

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Barbara Sue McEwan for the degree of Doctor of Education in Education  
presented on April 10, 1987.

Title: A STUDY OF THE APPLICATION OF JUDICIOUS DISCIPLINE: A  
CONSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE FOR SCHOOL RULES AND DECISIONS  
IN SELECTED OREGON SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

Abstract approved: \_\_\_ Signature redacted for privacy. \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Kenneth M. Ahrendt

The purpose of this study was to assess the attitudes of teachers at the elementary, middle, and high school levels toward student rights and classroom management. Specifically this study was designed to analyze the effect Judicious Discipline: A Constitutional Perspective for School Rules and Decisions had upon teacher attitudes toward student rights and behaviors in the classroom.

The instrument to measure teacher attitudes toward student rights and classroom management was constructed from two separate attitude inventories: the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (Cook, Leeds, and Callis, 1952) and the Questionnaire on Teacher Attitudes (Menacker and Pascarella, 1983). The attitude inventory was field-tested and submitted to the DELPHI panel to establish content validity.

Participants in this study included the teaching staffs of ten elementary schools, four middle schools, and five high schools located in Corvallis, Carlton, Beaverton, and Lincoln County, Oregon. Respondents to the study were inservice teachers who attended workshops based on the concepts of Judicious Discipline and presented by the author, Dr. Forrest Gathercoal. Pretest inventories were administered immediately prior to the presentations. Posttest inventories were administered six months after the workshop.

Two null hypotheses were tested to determine whether there was a significant difference in attitudes toward student rights and classroom management among elementary, middle, and high school teachers and between pretest and posttest data. The hypotheses were tested for significance at the .05 level.

1. Null hypothesis one which stated there was no significant difference among elementary, middle, and high school teachers in attitudes toward student rights and classroom management was retained.
2. Null hypothesis two which stated there was no significant difference between data gathered on the pretest and posttest was retained.
3. Descriptive data gathered through interviews did reveal an attitudinal change in some respondents as a result of workshops reviewing concepts of Judicious Discipline: A Constitutional Perspective for School Rules and Decisions, (Gathercoal, 1987). All respondents to the survey were provided with copies of Judicious Discipline to be used as a reference during time of the study.

Trends manifested by analysis of means from elementary, middle, and high school teachers failed to indicate consistent differences at the .05 level among the three groups. Similarly, trends manifested by analysis of pretest and posttest results did not reveal significant differences at the .05 level. However, descriptive data collected through interviews with respondents indicated high levels of interest and practical applicability of Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986).

Copyright by Barbara Sue McEwan

April, 1987  
All Rights Reserved

A STUDY OF THE APPLICATION OF JUDICIOUS  
DISCIPLINE: A CONSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE  
FOR SCHOOL RULES AND DECISIONS IN  
SELECTED OREGON SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

by

Barbara McEwan

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Completed April 10, 1987

Commencement June 7, 1987

APPROVED:

Signature redacted for privacy.

---

Associate Professor-in charge of major

Signature redacted for privacy.

---

Chair, Elementary Education

Signature redacted for privacy.

---

Dean of School of Education

Signature redacted for privacy.

---

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented - April 10, 1987

Typed for Barbara Sue McEwan by Nina R. Vaught

## DEDICATION

There are two people to whom I wish to dedicate this work.

To my mother, Evelyn Krauss. She never doubted I could accomplish this goal. Her support has been consistent as her love.

Last, and not by any means least, to my son Matthew. This work, *Boomer*, is truly for you. You've been through the educational mill and we both know how much better things can and should be. Maybe Judicious Discipline will be a significant first step. Thank you for your love, your support, and for being all the very special things you are.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express deepest gratitude for the guidance and concern so consistently offered by Dr. Kenneth Ahrendt. He has been a task master, a mentor, and most importantly an example of everything an educator should be.

Secondly I would like to acknowledge Dr. Forrest Gathercoal without whom this study would not have been possible. Judicious Discipline is a project of which I feel proud to be a part. I am deeply grateful to Dr. Gathercoal who never doubted that this degree was commensurate and compatible with my abilities.

I wish to thank my other committee members. Dr. Elizabeth Hoyser who has consistently encouraged me and Dr. Gary Welander who has been supportive and interested in this project. My thanks also go to Dr. Keith Parrott who served so faithfully as my Graduate Representative during this long process.

I want to express my thanks to the faculty and staff of Elementary Education and Educational Foundations. I have grown enormously as a person and an educator during my time at Oregon State University. I am proud to have called these fine people friends and colleagues.

And finally I would like to thank all of the subjects of this study for their willingness to participate. Without them and their feedback this study could not have been done.

## Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Need for the Study	3
Significance of the Study	7
Instrument of Measurement	7
Limitations	8
Assumptions	8
Definitions	9
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
Education and Its Role in a Democracy	11
The Law and the American Public School System	13
Educator Attitudes Toward Student Rights	16
Summary	18
METHODS AND PROCEDURES	19
Locale	19
Population	20
Design of the Study	20
Data Collection	21
Instrument of Measurement	22
DELPHI Panel	23
Treatment of Data	24
Hypotheses	25
Descriptive Data	25
Summary	26
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	27
Analysis Procedure	28
Findings	29
Summary	39

Table of Contents (continued)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	40
Results of Data Analysis	41
Interpretation and Conclusions of Quantitative Data	41
Interpretations and Conclusions of Descriptive Data	45
Recommendations for Further Study	47
REFERENCES	50
APPENDIX A	55
APPENDIX B	58
APPENDIX C	60
APPENDIX D	62

## List of Tables

Table I	Pretest Data for Group 1/Disruptive Students	31
Table II	Posttest Data for Group 1/Disruptive Students	31
Table III	Pretest Data for Group 2/Classroom Mngmnt. Situations	32
Table IV	Posttest Data for Group 2/Classroom Mngmnt. Situations	33
Table V	Pretest Data for Group 3/Legal Issues	35
Table VI	Posttest Data for Group 3/Legal Issues	35
Table VII	Pretest Data for Group 4/Student Behaviors in Classrooms	36
Table VIII	Posttest Data for Group 4/Student Behaviors in Classrooms	36
Table IX	Anova Data Comparisons for Pretest/Posttest Results	37

# A STUDY OF THE APPLICATION OF JUDICIOUS DISCIPLINE: A CONSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE FOR SCHOOL RULES AND DECISIONS IN SELECTED OREGON SCHOOL DISTRICTS

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Background

Management techniques employed by a teacher are one of the key aspects in the development of a productive classroom learning environment. Many models are available for the teacher to use in maintaining classroom management. Frequently the model used by teachers reflects their attitudes and educational philosophy. In many instances, the school district will advocate a prescribed management program that is imposed upon the individual school and classroom.

Rules usually form the foundation of most management methods. One approach to discipline which meets with some approval today is to encourage student input and cooperation into the development of classroom and/or school rules. Administration directed or teacher/student created rules frequently fail to reflect the basic constitutional rights of free speech and expressions, due process, and other protected liberty interests (Hickman, 1986). This oversight is usually a result of ignorance of the law on the part of school personnel rather than an attempt to subvert it.

Misinformation about or ignorance of constitutional concepts can lead to

a classroom atmosphere which does not adequately reflect our government's foundational beliefs. As a consequence, situations may ensue that ultimately result in litigation involving teachers, schools, and districts.

### Purpose of the Study

There has been no major research conducted to date investigating the influence of a teacher's knowledge of constitutional law and guaranteed student rights upon teacher attitudes toward classroom management techniques. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to assess teacher attitudes toward the constitutional rights of students as these rights apply to school rules. Specifically, the research focused on whether or not management techniques were significantly affected by providing information about individual student rights as balanced against the rights of the majority as described in the document Judicious Discipline: A Constitutional Perspective for School Rules (Gathercoal, 1986).

Because children perceive teachers as models of adult attitudes and beliefs, teachers must be cautious of introducing a hidden curriculum into their classrooms. The basic concept underlying our constitutional protections is the "delicate balance" that must be struck between the interests of all students and the rights of each individual. William O. Douglas' statement in 1966 best summarizes this idea.

"If a Mohammedan or Hindu or atheist refuses to repeat the Lord's Prayer, or if a foreigner or Jehovah's Witness refuses to salute the flag, how do his classmates react? Do

they accept and respect this nonconformity or do they insult him and turn away?

