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This study examined the effectiveness of the LEAST Approach to Discipline with junior high school teachers having behaviorally disordered pupils in their classes. A posttest only control group design was employed. The sample consisted of twenty junior high school teachers who were paired on the basis of quantity and problem severity of behaviorally disordered pupils in their classes. Each matched pair was split and randomly assigned to the experimental and control group.

Treatment consisted of eight hours of training in the LEAST approach. Subsequently, each experimental teacher was observed in class and given feedback regarding his application of the LEAST approach. The control group received no treatment.

Following treatment, a two-month data collection period ensued. During this time data was collected for both groups on seven dependent variables. Specifically these were (1) teacher deviancy management skills, (2) pupil perception of the classroom environment, (3) pupil compliance, (4) office referrals, (5) teacher-parent conferences, (6) pupil absences and (7) non completed assignments. Data were analyzed using Hotelling's $T^2$ procedure.
Results indicated that the experimental group scored significantly better than the control group on three dependent variables (teacher deviancy management skills, pupil compliance, office referrals). A fourth variable, non-completion of assignments, approached significance for the experimentals. The three remaining variables (pupil perception of classroom environment, teacher-parent conferences, pupil absences) were not significantly different between groups.

Overall, the results support the use of the LEAST approach as one that teachers can learn quickly and apply effectively. Further research is needed to determine if extended training time would improve results and if other deviancy management approaches are equally or more effective.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Recent legislation and special education policy notwithstanding, pupils with mild to moderate behavioral disorders entering the public school system have a low likelihood of receiving services for their handicapping condition. The United States Office of Education (1975) reports that only 18% of pupils in need of services for their behavioral disorders receive such services. Adolescents with behavioral disorders face an even bleaker prospect of receiving services since provision of such services at the secondary level has lagged far behind services for younger pupils (Nelson & Kaufman, 1977).

Regular classroom teachers are aware of this service deficit. When asked to indicate how many pupils they would refer if services were available, 2,264 kindergarten through grade 12 teachers selected 18.1% of their classes as in need of services for the behaviorally disordered (Kelly, Bullock & Dykes, 1977). Of particular interest to this study is the 20% plus figure reported for junior high school pupils. Administrators in School District #57, British Columbia, Canada, concurred that these findings are consistent with the situation in their district (Vawter, 1981).
Based on Public Law 94-142 and recent trends in special education, it appears that, if served at all, junior high school behaviorally disordered pupils, like their counterparts in elementary schools will most often be served in the regular classroom by the regular classroom teacher (Hallahan & Kauffman, 1978). However, caution should be exercised in determining how regular teachers might provide services since their primary role is an instructional one and not that of a therapeutic agent for potentially complex emotional conflicts (Aspy & Roebuck, 1977). Furthermore, classroom teachers' current ability to deal with classroom conflicts of a disruptive nature is questionable. Gargiula and Pigge (1978) and Ingersoll (1976) found that both regular and special education teachers doubted their ability to handle disruptive behavior effectively. This doubt is substantiated by research demonstrating that teachers are not necessarily able to manage the inappropriate and disruptive behavior characteristic of the behaviorally disordered (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1980; Kounin, 1970; Zimmerman & Zimmerman, 1962). It appears then that there is a real service deficit for behaviorally disordered pupils and that their regular classroom teachers lack the necessary skills to deal effectively with inappropriate and disruptive behavior.

Practitioners who have developed specific training programs for improving teacher skills in dealing with
inappropriate and disruptive behavior have borrowed from several theoretical positions. These positions, not necessarily unique to the field of behavioral disorders, include psychoanalytic (Berkowitz & Rothman, 1960; Bettelheim, 1970), psychoeducational (Fenichel, 1964; Long, Morse & Newman, 1971), humanistic (Aspy, 1971; Knoblock, 1973; Rogers, 1969), ecological (Hobbs, 1974), and behavioral (Harring, 1974; Hewett, 1974). Well known programs currently being disseminated to regular and special education teachers include reality therapy (Glasser, 1969, 1978) and teacher effectiveness training (Gordon, 1974). Recently Carkhuff, Griffen and Mallory (1978) have advocated a program entitled the LEAST Approach to Discipline. All of the above programs share the commonly accepted notion that teachers must be equipped with the skills necessary to facilitate a reduction in inappropriate and disruptive behavior by handling such incidences in as constructive a manner as possible (Aspy & Roebuck, 1977; Brophy & Putnam, 1979; Carkhuff & Berrenson, 1967; Rogers, 1969). There is little published research regarding program effectiveness with overall pupil populations and no research specifically related to mainstream junior high school teachers of the behaviorally disordered or the pupils themselves (Brophy & Putnam, 1979; Dunkin & Biddle, 1975; Griffen, 1981; Martin, 1983).
Of the available programs, the LEAST Approach to Discipline was chosen as the independent variable in this study for two reasons. First, this program seems to have particular interest for the field of special education in that it is philosophically consistent with the concept of the least restrictive environment. LEAST is described by its authors as a simple but comprehensive strategy for the classroom teacher and is specifically designed to be used in the management of inappropriate and disruptive behavior in the least intrusive manner possible. Second, the brief training period (8-24 hours) makes the program one that could be easily implemented on a large scale. This consideration is an important one in view of the service deficit previously cited and the large number of teachers who are responsible for the appropriate education of this unserved group.

It is believed that research in the area of applied methods for increasing behaviorally disordered pupils' chances of success in the regular classroom is needed. These methods may also be useful in special class settings with the behaviorally disordered and other handicapped pupils.

**Statement of the Problem**

The effectiveness of the LEAST Approach to Discipline as a classroom intervention strategy with junior high
classroom teachers having behaviorally disordered pupils in their classes has not been determined.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to obtain information which could be used to answer the following general questions.

1. Do junior high school teachers trained in the LEAST Approach to Discipline exhibit superior deviancy management skills over their untrained counterparts?

2. Do the behaviorally disordered pupils of junior high school teachers trained in the LEAST approach respond more favorably to their teachers compared to pupils of untrained teachers?

**Definition of Terms**

For the purposes of this study, the following major terms have restricted meaning. They are defined as follows.

1. **Deviant behavior** is any behavior, inappropriate or disruptive, which conflicts with teacher expectations regarding school and/or academic performance in the classroom. It includes that which can be classified as (1) disruptive (disobedient, fighting, destructive, profanity), (2) withdrawn (daydreaming, crying, depressed), (3) immature
(preoccupied, short attention span, picked-on by others) and (4) socialized delinquent (stealing, truant).

2. **Behaviorally disordered pupils** are those who are classified by their teacher as having a mild, moderate or severe behavioral disorder according to a service classification definition (Appendix A).

3. **Junior secondary school pupils** are those attending eighth-, ninth- or tenth-grades. In the participating School District, seventh-grade classes are housed in the elementary schools and are therefore not included in this study.

4. **Deviancy management skills** are those skills a teacher uses to return a deviant pupil to on-task or acceptable classroom behavior.

5. **Office referral** is the referral of any behaviorally disordered pupil to the school office by a teacher because the pupil's deviant behavior cannot be corrected by the teacher.

**Hypotheses**

Following treatment intervention, seven research hypotheses were tested. These hypotheses are as follows.

**Hypothesis 1.** The mean deviancy management score will be significantly higher for experimental teachers than
their control counterparts as measured by Kounin's Deviancy Management Rating Scales.

Hypothesis 2. The mean classroom environment score will be significantly higher for behaviorally disordered pupils of experimental teachers than their control counterparts as measured by the Classroom Environment Scale.

Hypothesis 3. The mean pupil compliance rating to teacher attempts to manage deviancy will be significantly higher for behaviorally disordered pupils of experimental teachers than their control counterparts as measured by Kounin's Student Compliance Rating Scale.

Hypothesis 4. The mean number of office referrals for disciplinary purposes will be significantly lower for behaviorally disordered pupils of experimental teachers than their control counterparts as measured by office-kept records during a two-month period.

Hypothesis 5. The mean number of teacher-parent conferences for disciplinary purposes will be significantly lower for behaviorally disordered pupils of experimental teachers than their control counterparts as measured by teacher-kept records for a two-month period.

Hypothesis 6. The mean number of absences will be significantly lower for behaviorally disordered pupils of
experimental teachers than their control counterparts as measured by official school records during a two-month period.

**Hypothesis 7.** The mean number of non-completed assignments will be significantly lower for behaviorally disordered pupils of experimental teachers than their control counterparts as measured by a two-month sample of assignments.

**Significance of the Study**

The proposed study is significant in that it investigates an easily implemented training program which could provide a needed service to an underserved population of exceptional pupils. If the LEAST procedure assists in reducing disruptive classroom behavior, it may offer behaviorally disordered pupils a chance to remain in the public school and avoid the "drop-out" and "push-out" rate which is characteristically high for this group. In turn, the potential decrease in inappropriate and disruptive behavior may lead to a more desirable instructional/management ratio for the teacher.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study has the following limitations which will restrict generalizations.
1. The nature of disruptive behavior and disruptive pupils narrows the meaning of behaviorally disordered pupils. This study focused mainly on behaviorally disordered pupils who could be classified as disruptive or a socialized delinquent and did not specifically address itself to withdrawn or immature types of behavior (Quay, 1972).

2. The trainer of the group of experimental teachers had knowledge of the measuring instruments, the scores of which served as the dependent variables.

3. The teachers who participated in this study were volunteers. Caution must be exercised in generalizing results to all classroom teachers.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that pupils responded honestly to the Classroom Environment Scale. It is also assumed that the observational ratings of teachers in interaction with pupils accurately reflected typical behavior of the subjects.
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CHAPTER II

SYNTHESIS OF RELATED LITERATURE

The provision of services for behaviorally disordered adolescents has typically lagged far behind services for their elementary-aged counterparts. In 1964, Morse, Cutler and Fink offered the following explanation for this.

By the time disturbed children reach high school age, they are much more difficult to handle, their pathology is likely to be deeply ingrained, and their anti-social behavior as often as not has taken them out of school into the hands of a secondary school agency. Their less bright prognosis, and the limited efficacy of educationally oriented remediation makes the schools less willing to undertake special programs of this sort for them (p. 21).

The recent emphasis to reach unserved and underserved special populations notwithstanding, Nelson and Kaufman (1977) reached the same basic conclusion 13 years later.

Delinquent and/or maladjusted adolescents are for the most part, experiencing the same fate as their counterparts in previous generations. For instance, they are leaving school in large numbers, for diverse reasons, most of which involve a misfit between the student and the educational system to which he is expected to conform. Although the past few years have seen a significant rise in public and professional interest in educational programs for these children, the number of planful, public educational services for them is pitifully short of what is needed (p. 109).

It is not surprising, then, that the narrower topic of secondary school mainstream teachers and their pupils identified as behaviorally disordered has received little
attention in the literature. For this reason, the following synthesis includes relevant literature from both elementary and secondary settings.

The synthesis of related literature deals with the following topics. First, the perceptions of teachers, teacher educators, and researchers regarding the classroom teacher's ability to manage deviant behavior is discussed. Second, research on teachers as managers of deviancy is presented. This research includes pupil perceptions of their teachers, teacher self-reports and naturalistic studies of teachers in the act of deviancy management. Lastly, approaches/programs that offer teachers a framework within which to manage deviant behavior is reviewed. In this section, the effectiveness of each approach is discussed based on available research findings.

Perceptions of Teachers, Teacher Educators, and Researchers

There is evidence from teachers themselves that they lack the necessary skills to effectively manage deviant behavior. As early as 1930, James reported that the regular classroom teacher found it difficult to discipline effectively. More recently, Gargiulo and Pigge (1978) reported that both special and classroom teachers perceived their need for competence as much higher than their self-perceived proficiency in dealing with deviant behavior or developing
social skills. Similarly, Ingersall (1976) found that while newer teachers were more apt to admit to perceived deficits in dealing with deviant behavior than were more experienced teachers, both groups expressed a need for improved skills in dealing with misbehavior. Kelly, Bullock and Dykes (1977) in a survey of teachers in grades K through 12 (N=2,664) reported that junior high school teachers nominated 20% or more of their pupils as in need of services for the behaviorally disordered. While this was not specifically a survey of teachers' perceived need for effective discipline strategies, it is another expression by teachers that they are unable to meet the needs of behaviorally disordered pupils in regular classrooms.

Several teacher educators have offered explanations for the lack of teachers' skills in managing disruptive behavior. Brophy and Putnam (1979) in a review of classroom management practices state that

...teacher education programs rarely treat classroom management effectively. Typically, students are either given a high-powered exposure to a well structured but narrow set of ideas and techniques or are encouraged to sample from everywhere and make sense of it all on their own (p. 215).

Shea (1978), in a similar vein, writes that "the new teacher seldom arrives in the classroom with specific behavior management techniques." Morse (1975) supports the above stated observations and adds that, "Despite the mounting problems in some schools, the teacher is still expected to
deal with the whole gamut of behavioral problems in the classrooms and asking for help is considered a sign of failure" (p. 62).

