be effective in helping students, the problem from the students' viewpoint must be seen.

In their study, Gardner and Carpenter (1985) demonstrated a need for the use of the student perspective during the transition period from elementary school to middle school. Using a student questionnaire, the students showed that they had many needs in their adjustment to a change in schools. The needs were in
relationship to the new experience, a new organization of
school as well as new academic, social and personal
challenges.

Mergendoller and his colleagues (1982) used
questions with seventh graders about their perceptions of
classroom rules and what the implications of their
perceptions were for successful participation in
classrooms. The requirements for successful
participation as perceived by the students showed little
variance when compared across classrooms. The role of
the student, as perceived by these students, was one of
being quiet, or not talking out of turn, moving around
the room without disturbing others and treating others
with respect. Academic rules fell below mobility,
ethical, and talk/noise rules for these students.

Several studies have been done to investigate the
transition period and adjustment to middle/junior high
school from the students' perspective. The results of
most of these studies illustrated that students viewed
themselves as having adjusted to the new environment and
its adjustment problems early in the school year. They
also showed a less positive attitude toward school at the
end of the year of transition than earlier in the year.
(Evans and Richards, 1980; Mitman, et al, 1982; Power and
Cotterell, 1979)
There have been researchers who have taken the role of the outside observer to try to understand the student perspective. (Delamont, 1976; Jackson, 1968; Mehan, 1979; Smith and Geoffrey, 1968; Woods, 1980 a, 1980 b) Duke, (1977, p. 262) suggested that it is very difficult for adults to accurately describe the students' perceptions of classrooms. He stated two assumptions for his suggestion for the use of the student perspective:

"1) adults cannot infer or guess or intuit what children are thinking, and
2) student perceptions about what occurs to them and around them are a valuable source of information for teachers and researchers."

His study suggested utilizing an approach which will allow students to have input into the research; one approach is student interviews and student questionnaires.

Florio (1978), Corsaro (1985), and Allen (1982) have taken the roles of participant observers: they became members of the class of students they were studying. Florio, in her study of kindergarten/first grade, studied interactions of students as they became competent members of the classroom. Corsaro, in his study of students in day care, studied peer interaction and the socialization process. Allen, in his study, studied the interactive nature of students' and teachers' agendas to see how they effect classroom management. All three of these
Researchers became part of the classroom they studied as a student and were treated as such by the teachers.

The student perspective of classroom life is just one area of classroom complexity. The studies reviewed above provided some beginnings about the student perspective and suggested more work be done in this area in order to understand how students perceive classroom life.

Students perceive classroom life from both a verbal perspective as well as a non-verbal perspective. The following section reviews selected works from the field of non-verbal communication.

**LITERATURE ON NON-VERBAL BEHAVIOR**

The area of non-verbal communication has volumes of work. For the purposes of this study, the literature reviewed concentrated on teacher non-verbal behavior as related to teacher expectations and attitudes as perceived by students.

Woolfolk & Brooks (1985) reviewed this literature. They reported a contradictory set of findings on teacher non-verbal behavior. One set of studies found that students evaluated their teachers more positively when teachers leaned forward, smiled, nodded affirmatively, and maintained eye contact. The other set of studies found that the teacher's words rather than the non-verbal
carried more weight, at least when the teacher was unfamiliar to the students.

Weinstein (1981) used interviews to determine what cues students use to help decide how they are doing in class. She found that public feedback was the main source with the teacher non-verbal appearing to play a role. Public feedback was noted as feedback which is seen or heard by the entire class. Weinstein suggested from this study that the feedback and decisions on instructional practice were more important than the quality of work or the students' work.

The importance of the cultural diversity of classrooms becomes important in the non-verbal cues given to students. (Weinstein, 1981) For younger children it is easy to interpret the non-verbals from adults from the same cultural background but difficult to interpret those from different cultural backgrounds.

To fully understand the effects of teachers' non-verbals upon students as they interpret these non-verbals, researchers must use an approach which will allow the student responses to give the information. (Weinstein, 1981) At the present time, most knowledge about non-verbal behavior and its effects on students must be inferred from students' written responses.
SUMMARY

The present study reviewed literature which attempted to show the necessity of using the perspective of the student, the transition period, and developmental literature to gain a fuller understanding of life in middle school classrooms.

To conclude Chapter Two, a quote from Nash (1976, p. 94) illustrates why there is a need to look at students and their perspective in our classrooms:

"A new class is not a clean slate passively waiting for the teacher to inscribe his will on it. It is an ongoing social system with very definite expectations about appropriate teacher behavior. If these are not confirmed, the pupils will protest and renegotiated patterns of behavior may not prove to be just what the teacher intended."

Nash (1986) also believed that teachers should be concerned about how student perceptions and the evaluations made on these perceptions. To have the patterns of behavior teachers want, teachers need to be made aware of what cues they are sending to students and how these cues are interpreted by students.
CHAPTER III

INTRODUCTION

Because the focus of this research was the "tacit" dimensions of the classroom, from the perspective of the student, a naturalistic field case study model was employed. The direction of the study was one of searching for qualitative data to answer the question: How do students come to learn what they perceive as the "tacit" dimensions of the classroom and what cues help them to understand the implicit rules of the classroom. The naturalistic field study allows the data from the perspective of the student to emerge without the manipulation of either the subjects or the materials used to gather the data. The naturalistic paradigm holds the belief of multiple, constructed realities which are studied holistically rather than fragmented. As the classroom is studied, the multiple realities emerge and questions arise; often more questions arise than are answered. The interactive nature of the multiple realities often prohibit the causality of any one event
to be identified because a simultaneous, continuous shaping of reality is occurring.

This paradigm also holds the belief that the relationship between researcher and researched is interactive; one influences the other and the two may be inseparable. The aim of the investigation using a naturalistic perspective is to develop knowledge relating to a specific case having specific context and time boundaries. Therefore the knowledge gained is limited to the specific case studied and can not be transferred to other similar situations. (Guba and Lincoln, 1985)

The degree of transferability is a direct function of the similarities between the two settings to be investigated. One setting may be considered the sending context and the other the receiving context. If research context A is very similar to research context B, then the working hypothesis or set of questions of context A may be applied to context B. For a researcher to infer transferability from context A to context B, the researcher must be familiar with both the sending and the receiving settings. (Guba and Lincoln, 1985)

If another researcher were to use this research and employ the concept of transferability, that researcher would need to prove the similarities of the two contexts. S/he would need to demonstrate the degree to which the
contexts were similar in order to transfer the results and findings. (Guba and Lincoln, 1985)

A naturalistic researcher is able to posit working hypothesis or questions with descriptions of time and content in which the hypothesis or questions were found. On the other hand, the conventionalist is expected to make precise statements in the form of statistical confidence levels about validity, the extent of which can be presumed that the causal relationships can be transferred or generalized across settings, time and persons.

The naturalist can not specify external validity but can only provide thick descriptions of the contexts, setting, time and persons, to enable another researcher interested in transferring the results of one study to reach conclusions about the possibility of transferability.

In conclusion, the responsibility of the naturalist is to provide a database for others to make decisions and judgements concerning transferability. (Guba and Lincoln, 1985)

The naturalistic field case study model for investigating different perspectives has a strong tradition in the field of sociology. (e.g. Becker et. al., 1961, 1968; Smith and Geoffrey; 1968; Lofland, 1976) More recently this model has been recognized as a
necessary way to obtain a more fuller understanding of the complexities of classroom life. (Doyle, 1979; Mehan, 1979, Woods, 1980a) A person's perspective is dependent upon many cultural patterns influencing their behavior in interactions. For this reason, the investigation of the student perspective was undertaken in their classrooms under naturalistic conditions. A naturalistic field case study is considered a descriptive research method described in the following paragraph.

Descriptive research is defined as research which describes and interprets what exists. It is concerned with conditions and/or relationships that exist, with practices that prevail, attitudes that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are being felt and trends that are developing. A naturalistic field case study is a descriptive research that studies a discrete social unit and attempts to discover the characteristics that are important to understand about that social unit. It tries to understand why an individual within that unit behaves the way s/he does and how the individual responds to the environment. (Ary et al, 1985)

Combining the naturalistic field study with a descriptive case study allowed the researcher to study individual classes in their natural environment yet not study the entire school. The case study may have depth
yet lack breadth, since the classrooms are embedded within the society of the school as well as the community. The dynamics of both of these social units has impact on the classrooms. The researcher needs to be aware of these dynamics as they affect the classroom and students under investigation and investigate these relationships as they arise to discover the extent of their influence on the classrooms and students. (Spindler, 1971 as cited in Sanday, 1979 p.532)

While naturalistic inquiry and ethnography are used interchangeably by some, others see distinct differences. Rist (1980) discussed the movement where any study that included classroom observation or other educational settings or used one or more of the ethnographic methods was labelled an ethnographic study. He used the term "Blitzkrieg Ethnography" (1980) to describe these studies and argued that they do not meet the criteria for adequate ethnography.

These differences, as seen by others, appear to be in the amount and degree of immersion into the society or culture that the researcher wants to allow him/herself or the theory from which they are working. One side has the researcher attempting to accomplish an "insiders" perspective where the researcher becomes a part of the social unit or culture under study. The other side implies that the study be undertaken in a naturalistic
setting yet the researcher does not become a part of that social unit or culture and uses an "outsiders perspective. (Wolcott, 1975) The "insider" takes on the role and attitudes of the social unit under study while the "outsider" does not try to take on a role or adopt the attitudes of the social unit. An issue may be one of the researcher being able to correctly interpret the actions and language of the subjects.

Green and Bloome (1983) describe in detail the differences between ethnography and using methods of ethnography, (e.g. participant observation, field notes, and ethnographic interviewing). The concern of researchers who appear to use ethnography and methods of ethnography as synonyms is one of being able to capture the on-going real life situations which are many times not observable behaviors which can be captured using observational checklist.

Green and Bloome (1983) argue that using an ethnographic perspective represents an emergent and principaled systematic way to study the settings processes of education. They further argue that this approach is grounded in the frame work of ethnography especially the ethnography of communication which had as a primary theoretical concern the discovery of how talk is systematically patterned and how these patterns reveal how speakers perceive their roles and relationships in a
specific thus providing diversity and a variety of options for studying teaching.

They further argued that the variety of studies "...demonstrate the richness of information and the complementarily of views that can be obtained by systematically building on different approaches." (Everston & Green, 1986, p. 165) No single approach or system captures the whole of what happens in classrooms, therefore there is a need for an approach that permits the capture of multiple perspectives of classroom life e.g. the teacher perspective, the student perspective, teacher-student interactions, as well as the curriculum and organizational perspectives.

Studies using direct observation with coding systems have flourished since N.A. Flanders developed his instrument for observing classroom behavior: Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories. Although his instrument was not substantially different from earlier models, he added two categories which allowed coding for pupil verbal behavior. (Flanders & Amidon, 1981)

Modifications of FIAC have been made to make distinctions in teacher behaviors as well as a broader set of categories for coding student behavior. Amidon and Hunter (1967) modified FIAC to distinguish between narrow and broad teacher questions. Their basis for
In order to discover these patterns and establish a theoretical model of the social system being investigated, an ethnographer must begin to identify those key events that contribute to the formation of behavior patterns that exist between these events and the entire social system that describe these relationships in a manner which will allow others to see the generic patterns which sustain the social system. The ethnographer then has a goal to come to a global understanding of the "historical, cultural or social context" (p.8) whether the whole unit is the entire social system of one segment of that system, i.e. in the case on an educational setting the segment may be dismissal procedures.

According to Green and Bloome who use Hymes (1977) as the reference, the last goal of the ethnographer task is the principle of the "contrastive relevance:, i.e.
"...showing that a particular change of choice counts as a difference within a frame of reference." Hymes (1977) in Green and Bloome (1983). The ethnographer seeks to discover what changes in behaviors have meaningful consequences and the choices of meaningful consequences change behavior.

The approach of ethnography used in this research was one of focusing on meaning: the researcher was concerned with the "natives point of view." (Sandy 1979
The "native" investigated in this research was the student and their perception of behavior cues of teachers and how they, the students, gained meaning from those cues to become active participants in the classroom.

Although many researchers in education consider the teacher as the only "native" in the classroom (Florio, 1978), the children can be considered "natives" to the school if they have been in attendance for a number of years. The children who enter an elementary school at the kindergarten and remain until grade 5 or 6 may be considered natives. The researcher is the new person in the setting when she is new to the setting. The teacher, is "native" to his/her classroom in the respect that s/he is the one who remains for a period of years and the children enter new each year.

This investigation was neither totally from the "insider" nor the "outsider" perspective. The researcher made no attempt to become fully immersed in the entire culture of the students, school or community. Guba and Lincoln, (1985) discuss this approach as "emic" and "etic". Emic is described as how people interact with each other inside the group sharing and constructing meaning, while etic is described as an external view and interpretation of peoples' actions inside the group.
This "etic" approach was the approach employed by this researcher.

The remainder of this chapter is concerned with the details of the setting, gaining access to the school and the individual classrooms, the subjects, the data collection and the analytic procedures used in this naturalistic field case study.

**SETTING:**

The setting for this study is a sixth, seventh, and eighth grade middle school located in a consolidated school district composed of seven small districts in Northeast Ohio. The consolidation took place approximately twenty years ago and the district has two high schools, three middle schools, and six elementary schools. There have been consolidations of schools within the district which resulted in the closing of schools on the elementary level and the middle school level; two elementary schools and one middle school. The district presently has an enrollment of 10,000 students and a staff that has been stable over the past ten years, i.e. not many teachers leave the system causing an influx of new staff. The middle school in which this research took place had a population of approximately 650 students with a teacher-pupil ratio of 17-1 per class.

The communities represented in this district cover the complete range of socio-economic statuses with one
small area sending their students to private schools. The middle school in which this study took place, for the year of the study, had an all Caucasian population with a lower to upper middle class socio-economic level. The school had a 19% free or reduced lunch over the three grades. These figures were for the year of this study, 1986-1987.

The school of this study was a sixth, seventh, and eighth grade middle school designed so that the sixth grade was used as a transition grade. They were located in their own wing, had their own lunch hour and basically were isolated from the other students with the exception of travelling on buses to and from school. The scheduling for the sixth grade was a cluster type schedule while the seventh and eighth grades were scheduled according to a high school format and changed classes and teachers every period. In the sixth grade, three teachers were responsible for the academic work of the students assigned to them, approximately fifty-five students in each cluster. The other areas of the curriculum, the areas of fine arts and physical education were taught by teachers of those specific areas. These teachers taught special classes to all three grades.

The students were assigned to the homerooms alphabetically, and remained together for science and social studies with the homeroom teacher having his/her
homeroom for one of those subjects. For example, Teacher A had her own homeroom for science as well as Teacher C's group. The students were ability grouped for Reading and Mathematics. All teachers taught ability-grouped reading first period with Teacher C teaching all of the Mathematics. The reading group in this study was considered to be a low-average ability group. There was not a math group in this study because of the scheduling and the concern of having the six volunteer students together as often as possible in order to obtain their perspective of the classrooms. The composition for the groups for periods three and four in the morning depended upon the mathematics groupings. This is shown in the daily schedule for Teacher A's homeroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Homeroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:38-9:18</td>
<td>Reading (ability grouped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:22-10:02</td>
<td>Science Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:06-10:46</td>
<td>Science Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50-11:30</td>
<td>English Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:14</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:18-12:58</td>
<td>English Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:02-1:42</td>
<td>Music/Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:46-2:26</td>
<td>Physical Education/Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-3:10</td>
<td>Study hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 1 DAILY TIME SCHEDULE**

Teacher A had her homeroom students second period for science and Teacher C's students for science third period while her homeroom as a group goes to Teacher C
English fourth and seventh period. Teacher A also has a mixed group for English fourth and seventh period because of the grouping for mathematics. Since Teacher A was the homeroom teacher of the sample, this schedule allowed the researcher to travel with the six students used as informants.

THE SAMPLE

Teacher A's homeroom was chosen as the sample homeroom because she was the teacher who first expressed interest in the study. Within her homeroom, six children were selected to be the target students to act as informants because they stayed together for the first three periods of the day. They were in the same ability group for reading, with Teacher B first period, returned to their own homeroom teacher, Teacher A, for science second period and travelled to Teacher C third period for Social Studies. Since they stayed together for these three periods, they were able to interpret teacher behaviors for all three teachers involved in the study.