These are not problems that often find their way into the courts. But our reactions to them are a measure of the quality of the lives we lead. We need to renew our faith in the principles of the Bill of Rights. These are principles of toleration and respect for others, of encouragement of differing opinions, of treating man with dignity. These are principles that put man above the state when it comes to his dignity, his beliefs, his conscience, his life and liberty.

Our liberties will rest on a secure foundation only if the principles of the Bill of Rights are fully accepted by our communities" (Douglas, 1966).

Therefore, a major challenge for education is to insure that teachers and administrators understand the Constitution and its impact on student rights and school rules. "The kind of education that is needed is one that prepares the youth of this nation intellectually, psychologically, and politically to be active citizens in the decades ahead" (Danforth Foundation and Ford Foundation, 1970).

#### Need for the Study

Too often a teacher's understanding of the impact Supreme Court rulings and the Bill of Rights have had on management methods used in the classroom are dependent on whether or not they have taken courses in educational law, attended workshops or inservice programs on the subject, or have made a personal effort to keep abreast of current rulings (Menacker and Pascarella, 1984). In the last ten years there have been a number of court

rulings that have had a significant impact on the public schools. Yet, this information has not been adequately disseminated to educators, those who have the greatest need to know, use and understand these court rulings.

Teitelbaum, in a 1983 study, found that:

"Until the last ten years or so, the operation of public schools was largely a matter for local determination, subject even to state control only in certain respects. Recently, however, a number of federal statutes and judicial decisions have regulated, in one way or another, the activities of public schools, and some of these have engendered state legislative action also affecting local practices" (Teitelbaum, 1983).

Teitelbaum further stated that although decisions made in the courts are expected to filter down to local levels to be translated into policies, the system is in fact not set up to run so smoothly. Application of judicial decisions hinges on local administrators and their willingness to know, understand, and institute policy. The result is an inconsistent approach to the application of law and court rulings when considering a classroom management model. Some school district policies accurately reflect the Constitution, and their overall perspective is one of uniformity and fairness. Teachers and administrators in other districts do not possess a clear understanding of students' rights and, therefore, often find themselves involved in adversarial situations that could have been avoided.

Today, more than ever before in our history, we have become a litigious society (Miller, 1986). Although there are positive aspects to the airing of

grievances in the public domain, school districts in the interest of political and economic realities, might prefer to avoid this type of notariety. In the day to day business of running a school, teachers and administrators are confronted with such issues as free speech and expression, due process, and student publications. Menacker and Pascarella, (1984), found that the Supreme Court, in Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District, Goss v. Lopez, and Eisner v. Stamford Board of Education, specifically addressed these situations and resulted in guidelines that are not useful if there is "an ineffective and haphazard communication network for transmitting important Supreme Court decisions to the schools where they can have the greatest impact" (Menacker and Pascarella, 1984).

Menacker and Pascarella in 1983 conducted studies in the Chicago area which evaluated local teachers' knowledge of and attitudes toward student rights. The study further investigated whether or not teachers and administrators knew and understood Supreme Court rulings that affected their professional settings. This research included a number of cross comparisons among teachers across all descriptors. Their findings indicated that there was a wide-spread lack of knowledge concerning Supreme Court rulings.

In a 1984 study Menacker and Pascarella investigated the attitudes teachers and administrators had toward decisions which affect student rights within the public schools and whether or not those attitudes mirrored " . . . the attitudes of the jurists promulgating them." They concluded:

"The greater conservatism among educators also illustrates the gap between theoretical analysis of educational issues and the demands of practical execution of the educational process. It is the educators who must

contend with the problems of indiscipline and cope with the need for order, control, and predictable routine in school management " (Menacker and Pascarella, 1984).

Despite these attitudes, a 1984 study of Sametz and McLoughlin based on the Menacker and Pascarella research, demonstrated the need for teacher inservices to disseminate information about laws that apply to student rights and classroom management. Sametz and McLoughlin found that ". . . in the survey, both educators and prospective educators demonstrated an uncertain knowledge about their professional responsibilities in relation to children's freedom of speech; press and religion; search and seizure of children's property within school . . . The results of this survey conclusively demonstrate the need for inservice training regarding legal issues affecting children." With the above research as support, this study attempted to look at those concepts and techniques that might serve to instruct educators in the knowledge of and applications for constitutional law in the classroom.

Therefore, this research evaluated the attitudes of teachers who participated in workshops or inservice presentations conducted by Dr. Forrest Gathercoal. Specific guidelines reviewed in Gathercoal's Judicious Discipline (1986) were followed.

### Significance of the Study

The information obtained from this study of teacher attitudes toward classroom discipline and student rights would be useful when planning topics for educational inservice sessions and classes in teacher training programs. The significance of the research was discernable through responses to the attitudinal survey as well as through individual and group interview sessions with the workshop or in-service participants.

The knowledge level of teachers in terms of students' constitutional rights was ascertained from those items on the survey which specifically addressed religion, search and seizure, and other rights issues. Other items on the questionnaire which dealt with such topics as lowered grades on late papers, student suspensions, and teacher attitudes identified strengths and weaknesses in classroom management techniques that protect individual rights yet maintain an orderly educational atmosphere.

The instrument developed for this study has been adapted specifically to reflect these areas and should therefore prove a useful tool in future studies. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (Cook, Leeds, and Callis, 1952) is not a predictor of successful teaching abilities, but in this adapted form it will prove a valid indicator of areas that need to be addressed both during inservice sessions and in teacher training programs.

### Instrument of Measurement

The Attitudinal Survey used in this study was constructed from items which originally appeared in the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, MTAI (Cook, Leeds and Callis, 1952) and from a Questionnaire on Educator Attitudes (Menacker and Pascarella, 1983) for the purpose of evaluating what educators know about student rights.

Eighty items were selected from the MTAI which specifically addressed the subject of classroom discipline and student rights. The researcher narrowed the eighty MTAI items to forty-five and included five items from the Questionnaire on Educator Attitudes by Menacker and Pascarella items which

were interspersed throughout the forty-five MTAI items. The Attitudinal Survey, which contained fifty items, was presented to a DELPHI panel.

The instrument was reviewed by the DELPHI panel a total of four times. When consensus by the panel was reached, forty-two items were retained. The instrument was then printed on the optical scanning forms and was administered to the subject of the study.

### Limitations

This study has the following limitations:

1. The study was limited to teachers in those school districts in the state of Oregon who chose to participate in the study. These districts include: Beaverton SD 48J, Corvallis 509J, Carlton SD 11, and Lincoln County SD.
2. The study was limited to those teachers who had the opportunity to attend workshops which were conducted by Dr. Forrest Gathercoal and based on the text Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986).
3. Due to the guarantee of anonymity it was not possible to identify individual respondents to this study. As a result pretest and posttest scores could not be analyzed through means of a One-Way ANOVA.

### Assumptions

This study contained the following assumptions:

1. There is a lack of understanding in many Oregon school districts as to the impact Supreme Court rulings and the Constitution have on our public schools.

2. All teacher participants would understand and apply constitutional laws that impact on public education by exposure to Judicious Discipline: A Constitutional Perspective for School Rules and Decisions (Gathercoal, 1986).
3. All analysis assumptions are met for the scaling and research design aspects of the study.

### Definitions

For the sake of consistency, the following definitions were accepted for selected terms which were used in the study. Other terms and phrases were considered to be self-explanatory in their definitions.

Attitude Inventory: A scale constructed to measure attitudes of educators using items taken from the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (Cook, Leeds and Callis 1951) and a Questionnaire on Educator Attitudes (Menacker and Pascarella, 1984).

Student rights: Those constitutional rights applied to students by Court rulings which protect the individual within the public sector.

Teachers: Classroom teachers working at the elementary, middle, or high school levels.

Attitudes: Feelings, favorable or unfavorable, toward student's rights and discipline within the public school setting.

Pretest: Attitude Inventory administered prior to workshops or inservice sessions conducted for the purpose of disseminating information contained in

Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986).

Interview: A brief series of questions based on pretest results. Interviews will be conducted for the purpose of establishing content validity of questionnaire items.

Posttest: Attitude Inventory administered to educators after application of concepts contained within Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986).

Classroom management: Strategies and tactics used by educators to establish and maintain "orderly conduct" (Webster's New World Dictionary, 1983).

DELPHI panel: A description of a specified procedure for gathering and measuring the opinions of a selected group in order to establish consensus (Gallagher, 1979).

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of related literature was divided into three sections. The first section reviews philosophic writings concerned with the importance of maintaining a democracy through an educated citizenry. The second section presents an overview of constitutional law and recent Supreme Court rulings that affect the public schools. The final section reviews attitudes public school teachers hold toward the application of student rights in the classroom.