Researchers have also lent support to the above stated beliefs of teachers and teacher educators. For example, Zimmerman and Zimmerman (1962) observed that a behaviorally disordered pupil's disruptive behavior was unthinkingly reinforced by his teachers because they attended to it. Similarly, Madsen, Becker, Thomas, Koser and Plager (1970) noted that the more often a teacher told pupils to sit down, the more often they stood up. Taken together, these studies indicate that teachers may often exacerbate the very behavior they are trying to eliminate.

Research on Teachers as Managers of Deviancy

Researchers working in the area of classroom discipline and management have studied the issue of teachers' abilities to deal with disruptive and inappropriate behavior from the standpoint of pupil reactions and perceptions, teacher self-reports, as well as naturalistic studies of teachers interacting with disruptive pupils. These investigations have attempted to define what specific techniques teachers employ to manage deviancy and how pupils react to these techniques.

Several investigations conducted by Kounin and his associates focused on the ripple effect, that is, how a
teacher's handling of the misbehavior of one pupil influenced other pupils. Kounin and Gump (1961) studied 26 kindergarten teachers and their pupils during the first four days of the school year. The dimensions of teacher clarity, firmness and roughness during a discipline incident were operationalized into behavioral rating scales (Appendix B) as was the type of ripple effect (i.e. no reaction, behavioral disruption, increased conformance). Four hundred and six desist incidents were then coded for absence or presence of the teacher dimensions and for subsequent audience reaction (i.e. ripple effect). The results indicated that all three desist dimensions influenced the ripple effect in the expected direction. That is, the more clarity and firmness and the less roughness a teacher employed, the less ripple effect. However, when ripple effects were tabulated separately for each of the four days there was a significant decrease in any ripple effect during the second through the fourth day.

Pupil attitudes towards misconduct as a function of punitive versus non-punitive teacher control techniques was the object of a subsequent study by Kounin and Gump (1958). Seventy-four boys and 100 girls in 1st grade were interviewed to determine their response to questions such as "What is the worst thing you can do in school?" and "Why is that so bad?" Responses were coded for content and a series of qualitative dimensions. The researchers concluded
that compared with pupils who have non-punitive teachers, pupils who have punitive teachers exhibit more aggression in their misconduct, are more unsettled and conflicted about misconduct and are less concerned with learning and other school values.

Ofchus (1960) studied how high school pupils, witnessing a teacher and pupil involved in a desist incident, saw the issue and reacted to it. One hundred and twenty-five high school pupils classified as high or low motivation-to-learn students were interviewed. They were asked to determine, from their perspective, the kinds of misbehavior that occurred, how disruptive it was to classroom activities, what desist technique was used by the teacher (clarity, firmness, punishment, humor) and how the teacher's technique affected the pupil who observed the event (i.e. positive, negative, or no ripple effect). Pupils reported that the most frequent deviancies were infractions of classroom rules and were judged as moderately serious. Pupils also reported that the most frequent technique used to stop deviancy was punishment and the most infrequently used technique was clarity. In the author's words, "the vast majority of the desists contained little information beyond 'stop it' and 'I'll punish you in some way'." Furthermore, it was reported that while punishment consistently created emotional discomfort among pupils, it only produced a ripple effect for highly motivated pupils.
Ryan, Gump and Kounin (1962) attempted to verify the results of Ofchus' work in a controlled experimental setting. Pupils from junior high school (N=246) were paid to participate in research at a local university. Discipline techniques (punitive-angry, simple reprimand, and ignoring) were manipulated during a mock lesson to determine the effect on pupil perception of the incident. These researchers found that pupils could accurately perceive punitive, simple reprimand and ignoring techniques and react differently to these desist techniques. Specifically, punitive teachers created the most personal discomfort while simple reprimand teachers caused pupils to pay more attention to the lesson.

In a naturalistic study of grades 1-5, Kounin, Friesen and Norton (1966) investigated the effects of various deviancy management techniques upon pupil behavior. Videotapes were obtained from 30 classrooms, each containing one or more behaviorally disordered pupils. Scores for deviancy and work involvement were obtained for both disordered and regular pupils as were the teacher desist techniques of clarity, firmness and pupil treatment (termed roughness in Kounin and Gump's kindergarten study). For the 30 teachers involved, only one showed any correlation between the desist techniques and their pupils' work involvement or degree of deviancy. However, it was found that other dimensions of classroom management, namely "withitness"
and "overlapping" were significantly correlated with managing classroom activities (r=.77-.40 for various work involvement and deviancy measures). Kounin (1970) defines these dimensions as follows.

Withitness was defined as a teacher's communicating to the children by her actual behavior (rather than by simple verbal announcing: "I know what's going on") that she knows what the children are doing, or has the proverbial "eyes in the back of her head" (p. 81).

Overlapping refers to what the teacher does when she has two matters to deal with at the same time. Does she somehow attend to both issues simultaneously or does she remain or become immersed in one issue only, to the neglect of the other? (p. 85).

It was also found that if teachers were successful in managing the deviant behavior of regular pupils, then they were also successful with the behaviorally disordered in their classes.

In a replication and extension of Kounin et al. (1966), Kounin and Obradovic (1968) studied 49 first- and second-grade classrooms. These classrooms were videotaped for a complete day. Scores for deviancy and work involvement were obtained from the videotapes for randomly selected disordered and regular pupils. Management techniques and rating procedures were formulated from the authors' experience of observing classrooms. These techniques included withitness and overlapping (previously defined), movement management (the quantity and quality of major changes in learning activities), group focus (the quantity and quality of tech-
niques used when focusing on individuals and groups of students during instruction) and seatwork variety and challenge (the number of changes in assigned seatwork during a given time). The correlations among the various forms of teacher and pupil behavior were significant at or above the .05 alpha level in 52 out of 68 instances. As in the Kounin et al. (1966) study, withitness was the single most predictive teacher variable and teachers who were effective in managing regular pupils were also effective in managing the behaviorally disordered.

The foregoing studies conducted by Kounin and his associates point to at least four important conclusions. First, the concept of a measurable ripple effect, positive or negative, is only partially supported by the research literature. While the phenomenon may initially exist with kindergarten pupils, they seem to habituate within the first four days of school (Kounin & Gump, 1958). Furthermore, high school classes are only affected by a ripple effect if they possess a high motivation to learn (Ofchus, 1960), a condition which cannot be depended on. Second, teachers are most often punitive in their attempts to manage deviancy and pupils who are the recipients of this punitiveness have negative emotional reactions (Kounin Gump, 1958; Ofchus, 1960). Third, teachers are able to manage the deviant behavior of both normal and behaviorally disordered pupils or not at all. While there may be certain techniques that
are valuable when dealing with disordered pupils, there appears to be a common core of skills that teachers must possess if they are to be effective managers of deviancy. Finally, managing deviant behavior, whether it be with the behaviorally disordered or otherwise, may not be dependent on deviancy techniques per se. Rather, broader based dimensions of classroom management such as withitness may be more relevant variables to focus on. However, it is important to keep in mind that the measurement of withitness, the most predictive of the classroom management techniques employed, was taken solely from incidences involving deviancy. Kounin states

These [desist] events satisfy the criteria for a behavioral measure of communicated withitness: (1) a child behavior does occur; (2) a teacher takes some action about this behavior; and (3) the action the teacher takes has the potential of communicating to the children that she does or doesn't know what is going on—that is, she can be correct or make a discernible mistake. In addition, desist events occur with sufficient frequency to provide an adequate sampling (p. 81).

The finding regarding teachers' reliance on punishment as a deviancy management technique has been repeated in more recent literature. Brophy and Rohrkemper (1980) investigated 98 male and female elementary teachers' thinking about and strategies for coping with 12 types of difficult or problem pupils often encountered at the elementary level. Responses were coded with a variety of instruments derived from Dreikurs, Redl, Glasser and Gordon's conceptualizations
on managing deviancy (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1980). Teacher reliance on punishment as a socialization technique, failure to gather important information about the misbehavior before acting, and a tendency to blame pupils for misbehaving intentionally led the researchers to conclude the following.

Given that all of the teachers in this study had at least three years experience and had been recommended as either average or outstanding at dealing with problem students by their principals, the data suggests widespread knowledge and skill deficiencies in these areas (p. 20).

According to the authors, this situation is intensified by a trend to emphasize academics and deemphasize socialization as grade level increases. That is, teachers in the lower grades were more likely to try to socialize the aggressors and follow up the incident with a referral or assistance while teachers in the higher grades were more likely to treat pupils via bureaucratic measures designed to force them to conform.

White (1975), using grade 1-12 classrooms, confirmed the trend noted by Brophy and Rohrkemper. Observational studies involving 104 classrooms were conducted to determine natural rates of teacher verbal approval and disapproval of instructional and managerial interactions. From grade 3-12 the total rate of teacher disapproval exceeded the rate of approval. Approval rates for appropriate non-instructional pupil behavior (i.e. managerial interactions) were virtually non-existent in grade 4-12. Further, disapproval
in the form of criticism or reproach was the only method employed in several classrooms at the secondary level.

Contrasting results regarding teacher deviancy management style were obtained by Lambie (1978). The Indiana Behavior Management System II was used to record teacher and pupil behaviors in 30 classes. Fifteen of the classes were for the behaviorally disordered while the others were regular classrooms that included mainstreamed behaviorally disordered pupils. Teachers in both types of classes were found to use any form of management technique in less than 10% of the off-task incidences presented by the behaviorally disordered pupils. Further, it was found that behaviorally disordered pupils in mainstreamed classrooms were off-task significantly more than their counterparts in self-contained classes yet regular class teachers used any form of management technique in less than 3% of the opportunities available. When management techniques were employed they were of an authoritarian, although not necessarily punitive, nature. Nevertheless, Lambie concluded,

> These techniques are characteristic of dominative teacher behaviors which were seen, in the review of literature, to result in more hostile pupil behaviors (Anderson, 1939; Flanders, 1961; Flanders, 1965; Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939; Whithall & Lewis, 1963) (p. 38).

Recent research (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1980; Lambie, 1978; White, 1975) supports previous research that teachers rely on punishment and authority as a primary deviancy management technique. In this regard, the conclusion that the
search for effective deviancy management techniques should be abandoned in favor of broader based classroom management techniques (Kounin, 1970) seems premature since the use of punishment, or a punitive attitude, may act to mask the success possible with specific deviancy management techniques. While it is not possible to discern this from previous research, it appears to be a plausible explanation especially in light of Brophy and Rohrkemper's investigation. Furthermore, the paucity of research on adolescent behaviorally disordered pupils and their teachers (Nelson & Kaufman, 1977) as well as the complete lack of naturalistic or cause and effect research with this group regarding deviancy management techniques, suggests more study before such a conclusion can be reached.

Deviancy Management Strategies and Their Results

A variety of strategies are available and have been employed in the schools to assist teachers in the management of deviant behavior. These strategies are exclusive of broader based management and instructional strategies such as Flanders' Interaction Analysis (Flanders, 1970), Aspy's adaptation of Bloom's Taxonomy to cognitive classroom interaction (1971), and Aspy, Gazda, and others' adaptations of Carkhuff's Human Resource Development Model to the classroom (Aspy, 1977; Gazda, 1976; Robinson & Brosh, 1980). Several of these specific deviancy management strategies
have evolved directly from work with the behaviorally disordered in school settings. They include life space interviewing, managing surface behavior, the self-control curriculum and the systematic application of consequences. Other strategies developed by Gordon (Teacher Effectiveness Training) and Glasser (Reality Therapy) have been suggested by their creators as meaningful approaches whenever teacher-pupil conflict arises. These aforementioned strategies will be reviewed in an attempt to identify key aspects of each approach as well as research results of their application.

**Life Space Interviewing**

The concept of life space interviewing was first developed by Redl and Wineman (1952). Its basic assumption is that conflict can be used productively to teach new ways of understanding and coping with disruptive pupil behavior. Its creators purport to accomplish this by exploiting the meaning of a behavior episode. Descriptions of procedures for life space interviewing for teachers were developed by Redl (1965) and later by Morse (1976). The two major categories of this approach are clinical exploitation of life events and emotional first aid. The teacher must choose between the two based on what he/she wants to accomplish. The goal of clinical exploitation is to use a given life event to develop self-understanding. It requires that the teacher translate the pupil's immediate life experience into
something that could be used as a long range goal to avoid reoccurrences of the same disruptive behavior. The goal of emotional first aid, on the other hand, is to help a pupil overcome an obstacle by offering adult support.

The length of time needed to conduct a life space interview varies from occasion to occasion but can be quite long in many instances. For this reason the technique may have limited value as an expedient strategy for the classroom teacher. No research could be located that reports the effectiveness of life space interviewing.