The majority of the observation data was collected in the classroom the first three periods of the day. The observations were made in three different phases. Phase One consisted of the first three weeks of school, the first three periods of the day; Phase two consisted of a Monday and a Tuesday in the middle of November and Phase Three consisted of the first two days of the second
semester. These times were selected with the purpose of verifying with the video tapes and the six informants that the rules and cues that the students had verified in the first three weeks of school were still appropriate.

**PROCEDURES**

Because this was a study in a naturalistic setting, gaining access to the setting became important. The original contact with this school system was made when the researcher was asked to conduct a workshop for teachers. In the course of discussion during the workshop, it was discovered that the organizational pattern of this school system was the pattern the researcher was seeking for investigation. The middle school was initiated at the sixth grade level and the students stayed together and travelled together during the day. They were ability grouped for Reading and Math; otherwise the group remained constant and changed teachers as a group for all academic subjects. This format allowed the formation of a group of six students, who were together for all subjects, to become the interviewees. They are the students who viewed the video tapes and interpreted the teachers actions to give insight to the "tacit" rules as they unfolded. To gain access, the researcher had to first gain entrance to the field, i.e. the school system and, ultimately, the middle school.
GAINING ACCESS

The researcher approached the teacher in the workshop to inquire about an interest in participating in the study. She and another colleague who worked with her were agreeable yet felt the agreement of the third teacher should be obtained. The scheduling format for the sixth grades had the students travelling together and all academic subjects were taught by a triad of teachers, with the special areas of art, physical education and music being taught by content area teachers. Therefore the permission of the third teacher was necessary. It was agreed that all of the teachers would meet with the researcher to discuss the project further and gain the approval of the third member of their triad. At the meeting, the third teacher did not want to be involved so further discussion with this triad of teachers was unnecessary. The third teacher gave as her reason a reluctance to be video taped having had an unfortunate experience previous to this investigation. Her concerns were respected and a second group of teachers was sought. A second group of teachers, one of which had also participated in the workshop, from the same district but another middle school was approached. This teacher contacted the other teachers in her triad and all agreed to the study being done in their classrooms.
contacted the other teachers in her triad and all agreed to the study being done in their classrooms.

Having gained the approval of the teachers involved, the administration of the district was approached for their approval. The project was explained to the Directors of Curriculum for both the elementary and the secondary school and approval was given. The next step was to approach the principal of the middle school involved and seek his approval. The researcher made the appointments with the Directors of Curriculum while the interested teacher made the contact with the principal of the school. The researcher met with the principal before the beginning of the school year. At this meeting the project was discussed and the researcher's time frame for presenting the project to the other personnel, i.e. parents and students was discussed. The principal felt that to do the explanation of the project at the orientation meeting was inappropriate since he had planned many activities for that meeting. He suggested instead that the researcher meet with the entire faculty at the first faculty meeting of the year and he would introduce both the researcher and the project to the faculty. This was ultimately the procedure used to gain the access to the school and the classrooms. This also helped to build the trust and confidence needed to complete the data collection at the times mentioned above.
because the principal was really involved in all of the time frame planning. All of the administrators approached were willing to discuss the project and when rationale and design were explained, they were co-operative. This approach of first seeking the approval of the teacher appeared rather an informal approach. It was used to insure that the teachers were aware of the project and consented to it without any type of coercion from administration. This proved to be a great asset as another researcher who had used this school had made approach from administrators down and the attitude displayed to the two researchers was different. This was apparent in the number of remarks made to this researcher as the project progressed. At one time, this researcher was praised by three teachers as "doing my own work". The explanation given was that I wasn't taking students out of the classroom during instructional time to gather my data.

So that all of the staff would be aware of the presence of the researcher in the building, following the suggestions of the principal, the researcher was asked to attend the staff meeting prior to school. The researcher was introduced to the faculty and the project was explained by the building principal and as the staff began the school year, the researcher began the project accepted by them. This procedure also helped to build
school had made approach from administrators down and the attitude displayed to the two researchers was different. This was apparent in the number of remarks made to this researcher as the project progressed. At one time, this researcher was praised by three teachers as "doing my own work". The explanation given was that I wasn't taking students out of the classroom during instructional time to gather my data.

So that all of the staff would be aware of the presence of the researcher in the building, following the suggestions of the principal, the researcher was asked to attend the staff meeting prior to school. The researcher was introduced to the faculty and the project was explained by the building principal and as the staff began the school year, the researcher began the project accepted by them. This procedure also helped to build the trust and confidence needed by both the researcher and the staff to conduct a naturalistic case field study. The following figure explains the time frames for the research design.
RESEARCH DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE I</th>
<th>PHASE II</th>
<th>PHASE III</th>
<th>PHASE IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS</td>
<td>OBSERVATION STAGE</td>
<td>INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per.1 - Reading  
Per.2 - Science  
Per.3 - Social Studies  
Per.4 - English/Math  
Per.5 - Lunch  
Per.6 - Music  
Per.7 - English/Math interviews  
Per.8 - Literature/P.E.  
Per.9 - Activity

FIGURE 3 The Four Phases Of Research Design  
(A Comparison of time given to data collection/analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>8/26</th>
<th>8/27</th>
<th>8/28-9/12</th>
<th>11/10-11</th>
<th>1/6-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation:</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes:</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Tapes:</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Tapes:</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation:</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews:</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates procedure used in that time frame

FIGURE 4: DATA COLLECTION FOR TIME TABLE

The Data Collection Time Table indicates the time span and the variety of tasks used to collect data.
Reasons for the various tasks are explained in the following paragraphs. (Figure 3)

Participant observation was used throughout this study to enable the researcher to become as much a part of the classroom as possible. The researcher did not attempt to become a student in the classroom, but took the role of teacher assistant of the classroom for Teacher A during science activities and observer in Teacher's B and C's classrooms. It was from Teacher A's classroom that the six student interviewees were chosen.

The audio and video tapes were used to obtain a permanent record of the days activities; to present each class as an entire chunk of time across the day.

The teacher interviews were used to gain insights into their thoughts about middle school, to discover their interpretations about the concept of middle school. They were also used to gain insights into their perceptions of the six target students. These informal interviews took place with the three teachers who participated in the study.

The student interviews were used to gain the students' perceptions of the interactions of the classroom. They discussed the videos and interpreted the teachers behaviors as cues to the teachers expectations for the students' classroom behavior. The interviews in
January did not include all six students as one student had been returned to the resource room for full time instruction.

**VIDEOTAPING:**

Videotaping began the second day of school so that the first impressions of the students were on a permanent record. The second day of school was chosen rather than the first because it was the first day of scheduled classes. The first day the students remained with their homeroom teachers for the greatest part of the day. The first three periods of the day were videotaped because these were the three periods in which the six students who were to be the interviewees were together. The first three periods also had an impact on the grouping since the students were ability grouped for reading and reading was the first period for everyone in the building. The grouping for reading decided the population of the composition of the other academic groups. The ability grouping was determined the previous spring using the standardized test from the adopted reading series. (Schedule will be placed in the appendix)

Videotaping was done from the right front corner of each room as this afforded a better view of all of the students as they participated in academic lessons. It allowed for the capture of the six targeted students so
that when they viewed the videotapes they could interpret what was taking place as the teacher was conducting the class. This allowed for the student perspective to emerge as they continued to view the tapes of each day. They could interpret the "tacit" dimensions of the classroom by interpreting their actions and reactions to teacher behaviors related to the "tacit" rules of the classroom. The teacher appeared on the tapes as s/he moved around the classroom to work with students and instruct lessons. The taping was continuous for the entire period so that the entire "chunk" of time was presented on one tape for each teacher. This provides a complete and undistorted flow of the interactions in the classrooms. All of the videotapes were sound tapes and no other method was attempted to capture the sounds of the classrooms.

The issue of "obtrusiveness" (Erikson and Wilson, 1982), i.e. the participants becoming nervous about videotaping, was addressed on the first day of school while the students were still in their homerooms. The fact that the recording were being done with a corda-cam recorder was seen as an asset because most of the children were familiar with this type recorder and thus were comfortable with it in the room. Another factor which helped in this area was a comment of the building principal about the school system being "sensitive" to
research and people being in the building. (Private conversation with principal). As the project progressed, the students paid little or no attention to the video camera being in the room.

The goals of the project were explained to the students in terms that they could understand and time was allowed for questions by the students which were answered by the researcher. They were assured that this project would not affect their grades, a major concern of the students. This issue was also addressed in a letter to the parents. (In appendix) The letter was also used to obtain the permission of the parents to videotape their child and for the six interviewees, permission was sought from the parents to use their children in this capacity. The children who were used as interviewees also signed a permission slip stating that they were willing to participate as the interviewees. This permission slip is also in the appendix.

**VIDEOTAPING TIME FRAME**

The time frame for videotaping was every day for the first three weeks of school, two days in November and the first two days of the second semester. The weekdays chosen for the two day segments in November and February were Monday and Tuesday because these two days had been
determined to have the least absenteeism in this particular school.

The time frame of the first three weeks of school was based on the beginning of school research. This research indicates that the students have learned the rules for participation by this time. (Brooks, 1985, Green and Wallat, 1981, Zumwalt, 1977) Buckley and Cooper, (1978) found that sixty-eight percent (68%) of classroom rules were established in the first three weeks of school and all rules were established by the end of the first month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st., 2nd., 3rd., periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 27-Aug 30</td>
<td>1st., 2nd., 3rd., periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2 -Sept.5</td>
<td>1st., 2nd., 3rd., periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 8-Sept.12</td>
<td>1st., 2nd., 3rd., periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 11</td>
<td>1st., 2nd., 3rd., periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 14</td>
<td>1st., 2nd., 3rd., periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 6</td>
<td>1st., 2nd., 3rd., periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 7</td>
<td>1st., 2nd., 3rd., periods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 4 TIME CHART FOR VIDEOTAPING AUDIOTAPING**

Audiotaping was incorporated along with field notes during the interviews with the small group of students to provide a permanent record of the interviews and the viewing sessions. These permanent records also became a method of verification. They allowed for the validation
of the interviews by comparing the audio tapes with the field notes. It also allowed for a comparison of the notes from the video tapes which were taken as the students viewed the video tapes. Student interviews took two forms: one form was a modified ethnographic interview (Spradley, 1979). He describes these as a "series of friendly conversations" (p. 55) into which the researcher introduces new elements thereby permitting the informants to act as informants.

The second form was one where the questions were designed by the researcher to obtain the background information of the students' perspective of school; likes and dislikes, reasons for coming to school and their expectations. The six students who were the interviewees met with the researcher at the end of the day in one group. The questions were posed to each student and their responses record on audio tape for the permanent record. This first set of questions was posed to the students to help determine their expectations of sixth grade.
QUESTIONSPOSED TOSTUDENTSONEXPECTATIONS

1) What do you expect sixth grade to be like?
2) How do you think sixth grade will be like fifth grade?
3) How is it going to be different than fifth grade?
4) What do you think it will be like getting used to so many teachers?
5) What are some of the kinds of things you will learn in sixth grade?
6) What do you do if you don't understand what the teacher is saying?
7) Now let's pretend that I'm a brand new student and you have been in school all last week and three days this week, what do you think I have to know to get along in your sixth grade?

FIELDNOTES

Field notes were the written account of what the researcher observed; a record of what was seen, heard, experienced otherwise plus their thoughts about the data collected on a given day. (Bogden and Bilken, 1982) The written field notes also became a basis for the interviews as they raise questions about what is happening during observation. Field notes used in this manner were introduced by Strauss (1964) and are similar to those used by Corsaro (1985) in his study of the nursery school. Corsaro identified the components of field notes as:

a) field notes,
b) methodological notes,
c) theoretical notes,
d) personal notes.
Corsaro describes the field notes as describing what is taking place, i.e. the students are doing a worksheet; methodological notes describe the actions of the researcher, i.e. what time did I arrive and where did I set the camera; theoretical notes record activities that need to be discussed in an interview for interpretation and/or clarification. They also suggest contextual factors, i.e. when a teacher puts an assignment on the board and does not refer to it all day. This action needs some interpretation by the teacher and that is accomplished by the interview. Personal notes are those written for the researcher. They include feelings, frustrations, and thoughts, as well as the reasons for not doing a particular thing; eg. I found it impossible to record, in note, the direct conversation at a given time so now recorded key word(s) to guide the conversation as recorded on the tapes.

**AN EXAMPLE OF NOTES FOR THIS PROJECT**

**M.N.** Arrived at 8:00 A.M. to set up camera. 10 mins. early.

**P.N.** PANIC! Camera didn't work. Glad I came early so there is time to investigate problems. Will continue to arrive early.

**F.N.** T. "Give me a sentence."

**R.** Teacher expects to have students answer in complete sentences.

**T.N. S.** "It's O.K. to give my friend the pronunciation of a word" Need to ask K. why?
TEACHER INTERVIEWS

Most of the teacher interviews took the form of friendly conversations because as the elements that needed elaboration were introduced the teachers gave background information as well as the information requested. For example when I asked Teacher A how the reading groups were decided she not only answered that question but added that the students were not permanently assigned to any one group for the entire year but could be changed if warranted, based on achievement growth and teacher recommendation.

The first two period teachers, Teacher B for first period reading, and Teacher A for second period science were the most co-operative about interviews. Teacher C, third period social studies, had agreed to be part of the instructional team for the project yet did not have the enthusiasm for the study that the other two teachers had. This could be due to the fact that Teacher C was in the last years of teaching and did not have the interest of the teachers who would be teaching for a longer period of time. This is an assumption based on the conversations held with this teacher since the issue was not directly addressed. For example, when I discussed with Teacher C the fact I was returning the first two days of the second semester and asked him for input his response was "Mrs. P
is taking care of all that. I don't have anything to do with it." Yet Teacher C was co-operative as far as the videotaping was concerned.

Field notes were taken during the teacher interviews but only one interview was recorded. This interview was with Teacher B because she had served on the districts committee when the middle school concept was first investigated and she had input on the district philosophy and how the original concepts of the middle school philosophy were being implemented. The interview was used to compare the administration's view of the middle school as set forth in the policy manual and discussed by the administrators and what the teachers were seeing as being implemented.

ANALYTIC PROCEDURES

Because the naturalistic paradigm was guiding this study, cursory analysis began with the beginning of school. This analysis is apparent in the theoretical notes in the written record taken daily as the videotaping and conversations took place. As questions were raised about what was happening in the classrooms, they were answered by conversations with students, teachers or further videotaping. The answers to these questions provided additional data which supported the data that had been collected on the permanent records.
The final analysis was completed using all of this data.

The naturalistic ethnographic cycle moves from asking questions to collecting data to ethnographic record in field notes, photographs or permanent means of recoding observations to analyzing data. (Spradley, 1980) The analysis becomes a search for patterns or categories existing in the data. The analysis is a search through all of the data to discover cultural patterns.

Cultural refers, in this study, to the patterns of behavior of the participants in a particular location, a middle school. The culture is the organization of things in the location or social setting. This organization describes the meaning people in the social setting have given to places, objects or activities. Further, a cultural domain is a category of cultural meaning that includes other categories. (Spradley, 1980) For example, "students" was a cultural category or basic unit of cultural meaning in the context of the school. "Teachers" was a separate cultural category. Cultural domains are categories of meaning applicable to a social setting.

The cultural domains are made of three basic elements: cover term, included term, and semantic relationship. (Spradley, 1980) For the example above,
students is the cover term for the young people in the school setting; the learner. The included terms, W.E. students, 6th. grade students and finally Cluster A students further categorize the broad cover term "students". The third element, semantic relationship, is the linking together of two categories. Its function is to include the terms Cluster A, 6th. grade students and W.E. students inside the cultural domain of students.

Spradley discusses the fact that the number of semantic relationships are being quite small with certain semantic relationships being quite universal. All cultures have what he terms "strict inclusion" semantic relationships. For example "a rose (is a kind of) flower is a quite universal accepted semantic relationship with the words changing according to the national language spoken. (Spradley, 1980)

Following this line of thinking, children in every school society grow up and learn the "domains" of school culture unconsciously; they do not even know that a "domain" exists. Very early, they become participant observers by watching each other, listening to others, classifying what they see and hear then coding their experiences.

The researcher using domain analysis is much like the child who is becoming familiar with school. The
researcher has the field notes, the video tapes, the audio tapes and the interviews; is familiar with them, reviews them time and again to find the cultural domains or categories to organize and code events.

Domain analysis is an ongoing procedure. It is repeated often as new data is collected throughout the research project. The questions posited by the researcher become the guide as to how frequent domain analysis is used. With the posited questions answered, a domain analysis raises other questions for further research.