#### Education and Its Role in a Democracy

"We are asked again: What is the job of a public school in society?" (Goodman, 1986) This question has been addressed philosophically and theoretically at least since the time of Aristotle. In his work titled Politics, Book VIII, Aristotle wrote: "States are formed to enable men to live; they are perpetuated to make them live well. An important function of the state is to educate its citizens."

What is true of any form of government is especially true of a democracy

that requires for its survival the existence of educated voters, educated not only in reading and writing but in the day to day application of law as well.

If education in American democracy places proper emphasis on individual responsibility for social progress. . . if it promotes real patriotism among the masses of the American people, then the perpetuity and integrity of American institutions are guaranteed. Now, as never before, if the educational history of this country teaches anything at all, the preservation, protection, and transmission of American democracy constitute the highest responsibilities of public education in the United States (Knight, 1929).

Whereas a totalitarian form of government could teach its values to children directly, teaching our constitution and laws to students is more subtle because education must allow for differences in individual expression.

The general values of individual dignity, rationality, and pluralism are translated into more specific values such as freedom of speech and assembly and equality of opportunity. These values form the "American creed," which is expressed in the Constitution and particularly in the first ten amendments, known as the Bill of Rights. The American creed provides the legal and ethical framework of this orientation. However, the values of freedom and equality of opportunity can come into conflict . . . Citizenship education teaches students to work through such value conflicts in a rational manner (Miller, 1983).

These values of democratic citizenship, if properly transmitted, have far ranging implications because they mold not only citizens but strong individuals

as well. Dewey, in 1959, stated that: "The child is to be not only a voter and a subject of law; he is also to be a member of a family, himself in turn responsible, in all probability, for rearing and training of future children, thereby maintaining the continuity of society . . . He is to be a member of some particular neighborhood and community, and must contribute to the values of life, add to the decencies and graces of civilization wherever he is" (Dewey, 1959).

The task of educating citizens who appreciate and practice democratic values is not an easy one for teachers and yet is perhaps our most important goal. Certainly teachers must be aware of the values they transmit daily in their classrooms when carrying out the discipline decisions they make.

Aquerribere (1985) clarifies this role of the classroom teachers and the school system when he states:

"The goal of a democratic approach to school discipline should be development of an individual able to exercise self-control in an atmosphere of equality, mutual respect, and freedom of choice. We cannot continue to operate our classrooms and schools using the authoritarian and punitive model while the society at large is striving for democratic ideals. It is time to put into practice what we purport to teach" (Aquerribere, 1985).

### The Law and the American Public School System

In order to integrate constitutional guarantees into classroom management, teachers must first be aware of what the laws are and how they

affect the public school system. Recent Supreme Court rulings have had a significant impact on the public schools. These decisions have been critical in determining who will go to school, where they will go, and how they will be treated once they enter the "schoolhouse gate". A public school administrator who deals with short skirts, spiked hair, and obscene monograms on T-shirts might, unless otherwise informed, view each situation as a separate issue. In fact, all of the above are legally considered to be First Amendment issues of free speech and expression. Student rights in this area were delineated in Tinker v

Des Moines Independent Community School District. Writing for the majority opinion, Justice Fortas stated:

"First Amendment rights, applied in light of the special characteristics of the school environment, are available to teachers and students. It can hardly be argued that either students or teachers shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate. This has been the unmistakable holding of this Court for almost 50 years" (Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District, 1969)

Further, Goss v. Lopez is a landmark case which addresses the issue of protecting students' Fourth Amendment right to procedural due process. Specifically the case deals with students' rights to due process when they are faced with a short-term suspension. In a moment of anger and frustration teachers have been known to demand that a student either be expelled or suspended from school. However, even a student who causes teachers to

reach that level of frustration has certain constitutional guarantees as stated in

Goss v Lopez, 1975:

The difficulty is that our schools are vast and complex. Some modicum of discipline and order is essential if the educational function is to be performed. Events calling for

discipline are frequent occurrences and sometimes require immediate, effective action. Suspension is considered not only to be a necessary tool to maintain order but a valuable educational device. The prospect of imposing elaborate hearing requirements in every suspension case is viewed with great concern, and many school authorities may well prefer the untrammelled power to act unilaterally, unhampered by rules about notice and hearing. But it would be a strange disciplinary system in an educational institution if no communication was sought by the disciplinarian with the student in an effort to inform him of his defalcation and to let him tell his side of the story in order to make sure that an injustice is not done (Goss v. Lopez, 1975).

A sampling of other case law includes a ruling on the legality of school prayer in the case of Murray v Curlette, 1963: "required special compensatory instruction for non-English speaking students under the Civil Rights Act of 1964", (Menacker and Pascarella, 1984); and Brown v Board of Education of Topeka which led to the integration of public schools in the United States.

Today the Constitution is still the individual's protection against inequitable and unfair actions. Constitutional rights apply to the public sector and extend to anyone within that scope. Therefore public school students, from kindergarten through high school, may expect their rights to be secured.

As educators learn to protect the individual rights of students they are also teaching an explicit lesson in citizenship. Educators who demonstrate respect for student rights model tolerance and understanding to those in their care.

Effective disciplinary techniques in a democracy also incorporate respect for the rights of individuals. In schools that use such disciplinary techniques, the students

perceive their teachers and administrators as fair and just . . . Our statements above suggest that successful disciplinary programs bring the process of democracy into the schools (Education 86/87).

#### Educator Attitudes Toward Student Rights

Teachers who are familiar with constitutional guarantees and apply them to classroom management demonstrate a positive attitude toward and an understanding of the rights and privileges to which their students are entitled. If teachers believe in constitutional precepts they should reflect those personal beliefs in their approach to school management. (Harvey, Prather, White and Hoffmeister, 1968; Weiser and Hayes, 1966) In 1984 Menacker and Pascarella replicated the aforementioned studies through a research study conducted in Chicago, Illinois; they concluded that ". . . educator attitudes about civil rights may be more influential than their knowledge of such rights in determining how they behave. It is certain (sic) true that attitudes influence perceptions, and perceptions of complex court decisions are critical to the

behavioral responses of educators" (Menacker and Pascarella, 1984).

In 1975 George Gallup conducted a poll for Phi Delta Kappan concerning the public's attitudes toward education. Of the people polled, only forty-one percent had heard of Goss v Lopez. Of those, "twenty-six percent thought the Court went too far and sixty-seven percent agreed with the Court" (Gallup, 1975). The survey also found, ". . . the weight of opinion in the nation is that students have too many rights and privileges." In 1984 Alec Gallup conducted a follow-up poll for the Kappan into teacher attitudes toward public schools. One section of the survey focused on discipline problems such as: degree of seriousness, frequency and motivating factors. Teachers overwhelmingly felt that the primary cause of discipline problems in schools was the absence of discipline in homes. Ninety-four percent of those teachers questioned ranked, "Lack of discipline in the home" first on a list of possible problem sources.

Teachers also had an opportunity to address Supreme Court decisions on Gallup's attitude survey. Gallup's survey found that ". . . seventy-four percent cite lack of respect for law and authority throughout the society, sixty-six percent mention student troublemakers who cannot be removed from school, and sixty-five percent say that the courts have made administrators too cautious in dealing with student misbehavior" (Gallup, 1975).

In the literature concerning teacher attitudes toward student rights this same conservative stance surfaces again and again. However, it is unclear if the attitudes seen reflected in the above survey originate from conviction or

ignorance. As Weiser and Hayes, 1966 state:

"(Teachers) (sic) appear to realize the probabilities of change in our society - perhaps would even accept the need for change; but some would not provide for change through democratic means. They seem generally to have concern for the private rights of individuals, but many do not approve of the free exercise of means to bring about change. Many would seem not to be in accord with an idea expressed in the NEA Project on Instruction report: "Differences of opinion are a continuing and important part of life in a democratic society; they are to be respected, encouraged, resolved." The preoccupation of many teachers with authority, and in particular with authority over

children, arouses serious questions. How many teachers are there who really understand and practice democracy?" (Weiser and Hayes, 1966).

### Summary

The present research study focused on whether or not teacher attitudes toward student rights can be influenced by knowledge and application of constitutional and court law. The scarcity of research and literature into this area has resulted in the hypotheses upon which the present research was based.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was: A) to evaluate the attitudes of classroom teachers in regard to student rights and discipline and, B) to determine the effect of inservice training and application of the concepts included in Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986) on those attitudes.