Managing Surface Behaviors

The management of surface behaviors was first described by Redl and Wineman (1952). They described 17 different techniques which could be applied to deviancy management including planned ignoring, signal interference and tension decontamination. Long and Newman (1965) related these surface management techniques to teachers and pupils. Four equally desirable alternatives to dealing with disruptive behavior were described. These included permitting, tolerating, interfering and preventative planning. Within these alternatives are 12 specific techniques. Fink (1972) analyzed pupil teacher interactions in classes for the behaviorally disordered. Many of the behaviors recorded are included in the 12 techniques specified by Long and Newman (1965). The study did not, however, describe which techniques were
effective but rather related the frequency with which they were applied by teachers. In a subsequent study, Lambie (1978) studied teachers and behaviorally disordered pupils in regular and self-contained classrooms. The Indiana Behavior Management System - II, which is a modification of the instrumentation used by Fink (1972), was used to determine not only the frequency but the effectiveness of Long and Newman's techniques. However the frequency with which teachers used any of the techniques (less than 10% for self-contained and less than 3% for regular teachers) prohibits validation of the managing surface behavior approach.

The Self-Control Curriculum

The self-control curriculum (Fagen, Long & Stevens, 1972) was developed on the assumption that disruptive pupils are the result of poor interpersonal teaching and not psychodynamic causes. The aim of the curriculum is one of building adaptive controls and interrupting self-defeating behavior problems. Eight areas comprise the curriculum: selection, storage, sequencing and ordering, anticipating consequences, appreciating feelings, managing frustration, inhibition and delay and relaxation. These areas are further broken down into detailed sub-units for teachers to follow. While several publications have appeared which debate the theoretical position of the self-
control curriculum, no research on this strategy was found.

The Systematic Application of Consequences

The application of consequences, also known as contingency management, uses various schedules of reinforcement to extinguish and acquire and maintain behavior. The literature has reported the use of a variety of reinforcers and schedules with the behaviorally disordered in school settings. Basically, reinforcers can be categorized as natural—praise, attention and verbal aversives and tangible—trinkets, gum, tokens and time out (Hall, 1971a). Schedules of reinforcement (Hall, 1971b) include (a) continuous in which reinforcement follows each response and (b) intermittent in which reinforcement follows a fixed or variable schedule. Under ideal conditions, continuous reinforcement is used when behavior is being acquired whereas intermittent reinforcement is used during maintenance. Detailed descriptions of measuring techniques, recording procedures, graphing and research designs for contingency management have been presented by practitioners such as Hall (1971b), O'Leary & O'Leary (1977), and Huck, Cormier and Bounds (1974).

Numerous investigations have demonstrated the effectiveness of contingency management with behaviorally disordered pupils (Brophy & Putnam, 1979; Dunkin & Biddle, 1974; O'Leary & O'Leary, 1977). For the most part, these
investigations have been successful by focusing on the disruptive behavior itself and/or attention to task. This has been to the exclusion of other variables such as academic performance (Edwards, 1980). The following is a review of those studies which attempted to reach conclusions that would be helpful to classroom teachers in their attempts to manage deviancy. The review is further restricted to those studies which would have application to regular classrooms at the secondary level. For example, studies which investigated token economies or various time out procedures are excluded because teachers at the secondary level are seldom in a position to implement them except in specialized settings (Kaufman & O'Leary, 1972; Burchard & Tyler, 1965).

Research was reported in an earlier section of this synthesis that cited teachers as lacking an effective repertoire of responses to pupil deviancy because they over-relied on punishment (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1980; Kounin et al, 1970; Ofchus, 1960). Others have objected to the use of punishment on moral (Mauer, 1974; Neill, 1960) and scientific grounds (Bandura, 1962; Skinner, 1953). Research findings concerning contingency management principles in classroom settings have both rejected and supported the use of punishment with the behaviorally disordered depending on the type of punishment. For example, Thomas, Becker and Armstrong (1968) demonstrated that when teacher disapproval responses were tripled significant increases in inappropriate
behavior were observed and approval rates for appropriate behavior led to significant decreases in disruption. In a similar study, Madsen, Becker, Thomas, Koser and Plager (1970) found that "sit-down" commands actually increased standing responses while praise for sitting lowered the rate of standing.

Madsen, Becker and Thomas (1968) believe that praise for appropriate behavior is the key teacher behavior in achieving classroom management. They compared the effects of rules, praise, and ignoring on the inappropriate behavior of three elementary school children. It was found that rules alone and rules plus ignoring of deviant behavior were not effective in reducing deviant behavior from baseline rates. However, when contingent teacher praise was added to rules and ignoring a significant reduction in deviant behavior occurred.

Finally, Becker, Madsen, Arnold and Thomas (1967) investigated the contingent use of teacher attention and praise in reducing inappropriate classroom behavior. It was concluded that a combination of ignoring inappropriate and positively reinforcing appropriate behavior that was incompatible with the inappropriate, was most effective.

Much literature on verbal and social punishers has demonstrated the effectiveness of some types of verbal reprimands with the moderately behaviorally disordered. O'Leary and Becker (1968) investigated the behavior of 19
1st-graders. During a base-line period, disruptive behavior occurred in 54% of the time intervals observed. When appropriate behaviors were praised and disruptive behavior ignored, disruptive behavior dropped to an average of 32%. A second intervention involving teacher quiet reprimands resulted in pupils' disruptive behavior rising somewhat to 39%. A third intervention, teacher loud reprimands, increased disruptive behavior to 53%. A reinstatement of the praise and ignoring procedure resulted in pupils' disruptive behavior dropping to 35%. The authors concluded that loud reprimands appeared to reinforce disruptive behavior while soft reprimands may act to suppress these behaviors. Furthermore, praise and ignoring did not appear to be any more effective than soft reprimands.

In a similar study, O'Leary, Kaufman, Kass and Drabman (1970) contrasted the use of loud and soft reprimands. They found that when teachers used soft reprimands, audible only to the target pupil they were effective in reducing disruptive behavior in seven of nine pupils. As with the previous study, loud reprimands, audible to the entire class, appeared to increase pupils' disruptive behavior. It can be seen from these two studies that while mild punishers (soft reprimands) appear to be effective in controlling disruptive behavior, harsher punishers (loud reprimands) exacerbate the problem.
Jones and Millar (1974) observed the behavior of four private school teachers with regard to their use of negative attention. Two comparison teachers led orderly classroom discussions while the target teachers led discussions characterized by excessive disruptiveness. Target teachers were then taught to deliver negative attention in a manner similar to that which the comparison teachers were using. Behaviors such as hand gestures; short, low-intensity verbalizations including "Not now." or "That's enough."; reacting quickly and standing close to the offending student when delivering the negative attention were highlighted. The results of the study led the authors to conclude that not only can teachers be taught to use negative attention but that negative attention is effective in reducing disruptive classroom behavior. In one of the few studies at the secondary level, McAlister, Stochowiak, Baer and Condorman (1969) showed that a combination of teacher verbal disapproval for turning around and inappropriate talking, and teacher verbal praise for appropriate behavior significantly reduced the disruptive target behaviors.

One question which arises upon reviewing contingency management research is whether decreasing deviant behavior and/or increasing attending behavior is a desirable goal. Spaulding (1978) has challenged this entire approach in terms of the effects of contingency management on overall personality development. He states that,
Studies of the use of principles of behavior modification in the classroom have also aimed at the reduction of "unacceptable" behaviors and have largely begged the question of effects of specific behavior control techniques (such as token economies) on long-term pupil outcomes such as self-control, achievement motivation, levels of aspiration, self-esteem (or self-concept), cognitive development, academic achievement, and interpersonal functioning. The findings for behavior modification are, however, relatively consistent and impressive (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974). Their remarkable consistency and dramatic results in highly controlled settings make behavior modification techniques highly attractive to those teachers who have strong impulses to control and direct and to those who are confronted with high frequencies of aggression, resistance and defiance in the classroom (p. 40).

Spaulding has applied the principles of contingency management to what he terms the control of deviancy in the classroom as a consequence of ego-enhancing behavior management techniques (Spaulding, 1978). In his CASES system (Coping Analysis Schedule for Educational Settings), pupil behavior is categorized in terms of normal personality development and socialization. Inclusive in his 13 categories of pupil coping behavior are the types of dependent variables typically seen in contingency management research. However, these typical variables (e.g. on-task) are integrated with personality and socialization concepts. Spaulding has reported success in training teachers to shape assertive, thoughtful and independent student behavior using this system in several tightly controlled experiments involving much clinical support for project teachers (Spaulding, 1971, 1972, 1977).
In a field-based application, Showers (1974) demonstrated that secondary school teachers (N=11) trained in the CASES system obtained significant decreases in aggressive student behavior and significant increases in appropriately self-directed, task oriented, socially integrative behavior. The control group (N=5) made no such gains.

In another vein, Allyn and Roberts (1974) stated that the contingency management procedures "have most often led to a strengthening of the status quo: that which measures teacher effectiveness not by increase in student performance, but by the maintenance of orderly, docile, obedient students." These same thoughts were also suggested by Winett and Winkler (1972), who objected to the lack of emphasis upon student academic performance. They attribute this lack to two factors. First, Winett and Winkler believe that many researchers are over zealous and intent on proving Skinnerian concepts. Second, they, along with Spaulding (1978) believe that researchers are reluctant to disagree with the values and goals of the schools.

While behavior modification procedures have been found to be very effective in classroom settings there appears to be another drawback to their use. Teachers do not generally employ behavior modification techniques after the experimental period is over for at least two reasons. They either compete for time with other classroom routines and/or they are not perceived as useful by the teacher
(Abidin, 1975; Lobitz & Burns, 1975; McNamara, 1975).

In an attempt to make behavior modification procedures more attractive to teachers, Lobitz and Burns (1975) devised a "least intrusive" behavior modification system ranging from less to more intrusive strategies to reduce a child's disruptive behavior. Teacher attention, private feedback and public feedback were the graduated strategies. As each strategy failed, the next was tried until the last, public feedback, reduced the disruptive behavior to below the class average. These findings suggest that systematic feedback from the teacher, with no additional contingencies, may be effective as an intervention strategy.

**Reality Therapy**

Glasser (1969) has suggested applications of what he calls reality therapy applied to classrooms. In his book *Schools Without Failure*, Glasser provides guidelines for both general classroom management and problem solving with disruptive and inappropriate pupil behavior. The title of the book illustrates Glasser's desire to create a constructive school atmosphere and not just a facilitative teacher-pupil relationship. To accomplish these ends, he advocates that classroom meetings be used by pupils and teachers jointly to (1) establish and adjust classroom rules, (2) develop new rules when needed and (3) deal with problems. This portion of Glasser's approach has not been as well
accepted as his problem solving steps because many teachers do not agree with pupil self-government while others find the procedure cumbersome (Brophy & Putnam, 1979). Glasser (1977) has outlined his problem solving approach as 10 steps for teachers to follow which do not require the use of his classroom meetings for rule setting.

1. Select a problem pupil that you could be successful with and list the techniques you use when this pupil is disruptive.

2. Analyze the list and determine which if any of the techniques are working—stop using the ones that don't work.

3. Communicate to the pupil that you care via praise and special attention (don't expect this to help immediately).

4. Deal with the next incidence of behavior disruption with objective questioning of what the pupil is doing—ask him/her to stop.

5. When the problem in 4 persists, repeat step 4 in depth and lead the pupil to explicate the acceptable behavior.

6. When the problem in 5 persists, engage the pupil in specific planning to avoid the reoccurrence of the problem situation.

7. When the problem in 6 continues, initiate time out procedures appropriate to elementary or secondary classrooms.
8. When the problem in 7 persists, initiate constructive in-school suspension procedures.

9. When in-school suspension does not control behavior, notify parents and arrange for the pupil to go home.

10. When out-of-school suspension does not control the behavior, refer the pupil to some other community agency.

Program evaluation (case study) presented by Glasser (1977) indicates that systematic application of the program has been associated with reduced office referrals, fighting and suspension. No further research demonstrating the effectiveness of reality therapy in classrooms could be found in the literature, although this approach has been widely disseminated in public schools (Brophy & Putnam, 1979; Glasser, 1978).

Teacher Effectiveness Training

Teacher Effectiveness Training (Gordon, 1974) stresses freedom, responsibility, and the abandonment of power and authority in favor of a "no lose" approach to managing deviancy in the classroom. To be successful with this approach, Gordon states

...the first hurdle to problem solving is the identification of problem ownership. Problems may be owned by the teacher, the students, or both. Unless accurate ownership is recognized by all parties involved,
solutions that will eliminate the problem will not be found because appropriate needs will not have been met (p. 47).

He suggests the use of several communication skills especially "I messages" and active listening. "I messages" link a specific pupil behavior as a cause to a specific effect on the teacher which leads to undesirable feelings. When this technique is employed in an objective, non-punitive way, pupils are more able to comply with rules than when traditional power and authority techniques are used (Gordon, 1974). Gordon has outlined a six-step problem solving approach to be used by a teacher when problems with deviant pupils arise: (1) define the problem, (2) generate possible solutions, (3) evaluate these problems, (4) decide which is best, (5) determine how to implement the decision and (6) assess the success of the decision.

Brophy and Putnam (1979) have observed that Gordon's teacher effectiveness training is the approach undergoing the most vigorous dissemination today. However, research demonstrating its effects (either immediate or long term) could not be located in the research literature. While it is quite possible that local school districts conduct some form of program evaluation when implementing this program, they have not been published in the literature (Martin, 1983).