The final analysis uses Spradley's Domain Analysis, (1979). Domain analysis is the first type of ethnographic analysis. (Spradley, 1979, p.87) This analysis involved searching through the collected videotapes, audio tapes and field notes to discover cultural patterns, patterns of behavior that the participants have learned or created. They are the organization of things to which people in the situation have given meaning. According to Spradley, "Every human society is culturally constituted." (1979, p. 86) He defines cultural domains as a category of cultural meaning that includes other categories. For example consider the students of the middle school. At first they are students but as soon as they are introduced as
sixth, seventh or eight graders, they are no longer viewed as just students but rather have been categorized. Sixth grade becomes the cultural category for a particular group of persons in the school. It gets further differentiated by cluster A sixth grader or cluster B sixth grader. "Students" becomes a cultural domain or cover term with the categories of sixth grade students as a category and cluster A sixth grade students as a further category. The smaller categories become known as "included terms" in Spradley's terminology. This concept may be illustrated in the following manner:

**TABLE 2**

**DOMAIN ANALYSIS WORKSHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Relationship</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Structural Question</th>
<th><strong>Included terms</strong></th>
<th><strong>Relationship</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cover Term</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X (is a kind of)</td>
<td>Handraising (is a kind of rule)</td>
<td>Are there different kinds of rules?</td>
<td>talking</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td>rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strict inclusion</td>
<td>rule</td>
<td>rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis method makes use of semantic (meaning in language) relationships because meaning depends upon relationships among symbols (words). The semantic relationship functions to define included terms by
placing them inside the cultural domain. The language of
the students in school contains many symbols (words) that
they use to refer to things they experience and may or
may not be understood by the adults in the situation.
This is also true of the teachers in a particular school
district. The language of teaching and education may
appear to be universal yet each school has those meaning
which are particular to them. The semantic relationships
of these symbols (words) allow the people within the
school or culture to speak in subtleties of meaning
connected to their culture.

Domain analysis consists of six procedures:
1) Selecting a single semantic relationship
2) Preparing a domain analysis worksheet
3) Selecting a sample of informants statements
4) Searching for possible cover terms and included terms that
appropriately fit the semantic relationship
5) Formulating structural questions for each domain
6) Making a list of all hypothesized domains
(Spradley, 1979 p. 118)

The following example is a simple extraction from
field notes, video tapes, and interviews to uncover some
of the domain rules. The next step would be to
hypothesize about how these rules are conveyed to the
students, e.g., ways the rules are conveyed.
The domain analysis provided the students' thoughts in categories and helped the researcher gain some overview of the classrooms under study. This procedure was used with all the data collected. The questions raised in this research should have answers surface as this analysis proceeds.

The final stage of this project was used to explain the students' perspective of the "tacit" dimensions of the classroom when the major themes are analyzed and the relationships discovered.

In summary, this chapter focuses on the methods and procedures used to collect and analyze data, from the perspective of the student, that will attempt to generate a theory useful in understanding how students make the transition from a one teacher, one classroom situation for elementary school to a multiple teacher, multiple classroom situation in middle school and how they learn to participate successfully in each classroom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>WHAT DATA COLLECTED</th>
<th>DATA ANALYZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the overall method of conveying rules to the students?</td>
<td>Video/Audio taped classes.</td>
<td>Brook's elements of rule teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Are rules taught?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Are rules written and given to students?</td>
<td>Field notes of the</td>
<td>Domain analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Are rules negotiated between teacher and student?</td>
<td>Transcriptions of both video and audio tapes</td>
<td>Student Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Are rules embedded in instruction?</td>
<td>Naturalistic descriptions of the classroom interactions</td>
<td>Domain analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Are rule infractions cued to the students by the teachers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do students interpret teacher behaviors to help them understand the tactic dimensions of the classroom?</td>
<td>Review of video tapes by six target students</td>
<td>Domain analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do students come to know and understand the tasks necessary to become active participants in their classrooms?</td>
<td>Video tapes of classroom life</td>
<td>Student interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of classroom context influence the students' perceptions and understanding of classroom life</td>
<td>Audio taped interviews</td>
<td>Classroom scheduling cues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field notes taken during student interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naturalistic descriptions of classroom interactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

The purpose of this study was to investigate the tacit dimensions of the classroom from the perspective of the students: to investigate how the students come to know the social demands and norms of each classroom. To accomplish this goal, it became necessary to investigate how these social demands and norms were conveyed to the students. This necessitated investigating the classroom as a communicative environment where the demands and norms were presented in a variety of ways. The rationale and conceptualization of the classroom as a social and communicative environment has been outlined in the previous chapters. The methodology for investigating and analyzing the daily life of the classroom was outlined also.

Because the demands and norms were conveyed to the student in a variety of ways, it became necessary to investigate the procedure used by the teachers in the study to determine how they conveyed their own demands, norms and expectations. To investigate how the demands, norms and expectations were conveyed to the students and
how the students perceived them, four major questions guided this investigation:

1. How do teachers convey their classroom rules and expectations to the students?

2. How do students interpret teacher behaviors to come to an understanding of the tacit dimensions of the classroom?

3. What aspects of classroom context influence the students' perception and understanding of classroom life?

4. How do students come to know and understand the tasks necessary to become active participants in their classrooms?

These questions may be viewed as an embedded nest and question 4 became the summary question for questions 1, 2, and 3. Viewed from this perspective, question 4 is the primary question being investigated while the other questions serve to provide information which substantiates the complexity of classrooms and their tacit dimensions.

The complexity of classroom life and question 4 becoming the primary question demanded that subquestions be addressed. These subquestions are directly related to the other major questions as well as having a relationship to all questions. Therefore questions 1, 2, and 3 will be discussed with their subquestions to show the relationship of all questions.

Question 1 necessitated the investigation of all persons who presented rules and how they presented the rules. In the course of the investigation, similarities and differences were discovered in the presentation of rules.
These similarities and differences are discussed in response to question 1.1:

"What are the similarities and differences in the presentation of rules by those in authority?"

Question 2:

"How do students interpret teachers' behaviors to come to an understanding of the tacit dimensions of the classroom?"

necessitated the investigation of each of the students' interpretation of rules and teacher behaviors in presenting those rules. The teacher behaviors included both the initial behavior and a follow-up behavior, so subquestion(s) 2.1 became:

"What teacher behaviors cued the students to a rule or social norm?"

and 2.2 became:

"What consequences were observed that cued the students that this was a rule or norm to be followed?"

Question 3:

"What aspects of classroom context influence the students' perceptions and understanding of classroom life?"

There emerged from this question a concern of rules across classroom contexts for the three teachers in this study.

Question 3.1 became:

"Are the rules and expectations the same across all classroom contexts? If not, why not?"
This question raised another concern of rule conveyance to the students and question 3.2 became:

"How are the differences conveyed to the students?"

By using a naturalistic, case study design in this research process, a variety of sources were used to extract the data to answer the questions posited as well as to provide an understanding of the students' grasp of the social norms and expectations. Each question posited will be analyzed separately with a final analysis of all questions as a unit to synthesize the findings of the study. Most of the findings for this study will be provided in the narrative form using charts and graphs, where applicable, to further an understanding of those findings.

Question 1:

"How do teachers convey their classroom rules and expectations to students?"

was analyzed using Brooks (1985) elements of rule making or teaching rules.

The first analysis, using Brooks (1985) elements for rule making or teaching rules, was the analysis of the principal's presentation of the generic rules of the school, i.e. those rules that apply to all the students in the school. Following the analysis of the principal's presentation will be an analysis of each of the teacher's presentation of their rules. Segments of the transcript
of the principal's presentation as well as those of each teacher are presented as each was analyzed in Chapter four(4).

**ANALYSIS: QUESTION 1**

The primary analysis for question one employed Brooks (1985) sequence for teaching rules to students. This sequence consisted of five steps:

1) providing the students with a written set of rules;
2) presenting a sequence of rules for the classroom;
3) including examples of the rule(s) with questions and answers from the students for clarification;
4) rationale for the rules; and
5) consequences for infractions of the rules.

The results of this analysis illustrated that the teachers in this study did not teach the rules rather told them to the students. The principal, however, did employ the five criteria set out by Brooks (1985) and directly taught the generic school rules to the students. These findings are presented in Figure 5 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written rules</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = element employed  P=Principal,  A=Teacher A,  B=Teacher B,  C=Teacher C

**FIGURE 5 ELEMENTS OF RULE MAKING**
As Figure 6 illustrates, the principal used the five criteria when teaching rules to the sixth graders. He used their school folders as the written rules. Each child had the folder in his or her hand as the principal explained the rules. He had them follow along with the sequence of the rules, pointing out the most important administrative ones first, i.e. attendance and returning to school, then moving to the rules with academic behavior and finally to acceptable social behavior. As he covered each rule, he gave examples and allowed students time to ask questions and then gave the consequences. The transcription segment of the principal's talk below illustrates these five criteria. Transcription A is the transcription of the principal's talk to Teacher A's homeroom. He indicated in an interview with the researcher that he basically discussed the same issues with each of the sixth grades so this transcription is representative of the talks to the sixth grades.
TRANSCRIPTION A

DIALOGUE/EPISODE ACTION

EPISODE 1: You probably already have one of these. It's called a school handbook or folder. Because inside it is your stuff about school.

Holds up folder.

EPISODE 2: Over here it tells you about attendance. This is different than elementary school. And the way it's different is...

Speaks to a student he knows from outside school.

Speaks to another student

EPISODE 3: O.K. This young lady's last name is McElroy and I'm going to pick on her a little bit. What I mean is I'm going to use her for an example.

EPISODE 4: Let's say that tomorrow she is sick. O.K. Then she comes back to school Thursday. She is supposed to come to the library with her note. She's going to see two people in the library. She's going to give them the note. They're gonna give her a little pass either yellow or blue and she's going to go on her merry little way down here and tomorrow she's sick and doesn't have a note. She's going to be told this, 'You bring a note the next day or she's going to have an unexcused absence.'

EPISODE 5: What in the world does that mean? That means if you have an unexcused absence, that work that you missed, you may not make up and you get zeroes.

EPISODE 6: Now that's not too bad if you're straight A students. But not all of us are. And that can hurt. So if you're gonna be sick bring a note.

ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPAL'S PRESENTATION

Using Brooks' (1985) criteria to analyze the presentation of the principal did show that the principal used all five of the criteria. He did teach the rules rather than just tell them to the students. Episode 1
illustrates that the students were given a set of printed rules, generic to the school. This handbook was provided to the students the first day of school without any discussion of the rules in the handbook. The teachers were directed on the first day of school, their in-service day, that the principal would be in each sixth grade classroom on the student's first day to discuss the handbook rules and welcome the students to the school. The handbooks contain the rules of the district for smoking and drug use as well as the rules which are generic to this particular middle school. The teachers distributing the folders of printed rules and the principal discussing them met Brook's first criteria.

Episodes 2 and 4 illustrate Brooks' second criteria; a sequence of rules. A sequence of rules consists of stating the rule, its rational, and providing an example. EPISODE 2 introduces the rule about attendance and that it is difference than elementary school; the rationale. EPISODE 4 uses the example (criteria three) of the student and explains the rule fully to the students. He goes through the entire rule of attendance and returning to school and the rules for obtaining a pass to re-enter class, which is a new rule for the students this year. After he presented the rule and its consequences in its entirety, he paused and scanned the room, looking for raised hands or questioning looks. He anticipated the
students' questions when he asked at the beginning of EPISODE 6, "What in the world does that mean?" and followed through with the explanation of an unexcused absence in the light of its consequences. This rule is presented first because it is administrative and new to the students (conversation with the principal).

Brooks' fourth criteria is met with EPISODE 6 as the principal explains the meaning of an excused and unexcused absences, the rationale for the rule. EPISODE 7 discusses the consequences of unexcused absences, i.e. they can hurt if you are not a straight A student, thus meeting the fifth criteria i.e. consequences. The principal used this same procedure as he presented the remaining rules to the students. This presentation took the principal approximately one hour and fifteen minutes.

ANALYSIS OF TEACHER'S PRESENTATION OF RULES

Now let's look at the teachers' presentation of rules. Return to Figure 8. What is indicated here is that the teachers did not directly teach their rules to the students. They employed some of Brooks (1985) elements but did not employ all of them nor did they employ them consistently. Teachers A and B used examples, rationales, and consequences but no sequence of presentation nor written presentation of rules. Teacher C used only consequences when he presented rules. He did not employ any other of Brooks (1985) elements.
Now let's take a look at the teachers' presentations of the rules illustrated that the teachers did not clearly teach their classroom rules rather appeared to present them as the need arose or the teachers were reminded of them by classroom activity. A printed form of the rules was not presented to the students by any one of the three teachers in this study and there was no sequence to the rules. While the teachers had rationales and consequences for the rules, these were not conveyed to the students in a systematic manner. Teacher A and Teacher B used some humor when they presented the consequences while Teacher C presented the consequences when the rule was infringed upon.

To tell the rule is to present it orally, without the sequence of activities recommended by Brooks (1985). Most of the rules for the three teachers in this study were embedded in their instructional presentations; some were embedded in academic lessons; others were embedded in managerial instructions (instructions given to direct use of time or tasks for classroom organization) while still others were presented as the answers to questions asked by the students.

When this was the approach used by Teachers A and B, they generally gave some rationale for the rule. For example, Teacher A gave as the rationale for her pencil sharpener rule its distraction to her and the other
students. Teacher B gave as her rationale for the rule of keeping the aisle clear the fact that she had a habit of tripping. Teacher C gave as the rationale for the rule for sitting alphabetically the fact that he felt he would learn their names quicker.

In each case, the rule was stated at the time it was needed rather than being presented in a formal rule presentation. This approach prevented the rules, at least in the case of these three teachers, from being given to the students in a written form as the generic rules of the school were presented by the principal. It should be noted, except for Teacher B's rule for clear aisles, these rules do not appear again in the transcripts of the video tapes of the classrooms. Video tapes revealed that by the third week of school, the students in Teacher A's room began to use the pencil sharpener when needed rather than at the beginning of the homeroom period as she had indicated in her rule presented when the student asked the question, "Where is the pencil sharpener?" (Teacher A, Transcript A) Excerpts from each teachers' transcripts presented data to verify the above examples.
TEACHER A TRANSCRIPTION A

DIALOGUE/EPISODE

EPISODE 1: I don't care where you sit for now O.K. In my room you should try, you know where you are right now, try to sit there for the rest of the week. That way I have an easier time learning your name.

ACTION

Students have entered the room and Teacher A is giving directions as to where they are to sit.

EPISODE 2: The pencil sharpener is back there.

S. Where's the pencil sharpener?

EPISODE 3 And we do our pencil sharpening - it's alright to do it now - but from now on pencils are to be sharpened when you first come into the homeroom, not during class when the teacher is giving directions or so forth because it is distracting.

In this example, Teacher A has given the rule for sharpening pencils during her instructions for her seating arrangement. The teacher does not have the rule written for a presentation to the students. She has no handout prepared nor does she have the rules posted anywhere in the room. Both of these rules are particular to this classroom and therefore not presented in the student handbook. In EPISODE 3, the teacher has no sequence in presenting this rule rather presents it as a result of a student's question to answer a need he has at that particular time. She gives a rationale for the rule in EPISODE 3 but no consequences for its infraction.
Another example from the same day will illustrate that this became the pattern for presenting rules.

**TEACHER A TRANSCRIPTION**

**DIALOGUE/EPISODE**

EPISODE 1: Let's talk about the cafeteria. Today we'll all walk to the cafeteria together.

EPISODE 2: As far as I know, they'll let you sit where you want. But the main thing is - what they do is - as the tables get quiet, they are selected...

EPISODE 3: Pizza

EPISODE 4: You're the first one I ever met who didn't like pizza. The main thing is that you go in and sit down and get quiet.

In this short segment, the teacher in EPISODE 2 told the students the rules for entering the cafeteria. She did not follow the criteria set forth by Brooks (1985) to teach these rules to the students: she gave no written rule, no rationale for the rule or any explicit consequences for infractions of the rule. The implicit consequences are suggested when she tells the students to "...go in, and sit down, and get quiet." This segment implies that as these behaviors are exhibited, the students at a particular table will be called to get into line and will receive their lunch sooner than students
who do not perform these behaviors. Although this is a
general school rule for the cafeteria, it is not one
which is presented in the school handbook or folder
because it was a rule that the monitors in charge of the
cafeteria devised rather than the administration as the
rules in the handbook or folder are. There is no
sequence in its presentation, no other examples nor any
consequences for not following the rule. Excerpts from
the other two teachers were analyzed to uncover their
approach to teaching their rules. These excerpts follow.
The first excerpt is Teacher B, Transcript A and the
second is Teacher B, Transcript B.