#### Locale

The survey of teacher attitudes used for pretest and posttest data was administered in the following Oregon schools and districts: Carlton SD 11, Sunset High School in Beaverton, SD 48J, Western View Middle School and Lincoln Elementary School in Corvallis, 509J, and Waldport Elementary School, Waldport High School, Yaquina View Elementary, Sam Case Elementary, Newport Middle School, Newport High School, Mary Harrison Elementary, Arcadia Elementary, Toledo Middle School, Toledo High School, Delake Elementary, Oceanview Elementary, Taft Elementary, Taft Middle School, and Taft High School all located in Lincoln County, SD.

### Population

The population for this study of educator attitudes consisted of teachers from cooperating school districts throughout the State of Oregon. The selection of school sites was dependent on the willingness of the school district and building administrators to participate in this study.

Respondents consisted of all those teachers employed in elementary, middle, and high schools who attended workshops or inservice sessions designed to present information contained in Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986). The respondents represented a number larger than the fifty participants required as a baseline for statistical analysis.

There was an interval of six months between the administration of the pretest and the posttest. Due to the time period involved between the pretest and posttest, and the attrition that was likely to occur, there was a small difference in respondents for both tests.

A random selection process was used to establish a sample size from the total population sample. Cohen's tables required a sample size of no less than fifty-two (52) subjects per cell. The power level was set at .80, the effect size was equal to .25 and the alpha level was .05.

### Design of the Study

Workshop and inservice sessions were conducted during the months of

August and September in order to instruct participants in the use of concepts contained in *U*, (Gathercoal, 1986). The data relative to attitudes of elementary, middle, and high school teachers toward student rights was collected by means of a questionnaire survey. At the beginning of these workshops, pretest questionnaires were administered by the researcher. Anonymity was guaranteed to the respondents; however, the participating schools were coded on the answer sheets. The code allowed the researcher to distinguish among elementary, middle, and secondary school subjects.

#### Data Collection

Teacher attitudes were assessed with the pretest administered during the inservice sessions held in August and September of 1986. The researcher accompanied Dr. Forrest Gathercoal to the participating schools for the purpose of administering these pretests. The inservice sessions were scheduled for the beginning of the school year in order to allow classroom teachers an opportunity to develop discipline procedures for the 1986/1987 school year based on the concepts of Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986).

The researcher was on-site in each school involved in the field-test study of Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986). Each school was visited at least three times. The purpose of the first visit was to administer the pretest inventory. A subsequent visit was made in order to interview teachers. Interviews were conducted for the purpose of assessing the applicability of

concepts contained in Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986). These interviews were conducted informally and focused on ways in which the classroom teachers were applying the concepts of Judicious Discipline. Questions were constructed to not convey or promote bias for or against this project. Teachers were asked how their year was progressing, what concepts they were able to employ, and if they felt this was a workable system. They were also asked for opinions as to how this project might be more applicable for them. The final visit to the schools in February, 1987 was made in order to posttest the subjects in the study.

#### Instrument of Measurement

The instrument developed to assess teacher attitudes was a modified form of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (Cook, Leeds, and Callis, 1951). Thirty-seven items were selected from Form A of the Inventory. Form A of the MTAI contained one hundred and fifty items and "had . . . been validated, giving a validity coefficient of .60 . . . The reliability of this scale as determined by the split-half method was .92" (Cook, Leeds, and Callis, 1951). Reliability of the survey was established by means of the Hoyt-Stunkard reliability test. The items from the MTAI were combined with an additional five items selected from the Questionnaire on Educator Attitudes (Menacker and Pascarella, 1984). The two inventories had been specifically adapted to serve as the instrument in this study, therefore a DELPHI Panel, field-testing

procedures, and on-site interviews were employed to insure content validity. The resulting Attitude Inventory was printed on optical-scanning sheets that allowed scoring with a six point, Likert-type scale.

### DELPHI Panel

The DELPHI Panel was designed originally as "an intuitive methodology for organizing and sharing "expert" forecasts about the future" (Weaver, 1971). It has been adapted as a forecasting tool to insure the content validity of a research instrument. The validation process involves several steps which will be reviewed briefly.

Having defined a problem and selected an instrument, the research must insure the validity of the data collection tool. Toward this end, a panel of experts was assembled to review and evaluate the various items of the instrument. The initial step was to define the term "expert." For purposes of the present study, experts were defined as: 1) school administrators who had been employed in that position for two or more years, 2) teachers who had been in the classroom for at least five years, 3) lawyers with a background knowledge of educational issues.

Panel members invited to assist with the current study were: Mr. Dan Hayes, principal of Wilson Elementary School; Ms. Holly Endersby, principal of Highland View Middle School; Mr. Henry Golden, principal of Corvallis High School; Ms. Jackie Barrington, First grade teacher at Garfield Elementary

School; Ms. Marla Fries, Sixth grade teacher at Cheldelin Middle School; Mr. Jerry Neil, Health and Physical Educaiton teacher at Crescent Valley High School; Mr. James Eickelberg and Mr. Jay Conroy, both practicing attorneys.

The questionnaire used as the instrument for the pretest and posttest in the study was reviewed by the DELPHI panel until consensus was reached on the items. The questionnaire originally consisted of fifty items. Through the DELPHI process, the research instrument was reduced to its present length of forty-five items. Most DELPHI panel members reviewed the items at least twice, two reviewed the instrument three times, and one panel member requested five revisions.

#### Treatment of Data

A One-Way ANOVA was employed in this study in order to test null hypothesis one, which measured significant differences in attitude among elementary, middle and high school teachers. Frequencies, tables, and percentages were used to describe interval measures. Reliability was established through use of the Hoyt-Stunkard Test for Unrestricted Item Scoring (Hoyt and Stunkard, 1952).

The Pearson product moment correlation was employed for an item by item analysis. "This bivariate correlation provdes a single number which summarizes the relationship between two variables" (Gallagher, 1979).

A Tukey's test was used to ascertain individual mean differences for Hypothesis one. A Tukey's test was employed to avoid the statistical

probability of committing Type I errors. "When the assumptions are made regarding the committing of Type I errors, the Tukey's test may be more appropriate than (sic) the L.S.D. for multiple comparison analysis" (Courtney, 1984). A Type I error results in a hypothesis being rejected when it should be retained (Courtney, 1984).

### Hypotheses

Hypothesis one: There are no significant differences among the attitudes of elementary, middle, and high school teachers toward classroom management and student rights.

Hypothesis two: There are no significant differences between teacher attitudes as reflected on the pretest and posttest.

### Descriptive Data

Narrative information was gathered by the researcher to enhance the statistical basis of the study. Responses to specific questions helped give depth to the data collected. Because anonymity was guaranteed for the pretest and posttest, the researcher found it to be a useful exercise to ask individual teachers about their reactions to Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986). Respondents were asked for specific examples of how the concepts of Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986) were being employed in their classrooms. Follow-up questions dealt with whether or not these concepts

were an improvement for the teachers in terms of classroom management and what variations the individual teachers may have developed.

### Summary

The assessment of teacher attitudes toward classroom management and student rights was obtained through use of an adapted form of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (Cook, Leeds, and Callis, 1952) with additional items from the Inventory of Educator Attitudes (Menacker and Pascarella, 1984). Pretests and posttests were administered during on-site visits to participating schools. The pretest was administered prior to an inservice presented by the author of Judicious Discipline, Dr. Forrest Gathercoal.

Field testing and a DELPHI panel were employed to establish content validity to the revised Attitude Inventory. Descriptive information was obtained through interviews with the subjects of this study.

The analysis of the data, and the findings of the study, will be presented in Chapter Four.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to study the attitudes of elementary, middle, and high school teachers in selected Oregon school districts toward student rights and classroom management. Specifically the research was designed to determine the influence of concepts from Judicious Discipline: A Constitutional Perspective for School Rules and Decisions, (Gathercoal, 1987), on those attitudes. The subjects of the research were in-service teachers employed by schools which volunteered to participate in workshops designed to introduce the concepts of Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986). Respondents were administered an attitudinal survey structured to assess pretest and posttest attitudes toward student rights and classroom management.

The instrument used to measure the attitudes of teachers was a modified version of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (Cook, Leeds, Callis, 1952) with additional items selected from the Questionnaire on Educator Attitudes (Menacker and Pascarella, 1983). There were a total of forty-two items in the combined form of the instrument which used a rating scale of one for very strongly agree to six for very strongly disagree. This adapted Likert scale was designed intentionally to avoid a "no opinion" rating.