Several conclusions to this section of the synthesis seem relevant. First, with the exception of applications
of contingency management principles, research is lacking as to the effectiveness of current approaches. Even though Glasser cites significant reductions of problem behaviors there is no experimental evidence to verify his claim. Consequently, while Glasser and Gordon have offered approaches that appear to have face validity, it is unclear what specific effect these approaches have on deviant behaviors or the broader based dimensions suggested by Spaulding (1978) and Allyon and Roberts (1974). Second, the degree to which teachers are consistent in managing deviancy may be as important as the system chosen. For example Kounin's (1970) research indicated that withitness (the accuracy and speed with which a teacher reacted to deviance) was more important than what approach the teacher used during a desist incident. Further, Brophy and Putnam's (1979) comments regarding the mutuality of Glasser's and Gordon's approaches highlights the fact that there are more similarities than differences among most of the approaches reviewed. An illustration of this is the fact that all approaches reviewed emphasized a steering away from power and authority which rely on scaring pupils into conformity. Third, despite the promise that contingency management techniques hold, there is much controversy about their use. As previously cited, the desirability of focusing on deviant behavior in isolation is questionable. The results of researchers such as Spaulding (1978), Winett and Winkler (1972)
and Edwards (1980) all demonstrate that deviant behavior can be reduced by focusing on social and academic variables. It seems advisable then to include not only dependent measures of deviant behavior in future research, but cognitive and affective variables as well. This may help to avoid the skepticism with which many educators view contingency management techniques (Abidin, 1975; Brophy & Putnam, 1979).
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CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Design

The experimental design used in this study was a variation of the posttest only control group design as defined by Campbell and Stanley (1963). This design is diagrammed by these authors as

\[
\begin{array}{c}
R_m \times O_1 \\
\hline
R_m \quad O_2
\end{array}
\]

\(R_m\) represents the random assignment of matched pairs of volunteering teachers to the experimental and control conditions. For the purposes of this study, teachers were matched on the quantity and problem severity of behaviorally disordered pupils in their classes. \(X\) stands for the treatment (i.e. the in-service training). Observations of experimental and control groups are represented by \(O_1\) and \(O_2\) respectively on the following dependent measures:

1. teacher deviancy management scores,
2. pupil rating of classroom environment,
3. pupil compliance scores,
4. frequency of requested parent-teacher conferences,
5. frequency of office referrals,
6. pupil absentee rates and
7. pupil completion of assignment rate. Campbell and
Stanley (1963) report this design as a true experimental design because through the random assignment to groups, it controls for most threats to internal validity such as selection, history, maturation, and statistical regression. In addition, the threat of testing and instrumentation are overcome because there is no pretesting. This design is considered to be as good or better than a pretest, post-test design when there is no question of the genuine randomness of assignment (Huck, Cormier & Bounds, 1974; Isaac & Michael, 1971).

Subjects

The subjects for this study were teachers drawn from the urban junior secondary schools in School District #57, Prince George, British Columbia. School District #57 serves a small urban center and a far-reaching rural area with a total population of approximately 125,000 and a pupil population of 21,000. There are 11 junior secondary schools, five of which are part of larger high school complexes. Only the eight urban junior secondary schools were used as a population pool in order to obtain a homogeneously urban sample. These urban schools draw from all socio-economic levels and include North American Indian, East Indian, and Oriental minorities. The predominant culture is white.

Prior to recruitment of subjects, permission to proceed with the research project was secured from the
superintendent of schools. Teachers were then informed of the project via a memo from the superintendent to the principals. This memo was followed up with a brief presentation by the experimenter during regularly scheduled staff meetings. Teachers were solicited on a volunteer basis with the only incentive being the opportunity to improve their skills in dealing with inappropriate and disruptive behavior through a one day in-service program and one hour of in-school follow up. A total of 28 teachers volunteered initially.

The District's efforts with special students is heavily concentrated at the elementary level and there is no formal screening of behaviorally disordered pupils at the junior secondary level. As a result, the identification of behaviorally disordered pupils for this study was made using a procedure designed by Kelly, Bullock and Dykes (1977). In this procedure, behavioral dimensions and terminology (e.g. conduct disorder, immature personality) are avoided and a three-level service classification scheme related to the severity of the problem is the criterion by which teachers make judgments. This approach to identifying the behaviorally disordered is supported by several researchers (Bullock & Brown, 1972; Nelson, 1971; Ulman, 1952) who have concluded that teachers are in close agreement with mental health professionals when discriminating normal pupils from those with behavioral disorders.
Experimental Conditions

The study was carried out in three phases allowing for (1) the identification of behaviorally disordered pupils and subsequent assignment of teachers to experimental or control groups, (2) in-service training and follow-up and (3) posttesting.

Phase I—Identification of Pupils

Volunteering teachers were asked by letter (Appendix A) to use the following classification scheme and nominate pupils in each of their classes as needing services for their inappropriate and/or disruptive behavior.

1. Mild behavioral problem pupils are those pupils who can be helped adequately by the regular classroom teacher and/or other school resource personnel through periodic counseling and/or short term individual attention and instruction.

2. Moderate behavioral problem pupils are those pupils who can remain at their assigned school but who would benefit from intensive help from one or more educational specialists (e.g. counselors and special educators) and/or specialists from community agencies (e.g. mental health clinics and diagnostic centers).

3. Severe behavioral problem pupils are those pupils who would benefit from assignment to a special
class or a special school.

A total of 323 pupils, 249 males and 74 females, was identified. However, no data analysis was conducted regarding sex differences. Teachers were then matched based on a quantity and problem severity ratio of behaviorally disordered to normal pupils in their classes. The numerical value of the service classifications for each pupil nominated by a teacher were added and then divided by the number of pupils in the nominating teacher's class. The resulting fractional value was then converted to a percentage according to the following formula for ease in matching teachers.

\[
\frac{\text{Sum of service classification designations for all pupils nominated by a teacher}}{\text{Sum of all pupils in nominating teacher's classes where pupils were identified}} = xxx
\]

A total of 23 of the original 28 volunteering teachers provided pupil nominations. One teacher was randomly drawn and dropped from the study so that groups with equal N's could be formed. As a result, 11 matched pairs were formed and randomly assigned to the experimental or control group (see Table 1). One matched pair was deleted when a control group teacher dropped out of the study and the corresponding experimental teacher had a student teacher assigned during the data collection period. Consequently, data was analyzed for 10 matched pairs of teachers.
Table 1

Experimental and Control Group Assignment Based on Percentage of Behaviorally Disordered Pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Pair</th>
<th>Experimental Teachers</th>
<th>Control Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>8.15 %</td>
<td>9.07 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>12.00 %</td>
<td>11.86 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>13.73 %</td>
<td>13.61 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>14.48 %</td>
<td>14.93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>16.53 %</td>
<td>17.98 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>18.18 %</td>
<td>18.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>18.91 %</td>
<td>19.55 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>19.90 %</td>
<td>20.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>21.33 %</td>
<td>21.76 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>23.37 %</td>
<td>22.20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>26.13 %</td>
<td>24.31 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase II--Treatment

The experimental group received the LEAST workshop as the independent variable. The eight hour, one day workshop was conducted in March, 1983 by the experimenter. At the conclusion of the workshop an additional one half hour of record-keeping instruction was provided to familiarize experimental teachers with the format required to collect data on identified behaviorally disordered pupils for the dependent variables of (1) frequency of requested parent-teacher conferences, (2) frequency of office referrals, (3) attendance and (4) completion of assignments (Appendix C). While teachers often kept this information voluntarily, the format helped to ensure that all data was uniformly recorded. Within 10 school days following the LEAST workshop,
the experimenter consulted with each experimental group teacher for one hour after making a follow up observation of one class period per teacher.

During the treatment phase teachers in the control group engaged in the regular activities of the school. Control teachers were contacted individually by the experimenter for the dual purpose of (1) explaining the record-keeping format and (2) encouraging control teachers to be diligent in their record keeping. Since teachers in the experimental and control groups often worked in the same school, both groups were advised to talk about problem pupils as they normally would, but to avoid asking or telling about the LEAST workshop or follow-up.

**Phase III—Posttesting**

Posttesting consisted of (1) training of raters and their subsequent collection of classroom observational data pertinent to teachers' deviancy management skills, (2) classroom records maintained by project teachers and (3) administration of the Classroom Environment Scale. Complete data records were collected for all but one of the 11 pairs of teachers.

A two-month period was allowed for teachers to keep records on the pertinent dependent variables (i.e. parent-teacher conferences, office referrals, attendance, and completion of assignments). In the 6th week of this time
period, the trained raters observed each experimental and control group teacher for two class-periods using Kounin's Deviancy Management Rating Scales (Appendix B) and Kounin's Student Compliance Rating Scale (Appendix E) as the observational instruments. During the first day of the last week of the two-month period, teachers administered the Classroom Environment Scale (CES) (Appendix D) to each class where behaviorally disordered pupils had been identified. Coded forms of the CES were discretely given to each identified behaviorally disordered pupil while the rest of the class received an uncoded form. While only scores of identified behaviorally disordered pupils were used in the data analysis, this procedure avoided a focus on these pupils and thereby reduced one source of testing bias.

**Description of the Treatment**

The LEAST Approach to Discipline is described by its authors (Carkhuff, Griffen & Mallory, 1978) as a simple strategy that can be used by classroom teachers to deal with disruptive and inappropriate behavior. The program is reportedly based on research into the effective ingredients of teaching and learning (Aspy, 1977; Carkhuff, 1979; Carkhuff, 1981). LEAST is an acronym for the following sequential options a teacher should choose from in dealing with disruptive and inappropriate behavior.
Option #1 Leave disruptive and inappropriate behavior alone when no problems are likely to ensue.

Option #2 End disruptive and inappropriate behavior indirectly when the behavior is interfering with classroom activities.

Option #3 Attend more fully when information regarding causes for disruptive and inappropriate behavior are necessary to resolve the situation.

Option #4 Spell out the problem and desired behavior when further learning is impossible.

Option #5 Track pupil behavior to evaluate and reinforce progress.

The fifth item in the sequence, track pupil behavior, is not an option in dealing with misbehavior; it is considered an essential part of the overall strategy (Carkhuff, Griffen & Mallory, 1978). Basic to the strategy is the notion that while there is some behavior that all teachers would agree is disruptive or inappropriate, there is much behavior that affects different teachers in different ways. Therefore, while guidelines are clearly defined by authors, it is ultimately each individual teacher's responsibility to determine the nature and seriousness of the misbehavior in relation to his or her own expectations. With these guiding principles in mind the four options and one "must" of the
LEAST strategy were presented. Instruction for each option included a didactic presentation in which terms were defined, a rationale for the use of each option was discussed, and clear guidelines for selecting each option were given.

Following the didactic presentation, the workshop leader provided representative examples of circumstances in which each option might be used. Each trainee was then asked to describe situations from his or her classroom which would be appropriately dealt with using the option under discussion. Finally, each trainee was asked to react to role-play situations created by other trainees and discuss the option selected based on the guidelines for that option.

Materials used during the workshop included a trainee's guide (Appendix F), a facilitator's guide (Appendix G) and handouts and overheads prepared by the experimenter. The trainee's guide was presented to the trainees with instruction to use it for reference and further refinement of the workshop skills.

Following the workshop, the experimenter consulted with each trainee for one class-period. The class was chosen by the trainee with encouragement given by the experimenter to selecting a class that contained a high ratio of nominated behaviorally disordered pupils. The intent of this consultation was to (1) reinforce each trainee's attempts to apply the LEAST strategy, (2) make suggestions as to how unique problems could be dealt with using the strategy and
(3) encourage further reading of the trainee's guide to maintain and refine the skills learned in the workshop.

The Trainers

The experimenter was the trainer for the LEAST workshop. While the trainer received no direct instruction in the LEAST strategy, he had previously received instruction in related programs from two of LEAST's authors. The program also includes a detailed facilitator's manual. The trainer for the raters was an individual who has had extensive experience in the observation of classroom behavior and the training of raters (Roebuck, Aspy, Sadler & Willson, 1973; Williams, 1983). The rater trainer was not informed of the experimental/control group status of the teacher-trainees thus avoiding the possibility of communicating any expectations to the raters.

The Raters

Five raters were trained to observe and record data on Kounin's Deviancy Management Rating Scales and Kounin's Student Compliance Rating Scales. The raters were special education program administrators in the school district. They had knowledge of the study but were naive as to the training protocol or the experimental/control group status of the project teachers.