TEACHER B TRANSCRIPT A

DIALOGUE/EPISODE ACTION

The students have entered the room and
Teacher B has handed out the book forms
and given the directions for filling
them out. The entire time the students
are filling out the forms, the teacher
is talking to them about matters
concerning her classroom.

EPISODE 1: O.k. Now let's try to keep
the aisles clear. I have a habit of
tripping.

EPISODE 2: If you have any extra stuff, find a space.

In this short dialogue, the teacher in EPISODE 1 has
set forth a rule about keeping the aisle clear. She also
does not follow Brook's criteria for teaching rules to
the students. This rule is not written and handed to the
students. There is no sequence and no clear rationale nor are there any consequences set forth. This rule is told to the students and not taught on the first day of school. It is repeated later in the week in the same manner, embedded in an instructional session.

**TEACHER B TRANSCRIPT B**

**DIALOGUE/ EPISODE**

Let's clear your desks. Put your books in a pile under your desk so that the aisles are clear.

**ACTION**

The students put all of their books under the desk except their reading book.

Here again embedded in the managerial instructions to begin class, the rule for keeping the aisles clear again appears. Again Brook's criteria for teaching rules is not followed. With this particular rule, it appears that repetition is sufficient for the students because the rule does not appear again in the transcripts and the video tapes reveal that the students began putting their excess materials in neat piles under their desks or in the baskets under the desks when they were available.

Teacher C's transcripts reveal very few rules given to the students. He took the time to put the students in alphabetical order, gave them the rationale for doing this, then the following day allowed them to sit wherever they chose. He made the rule for the alphabetical order
then failed to follow up on it the following day. The rule is embedded in the activity of completing the book forms and is illustrated in Transcript D, Segment A.

**TEACHER C TRANSCRIPT A**

**DIALOGUE/EPISODE**

**EPISODE 1** Fonts. So have your book forms out. You know what I'm saying.

**EPISODE 2** The one we did yesterday or were supposed to do yesterday. If there are one or two who have lost it already, raise your hand right now and I'll give you one because you gotta have one today. Let's see about four.

**EPISODE 3:** O.K. Anyone else? Anyone else?

**EPISODE 4:** Alright

**EPISODE 5:** Now run through the numbers to see if we have that right. Then I'll pick the forms up. Then we can get started.

**EPISODE 6:** So you can be getting your Social Studies book out. We'll be staring at the very first prologue so you can turn to there.

**EPISODE 7:** Jennifer B. #52

**EPISODE 8:** It's going to cause some noise and confusion I think but let's get ourselves in alphabetical order.
In analyzing this segment of the transcript for Teacher C, it appeared in EPISODE 8 that he put the rule in place for the seating arrangement of the room. There are two facets of this rule:

1) the students were to seat in alphabetical order, and
2) the alphabetical order of the room went from right to left across the rows of the desks rather than from front to back down the rows.

To analyze this segment using Brook's (1985) criteria, the teacher has no written rule, no sequence of the rule, no examples or student questions but he does give his rationale in EPISODE 13, i.e. to be better able to learn the names of the students. It is interesting to note that on the following day, as the students entered this room, they took whatever seat that they wanted. A
segment of the following days' transcript showed that the teacher did not hold to the rule of alphabetical order.

**TEACHER C TRANSCRIPT B**

**DIALOGUE**

**EPISODE 1:** Let me take the roll to see if we have everyone present and accounted for today.

**EPISODE 2:** Angela?

**EPISODE 3:** I'm trying to get an accurate account for the guidance department was she here yesterday?

**EPISODE 4:** Was she here the first day?

**EPISODE 5:** Mike?

**EPISODE 6:** That's O.K. Stay there. As long as I know you're here. Stay as long as you behave. If not, I'll put you up in the front corner away from everyone.

**ACTION**

Teacher begins to call roll.

S. Angela is absent.

S/1. No She was absent.

S/2. She was here the first day.

Mike was in the wrong seat, out of alphabetical order and got up to move to the correct seat.

After this statement to Mike, none of the other students who were out of alphabetical order attempted to move to their assigned seats. Those who were in alphabetical order stayed in the assigned seats.

This segment of the transcript for Teacher C, which was recorded the day after the rule and rationale for placing the students in alphabetical order was given, showed that the teacher put the rule in place but did not enforce it when the students failed to follow it. In fact, when Mike did attempt to follow the rule, he was told, in essence, that it was acceptable to break the
rule. This exchange between Mike and Teacher C set up that it was acceptable to break certain rules as long as you "behaved". The students who served as he interviewees for this study, interpreted "behaved" as being quiet and not talking when the teacher was talking. (Student interviews for day 2)

To summarize the presentation of the rules by those in authority and their use of Brook's criteria for teaching the rules, these teachers did not teach rules to their students. According to Brooks, rule presentation includes written rules, is sequenced: i.e. present, rationale, example, and consequences. To teach the classroom rules means to state the written rule, state the rationale, provide an example including a behavioral suggestion and state the consequences. Handouts of printed rules or to encourage the students to copy the rule is also part of teaching the rule. To tell the rule is to present the rule orally without the sequence of activities used to teach the rule, i.e. no sequence of activities used to teach the rule, no written presentation and no consequences presented. The teachers in this study often delivered the rule embedded in some instructional or managerial discussion with the students. When this was the approach used for Teachers A & B, they generally gave the students some rationale for the rule. For example, with the pencil sharpening rule of Teacher
A, she used the distraction to herself and other students as her rationale. Teacher B gave as her rationale for the rule of keeping the aisles clear the fact that she had a habit of tripping. Teacher C gave as his rationale for the rule of sitting alphabetically the fact that it would help him to learn the names of the students.

In each case, the rule was stated at the time it appeared to be needed, was not given to the students in written form, nor posted in the classroom. It should also be noted that with the exception of Teacher B's rule for the clear aisles, the rules do not appear again in the transcripts of the first three weeks of school. Following the other criteria of Brook's, there is no sequence for the rules, no time for student question and answers and no consequences for the infraction of the rules. The following paragraphs will further illustrate the embedded presentation of rules beginning with the second day of school. The Aug. 27 transcripts will illustrate the embedded rules.

During the activity of filling out the book forms required by the district, Teacher B initiated her rules for putting the books in the lockers.
By the way, I want to show you how you put our books into your lockers. We do not put books in lockers by throwing them. We stand them up like little soldiers: like little books in the library or we lay them flat.

This rule was not given any consequences nor were the lockers checked, during the research period, to see if the students followed the rule. During the same activity, she gave the rules for covering the books.

A student had covered a book the previous year and used tape to secure the cover, damaging the inside cover, therefore her comment. She did follow through on the rule for having all books covered by Friday. Transcripts show comments each day praising those who had covered their books. Transcripts do not show any consequences for students who did not cover books, again illustrating no follow through on rules.

During this same activity, which took the entire class period, Teacher B also gave the rules for class discussions, stressing the students' need to participate.
in those discussions. She discussed the fact that she held and knew her ideas but that she wanted to hear their ideas. They would read the stories and talk about them and the students needed to be participants: share their ideas during these discussions. Pointing directly at the students as a group she said; "... I know my ideas and I want your ideas. So be prepared. In this class you're gonna talk."

Further on during the book form activity, Teacher B was much firmer in her directions concerning damaging textbooks than any of the other two teachers. She set out the consequences for damaged books in terms of monetary fines. Teacher A did not take the class period nor did she set up any fines or other consequences for damaged books. Teacher C took only the time to collect the book forms. He had sent them home the first day of school to be completed at home and spent no classtime going over the books for damages and recording them on the book form.

Teacher B also had a rule about wearing outer clothing in the classroom. Also during the book form activity, she saw a student wearing a jacket and took this opportunity to state her rule.
TEACHER B TRANSCRIPT D

DIALOGUE/EPISODE

EPISODE: Oh, by the way I'm so glad that this child wore a jacket. May I make an example of you please? Would you stand up? I'm not yelling at him because it's today. But I don't like to see him wearing a jacket in class. So from now on I don't want to see a jacket. O.K. Thank you."

ACTION

The student stood up and moved to the front of the room.

As the teacher continued her rule presentation, she had her hand on the student's shoulder. He returned to his seat with a smile on his face. There were no other incidents of wearing jackets in her room while I was there. She had given public notice to the entire class about the "no jackets" rule. An effective teaching of the rule without using the criteria of Brooks to teach rules, rather she used the concepts of Banura's (1973) social learning theory.

The transcripts of Aug. 29th. revealed the hand-raising rule embedded in review of homework. This would be an example of rules being embedded in instruction. A student answered a question without raising his hand. For two days there has been a combination of hand-raising and speaking out the answers. The teacher had been accepting both solicited answers and unsolicited answers, hand-raising and answers without hand-raising. On this occasion, students are raising hands. Jeff, who has frequently answered without
recognition and had his answer accepted, answers a question without hand-raising or teacher recognition. The transcript shows the teacher asking the question.

**TEACHER B TRANSCRIPT E**

**DIALOGUE/EPISODE ACTION**

**EPISODE 1:** What's a good thing to do?

**EPISODE 2:** O.K. You already answered. Raise your hand.

**EPISODE 3:** Josh?

**S. Read**

This dialogue illustrated the hand raising rule at the same time that the teacher's O.K. was a cue that Jeff's answer was correct. She accepted the correct answer and then re-inforced the rule for hand-raising. As the transcript continues seven interactions of dialogue pass with students raising their hands for recognition and participation. The eighth answer is accepted as correct without the reprimand about raising your hand for recognition and participation. The teacher became the first person to break the rule and again set up the answering without hand-raising. The following dialogue is from that transcript.
TEACHER B TRANSCRIPT F

DIALOGUE/EPISODE

EPISODE 1: ... Besides reading the black print, the headings, what's another good idea to do? S. The number, the date and the times.

EPISODE 2: Another thing. They have another thing. Look at the ...

EPISODE 3: Italics. Right

The transcripts for Teacher B for Aug. 28th. reveal the same pattern for rules embedded in instruction. As the class instruction on study habits is proceeding, the teacher initiates a rule for making definition notebooks. Definitions are being discussed as a part of study habits. The study habit guides discusses the use of flashcards and the teacher initiates the rule.

TEACHER B TRANSCRIPT F

DIALOGUE/EPISODE

T. O.K. We're going to do something like this for science words and definitions. I'm not going to ask you to do flashcards. We're going to keep a definitions notebook. O.K. For stuff like that. And sometimes when we have a few minutes at lunch or an activity period. I'm going to say 'Get out your science words" or "get our your English words" O.K. I want you studying those words. Alright"

It's interesting that this teacher is the reading teacher for this class and she has given the rule for extra minutes at lunch time or activity time when she has only her own homeroom. She has only four of the students in this class period for her homeroom periods. Fourth period, just prior to lunch, she has a class composed of
Teacher A and Teacher C's homeroom students for English and for activity period she has her own classroom. The researcher spent some time in her room for activity period. The students were using the period as a study hall period but most of the time I spent in the room was spent doing homework and I did not observe the use of "definition notebooks" being used. In Teacher A's room during activity period, her homeroom did use their science notebooks but these were Teacher A's students and she had all the students for science. She also had a rule for science notebooks and their use for study during activity period. She had stated that the notebooks could be used any time the students were in the room but were to be taken home only the evening before an examination.

Teacher B, further on in the lesson about study habits, initiates the rule for reading assignments and homework.

**TEACHER B TRANSCRIPT**

**DIALOGUE**

**T.** I'll put the assignment on the board. You can copy it in your assignment book. O.K. First my codes. What does this say?

**T.** That is the book. Whenever you see 'book' you know what I'm talking about.

**T.** What do you think the R.S. is?

**(Points to a set of letters on the board)**

**(Points to the basal reader)**

**(Teacher points to student to acknowledge him)**

**(Unsolicited)**
T. Worksheet. This will be your reading skills workbook. This is your reading skills workbook so whenever you see R.S. you're supposed to what?

T. O.K. Write that in your assignment book. It's due tomorrow. Put them in the basket. This is reading and it's due the beginning of the period. 'Cause I'm going to collect everything at the beginning of the period.

In this portion of the dialogue, the teacher has given the students the rules for reading assignments which include:

A. the reading assignment codes are placed on the board
B. the procedure for handing in the assignments
C. the time that she will collect the assignments.

She has also re-inforced the rule for the use of assignment books.

The pattern of answering questions and participating emerges again. The format of the questions and the pointing of the finger at the student again are strategies which are not included in the rule for participation i.e. raise your hand and be recognized before you answer the question. The use of the non-verbal pointing of the finger to recognize the student is not included in the rules for participation that the teacher has given the students. Students follow their own strategies for answering as is illustrated in the segment of student interviews above. This pattern is
very evident as the video tapes are reviewed for this day. The teacher ends the lesson with a question in this format. "... And you're supposed to think of...?" and the question "Look at the ...?" These examples are ones which change the format of her questioning technique and also change the rule for student participation. Her questions demand a response and she allows a response without hand-raising and also invites a group response rather than a single response. The students quickly learned the pattern for participation in this classroom and use any form of participation disregarding the hand-raising rule because they have learned that as long as their answer is correct, it will be accepted and they don't participate unless they are certain of their answer.

As the students move to Teacher C, there was a clear indication of school rules learned previously being used. As they moved to this teacher's room, they were very quiet. They had learned from previous students the rules for moving in the hall quietly. (Student interviews) On the first day, the students took any seat in this teacher's room. On the second day of school, the teacher put them in alphabetical order. On day one he had stated: "Sit where you want today. We'll be in alphabetical order but won't get that done today." By
day three the students were sitting again where they wanted with no admonition from the teacher.

On the first day, Teacher C passed out the book and book forms. He took down the book numbers and attendance. There was very little dialogue between teacher and students. As the researcher observed the students in this shortened period on the first day, the classroom rules that the students indicated "were learned in first grade" were very obvious. They entered, took a seat quietly, and did not talk unless spoken to. Common rules that many students learn in the first grade and carry with them throughout school years.

The common rule that Teacher C gave then students was the one concerning the covering of books. He told them the books had to be covered by the following Friday. He explained the rule for the books being covered and the book forms in one statement.

T. "Kinda tiring to go through the book. It's to protect you so at the end of the year, you won't be charged. (for damage). That's also why we cover the books." 

This rule was common to all three classrooms in this study. However, the other two teachers were much more precise in having their students cover the books and in completing the book forms. All three gave the same timeline for covering books. Teachers A and B checked on Friday to see if books were covered. Teacher C did not mention it on the designated Friday. Even though
Teachers A and B gave consequences for not having the
books covered, no consequences were enforced.
It should be noted that Teacher C employs the "lecture"
approach to teaching. There is much less student
initiated activity in this classroom. Students
participate only when called upon and seldom ask a
question for clarification of a point or even
clarification of directions. The teacher reads all the
directions on the homework sheets to the students. (See
transcript for Teacher C). The teacher used the grade
book and the alphabetical order seating arrangement to
call out the names for answering questions. In an
interview with him on Aug. 29th., he stated "it would
enable him to learn names quickly".

One student's perception of this procedure was one of
unfairness. On the day that they were put in
alphabetical order, he asked the question about changing
the order so that all students had a chance to answer.
(Some students at the end of the alphabet had not
answered any questions during the class period.)

TEACHER C TRANSCRIPTION C

DIALOGUE

T. "How do you mean?"

S. "It's not fair always to start with
the A's. The rest of us don't get a
chance."

T. "When you have a college degree and
have taught as long as I have then you
can ask that question. This is my
classroom, I'm in charge and I'll do it
my way."
This comment set the format for the class. He has his other rules embedded in his instruction. The transcript for Aug. 27th revealed the rules for the worksheet.

T. "Now the people that do not have an assignment who come in and say 'I left mine in my folder at home or over the hills at grandmother's house or wherever it happens to be - these people we will give you a warning this week. After this week is over, this is what will happen if you don't have your assignment. I'll be happy to give you another to do but I give it to you at lunch or at 11:30 and you do it the first half of the lunch period."

During this direction, Mike, who was in the wrong seat, i.e., not the seat assigned to him the previous day, gets up to move to the assigned seat. The teacher interrupts his direction and addresses Mike.

TEACHER C TRANSCRIPT D

TEACHER C TRANSCRIPT D

T. Mike?

T. Mike?

Mike looks up at the teacher.