The items were individually analyzed to determine if: 1) there was a

significant difference in the attitudes of elementary, middle, and high school teachers in regard to the rights students are guaranteed in the public sector and the impact of those rights on classroom management: and 2) there was a significant difference in the attitudes of respondents toward student rights and classroom management that would be reflected between pretest and posttest data.

The attitudes of elementary, middle, and high school teachers toward disruptive students and common classroom problems such as truancy and note passing were investigated by means of the survey instrument. The instrument also tested for the educators attitudes toward and knowledge of pertinent legal issues.

#### Analysis Procedure

The data was analyzed by means of a One-Way ANOVA for the comparison of attitudes toward student rights and classroom management situations among elementary, middle, and high school teachers. A One-Way ANOVA to analyze the difference between pretest and posttest data could not be run because no individual subject numbers were assigned to respondents. All participants in this study were guaranteed anonymity, therefore individual pretest and posttest data could not be compared.

The survey results were also analyzed through the use of a Tukey's test to ascertain individual mean differences for Hypothesis One. Means and computed F values for elementary, middle, and high school responses were

used to determine differences between pretest and posttest responses.

Rejection of the null hypothesis one on the basis of computed F values or of the null hypothesis two on a comparison of item by item computed F values supports the alternative hypothesis that a significant relationship exists between the pretest and posttest results or among the three respondent groups. An item by item analysis was conducted in order to obtain the information of whether to retain or reject the null hypotheses.

The restated hypotheses are followed by an item by item analysis of the data. The items cited in these data are referred to by number only. The agreement with the publishing company of the Minnesota Teacher's Attitude Inventory (Cook, Leeds, and Callis, 1952) prohibited the actual test items from being printed in this study (Refer to Appendix A).

### Findings

(Hypothesis one) - There will be no significant difference among the attitudes toward classroom management and student rights of elementary, middle, and high school teachers.

This hypothesis was tested through the use of a One-Way ANOVA to compare the mean score of elementary, middle, and high school teachers. The hypothesis was tested on an item by item basis. Significance was set at the .05 level.

Pretest results indicated that null hypothesis one was rejected in nine of

the forty-two items of the instrument employed in this research. Posttest results indicated that null hypothesis one was rejected in fourteen of the forty-two items.

For the purposes of reporting the data gathered in this study, the items included in the survey have been clustered under four topic areas. The first grouping reflected the attitudes of teachers toward a disruptive student, the second referred to a variety of classroom management situations, the third group of items focused on legal issues, and the last group evaluated perceptions teachers hold of typical student behaviors.

Results for hypothesis one were reviewed in terms of the four groups. The data reflected in Tables I and II indicate hypothesis one was retained for all but one item in the pretest. Hypothesis one was retained in the posttest for six of the ten items. On the basis of the data collected under the heading of Group 1/Disruptive Students, hypothesis one was retained for seventeen of the twenty items.

The second group of items, titled Group 2/Classroom Management Situations, reviewed attitudes of teachers toward typical classroom situations such as note passing, cheating, and truancy.

Table III data indicated that hypothesis one was rejected in five of the eighteen items on the pretest. Table IV data indicated that hypothesis one was rejected on three items in the posttest.

TABLE I

Pretest Data for Group 1/Disruptive Students

#	PreX0	PreX1	PreX2	Pre Comp. F	H0
Dec.					
4.	5.0096	4.6486	4.5851	5.297	reject*
5.	3.8396	3.8514	3.4787	3.322	retain
10.	3.5619	3.5270	3.2447	3.060	retain
14.	3.8667	3.9595	3.6702	1.341	retain
22.	2.5377	2.5946	2.3511	1.496	retain
27.	3.9528	3.9865	3.9255	.053	retain
28.	3.7170	3.7703	3.7447	.053	retain
29.	3.5283	3.2973	3.5638	1.981	retain
34.	2.0472	1.8649	1.8617	1.181	retain
38.	3.5189	3.2703	3.2660	2.840	retain

\* = .05 level of significance

TABLE II

Posttest Data for Group 1/Disruptive Students

#	PostX0	PostX1	PostX2	Post Comp. F	H0 Dec.
4.	4.8444	4.5962	4.3478	4.532	reject**
5.	3.8111	4.0577	3.5217	3.352	reject*
10.	3.4556	3.3077	3.0290	3.365	reject*
14.	3.5111	4.0385	3.3652	3.256	reject*
22.	2.5055	2.4038	2.4783	.160	retain
27.	4.3407	4.3462	3.5362	2.745	retain
28.	3.6703	3.6731	3.8706	.604	retain
29.	3.4945	3.1346	3.5362	2.745	retain
34.	2.0333	1.8462	2.1159	1.025	retain
38.	3.2889	3.2500	3.4348	.754	retain

\* = .05 level of significance

\*\* = .01 level of significance

TABLE III

Pretest Data for Group 2/Classroom Management Situations

#	PreX0	PreX1	PreX2	Pre Comp. F	H0 Dec.
2.	3.2190	3.3378	3.2128	.253	retain
3.	4.4327	4.6351	4.6702	1.455	retain
7.	3.1698	3.4189	3.4574	2.267	retain
9.	3.5288	3.7297	3.1809	4.925	reject*
11.	2.0472	2.1216	2.1383	.209	retain
12.	4.0943	4.0000	4.1809	.731	retain
13.	4.3868	4.4054	4.3723	.018	retain
15.	1.8396	1.7973	1.9574	.493	retain
18.	5.1619	4.8514	4.8298	3.600	reject**
21.	3.1792	3.4459	3.3404	1.983	retain
23.	2.1698	1.9189	2.1064	1.568	retain
25.	3.4623	3.8514	3.6667	2.384	retain
26.	4.8667	4.8514	4.6596	1.044	retain
30.	4.7143	4.4595	4.2234	5.389	reject*
33.	4.0377	3.5270	3.5000	7.221	reject**
35.	3.4528	3.2781	3.4043	.445	retain
36.	3.9524	3.7162	3.6915	1.919	retain
39.	3.6857	3.7838	3.7872	.378	retain
42.	3.7282	3.9595	3.1915	12.2000	reject**

\* = .05 level of significance

\*\* = .01 level of significance

TABLE IV

Posttest Data for Group 2/Classroom Management Situations

#	PostX0	PostX1	PostX2	Post Comp. F	H0 Dec.
2.	3.0769	3.3462	3.4493	1.561	retain
3.	4.4000	4.6154	4.5362	.665	retain
7.	3.4111	3.2885	3.6812	2.486	retain
9.	3.4111	3.5962	3.2609	1.306	retain
11.	2.1778	2.1731	2.5362	2.076	retain
12.	4.1099	4.1923	4.2319	.342	retain
13.	4.5000	4.4038	4.2464	1.160	retain
15.	1.9451	1.8846	1.9130	.050	retain
18.	5.0667	4.9231	4.5072	7.029	reject**
21.	3.5444	3.2500	3.2607	1.896	retain
23.	2.2967	1.8654	2.1594	3.158	reject*
25.	3.6044	3.6275	3.5942	2.384	retain
26.	4.6718	4.9615	4.5362	2.436	retain
30.	4.5556	4.4615	4.2464	1.646	retain
33.	4.1556	3.7500	3.2319	11.112	reject**
35.	3.5165	3.5962	3.2754	1.086	retain
36.	4.0549	3.9423	3.7826	1.240	retain
39.	3.7802	3.6538	3.8696	.762	retain
42.	3.7444	3.9231	3.4638	2.708	retain

\* = .05 level of significance

\*\* = .01 level of significance

The third group of items was titled Group 3/Legal Issues. These data revealed that hypothesis one was rejected on the pretest for one of the six items. The posttest data revealed that hypothesis one was rejected twice.

The data in the fourth category of items, which was titled Group 4/Student Behaviors in Classroom, are reported in Tables VII and VIII.

The data reviewed in Table VII indicated that hypothesis one was rejected two times out of the seven total items. Table VIII revealed that hypothesis one was rejected five times.

Null hypothesis two, stating that there was not significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the survey has been reviewed with the use of information contained in Table IX. The item numbers appear grouped in Table IX reflecting the same groupings as were referred to in Tables I through VIII.

Data in Table IX indicated that hypothesis two was rejected eleven times out of the forty-two total items appearing on the survey. Based on these results, hypothesis two was retained.