For purposes of training, 20 hours of junior secondary classroom activities were recorded on videotape. To avoid
any biasing effect to project teachers, these tapes were made with teachers from a junior secondary school which did not participate in the study. These tapes were reviewed by the rater trainer to identify segments of the tapes which would be representative examples of the various dimensions of Kounin's scales. Subsequently, raters received a total of 10 hours of training and practice in the use of the scales. To facilitate training and actual classroom rating, Kounin's deviancy management scales were transformed from their original form to a low inference check list (Appendix G). To determine the reliability of each rater with a criterion (i.e. the rater trainer), 10 video segments not used during training were rated. Rater-criterion reliability was checked twice, once for reliability of the deviancy management scales and once for reliability of the student compliance scale. While all rater trainees reached the predetermined level of \( r = .75 \) for the student compliance scale \( (r = .88 \) or higher), one of the five failed to reach the .75 reliability level on the deviancy management scales. Therefore, this individual was not used to rate the actual classroom observations. Reliability was calculated using the following formula.

\[
r = \frac{\# \text{ agreements} - \# \text{ disagreements}}{\text{total \# of agreements & disagreements}}
\]
Measuring Instruments

The following are descriptions of the measuring instruments used in this study. The scores of these instruments served as the seven dependent variables.

Kounin's Deviancy Management Rating Scales were used to determine deviancy management scores. These scales were specifically designed to study the deviancy management styles of teachers in naturalistic classroom settings. Each scale which was used measures the qualitative dimension of deviancy management including clarity, firmness, child treatment, and withitness (Appendix B). Constructs for the scales were developed from experts' analyses of classroom observations and for that reason are deemed to have construct validity (Kounin & Gump, 1958; Kounin et al., 1966). Inter-rater reliability has been reported as $r=.81$ for combined ratings of all scales (Kounin et al., 1966).

Kounin's Student Compliance Rating Scale is a seven-point behavioral scale ranging from open defiance to immediate, quick and enthusiastic conformity to the teacher's attempt to manage the pupil's deviancy. As with Kounin's deviancy management scales it was developed specifically for the purpose of measuring a deviant pupil's reaction to teacher attempts to manage the deviancy. Inter-rater reliability has been calculated at $r=.97$ (Kounin et al., 1966). This scale was selected because it is a companion to Kounin's deviancy management scales and will allow the
deviant incident to be rated in its entirety.

The Classroom Environment Scale is designed to assess the social climates of junior and senior high school classrooms (Appendix D). It is reported to focus on teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil relationships and on the organizational structure of the class (Moos & Tricket, 1973). The instrument was developed under the premise that an individual's characterization of his or her environment constitutes a measure of environmental climate and that this climate influences behavior. The scale consists of 90 items measuring the four broad dimensions of relationship, goal orientation, system maintenance and system change. Internal consistency for the scale ranges from $r=.86$ to $.67$ across subscales. Intercorrelations are around $r=.25$ indicating distinct though related aspects of classroom environments. The short form of the scale (Form S) consists of 36 items and the authors report a correlation of above .80 between Form D (90 items) and Form S (Moos & Tricket, 1973). The correlation indicates that very similar results are obtained using either form. The short form was used in this study to reduce classroom time needed for testing and to increase the probability of honest responses. The short term profile stability of the CES is reported as $r=.91$ (two week test-retest).

The remainder of the dependent variables (requested parent-teacher conferences for the purpose of discipline,
office referrals, attendance, and assignment completions) were collected from school records.

**Statistical Analysis of the Data**

Because there were multiple dependent variables, a multivariate statistical procedure was required. In the instance of this study, Hotelling's $T^2$ was selected. This technique compares the means of the multiple dependent variables adjusting for possible correlations among the dependent variables and reducing the probability of a dependent variable being found significant by chance alone. The $T^2$ test was applied to the dependent variables of (1) teachers' scores on Kounin's deviancy management scales, (2) pupil compliance scores, (3) pupil responses to the classroom environment scale, (4) pupil absenteeism, (5) office referrals, (6) parent-teacher conferences and (7) completion of assignments. Subsequently, univariate $t$-tests were used as a follow-up test to ascertain which of the dependent variables contributed to any measured effect. While a .05 significance level was set, all levels are reported and discussed.
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CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results of the study are presented in two sections. First, the general results are presented for the main analysis. Secondly, the specific hypotheses are restated and the statistical findings pertaining to each one are analyzed and interpreted.

General Results

The seven dependent variables in the study were the scores derived from (1) Kounin's Deviency Management Rating Scales, (2) the Classroom Environment Scale, (3) Kounin's Student Compliance Rating Scale, (4) office referrals for disciplinary purposes, (5) teacher-parent conferences for disciplinary purposes, (6) pupil absenteeism and (7) number of completed assignments. Data was analyzed for the experimental and control group using the $T^2$ procedure as defined by Hotelling (Finn, 1974; Morrison, 1967). Table 2 summarizes the posttest data for the experimental and control groups, reporting the differences among group means when all variables are taken together.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotelling $T^2$</th>
<th>138.571</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$F$ Value</td>
<td>13.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>7, 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .001$. N=10 matched pairs.

The results of Table 2 indicate that the experimental group was significantly different than the control group at less than the .001 level significance. Since a significant difference exists, follow up tests are necessary to determine which of the seven dependent variables is contributing to the overall main effect. Furthermore, since the $T^2$ test is a two-tailed test, follow up tests are required to determine if the differences are in the expected direction. One accepted follow up test to the $T^2$ test is a series of univariate $t$-tests (Finn, 1974). This procedure was selected because it not only tests for significance at a specified level (i.e. .05) but it also reports the actual level of statistical significance of each univariate test. These characteristics allow for a more meaningful discussion of nonsignificant results.

**Testing the Hypotheses**

Hypothesis 1 states: The mean deviancy management score will be significantly higher for experimental teachers than
their control counterparts as measured by Kounin's Deviancy Management Rating Scales. Table 3 summarizes the data that tested this hypothesis.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>18.914</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>2.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>16.581</td>
<td>2.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01 for 18 df. N=10 matched pairs.

The results indicate that the mean score of the experimental group is higher than the control group in the expected direction. Since the t value of 2.95 is significant at the .01 alpha level or better, the research hypothesis is allowed to stand and the null hypothesis of no difference is rejected. The conclusion is drawn that LEAST trained teachers have a greater repertoire of responses when managing deviancy than their untrained counterparts.

Hypothesis 2 states: The mean classroom environment score will be significantly higher for behaviorally disordered pupils of experimental teachers than their control counterparts as measured by the Classroom Environment Scale. Table 4 summarizes the data that tested this hypothesis.
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>22.288</td>
<td>1.970</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>21.218</td>
<td>2.761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at .05 for 18 df. N=10 matched pairs.

There is no significant difference between experimental and control group teachers with regard to their pupil responses to the Classroom Environment Scale. Since the $t$ value of 1.00 does not reach significance until the .33 alpha level, the research hypothesis is not allowed to stand, and the null hypothesis of no difference is accepted. The conclusion is drawn that behaviorally disordered pupils of LEAST trained teachers do not respond more favorably to indices of classroom environment than behaviorally disordered pupils of untrained teachers as measured by the Classroom Environment Scale.

Hypothesis 3 states: The mean pupil compliance rating to teacher attempts to manage deviancy will be significantly higher for behaviorally disordered pupils of experimental teachers than their control counterparts as measured by Kounin's Student Compliance Rating Scale. Table 5 summarizes the data that tested this hypothesis.
Table 5

$t$-Test of Experimental and Control Group Differences
On Pupil Compliance to Teacher
Attempts to Manage Deviancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>-4.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.540</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .01$ for 18 df. $N=10$ matched pairs.

The experimental group mean is lower than the control group mean. Since this difference is in the expected direction and the $t$ value of 4.58 is significant at the .01 alpha level or better, the research hypothesis is allowed to stand and the null hypothesis of no difference is rejected. The conclusion is drawn that LEAST trained teachers' behaviorally disordered pupils are more compliant than their untrained counterparts.

Hypothesis 4 states: The mean number of office referrals for disciplinary purposes will be significantly lower for behaviorally disordered pupils of experimental teachers than their control counterparts as measured by office-kept records during a two-month period. Table 6 summarizes the data which tested this hypothesis.

The experimental group mean is lower than the control group mean and the difference is in the expected direction. The $t$ value in this comparison is significant at below
Table 6

$t$-Test of Experimental and Control Group Office Referrals of Behaviorally Disordered Pupils for Disciplinary Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.977</td>
<td>-2.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>7.900</td>
<td>3.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .02$ for 18 df. $N=10$ matched pairs.

the .02 alpha level. Therefore, the research hypothesis is allowed to stand and the null hypothesis of no difference is rejected. The conclusion is drawn that LEAST trained teachers send significantly fewer behaviorally disordered pupils to the office for disciplinary purposes than their untrained counterparts.

Hypothesis 5 states: The mean number of teacher-parent conferences for disciplinary purposes will be significantly lower for behaviorally disordered pupils of experimental teachers than their control counterparts as measured by teacher-kept records for a two-month period. Table 7 summarizes the data that tested this hypothesis.

The control group mean is lower than the experimental group. While the difference is not in the expected direction, it is slight and the $t$ value is not significant at the .05 level ($p < .92$). The research hypothesis is not allowed to stand and the null hypothesis of no difference
Table 7

Table 7

$t$-Test of Experimental and Control Group Parent Conferences for Disciplinary Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>1.874</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.700</td>
<td>2.908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at .05 for 18 df. N=10 matched pairs.

is accepted. The conclusion is drawn that there is no difference in the number of parent conferences requested by LEAST trained teachers when compared to their untrained counterparts.

Hypothesis 6 states: The mean number of absences will be significantly lower for behaviorally disordered pupils of experimental teachers than their control counterparts as measured by official school records during a two-month period. Table 8 summarizes the data that tested this hypothesis.

Table 8

Table 8

$t$-Test of Experimental and Control Group Absences of Behaviorally Disordered Pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>39.30</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at .05 for 18 df. N=10 matched pairs.
The experimental group mean is larger than the control group and the difference is in the expected direction. However, since the t value does not reach significance at the .05 level (p<.50) the research hypothesis is not allowed to stand, and the null hypothesis of no difference is accepted. The conclusion is drawn that LEAST training does not result in better attendance of behaviorally disordered pupils.

Hypothesis 7 states: The mean number of non-completed assignments will be significantly lower for behaviorally disordered pupils of experimental teachers than their control counterparts as measured by a two-month sample of assignments. Table 9 summarizes the data that tested this hypothesis.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-Test of Experimental and Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviorally Disordered Pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>57.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>34.74</td>
<td>58.37</td>
<td>1.49*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at .05 for 18 df.
N=10 matched pairs.

The mean of the experimental group is lower than the control group and this difference is in the expected direction. However, since the t value does not reach significance
at the .05 level ($p < .16$) the research hypothesis is not allowed to stand and the null hypothesis of no difference is accepted. The conclusion is drawn that LEAST trained teachers do not significantly affect the completion of assignment rate of their behaviorally disordered pupils.
Aspy, C. Personal communication, December, 1982.


The specific behavior of teachers in the act of managing deviancy has been quantified. However, most training approaches to dealing with deviant classroom behavior have not been empirically tested. Consequently, the specific effects of these programs on regular and behaviorally disordered pupils is unknown. When validating research has been conducted on the contingency management approach, critics have questioned (1) its long term effects on deviant behavior as well as its long and short term effects on social-affective variables associated with constructive personality growth and (2) the reluctance of teachers to use contingency management in the absence of school psychologists and/or university researchers. The primary focus of this study was to determine the effectiveness of one program believed to be particularly relevant to dealing with the behaviorally disordered.

The program in question is entitled the LEAST Approach to Discipline and has been described as a set of sequential strategies that can be used by classroom teachers to deal with disruptive and inappropriate behavior. It has particular appeal to the field of special education because of
its compatibility with the principle of a least restrictive environment for dealing with exceptional pupils. Furthermore, the brief training time required and the detailed trainer's guide make the LEAST approach one that would be easy to implement on a wide scale.

Summary

The Purpose

The purpose of the study was to obtain information which would help determine answers to two questions. (1) Do junior high school teachers trained in the LEAST Approach to Discipline exhibit superior deviancy management skills over their untrained counterparts? (2) Do behaviorally disordered pupils of junior high school teachers trained in the LEAST approach respond more favorably to these teachers than to the control group teachers?

The Sample

The sample used in this study consisted of junior high teachers who had unserved and unidentified behaviorally disordered pupils in their classrooms. These teachers were drawn from junior secondary classrooms in a small urban area of British Columbia, Canada. A total of 28 teachers out of a possible 175 volunteered. Complete data records were obtained on 10 experimental and 10 control group teachers.
The Procedure

The study followed a posttest only control group design. Before the study began, teachers who volunteered were asked to nominate and classify unserved behaviorally disordered pupils in their classrooms using a service classification scheme. Teachers were matched based on the quantity and problem severity of behaviorally disordered pupils and then randomly assigned to experimental and control groups.

The experimental group received eight hours of LEAST training and one hour of follow-up classroom observation and discussion. The LEAST training session consisted of (1) a didactic presentation in which terms were defined, (2) a rationale for the use of each option explained, (3) representative examples given of when each option would be used and (4) role-play situations enacted in which each teacher practiced the various options and discussed their performance. Following training, a two-month period ensued in which data pertinent to the seven dependent variables was collected. The control group received no treatment.