T. That's O.K. Stay there. As long as I know you where you're here. Stay as long as you behave. If not, I'll put you up in the front corner away from everyone.

This dialogue took place during the roll call activity. The teacher had put the students in alphabetical order yet when a student attempts to return to the rule, the student is told differently. This sends two messages to the students. It is an open public
dialogue which all of the students hear. It tells the students

1) they may sit where they want 
and 
2) they will be moved to the front corner if they misbehave.

The teacher has broken the rule he instituted for the seating arrangement and set up a new rule for the students.

As this transcript proceeds, the rules for participation are embedded in instructional review of the previous day's lesson.

TEACHER C TRANSCRIPT E

DIALOGUE ACTION

T. "O.K. Yesterday we talked a little bit about immigrants but I don't remember if we said what an immigrant was. So raise your hand if you know what you think an immigrant is anyway. Maybe we're all immigrants. What is an immigrant?"

S. "A person who comes from another country."

This passage illustrates the handraising. As the video tapes of the lessons were reviewed, this behavior continued. Questions were asked and if students chose to participate, they raised their hands. Other times the teacher called on people. For the first three weeks, Teacher C continued to call in alphabetical order when he employed the teacher initiated questioning.

This teacher's classroom routine remained the same for the time I was in the room. Returning in November
and again in January to observe. The behaviors were the same, making the classroom procedure in this room very predictable.

To summarize these classroom rules for these three teachers, a review of the time frame and the criteria for teaching the rules is necessary. A review of the video tapes, field notes and transcripts revealed that all three teachers presented all of their rules during the first three weeks of school. The week in November and the week in January used to verify the predictability of the classroom procedure revealed no new rules being taught with the exception of Teacher A teaching the rules for laboratory procedures in Science. The results according to Brooks' (1985) criteria are presented in Chart 1. The results in September and at the end of the project remained the same.

There is an abundance of research from classroom management that discusses effective classroom organization and management. Much of the effective organization and management may be predicted from the first weeks of school. More effective managers "taught" their students a workable system of rules and procedures during the first weeks of school. This concept is supported by Kounin (1970) and his concept of "withitness": Brophy and Putnam (1979) "proactive" teaching and planning as well as Doyle (1979)

ANALYSIS: QUESTION 1.1

Question 1.1 "What are the similarities and differences in the presentation of rules by those in authority?" is answered in the analysis of the teacher and the principal's presentation of rules for the school and the classrooms. A review of the audio and video tapes revealed more similarities than differences in presentation of the rules. The principal clearly taught the rules to the students while the teachers presented the rules on an as-needed basis or embedded in instructional lessons. The principal presented his rules orally, using the school handbook in his hand while that students viewed theirs, and used students in his examples. His presentation was his only presentation of the school's generic rules but the teachers had been prepared for his visit during the staff's in-service day. The teachers in turn prepared the students for his presentation so they were anticipating his presentation. Because all three of the teachers in this study were veteran teachers in this building and with this principal, they were well aware of the format of the principal's presentation and prepared their students. All of the teachers, at some time during the first three
weeks of school, referred to the principal's presentation. Their rationale for this, according to each teacher's answer when questioned about it, was to use his talk as a re-inforcer for her/his own rationale for a classroom rule. Examples of classroom talk regarding responsibility and attendance will illustrate this re-inforcement.

**TEACHER A:**

Teacher A: "Mr M. said the responsibility is yours. And if you come in to school... If you're absent one day you're going to have one day to make it up. If you're absent three days, you have three days to make it up."

**PRINCIPAL:**

Principal: "She's got to see her teacher. Herself. She's got to get up outta her chair. Walk over to whoever is her teacher... Say "I was absent yesterday. Was there anything I need to making up. It is you responsibility to do it. It is not the teacher's responsibility."

**TEACHER B:**

Teacher B: "As Mr. M. said I don't care if your mother didn't put your work in your folder, it's your responsibility."

**TEACHER C:**

Teacher C: "I forgot it at home is not a valid excuse. Mother threw it away it is not a valid excuse. There are no valid excuses. As Mr. M. said, it's your responsibility."

Most of the rules in the three classrooms were presented when the need for the rule became apparent. The principal, as was his custom, presented all the incoming sixth grades the rules. He presented the rules to each classroom at the beginning of the school year and illustrated each rule with examples by using students in
the class. He did not wait until a rule was requested by 
the student or present the rules as infractions of the 
rules came about as did the teachers in this study. It 
is true that the principal only presented the generic 
rules of the school and only presented those rules once 
in the classroom(s) while the teachers presented and 
re-inforced rules constantly in their classrooms. The 
major difference is in the presentation when the 
principal's and teachers' rules are presented. The 
students had clear understandings of the principal's 
expectations of them and what consequences would be 
enforced if infractions of the rules occurred and he 
needed to enforce the consequences. The rules of the 
teachers, on the other hand, did not have definite 
consequences and the students were left to engage their 
own perceptions of what consequences would be enforced. 
The exception to this is seen with Teacher C and his rule 
for homework completion. This rule he presented clearly 
following Brook's criteria for teaching rules. His 
rationale, the need for grades, was expressed in a 
conversation as well as in the transcripts. This is the 
only rule he has written on the board to provide Brooks' 
(1985) first criteria.

To illustrate the similarities in rules across 
classrooms, the following excerpts from transcripts are 
offered. All of these transcripts are from Aug. 29th and
are initially concerned with the common rule for
dismissal from the classroom. Beginning in Teacher A'
classroom at the bell. The teacher now gives the rule for
dismissal and it does not appear again in her
transcripts.

TEACHER A:

T. "Bell rings. That's the end of the period but that does not mean
you can leave the room. If I'm still talking or another teacher,
wherever you are, and they are still talking, you are to sit still.
The bell does not mean you jump up and leave."

The following day Teacher A is discussing animal cells
when the bell rings. The following section of transcript
show that the students did follow her rule for dismissal.

TEACHER A:

T. "... It says animal cells. That's the next section."
The bell rings.

T. "The next section is plant cells. O.K. You're dismissed."
The students leave on her cue. By the time the
researcher returned in November, these students were
leaving as soon as the bell rang and were not waiting for
her cue for dismissal.

Teacher B has a similar explanation for dismissal
revealed in her transcripts the same day and not repeated
on any day the researcher was in the classroom. The
students were discussing a reading homework assignment
and the bell rings. Students start to get out of their
seats to leave when the teacher said. "The bell doesn't
dismiss, I do." These students again followed the rule for the first weeks of school and by the time the researcher returned in November, students were leaving the classroom as soon as the bell rang.

Teacher C also stated the rule concerning the bell and dismissal. The teacher was discussing a homework assignment on Aug. 29th. The bell rang before he was finished and students rose to leave. He stated:

TEACHER C:

T: "Will you people please sit down. I haven't dismissed you yet. I don't intend to dismiss you yet."

Again by the time the researcher returned to the classrooms in November, these students were also leaving at the sound of the bell. During the observations in November and again in January, students moved with the bell rather than waiting until the teachers dismissed them. I questioned Teachers A and B about the procedure and both gave similar answers. They both had allowed the rule to be broken because students were more accustomed to the building and the schedule. They had stated earlier that the major adjustment was one of schedules and changing classes. Once the students were familiar with the routine, both of these teachers changed their rule.

Another common rule was the use of the student assignment books to record homework assignments. Teacher
A on Sept. 27th. spent a great deal of time concerning the assignment book. She discussed the cover of the books not being very heavy and the need to keep them the entire year. She has the assignment book in her hand and states:

**TEACHER A:**

T. "This is your assignment book. I don't know how these are going to last through the year. But I think, if some of you, ever hear of clear contact paper?"

T. "To put a piece on each side. It'll protect it and you'll still be able to see through it. So we will have these all year. And I will come around occasionally in Science to see your little gold book. So I do expect you to have this with you every day."

Teacher C's transcripts revealed the rule for the assignment books on Aug. 27. He was giving the homework assignment and stated to the students:

**TEACHER C:**

T: "One and two on page twenty-four. You need your assignment books to copy this down. You should have them every day to copy your assignments."

He does not indicate to the students that he will ever check the assignment books or check if the students have them.

**ANALYSIS: QUESTION 2**

In analyzing question 2, "How do students interpret teacher behavior to come to an understanding of the tacit dimensions of the classroom?", the researcher reviewed the answers of the students given in the first interview.
The student answers for this interview exposed the data for subquestion 2.1:

"What teacher behaviors which cued the students to a rule or a social norm?"

It also contained the data for subquestion 2.2:

"What consequences were observed that cued the students that this was a rule or a norm to be followed?"

This interview was audio taped the second week of school. The researcher is asking the students their interpretation of verbal phrases that have been recorded as being used frequently by Teachers A and B. The first verbal phrase that both of these teachers used was "Excuse me?". The students were asked their interpretation of this phrase and each of them gave the same response, "Be quiet." To illustrate their responses, the transcript of that interview follows. The questions are those posited by the researcher based upon the students' answers as well as question designed to gain specific information. Questions preceded by the R. are the researcher's questions. Responses marked Ss are responses where all the students answered in unison. Individual student responses use the students first name only.
TRANSCRIPTION OF STUDENT INTERVIEWS

R. "I've picked up on one word - two words really. They're used in almost all, well it's used in the first two classes. And those words are 'excuse me'. When the teacher says that, what does it mean to you?"

Ss. "Be quiet."

Kelly. "He goes, Mr. H., 'Excuse me.'"

R. So all the teachers use it and it means the same thing?"

Kelly. "Yeah all the teachers use it."

Jessie. "Other teachers mean that too."

R. "That means then you have to be quiet. Then one of the other things I heard was ..."

Jeff. "Is there a problem?"

R. "And who does that mean to you?"

Kelly. "Not to talk."

Bill. "Or do anything bad."

Jessie. "Or usually they say it to you when you're talking.

R. "Everything cues you 'Not to talk.'

Kelly. "Well Mrs. P, she goes,...'You comedians be quiet'."

R. "Does that mean anything to the rest of you?"

Jeff. "Not to be funny in class."

Jessie. "Not to be funny in class."

Kelly. "Not to try to be funny and think you're funny."

Ss. "Not to talk when they're talking.

All of the students perceived these two phrases, "Excuse me" and "Is there a problem?" as cues to cease talking or cease a behavior. Usually a student-student conversation accompanies a behavior for which the students are
reprimanded. The most frequent example of this, as recorded on the video-tape, occurs while the students are handing in their assignments which they have corrected. In Teacher A and Teacher C's room the procedure for turning in assignments is to pass the assignment forward. This activity causes a lot of movement accompanied by the talking. This activity may be considered a transitional period which takes the student off-task and provides a more open opportunity for talking and other disruptive behaviors. These are the observations noted in field notes and noted on the video-tapes of the classrooms.

Returning to the interview, the students had other responses for the statement, "Everything cues you not to talk." The following responses followed in sequence during the interview.

**STUDENT INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS**

R. "When you're sitting there, just kind of gazing off, what's going on?"

Kelly "We're bored."

Jessie "Most of my classes, I'm bored."

Kelly "All he classes are boring until like..."

Jessie."Something funny happens or someone burps."

Bill "They think we know all the answers. I don't know all the answers so I can't answer."

R. "So you sit there and daydream?"

Bill "I look at my book."

Jessie "I look at my book."
R. "When you look at your book are you telling me that by looking at your book you avoid getting asked a question?"

Jessie "No. By looking at my book I try to find the answer.

Kelly "If you look at your book, the teacher thinks you're finding the answer and they call on somebody who knows."

The students each felt that all the teachers held the rule "No talking when I'm talking." When questioned, the students all had the same perception of what they should be doing; listening. Further questioning of the students as they viewed the video tapes illustrated that "listening" was not the activity taking place, at least for some of the students.

As this portion of the interview closed, the students disclosed their perceptions on the two most frequently used verbal cues for appropriate social behavior and one non-verbal cue; i.e. if they looked into their books the teacher would move to another student thus allowing the first student time to look for the answer or as one student admitted, "I don't know the answer so I can't answer." therefore avoiding giving an answer. By the teacher moving on to another student, Bill doesn't have to answer. By not having to answer both the teacher and Bill have signalled to the other students a procedure to avoid answering a question if the answer is not readily available from the student.

During this same interview, the students answered questions about their observations that cued them that a
rule was being envoked and how they, the students knew that this was a rule. The researcher posited the following question:

RESEARCHER/STUDENT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

R. "How do you think you're going to learn the rules of the room?"

Kelly "Well, the teachers say them and I'm going to repeat them in my head.

R. "So you strategy is to repeat the rules in your head."

Kelly "I try to memorize them and practice them at home.

R. "Alright. Anybody else? How about you Jeff?"

Jeff "First you don't know them. Then you get into trouble. Then they (the teachers) tell you.

R. "You get in trouble, then they tell you?"

Kelly "Half of them are like in elementary school. It's like "Don't talk in the hall" You not allowed to in elementary school. Don't talk when the teacher is talking."

Jeff "Most of them we memorized in first grade."

R. "Mark, what do you think?"

Jesse "Except your not allowed to go to your lockers."

Kelly "Only so many times -- before school. at lunch. after lunch. after school."

R. "What else? You said something, Billy, about chewing gum."

Billy "Well, its not fair. People in North ignore it. They get to chew gum."

Kelly "That's North. They're two grades above."

Jeff "Yeah. So what?"

Jesse "And we go there next. After eighth grade."

These segments of the students' interviews, conducted after two weeks of school had been completed.
demonstrated that these teachers did not teach their students the rules applicable to their classrooms. The teachers inserted the rules within the context of their daily instructions and the students used a variety of strategies to learn the rules.

As illustrated by Jeff's response, many of the rules are learned by trial and error. Kelly's response indicates that the classroom rules do not change drastically as students move through the grades. Once an infraction of the rule(s) is made, and the consequence known, the rule becomes known for all of the students. This method of teaching the rules does not fulfill Brook's (1985) criteria for teaching rule. It does illustrate that the students make use of social learning theory and follow the behaviors which are rewarded in some manner, bring pleasurable consequences and avoid the behaviors which award them a negative or displeasurable consequences. (Bandura, 1973)

Another segment of the same interview with the same students will illustrate further Bandura's social learning theory.
TRANSCRIPTS OF STUDENT INTERVIEWS

R. "If you don't understand what the teacher is saying, how do you know what to do?"

Jeff "You just play it cool for a few days."

R. "What does that mean?"

Jeff "You know. You don't do anything bad and you watch the other kids and what they do bad, then you don't do."

Jessie "Then you listen to the rules."

An incident in the classroom illustrates this point. During a literature period, Teacher A separated two boys. She had told them the first day of school she would separate students from their friends only if they caused a disturbance or did not follow the rules. She had stated on the second day of school:

"Some people in my room, I can tell, have chosen to sit together or by one another. And my policy is you may sit next to whoever you would like to. Now if I find it necessary, I will move people. Weekly O.K. I just want you to know so that if I point to you, ask you to stand up, change seats with somebody, you will know why I'm doing that. So if you chose to sit next to some friends -then uh- you and your friends should decide whether or not you're going to stay together and how you're going to go about it."

This was the only time this rule was stated to the students. By employing the social learning theory, the students who were the interviewees for this research had decided that by watching the teacher's action of separating the two boys, they (the other students) should not engage in the behavior which caused the two boys to be separated, i.e. talking and making funny noises during the presentation of the lesson. The interview transcript clearly revealed that this concept was learned.
TRANSCRIPTS OF STUDENT INTERVIEWS

R. "So the other day, for example, when the two boys got moved... They got separated. What did you learn from that?"

Jessie "That you shouldn't do what they what they were doing."

R. "And what were they doing?"

Billy "Talking"

Kelly "They would just keep talking and making funny noises."

R. "What did that cue you into? What did it tell you you had to do?"

Ss "Not to talk and not to make funny noises."

Kelly "Funny noises and burps."

R. "So what you do is watch what the teachers does to others students."

Ss. "Yeah."

At the end of the interview, the researcher asked a question to summarize:

R. "To review. How are you learning about the rules this year?"

Mark "Just listening to them and remembering."

R. "Alright. You're just listening and remembering. So we've got one that listens and remembers one that writes them down. One that says them over in their head. One that plays it cool and doesn't do anything until he sees someone else do it and what happens."

R. "Billy, how do you remember all those rules?"

Bill "I don't. I never talk or think about them."

The students responses to the final question illustrates that they incorporate the theory of social learning into their learning and accepting the social norms of their classrooms. They also used the theory to observe students behaviors which received teacher
reprimands and then determined for themselves which rules were in place.