TABLE V

Pretest Data for Group 3/Legal Issues

#	PreX0	PreX1	PreX2	Pre Comp. F	H0 Dec.
8.	4.7905	4.7703	4.6702	.311	retain
16.	2.3868	2.2877	2.5376	.847	retain
20.	2.1792	2.3919	2.8298	6.912	reject**
24.	2.4340	2.4324	2.6596	.865	retain
31.	2.7714	2.7297	2.7447	.020	retain
37.	2.4623	2.6081	2.2366	1.753	retain

\*\* = .01 level of significance

TABLE VI

Posttest Data for Group 3/Legal Issues

#	PostX0	PostX1	Post X2	Post Comp. F	H0 Dec.
8.	4.6444	4.8845	4.4783	1.879	retain
16.	2.3407	2.4231	2.7101	1.991	retain
20.	2.1556	2.3846	2.8841	6.893	reject**
24.	2.5495	2.5192	3.2029	5.236	reject*
31.	2.7692	2.7308	2.6667	.087	retain
37.	2.7582	2.4231	2.4493	1.361	retain

\* = .05 level of significance

\*\* = .01 level of significance

TABLE VII

Pretest Data for Group 4/Student Behaviors in Classrooms

#	PreX0	PreX1	PreX2	Pre Comp. F	H0 Dec.
1.	2.3288	2.4324	2.5426	1.949	retain
6.	3.9434	4.0135	3.8936	.221	retain
17.	2.6857	2.7838	2.9255	1.761	retain
19.	1.5189	1.6351	1.7234	1.122	retain
32.	4.0762	3.8649	3.6170	7.051	reject**
40.	2.2830	2.3984	2.2660	.239	retain
41.	2.3396	2.4865	2.9468	8.853	reject**

\*\* = .01 level of significance

TABLE VIII

Posttest Data for Group 4/Student Behaviors in a Classroom

#	PostX0	PostX1	PostX2	Post Comp. F	H0 Dec.
1.	2.4444	2.3922	2.6087	.996	retain
6.	4.0989	4.0192	3.6232	3.919	reject*
17.	2.6813	2.7115	3.2029	7.495	reject**
19.	1.5556	1.4615	1.9565	5.140	reject*
32.	4.0549	3.8654	3.4783	6.626	reject**
40.	2.0778	2.3462	2.3333	1.996	retain
41.	2.4066	2.4615	3.1159	10.653	reject**

\* = .05 level of significance

\*\* = .01 level of significance

TABLE IX

ANOVA Data Comparison of Group 1 Pretest/Posttest Results

#	X0	X1	X2	Comp. F	H0 Dec.
Pre					
5.	3.8396	3.8514	3.4787	3.322	retain
Post					
5.	3.8111	4.0577	3.5217	3.352	reject**
Pre					
10.	3.5619	3.5270	3.2447	3.060	retain
Post					
10.	3.4556	3.3077	3.0290	3.365	reject*
Pre					
14.	3.8667	3.9595	3.6702	1.341	retain
Post					
14.	3.5111	4.0383	3.5652	3.256	reject*

ANOVA Data Comparison of Group 2 Pretest/Posttest Results

#	X0	X1	X2	Comp. F	H0 Dec.
Pre					
9.	3.5288	3.7297	3.1809	4.925	reject*
Post					
9.	3.4111	3.5962	3.2609	1.306	retain
Pre					
23.	2.1698	1.9189	2.1064	1.568	retain
Post					
23.	2.2967	1.8654	2.1544	3.158	reject*
Pre					
30.	4.7143	4.4595	4.2234	5.389	reject*
Post					
30.	4.5556	4.4615	4.2464	1.646	retain
Pre					
42.	3.7282	3.9595	3.1915	12.200	reject**
Post					
42.	3.7444	3.9231	3.4638	2.708	retain

Table IX (continued)

ANOVA Data Comparison of Group 3 Pretest/Posttest Results

#	X0	X1	X2	Comp. F.	H0 Dec.
Pre 24.	2.4340	2.4324	2.6596	.865	retain
Post 24.	2.5495	2.5192	3.2029	5.236	reject*

ANOVA Data Comparison of Group 4 Pretest/Posttest Results

#	X0	X1	X2	Comp. F	H0 Dec.
Pre 6.	3.9434	4.0135	3.8936	.221	retain
Post 6.	4.0989	4.0192	3.6232	3.919	reject**
Pre 17.	2.6857	2.7838	2.9255	1.761	retain
Post 17.	2.6813	2.7115	3.2029	7.495	reject**
Pre 19.	1.5189	1.6351	1.7234	1.122	retain
Post 19.	1.5556	1.4615	1.9565	5.140	reject*

\* = .05 level of significance

\*\* = .01 level of significance

### Summary

Chapter IV reviewed the analysis of quantitative data obtained during this study. The data were grouped under general subject headings and described through the use of nine separate tables.

Null hypothesis one was rejected a total of twenty-three times at the significance level of .05. Null hypothesis two was rejected a total of seven times at the .05 level.

The conclusions related to the data results and recommendations for further study will be discussed in Chapter V.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The central focus of this study was to discern the attitudes of elementary, middle, and high school teachers toward student rights and classroom management. In particular, this study focused on what effect the concepts of Judicious Discipline: A Constitutional Perspective for School Rules and Decisions (Gathercoal, 1986) had upon those attitudes. Teacher attitudes were assessed through the use of an instrument which was a compilation of items selected from the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (Cook, Leeds, and Callis, 1952) and the Questionnaire of Teacher Attitudes (Menacker and Pascarella, 1983). The instrument consisted of forty-two items which had been approved by a DELPHI panel and had been field tested. This instrument was administered to respondents immediately prior to inservice presentations on the subject of Judicious Discipline by the author, Forrest Gathercoal. Six months later the instrument was readministered as a posttest.

Data was gathered in two forms and both have been included in this final chapter. The quantitative data, presented and analyzed in Chapter IV was enhanced by descriptive information gathered from respondents during interviews. Interview questions were designed to discover what concepts of Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986) had been more readily adaptable to classroom management strategies currently being employed by the

respondents to the study.

A One-Way ANOVA was used to assess whether or not there was a significant difference in attitudes among elementary, middle, and high school teachers. An item by item evaluation was employed to ascertain whether or not there was a significant difference between pretest and posttest attitudes.

### Results of Data Analysis

#### Hypotheses

\*Hypothesis one: There was little significant difference at the .05 level among elementary, middle, and high school teachers as was reflected in the scores of items of the survey instrument. Hypothesis one was therefore retained.

\*Hypothesis two: There was little significant difference at the .05 level between results on the pretest and posttest in regards to the scores of items. It is interesting to note that most frequently when a shift occurred, this difference was observed to be evenly divided among all teachers than any particular group. Based on these findings, hypothesis two was also retained.

#### Interpretation and Conclusions of Quantitative Data

Attitudes reflected in data collected and labeled as Group 1 favored a firm,

consistant posture when dealing with a disruptive student. Although all the elementary, middle, and high school teachers included in this survey expressed disfavor at the idea of children keeping likes and dislikes to themselves, they agreed with the idea that too many children today are allowed to follow their own directions. These data suggest that although the three groups of teachers tested recognized that children should be able to express their preferences, the idea of a child experiencing freedom of choice within the classroom was one with which they disagreed. The dichotomy would seem to reflect a discomfort with the idea of presenting students with choices.

The data from Group 1/Disruptive Students also supports the fact that discipline techniques generally considered common, although not always the most appropriate for managing a troubled student, are widely accepted by the three groups of respondents to this survey. Those items which dealt with strategies such as punishing the whole class for the acts of one student or correcting a student in front of other students, were generally accepted. This led to hypothesis one and two being retained in most instances. It is interesting to note that middle school teachers reflected a statistically significant difference between pretest and posttest attitudes toward correcting students in the presence of other students. This may be attributed to the fact that middle school teachers work with students who are going through a time of life when self concept and self esteem are crucial.

The data reported as Group 2/Classroom Management Situations consisted of items which ascertained teacher attitudes toward typical classroom

situations. This data revealed more consistency in the way all three levels of teachers responded to certain specific occurrences. It should be noted that in a study such as this, it is impossible to factor out observed or implied influences of the school administrator.

The data show all three groups of respondents agreed that there are times when disciplinary situations should be turned into jokes and disagreed with the idea that a teacher laughing along with students would lose control of the class. There was a strong alignment with the item that stated discipline should be enforced in a "consistent manner." There was strong disagreement with the item stating that teachers need to be "callous and tough" to maintain good discipline. In all, the responses to the items reflected an attitude of evenhandedness toward a variety of typical classroom encounters. The fact that some of these responses appear to conflict with attitudes toward disruptive students may be understood when it is considered that one-on-one confrontations are more threatening to a teacher than dealing with generalized classroom situations.