Statistical Analysis

Hotelling's $T^2$ was the primary statistical treatment applied to the data collected from experimental and control group teachers. Follow-up analyses using univariate $t$-tests were applied to determine which of the seven dependent variables were contributing to any overall significant effect.
Results

The results of this study indicate that teachers trained in the LEAST Approach to Discipline are more effective at managing deviancy than their untrained counterparts and have pupils who subsequently respond more favorably to them on selected measures of social and academic success. The data demonstrates that at the conclusion of the study the experimental group scored significantly better than the control group on a composite measure of the seven dependent variables ($p < .001$). Follow-up tests to this composite measure indicate that three of the seven dependent variables accounted for the main effect, namely level of teacher deviancy management skills, level of student compliance and number of office referrals for disciplinary purposes. A fourth variable, noncompletion of assignments, showed a favorable trend for the experimental group ($p < .16$). Measures of classroom environment, pupil attendance and parent conferences showed no significant effects.

Findings

The findings drawn from this study are based on the results of the statistical analyses of the measuring instrument scores which were reported in Chapter IV. These findings correspond to the seven hypotheses stated in Chapter I.
1. Training in the LEAST Approach to Discipline resulted in significantly higher deviancy management skills for experimental teachers than for their control group counterparts ($p < .001$).

2. The analysis of group data on pupils' perception of classroom environment resulted in no significant difference between experimental and control groups ($p < .33$).

3. The analysis of group data for pupil compliance to teacher deviancy management attempts resulted in significantly more favorable scores for the experimental group ($p < .01$).

4. The analysis of group data for the number of office referrals for disciplinary purposes resulted in significantly fewer referrals for the experimental group ($p < .02$).

5. The analysis of group data for the number of teacher-parent conferences resulted in no significant difference between experimental and control groups ($p < .92$).

6. The analysis of group data on the number of absences of behaviorally disordered pupils revealed no significant differences between experimental and control groups ($p < .50$).

7. The analysis of group data for the number of non-completed assignments resulted in no significant
differences between experimental and control groups ($p < .16$).

These results provide support for the use of the LEAST Approach to Discipline with junior high school teachers who have behaviorally disordered pupils in their classes. This finding is encouraging and suggests that behaviorally disordered pupils can be helped to better adjust to mainstream classes with a minimal amount of teacher training time (8 hours).

**Conclusions**

With regard to Hypothesis 1, it can be concluded that teachers trained in the LEAST Approach to Discipline exhibited significantly more appropriate deviancy management skills based on constructs designed to measure deviancy management (i.e. Kounin's scales). However, the main analysis of the data did not indicate which of the constructs contributed to the experimental and control group differences. Therefore, a further analysis of the data was conducted. Mean subscale scores on clarity, firmness, child treatment and withitness that comprise the total deviancy management score in this study were computed for experimental and control group teachers. These scores were then subjected to a $T^2$ procedure to determine which of the subscores accounted for the group differences. The results of this analysis indicated that experimental teachers outperformed control
teachers on three of the four subscales ($p<.02$). Specifically, the subscale scores for clarity, firmness, and withitness favored the experimental group while child treatment showed no difference between groups.

The additional analysis of the data for Hypothesis 1 is not only statistically significant, but also practically meaningful. First, the finding that LEAST trained teachers offer more clarity than untrained teachers when managing deviancy suggests that when an incident occurs, the deviant pupil(s) will receive specific instructions on what is expected. This specificity includes who is deviant, what to stop doing, what to start doing (i.e. acceptable behavior) and why the pupil should comply. Second, the finding that LEAST trained teachers are more decisive when managing deviancy than untrained teachers suggests that when a pupil is deviant the teacher will communicate that he or she expects the pupil to comply by making a clear geographical break from a previous activity, physically attending to the deviant pupil and using a tone of voice that stands out and is clear. Finally, and perhaps of greatest significance, LEAST trained teachers are more accurate than untrained teachers in their attempts to manage deviancy. That is, given an incident the teacher perceives as serious enough to respond to, he or she identifies the actual deviant pupil(s), overlooks insignificant misbehavior and does not
let the incident spread to other pupils or increase in intensity. In light of the experiential and research findings on teachers' general lack of strategies to deal with deviant behavior (Brophy & Putnam, 1979; Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1980; Morse, 1975; Shea, 1978) and reliance on punishment as a management technique (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1980; Kounin, 1970; White, 1975) these results are impressive.

There are several aspects of the LEAST program which are here hypothesized to account for these results. Elements of both clarity and firmness are built into the sequential steps of the program. Thus, during the workshop, teachers learned to perform behaviors such as making a geographical break from a previous activity, physically attending to deviant pupils, and giving clear directions as to who should stop doing what and what appropriate activity to start doing. The results for withitness are not so easily explained. It is not clear why teachers would be more accurate as a result of using the LEAST approach. One possible explanation is that the program provides a framework for teachers to use when analyzing deviant behavior. By using this framework teachers may have become more attentive to pupils and their behavior thus allowing for more accurate discriminations about deviant behavior.

The child treatment construct showed no difference between the experimental group and control groups. Child
treatment is defined by Kounin (1970) as behavior which demonstrates that the teacher is genuinely trying to protect the pupil from harm. Thus, the teacher could be protecting the pupil from disciplinary action, failing grades or physical danger. The opposite extreme of child treatment is a punitive attitude on the part of the teacher. Thus the teacher would communicate anger and sarcasm as well as threats and punishment when interacting with a pupil who is deviant. The LEAST program does not address this construct. It is this investigator's opinion that a significant change in teacher attitude would have to occur before measures of child treatment would show a significant difference. Clearly, the program is an action-oriented approach to changing teacher behavior with the underlying assumption that changes in attitude follow changes in behavior. While this assumption may be true, it did not affect the child treatment construct in this study.

Hypotheses 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 were designed to determine what effect LEAST trained teachers had on behaviorally disordered pupils in their classes. The analysis of the data revealed that two of these six hypotheses demonstrated that LEAST trained teachers had significantly better scores than their control counterparts. The remaining four hypotheses showed no significant differences at the .05 alpha level or better. Specifically, trained teachers had (1) pupils who were more compliant to their
teachers' attempts to manage deviancy (Hypothesis 3), (2) fewer incidences of office referrals (Hypothesis 4) and (3) a tendency to have behaviorally disordered pupils who completed more assignments (Hypothesis 7).

These findings are important for several reasons. Regarding Hypothesis 3, it is not only statistically significant but practically significant that pupils were more compliant to LEAST trained teachers. While teacher deviancy management skills were significantly higher for the experimental group (Hypothesis 1), this would be relatively meaningless if pupils did not react more positively to their teachers. Regarding Hypothesis 4, it can be concluded that LEAST trained teachers were less reliant on school authority to solve their discipline problems. Apparently, they do not reach the impass or the "I've had it with you" state with a behaviorally disordered pupil that untrained teachers do. As a result, they do not seek help in the form of authority from the principal as frequently as do untrained teachers. The support of this hypothesis suggests that the effects of the LEAST program may go beyond the immediate deviancy incident and translate into a reduced incidence of chronic misbehavior that usually results in office referral. This is a tenuous conclusion and one that deserves further investigation with more sophisticated measuring instruments.
The analysis of the data for Hypothesis 7 revealed that completion of assignments was not significantly affected by LEAST trained teachers. It was anticipated that an improved relationship between a behaviorally disordered pupil and a LEAST trained teacher would result in a positive effect on this academic factor. Nevertheless, it must be concluded that LEAST training does not result in such effects. The lack of a significant finding for Hypothesis 4 is consistent with the observations of researchers such as Edwards (1980) and Winett and Winkler (1972) that programs must be designed specifically to improve the academic performance of behaviorally disordered pupils in order to accomplish this end.

Hypotheses 2, 5 and 6 were not supported and conclusions regarding them are presented below. Regarding Hypothesis 2, data analysis revealed that the classroom environment scores showed no difference between experimental and control groups ($p = .33$). It can be concluded that LEAST training had no effect on how behaviorally disordered pupils saw themselves in relation to their teacher or classmates. Since the Classroom Environment Scale is comprised of nine subscales, a further analysis of the data was conducted to determine if any differences could be found. The CES subscale scores were analyzed according to the four dimensions presented by its authors (Moos &
Experimental and control group means were computed for the dimensions of relationship, personal development, system maintenance and system change. An analysis of group differences using the $T^2$ procedure revealed no significance for any of the dimensions. Therefore, it can be concluded that student perceptions of classroom environment as measured by the Classroom Environment Scale were not affected by LEAST training. This finding may be true due to (1) the time period not being sufficient for a major shift in student perceptions, (2) the broadbased nature of the instrument, and/or (3) the brief training period (8 hours).

Regarding hypotheses 5 and 6, data analysis revealed that neither of these variables were affected by LEAST trained teachers. There is no clear-cut explanation as to why Hypothesis 6 was not significant except that absence from school can be affected by many factors, and cannot be readily explained in terms of teachers’ deviancy management skills. The results for Hypothesis 5 (parent conferences) were somewhat contradictory to those of Hypothesis 4 (office referrals). On the one hand, LEAST trained teachers referred fewer students to the office for disciplinary reasons but on the other hand requested the same number of parent conferences as did the control group.
A survey of experimental teachers on this point revealed that they perceived the issue of misbehavior as relative. That is, they did not perceive a reduced need to interact with parents on the issue of misbehavior even though the overall rate of misbehavior may have been reduced as a result of the training program. Furthermore, in most cases, experimental teachers felt talking to parents regarding serious deviant behavior was more productive than an office referral.

**Implications**

The present findings seem to have implications for both secondary school teachers and their behaviorally disordered pupils. First of all, the results of this study imply that deviancy management skills per se are effective in managing deviant behavior independent of broader based classroom management skills. This finding is somewhat contradictory to previous research (Borg & Ascione, 1979; Kounin et al., 1970) and the current thinking of others (Brophy & Putnam, 1979; Doyle, 1979) who believe that deviancy management skills do not contribute significantly to the overall effectiveness of the classroom teacher. They contend that broader based concepts of classroom management are more promising areas upon which to focus. The current study, however, indicates that teachers who have been
trained to manage deviancy do so more effectively independent of more broadly based classroom management skills. This implication does not negate current thinking, but rather puts it into a clearer perspective. Teacher trainers who attempt to engage teachers in broad based classroom management strategies may find their efforts thwarted by a teacher incapable of experimenting with these techniques because of a classroom which is out of control. In these instances, it may be more effective to engage the teacher in a short-term, effective training program such as the LEAST approach. In this way, the teacher may, as a result of gaining control of his/her classroom, be more receptive to broad based changes in classroom management.

Further support for this notion comes in the form of subjective reports from the project teachers. All experimental group teachers expressed increased satisfaction with their ability to deal with deviant behavior. To paraphrase the teachers' words, they were more relaxed and in control of deviancy because they had a system with which to analyze and act on misbehavior. The most succinct comment was reported by two teachers—"I don't take it [misbehavior] so personally any more and that makes it a lot easier to deal with the problem objectively." These subjective reports lend some insight into research findings that revealed that teachers often exacerbate the very problems

Secondly, while it is not possible to make any data-based comparisons between the LEAST approach and other currently popular approaches (Teacher Effectiveness Training, Reality Therapy), it is possible to speculate on why the LEAST approach was effective in this study. One possible reason lies in the concept itself. The acronym embodies the philosophical base of the program that the least amount of deviancy management necessary to return the pupil to appropriate behavior is the appropriate amount.

The program has specific guidelines and a logical sequence for teachers to follow. After a brief training period it is possible for teachers to recall these guidelines from memory, or at most, teachers require them to be printed on an index card and left visible for their classroom reference. The teacher is, in effect, asked to commit a minimal amount of time and energy to starting to manage deviant behavior more effectively. This is significantly different from some other approaches which require considerable training before initiating the strategy and which may interfere with regular classroom routines (Lobitz & Burns, 1977). Also, the LEAST approach is not tied to any particular orientation such as Adlerian psychology,
Reality Therapy or Teacher Effectiveness Training. Rather, as its authors suggest, it provides a context within which the significant attributes of other approaches may be used. Therefore, it does not ask teachers to abandon previously learned techniques in favor of new ones. Instead, it requires that teachers set their own definitions of acceptable and unacceptable behavior and apply the LEAST guidelines using any techniques that are deemed effective.

Lastly, it appears that the LEAST Approach to Discipline demonstrates that the concept of the least restrictive environment can be extended beyond physical environments. Current thinking in special education advocates that the instruction of exceptional students should take place in the least restrictive environment (Hallahan & Kaufman, 1978). This has been implemented, for the most part, in the physical environment (i.e. regular classroom vs. self-contained, community-based vs. institutionally-based). The current study suggests that this concept can be successfully applied to the classroom interpersonal communications between teachers and their behaviorally disordered pupils.