It should be noted that Kelly was the only student who admitted being in trouble in the fifth grade and was the one who was reprimanded most often during the time the research was being conducted. Billy admitted to only one incident in which he was close to being suspended from school before a solution was found. Not one of the other interviewees admitted to being reprimanded for misconduct during the fifth grade.

ANALYSIS: QUESTION 2.2 "WHAT CONSEQUENCES WERE OBSERVED THAT CUED THE STUDENTS THAT THIS WAS A NORM OR RULE?"

The teacher behaviors noted in the preceding paragraphs are those behaviors observed by the students during the first week of school and reported to the researcher during the first formal interview. Other teacher behaviors were noted by the researcher in the classroom, noted in field notes and verified when the tapes were viewed for transcription. A review of each teacher’s transcription revealed the behaviors and proved to be the most effective manner for tracking the emerging patterns.

Teacher A, the homeroom teacher, had at the front of her classroom a metal stool. She did much of her direct instruction seated on this stool. When she was instructing using a different approach, eg. direct
instruction from the board, she had a behavior which cued the students that there was inappropriate behavior. She would move back to her stool, sit down, and stop talking. This behavior was seen often and was an effective method to bring the students' attention back to the task at hand. It usually took approximately 45 seconds for the students to become quiet and be prepared to return to the task at hand. If more than 45 seconds passed, she used the phrase "Excuse me" to bring the students back to the task at hand. She was successful using her strategy with the stool and did not need to use her verbal cue very often; her silence got the anticipated results. Teacher A, of the three teachers in this study, allowed for more student interaction than the other two teachers.

The students participated more as is evidenced by the amount of teacher talk-student talk on the transcriptions. Not only is there more student talk in responding to teacher questions, there is more student initiated talk. They ask more questions and contribute more as indicated by the length of their answers. When Teacher A was questioned about the amount of student interaction in her classroom she stated, "children should have some enjoyment" (informal conversation) and she felt that allowing them more freedom in their interactions was one way to accomplish that goal. She also taught science and the students had group laboratory work whenever
possible as well as group drawings. Both of these activities also had as a goal student interaction.

Teacher A's perception of the ability of the students in this cluster was also very different than the other teachers in this cluster. She felt that they were capable of accomplishing much on their own with guidance from her. Teacher B, on the other hand, thought that this was a very low group academically and to expect them to do good academic work was expecting too much from them. Her description of the reading group she had was expressed in an informal conversation when she stated "This reading group is a 'pulling teeth' group". (informal interview 8/28).

As the researcher spent time in this classroom and continued to discuss the students with her it became apparent that she expected less academic work from the students and the students were not performing at their academic best. This is a clear example of the research on the correlation between teacher expectations and student achievement. (Rosenthal & Jacobson.1968)

Teacher B wants all of the students to participate in the class discussions as illustrated by her comments on work expectations. "I do insist you do your work. I insist you have it here. And I insist you participate as much as possible. It's your responsibility to learn." (Aug. 27) This statement was made on the second day of
school. It suggests to the students that they are to be responsible for their work and sets up an expectation for them. It appears contradictory to her own statement of the next day that the students can't do good academic work without "pulling teeth".

Teacher B's strategy to get all the students to participate in class discussion is one of using the students seating arrangement. Her class is arranged in the traditional arrangement of desks in rows. To meet her goal of having all the students participate, Teacher B call on each row. When she senses that a row has not been actively participating, she moves to the row or points to it and calls on students. Her transcript of Aug. 27 illustrates this pattern and it continues to emerge in her future transcripts.

"... I want everyone to participate and I do mean rotten things to people when they don't participate. So be prepared. In this class you're gonna talk."

This statement sets up the expectation. Her strategy emerges as the school year progresses. The transcription for Aug. 28 revealed the following strategy.

T. "Very good. I'd like someone in row, this row (points to row 4) You need your paper, pen or pencil and one other thing if you want to take notes..."

S. Notebook (This answer is given by a student in r.4)
The transcription for Aug. 29 revealed the pattern again. The discussion is around the Scandinavian countries.

T. "Scandinavian countries. Who knows what the Scandinavian countries are? Come on Row 3. Anybody know where the Scandinavian countries are?"

In this portion of the video for this day, the teacher has moved from the front of the room, to row 3. She is standing about the middle of the room, next to row three.

Another transcript for September 10th. revealed the same pattern.

T. "Boys, I would like you to each give a fact statement, a true statement. Hands down. Think of one and we will go around. Only boys. I want you to be quiet. Alright gentlemen, starting in row 1. Brian, can you give us your fact statement please."

As the students became familiar with her strategy, they began to answer only when she called on their row. The teacher also used this strategy when she felt it necessary to bring a person back to task. The phrase "I haven't heard from row ..." was heard frequently as she moved to keep the discussion moving and students on task. The flow of interaction increased as the students learned her strategy. As they became more familiar with her, they began to answer without raising their hand and her rule for both raising the hand involving the students by row calling were broken. The hand raising rule is re-instated whenever the teacher feels there is too much
noise or the discussion is wandering from the topic of the lesson.

Robert L. DeBruyn, author and publisher of the "MASTER TEACHER", a series of monthly pamphlets for classroom teachers has published a pamphlet, "THE FOUR NECESSITIES OF CLASSROOM RULES" in which he summarizes criteria for classroom rules. He discusses one of the necessities as follows: "... the rules must flow out of something deeper than only the rule itself. Most educators make both good and bad rules, appropriate and inappropriate rules, simple and complex rules." (The Master Teacher, Inc. V. 21, #2, 1989) It appears that all rules need some form of learning in order to accomplish the goal or outcomes for which the rules were initiated. Rules are necessary for each classroom to function as a society just as rules are necessary for any community to function securely and freely. The rules we put into practice must have a reason and a function: they must serve the students and better prepare the students as workers and learners in the classroom. The rule must function for the students not the teachers. It is evident in the research that, for example, the rule: "Pencils can be sharpened only before class." (See Teacher A transcripts) does not serve the needs of some of the students especially if they are a student who has only one or two pencils. If the pencils break during the
class period, the rule does not serve the student's need. For the needs of the students to be met, they would have to ask permission for them to sharpen their pencils during the class period. The criteria for rules laid out by Brooks (1985) is also re-iterated in De Bruyn's article. Rules need to be taught with rationale not just told to the students when the need arises. Teacher A negotiates this rule with the students as needed. This does not lessen the need for classroom rules rather indicates that the rules need to meet the student needs and that students need to be taught the rules in a meaningful way.

Teacher C's rule for alphabetical seating was not lasting. He did explain his reason and function of the rule but did not enforce the rule over time therefore the rule did not serve the function he intended. His intention was one of learning the students' names. Upon my return to the classroom in November, I observe students being called by the wrong name and them correcting Teacher C as to names.

Teacher B's rule for handing in homework was also negotiated to meet the students' needs. Handing in the homework prior to the class period did not meet the students' need as some of them completed the work while waiting for class to begin. They silently negotiated this rule by simply walking to the front table and
putting their work in the basket when it was finished either before or during the class period. Since Teacher B did not reprimand them for this behavior, and accepted the homework as long as it was in before the end of class period, her rule did not serve the function she had intended; to have the students' attention for the entire class period without the distraction of student movement in the room. (Informal interview Aug. 28th.)

The teacher behavior cues described in the preceding paragraphs and the student negotiations to circumvent those rules serve to illustrate the need for classroom rules to be functional and serve the needs of the students. The strategies students use to circumvent rules are as individualistic as the students who negotiate the changes. It would be well to note here the students' reaction to the transition to sixth grade as the investigation into their individual strategies is presented.

The movement to a departmentalized sixth grade from a self-contained fifth grade did not appear to have a negative effect on five of the six students who volunteered to participate in this study. The sixth student, a girl from a resource room for learning disabled students, did have a great deal of trouble adjusting. She perceived herself as receiving negative consequences and being placed in the "wrong" room. In
our conversations, she repeatedly stated that she did not belong with this group and that she should be in the resource room. The student revealed that she did not feel positive about the change nor about her experiences thus far in the regular sixth grade classes. As her behaviors were observed for the first three weeks of school, one would conclude that the student was correct in her statement. Her perception was one of the amount of classroom and homework work as being more than she could handle and the organization of the classes being problematic for her to follow the schedule. She revealed these facts to the researcher during the first three weeks of school. She was often lost between classes, not being able to find the correct class or follow her schedule and losing her personal possessions as she moved from class to class. Conversations between the researcher and the teacher from the resource room indicated that the teacher felt that the student was capable of performing in a regular classroom and made that recommendation. The student indicated that she wanted to return to the resource room. The resource teacher's perception of this comment was one of concern and felt the student didn't want to put forth the effort needed to stay in the regular classroom and behaved in a manner that would result in a recommendation for the student to return to the resource room. This teacher
felt that the student needed positive influences and re-inforcement and was properly placed. When the researcher returned in November, this student was indeed back in the resource room. Her strategies had worked for her.

Teaching strategies, changes in curriculum and greater emphasis on academic performance stressed in sixth and seventh grades in middle schools and/or junior high organizational structures may tend to have the students focus change from the process of learning strategies of lower grades to the focus of grades. (Kowalski, 1986) It is evident to this researcher, based upon the conversations with this student, observations in the classroom and discussions with the teachers involved, that these factors may have overwhelmed the student. To compensate, the student began to initiate behaviors which would result in her return to the resource room. At no time did the student indicate that the behaviors were deliberate and goal-oriented. Her behavior in the social and academic domains were not consistent with her behaviors in our small group discussions. In the small group she answered questions, interacted well with the other students and generally displaced appropriate behavior consistent with small group interaction. In the large classroom group, she consistently refused to answer questions even after volunteering by raising her hand to
indicate a willingness to participate. Her behavior once recognized to answer a question would be either a verbal response of, "I don't know", "Never mind" or no verbal response. The reviews of the video tapes illustrated frequent repetition of these behaviors for this student. It might be concluded that the culture of the middle school overwhelmed this student and she sought refuge in a "safer environment". The remaining five students discussed their strategies with the researcher during the January visitation which had as its purpose a verification of rules and student predictability of teacher behaviors.

On January's visitation, the first rule infraction observed by the researcher was the rule for going to the student's lockers. The students were going to lockers between classes as well as during classes. During the interview portion of this visit, the six volunteers were queried about this observation.

**TRANSCRIPTION OF STUDENT INTERVIEW IN JANUARY**

R. "I notice that students are going to their lockers during class time. What happened to the rule for before school?"

Bill "I just say someone sent me to my locker"

Ss "Yeah"

Jessica "Just tell them you forgot something"

The strategy students used to circumvent this rule was one the researcher's students used in junior high
where the same rule was common. The students have needs that must be met from their perspective so they place the purpose for their being at their lockers on someone else. They have learned that the teachers will not take the time to confirm the students' statements. This strategy re-inforces both Brooks' and DeBruyn's assertion that a rule must be taught, must be functional and meet the needs of the student. It also illustrates that rules should be broad rather than very specific in time constraints. The limits of this rule as originally stated, i.e. going to lockers before school and at lunch places constraints on the teachers, who should follow the rules as well, and on the students. The rule should function to prevent teachers sending students to the lockers as well as preventing students going to the lockers. The constraints do not serve the needs of either the students or teachers and therefore initiates student strategies to circumvent the rule. Both this study and the researchers' experience in junior high found teachers breaking the rule because they send students to the lockers for forgotten items or homework.

Once students learn that it is acceptable for teachers to send them and thus break the rule, students incorporate the knowledge into their strategy. Again the concepts of social learning theory are illustrated. Students observed behaviors of other students and
teachers and incorporated that knowledge into their own scheme for circumventing that rule. The students had learned that teachers did not confirm the statement "Someone sent me..." and performed the behavior which would get them the reward they needed.

The information presented in the preceding paragraphs served to answer the questions posited concerning teacher behavior cues and observable consequences to students so that students were aware of rules being presented or when rule infractions occurred. By the third week of school, most of the student interviewees has a firm grasp on what behaviors were expected from them to become an integral part of each of the three classrooms investigated in this study. Once this knowledge was ascertained, contexts of the classrooms were investigated to determine if the rules remained constant across contexts.

The investigation began with Teacher B and reading class since this was the first period class. Teacher A's homeroom period will be analyzed after the three academic periods so comparisons can be made in subject areas and contrasted to the only homeroom period investigated.
To analyze this question, it became necessary to look at the individual classrooms and to differentiate the different contexts as viewed by the researcher and verified with the video tapes, field tapes, and student interviews. It was most convenient to start with Teacher B since she had the first class. Teacher B had three time frames in her classroom. The first was the first five minutes of the period. During this period, the students were to put their homework in the correct basket at the front table. This period also allowed for the taking of attendance during this time the students could converse with their neighbors quietly. Once attendance was taken, class time began. The teacher gave the verbal cue of "Everyone in their seat." From this cue, the students were made aware that the direct teaching for the day would begin. Depending on the lesson, i.e. vocabulary building, workbook or reading for comprehension the major rule remained the same: the students were not to talk while other were talking. The other rules changed depending on the lesson with all lessons demanding student participation. It may be appropriate to view this action in chart form for clarification. The chart will indicate time, activity and rule(s) in place.
### Table 3

**Teacher B's Display of Rules and Context of those rules**

| TIME     | ACTIVITY                  | RULE                                                                 |
|----------|---------------------------|                                                                     |
| 9:00-9:05| Hand in homework          | Homework in the correct basket                                     |
|          |                           | Class preparation                                                   |
|          |                           | Materials on desk other items on floor. Students may talk           |
| 9:05-9:45| Direct instruction        | Students do not talk unless asked                                   |
|          | a) Oral reading           | Everyone follows in own text while others read. Raise hands to be   |
|          |                           | recognized for participation.                                       |
|          | b) Workbook               | Teacher calls on students for participation. May be called on       |
|          |                           | without a raised hand. Teacher is control of who participates as    |
|          |                           | she recognizes students for participation.                           |
|          | c) Group discussion       | Teacher is in control of participants as she calls on the students  |
|          |                           | for the answers. Often uses her row-calling strategy.               |
| 9:45     | Dismissal                 | Teacher may or may not dismiss. Many times the students leave at    |
|          |                           | the bell without her cue.                                            |

The above section is an illustration of Teacher B's class period for the first three weeks of school. Upon return in November and January, the same procedure was observed. The instructional activities, direct instruction, workbooks and class discussion usually are the activities for the entire class period on any given day. There is usually not a combination of instructional activities during any one 45 minute class period.
There were a few times during observation where this teacher accepted answers that were unsolicited but correct. This practice broke the teacher's rules of hand-raising to be recognized or recognition by the teacher. It would appear the rule for handraising changed as the teacher's perception of class momentum changed. If the students negotiated control by answering without teacher recognition and the teacher accepted this behavior, the behavior continued until the teacher's perception of the class discussion was one of a chaotic and noisy discussion. At this point she would enforce the hand-raising rule by stating, "Raise your hands." (Viewed on video tapes) It appears that the rules changed to meet the needs of the teacher and some of the students.

A class period used for any type of testing or written evaluation was not observed during the time of this study. As illustrated, Teacher B did control a lot of who participated in the oral work of her classroom. Even though she has stated numerous times that she wanted everyone to participate, it was evident that not all students participated, either by hand raising or teacher selection.
A review of Teacher C's class times will provide a comparison.

TABLE 4

TEACHER C Display of context and rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>RULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:06-10:20</td>
<td>Correct homework</td>
<td>No student inter-action while the teacher was discussing things. Teacher is in control of all student participation. Uses alphabetical order to call on students. Hand-raising was not evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20-10:40</td>
<td>Reading of lesson</td>
<td>Reading was done by row beginning at row one and moving across the row. Any discussion was done by the teacher with no student interaction. There were little student initiated questions or interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40-10:46</td>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>Every day there assignment was a worksheet for the lesson. Directions were read by the students and then explained by the teacher using one example from each section of the worksheet. There was little student questioning. He was in control of all interactions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above outline covers a typical day in Teacher C's classroom. Students were very passive in their participation and most days waited to be called upon rather than initiate participation by hand-raising. As stated earlier, the tone of this class was set when the teacher responded to a student request to start questioning at the last of the alphabet so all could have a chance to answer. At the time of Jeff's inquiry, the teacher set the rule in place that he would decide how
people would be chosen to participate and justified his rule for calling in alpha order. It should be noted that the teacher often used to grade or roll book to call the names and did not call the names by looking at the students. When the researcher visited in November and January, the same procedure was observed. The patterns for this classroom were extremely predictable and the student interviewees reported boredom in this classroom more often than in the other two classrooms.