Group 3/Legal Issues consisted of items included to gauge teacher attitudes toward legal issues. The items specifically addressed questions about search and seizure, religion in the classroom, and grading practices. The data gathered in this area would appear to support the findings of Menacker and Pascarella as well as Sametz and McLoughlin. Menacker and Pascarella were able to demonstrate through their research that information about court rulings which impact on students and classrooms was not filtering down to teachers and

administrators unless there was a special effort made to do so. Sametz and McLoughlin reached similar conclusions as a result of their research and recommended teacher inservice sessions to raise the level of awareness educators have of legal issues.

Respondents to the current study reflected this unfortunate lack of understanding teachers have of the manner in which legal issues impact the public school setting. Responses to Item Sixteen, "In general students should be entitled to the same consitutional rights protections as adults," indicated strong agreement by all three groups of teachers. However, Item Thirty-Seven, "Since the schools own the lockers, school authorities, as a matter of policy, should be permitted to search student lockers without notice when they suspect that they contain drugs, weapons, or other banned materials," also indicated strong agreement by all groups of respondents. It is apparent that transfer of the general concept of equal rights to specific applications of those rights has not occurred. These conclusions were further supported by the rejection of hypothesis two on Item Twenty-Four. Item Twenty-Four stated: "Materials such as the Ten Commandments should not be posted in public schools, as this violates the spirit, if not the letter, of the Constitution's concept of separation of church and state." Although on the pretest all three levels of teachers agreed that posting the Ten Commandments in the classroom violated the spiirit, if not the letter of the law, the posttest revealed that teachers at the secondary level had altered their attitude and now were in disagreement with the item. It is difficult to account for this shift but it clearly demonstrates a lack of

understanding of the implications of recent court rulings.

The items collected under the heading of Group 4/Student Behaviors in a Classroom addressed teachers' assessments of general student behavior. Teachers at all three levels responded on both the pretest and the posttest that they believed all children to be well behaved. Item Six questioned attitudes toward the belief that children had to learn to obey an adult without question. On the pretest elementary teachers agreed with this item. On the posttest, however, their attitudes had shifted to one of disagreement. The other levels remained essentially unchanged in attitudes toward this item from the pretest to the posttest, but there was a difference between middle school teachers and high school teachers although the difference was not significant at the .05 level. The mean score indicates middle school teachers disagreed with this item on both the pretest and the posttest, while the mean scores for high school teachers indicate a general agreement.

Item Thirty-Two questioned teachers as to their belief that children today have too much freedom. Teachers at the elementary level disagreed with this statement on both the pretest and the posttest as indicated by the mean scores. Teachers at both the middle school and high school levels reflected a general agreement with this item, again as indicated by the mean scores.

#### Interpretations and Conclusions of Descriptive Data

The significant impact of Judicious Discipline : A Constitutional

Perspective for School Rules and Decisions (Gathercoal, 1986) was contraindicated by the quantitative data that was gathered. Nonetheless, there did appear to be a shift in the attitudes of some teachers which was reflected in the descriptive data gathered by the researcher. Teachers at the elementary and middle school levels appeared to be willing to attempt a new approach to discipline. Portions of Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986) were adapted by various teachers to meet particular needs. For example, some teachers at the middle school level found accepting late papers or offering the option of an "Incomplete" grade in lieu of work handed in on time to be a more satisfying approach to the problem of work not completed than the more common practice of lowering a grade as punishment for late work. One teacher at the fifth grade level, when faced with a disciplinary situation, would ask her students what "compelling state interest" was involved in the problem. The students learned to identify the state interest that applied to the situation and, according to the teacher, gained a new understanding of why certain behaviors are considered inappropriate in a classroom. However, the one consistent response by teachers at all levels to Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986) was that it seemed to be an intriguing idea, but they were unsure of how to implement the concepts into their daily classroom routine. Elementary, middle, and high school teachers all expressed the desire to have an opportunity to attend further inservice sessions. These attitudes form the basis of the section of this chapter titled "Recommendations for Further Study."

### Recommendations for Further Study

Further research is needed to ascertain the potential impact of Judicious Discipline: A Constitutional Perspective for School Rules and Decisions, (Gathercoal, 1986) on the management strategies in elementary, middle, and high school classrooms. The quantitative data appears to be inconclusive in terms of an overall shift in the attitudes of teachers. In particular, the data does not reveal a significant acquisition or understanding of legal issues. The descriptive data gathered appears to offer an alternative approach to clarify these issues for teachers.

The research and its results indicate the method for a second study of the attitudes to teachers in all three groups toward student rights and classroom management. The follow-up study would focus more particularly on Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986). There are three primary thrusts for the next study.

First: Follow-up research should employ a pretest and posttest survey with an instrument constructed specifically for this study. The use of a generic instrument in the present study reduced the likelihood of addressing those issues that would more clearly assess teacher attitudes toward and understandings of student rights and classroom management strategies. The new instrument would contain items that avoid vague classroom management situations and deal instead with potential legal problems. Respondent identification numbers should be incorporated into the administration of the

pretest/posttest instrument. This would permit a more accurate examination of significant differences between pretest and posttest data.

Second: A follow-up study should include five inservice sessions over the course of a school year in order to provide teachers further information on and the time to interact with the concepts contained in Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986). The workshops would be designed to assist teachers in achieving transfer of the concepts of Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986) to their classroom management strategies. The first workshop would be an overview of Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986). Other workshops would explore topics such as Fourteenth Amendment guarantees to Due Process and the concept of liberty, free speech and expression, equity in grading practices and attendance policies, and the last workshop would focus on ethical standards for the education profession.

Third: The second study suggested by the present research would include introducing a system for peer coaching among staff members in order that teachers may support each other in the application of concepts contained in Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986). This would be particularly helpful to the participants of this study when the researcher could not be on-site. Peer coaching would include preconferences, postconferences, and videotaping of classroom sessions. The classroom sessions targeted for videotaping are those during which Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986) would be introduced to the students by their teachers. Other video taping opportunities will present themselves during the year. These sessions will be determined

based on the needs of the teachers to view themselves and analyze the strengths and weaknesses of their classroom applications of Judicious Discipline (Gathercoal, 1986).

The researcher, over the course of a year-long study, has gleaned the information to support the above suggestions. Results of the current study provide a natural impetus for the suggested follow-up study.

## REFERENCES

Aquerrebere, Joseph; "As Goes Society, So Goes Discipline", Thrust, Volume 14, No. 4, January, 1985

Aristotle, Politics, Book VIII, reprinted in The Philosophy of Aristotle, Mentor Classics 1963

Avant, Gayle R., and Hugh Davis, Jr.: The U.S. Constitution In School: The Rights of the Student (Prepared for presentation at the Southwestern Political Science Association, March 21-24 in Forth Worth, Texas), 1984

Bell, John A.; "Stability of the Factor Structure of a Short Form of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory", Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 14, No. 2, April, 1977

Budd, William C. and Lynda S. Blakely; "Response Bias in the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory", Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 51, May, 1958

Brody, Ernest B.; "A Note on the Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory", The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 64, No. 2, October, 1970

Cook, W.W., C.H. Leeds, and R. Callis; Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, Psychological Corporation, New York, 1952

Courtney, Wayne; Analysis, Department of Continuing Education, Oregon State University, 1982

de Tocqueville, Alexis; Democracy in America, reprinted by arrangement with Alfred A. Knopf, 1945

Douglas, William O.; "The Need For Fundamental Education in The U.S. Constitutional System", Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1966

Dewey, John; Moral Principles in Education, Philosophical Library, Inc., 1959

Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook; Oscar Krisen Buros, Editor, Vol. 2, University of Nebraska Press, 1978

Gallagher, Patricia Reed; The Context in Which Student Teaching Occurs and Its Effect on Student Teacher Performance, Unpublished

Research, 1979

Gallup, Alec; "The Gallup Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools", Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1984

Gallup, George; "Public Attitudes toward Education", Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 57, December, 1975, Reprinted in The Education Digest, Vol 51, No. 3, November, 1985

Gathercoal, Forrest; Judicious Discipline: A Constitutional Perspective for School Rules and Decisions, unpublished manuscript, 1986

Goodman, Ellen; "Toward a Less Devisive Education", The Oregonian, Vol. 136, No. 44,814, July 18, 1986

Harvey, O.J., Misha Prather, Jack B. White and James K. Hoffmeister; "Teachers' Beliefs, Classroom Atmosphere and Student Behavior", American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 5, No. 2, March, 1968