Overall, this study presents process data which demonstrate that teachers can be trained to employ specific deviancy management skills with behaviorally disordered junior high school pupils using the LEAST approach. Furthermore, the significant improvements in pupil compliance
and office referrals demonstrate that the approach is
effective in managing deviant behavior. Yet several in-
adequacies exist which restrict generalization of the
findings. Foremost is the volunteer status of the project
teachers. It was not possible to sample from the total
population of secondary teachers in the school district.
Faced with this reality, teachers were solicited on a
volunteer basis. Less receptive teachers, who may be in
greatest need of improved deviancy management skills, were
not included in the study. Consequently, conclusions re-
garding the effects of the LEAST approach with the teacher
population at large cannot be made.

Another inadequacy of the present study is the limited
data collection period. Two months seems an adequate per-
id of time to observe changes in teacher and pupil behavior
in the context of this study. However, the stability of the
observed changes should be judged after a minimum of six
months. Consequently, conclusions regarding the long term
effects of the observed changes cannot be made.

Finally, the current study contained a control group
but no treatment control group. Consequently, there is no
way to determine the effects of the treatment apart from
a possible hawthorne effect. In this study, two common
sources of error may have included (1) novelty of the
treatment, and (2) awareness by experimental teachers that
they were participating in an experiment.
In conclusion, the results of this study provide strong support for the use of the LEAST approach with secondary teachers who have behaviorally disordered pupils in their classrooms. It is hoped that this particular investigation will serve to stimulate improvements in research and practice with teachers of the behaviorally disordered and the pupils themselves.

**Recommendations**

The results of this study, as in many research projects, are limited in the number and kind of generalizations possible. However, the results do suggest some recommendations for future research related to the present study. Such recommendations are as follows.

1. There is a need to conduct similar studies with a larger number of subjects in each group. This would serve to replicate the present study and improve the generalizability of the results.

2. There is a need to investigate the effects of the LEAST approach with a truly random sample of teachers. The use of volunteers raises important questions about the effect of the LEAST approach with a less motivated group.

3. There is a need to investigate the effects of the LEAST approach in comparison to other deviancy management strategies. It is not clear from the
present study if the same or more impressive results could be achieved with another approach.

4. There is a need to investigate the effects of the LEAST approach over an extended follow-up period. While two months was an adequate observation period to note significant changes, it is not sufficient to make generalizations as to the stability of change.

5. There is a need to investigate the effects of training teachers in deviancy management strategies on the punitive characteristics of these teachers in the act of managing deviancy. The current investigation provided no evidence of a reduction in punitiveness. Considering the consistent reports that teachers rely on punishment to the exclusion of other socialization techniques, the effects of the deviancy management techniques, and other approaches, should be investigated more specifically.

6. There is a need to investigate the effects of the number of training hours on teacher deviancy management skills and pupil outcomes. The current study employed the minimum training time employed by the authors (8 hours). It is possible that additional training time could lead to improved results.
7. There is a need to investigate the effects of the LEAST approach, and other deviancy management strategies, in school-wide research. The current investigation enlisted teachers from several schools. The potential supportive effects of an entire school may produce more favorable results than did the current study.

8. There is a need to investigate the effects of deviancy management approaches on the long-term incidence of deviant behavior. It is significant that the LEAST approach is effective in improving teacher deviancy management skills and student compliance. However, the current study does not reveal if such techniques can or do reduce naturally occurring rates of misbehavior.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER TO TEACHERS REQUESTING IDENTIFICATION OF BEHAVIORALLY DISORDERED PUPILS

March 10, 1982

Dear

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the Least project. Regardless of your status - training or control group - I think you will find that your involvement was worth the time. Before you are told which group you have been assigned to please use the information below to identify pupils in your classes who you consider behavior problems. For the purposes of this project behavior problems should be defined as that type of behavior - active or passive which prevents the pupil or classmates from engaging in regular classroom activities. While these problems might be caused by many different things, the cause(s) of the problem - if known - are not important in completing this task.

Research has indicated that teachers are in close agreement with mental health professionals regarding which of their pupils are in need of help. This makes a good deal of sense considering it is the classroom environment in which many of their problems are acted out. As a first step in this project will you please apply your knowledge in this area by judging your pupils service needs.

The purpose of this task is to insure the training and control teachers are matched for the number of pupils who are behavior problems.

Use the attached form and for each class you teach assign one of the three levels described below to each pupil you consider to be a behavior problem.

1. Mild behavioral problems: Pupils with behavioral problems who can be helped adequately by the regular classroom teacher and/or other school resource personnel through periodic counseling and/or short term individual attention and instruction.
2. Moderate behavioral problems: pupils with behavioral problems who can remain at their assigned school but require intensive help from one or more educational specialists (e.g., counselors and special educators) and/or specialists from community agencies (e.g., mental health clinics and diagnostic centers).

3. Severe behavioral problems: Pupils with behavioral disorders who require assignment to a special class or special school.

If a pupil is absent frequently place an A after the level you assigned.

The following points should help you with this task.

1. Do not try to second guess the score by assigning a certain number to each group - the percentage varies depending on the individual teacher and class.

2. Do not hold back on the number of pupils you assign because "the service doesn't exist anyway". Imagine it does exist and you have the opportunity to get that service for pupils who need it.

3. Do spend some quiet time making these judgments for each of your classes. On the average teachers spend five to fifteen minutes per class on this task.

Please return your responses in a sealed envelope, with my name on it to your principal as soon as possible. When all judgments have been received your status as an experimental or control group teacher will be revealed to you. If you are disappointed, remember the workshop will be conducted again for control group teachers once the research period is over.

Let me close for now by thanking you for your interest in this project. I am confident that you will find it a rewarding and informative experience.

Sincerely,

Hadley Williams.
Teacher's Judgment of Pupil Behavior Problems

Teacher
School

Period/block Starting time Grade Subject

Student name: Classification (1, 2, or 3)

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

Period/block Starting time Grade Subject

Student name: Classification (1, 2, or 3)

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

Period/block Starting time Grade Subject

Student name: Classification (1, 2, or 3)

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
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KOUNIN'S DEVIANCY MANAGEMENT RATING SCALES

Clarity

In clarity the rater seeks to categorize how much literal (not by inference) information the desist contains. From the point of view of the student who would be looking at the teacher at that moment, does the desist contain, either by actual words or by definite signals (looking or pointing directly at, motioning to "sit," finger to mouth with a "shh") the following information?

1. Who is deviant? ("Johnny" rather than "somebody.")
2. What is stop doing? ("Stop talking" rather than "stop.")
3. What to do? ("Take your seat," "Get to your work," or use of a model: "I like the way Mary is sitting.")
4. Why? ("You're disturbing others," "You might trip and get hurt.")
5. Nagging. A distinction was made between nagging and clarity. A nag consisted of a teacher bombarding or "lecturing" with content or reasons beyond which the student may be presumed to already know quite well. A nag was defined as producing a reaction on the part of the student of "O.K., O.K., I know already!"

Firmness

Firmness means the degree to which the teacher conveys an "I-mean-it" and a "now!" in the desist order. Part of
firmness comes from the manner used in sending out the message and part of firmness comes from the follow-through once the message is issued.

The message part has a "clarity" aspect: does the desist order make a clear break from the previous activity? Is it clear, precise, sharp, and have a good figure-ground contrast (all conveying a "right now!")? This is conveyed by the teacher making a clear break from her previous geographical position, stopping the previous activity, emitting a warning signal ("In a minute I'll..."), and using a tone of voice that stands out.

The reverse is "wishy-washy" and hesitant, conveyed by remaining half-in or half-returning to the previous activity, communicating uncertainty ("Well, let's see now," "I guess...").

The message-clarity part of firmness was coded as:

1. High: If the teacher used two or more of the above clarity manners.

2. Ordinary: If she used one of the above clarity manners.

3. Hesitant: If she used none of the above clarity manners or if any of the anti-clarities were present.

The follow-through aspect of firmness entails the following behaviors: moving closer to deviant, looking at firmly during and for a while after the issuance of the
order, using a "physical assist" (leading by arm, holding, moving a chair or prop), using a "repeat urge" that is not a repeat in response to a failure.

The follow-through part of firmness was scored as:

1. High: If two or more of the above behaviors are used.
2. Some: If one of the above behaviors are used.
3. None: If none of the above or had the opposite (such as immediate turning to something else before the desist was settled).

Harassed was coded to distinguish a "fake" firmness from a real firmness (much as "nagging" was distinguished from clarity). It is a desist in which the teacher is "beaten" and is "giving up." Thus she shows anger, raises her voice, or bombards with repeat orders either because her desist has already failed or because she shows she really doesn't expect conformity.

Child Treatment (Roughness)

This part of the code deals with how the child was treated in the desist. Does the child see the teacher as being for or against him in this incident?

1. Pro-child or Positive: If the teacher's manner is such as to be seen by the child as protecting him against harm then this would be coded as pro-child. (This might have negative focus, but the manner might be pro-child. "You might get hurt if you fight," could be pro-child even though there is harm in the content, if the teacher communicates an intent to protect him from being hurt. "I don't
want you to fail," may be negative in focus but pro-child here.) "Cushions" ("You may play later"), and other attempts to protect the feelings of a child would be coded as pro-child. Rewards, compliments, and praises would, of course, be coded pro-child. (It was rare to find a teacher who praised a child for deviancy. Teachers just don't say "My, but isn't it nice that Johnny hit Mary.")

2. Anti-child or Negative: This category was the equivalent of roughness in the Kindergarten Study and of anger/punitiveness in the High School Studies. Manifest negative feelings towards the deviant (anger, sarcasm) as well as threats and punishments were coded as anti-child.

3. Neutral: These were desist that contained neither negative nor positive child treatments.

Withitness
Is defined as a teacher's communicating to the children by her actual behavior (rather than be simple verbal announcing: "I know what's going on.") that she knows what the children are doing, or has the proverbial "eyes in back of her head." What kinds of teacher behaviors, and in what circumstances, provide cues to pupils as to whether the teacher does or does not know what is going on? It is not adequate to measure what a teacher knows in order to obtain a score for the degree of her withitness. It is necessary to measure what she communicates she knows. The children, after all, must get the information that she knows or doesn't know what they are doing. Each separate and distinguishable desist is
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categorized as being correct or incorrect for both the
target of the desist and for its timing.

Target mistakes consist of:

1. The teacher desists the wrong child for a deviant
act, or desisted an onlooker or contagee rather
than an initiator.

2. The teacher desists a less serious deviancy and
overlooked a more serious deviancy that was occurring at the time or that had occurred between the
time of this desist and the previous one. Thus,
if a teacher desists a child who is whispering to
a neighboring child while two children were running
around chasing each other, the event would be
categorized as a wrong target due to "more serious
ignored."

Whether the teacher uses correct or incorrect timing
is determined by whether or not the deviancy became clearly
more serious before the teacher acted. A desist is cate-
gorized as correct in timing if the misbehavior is no more
serious at the time of the desist than at the time it
started. The issue here is not how much time elapses between
the initiation of the deviancy and the teacher's doing some-
thing to stop it. Rather, the issue is whether the deviancy
increases in seriousness between the time it started and the
teacher desisted.

Timing mistakes, or being too late, consist of:

1. The deviancy spreads before it is desisted. Thus,
if two children started to whisper illegally, then
a third joined them, then a fourth joined them and
then the teacher desists for talking, the desist is
categorized as being "too late" by reason of
its having spread before the teacher stepped in.
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2. The deviancy increased in seriousness before it is desisted. Thus, if John turned around and whispered to Jim, then Jim poked John, then John poked Jim, then Jim started to pull off John's shirt and John started to pull off Jim's shirt, and then the teacher desists, the desist is coded as "too late" by reason of having increased in seriousness before the teacher does something about it.

A teacher's withitness score is obtained by dividing the total number of desists by the number of her mistake-free desists.
## APPENDIX C

### LEAST PROJECT PUPIL CODING SHEET

**Teacher’s Name**

**School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day/Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Code (insert one or more of the following codes for each pupil who fits 1-4 on each day the code(s) apply):

1. absent
2. office referral
3. requested parent conference
4. non-completion of assignment
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

P. 108-110 Classroom Environment Scale
APPENDIX D
CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT SCALE

Form S

Name ____________________ School ____________________
Age _______ Date _______ Class _______
Sex _______ Classroom subjects ____________________

How long have you been in this school?

_________________________________________________________________

How long have you been in this classroom?

_________________________________________________________________

Instructions

On the following pages are statements about high school and junior high classrooms. You are to decide which of these statements are true of this particular classroom and which are false.

True -- Circle the T when you think the statement is True or mostly True of this class.

False -- Circle the F when you think the statement is False or mostly False of this class.

Please be sure to answer every item.

Copyright, 1971 Edison J. Trickett and Rudolf H. Moos.
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Classroom Environment Scale

Form S (Short)

Name ____________________ Subject ____________________

Teacher ____________________ Time class meets ____________

T  F  1. There is a clear set of rules for students to follow.

T  F  2. The teacher takes a personal interest in students.

T  F  3. Students in this class aren't very interested in getting to know other students.

T  F  4. Almost all class time is spent on the lesson for the day.

T  F  5. If a student breaks a rule in this class, he's sure to get in trouble.

T  F  6. Students are expected to stick to classwork in this class.

T  F  7. Some students always try to see who can answer questions first.

T  F  8. Students put a lot of energy into what they do here.