A written evaluation was observed in this classroom and the preparation and review for the evaluation varied the routine somewhat. For the review period, the teacher would spend the entire period reviewing all the worksheets, making certain that the students had the correct answers on all of them. (The were to keep all worksheets upon return to them.) Very few questions were asked of or by the students, rather the teacher read off all the correct answers with some explanations for the more difficult ones. (His perception of difficult) The evaluation day consisted of handing out the evaluation, reading the directions with explanations and handing in the evaluation. This procedure was to wait until everyone was finished then the teacher would walk around and pick up each evaluation, checking to make sure that each had a name and period number on it. There is very little teacher-student verbal interaction and less
student-student verbal interaction in this classroom. A glance at the transcript for this teacher will illustrate the amount of teacher talk versus the amount of student talk. Most of the student communication in this room took the route of note passing. It is the belief of this researcher that the tone for this classroom was set by the teacher's response to Jeff very early in the school year and the students accepted that they could not change anything. (Quote is in student interviews.)

It is clear, based on the schedules of the days and the activities of those days, that context did have an influence on the rules for each classroom. Context across the class period changed as the activities of instruction changed. The rules for participation changed with the activities i.e. round robin reading or science demonstrations and written workbook activities.

In summary, contexts do govern rules for participation and behavior in these three classrooms. A discussion of how the students combine all of this knowledge to become active participants in their classrooms will form the basis for Chapter Five. Therefore Question 4, "How do students come to know and understand the tasks necessary to become active participants in their classrooms?" will be answered in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER V

Entering middle school can be compared somewhat to a child's first entry into formal school. When children enter kindergarten their perceptions of school, learning and daily appropriate behaviors emerge. The pattern for the emerging of appropriate behaviors for middle school is much the same as students perceptions and expectations to form a mini-society for each class period.

The purpose of this study was to attempt to gain a clearer understanding of how students moving from a self-contained elementary to a departmentalized middle school came to know the tactic dimensions of their many classes.

Much of the research that has investigated classrooms has used a "uni-directional" approach based on the assumption(s) that teachers behaviors are the controlling factors of students' behaviors and so the focus became one of improving teacher strategies to control student behavior. (Kounin, 1970); Good and Brophy, (1973); Rohikemper and Brophy, (1980) and Emmer, Evertson and Anderson, (1979)) This body of research ignores the student perspectives and influences on
classrooms. It does not recognize the interactive nature of classrooms. Other research investigating classrooms has used the "bi-directional" but has used only the teacher's perspective. "Bi-directional" research works on the assumption that students' behavior influence teachers behaviors as well as teachers' behaviors influence students' behaviors. (Alschuler, 1980; Hunt,1976)

The major focus of this study was from the students' perspective - how they singulary and collectively learned the tactic dimensions of classroom life in their middle school. The seemingly most appropriate manner to facilitate the focus was to undertake an exploratory study using some guidelines from ethnography. The major methodologies employed were limited participant observation and interviews based upon students viewing video tapes of classroom settings and verifying the researchers interpretations. Being a participant observer gave the researcher the opportunity to gain first hand knowledge of classroom life in the observed classroom societies. Close actual observation of student-teacher interactions was possible while the video-tape provided a permanent record. Data was drawn from conversations in the classroom, during instruction, field notes, student interviews and conversations with the teachers.
Students viewed the videos and supplied their interpretations of what was happening in the classrooms to verify the researcher's interpretations and to allow their perspective to emerge. The procedure provided some validity for the researcher by having a comparison of interpretations. As the interviews during the viewing sessions continued, there also emerged the strategies the students devised to circumvent rules or to negotiate rules to meet their needs. Those strategies will be discussed in the conclusions.

The basis for the summary and conclusions for this research was the question 4 of the research questions: How do students come to know and understand the rules of the classroom. The other questions are summarized with method of analysis, findings and implications made for each question.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Question 1: How do persons in authority convey rules to students.

This question was analyzed applying Brooks (1985) elements of rule making to the transcription of the principal's presentation of generic school rules to the students and review of all teachers' classroom transcriptions. Because the principal had only one presentation and the teachers' rules were not presented at one time, a continual review of transcripts compared
with field notes and interviews was necessary to uncover rules. Once rules were uncovered, Brook's (1985) elements of rules were applied to ascertain if all persons in authority directly taught students rules for participation in the school and in the classrooms.

FINDINGS

Who sets the rules?

Analysis revealed that rules in reality were on a continuum from grand of non-negotiable rules to situational of negotiable rules. Rules are put in place by the principal, classroom teachers, cafeteria monitors and students.

The principal presented the generic official rules of the school. These rules were applicable to all students and enforced by the principal. As he presented these rules, he did employ the elements of rules presented by Brooks (1985):

a) written rules - use of school handbook
b) a sequence of rules
c) examples of rules with questions and answer period
d) rationale for rules
e) consequences for infractions

The rules presented by the principal were identified as the grand or non-negotiable rules - rules on one end
of the continuum. The rules were directly taught, had explicit consequences and were non-negotiable.

The rules presented by the teachers were not directly taught. Many were told to students as the need arose; others were embedded in managerial or instructional verbal interactions with the students. Most of the teachers' rules were identified as situational and highly negotiable. These rules were negotiated by both students and teacher to fit different contexts and situations throughout a class period. Rules were also presented to the students by the cafeteria monitors.

The rules presented by the cafeteria monitors were at the middle of the continuum between grand or non-negotiable rules and situational rules. (See Table 5 p.164) They were grand to the extent that they were explicitly imposed on the students even though they are not written anywhere. Also, they were grand because they crossed all grade levels and were generic to all the students. They were situational to the cafeteria and negotiable to the extent that student behavior ie; quiet and orderly conduct controlled which group of students were permitted in the food line first. To this end, they were identified as having a behavior controlled orientation.
Students negotiated rules to meet their needs. This researcher defined needs as opportunities presented to students which allow them to make appropriate choices and decisions, in classroom situations, congruent with their intellectual development level.

Examples appeared throughout the transcripts of all the teachers involved in the study. The students, by performing a behavior in opposition to being told another behavior was acceptable, negotiated these rules:

a) alphabetical seating in Teachers C’s room
b) use of pencil sharpener in Teacher B’s room
c) procedures for handing in homework in Teacher B’s room
d) seating arrangements in Teacher A’s room (being able to sit with friends)
e) homework assignments in assignment books in all classes
f) carrying assignments books to class in all classrooms
g) going to lockers between classes in all classrooms

The rules when first introduced did not meet students’ needs. Students who felt a need to sharpen pencils, for example, walked to the sharpener at anytime when the teacher wasn’t talking to sharpen their pencil. The students sat where they wanted to and not in alphabetical order. When these and other behaviors were performed without a consequence, students learned they could negotiate rules in their favor, to fit their needs.
This concept is depicted below.

**TABLE 5**

**RULES AND THEIR NEGOTIATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiable Situational</th>
<th>Semi-negotiable</th>
<th>Non-negotiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior controlled</td>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitors</td>
<td>Imposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Viewed from this rule orientated perspective, competent students for these three classrooms were students who knew which rules needed to be followed rigidly and which could be negotiated.

Student interviews revealed that students felt most of the rules they had to follow were rules that were in place in elementary school and did not change as they moved through school to the middle school. This finding suggests that the culture of school is very similar in elementary and middle school. The social norms for appropriate behavior remain the same across grade levels and classrooms. Because these students came to middle school from a variety of fifth grade classrooms in three different elementary schools, credence was given to the fact that there is a culture which can be identified as student culture in schools. The students in this study did learn to be competent students i.e. they learned the rules in the first three weeks of school. This re-
affirms Everston and Emmer’s (1982) study done with seventh and eighth graders.

**CHALLENGES**

The research on effective managers (Emmer et al 1980), (Emmer, Everston and Anderson, 1979), (Schultz and Florio, 1979), Everston and Emmer, 1982) and (Brooks, (1985) suggested that rules should be taught concretely and explicitly rather than abstractly and implicitly. Distinguishing characteristics of effective managers have been identified by (Everston and Emmer, 1982), (Sanford and Everston, 1981) and (Berliner and Rosenshine 1987). These characteristics include:

a) explaining rules and procedures explicitly in a coherent sequence

b) monitoring student behaviors and dealing with disruptive behaviors

c) developing student accountability with detailed system for keeping track of academic work

d) communicate information by reducing complex steps into levels appropriate to student levels

e) organize instruction by preserving instructional time and engaging students in appropriate academic work.

A review of all the types of data collected during this study would challenge all but the last of these characteristics. These teachers were effective managers if that term means that

a) students learned the rules

b) students learned the context of the academic areas

c) students and teachers interactions contributed to the expected academic performance of school and community expectations.
As stated previously, the students stated in their interview that . . .

K. "Half of them are like elementary school. It's like 'Don't talk in the hall'. You're not allowed to in elementary school. 'Don't talk when the teacher is talking'."

Je. "Most of them we memorized in elementary school."

M. "A lot of rules we had in elementary school."

(Student interviews Sept. 8, End of week two)

If it was true for these students that most of the rules were those that existed in elementary school, this fact would also challenge Brooks (1985) elements of rule making. Rules that were learned in elementary school would not need to be taught following the criteria he established.

The continuum of rules revealed in this research also indicated that rules are not static rather they are flexible according to the context of the classroom and the needs of both teachers and students. Because rules are flexible, the need to directly teach them and create a system of rules early in the year and insist that students behave consistently in terms of these rules becomes questionable. It is a theory that must be challenged. It appears, as a result of this study, that to have rules in place and have students follow those rules across contexts, gives opportunities for students to
develop strategies to circumvent those rules and negotiate some control over their classroom life. Smith and Geoffrey (1968) as cited in Lortie (1970, p.70) state "...teachers learn they must create a system of rules early in the year and must behave consistently in terms of those rules." This research suggests that this is unnecessary and if teachers do put a rules system in place across classroom contexts and consistently enforce those rules, students will find opportunities to negotiate and circumvent those rules. The students in this study learned new rules, knew which rules were negotiable and which were non-negotiable by the end of the first three weeks of school without applying Brooks (1985) criteria, Berliner and Rosenshine's (1987) effective managers characteristics or Bagley's (1907, cited in Doyle, 1986) suggestion that "first day be vigorous in all details."

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major implication for teachers appears to be the greater understanding of developmental stages of the population they serve, i.e.: the 10-15 year olds served in today's middle school. According to the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development's 1989 study of the middle school, junior highs and intermediate schools are ill equipped to deal with either the biological or emotional changes of adolescence. The middle school may
be considered a pivotal institution which may neglect the cognitive (Piaget) and social-emotional (Erikson) stages of early adolescent.

All too often the middle school becomes regimented to the needs of high schools using ability tracking, a strong emphasis on later adolescent social demands and a curriculum that assumes students are not capable of complex thought during a period of rapid physical and emotional development. One of the recommendations of the Carnegie Council is smaller learning communities which allow close respectful relationships to develop with adults and peers. Some of the current cluster type schedules are intended to allow those relationships to develop. However, they are hindered, as in this study, by tracking or ability grouping and regimented 42-50 minute class periods daily. Elimination of tracking would promote cooperative learning, flexible instruction time and better use of teacher instructional time.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

QUESTION II: "How do students interpret teacher behaviors to come to an understanding of the tacit dimensions of the classroom?"

The data for this question was garnered from video tapes, field notes and informal observation by the researcher and the researchers interpretations verified by formal student interviews. Student conversations with
each other while viewing the video tapes was also recorded in field notes and used as verification.

**FINDINGS**

The students involved in this study primarily employed Bandura (1973) social learning theory. In their words, they had learned to sit and watch, to "play it cool." The following questions and answers from student interviews demonstrate how students employed social learning theory.

R. If you don't understand what the teacher is saying, how do you know what to say?

S. You just play it cool for a few days.

R. What does that mean?

J. You know. You don't do anything bad and you watch the other kids and what they do bad and then you don't do it.

(Student Interviews, Sept. 4, 1986)

This section indicated that the students would watch and listen to admonishments given to other students and decided which behaviors were appropriate and which were not appropriate. This action on the part of the students also indicated that the teacher actions in a classroom are public i.e. viewed by all students and interpreted by them. This is true even when teachers attempt to talk privately to students in the classroom or move to the hall, for example, for more privacy.
Another segment of interview further confirmed the use of social learning theory.

R. So the other day... They got separated. What did you learn from that? What did it cue you into? What did it tell you you had to do?

Ss. Not to talk and not to make funny noises.

K. Funny noises and burps.

R. So what you do is watch what the teacher does to other students?

Ss. Yeah.

(Student Interviews, Sept. 4, 1986)

In this incident the teacher separated two boys she had warned about their inappropriate behavior. The students in the classroom interpreted the teacher behavior as disciplinary and shared their interpretation. This segment also gave affirmation to the public nature of classrooms.

Another strategy used by Teacher A was moving to her metal stool in the front of the classroom. Video tapes consistently showed that this behavior was interpreted by the students as a signal to lower classroom noise and return to the task assigned. Although this teacher behavior was not discussed by the students, video tape reviews confirmed that classroom noise decreased and students, visibly, returned to tasks.

Continual review of video tapes and confirmed by student interviews, it was determined that all of the teachers in this study used specific short verbal
statements to return students to appropriate classroom tasks. Student interviews confirmed the researcher's interpretation of these phrases. A segment of student interviews is presented.

R. Someone said, J., I think it was you said, 'You do something until you get caught then you know not to do it'.

J. You didn't know one of the rules and you're doing it, like talking to your friend and asking stuff. Then the teacher says "Is there a problem?" Then you know that it's not allowed. That it's a rule.

R. Do all the teachers use that phrase?

Ss Yeah

(Student interview, Sept. 5, 1986)

Another section of the interviews provided the confirmation of the other phrase all of the teachers used to identify inappropriate behavior.

R. I've picked up on one word-two words really. They're used in all, well it's used in the first two classes. And those words are "Excuse me". When the teacher says that, what does it mean to you?

Ss Be quiet

K. He goes, Mr. H, 'Ex cuuuuse me?'(exaggerated)

R. So all the teachers use it and it means the same thing?

K. Yeah. All the teachers use it.

J. Other teachers mean that too.

R. That means then you have to be quiet. Then one of the other things I heard was...

Je. Is there a problem? (Unsolicited response)

R. And what does that mean to you?
K. Not to talk.
R. That cues you not to talk?
B. Or do anything bad.
J. Or usually they say it to you when you're talking.

(Student interview, Sept. 5, 1986)

These segments provided verification of the researcher's interpretation of the teacher's actions seen both in the classroom and on the video tapes. The two phrases discussed above are the two most common phrases used by these three teachers.

The two female teachers in this study, Teachers A and B, also used the technique of moving closer to the student(s) who were misbehaving. This technique caused the students to cease the behavior and allowed the teacher to continue teaching as she moved across the room to the appropriate student. The male teacher, Teacher C, only moved from the front of the room to pass out material or to collect papers. All of his interactions with the students were carried out from the front of the room or from behind his desk.

Both female teachers taught as they moved around the room and used proximity to the students as a deterrent to misconduct.

CHALLENGES

This research does not offer any challenges to the research on non-verbal behavior and the messages that it
conveys. Rather it re-inforces the fact that teachers need to be aware of their non-verbal behavior both from negative and positive aspects. Being aware of non-verbal may decrease inappropriate behavior. This researcher believes that most teachers are aware of this use of non-verbal. In the area of sending mixed messages to the students or confusing messages, when the verbal spoken words do not match the non-verbal body language, teachers need to become more aware. Pease, (1984) and Galloway (1971) state that non-verbal signals carry approximately five times the impact as our words and when the words and the body language are incongruent, the non-verbal message carries the impact and the verbal message may be lost. Hall and Hall, (1987) confirm Pease and Galloway's statement and further argue that kinesics, body language, can only be interpreted correctly in context not only situational, i.e. in the classroom but also the context of the person giving and receiving the message must be known. Not all ethnic groups interpret body language and gestures to obtain the same meaning.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Effective teachers must be able to "read" nonverbal messages from their students as well as be aware of what messages their non-verbal body language sends to their students. (Jackson, 1968, Feldman, 1985). The ability to read students' body language helps teachers understand
their students as their non-verbal behaviors qualifies and clarifies their words. (Galloway, 1971). Non-verbal body language conveys information about the emotional states of the participants through body positioning, facial expression and gestures. It also provides basic social information and facilitates the regulation of talk because the hearer must know s/he is being addressed.