Hickman, Michael J.; "The Supreme Court and the Decline of Students' Constitutional Rights: A Selective Analysis", Nebraska Law Review, Vol. 65:161, 1986

Hoyt, Cyril J. and Clayton L. Stunkard; "Estimation of Test Reliability for Unrestricted Item Scoring Methods", Educational and Psychological Measurement, Winter, 1952

Hyman, Irwin A. and John D'Alessandro, "Good, Old-Fashioned Discipline: The Politics of Punitiveness", (from Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1984), reprinted in Education 86/87, Dushkin Publishing Co., 1986

Johnson, William L. and Paul N. Dixon, "Response Alternative in Likert Scaling", Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 44, 1984

Leeds, Carroll H.; "Predictive Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory", The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 20, No. 1, Spring, 1969

Leeds, Carroll H.; "A Second Validity Study of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory", The Elementary School Journal, March, 1952

Leeds, Carroll H. and Walter W. Cook; "The Construction and Differential Value of a Scale for Determining Teacher-Pupil Attitudes", Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 16, No. 2, December, 1947

McDaniel, Ernest; "A Disguised Minnesota Teacher Attitude Test", The Journal of Educational Research, Vol 58, No. 2, October, 1964

Menacker, Julius and Ernest T. Pascarella; "How Aware Are Educators Of Supreme Court Decisions That Affect Them?", Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1983

Menacker, Julius and Ernest T. Pascarella; "What Attitudes Do Educators Have About Student and Teacher Civil Rights", Urban Education, Vol. 19, No. 2, July, 1984

Miller, Arthur; from a speech delivered in Portland, Oregon, as reported in The Oregonian, March 26, 1986

Miller, John P.; The Educational Spectrum: Orientations to Curriculum, Longman Press, 1983

Office of General Counsel; "The Law and the Schools", Today's Education, 1982-83 Annual.

Orzech, Mirian Weitz; Attitudes of High School Students Toward Three Selected Ethnic Groups as Affected by Participation In an Ethnic Studies Program, Unpublished Research, 1974

Reutter Jr., E. Edmund and Robert R. Hamilton; The Law of Public Education, Second Edition, Foundation Press, Inc., New York, 1976

Sametz, Lynn and Caven S. McLoughlin; "Curriculum Innovation: Legal Education", Educational Horizons, Spring, 1984

School and The Democratic Environment, Danforth and Ford Foundations, Columbia University Press, 1970

Stein, Harry L. and James Hardy; "A Validation Study of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory in Manitoba", Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 50, No. 5, January, 1957

Teitelbaum, Lee E.; "School Discipline Procedures: Some Empirical Findings and Some Theoretical Questions", Indiana Law Journal, Vol. 58, No. 4, 1983

Weaver, W. Timothy; "The DELPHI Forecasting Method", Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1971

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, David B. Guralnik, Editor in Chief, Warner Books, New York, July, 1983

Weiser, John C. and James E. Hayes; "Democratic Attitudes of Teachers and Prospective Teachers", Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1966

Yudof, Mark G., David L. Kirp, Tyll van Geel and Betsy Levin;  
Educational Policy and The Law: Cases and Materials, McCutchan Publishing  
Corporation, 1982

Zirkel, Perry A; "A Test on Supreme Court Decisions Affecting  
Education", Phi Delta Kappan, November, 1978

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A



# THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CORPORATION

555 ACADEMIC COURT, SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78204-0952  
 TELEPHONE: (512) 299-1061 TELEX: 5106015629 TPCSAT FAX: (512) 270-0327

July 11, 1986

Ms. Barbara McEwan  
 School of Education, Oregon State  
 University and Western Oregon State College  
 OSU Campus: Education Hall, Room 401  
 Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Dear Ms. McEwan:

Please refer to your April 28, 1986 letter regarding the MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY, Form A (there is no Form B).

The Measurement Division within our company has reviewed your request. It is suggested that you administer the entire test and score only the items you wish to use. However, if there is some reason why you would prefer separating the 87 items you mentioned, please indicate such; we would then consider granting you permission to reproduce only those items.

Please note that actual copies or portions of the MTAI should not be bound in, nor permanently filed with your dissertation. Professors who are advisors have concurred in the belief that it is unwise to place test copies in libraries — even within the bindings of a thesis or dissertation — where the public can have free and unsupervised access to them. Beyond this, many theses and dissertations now are available through university microfilms which does not restrict their availability to professional persons. Any professional person who reads the thesis would know how to gain access to the tests used if she/he wants and needs to do so. In short, you may make reference to the MTAI, but no actual portion of it may be reproduced within your dissertation.

Please indicate whether you choose to administer the entire MTAI or would prefer reproducing the items you mentioned. I will also need a letter from your sponsoring Professor verifying your student status and supporting your request. Once we have this information, we can give full consideration to your request.

Sincerely,

Signature redacted for privacy.

Teri Pierce, Supervisor  
 Rights and Permissions



# THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CORPORATION

555 ACADEMIC COURT, SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78204-0952 (512) 299-1061

July 25, 1986

Ms. Barbara McEwan  
School of Education, Oregon State  
University and Western Oregon State College  
OSU Campus: Education Hall, Room 401  
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Dear Ms. McEwan:

Enclosed please find 2 copies of a Permission Agreement authorizing you to reproduce up to 300 copies of 36 items from the MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY on your specialized scoring sheet and also score said answer sheets; we ask that you be responsible for the distribution and collection of the answer sheets upon test administration.

If the terms and conditions are acceptable to you, please sign all copies and return them to me at the above address. One copy will be returned to you after it has been countersigned by The Psychological Corporation. Please make certain that the copyright notice specified in paragraph 5(a) of the Agreement appears on all reproductions.

If you have any questions at all, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Signature redacted for privacy.

Teri Pierce, Supervisor  
Rights and Permissions

Enclosure

APPENDIX B

June 4, 1986

Dear

Thank you so much for your willingness to help me with my dissertation entitled, "A Study of the Applications of Judicious Discipline: A Constitutional Perspective for School Rules and Decisions in selected Oregon School Districts."

As an expert on my DELPHI panel, your role will be to review the attached questionnaire and respond to the quality of each item. If an item is one that you feel will adequately measure a teacher or administrator's attitude toward student rights and school rules, please circle the item's number. If you feel an item is inappropriate, please cross out the item's number. If you feel an item would be improved by altering a word or two, please feel free to do so.

Again, thank you for your help. I will be calling you in a few days to see if the questionnaire is ready to be picked up. If you have any questions or are not sure of these instructions, please call me at 754-3648. I look forward to seeing you again soon.

Sincerely yours,

Barbara McEwan

APPENDIX C

TEST PURPOSE:

The tests proposed are designed to discover teacher and student attitudes concerning Constitutional rights as they apply to school rules. Specifically, the research will investigate whether or not there is a significant effect upon management techniques through application of information contained in, Judicious Discipline: A Constitutional Perspective for School Rules, by Forrest Gathercoal.

INSTRUMENT DESIGN:

The studies will employ questionnaire surveys measured with Likert-type Scales. The surveys will be printed on IBM paper and scored with No. 2 pencils. The time involved to administer the tests should be no more than 30 minutes.

During the school year, the researcher studying attitudes of teachers will conduct, at the convenience of school personnel, random interviews. The purpose of interviewing is to validate questionnaire data and assess the value of concepts presented in Judicious Discipline.

TIME FRAME

The pretest questionnaires for teachers will be presented immediately prior to a workshop on the subject of Judicious Discipline. Both researchers will attend this workshop. Pretest questionnaires for students will be administered at the beginning of the school year. Exit surveys will be administered to teachers and students in March.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The researchers guarantee that all information gathered, both in survey and interview form, will be kept strictly confidential. For purposes of the study, the school level will be coded on the answer form.

APPENDIX D



THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF  
ILLINOIS  
AT  
CHICAGO

College of Education  
Box 4348, Chicago, Illinois 60680  
(312) 996-6000

8131

Dear Ms. McEwon:

Julius Menacher asked if I would respond to your Sept. 29<sup>th</sup> letter. The alpha or internal consistency reliability of our instrument was .81. We never reported the overall reliability because we analyzed individual items. We have no validity index per se for our instrument and that probably isn't important since we chose the items to represent what we thought were important legal/education issues. In this sense our instrument had good content validity for us. I hope this is the information you need. If not please contact me. Good luck with your research

Signature redacted for privacy.