T  F  9. We often spend more time discussing outside student activities than class-related material.

T  F  10. There are very few rules to follow.

T  F  11. Rules in this class seem to change a lot.

T  F  12. Students in this class get to know each other really well.

T  F  13. This teacher spends very little time just talking with students.

T  F  14. New ideas are always being tried out here.

T  F  15. The teacher explains what will happen if a student breaks a rule.

T  F  16. The teacher is not very strict.

T  F  17. This is a well-organized class.
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T  F  18. Students are almost always quiet in this class.
T  F  19. What students do in class is very different on different days.
T  F  20. The teacher is more like a friend than an authority.
T  F  21. Students daydream a lot in this class.
T  F  22. A lot of friendships have been made in this class.
T  F  23. Students try hard to get the best grade.
T  F  24. The teacher explains what the rules are.
T  F  25. Getting a certain amount of classwork done is very important in this class.
T  F  26. Students don't feel pressured to compete here.
T  F  27. Students fool around a lot in this class.
T  F  28. Students can get in trouble with the teacher for talking when they're not supposed to.
T  F  29. New and different ways of teaching are not tried very often in this class.
T  F  30. The teacher goes out of his way to help students.
T  F  31. It's easy to get a group together for a project.
T  F  32. Students are often "clock-watching" in this class.
T  F  33. The teacher likes students to try unusual projects.
T  F  34. This class is often in an uproar.
T  F  35. Most students in this class really pay attention to what the teacher is saying.
T  F  36. Students don't compete with each other here.
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KOUNIN'S STUDENT COMPLIANCE RATING SCALE

1. Immediate, quick, eager, and enthusiastic conformity. The target quickly stops the deviancy and also gets with the legal activity hurriedly.

2. Same as 1 but not quite. The target stops the deviancy quickly but unhurriedly starts the legal activity.

3. Ordinary conformity and obedience. The target stops the deviancy immediately but slowly and laggingly gets with the legal activity.

4. Same as three but not quite. Normal conformity for the cessation of deviancy but not getting with the legal activity.

5. Resistance shown. The stopping of deviancy is only partial (reduces intensity of misbehavior only, but still somewhat misbehaving) or very slow, and does not start any legal activity.

6. Same as five but not quite. More defiant than compliant.

7. Open defiance. The deviancy continues in the same manner or with more intensity.
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FACILITATOR'S GUIDE
to
The LEAST Approach to Classroom Discipline

I. INTRODUCTION

Introduce purpose, self, participants, perspective, workshop materials and authors, and workshop plan.

A. Purpose of Workshop -- Introduce goals of workshop.

1. To understand the responsibilities and limits of authority a teacher has in maintaining discipline.

2. To provide teachers with a specific and well-structured plan for "dealing with discipline" in the classroom.

B. Self -- Introduce self, position, and association.

1. Encourage questions regarding self.

2. Respond to participants in terms of feelings and concerns expressed.

C. Participants -- Introduce participants, positions, and experiences.

1. Organize groupings for workshop.

   a. With a large group of 20 or more, sample several participants.

   b. With a smaller group of less than 20, encourage all participants to introduce themselves.

2. Stimulate presentation of classroom discipline problems.

   a. Have participants present range of types of problems with which they would like to deal.

   b. Note that seminar excludes some concerns, e.g., how to punish students.

D. Perspective -- Introduce disruptive behavior in perspective.

1. Emphasize realization that student behavior is a response to the total environment of the school. Typically only 900 out of 9,000 hours a year are spent in school. Other influences include:

   a. Peers
   b. The home
   c. The community
   d. The shopping center
   e. The TV
   f. The various school settings outside the classroom.
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II. REVIEW

Review previous experiences and perspectives based upon those experiences.

A. The environment that controls the teacher

1. The teacher is an authority in the classroom, by assignment, position, and statute.

2. Questions:
   a. Job description requirements?
   b. Contract authorizations?
   c. Exclusive or special rights from teaching certificate?

3. Discuss consistency/inconsistency of answers within school districts.

B. The environment the teacher controls

1. Inquire regarding responses in group situations where someone else is in authority (like this workshop).

2. Inquire regarding participants' perceptions of student behavior that would be classified as "good."

3. Inquire regarding participants' perceptions of student behavior that would be classified as "poor."

4. Inquire regarding participants' perceptions of what they feel best about in their own teaching.

5. Inquire regarding participants' perceptions of what they are most critical about in others' teaching.

6. Inquire regarding participants' perceptions of what they are most critical about in their own teaching.

C. Preteaching assessment

1. Use student behavior stimulus situations:
   a. Elicit elaboration of a sample of several problems presented by participants during workshop introduction (Section I.C.2.a.).
   b. Use six example situations presented in the introduction to "The LEAST Approach to Classroom Discipline."
   c. Have participants write down situations they handled well and situations they mishandled or "blew."

2. Have participants write down the responses they made or would make to those situations.
3. Discuss different responses that teachers made to the situations.

   a. Discuss "school board policy" or "administrative directives" and teachers' common sense.

   b. Discuss other influences on student behavior which are not under teachers' control.

III. OVERVIEW

Present overview of key concept, principles, skill goals, and skill steps.

**Concept:** Classroom discipline
Minimizing disruptive behavior in a learning situation

**Principles:** If the teacher employs the least methods needed to attend to student behavior, then the students will engage in the least amount of disruptive behavior so that the learners will be able to learn more effectively.

**Skill Goals:** Learning the skills that make up the LEAST approach to classroom discipline

**Skills Steps:**

- **T**
  Track student progress to evaluate and reinforce student behavior

- **S**
  Spell out directions because disruption or harm will occur

- **A**
  Attend more fully because you need more information or communication

- **E**
  End the action because behavior is disrupting the classroom

- **L**
  Leave things alone because no problems are likely to occur
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IV. PRESENTATION

Present "The LEAST Approach to Classroom Discipline"

A. Present the five components of the LEAST Approach

1. Emphasize that although they appear separate and sequential, the components may function together in reality.

2. Emphasize that component #5, "Track Student Progress," is really not an option, i.e., the progress of all students should be tracked all the time.

B. Present each component of the LEAST Approach using the tell-show-do method

1. Option #1 -- Leave Things Alone
   a. Tell -- Leave things alone when no problems are likely to occur.
      (1) This does not mean to ignore behavior.
      (2) It does mean the teacher must quickly assess what is happening in terms of these three criteria:
         (a) The behavior will "go away"
         (b) No one is harmed
         (c) There is no "ripple effect."

         If these three criteria apply, then this option is a good one.

      (3) Using this option provides the teacher the opportunity that he/she needs to be aware of the behaviors of other students in the class. Too much personal attention given to one or two students often deprives other students of the attention they should be getting.

   b. Show -- Show how leaving things alone might be employed.
      (1) Elicit situations from participants where teachers had to decide whether to leave things alone.
      (2) Discuss with participants the decisions about whether to leave things alone:
         (a) Compare with three criteria
         (b) Respond to participants' feelings then and now.

---

c. Do -- Provide participants with experiences for practicing Option #1 at this time (optional, if possible).

(1) Use behavior on one participant in the workshop as a stimulus to deciding whether to leave things alone, and role-play responses.

(2) Discuss with participants the decision about whether to leave things alone.

(3) Note: Teachers are learners and act out behavior of their own students.

2. Component #5 -- Track Student Progress

Note: Skipping ahead to fifth component --

a. Tell -- Track student progress at all times.

(1) This is really not an option.

(2) The teacher must do more than trust to memory or impulse when dealing with student behavior.

(3) Teachers must keep records of student behavior.

(4) Teachers must follow through on consequences of student behavior.

b. Show -- Show how records of student behavior might be kept.

(1) Discuss behaviors to be recorded:

(a) Positive
(b) Negative.

(2) Record frequency of student demonstration of behaviors.

c. Do -- Ask all participants to develop their own tracking record.

(1) Compare and contrast different tracking records.

(2) Discuss pro's and con's of different approaches.

3. Option #2 -- End the Action Indirectly

a. Tell -- End the action when the behavior is disrupting classroom activities.

(1) The teacher ends the action indirectly when the student behavior meets these two criteria:

(a) The behavior is disruptive
(b) The situation will deteriorate.
(2) Stopping the behavior is the goal.

(3) Further intervention may aggravate a situation that is under control (return to Option #1).

(4) Remember to track the student's behavior (component #5).

b. Show -- Show how ending the action might be accomplished.

(1) Elicit situations from participants where teachers had to decide whether to end the action.

(2) Discuss common teacher behaviors in ending action:
   (a) Compare with two criteria
   (b) Respond to participants' feelings then and now.

c. Do -- Provide participants with experiences for practicing Option #2 at this time (optional, if possible).

(1) Use behavior of one participant as a stimulus to deciding whether to end the action indirectly.

(2) Discuss with participants the decision about whether to end the action indirectly.

4. Option #3 -- Attend More Fully

a. Tell -- Attend more fully when you need to obtain more information and/or communicate.

(1) The teacher attends more fully when the student behavior meets these three criteria:
   (a) The behavior or appearance is highly emotional
   (b) The student needs to know you are seeing or hearing him/her
   (c) The teacher needs to know more from the student about what is going on.

(2) Teachers frequently overlook attending more fully.

(3) After attending, the teacher may leave things alone (Option #1).

(4) After attending, the teacher should track student progress (component #5).

(5) After attending, the teacher has a better understanding of the situation.

b. Show -- Show how attending more fully might be implemented.

(1) Use immediate situation:
   (a) Use self in relation to class of teachers
   (b) Use teachers in relation to self.
(2) Discuss attending behaviors:

(a) Compare with three criteria
(b) Respond to participants' feelings.

c. Do -- Provide participants with experiences in practicing Option #3 at this time.

(1) Practice attending behaviors by role-playing teachers and students in a class:

(a) Attending physically
   . Squaring
   . Leaning
   . Making eye contact
(b) Observing
(c) Listening.

(2) Practice responding behaviors:

(a) Responding to content of expression
(b) Responding to feeling
(c) Responding to the reason for the feeling.

(3) Option #3, attend more fully, can be expanded most fully with extended time.  

5. Option #4 -- Spell Out Directions

a. Tell -- Spell out directions when disruption and/or harm will occur.

(1) The teacher spells out directions when student behavior meets these two criteria:

(a) The disruption precludes further learning
(b) Students are risking harm to themselves or others.

(2) Many teachers start discipline control at this point -- effectiveness is diluted.

(3) Note the components of direction:

[a] What to do
[b] The consequences.

b. Show -- Show how spelling out directions might be implemented.

(1) Spell out directions for one participant in the group regarding homework assignment.

---

(2) Discuss comprehensiveness of directions:
   (a) Compare two criteria
   (b) Respond to participants' feelings.

c. Do -- Provide participants with experience in practicing Option #4 at this time.

(1) Practice spelling out directions in response to role-played student behavior.

(2) Discuss difficulty in implementing Option #4.

V. EXERCISES

Provide assignments for acquisition and application of LEAST Approach skills

A. Provide role-playing opportunities

1. Organize participants to role-play students and teachers in front of the large group.
   a. Have one or more participants present different difficult situations requiring application of the LEAST Approach.
   b. Have different participants role-play the teachers and develop responses to the situations.
   c. Discuss the decisions that were made concerning the application of different components of the LEAST Approach.

2. Organize participants in groups of 5-10 and repeat the above steps.

B. Provide schoolwork/homework assignments

1. Develop simple individual programs for application of the LEAST Approach in the teachers' school settings.

2. Implement the programs in the real-life school settings.

3. Make arrangements for teachers to get together in functional groups one or more times, at their convenience, to critique their application of the LEAST Approach.
VI. SUMMARY

Summarize the learnings of "The LEAST Approach to Classroom Discipline."

A. Conduct post-teaching assignment.
   1. Use student behavior stimulus situations (see I.C.2.a. or the introduction to the LEAST Approach).
   2. Have participants record their responses to these situations.
   3. Compare post-teaching responses to preteaching responses.
   4. Discuss differences in pre- and post-teaching responses.
   5. Analyze which components of the LEAST Approach were utilized and which were not in each assessment.

B. Summarize the contributions of "The LEAST Approach to Classroom Discipline."
   1. The LEAST Approach requires minimum investment and produces maximum returns for teachers.
      a. It is the LEAST the teacher can do.
      b. It elicits the LEAST disruptive behavior.
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DEVIANCY MANAGEMENT SKILLS RATING FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop What</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start What</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firmness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- geographical break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- stop previous activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- tone of voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- move closer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- eye contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- physical contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- repeat urge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withitness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- wrong st.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- less serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- spreads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- increases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1 to 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions:
1. For each incident signify the presence or absence of each teacher behavior by placing a 1 (presence) or 0 (absence) in the appropriate box.
2. For child treatment signify 0 (absence) 1 (neutral) 2 (presence) as defined in the child treatment scale.
3. Rate subsequent pupil compliance from 1 to 7 as per the pupil compliance rating scale.

Teacher ____________________  Date ____________________
School ____________________  Period/subject _____________
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