It is equally important for teachers to be aware of their non-verbal behaviors as they express much of their feelings through facial expression, gestures and tone of voice. Non-verbal behavior can express information one would not verbalize. (Purs and Bloome, 1987, Feldman, 1987, Knapp, 1971). Being aware of mannerisms which may create negative results, teachers may prevent messages of exclusion being sent to students as well as possibly removing themselves from the classroom. One way a teacher may separate themselves from the classroom is the use of the incongruent message: the verbal words and the body language are not sending the same message. This may well be a cause for disruptive behavior. Many of the incongruent messages sent by teachers are unconscious and teachers are not aware that they are being perceived as not listening or not caring about the other person, most likely a student. Teachers need to be versed in body language and the messages it sends.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Question 3  What aspects of classroom context influence the students' perceptions and understanding of classroom life?

This question was analyzed by reviewing the video tapes of all the classroom time the researcher spent in classrooms. Patterns were documented as they emerged of the different activities taking place in the classroom. Time frames for those activities were then documented to determine if those activities took place every day or were specific to a certain classroom activity. The three teachers were analyzed independently and no attempt was made to compare across classrooms.

FINDINGS

Teacher A's classroom was analyzed first. A pattern emerged as far as attendance and homework was concerned. Her attendance pattern remained the same on all days regardless of the activities planned for that day. She had three types of instructional days:

a) text reading and discussion
b) concept illustrations and notebook
c) science experiment or demonstration days.

As shown by her schedules, her rules changed depending on the type of day she had planned. The patterns emerged to show that the specific days had specific rules. For example, on the reading of text day, the attendance was taken first, homework handed in in folders, and reading
of the text. The choice of who was to read was the teacher's as she had the hand raising rule in place and chose the person who was to read. Each child who volunteered got the chance to read but others were chosen by the teacher. There was no talking as the reading was being done. Also during the discussion period, the teacher controlled who was called on as the hand raising rule was in effect. This classroom context was the least student-student interactive in this teacher's class. The day which was devoted to illustrations of the concepts was the most interactive day for the students as they were allowed to openly discuss their drawing with each other, share markers or crayons, and were very much aware that they could talk openly and did so. If noise got too great, she would move to her metal stool and the noise would decrease to an acceptable level for her.

While the students were working on their drawings, the teacher would move around the room and discuss their drawing with the students. This teacher expressed many times in our interviews that she felt that the students could learn while working together and discussing each others' work. She felt that they had to have some enjoyment in school and this was one way she could accommodate that belief.

The format for experiment and demonstration days was also a more relaxed day. The teacher, with the students.
negotiated the best method for all of the students to participate in the experiments and view the
demonstration. This negotiation may be as simple as one row at a time to the front of the room to view a
demonstration to as complex as to which students would be responsible for each step of an experiment after the small groups were negotiated. This teacher is the only one of the three who made a conscious effort to involve her students in some of the classroom planning. Her efforts were rewarded by the students appreciation of her as a teacher. This was often expressed in the student small talk as they viewed the video tapes with the researcher. Because this project was not intended to review teacher characteristics which students view as reasons for teacher favoritism, these comments were not recorded as data. That these students favored Teacher A was evident and her consideration of them in classroom planning may well be a factor for that favoritism.

Teacher B's class activities days which were video taped were basically all oral reading and discussion days or workbook correction days. Her attendance time frame was consistent no matter what day she had planned. She would ask for the absences from the other homerooms and not call her own roll. She depended on the students to give her accurate information on absences. Her homework procedure was always the same also. The exception is
that she did not monitor her procedure and the students soon realized that they did not have to hand in the homework during the time frame she had designated but could hand it in at any time during the class period. As long as it was in the basket before the end of the period, it was counted as being in on time.

Teacher B's rules for class participation were the same for all types of class activities. She had two types of activity days:

a) oral reading

b) workbook activities

Both days held the same rules for attendance and handing in homework. They basically had the same rules for participation in discussion or volunteering information.

When she was talking or instructing, there was to be no talking. When they were discussing the material read, it was expected that the only person talking was the person answering. There was no student to student interaction to discuss materials presented in class. She controlled who was to participate by her various rules for recognizing students for participation. There was no sharing of information or small group work displayed on the days this class was video taped. There was also no mention of any type of small group work as her class approach was discussed in interviews. Her comment early in the research project that this group was a "teeth-
pulling group" set the tone. She felt she needed to have
the control exhibited to meet the curriculum needs of the
students.

Teacher C had only two types of days:
  a) lecture approach with homework correction before lecture
  b) examination day at the end of each chapter

His attendance approach did not vary nor did his approach
to the work at hand. He was very regimented in his
approach and very much in control. He chose the students
to read in alphabetical order. He also used the alpha
order when the class corrected their homework at the
beginning of the period.

This teacher set the mood for student participation
when on the fourth (4th.) day of school a student asked
him a question. The transcript for that question is
inserted here to confirm a reason why students felt as
they did during this class.

J. Next time can you start at from the back?

T. Well, I'll be honest with you. I've always been this way. I like to
teach my own class and when you get to become a teacher, you can
teach your own class. Okay? I know it doesn't suit you, but I didn't
say that. I said I will teach my class and when you get to be a
teacher after five years of college, you can teach your class. Is
that fair enough?

J. Yes

T. The end of the story.
K. I think he means, when you start from the beginning, many of the people at the end don't get a chance.

T. But, the other people get a chance to listen and they have ears, don't they?

K. Yes

This short dialogue, when discussed with the students, gave them the information they needed as far as being able to verbally negotiate any changes with this teacher. They then decided to go to class and follow the rules set down. As they discussed this class, all of them indicated boredom in this class. Video tapes show this boredom on the faces of the students. The tapes also show the students doing their homework as the homework is corrected and then handing it in. The teacher stood at the front of the room as they checked their homework and discussed the answers given by the students. This procedure was seen everyday on the video tapes.

On a test day, the students handed in any homework at the beginning of the period. They were given their test paper by the teacher, (each student), kept their paper until the end of the period and passed them to the front at the end of the period. There was little student interaction in this classroom. Context, at least in this classroom, appeared to have little influence on rules or approach to subject matter.
CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this project, in the area of context challenged the concept of rule making based on observable behaviors, i.e., those teacher behaviors which seemed to indicate good management techniques. There are many classroom discipline courses based on teacher expectation parameters. The parameters of teacher's "wants" and "consequences" and the "teacher take charge" influence of assertion training techniques rule out any influence that students may have on rule making in the classroom. This approach advocates teacher planning their discipline by using a systematic application of assertive principles. It is recommended in this approach that teachers set the rules, have them posted with levels of consequences. An illustration of a rule observed in a classroom was "Raise your hand for recognition". In this particular classroom there was no deviation from the rule. The question this raises is one of applicability when a teacher wants a class discussion. The rule applied to all contexts of the classroom thus virtually eliminating any spontaneous discussion. In the classroom where assertive discipline was in place, there were no rules changes for different type classes. The question that is raised was one of free dialogue between students and not controlled by the teacher recognizing the students for participation. It appeared that students
did not have the free dialogue necessary for open discussion. Students, according to this project, negotiate a way to meet their needs in the open dialogue.

There are contexts where rules may change, eg. field trips where behavior is vastly different due to setting changes. Again the assertive plan asks the teacher to set out the rules without any input from students. It is based on the students knowing the teacher expectations and the consequences for infractions of the rules.

The findings of this project indicated that rules put in place across contexts were negotiated by the students to meet their needs in those contexts. The findings also indicated that rules cannot be constant across contexts because the expectations of the teachers are different in the classroom, depending on the context. Teachers in this project, with the exception of Teacher A, did not change their rules to meet the different context, so the students negotiated rules to meet their needs.

Rules cannot be constant; they must be flexible to meet the needs of the students in any context or different rules must be set to meet the needs of the students in different contexts.

The findings of this questions also challenge Brooks' (1985) elements of rule making by challenging the criteria he set out for teaching rules. Throughout this
project, rules were negotiated by the students and teachers to meet the needs of the particular context of the classroom. Different contexts demand different sets of rules to meet the needs of the students and teachers. This section did reinforce DeBryun's (1989) need to have rules meet the needs of the students as well as the needs of the teacher. Student needs again means opportunities presented to students which allow them to make appropriate choices and decisions, in classroom situation, congruent with their intellectual development. Teacher needs may be defined as those restrictions placed upon them in terms of curriculum, school organizational patterns as well as personal needs in their professional position.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Question 4: How do students come to know and understand the tasks necessary to become active participants in their classrooms?

This question became the summary question for the entire project. As all the aspects were of this question were analyzed, it became apparent that the students' own observation of events in the classroom became the basis for their behavior. They employed the aspects of social learning theory of Bandura, (1977) to learn the rules of the classrooms. They observed teachers' body movements, their movements around the room, their tone of voice and
the reprimands of the other students to make their conclusions about acceptable and nonacceptable behavior.

Reviews of the audio tapes and written transcripts also revealed that the students felt that many of the rules that they encountered in the middle school were the same as they had in elementary school. This further indicates that the rules for being a student do not significantly change as the students move from grade to grade. It also indicates that teachers' assume that students have learned the acceptable behavior for school by the time they reach the middle school. As indicated in the interviews with the teachers, they did not feel a need to implement rules for their classrooms in a formal manner because the rules were not significantly different. This appeared to challenge Brooks (1985) from the teachers' perspective of the need to teach the rules as well as challenge Canter's (1987) concept of the need to employ assertive type rule making to influence appropriate student classroom behavior. Canter's "Assertive Discipline" is based upon rules and consequences made by the teacher in an attempt to influence student behavior. It is coercive in nature by setting rules with levels of consequences ranging from putting the student names on the board or other method of tracking misbehaviors to social isolation. Students observed under this method devise ways to met their needs
within the classroom. Thus strategies devised by students i.e. negotiating rules for their benefit, is an example of students trying to meet their needs in the classroom. Students negotiate "no talking rules" by learning how to secretly pass notes. They negotiate "homework rules" for examplae as these students did by filling in the papers as the answers are given.

Students in classes under coercive rule systems may well feel powerless. This powerless feeling of students may result in acting out behavior. Students, for the most part, are told where to go, what to do, when to do it, and how long they are to stay in any one place for the entire time they spend in a school day. Student participation in rule making is often negligible resulting in one group making the rules to control another group which has had no input. Schools that make rules in this manner often run a risk of wide spread dissatisfaction by students which may result in various forms of acting out behavior or the development of strategies to circumvent the rules. This strategies may be overt or covert giving the students more power than many school personnel realize. (Curwin and Mendler, 1988)

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this project indicated a need for teachers and teacher education curriculum to understand the needs of humans to have some control over the events
of their lives. It may be that the time has arrived to implement into the curriculum for pre-service as well as in-service teachers the control theory of William Glasser. (1986, 1990) Control theory, according to Glasser, "explains that all of our behavior is an attempt to satisfy basic needs". Students do not follow the rules of the classroom because a teacher asks them to; they follow the rules when they see that to follow the rule is a benefit to them. The motivation to follow the rules comes from within not from being coerced from some outside authority. Students will attempt to do what they can to best satisfy their needs at any given time.

As children progress in school, the "good" that parents indicated in kindergarten wanes and school does not feel as "good" as it did in kindergarten at age five. Not many students have the where with all to continue to bear frustrations of bad days without a strong support system. This system may be a family support or teacher/classroom support to help satisfy needs. By the time students reach middle school, many subjects are taught in fragmented 45 minute segments with a new teacher or classroom of students occurring every 45 minutes. It is difficult to build the necessary support system with these conditions.

A look at the co-operative effort given in many of the sports and extra-curricular activities may give
insight into the need for some co-operative effort in learning as well as in winning. Each member of the team, chorus or band is made to feel important to the results of the team. Co-operative methods similar to those used in extra curricular activities may result in better learning for students, give them a sense of power, and ultimately decrease acting out behaviors. (Curwin and Mendler, 1988, Glasser, 1990) A decrease in acting out behaviors would decrease the need for rules for the 5% of students who are chronic rule breakers who have typically experienced failure in school from early on and believe they have nothing to gain by trying to behave and learn to the 15% who break rules on somewhat regularly basis and need a clear set of guidelines and if not given enough structure or power can disrupt the learning of others while no longer enforcing rules upon the 80% of the students who are motivated to come to school to learn and need no discipline plan. (Curwin and Menddler, 1988; Glasser, 1990)

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The findings of this study should be a basis for further research and not transferred to other middle school classrooms. The recommendations for further research are:

continued exploration of the influence of students' behavior on teacher behavior
continued exploration of teacher strategies as viewed by the students as possible causes for "problem" behaviors by students

continued exploration of the classroom as a social system with the impacts of cultural influences explored

continued studies in schools using the student perspective for a continual understanding of how students perceive school.

This study focused on gaining and presenting information on the student perspective of school and how they used that perspective to become integral participants in their classrooms. Naturalistic field methods were used to obtain the student perspective. Future research should concentrate on finding the teacher and student perspective simultaneously on how students become members of the classroom society. This will continue to provide a rich description of life in classrooms using classroom interactions. It is still unclear as to the extent of either teachers' influence or students' influence on what gets taught in the classroom or the extent of either parties influence on behaviors.

An approach to obtain this information may be ethnographic research in which the teacher is the researcher and students are trained as observers in the classroom. Use of modern technology by both researcher (teacher) and researched (students) would provide a permanent picture with full rich description of classroom life.
Another area of research to be investigated would be the use of noncoercive techniques to determine if this approach would be a motivator for all students including the student who is not motivated to learning. These nonmotivated students are present in classroom and teachers need to develop some strategies of motivation which are less stressful for all classroom participants.

The most important need for research may be in the area of the first three weeks of school at transition periods. Those periods may be transition from elementary to middle school, middle school to high school and high school into college. These three weeks have been investigated and shown to be important to the teacher (Emmer, Evertson and Anderson, 1979, Emmer and Anderson, 1980) further research is necessary to describe the important for the students.

Further studies should look at similarities and differences in the there areas of transition as well as in different cultural settings. This approach would build a better understanding and broader knowledge base regarding students' perspective of school and their understanding of their influence on teachers. Using the teacher as researcher and student as observer would also provide a wider knowledge base on teacher-student interactions as they build community together within a
concentric circle of communities all of which impact on the classroom.

To complete the circle, research must investigate teacher and student behaviors and their influence on the classroom to improve instruction, cognitive and social learning. Improvement in these areas may affect a change in cognitive achievement which may be measured and social behaviors may improve to create a more positive learning atmosphere for all students. This may result in more classrooms becoming positive learning environments and promote less police action for our classrooms which have become battlegrounds for many social ills.
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APPENDIX A

Letter to Parents
Dear Parents,

The students' in your child's classroom are being asked to participate in a study conducted by me through The Ohio State University under the guidance of DR. Judith L. Green.

The purpose of the study is to gain an understanding of students' perceptions of school as they move from one class to another with different teachers. For most of the students, this will be the first experience with more than one teacher in academic areas. How they use their perceptions to become part of the class is the question under study.

Your child will be part of the study as a member of the class. If for any reason you do not wish to have your child participate, any portion of tape which involves your child will not be used. There will be no judgement as far as academics based upon your child's participation.

Six children, with parental consent, will be asked to participate in interviews. These interviews will be taped, with permission, to capture accurate wording. Again, there is no judgement for participation.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. All information will be confidential, including tapes and interview.

Sincerely,

Mary Ellen Higley

PROGRAM AREAS

Curriculum and Instructional Development
121 Ramseyer Hall 614-292-8518

Educational Administration
301 Ramseyer Hall 614-292-7700

Higher Education, Student Affairs and Adult Education
301 Ramseyer Hall 614-292-7700

Humanistic Foundations
121 Ramseyer Hall 614-292-5181

Vocational-Technical Education
160 Ramseyer Hall 614-292-5037
APPENDIX B

Letter of Permission
PERMISSION FOR INTERVIEW:

My child has my permission to participate in the interviews for the study being conducted by Mary Ellen Higley under Dr. Judith Green of The Ohio State University.

The interview will focus on the child's participation in the classroom. Video tapes of the classroom will be viewed during the interview as a reminder of the activities of the day being reviewed.

DATE ______________________
SIGNATURE ______________________

********

I agree to become a participant in the interviews for the study being done by Mary Ellen Higley under Dr. Judith Green of The Ohio State University.

DATE ______________________
SIGNATURE ______________________